



James L. Caswell, Chair (208-365-7420)

jcaswell@ig.com

Dale R. Harris, Vice-Chair (406-240-2809)

dharris@bigsky.net

Meeting Notes

Idaho Panhandle NF, Supervisors Office

Coeur d'Alene, ID

March 13-14, 2013

Wednesday, March 13

Attendees

Commission Members: Jim Caswell, Chair; Dale Harris, Vice-Chair; Patty Perry, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho; Robert Cope, Lemhi County Commissioner; Alex Irby, Knonkolville Lumber; Alan Prouty, Simplot; Kathy Rinaldi, Teton County Commissioner (via phone); Bill Higgins, Idaho Forest Group, LLC; Scott Stouder, Trout Unlimited; Dan Dinning, Boundary County Commissioner; Rick Johnson, Idaho Conservation League (via VTC).

Others Present: Mitch Silvers, Senator Crapo's office; Scott Carlton, Representative Labrador's office; Mike Hanna, Senator Risch's Office; Brad Smith, Idaho Conservation League; Sid Smith, Senator Risch's Office; Karen Roetter, Senator Crapo's Office; Aaron Calkins, Congressman Labrador's Office; Kelli Rosellini, note-taker.

Forest Service: Faye Krueger, R1 Regional Forester (via VTC); Jane Cottrell, R1 Deputy Regional Forester; Anne Davy, R1/R4 Idaho Roadless Coordinator; Mary Farnsworth, Forest Supervisor, Idaho Panhandle NFs (IPNF); Christine Dawe, Deputy Forest Supervisor, IPNF; Karl Dekome, Forest Environmental Planner, IPNF; Shanda Dekome, Ecosystems Staff Officer, IPNF; Lisa Spinelli, DFMO, IPNF; Wade Sims, District Ranger, IPNF; Linda McFadden, District Ranger, IPNF; Rick Brazell, Forest Supervisor, Nez-Clearwater NF; Joe Hudson, District Ranger, Nez-Clearwater NF; Craig Trulock, District Ranger, Nez-Clearwater NF; Mark Craig, District Ranger, Nez-Clearwater NF; Norma Staaf, Forest Environmental Coordinator, Nez-Clearwater NF; Lois Hill, NEPA Team Leader, Nez-Clearwater NF; Mike Ward, CFLRA Coordinator, Nez-Clearwater NF; Matt Bienkowski, Silviculturist, Nez-Clearwater NF. Via video Rob Mickelsen, Branch Chief, Caribou-Targhee NF; Lisa Klinger, District Ranger, Payette NF; Andrew Peterson, Recreation Specialist, Payette NF; Jeff Huntzman, Environmental Coordinator, Payette NF; Bobbi Filbert, Wildlife Biologist, Sawtooth NF; Carol Brown, Environmental Coordinator, Sawtooth NF.

Welcome and Introductions

November 11, 2012 Notes and Action Items

Add to the notes under the presentation by Kent Wilmer – “the description of alternative C is strengthened so it can be implemented without a rule change.” *Approved*

In looking at the Panhandle Report, there was support for making changes and one supported Alternative – going forward, would we be better served (in case of land designation) that meets the rule, but so can another? Show which alternatives best support the spirit of the Rule. The letter was discussed at length before it went to the Governor.

While a particular project may be aligned with the rule and may be permissible in terms of process, we should not term it that the Commission supports any one position as this negates the individual representation of organizations and some may have a need to approach a project in a different light. Be careful of the type of documentation. Deem that it is “in compliance” with the Rule.

Mileage charts and travel expense forms were distributed to the group.

General Updates and Reminders

Briefing papers have been distributed for the Significant Risk discussion to occur in detail later today. There are two segments: the Preamble and the Rule. The Preamble gives better understanding of Public Comment treatment by the Dept of Agriculture before determination. To be more informed, please read these documents. During the discussion, there will be an additional handout dealing with the essence of Significant Risk. This will be regarding areas outside the CPZ. When we have a project from FS, we want to be informed and able to address the project. This will be an ongoing discussion and development of a better understanding of Significant Risk. A previous RO suggested that we address this and have a better understanding so when we have a project outside the CPZ we will not struggle with decision making.

Tomorrow, we will be focused on Planning on both the last update from the Panhandle and the Clearwater/Nez Perce as well as projects on both forests.

Finally, Harv retired in January and it has come to our attention that he is extremely ill. Our best wishes are with him.

Litigation Update

We won! Most have seen the short Opinion. We felt very confident in the case, so this is a great decision. There are 60 days in which to file an appeal. We do know that a representative in Washington DC met with Secretary of Agriculture, Governor and others and their report indicated the Secretary was elated with the decision and how well things were going.

Modifications and Corrections

We have in-holdings that were submitted last September to WDC and have wound its way past the elections. It's been through Regional Management Services, through Budget and analysis, through OMB and it looks like it may be published in Federal Register next week for 45 day public comment period. OMB would like to know the public comments and how we respond.

Call from United States Senator James Risch

...excerpts...

Thank you for the time to talk from Washington DC. I would consider this a victory lap for all of us with regards to the Roadless Rule. We should not only pat ourselves on the back for our hard work, but to take a

deep breath and look at the new way we are doing business. We are the only State in the Union that is the master of their own destiny over 9 million acres of land for the State of Idaho. What we've done here is to set a model, referred to in DC frequently, as how collaboration should take place for environmental issues. There is no one way, or one size fits all, but definitely the philosophy and model of getting people to the table and coming away with something for everyone for the issues. I also think it's important, that what we've done is write a rule, or system or process, to manage these lands that will be around for a long time. At some point in time, someone may try to pass a bill to move these lands into another designation, but until then, I think it will be difficult for anyone to change the system and process the way we have it set up.

