

Meeting Notes
Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative
Forestry Committee
May 12, 2017, 8:30 a.m.
Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

Attendance:

Dan Dinning, Boundary County Commissioner & KVRI Co-chair
Kevin Knauth, Bonners Ferry Ranger District, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)
Doug Nishek, USFS
Tim Dougherty, Idaho Forest Group (IFG)
Ed Koberstein, USFS
Russ Hegedus, IFG
Beth Bigelow, USFS
Kevin Greenleaf, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho
Barry Wynsma, County Resident
Dan Gilfillan, USFS
Brad Smith, Idaho Conservation League
Patty Perry, KVRI Facilitator & KTOI
Sherrie Cossairt, KVRI Recording Secretary & KTOI

Opening:

Patty Perry opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Introductions followed.

Deer Creek Update-Kevin Knauth

The Forest Service received 2 objections to Deer Creek. The Regional Office Objection Review Committee is looking at those objections as well as the information that the Zone sent in reply to those objections this week. Our folks will take a look at the objections and respond to the different elements in those so that the team in Missoula has something to work off of. Shawna Kleinsmith (Bonners Ferry District) has been in Missoula all week with the team representing the project and she was the one that pulled together the responses to those objections points.

The District should receive a call today that will give some insight in to what the team has discussed and found and if there are any merits to the objections. The Forest does not anticipate any delays in Deer Creek due to any of the actions ongoing with Lynx.

They are still hoping to offer a sale in 4th quarter FY17. He also said they do have back up plans as a Forest if Deer Creek does not come on line this fiscal year and has to wait until fall. Back up plans would be on other Districts the Forest; nothing else available on the Bonners Ferry District.

Patty asked that after Kevin K. hears from that review team, would he email her so she can forward it to this committee.

Brad Smith added that he would also respectfully ask if anything of substance changes in the project or is being entertained, that folks around this table have the opportunity to participate in those discussions. Dan and Patty agreed with Brad's request. Kevin agreed.

Camp Dawson and Robin Hood Update- Ed Koberstein

Ed began by listing some of the items that have been done so far:

- Identified some preliminary treatment areas (3000 acres) for both projects to utilize the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) Categorical Exclusion (CE) authority.
- They have completed the initial vegetation reconnaissance.
- They will be beginning the other NFMA surveys this month (hydrology, wildlife, fisheries, archeology, etc.)
- They have had a kick off meeting with the North Idaho NEPA Strike Team.

This is a two phase project; all the NFMA planning, project design and survey will be done by in house staff and the Strike Team will then come in and do the final report and document writing and decision for them. Using the Strike Team gives them a mechanism to accelerate the program.

They are looking at an initial field trip in 2 weeks with the Strike Team to get them familiar with the area. Then schedule a field trip in June with the Collaborative and a Meet and Greet with the Strike Team.

Ed shared a Map of Camp Dawson and Robin Hood Project areas

- Areas included were: Camp Nine, Meadow Creek/Dawson Lake, Queen Mountain Road, Camp Nine/ Guiles Connection Road, and Brush Lake.
- Different treatment types in the areas were noted in different shaded areas.
- Identified those stands adjacent to private land, in need of treatment due to insect and disease, the proximity to infrastructure, Hwy. 95 corridor, and second entries.
- Hogue Mountain area; Gillon Creek to Eastport, this area has been forgotten, dry site opportunities in additions to fuels treatment, more continuous blocks of treatment were identified.
- They have also identified large areas of helicopter logging.

Discussion followed concerning helicopter units, temporary roads, different types of treatments considered, trail concerns, time and energy in analysis, and making sure they had considered all resources available to restoration on the project.

Ed explained that from a forest health and restoration standpoint, to meet the purpose and need, they went big and capitalized on those opportunities that HFRA affords them to utilize, consequently they found a lot of ground on the east side of Harvey Mountain to treat with helicopter. Knowing the issues with helicopter they will work through that.

Tim asked if the agency could achieve the same objectives by under burning. Ed explained they could in some areas, but some were just too thick.

Dan D. asked about the opportunity to build temporary roads to access the timber. They could but it may cost more than the value of the timber. Patty stated that if it's too expensive for helicopter shouldn't they consider temporary roads if it would cost less.

Ed added that where the trail comes down is the only access they have to get down on to that slope. They would need to come a long ways out to get to the benches and there are still issues with trying to cable yard that because of blind leads all over. Even if you get a temporary road in because of the broken nature of the topography there it would become a nightmare, from even a cable yarding perspective. There just are a lot of challenges.

