

Clearwater Basin Collaborative Working Group Meeting

November 16, 2011

Clearwater Regional Fish & Game Offices
Lewiston, Idaho

NOTES

Attendees: Alex Irby, Dale Harris, Don Ebert, Greg Danly, Dave Galantuomini, Leo Crane, Jonathan Oppenheimer, Skip Brandt, Stan Leach, Brad Brooks, Bill Higgins, Dave Cadwallader, Larry Jakub, Heather Leach, Joyce Dearstyne, Scott Stouder, Holly Endersby

Liaisons: Elayne Murphy (US Forest Service), Mitch Silvers (US Senator Mike Crapo's Office), Mike Hanna (US Senator James Risch's Office), Scott Carlton (US Representative Raul Labrador's Office), Olleke Rappe Daniels (Facilitator), Ryan Haugo (The Nature Conservancy), Marty Gardner

Visitors: Bryan Ricker (Regional Director, Senator Mike Crapo's Office), Navin Risal (University of Idaho), Susan Graves (US Forest Service)

Bryan Ricker, Senator Mike Crapo's Office

Brian covers 10 counties in Idaho in addition to now working with the CBC. He provides feedback and works alongside other Legislative Aides for the Senator. He works with various agencies and covers a broad range of issues. He will be coming to meetings on a more regular basis and appreciates the opportunity to meet everyone.

Prior Meeting Notes and Action Items

Vote: Approve the Meeting Notes from October 17 – all thumbs up

Forest Health & Function

MOU Meeting – November 17, 2011

This is a reminder that there is an important MOU Meeting tomorrow to identify projects for collaboration with the FS. Before entering the details of any one project, there should be discussion on the overall selection of projects that bring forward issues that would apply on many types of projects. There are big issues of interest to CBC members, such as road conditions, that would benefit from collaboration. It will be a full meeting tomorrow.

There was a brief discussion on the content of the information that was distributed to the group on Monday. It was discussed that those projects within the packet were all those projects we could consider collaborating on. Some will be an easy choice, others will require more discussion. There was a request to the Forest Service to try and put all these projects on a singular map to indicate possible relationships to each other. Unfortunately, there was not enough time to accomplish this request.

We are still learning, through experience, on the best method of carrying out the MOU. There was also the reference of a wish that the Forest Service could provide support directly to the MOU. There was tremendous support shown at the last meeting by the Forest Service, and the CBC appreciates that there is such a desire to work together.

Ryan Haugo from The Nature Conservancy will be involved with the CBC to drive science based forest restoration through a collaborative process. He will also be involved with the Monitoring Process for the CFLRP Selway Middle Fork Project.

Comments:

- I'm really glad to hear that you're moving in the direction of looking at the big picture as it relates to the MOU. I'd like to offer any assistance I can. If we can increase the likelihood of success, and strengthen it somehow, I think it's really important. Keep in mind what CBC can do to strengthen that process if it requires legislative assistance.
- I recognize the importance of the meeting tomorrow and I'm very sorry I cannot be there tomorrow. If I could be there, I would be.

Action Items:

- ***Kelli will send the call in number for tomorrow's (November 17) Landscape Health Subcommittee meeting to all working group members.***
- ***Dale will take the lead finding/assigning support for the Landscape Health Subcommittee in implementing responsibilities associated with implementation of the MOU. He will also work***

with the Forest Service to identify an individual with responsibility for coordinating implementation of the MOU.

- ***Dale and Ryan will have a discussion regarding Ryan's short- and long-term involvement with the CBC.***

Missoula Meeting

We attended a meeting on the SIMPLE models, which are not simple. This was an effort to move forward on the Landscape Assessment which is the big picture working down, whereas the MOU is the small picture working up. There is also a hope that this Assessment, in a faster pace, can help answer the question of what the Timber interests within the group need.

Rural Economies

The County Commissioners convened to bring specific needs forward to the CBC. We will have a Rural Economies Meeting in early January to vet those needs. This will be considerably different that what we've done before. We will request time on the January agenda to bring those efforts forward.