PROJECT UPDATES, NEW PROJECTS and FOREST PLAN REVISION

Payette National Forest

Lisa Klinger, District Ranger; Andrew Peterson, Recreation Specialist; Jeff Hunteman, Environmental Coordinator via VTC

Initial Briefing: Twenty-mile Trail Relocation (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *Where are you with the process?* We are currently scoping both projects. This is almost complete (within couple of days). After Scoping, we will look at issues raised through Scoping and consider any proposed changes. Both Tribes have concurred with the projects as proposed. We will then complete NEPA and work towards implementation.
- *Talk to us about motorized trail and maintenance?* The current TMP does have this trail open to 2 wheeled travel; but is not designated for stock. Through this project we aren't making a TMP decision, only seeking to improve the trail.
- *Is it motorized the whole way?* Yes, two wheeled motorized, all the way through.
- *What kind of reconstruction?* We will be re-routing the trail to a different location (via Pulaski, shovels, etc.), and having most work done through volunteers (Mountain Bike Club, Boy Scouts, etc). The older sections will be decommissioned. The most difficult part will be to deal with erosion and keeping people from using the old trail.
- *Considering that it has been 19 years since fire has visited the landscape, do you consider this area stabilized?* The original trail layout was engineered prior to the fire, when there was less water movement. The existing trail is not holding up. The re-engineered trail will be better designed to handle runoff.
- *What is the schedule?* Hopefully get through NEPA this spring and have work commence this summer.
- *Is any of this area in Recommended Wilderness?* Yes, and it still fits within the designation of Wildland Recreation. *I was more concerned with motorized access.* At this point it is still "recommended", and right now they even have chainsaw use.

- *With regards to the previous question regarding water and reconstruction, will this enable an increased level or will more construction be needed?* We believe new construction engineering will enable the road deal with an increased capacity of water. This area has firmed off from lack of vegetation the due to previous fires. With the lack of large vegetation, this has increased erosion and sedimentation and the projects purpose is to reduce that sediment and put the trail where it will not contribute to further sedimentation.
- *To be clear, you're moving the trail from the lowland meadows and to the upland slope, where the meadows have increased water from previous fire?* Yes, true for about half. For the other half, the trail was built on a straight grade, which was fine in the past.
- *So, you're building drainage?* Yes.
- *Does a motorized trail change the construction standards?* If the trail were open to pack and trail only, the tread width would be 18", but for 2 wheeled vehicles it is 24". Otherwise, there is no significant difference.
- *The drainage would still be put in?* Yes, and proposed location would not change regardless of motorized access.

Does this project meet the intent of the Rule for Wildland Recreation? Agreed

Initial Briefing: Bear Pete Trail Relocation (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *Will this be a CE or EA?* CE, trail reconstruction.

Does this project meet the intent of the Rule for Wildland Recreation? Agreed

Caribou-Targhee National Forest

Robert Mickelsen, Branch Chief and Brent Larson, Forest Supervisor via VTC

Project Update: Husky Mine (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

Discussion:

- *We previously agreed this was the right thing to do, but there was question about the actual boundary issues relating to GPS work.* Yes, that was our initial discussion. We've since pinned the location down with GPS and know we need to make an adjustment based on knowledge.
- *What about the acreage to Forest Plan Special Area?* Less than 1 acre in general forest and less than 3 acres in Back Country Restoration.
- *From the last meeting the decision was to move forward with the proposed?* This must still go through the entire Rule Making Process, along with EIS and Public Comment.

- *Why is this tied to the EIS?*
- *Does the EIS have the pipeline relocated?* Our intent is to move forward with Rule Making before the Decision comes out.
- *What's the protocol for the outcome of this, as it's a correction, we've previously agreed that it's appropriate, the pipeline is already there and there are no alternatives for its location in the EIS.*
- *Is the road now there physically?* There was an access road when they built the pipeline, and we don't drive the pipeline every year.
- *Would there be construction involved for public use?* Along the pipeline there is no existing road open to the public, the proposal is to build one along there.
- *The precedent I see, are we saying the intent of the original line is where the green line is? Was the original intent to be down by the pipeline? I think this may be a recurring issue regarding boundary adjustments and with projects adjacent to Roadless where you look at the map of the boundary and it doesn't make sense where you can clearly see the intent was to follow a different line. It would be good to have a protocol for this Commission to interpret the intent of a boundary, and make GIS Mapping Corrections.*
- *We had several of those at our initial meeting.*
- *What is our next step?* A letter to the Governor, in turn to the Forest Service, that the State supports the change to the boundary? Wording may matter. As we run into these mapping areas in the future, it would be nice to look back and see previous decisions that could lead us to the same type of decision. Can we state why the Commission might recommend why the FS should go ahead with the re-route of the Boundary?
- *It's obvious we have an existing pipeline running in and out of the boundary, and the pipeline has been there since 1983.*

Draft a letter to the Governor that the Proposal is supported. Agreed

Project Update: Gibson Jack Trailhead Relocation (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *The cherry stem to be converted to Roadless, the trail would become non-motorized? It would remain a motorized trail.*
- *If you return to our 2012 Decision, we generally supported the Boundary Modification, versus a theme change, and since we were basically trading acres for acres it was supported. We committed to writing a letter supporting the Boundary Change, but they (the FS) wanted to get further down the NEPA process before requesting that support letter.*

Support the decision to go through the Boundary Modification Process. Approved

Initial Briefing: Smoky Canyon Mine Panel G Modification (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *As we've further looked at how to mine this, we've discovered that to get to the phosphate there we need to expand to the SE. What we've proposed changing, after rebuilding this area post-mining, to provide ground cover (synthetic) and protection to prevent erosion. There's been a technology advancement from 2004 on the ground cover, and that's contributed to the project. Also, there is a spring located near the area and the over burden was moved to avoid that spring.*
- *We went through the KPOA's more than anything else, does your recollection fit with what you see here? Absolutely.*

Sawtooth National Forest

Bobbi Filbert, Wildlife Biologist and Carol Brown, Environmental Coordinator via conference call

Initial Briefing: Salmon River Headwater Road 215 (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *On the map, is the red line is the proposed trail? Yes. The black dashed mark is just the overall project boundary.*
- *Given this is in Custer County, what is their opinion? This project is in Blaine County and we are just beginning to scope. It may appear to be in Custer County, but the Salmon River headwaters are in Blaine County – the Custer County border is about 20 miles north of the project area. The Blaine-Custer County line runs through the middle of the Sawtooth valley.*
- *It appears there may be vehicle traffic there, and how much usage there is? We know that primary use there is single track motorcycle route that actually connects to the Fairfield Ranger District. The project is in a Special Area: Wild and Scenic Rivers. This proposal would meet the W&SR criteria.*
- *Is there a question for this Committee? No, it's mostly for information.*
- *Please visit with the appropriate County Officials.*
- *Does the road to the north go into another county? That is a dirt road (FR 215) locally known as the Chemeketan Road. It connects to Idaho State Highway 75. If you continue north on State Highway 75, it is approximately 15 miles to the Custer County line.*