They are looking at trying to incorporate a design feature that allows some mechanical felling, and then helicopter it out. They may include some of that, but reality of that may be limited. It still may be an opportunity.

Russ H. asked about tether harvesters. Ed said they had not considered it yet. That would require Forest Plan modifications and would push them out of using the CE opportunity. But it's a tool worth investigating.

This still is preliminary, for thoughts and considerations. They will go on a field trip with this group to show us what they are talking about.

Brad S. questioned the trail issue on Harvey Mountain and Kevin said they had laid out those units with the trail in mind. Brad asked that they be thoughtful about those recreation opportunities and experiences; use modifications of prescription that is a little lighter around the trail.

Patty stated that in knowing the challenges and the acreages, going into this, is it really worth spending the time to do the analysis to go any further? Are we spending money and spinning our wheels? Is there some place better we ought to be going? If it is really that ugly and it is helicopter units, those are non-starters, why are we wasting our money?

Ed replied that they will revisit all access options. They were tasked with identifying the need from a forest health standpoint. They may get to a decision point and it's not worth it to take it any farther. They are not there yet, but it is a consideration.

The group asked about the fuels situation, can they do burning or not, is that an option? They brought up the point that in previous sales they went as far as they could at the time. In Mission/Brush they looked at extending a road to try to get to the bench, but there was so much rock involved it looked more like a system road instead of a temp road.

Dan D. brought up the fact that in the past in a CFLR project there had been money to subsidize helicopter units, if we had to subsidize temp roads now instead, we should look at that possibility too. And we can still analyze to include helicopter units for the future, since we never know if that market will return.

Patty questioned if we should go through all the activity (NEPA, reports, specialists) when there are limited CFLR dollars left and the deadline is approaching. Are we spending money on a project that part of it will just be on hold or can we go somewhere else on the District and do more work with those funds? Should we be making that decision before making this investment of time and money?

Ed answered that the cost per unit is low, not an exponential increase to cover additional acres for shelf stock, especially using the tool we are using here. The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) is

simple; we've used it a lot. Moving forward it is not a sizeable investment to keep it on the table proportionately over the entire project.

Kevin K. explained that the Strike Team will be doing Dawson and Robin Hood concurrently, so if they are not doing this, they won't be doing anything else. We have nothing else to assign to them. They won't be missing an opportunity in looking at the 5 year plan. There is no opportunity to grab another one.

Tim D. added that as a primary purchaser of Panhandle timber, if we don't submit a bid where the agency has a half million dollars to subsidize helicopter logging on projects like that; we won't submit a bid on this project. As a purchaser, realize that, if the agency has a half million dollars to fund a project and you get no bids, I'm not interested.

Patty added that she would rather see that ½ million dollars in the team go to another district then, if we don't have anything to offer them, it's common sense, don't throw good money after bad, just because it's there, if we can't figure out some way to make this somewhat feasible –quit wasting our time on it.

Doug verified that if he heard correctly, the committee would like to put the effort into temp roads wherever we can.

Patty agreed saying that if there is access by temp roads so they can do something besides helicopter, or burn them to still protect them or use other treatment, but if you can't and helicopter is the only way in that much acreage , not sure if you can get concurrence from this group.

Ed stated that if the brown units on the east side of Harvey are dropped there will still be over 2000 acres left. This is the initial phase of identifying forest health issues and we did that. We still have a lot of work to do this summer and will re-visit some of these areas.

Kevin K. added that in a CE they can only treat 3000 acres on the ground anyway and even though it's a lower level of investment, 2000 acres would be a good return on that.

Tim D. added that he was unfair in saying that about the helicopter units. It was his opinion to the helicopter sale you proposed. If silviculturally, we were doing something different, harvesting bigger trees, cutting more volume to the acre, that would be an entirely different aspect. If you make it appealing for a helicopter company to come in, I can see that.

Brad S. had one last concern. In using the farm bill, are we losing sights of other restoration opportunities out there. Are there aquatic or other resources needs in the landscape and other CE's to use, not just vegetation. The group discussed using multiple CE's, using CE's for temp roads, etc.

Kevin K. stated that they are encouraged to use all the tools that are available to them. And we are far enough out ahead of this one that we are not chasing a timeline.

Beth Bigelow reported that she has gone over the entire project

- They have the cultural work setup for contract.
- Between the two projects they will be surveying just less than 1500 acres.
- Revisiting just under 35 sites for re-documentation.