National Guard Youth Challenge Program

Where there were previous issues with creating a 501(c)3 organization for this group, this issue has been resolved and they will begin seeking contributions for the Center. The National Guard is very optimistic and they believe it will certainly happen. The Governor supports the project, and there is broad based support through the community. There was an announcement distributed to the Working Group that contained the details of the 501(c)3 organization and its structure.

Other

Of interest to Clearwater County, the Corps of Engineers has had their budget reduced by \$50,000 and this will equate to one less Deputy on the Reservoir and will also impact the CPTPA and the Sheriff's Office. Locally, this will be a big deal. This will be a topic of discussion in Washington DC. Where this doesn't have a specific impact on the County itself, they will not be able to provide a specific service – such as towing boats, shoreline assistance, and no evening shoreline sweeps. This will make it infinitely harder on the local Sheriff's Office as they will be answering missing person's requests instead of performing evening shoreline sweeps.

Recreation

Regional Office Meeting

We met with the Regional Office of the Forest Service regarding trails, concerns for outfitters and concerns from the CBC that wilderness support is diminished due to trail issues. In February we are due to have someone come speak to the CBC regarding trails.

Action Item: Chris Ryan and Garry Edson from the Regional Office will make a presentation regarding trails and trail maintenance to at the February Working Group meeting.

Potlatch Corporation / North South Route

The Recreation Group met with Vice Presidents of Potlatch Corporation and was very heartened that they were supportive of considering the North/South Route through their lands. They had concerns regarding Potlatch's ability to continue managing their land with the presence of this Route. However, they gave us a lot of time and questions. It was generally viewed that having that caliber of people meet with us was very illustrative of Potlatch's intent.

That evening, our Co-Chair met with the Pierce City Council to discuss the N/S Route. They made a motion at the meeting and will be sending us a letter of support. The Pierce ATV Club made an appearance at that meeting in full support.

We will also be getting a letter of support from Idaho Dept of Lands in support of a Feasibility Study for the Route.

Other than Elk River, we have all parties in agreement that we should pursue the North/South Route. We will be meeting with Kooskia on December 15th. We'll also be hosting a general Open House for the Public in Grangeville and Orofino.

Comments:

- *The purpose of the grant is to fund a Feasibility Study? Yes.*
- *Can we have a contest to rename the Route? Yes, but later.*
- *What about the price for an easement? Potlatch really wouldn't discuss that specifically. They were more interested in finding out if people used the trail, would there be a stream of income to them? They were very interested in a stream of revenue from users. They have 3,000 people now that buy their permits. They maybe think, perhaps 9,000 or 12,000 will use the trail.*
- *What would the Feasibility Study cover?*

- Briefly, and not in its entirety, the Feasibility Study would cover a field inventory of trails, take into consideration the level of skill required to traverse the trail, compatibility for different types of vehicles, route analysis and identification of alternatives for such issues as logging and forest management, delineating public roads, requirements for licensing and permits, environmental impacts, alternative routes and closure points, identification of locations for signage and educational kiosks, identification of location for sanitary facilities, economic feasibility and annual maintenance costs, identification of cultural locations and educational opportunities, long term and short term recommendations, and more.
- The Good Samaritan law was discussed. When a landowner charges a fee for access, they are not covered by the Good Samaritan law. Additionally, easements with Potlatch are of familiar use to the Fish & Game Offices and their understanding is that easements do not particularly aide a landowner. They decrease land values and there would need to be real positive caveats for Potlatch.
- They are willing to talk with us because of the broad based support brought by the CBC.
- Safety was of major concern to Potlatch and they recognize the need to address that.
- *My prediction is that IDL may be your bigger problem, as IDL doesn't even have easements with Potlatch Corporation – they issue multi-year permits, but not easements.* Two things have happened – Idaho State passed a law that stickers sold to ATV users pay \$2 and one goes to IDL for access and the other \$1 goes to local law enforcement. They also have an MOU with Parks and Recreation in other parts of the State of Idaho. If they already have this, then it's a bonus. We will be attempting to meet with Dave Groeschl, the new State Forester.