Initial Briefing: Deer Creek Watershed Project (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *Can you describe the Roadless Area: Buttercup Mountain IRA lies within the project area. Roughly 25% (14,000 acres) of the roadless area is in the project area. Treatments for prescribed fire are proposed. Prescribed fire treatment areas within the IRA total 10,300 acres, but we are prescribed burning on just over 5,000 acres, or 9% of the IRA.*

- *Is this area designated Primitive?* The IRA within the project area is designated as Primitive. Bald Mountain, which is not in the project area, is also within the IRA (just north) and has a special recreation designation.
- *How much beetle infestation?* Insect and disease is active, we aren't certain regarding beetle activity, but it is widespread in the project area. Mistletoe infection levels are very heavy in the drainage. The 2007 Castle Rock fire bound the project to the north and there has been beetle activity out of that area into the west and into the Bald Mountain area.
- *Would we lose the trees anyway?* The stands we are targeting are large and medium sized trees. We just finished our Wildlife Conservation Strategy (amending the Sawtooth Forest Plan) and this will do a lot for wildlife. This is Douglas fir and Subalpine Fir with a little bit of White Bark Pine on the upper ridges.
- *Seasonally, when will you prescribe burn?* We've identified fall burning, and are analyzing for spring burning. We are expecting a window between June-August where we would not want to burn due to elk calving and bird nesting. We have put out initial scoping to interested parties and user groups, and our draft EA will be out in early May. We hope for a decision in July and be ready to implement in the next fiscal year.
- *If you're burning and treating in the Roadless Area, what will you do on the east portion to protect it?* Outside the roadless area, we have roads perpendicular to the Deer Creek Main Road (north to south) and we will perform thinning (500 ft off roads) to create a fuel break for suppression purposes. Also, we've identified 425 acres for understory thinning in large tree stands of Douglas fir and other small timber treatments, including a precommercial thinning treatment and a timber harvest treatment of conifer encroachment in aspen stands.
- *Is that merchantable?* The drainage is very steep and not conducive to new road development. Opportunities available will be considered. Most will be contract work. It's not that roads aren't allowed, it's just that it's not terrain conducive.
- *Where is this from Liberal Willow?* The Liberal Willow project is located in a different drainage on the other side of the Deer Creek drainage, directly to the west.
- We've had recent large fires just west of Hailey in the drainage to the south and the Castle Rock Fire in 2007 in the drainages to the north of Deer Creek. This past summer we had a 250 acre fire in Deer Creek and in the late 1800s there was a very large fire in the Deer Creek drainage. There is a large residential community at the end of the drainage where the drainage connects to the Wood River Valley. The Deer Creek drainage is a realistic place to be implementing treatments when considering values at risk and recent fire history.
- *It's a lot to easier and cheaper to have someone to commercially remove the timber rather than to pay someone to contract it.* Our silviculturist will consider that.
- *Does Blaine County CWPP identify that as a priority area?* We will speak to our Fuels Specialist, and yes it is identified as a Priority Area. *Is Blaine County involved in that conversation?* Yes.

Salmon-Challis National Forest

Anne Davy

Project Update: Upper North Fork Project (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed) Discussion:

- *Why the delay?* The temp road of Pierce Creek is still on the agenda, and everything is behind as nothing happened last year. The fires did not help. There was 600,000 acres burned and that included their budget and crew time.
- *What about the effort to collect data, was it dropped, or what happened?* They looked into it, and it's just that the data wasn't ready. They had 20-25 starts in the Frank Church, and they went with initial attack and were successful on all but two – the Mustang and Hughes Creek.
- *Any re-scoping or design?* No. The fires that burned that way stopped at the Hughes Creek fire. This was our Field Trip Project.

Project Update: Thompson Creek Mine Land Exchange (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Not a lot has changed since November. The Feasibility Analysis has been completed. Unfortunately, the RO review was not complete in time for this meeting. This review will determine pursuit of the change. If approved, the next step will be to initiate the ATI, and that develops the timeline. It will be years down the road before it's completed.

- *Why enter the Roadless Area?* We haven't heard yet. They have scaled back their operations and reduced their staff.

Boise National Forest

Anne Davy

Project Update: Big Creek Whitebark Pine Enhancement Project (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

In the briefing paper, the update is highlighted. They are in the 30 day Comment Period and expect to make a Decision this Fiscal Year, but have not received funding yet.

Project Update: Stolle Priority Watershed Reforestation Project (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

This project Decision has been signed, the legal notice was published on March 7th, and no appeals were filed. Implementation will take place when funding is available.

COMMISSION WORKSHOP

Significant Risk: What does it mean and how is it applied under the Rule?

One page "Significant Risk" handout given to group. The Rule and The Preamble say much the same thing, but informatively speaking to the Preamble it shows you what the public had to say between the Draft and Final Rule and how the Forest Service responded to that and their mindset surrounding those comments. It also gives insight as to what RACNAC thought and what their conversations were as they reviewed the Draft.

We pushed strongly for a Commission and knew we'd have a discussion about Significant Risk, which is an alternative to Imminent Threat. We needed a Rule that provided exceptions and permissions. The Rule needed to be flexible enough to deal with circumstances that were critical, and that the Roadless values and characteristics needed to be considered at the same time; the entire conversation that revolved around Communities at Risk. We realized we had the HFRA law already passed, and someone brought the idea of Significant Risk.

The big problem we ran into over again and again was to really define Significant Risk. The problem was making definitions with our Forest History Maps. There are no models that fit the Salmon Challis, and it's difficult to quantify.

To provide perspective, in the National Arena, we were looking to gain buy in from a top-down and bottom-up. There were tipping points where we understood that we could pull this off.

Significant Risk was to be used infrequently.

We're talking about Back Country Restoration only, and we're talking about outside the CPZ. If you have an At Risk Community, from HFRA, or you have a municipal watershed you have the two criteria where you can think of applying this rule. The activity has to deal with fuels and be connected to one of those communities.

Temporary Roads was the inhibiting factor to consensus.

We need to create guidelines for the FS and consider the principles, which you must think about before you even come forward with a proposal. It's not unlike the working paper we use for CPZ, which has been very well articulated and laid out. It will define how we will deal with the ½ mile and how the Forest Service can expect when they bring a project forward. We need the same kind of result we came up with for CPZ.