- All well within the timeline, she does not see any major issues.
- Out ahead far enough, any issues that could jeopardize CE categories; they can do planning adjustments to accommodate that.

Boulder Creek Project Update- Kevin Knauth

Beth B. reported that there were no changes with heritage resources on the Boulder Project

Patty reported to the group that the Boulder Creek Project has gone to the Regional Office for review. In that review, there were changes that Regional Office suggested Mary consider at the forest level. She considered them and made changes to the project.

Kevin K. began his report by saying that Dan Gilfillan had initiated some of that discussion with the Roadless Coordinator at the Regional Office. As Dan G. was trying to compile his specialist report for this project, he realized that that we were proposing a fair amount of acres for treatment within two different Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA). He brought this concern to Kevin and then to the Regional Office and that is what put this on the Regional Office's radar. It was not a review from the Regional Office.

From the Regional Offices' perspective, they take a holistic look across the forest in Idaho and Montana. The Regional Office began noticing a number of projects proposing harvest activities within Roadless areas and they have been keeping an eye on that. We were another forest proposing another project within the Roadless.

The District has regular checkpoints with our Forest Supervisor, Mary Farnsworth on all our projects. Checkpoint one is simple; here is the project area we are looking at, the number of acres, things we can do, the analysis we may need, timeline, etc. Checkpoint number three is we have nailed down in terms of what we are planning to deliver.

In this case, I scheduled a Checkpoint 2.5. I met with the Supervisor's Office to remind them again that we were looking at this level of treatment within the Inventory Roadless Area (IRA) and it was predominately helicopter, before we moved forward and the specialists started writing their reports. They said go forward. That is when Dan G. started his report and finding the red flags.

This is the struggle we had. One: the Idaho Roadless Rule specifically allows for certain level of treatment and treatment activities with the Inventory Roadless Area in Idaho. It is a good tool. Two: We have internal direction in terms of what makes a project a CE, EA or an EIS. Then we try to combine these two things together.

Dan G. found that when we ran the project through a filtering process of the Idaho Roadless Rule it was a yes. When we ran it through the internal filter and we were looking at an EA, it was a no. Dan G. began conferring with the Regional Office; what did they want to do, what had they seen in other projects. The Regional Office lead, new in his position, did not give great direction.

Internally, certain indicators showed that it had gone beyond an EA to EIS. We thought we were still OK with an EA. As we continued to do briefing with Mary, she got nervous and she is the decision maker. She wanted it to be more black and white and it was not as an EA. Mary made the decision if we were

going to proceed with harvest in the Roadless she wanted an EIS. That decision was made by the deciding official.

As we took a look at timelines and how it affected the Boulder Creek Project, it was going to be a problem. Moving the EA to an EIS added 5-6 months increasing the analysis time; there is only one marking crew, if there is a delay the next thing won't be ready, there would be a holding pattern, and then multiple things would be ready at the same time and no capacity to do them. It was a ripple effect from Boulder to Camp Dawson and Robin Hood. It would change things, deliverables, meeting targets, more challenging to deliver targets within the close of CFLRP in 2019.

Or they could pull the harvest units out of the Roadless (1600 acres); that decision was made easier because of the helicopter issues, volume lost would be 2000 acres between conventional (375 acres) and helicopter, treat fewer acres, moist site, does not lend itself to burning and still looking at 7000 acres in burning in the IRA.

It was the right call in the end to avoid delay, avoid helicopter logging when feasibility is not wonderful.

Kevin K. continued. The game plan was that this Forestry meeting was on schedule, we would let the Forestry committee know, and then there was the Idaho Roadless Committee meeting tomorrow. We had the revised proposal for that group to explain that the helicopter would be taken out. Then Doug reminded me that Dan and Patty are on the Roadless Committee and they needed to hear about the change before that meeting; so I called and told them at the last minute. And we had a robust discussion during the Roadless Committee meeting about the change in the project.

Although the Roadless Committee says we can do it, internally, we are not supposed to change the character of an Inventory Roadless Area to the point where it can no longer be proposed to be recommended wilderness area in the next Forest Plan Cycle. The next Forest Plan Cycle is inside of 30 years and we believe openings or stumps will take a minimum of 30 years to go away.

Barry W. asked if the Forest Service is saying that the Idaho Roadless Rule won't apply to anything on the forest.

