

**Idaho Roadless Commission Meeting  
September 11, 2009 Boise, Idaho**

**Attending:** Dale Harris-RACNAC & Clearwater Basin, Tom Perry –State of ID, Bob Cope - IAOC, Dan Dinning, Boundary County Co, Patty Perry-Kootenai Tribe, Jim Riley-IFA, Tom Bowman-Blaine Co, Rick Johnson – ICL, Chris Wood – Trout Unlimited, Alan Prouty – Simplot. **Others present:** Harv Forsgren – Regional Forester R4, Joan Dickerson-FS Liaison, Jonathan Oppenheimer – ICL, Andy Brunelle-FS, Mitch Silvers – Senator Crapo, Bob Maynard– Legal Counsel for Idaho Counties, Lyle Powers – Salmon-Challis NF, Suzanne Endsley – FS (notetaker)

**Correction to the June 2009 notes:** Patty Perry will be representing the Kootenai Tribe, not KVRI.

**Background of the Commission/Role & Function:**

Governor Risch established the Commission through Executive Order 2006-43. This action was done by the State of Idaho as a method in maintain a broad collaborative approach for the management of roadless areas. Representation is broken into representative categories, of which, all but two positions are filled. Categories include:

**Industry** - Jim Riley, Alex Erby, Bill Higgins, Alan Prouty & vacant

**Environmental** – Chris Wood, Rick Johnson, Dale Harris, Jerry Bullock, & vacant

**Elected**, Tribal, Citizen at Large– Dan Dinning, Tom Bowman, Bob Cope, , Jim Caswell & Patty Perry (Kootenai Tribe)

Discussed the proposed mission and focus of the Commission established at the June 2009 meeting: *“to ensure the spirit and intent of the Rule is implemented in the State of Idaho.”* The Commission is an advisory committee to the Governor of Idaho. The Commission expects to initially review all projects proposed by the Forest Service but anticipates it will eventually establish a “threshold” for what types of projects would best benefit from the Commission’s review. Initial reviews may be focused and narrow, but may morph more broadly in the future. Key role would be to review, develop common understanding, make recommendations to the Governor, and provide support for specific projects. The goal is to advise the Governor that actions proposed by the Forest Service are consistent with the Idaho Roadless Rule and that the permissions provided by the rule are being utilized where warranted. By review and input, the Commission hopes to establish a common understanding of how the rule is being implemented by the Forest Service. At this time three projects are proposed but anticipate more being proposed as the Steering Commission is now established. Commission members urge the Forest Service to keep the Commission apprised of new proposals and consider any feedback being provided to the Governor.

The Administration has specifically stated support for Idaho Roadless; both the process of the development of the rule and the potential outcomes of it.

### **Procedural Function of the Commission:**

- Reviewed/Refined Protocols, which will be guidelines for operation – see attached.
- Chair – appointed by the Governor to be either a member of the Gov’s office or be members of the Commission  
*Agreed that for the interim, Tom Perry will be the chair of the committee*
- Designated Alternates – Every effort will be made by designees to make the meeting. Should there be the need for alternates there will be a proxy for commissioned members and should be approved by the Commission as a whole. *Chris would like to have Scott Stouder present at the meetings due to his familiarity with Idaho issues.*  
*Agreed that designated alternates may attend working sessions.*
- **Meeting Frequency** – *Agreed that there will be quarterly meetings or determined by need (no need to meet if no projects). There may also be fieldtrips necessary for the group to see on-ground proposals.* Initially there may be the need for more as the group is newly formed. Suggestion was made that meetings be held in the communities where the project is located.

*Group reached consensus that conceptually there is agreement to the Protocols for the Commission.*

### **Project Review:**

**Procedurally, it was recommended that proposals that come to the Commission address the following in order to streamline the discussion:**

1. What is the purpose of the presentation (information, common understanding, discussion on application of the rule)
2. What are the specific issue topics being covered?
3. Who is requesting discussion?

Lyle Powers from the Salmon-Challis National Forest presented an overview of the Upper North Fork Project located near the community of Gibsonville, Idaho. There was a large wildfire in the NE of Moose Creek Estates which is one of the drivers for the need for fuels reduction. The Gibbonsville area is the number one priority for the Idaho State National Fire Plan. On the Salmon-Challis NF lightning generally follows the middle fork of the Salmon and then up the Salmon River canyon and the North Fork area. This area is the Forests’ number one priority area for suppression. Burns tend to move from SW to the NE, with significant runs (up to 12 miles/day).