When I think about the rule, there was a lot of discussion about this and an aspect was "technical basis for the RO to make a decision." If someone brings a proposal for a temp road, and the rule speaks of two criteria: fire history and fire risk, they need the case why that road is needed.

It's not just about roads, it's cutting and harvest of trees, and what infrastructure you need for that – helicopter landings, or temp road systems.

What about timber harvest in Back Country Restoration for reasons other than Communities at Risk? I'm thinking about wildlife benefits? Are we going to get there?

The whole thing was based on Communities at Risk.

The first filter: close to a Communities at Risk?

Filter two: Does it add value to the Roadless Value and Characteristics?

There are 8 categories for which you can cut trees in Back Country Restoration:

1. Communities at Risk
2. Outside of a CPZ
3. TES Species
4. Maintenance/Restoration of NEPA components
5. (remainder not outlined)

It seems that where you are dealing with (c)(i) is to deal with CPZ, and (c)(ii) is to deal with outside the CPZ.

- The Significant Risk was risk to a community, outside the CPZ. The rest of the filters still had to be applied.
- You may have areas well outside the CPZ, but what if you are attempting to perform wildlife habitat.
- Is there help in the Preamble? It says the balance tips to the community when inside a CPZ, and outside the CPZ the Significant Risk deals with hazardous fuels.

Resulting Questions and Comments:

- How to quantify Significant Risk?
- Define Technical Basis for the Regional Forester to perform Decision Making
 - Not strictly focused on roads, include transportation, vegetation management
- Timber Harvest within Back Country Restoration for reasons other than Communities at Risk, consider Wildlife Habitat?
- Possible Temporary Road Construction guidance document needed.
- Clarify “inside/outside” CPZ risk situation and capabilities; does the rest stand alone?
- The difference between the Idaho Rule and every other rule across the nation is that the Idaho Rule is flexible enough to allow the Agency to do what is necessary to maintain the forest. While meeting the spirit and intent of the Rule.
- *Research grammatical expression for purposes of defining when semi-colons and colon use link requirements together or separate them.*

Thursday, March 14

**A Word from the Governor’s Legal Counsel Tom Perry regarding Significant Risk
(via Jim Caswell)**

Post discussion from yesterday, there were a lot of changes between Draft and Final for the Rule. There is truth in looking at final plans (Panhandle National Forest) and the allocation between Draft and Final. After speaking with Tom Perry, and insight into the RACNAC discussions, if you go to the Rule under Back Country Restoration I and II – the CPZ has 1 – 1.5 miles can have roads and necessary use. Then there is Significant Risk which is ii, also involves the ability to build roads. iii – viii are standalone. Yes, they are standalone. You could do a project to benefit Threatened & Endangered (T&E). You could do a project to maintain or restore ecosystem goals. However, you cannot build a road to perform iii – viii. If you review section 294(23) and review the road prohibitions and permissions, those are identical to what was in the 2001 Rule. You cannot build a road to get to those locations. That includes temporary roads or otherwise.

Looking at iii, under Back Country Restoration, “the activities in may use any forest road or temporary road..... until decommissioned.” If you had a Significant Risk project and you built a temp road to achieve the goals, and along the way you had a piece where you needed ecological permissions, or T&E permissions, you could do those projects off that road, until the original intent of the project was completed – then you have to roll up the road. If you return to the Preamble, under Alternative I, (page 64...it talks about the 2001 Rule and Harvest Activity and goes through to explain prohibitions and what was allowed and not allowed, and incorporates those into this Rule. So there is precedence for that rationale.

So, why number v? Is it out of context? To reduce the risk of uncharacteristic fire, the argument was that they wanted to separate iv from v. Because there was a particular timber type they were concerned they wouldn’t be able to treat. Not to tie to composition, structure or process. There will be some research into this issue. They are distinct from one another.

PROJECT UPDATES, NEW PROJECTS and FOREST PLAN REVISIONS

Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest

Rick Brazell, Forest Supervisor; Joyce Thompson, Planning Staff Officer; Norma Staaf, Environmental Coordinator; Joe Hudson, District Ranger; Mike Ward, CFLRP Coordinator; Craig Trulock, District Ranger; Lois Hill, NEPA Coordinator

Project Update: Orogrande Fuels Project (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

The McGuire fire burned with high severity within 1.5 miles of the area, causing another evacuation of the community of Orogrande. This was the second evacuation within 5 years. Post fire, we reviewed the effects of the fire and we’d like to move forward with the project sooner rather than later. With regards to entry once every 10 years (FP), there was a decision to implement a FP Revision to implement in 2014 rather than 2016. We are contacting initial respondents to the Scoping and informing them of the decision.

We plan to have comment EA out by this fall. The Team Leader is on the fire team.

Discussion:

- *What happened to the Road Connection with the Tribe? Last time, the notes indicate there is a Tribal Project below the road – they are cleaning up tailings along creek and were part of the reason they were talking about Amendment Issues. What happened to the Accumulated Effects?* Yes, it's an issue, but it is unrelated to Roadless but still slows down the project.
- *Is the Tribe performing the NEPA for that?* Separately for the Crooked River meanders and the road.
- *The realignment is just a portion of the old road?* Yes, where it comes down steeply as it relates to the Tribal road project. For the temporary road, the Forest took the Commission's recommendation and are not using the existing road that's in the roadless area, but putting in a stand-alone temporary road that will be decommissioned at the conclusion of the project.
- *Regarding the Rattlesnake Fire, how much burned into the Snake Fire?* They are opposite sides, and when you come out of the canyon the burn frequency is annual anyway. You have probably done some protection around 2/3 of the community.
- *Is this a HFRA Project?* No
- *Other than the need for the FP Amendment, are there any changes since the tour?* There was discussion regarding location of the temporary road.
- *The FP Amendment, the entry dates are spaced out due to watershed condition – are you confident that the detrimental soil disturbance to the watershed fisheries?* The analysis will still be completed to review that. At this time, we feel we will meet standards.
- *Last time, it was April for the NEPA, now it is fall?* Yes. The project was not re-scoped, but a letter was sent to those who commented saying we would now be doing an amendment, which will be sent out this month. The Tribe does not have to do an amendment because of the way Appendix A is written – the Crooked River realignment is not an entry.
- *When would implementation begin?* 2015

Update: Nez Perce/Clearwater Forest Plan Revision

Since the last briefing of the IRC, the NPC has held five Revision Collaborative Meetings and covered the topics listed below. The Forest also held five community check in meetings in Orofino, Grangeville, Moscow, Lewiston and Lolo, MT to share information about the collaboration and invite others to participate. As a result of the check in meetings, a few more people participated in our last collaborative meeting. There have been approximately 50 to 60 individuals participating.