Action Item: Individuals who have creative ideas regarding a “catchier” name for the North-South Route should submit them to Holly.

Land Allocation

We have met the Regional Office in Missoula about trail maintenance. Of interest, there were discussions regarding the creation of any new wilderness areas and how that could affect current roadless areas. We were encouraged with the discussions. They are aware of our concerns and the issues we deal with in our group.

Comments:

- *Has there been any discussion about Carol Hennessey's position?* Yes. We strongly defended the nature of her program and the fact that it brings in 8:1 revenue to her salary. The Region

really had no idea, and we got to them before the Budget people did. We clearly supported her program and her specific position.

- *We've had continuous support by CBC for trails maintenance, and we're impressed by the amount of work that she accomplishes, there is concern about what happens if she disappears, but it seems that it would be a major loss to our interest if we lost that institutional knowledge.*
- The proposal on the table would eliminate her position and distribute the money to the Districts.
- We should ask the question, "If we keep her job, who else's job will be eliminated?" We need to understand the whole picture. We also need to remain in support of the Forest Supervisor so as to not undermine him.
- If that money goes to the Districts, there is concern that the money will get lost in the weeds.
- She has been a huge help to the Outfitters and Guides and we should do whatever it takes to keep her position.
- One of the primary focuses of the conversation in Missoula was the Outfitters and Guides. Perhaps we should focus on the results of what the position brings to us rather than the individual. We need to incorporate this into part of the discussion tomorrow at the MOU discussion.
- I think it's a dynamic nature of the agencies that we work with. We'll see people come and go and we just need to keep focused on the job itself. We're losing our Regional Forester, this trails position may go away – we need to keep focused.

Action Item: Importance of trails is paramount, trails play an integral role, and we need a letter of support to the Region and to the Forest Supervisor.

Wilderness Report and Discussion

We will take a little different approach this morning. We will do an overview, have a bit of a recap of previous discussions and then will talk about The Great Burn and Mallard Larkins.

Special Introduction

In talking with other people, we thought about Leadership and how the Senator set this group up. It became important to realize that it's more important to move forward for the betterment of all involved. We ask that you recommit to being a Leader for this effort.

The Great Burn

This area has a few different names: Kelly Creek, and officially known as the Hoodoo Roadless Area. The Roadless Area spans both sides of 252,000 acres. 154,000 are on the Idaho side, and the area is basically the Kelly Creek watershed. It is defined, in large part, by Kelly Creek with the fishery there and the wildlife and backcountry resources. Early on, we decided if the stars line up and we can incorporate the Montana side can contribute, that would be great – however, that has not happened yet. So, this proposal focuses on the Idaho side. There are 30 lakes in there. This is relatively low elevation compared to other wilderness areas. Typically, wilderness is in the higher, alpine type environment. These elevations go up to 7,900 feet. In backcountry landscapes, this would be important for wildlife habitat, geology in the area (how Hoodoo got its name), fisheries (Kelly Creek is managed as catch-and-release and named as top stream in America). According to the Idaho Roadless Rule and it's called the Great Burn for a good reason, as a majority burned in the 1910 fires and why the area remains pristine. There are six outfitters operating in the area, from both Montana and Idaho.

What makes the area special? It's had long support for wilderness; it was recommended in the Forest Plan and has been managed as such. One potential conflict is there is a significant amount of snowmobiling from Montana (from Hoodoo Pass and Lolo Pass) and because this had been recommended as wilderness in the Forest Plan, we didn't spend nearly as much time in Subcommittee as other areas. This wasn't due to a lack of priority, just that there was broader acceptance for wilderness in this area.

In 1972 there was a RARE 1 designation, and we've been as far as being on the President's Desk for signature and didn't make it. The very first collaborative effort our Co-Chair was involved in sought protection for this area. The Idaho batholith is a very unique geological feature. National Geographic featured it in 1987. The horizontal relief is amazing in the area. You can get into portions of the Great Burn that are extremely unique. The fisheries are extremely important.