Patty stated that this is what the Roadless Commission spent a long time on, and there will a lot more policy discussion now surrounding this issue. The Idaho Roadless Rule Commission Chair and Vice Chair are frustrated with the Forest Service at this point and will be talking about this project and several others.

It precludes restoration work in a lot of those areas. There is no reason to have the rule if that is the case. It is not said specifically in the Forest Plan at all, that every Roadless area that has roads going through the middle of it, is supposed to be pushed toward wilderness characteristics and then appended into the next Forest Plan as being recommended wilderness. We just finished our Forest Plan and this area was not recommended wilderness. This issue needs to go to another arena for a policy discussion.

The Deputy Regional Forester made it clear that he did not suggest to Mary to remove all of the units out of Roadless. It was a no brainer to take out the helicopter units, we had that discussion around this table several times, and decided only to put them back in for the sake of having NEPA on those acres, so if there were any other way to go in and treat them again, helicopter or something else, the work would be done under this NEPA then we could go in and treat those acres in the next ten year period.

There are also acres coming out of the project on the road that allowed us to get a fire hold on the lower end to protect the infrastructure of Black Mountain which was part of the purpose and need of this project. It is the baby getting thrown out with the bath water.

I have no disagreement with the helicopter units. I am not sure if Mary has looked at it close enough to know there is another small amount in Roadless, that could gain us quite a bit along the purpose and need of the project without throwing it out. Those are the areas that we want to talk to Mary about further and discuss the 375 acres.

Kevin G. added that if you are only taking out the 375 acres across the Roadless boundary it is a minimal amount. Unless you are going to force political philosophy of not having a stump off the road, you shouldn't have to do an EIS for 375 acres of roadside management. A lot of stuff has already been thinned out by fire or other treatment in the 80's. I mapped them out and we are not talking about any larger continuous area, it's an area completely spread out along the road, almost not even noticeable.

Barry agreed that it is pretty minor compared to possible wildfire damage that could occur.

Kevin K. agreed that more discussion needs to be held. Because every forest that has Roadless areas has a different forest supervisor and every one of those has a different risk tolerance, level of intrusion, level and intensity of impact. One may view 375 acres and one may feel 1 acre will drive it to an EIS.

The discovery here is that we now know where Mary's risk level or tolerance lies with this on this forest. And now we know the level of tolerance and if other forests know their level of tolerance, they would know to start out with an EIS and know the timelines in the beginning.

We believed the level of intensity was below that need so we did not start out at that. We did have the checkpoints. We got further than we should have without the EIS determination.

Patty stated she didn't disagree with Mary's decision on her level of her intensity on the helicopter units. Her question was: is Mary aware of the small bit of acreage, on the road, leading to the tower, knowing the infrastructure, knowing the purpose of the project, and unwilling to re-visit the concern and have the discussion about this small acreage. And is she unwilling to look at the intensity to see if she has any different opinion or does it still push her outside her comfort level?

Kevin K. stated that he doesn't know if she is unwilling to re-visit that specific discussion but she is aware there are both helicopter and conventional acres in the project.

Patty continued to express that she just wants that small discussion and a field trip of that small piece of road that we want to treat and why. Not the helicopter acres.

Kevin K. stated that we have to re-visit the why also. According to Jennifer Anderson, who couldn't be here today, about those acres and the effects of treating those acres, her first answer was that those 375 acres were a part of the package. And as part of the package they were a valuable piece per say for what we were trying to do in purpose and need. But if you want her to say that those 375 will protect the infrastructure, she could not say that. They are miles from the infrastructure and there is a lot of country between the acres and the infrastructure. We need to keep in mind that when we thin something like that which is what we will do, we open it up; the wind can increase through those open

areas now; grasses and fine fuels can cure more rapidly and be available for fire. As part of a package the whole thing is ok. She did not do a fire behavior run, a long term large run. She didn't think it would lend enough. What she does when she does a polygon and plans a treatment she does a localized fire behavior run. But in terms of large scale she did not think it was important enough.

At this point, Kevin believes if it is Roadless it will be an EIS.

Patty asked what sensitivities or triggers are on the 375 acres.

Kevin K. stated that we will have changed the character within that piece which is part of the greater Inventory Roadless Area that would lead someone to look at the area in 15 years' time and see the stumps and not be able to imagine purposing it as a wilderness area.

The question was raised as to who would consider it a wilderness when driving on the road through there.