We have decided to slow down a bit and will not meet again until the fall.

We have also told people that we are not taking on the IRR. If something shows up, like the Slurry Line from yesterday, we're not going to make any recommendations we will only forward any Red Flags that we see.

Discussion:

- *What about the involvement of Tony Tooke?* We were going to be re-evaluating some processes after discussions with them. Interpretations of FACA, and our historical training on the subject, indicated that FACA got involved at NEPA but that isn't true. It engages a lot earlier.
- *Was it good to have Jim present?* It was great to have 101 on the IRR. It was well received and people really enjoyed it. Thanks for presenting.
- *Do the Directives speak to the IRR?* The State specific rules are referenced in Chapter 7. We talked about this last night and it will be reviewed again as it could impact the Rule. We don't have a definitive answer on that yet. Recommended Wilderness, under draft directives, could include roads and structures we normally would not like to see in RW.
- *When do you deal with issues related to IRR?* May. This will be a robust discussion. This should be in Grangeville, but could be in Orofino. We have them where we have the best VTC locations.

Initial Briefing: Roadside Hazard Tree Removal (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

Discussion:

- *Timing?* This is on accelerated timeframe for NEPA, we plan to have a comment EA out by March and 105 days to Decision. If we make it through without appeal, we could implement this fall. Archeology will proceed ahead of us. Some areas we have already cleared and can be expedited. Hopefully, by first of April, we'd get a Decision.
- *There wouldn't be any reconstruction?* Yes, all roads on existing transportation system. No temp roads, landing pads, or otherwise.
- *Are these roads closed now due to safety?* No, due to snow. After each fire, the obvious hazard trees were removed and we know that deterioration and time will increase other hazard trees that are likely to fall in the next 5-7 years. If we only looked at the near term (1 year) that would increase the cost too high.
- A goal of this is to take advantage of tree mortality before the wood product loses value and the timber industry can have product and the FS can get the project to pay its way out of the woods. There is a time element.
- *We talked a lot about timing and how it makes all the difference in the world and how it affects the commodity.*
- *What I am reading is that you can perform the activity without constructing new roads?* Yes, no new roads.
- *Are these roads to be open within all the alternatives of the TMP?* Yes.
- *I'm interested to hear about R&A areas, which isn't relative to the IRR, but I would like to hear more.*

Does this project meet the intent of the Rule? Yes

Hypothetical Example Discussion

Using this example, is there a prohibition to implement a project, without any new roads, to log commercially harvest that timber in that Roadless area that has been burned? Any prohibition? If the FS isn't constructing any new roads, does the IRR prevent going beyond that 100 feet on a timber salvage sale?

- Based on our earlier discussion, it has to fall under one of the categories iii, iv or v. So, yes, you could develop a project that meets an ecological purpose (because it burned), and theoretically, yes you could.
- A lot of those fires create new fuel, as the trees may be dead but not burned.
- Perform the analysis; if there is anything in the Rule that precludes it then you stop, if there isn't than you don't have to. But, it doesn't indicate that you have to perform it either.
- Large tree retention has to be part of the mix, so do the other directives.
- It does put side boards around it.

Initial Briefing: Clear Creek (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *This is a collaborative built project through CBC? Yes.*
- *Only 16 comments? Yes. For the whole project. And, mostly they were regulatory agencies commenting that we follow rules and regulations for the IRR.*
- *What are the total treatment acres? Roughly 9000 acres of commercial harvest, there is pre-commercial thinning, and prescribed fire – about 10,000 acres total.*
- *In terms of IRR, there is about 1400 acres of prescribed fire, and the rest would be handlines? Yes.*
- *Just an observation, on the map there is a trail system inside the boundary? Yes*
- *There is no protocol, to date, on the Commission that you have to bring us a project prior to Scoping.*
- *What do you need from us at this stage?*
- *It would be great if we could add value to the process, rather than just being a sounding board.*
- *When a project is as well set and within the guidelines, it only takes a short time.*
- *Thank you for the clarification, and I agree that it could have come forward sooner.*

Does this meet the intent of the Rule? Agreed

Draft a letter to the Forest, for record, that it meets the intent of the Rule. Agreed

Initial Briefing: Lolo Insect and Disease (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *The insects are pine bark beetles, so are you intending to replace the stand with insect resistant species? Yes*
- *Is White Pine a threatened species? Not at this time. White Bark Pine, a different species, is.*
- *This is pre-Scoping? Yes.*
- *The mechanical harvest is all going to be ground based? Skidders and line machines.*
- *Using existing road to reach out? Yes*
- *I encouraged them to bring this forward, as when on the field trip we recognized that we were working on one side of the road but not the other, only because of the IRR. It was pretty level along the ridge top and seemed like a logical place to harvest. We also saw where fires had erupted out of the IRA's into harvestable timber. One of the goals of the FP in this area is to restore White Pine, so I favor anything we can do to help projects like this.*
- *If this alternative is selected, and is compliant, a lot of the issues around boundaries would dissipate. Most projects do deal with ecological objectives, and while maintaining the Roadless Character, the ecological objectives are the same on both sides of the boundary.*
- *In maximizing the retention of the large trees, all treatments we are doing are performing that function. We are working on Western Larch and White Pine, and leaving them on all sites and leave that stand component.*
- *You leave large Doug Fir, even if it's infected? Yes, it's woody debris recruitment.*
- *Would this be a Stewardship Contract? Under NFMA, whenever we do a harvest, we have to replant and we are choosing White Pine.*
- *I believe this complies with the Rule, and helps to satisfy other needs within the Region.*
- *I see that we are to ensure the project meets with the spirit and intent of the Rule.*
- *This would be the first time there would be another component of the Rule being used, without being directly adjacent to a CPZ.*
- *I hear a lot of "why hear and why now?" The unit pool we are Scoping is about 5,000 acres total, so we are doing all of the similar stands in the drainage that meet the same criteria. We are trying to manage the entire landscape using the approach.*
- *I think not so much "why here", but more "why not?"*
- *What is the timing? Scheduled to have a Decision October 2014 and the first sale in 2016.*
- *I know that there are concerns with the project through CBC and we'll vet those through that venue. As far as the Rule is concerned, it seems consistent.*