The Forest Service is in the process of developing a proposed action under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act and is looking at a 41,000 acre project area of which approximately 18,500 are in two roadless areas. The focus for treatment is around Moose Creek Estates because of forest health concerns. The area is bordered by Hwy 93 and a steep canyon wall which is an Idaho roadless area. Access is limited and the proposal to treat could include temporary roads to access the area.

The preliminary proposals for the project would be to thin the smallest diameter and retain the larger diameter. They are also looking at some white bark pine restoration as well as aspen

rehab. A timber sale would be part of the proposal however the main purpose is to reduce hazardous fuels and reintroduce fire into the ecosystem.

The Lemhi County Forest Restoration Group has requested to collaborate in the development of the proposed action as provided for in HFRA. The local forest restoration group (and forest) may specifically like to get a better understanding of the permissions in the Idaho Roadless Rule including permissions related to road construction (when can it be used under the Idaho Rule, what information may be necessary to support its use) as well as the appropriate tools (prescriptions, tree size) that can be used in the IRA. Also, how to map the CPZ. This specific project is early in the process (no proposed action has been developed), addresses many of the issues in the Rule and is one of the first proposals after promulgation of the Rule. There are also representatives from ICL and Lemhi County on the collaborative group as well as the Commission and they are having constructive dialogue. Because this is a highly functioning collaborative group and has duplicative representation, the Commission felt the Lemhi group should progress further before the Commission is engaged.

***The Commission advises the Governor that the Forest Service develop the proposal further working with the Collaborative Group and others. If the Collaborative Group would like to discuss how Idaho Rule may apply to this proposal then they should submit a letter to the Commission when they would like further engagement.*** The topics to discuss are scope/size of treatment area, CPZ definition and application, determination of significant risk, large tree retention and the use of temporary roads in the project area. Bob Cope and the Forest will ask the Lemhi group if there is an opportunity for any Commission members that are interested to do an on-the-ground visit this fall.

**Big Creek Fuels Reduction Project – Payette NF.** The proposed action has been developed but scoping is not started. The proposed action would be to thin from (ladder fuels) below maximizing retention of large trees. Some broadcast burning is planned. No road construction is proposed. Treatment would be within the CPZ which has been identified as ½ mile from the community. Total treatment in roadless is 65 acres of thinning and 22 acres of treatment along riparian areas.

There is a need to correct some acres designated to a FPSA theme. These areas should have been designated as Backcountry/Restoration as there area was not recommended wild and scenic river corridor. There is also discussion regarding the CPZ identified around the FS work center.

The Commission gauged this proposal as being one that is very straight-forward; however there may be need for further discussion on whether or not FS work centers should be considered “communities”. In this case, the work center is adjacent to community and is considered an extension.

***The Commission advises the Governor that they do not have any concerns with this project. The Commission believes it is appropriate to treat the infrastructure of the Guard Station and Big Creek Lodge as an at risk community.***

**Free Gold Fuels Reduction Project – Sawtooth NF.** Project lies in a primitive theme with a community risk component. The project has no commercial product component but utilizes hand thinning 58 acres to reduce ladder fuels.

*The Commission advises the Governor that they do not have any concerns regarding this project.*

**Project review – continued:** The following projects maintain or restore ecological components, no commercial harvest, no roading and the projects lie in the backcountry/restoration or general forest, rangeland and grassland themes.

Commission reviewed projects – Little Slate White Bark Pine Restoration, Ephraim Valley Aspen Restoration, Slide Hunter Aspen & Sagebrush Restoration, Main Canyon Vegetation Treatment Project, and Strawberry Aspen Restoration.

*The Commission advises the Governor that they appreciate the opportunity to review and be informed of the proposed projects, but they do not find any need for further involvement by the Commission*

**Corrections to Idaho Roadless Areas on the Salmon-Challis:** Lyle Powers presented information about forest routes and IRA boundary corrections that have been identified through travel planning analysis due to mapping errors, clerical errors, digitizing errors or spatial/technology errors. This is an attempt to make the Roadless areas more accurate; either including unroaded land and/or exempting system roads that had been incorrectly included. 28 specific corrections are identified. There would be a net reduction of 1259 acres of IRA on the S/C; a net reduction of 10 miles of motorized routes in IRA; 50 routes and 3 non-route corrections of length. Lyle presented examples of the original “manuscripted” designations, the current maps showing the error and the proposed correction. The Forest anticipates using the Administrative Correction process set forth in the Rule