Dan D. stated that there were at least three conference calls on this decision and the collaborative was not made aware of these discussions until the decision was made. The Roadless Commission is extremely concerned. The Idaho Roadless Rule went to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals under an EIS analysis that said in backcountry restoration we were going to do this and it is allowed, this is the anticipated treatment of acres per year and some internal Forest Service document trumps that?

Dan D. believes this is a prime example of running scared of litigation; if the Roadless Rule says it meets it, the Collaborative supports it, when you have the partners here who will go to court with you along the Idaho Association of Counties, this is just running from fear and is irritating.

Patty questioned why we couldn't leave the acreage in until it is objected, and then remove it if necessary. Kevin stated that is what they had planned to do, but they will honor Mary's concern as the decision maker in not moving it to the EIS.

Discussion continued about burning in Roadless, which changes the characteristics of the landscape; interpretation of the Roadless Rule; and poor guidance to the region.

Dan G. stated the fact that the NEPA analysis going to an EIS from and EA is not saying it's not allowed or appropriate to happen (timber harvest or road building), it is just saying that we have to disclose the impacts of what we are proposing in a public forum under the right type of NEPA. There is a lot of case law that says you have to analyze the impacts based on wilderness attributes. Roadless areas were originally set aside to take a look at them for potential wilderness. This case was not proposed for wilderness, it was set aside as a non-wilderness designation; regardless we still have to disclose the impacts of how that will affect the future of that Roadless area whether it was set aside or not.

There was some litigation when they did the Idaho Roadless Rule that it was determined that it was not an irretrievable commitment of resources to give things non wilderness designations and to say here is the Roadless area that we have, this one we want to carry forward to wilderness because it makes sense and this one we do not. At that time they said that wasn't the commitment of resources but when you actually go and do the project level work, at that time it is a commitment of resources, because you are planning to carry forward actual change in that Roadless area. I feel that the EIS is the right mechanism for that purpose.

Dan G. continued, when I originally went to Brian Riggers (Regional Office Staff) to discuss these issues, it was not about the EIS, it was largely based on the Roadless area we were talking about that spanned both Montana and Idaho. Starry Goat was proposing timber harvest units on the Idaho side of the Kootenai and it was an EIS and those acres were pulled and we were doing a planning process on the other side in the same Roadless area and doing an EA. There was another layer of complexity.

Patty asked what is missing that you would go back and do an EIS to give more information to the impact of these few acres after those larger units are pulled. The public already knows we were going to treat it.

Dan G. explained his role in the planning process is to analyze the impacts being proposed, and he went through it very carefully and tried to get as much direction as he could so they would have a successful project. As a specialist, that is as far as he can go, he does not make a decision on moving forward or not. The overruling document is definitely the Wilderness Act.

Patty stated that –what I hear you saying is that it was already looked at in the revised Forest Plan and that area has never been determined to be moved toward recommended wilderness...so that is number one; secondly, we've taken out all those units that were helicopter so we are down to a road that is already built in an area that we would be doing some restoration work, saving the large stuff, would be putting ground fire there. My only point is under the EA, what would we be missing on that small piece of landscape; I don't want to talk about the whole Roadless area right now, just that small piece. You have clearly said that it was determined to never be pushed to recommended wilderness in the Forest Plan.

So why can we not state that, make it clear there is a road there in the EA and capture that small part of an analysis and move forward. If it ends up being a lightning rod, pull it out. What can we not cover with that?

Kevin K. added that if we try the EA then we have to make the case for why it is not a significant impact.

Brad S. stated that if I hear you right, you have not looked yet to see if decreasing the acreage from 1950 to 375 acres, will go from significant to insignificant. Kevin answered that it is the size as well as the location.

Patty questioned whether there that there would be support from KVRI, as the Collaborative, if you pull that, it is a CFLR project. We would like a further discussion with Mary and a better understanding.

Kevin K. added that the collaborative has been along with us, in step, all the way through this, and we are still going to do mechanical work on 3500 acres and all the restoration, as Collaborative we have been very outspoken. I can't believe that AWR for one little thing wants to sink the whole project. They are willing to fore go all the restoration work planned in the whole project because they don't like this one part.

Patty stated that she is just saying that we don't support moving forward with this change in the project.

Discussion followed about level of significance, the issue of stumps, differing opinions on what is visually appealing on the landscape, and the irony of the old stumps in the area from the sheep herders who built the road in the 1930's.