- *In looking at 2 – any action authorized pursuant to ii through v, the conditions set – procedurally, would we expect that the RO would issue a letter or document that this project meets these three conditions? I think it provides technical credibility.*
- *Are you seeing this as a Stand Alone Document, or incorporation? There needs to be something from the RO, and indicates the conditions are met and how. We should have the opportunity to look at that and see if we agree. It needs to come back to the Commission. It must be a high bar.*
- *So, before the EIS goes out to the Public, it would be a proper time to return.*
- *Yes, between now and then, we'll ask about the project again. Just for an update. At your next meeting, we could inform you of the Scoping Comments.*
- *Recognizing Brad Smith: Are there areas outside of Roadless that should be addressed. Think about context. Secondly, when we see regeneration harvest, it raises a Red Flag, but we are confident that those concerns will be vetted through the CBC.*
- *We will look at how the Regional Forester responds and how that is appropriate. It's within the Roadless Rule that helicopter logging could be performed, but we declined that due to economic reasons? Yes. We are talking 17-22 years that some of these stand tending activities would occur, so for us to make the commitment to Stewardship Contracting, we couldn't do that.*
- *Within the Back Country Restoration, these activities are permissible. Yes.*
- *We are setting a bit of precedence, and if we are – we need to meet the intent and have it embedded in the monitoring in the EIS. We should tie that specifically to the monitoring, so we know somewhere down the road if we achieved what we set out to do.*

Idaho Panhandle National Forest

Lisa Spinelli, Project Leader; Wade Sims, District Ranger; Mary Farnsworth, Forest Supervisor; Linda McFadden, District Ranger

Project Update: Simmons Landscape Fuels (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

Update: Releasing Legal Comment letter and a Decision is imminent. Specifically with regard to why timber harvest is not a part of this project, there are a variety of Forest Management Areas within the project area and a majority of those do not permit harvest. Landscape burning, regardless of harvest, was to be the major tool to accomplish the purpose and need. The units that permit harvest are 1, 2 and 3 and a portion of unit 9. That's the only place that roads exist to get in and harvest. With the condition of the timber, it's lodgepole pine which is rapidly deteriorating, and lack of accessibility to areas does not provide real economic feasibility. Helicopter logging is prohibitively expensive and wasn't considered.

Discussion:

- *Did you coordinate with the Lolo? Coming up to the State Line, it's not as heavily timbered and there are a lot of lakes.*

- *Any changes in timing?* The legal comment letter had a slight adjustment; we are expecting implementation of a fall burning. More work performed in 2014.
- There is the 391I Road, which ends at Heller Ridge installed in the late '70s and there has never been any harvest in this area because of the 1910 effects.
- South of Spruce Tree campground (Unit 11) is a trail and the Wild & Scenic River around Spruce Tree is Wild and Recreation.
- A complicating factor in the Upper Joe is that there is only one bidder and at the time of project development they were not available to participate.
- *I recommend that you take industry representatives into the stand and see if they agree with your analysis, as the FS should not be making the economic feasibility decisions for industry.* Yes, will do.
- 1, 2, 3 and 9 currently have roads that could be harvested from, and 7 and 8 are the top of Simmons Peak which wouldn't provide much for logging.
- *You're going to burn in the fall, that's when all the hunters will be in there, how will you inform them?* We have a similar project just south, Heller's Cascade, and part of the criteria is to post signs, put on website, a prescribed fire website, press releases and we also post every trail head and campground and we physically clear trails prior to project.
- *Do you close the roads?* The potential is there. We did not have to with Heller, with Simmons and to the peak (Units 7/8) would have temporary closures.
- *Do you have a Let Burn Policy?* For lightning fires. Before the Resource Benefit Program, all fires were suppressed, but since that time, three lightning fires have occurred that were managed for resource benefits and to allow fire to play its natural role in the forest, which this proposal is also designed to facilitate. This project is designed to give us a comfort zone and a resource benefit.
- *Is it wet enough to keep from getting too hot in the crown?* It's intended to be a mixed severity fire with short crown runs. We perform the burn after a wetting rain in the fall and many times there is snow in the upper elevations.

Keep up to date on the project and see future progress.

Project Update: Forest Plan Revision (Initial Briefing Papers Previously Distributed)

The Idaho Panhandle and Kootenai National Forests released their draft Forest Plans and Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS) in January 2012 and received public comments through May 2012. Currently, the Forests are completing the response to comments and making relevant changes to the Forest Plans and EISs as necessary. Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on a Biological Opinion is ongoing. The release of the draft Records of Decision, final Forest Plans, and EISs is expected in late spring/early summer 2013. The release will be followed by a 60-day public objection period and a 90-day objection resolution period. The final Record of Decision will be signed at the end of the resolution period.

Our Forest Planner left to be the Recreation Planner on the Willamette Forest in Oregon. We now have a new Planner.

We are in consultation with FWS and it has been going very well. It's a big ticket item and has been the first time it's been so smooth. We opted, due to capacity, to bring on a Contractor to help with the Forest Plan Consultation. We have a skilled individual and have been in a Level 1 Consultation and have been discussing different issues, species and more. This has been going on for over a year. The Biological Opinion is being drafted.

We are also continuing to address Comments to the draft FP, and we received a lot of them. We are answering each individual comment – not just the letter, but each comment. It's taking more time than we anticipated.

In a nutshell, due to consultation and comments, we are tidying up the draft Plan prior to going to print.

We expect a Draft Record of Decision in May, disburse Public Documents in June(ish).

The Objection Process will be implemented for the first time in the Region on this Forest Plan. We are working on the timeline for the actual fine points of the Objection Process. We're in the midst of fine tuning that: 60 day Objection Filing Period (publishing), within 10 days of the Objection Filing Period we publish a list of Objectors and their Concerns (in newspapers of record), within 10 Calendar days of Published Notice people may file as Interested Parties to engage in dialogue, then there is 90 day to Objection Resolution Period (RO is deciding Official) and the Chief is the Reviewing Officer who will engage with the Forest, the Region and working with the Objections.