This has been through tremendous public process already. It's not been scientifically determined, but wildlife corridors in this particular area appear to be a significant wildlife intersection. Why would we want to protect this area? Similar to the National Geographic response, this is one of the few places that there is 30-40 miles of horizontal sub-alpine terrain that is fragile, sensitive and erosive. We have something here that is very special.

There will be a time to negotiate boundaries, and that can be done later. It is not the appropriate time to do that now, that will happen in the corridors of Congress.

The snowmobile issue is flagged. The Great Burn is currently closed and is patrolled by Marshall's. It is open on the Idaho side and we expect that in the future it may be closed to motorized access.

Fish Lake is important to the motorized community. They have spent years developing the trail by bypassing the meadows, have installed outhouses and fire pits and it's important that this cherry-stem

road stays open. It's one of the only alpine lakes that one can ride to. From the motorized community, this is a rare opportunity for us. We can then hike to other lakes.

Comments:

- If the TMP knocks out snowmobiling in the area it becomes a moot point. However, if it does not, there is a map the group can refer to that describes the area the snowmobiler's are interested in. We talked about cherry-stemming Fish Lake – what about Scurvy Mountain Lookout? *That was not for today's discussion – but none of the wilderness would close any ATV trails.*
- *Can we have some assurances that Fish Lake will remain open?* That will, certainly, at least by my organization and others. Fish Lake will stay open. We are committed to that effort.

We do want to frame the discussion today that a vote today will be for including a *future* legislative package. Ultimately, later in the group progress, we will eventually vote on the inclusion of wilderness in an overall package. But, today, we are deciding to either include or exclude this area for consideration overall. We are just communicating on whether we support this in drafting legislation.

Comments:

- Most of you know that I've supported the Forest Plan. Based on knowledge I've received lately, I put more support in the Idaho Roadless Plan and it does set this aside the same as the Forest Plan.
- You've phrased this differently than you have before. You've demonstrated that the permanence of these issues are dependent upon the successes of other issues coming through the CBC. That makes a difference for me. I accept that I need to support wilderness in order to get my needs met. I understand that someday we'll have the "grand poobaa" meeting that will present the entire package to everyone and say "we are done" and we're ready to go forward. If we're working hard to bring other issues forward, then I can be satisfied with that.
 - *I'm really glad that you brought that up. Communication is never perfect. You may think you've been clear about something and when it's actually delivered it's not perfect. If you have concerns such as this, I want to make sure that you all agree, on the context of what we're all voting for.*
 - Yes, it's all in how it's phrased. We understand that we're going to move wilderness forward, and if I look at the map in front of me and can I ask about the Great Burn, I can say yes, and can I agree on the boundaries, no.
 - If you look at our Protocols, you honor our protocols by having these kinds of discussions. We've instructed our facilitator to keep us together as a group. It will be a

year before we can really talk about this again. We'll then have some drafted legislation that will be in front of us.

- Briefly, a lot of us have had this in mind for a long time. I'd like to thank you for articulating this so well.
- So that we're clear, after the last meeting, we had this discussion with the Steering Committee. From our Co-Chair (Subcommittee) perspective, we almost wanted to stop the discussion entirely because of the negative connotations that were occurring. From my discussions, our thought is that this has to be part of the larger legislative package. There may never be a "grand poobaa" meeting. The stuff that we work on will progress and evolve separately. Hopefully, we can keep the Legislative and Administrative approaches kind of level – but they most likely won't be. In context, this collaborative effort will never end because we have to have citizen involvement in the management of our forest lands. It's important to articulate that these votes aren't to say if these particular pieces are "going to be wilderness" they are to determine "if they will be part of our overall package."

I'm glad to hear that the County Commissioners will be bringing forward some specific ideas, because we need that.

- I am hearing two different things. I'm glad you said that.
- I don't think it's a big division. We signed the MOU, we committed to a long term contract. We applied for a CFLRP and received it, and that's long term. We're not asking you to sign in blood today; we're just trying to move this forward.