Dan G. expressed the fact that he understands the frustration and appreciates the work we have done. He has seen the Roadless issue cause a lot of frustration and confusion. Why he mentioned the 2001 Rule is that Lake Estelle and Willard Lake Roadless area spans 2 states and is 1 inventory unit. It would be evaluated for future wilderness designation under two different states and two different Roadless rules; as one inventory unit not a state boundary. Consequently both rules need to be looked at in this particular Roadless area.

Dan D. stated that in looking at the Idaho rule, this was analyzed by a zoning document, per area and different classifications. At that time the liability of an area to be proposed for recommended wilderness was considered all across the state. This was a collaborative effort, 42 counties held public meetings and took input, so this wasn't just a government action. The public of the State of Idaho decided that these recommended wilderness areas currently need protection. This was designed that way in this plan and designation of these areas it was taken into account what you are talking about that appears they will never be considered for wilderness designation so we should be able to do limited management activity. And he thinks that some of that guidance you may have gotten is that it is as if it occurred under the 2001 Rule.

Dan G. didn't agree. The first place he looked was the Idaho Roadless Rule. Most of the report is based on what the Idaho Roadless rule says; where the exemptions can take place, under the chosen alternative, what the implications of the Idaho Roadless Rule are. The only reason the 2001 Rule was investigated was because it spanned 2 states and 2 forests. Our actions on the Idaho Panhandle side of the inventory unit would affect the Kootenai's overall management of the same Roadless boundary. If we were trying to move forward with this project with an EA and we are proposing very similar activities, it warranted a deeper look.

Patty explained that the Roadless Commission did agree this was completely allowable under the rule, all of it, but they agreed that we should try to move forward with the ground based units along the road. That was the discussion but they did not take an official stand because it wasn't proposed to them.

Discussion followed about Katka Peak and the Idaho Roadless Rule, fuels reductions, different management allocations, different treatments, WUI and Municipal Watershed in that area.

Patty asked Dan G. to send the committee the Idaho Roadless Rule reference he was referring to on Katka Peak.

Road 1304- Doug Nishek

Doug explained that there is one more change in the project. They would like to add the system Road 1304 (.9 miles) to the storage portion of the project. There will be no credit for storage, no units there, just a piece of a road that was forgotten. It will show as a target accomplished.

After discussion, the group agreed to show the road and store it. We can bring it to KVRI pointing out that it has been discovered, we will add it in and take it out and will balance the ledger.

Patty expressed to Kevin K. that we would like to know whether or not Mary is willing to have the dialogue and visit with Dan G. and others further and consider that small area that the rule allows us to do.

We need to do it under the EA, reasonably looking at the small acreages in each one of those units. Ask if Mary would be willing to walk with us a little ways down this trail to bring it forward. If we don't get an objection, which we may not, then we have it done.

Parties in the Orogrande case are filing amicus briefings this week so we may have different case laws for how this will be looked at. There are several others on hold waiting for this determination.

Patty asked Kevin K. to contact Mary to ask if she will please consider thinking of including the 375 acres as an opportunity in this project. To go forward with an EA, looking at two separate Roadless areas, two very small acreages on those, on a roaded area where you are driving through it, knowing we can mitigate some of the effects of the visual. Why would we not be willing to try it? Could she consider it that way? That is the discussion we would like to have.

Kevin K. agreed to ask her, although she will not likely give an answer on Monday night.

Patty asked the committee if they agreed that that is what we would like to propose to Mary to talk about and consider on the project.

Brad S stated he believed the backcountry theme allows that to occur. From an Idaho Conservation League standpoint on these 375 acres we would support that if it is consistent with the Idaho Roadless Rule.

Barry W. stated, as a free agent he would support it too.

It was agreed that Kevin K. would pose the question to Mary.

Doug added that the spirit of this is good. In the Boulder Project we wanted to test the grey area and the concern and social angst associated with Roadless, using the helicopter and conventional and the EA and we were going to pull it later. The Regional Office had other thoughts. This way we still are able to learn from this and measure where that is.

CFLR Letter

Patty reported that Ed did a great job with the letter about the changes to CFLR will be suggesting on what we have accomplished in the 8 year period.

Kevin K. stated that they are ready for signatures on the CFLRP letter on Monday night, if no other changes are needed.

Field Trip – Camp Dawson/Robin Hood

The group agreed to schedule the Camp Dawson/Robin Hood Field Trip on Monday, June 26, 2017.

The maps used in this presentation are available on the KVRI website at Kootenai.org

Meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Sherrie Cossairt

KTOI/KVRI Admin. Assistant