Discussion:

- *So the 6 months, once you publish – from beginning to end. Is that right?* My Calendar shows December, and more likely January when the Responsible Official would sign the Record of Decision and release the decision. We will develop a one page briefing paper for our website so people can understand.
- *Will the two forests each have a ROD?* Yes, and separate decisions.
- *The Objection Resolution Period, is that public?* Yes, there are Objectors, Interested Parties and Observers and it's always an open forum. People can observe, but if you are an Observer you do not get to participate.
- *This will be the first Forest Plan Revision to go through this Process?* Yes. The Lolo went through this with an Amendment, but this is the first FP Revision.
- *What about the MA5 discussion?* There is information in the Briefing Paper.

Initial Briefing: Buckhorn Burning Project (Initial Briefing Papers Distributed)

Discussion:

- *On the Kootenai side, they are analyzing the same exact thing – both projects are called Buckhorn. This is a collaboratively supported project. To avoid confusion going forward, our project will be known as Idaho Buckhorn.*

Open Forum

Reminder from the RO that the Nez Perce/Clearwater will be considering Alternatives in the Forest Plan that has more recommended Wilderness. This could eventually lead to Theme Changes within the IRR, but it just keeps everyone informed. This would need to be publicly announced and that if were to go forward, they would have to clearly identify that it would require a Rule Making and what the process would be if that occurred.

We would have to review Chapters 20 and 22.

Public Comment

No comments from the public.

Commission Member Feedback

- I learned a lot about the review of the Rule, Risk and the projects. It's exciting to see how the Rule is going to work.
- I'm happy and satisfied with the last two days. I believe we've achieved milestones.
- This was valuable conversation, and we will revisit Significant Risk at some point – for the checklist for evaluation.
- Good meeting.
- The Significant Risk discussion is valuable and helps guide our role, so we are not over reaching. Thanks to all that came for their projects and the work they put into it.
- It looks like, after 8 years, what we aimed for – a Rule that allowed us to do what we need – I believe the flexibility is there to do things like fire reduction. That was our purpose, and I think we're getting there.
- I was reflecting on some early RACNAC meetings, and the struggle was how do you set it up with implementation guidelines? That's what we're doing and it's critical. In the past, we've seen how the Management Agency has to cope with laws that are passed. We are co-workers with the Agency and it works. Thanks to the Chairs for their work.
- If you need anything more from me, or less, just let me know.
- We are creating another way of doing business, and it's still a learning process for all of us, but we are getting better for all of us. There are a lot of collaborative efforts in the state and they are all healthy. It's a good experience.
- I enjoyed the Significant Risk conversation, and I agree that we'll continue to have it. I think it's incredible the support we have. The new RF from R4 wants to work with us. The fact that the Deputy RF is involved, that's a real commitment. Our Lead hasn't skipped a bit, and that's hugely appreciated.

- It's been a good meeting. One concern for everyone's edification: this goes back to the conversations between the Region and local Supervisors, we need to be cognizant as we work as individuals in other groups, that we don't send the wrong message. Anything that diminishes our communications, ensure that we get a hold of the right people and start making sure we have good coordination going on. Another caution: I wonder about the Leadership Issue, is it time to make a change? We've been here for almost 2 years, and I don't have a problem with that, but I don't want to assume that you want us to continue.
- Are there any projects for this upcoming field season? Any ideas, forward to the Chair.

ADJOURN – Noon

Governor's Roadless Commission



Idaho Roadless Rule

James L. Caswell, Chair (208-365-7420)
jlcaswell@g.com

Dale R. Harris, Vice-Chair (406-240-2809)
dharris@bigsky.net

Summary of Idaho Roadless Projects (36 CFR 294 Subpart C) April 2013

Table 1. Accomplishments since October 2008

Date	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
02/28/13	Boise	Stolle Priority Watershed Reforestation	Peace Rock/BCR & FPSA	Plant conifers and fell trees for helispots	6,500	292.24(c)(1)(vii)
08/30/12	Boise	Snowmobile Tr. Grooming in Valley, Gem, & Boise Counties	Poison Creek/BCR	Fell 10-12 trees along 0.65 miles of trail	NA	294.24(c)(1)(vii)
07/12/12	Sawtooth	Liberal Willow	Blackhorse Creek, Liberal Mt., Buttercup Mt./Primitive & GFRG	Reduce fuels/restore ecosystems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thinning ▪ Burning 	1,160 5,090	294.24(b)(1)(ii) and (d)
08/20/12	Payette	Chelsia Lode Exploration	Cottontail Point and Pilot Peak/Primitive and BCR	Excavate up to 25 sample pits that are 4' x 20' x 5' deep. Remove 1 ft ³ sample, then backfill.	57	292.25(b)
6/22/12	Sawtooth	Raymond Mine	Smokey Mts./BCR	Reopen two collapsed audits and a collapsed shaft. Underground mining.	5	294.25(b)
5/30/12	Caribou-Targhee	Whitebark Pine Protection	Mt. Jefferson/Primitive	Restore whitebark pine – lop and scatter	180	294.24(b)(1)(i)(ii)

Date	National Forest	Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Exception Applied
3/07/12	Boise	Oro Mountain	Stony Meadows/Primitive & BCR	Restore whitebark pine – lop and scatter	1,510	294.24(b)(1)(i) and (c)(1)(iii)
2/14/12	Nez Perce	Selway-Winter Range	Rackliff Gedney/BCR	Restore shrub fields – slash	3,000	NA
07/27/11	Nez Perce	Nut Basin	Little State Creek/BCR	Restore whitebark pine – lop and scatter; Rx burn	480	294.24(c)(1)(iv)
06/24/11	Sawtooth	Free Gold	Lime Creek/Primitive	Reduce fuels/restore ecosystems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thinning ▪ Burning 	58 173	294.24(b)(1)(ii)(iii)
06/10/11	Boise	Cache Creek	Red Mountain/BCR	Restore whitebark pine – slash; pile burn	164	294.24(c)(1)(iv)
12/21/09	Salmon Challis	Slide Hunter	Boulder White Cloud/BCR	Restore aspen – slash and burn	1,275	294.24(c)(1)(iv)

Payette Corrections

The Idaho Roadless Rule and associated maps mistakenly identified a Forest Plan Special Area (Wild and Scenic River) along a corridor of Big Creek. The Rule and associated maps were corrected in March 2011 (76 FR 17341).