There was discussion about the distinction between the correction process versus the modification process. There was also discussion regarding ORV routes/trails and creating corridors around them and the concern that Roadless Areas should not be reduced because of the presence of an ORV route. Leaving an ORV trail in a roadless designation does not have any effect on the trail. **The Commission advises the Governor that the Forest Service should consider not correcting the roadless boundaries around ORV routes but should consider leaving the ORV routes in the IRA.**

**Other Information:**

The Caribou-Targhee NF is moving forward with several phosphate projects (Dairy Sincine and Husky). Both Dairy Sincine and Husky involve exploration activities, including constructing temporary roads to access drill sites. Scoping has been initiated on the exploration activities. In addition, the BLM and FS have begun scoping (issued a Notice of Intent) for the development of Dairy Sincine.

Several forests have proposals that fall under the 1872 mining law in or adjacent to IRA's. There is also road decommissioning occurring on the Payette NF.

**Conclusion:**

Thanked Lyle Powers for his presentations today and encouraged other forests to share information with the Commission and attend commission meetings. For the next meeting:

- Have a general discussion of recommended definitions and interpretations of the rule by Commission members so all are have the same understanding. Specifically want to discuss how CPZ is defined (the process). Goal is to increase the common understanding of the rule so it will be interpreted consistently. A “Roadless Primer” may be developed.
- The Commission requests the Forest Service bring proposals/guidelines for the Commission to review. From that, common understanding can be established.
- The Commission requests that maps be provided in a consistent format – scale, style, legends. Especially incorporating the boundary of the IRA in the project.
- The Commission requests the Forest Service track the type and location of projects in IRAs in a spreadsheet and on a map. The Commission requests these be present to the Commission annually.

## **Protocols for Governor's Idaho Roadless Implementation Commission**

**Collaboration.** If an idea or proposal proves unacceptable for someone on the Committee, it is incumbent upon that person to explain this to the group, and the reason why. That person then needs to give a version that satisfies their concerns and needs as well as those articulated by the committee as a whole. This requires that everyone participate in good faith, recognize values, facilitate dialogue, and work together.

**Consensus.** The threshold ought to be that individually and jointly for your respective organization you can support the recommendations of this group.

### **Forming Consensus**

As to issues of consensus, if a member is not present for the formulation of a consensus recommendation, that member cannot subsequently block it. Skipping a meeting should not be used as a blocking strategy. The principle is “play or pass.” If a member who misses a meeting has a new idea, and can present it to the group before the official meeting notes are distributed, the Committee can decide whether to consider that idea, and whether a follow-up conversation is required.

**Scope.** The committee may have good input to recommend beyond the scope of the Executive Order, but will decide whether to proceed on a case-by-case basis.

**Minority positions.** Characterizing differences is better than voting and creating a minority report.

**Meeting summaries.** As a general rule for meeting minutes, there should be no attribution. If a committee member wishes for a comment to be attributed, they can request it.

The whole committee should have a chance to go over meeting notes and make sure they are right before they are made public. Meeting minutes will be circulated within five business days of the meeting, and the committee will have another five business days to respond with any edits or corrections prior to the document becoming public (e.g. posting to the Forest Service's roadless website).

**Public Participation.** The committee should accept written comments. Oral comments at meetings may be accepted at the discretion of the Co-Chairs of the Commission on a meeting-by-meeting basis.

**Press.** No one should talk to the press, as representing the group, without consent of the entire group. If someone is called by a member of the press, they should limit their comments to the topics discussed, and consensus recommendations, if any, but not provide any attribution. Committee members can let press know that the minutes will be publicly available in 10 business days following each meeting. Committee should designate a spokesperson for the general committee (Tom Perry). No one will represent the group without the permission of the group (or Tom).

**Facilitation.** The group does not need to hire a facilitator.

**Chair.** From the Executive Order, “[t]he *Chair of the Commission shall be appointed by the Governor from Governor’s Office staff or the membership of the Commission.*” *Tom Perry is the interim chair.*

**Designated Alternates.** Members should make every effort to be at every meeting. There might be extraordinary circumstances that force a member to miss a meeting. As these appointments are made by the Governor, designated alternates are required to be approved by the full Commission.

Every effort will be made by the committee members to attend decision-making recommendations at the quarterly (as needed) meetings. Designated alternates may attend “working sessions”.