The Idaho Roadless Rule did not identify an existing Forest Plan Special Area for the Wild and Scenic River corridor along Lake Creek in the French Creek IRA. The Rule and associated maps were corrected in March 2011 (76 FR 17341).

Table 2. Proposals – Scoping started

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Boise National Forest						
Idaho Power Line #328	Meadow Creek, Caton Lake, Reeves Creek/BCR and GFRG	0.12 miles of existing unauthorized road and 0.2 miles in GFRG added to Forest’s transportation system. Road maintenance would occur.	NA	0	294.23(f)	Scoped 03/12 30-Day 12/12 Decision 4/13
Big Ck. WBP Enhancement	Stony Meadows & Needles/Primitive & BCR	Eliminate competing conifers to enhance whitebark pine survival and to reduce bark beetle attacks	1,200	0	294.24(b)(1)(i)(ii) 294.24(c)(1)(iii)(iv)	Scoped 11/12 Decision 05/13
Caribou-Targhee National Forest						
Dairy Syncline	Huckleberry Basin/GFRG	Mine, reclamation plan, and land exchange <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Road construction ▪ Surface occupancy ▪ Land exchange 	1,798 640	0.5	294.25(e)(1) 294.25(e)(1) 294.27(b)	Scoped 04/10 DEIS 06/14 FEIS 06/15
Husky Mine	Schmid Peak/BCR and FPSA	Administrative correction – minor mapping errors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 0.71 acres GFRG to FPSA ▪ 2.6 acres BCR to FPSA 	NA	NA	294.27(a)	Not connected to NEPA project
Gibson Jack Trailhead Relocation	West Mink/BCR	Modification to facilitate trailhead construction and road reconstruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remove 11.4 acres from roadless in one area ▪ Add 18.8 acres to roadless from another area 	NA	NA	294.27(b)	
Smoky Canyon Mine Panel G Mod	Meade Peak and Sage Creek/GFRG	Lease modification for a permanent overburden disposal site and temporary storage site.	431	NA	294.25(e)(1)	
Idaho Panhandle National Forest						
Marble Creek Splash Dam Modification	Grandmother Mt./BCR	Breach two splash dams	NA	0	NA	Scoping 4/13

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Simmons Fuels	Sheep Mt-State Line/BCR Mallard Larkins/WLR	Rx burning and planting. Small number of trees may be cut for safety purposes	7,047	NA	294.24(a)(2) and 294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Scoping 4/13 Decision 5/13
Idaho Buckhorn Burning	Buckhorn Ridge/BCR	Rx burning to improve wildlife habitat, restore WBP, and reduce natural fuel accumulations. Some tree cutting may occur for safety purposes.	2,130	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Scoped 03/13 Decision 6/13
Nez Perce - Clearwater National Forest						
Orogrande	West Fork Crooked River/BCR	Reduce hazardous fuels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary Roads (CPZ) ▪ Fuel break (CPZ) ▪ Shelterwood (CPZ) 	18 252	2.05	294.23(b)(2) 294.24(c)(1)(i) 294.24(c)(1)(i)	Scoped 09/11 Draft 04/13
Clear Creek Integrated Restoration	Clear Creek/BCR	Rx burn with some hand-constructed fireline within CPZ	1,371	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Scoped 01/12 DEIS 04/13 FEIS 11/13
Roadside Hazard Tree Removal	Little Slate Creek North, North Fork Spruce-White Sands, Dixie Summit-Nut Hill, and Gospel Hump/BCR and FPSA	Felling, removing, and selling dead and dying trees impacted by 2012 wildfires.	272	0	294.24(c)(1)(vii)	Scope 04/13 Decision 05/13
Lolo Insect and Disease	Eldorado Cr/BCR	Commercial timber harvest to maintain and restore ecosystem composition and function	340	0	294.24(c)(1)(iii-v)	Scope 04/13 DEIS 02/14 FEIS 07/14
Payette National Forest						
Golden Meadows Exploration	Sugar Mt./BCR	Exploration drilling (10 holes) using a heli-portable tracked LF-70 core rig or equivalent. General Mining Law of 1872.	0.13	0	294.25(b)	Scoped 01/12 Decision 7/13
Twentymile Tr. Reroutes	Secesh/WLR	Rerouting and reconstructing sections of a motorized trail to mitigate ongoing resource damage. Some tree may be cut if unavoidable.	2	0	294.24(a)(2) 294.26(a)	Scoped 02/13 Decision 4/13

Project Name	Roadless Area/Theme	Activity	Acres	Road Const. (Miles)	Exception Applied	Status
Bear Pete Tr. Reroutes	French Creek/BCR	Rerouting and reconstructing sections of a motorized trail to mitigate ongoing resource damage. Some tree may be cut if unavoidable.	2.5	0	294.24(a)(2) 294.26(a)	Scoped 02/13 Decision 4/13
Salmon-Challis National Forest						
Upper North Fork	Allan Mt./BCR	Reduce hazardous fuels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rx burn Pre-commercial thin Shaded fuel break (CPZ) 	14,941 41 99		NA 294.24(c)(i) 294.23(b)(2)	Scoped 08/11 DEIS 05/13 FEIS 10/13
	Allan Mt./FPSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rx burn Shaded fuel break Meadow treatment Temporary roads 	14,941 41 99	0.05	294.28(f) 294.28(f) 294.28(f) 294.28(f)	
	Anderson Mt./BCR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rx burn Shaded fuel break (CPZ) Commercial harvest (CPZ) Meadow treatments Temporary roads (CPZ) 	5,180 67 600 1,074		NA 294.24(c)(1)(i) 294.24(c)(1)(i) 294.24(c)(1)(iv) 294.23(b)(2)	
	West Big Hole/BCR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rx burn 	1,580		NA	
Sawtooth National Forest						
Deer Creek	Buttercup Mountain/Primitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rx burn Handline construction Thinning for wildlife habitat/Douglas-fir stand restoration and WBP restoration Trail realignment and heavy maintenance Trailhead rehabilitation 	5,150 1.2 125 3.5 miles NA	0	294.24(b)(1)(i)(ii)	Scoped 11/12 Decision 10/13
Salmon River Headwater Road 215	Smoky Mts./FPSA	Relocate trailhead and motorized trail for purposes of river restoration and to mitigate ongoing resource damage.	NA	NA	294.28(f)	Scoped 03/13 Decision 8/13