Vote: Is there agreement by the CBC that an area in within "the Great Burn" should be included in a legislative package (boundaries to be decided later and contingent upon all pieces of the legislative and administrative package moving forward together)?

Those who had less than full support did not cite any issues in addition to those already recorded in previous votes.

Thumbs Up: 12

Thumbs Down: 1

Thumbs Sideways: 2

Down: I hear the discussion, and I hear everyone and we're not "mad". It's the same reason, and I think everyone knows that the Great Burn will probably be the first one I support. It's implied. If I'm forced to vote at this time, I have to say no.

Sideways: Nothing new. I worked really hard on the LaRocco bill and so many things have changed that I'm disappointed in what happened there. Outfitters are not opposed to wilderness itself, it's the

management that goes along with it that makes it difficult to do business. This is our livelihood and our business. That's the difference between us and those that just want to recreate.

Sideways: Nothing new.

Mallard Larkins

This has long been a centerpiece of conservation efforts. The tallest peaks are around 7,000 feet, so again, low elevation. Centered around Mallard Peak, there are about 30,000 acres designated as Pioneer Area in 1969. A copy of that is available. There are news stories from 1969 and how that came to be a Pioneer Area. The Roadless Area is 255,000 in size, so one of the largest in the State.

Comments:

- *Where is the county line?* The Shoshone/Clearwater boundary runs down Bear Ridge. The majority of the proposed area is not in Clearwater County.
- *Did anyone talk with Shoshone County Commissioners?* Last February we did. At that point in time, one Commissioner thought it already was wilderness. They have the same skepticism and general concerns about wilderness. When asked for specific issues, none of them were aware of them. They mentioned that it was so far south that the snowmobiling doesn't really go that far south as it's incredibly difficult to get to. It's a long ways from Wallace, from St Maries, etc. It was left with a desire to communicate further; there definitely wasn't a negative connotation at the conclusion of the discussion.
- *What about the Little North Fork drainage?* That's in the Panhandle Forest. The lakes are in the Panhandle Forest.
- *What about the two Counties?* We talked about outreach that would occur, pending the discussion coming out of the CBC, with Shoshone County and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe. We didn't want to make recommendations without that due diligence. Depending upon how the vote comes out today, that would give us direction to continue those discussions or not.
- *This question should be framed differently, because it sounds like it needs further development by the Subcommittee.*
- *This is an issue that has not been addressed by the Senator's Office. They are focused on the Clearwater Basin. We have discussed including the Nez Perce National Forest within the basin. But, in this instance, our offices have not come to an understanding nor have had a conversation with moving this particular boundary northward. So, where CBC is working on economics and land allocation, and here we want to leave the area for a particular concern and you are having*

discussions far ahead of what our office has talked about internally. That's just where we are. You can decide where to go as a group, and then we can go that direction. The Senator and Chief of Staff are going to ask the question "is Benewah County, Coeur d'Alene Tribe and Shoshone County now a part of the CBC?" The vast majority of this is within the Clearwater Basin. The NE portion, draining into the St Joe, doesn't drain into the Clearwater Basin. We are already working on an area that is in another county. It's not sudden. The whole Mallard Larkin area is within our geographic scope. *We have a map we've all agreed to.*

- *Our mission statement has no specific county designation; it is towards the Clearwater Basin. It does take in portions of Shoshone County. That is correct; the majority of the Mallard Larkins is in the Clearwater Basin. Perhaps this was a conversation we should have had earlier [our offices] but these are conversations that need to happen.*
- This was not unanimous in the Land Allocation Subcommittee, because I voted down on it. I don't think we have the resources for it or the time. I think it's awkward and not useful.
- The majority of Mallard Larkin is in Shoshone County and I don't see how you can talk about Mallard Larkin without talking about Shoshone County.
- I talked briefly with Chairman Cantemessa, and I can't speak for Shoshone County, but I believe that if Clearwater County were to ask, I get the sense that they would agree. I would have a hard time supporting something outside of our boundaries without consulting them. This is a particular area of concern and I realize how important this is to you. I think it's something we need to work through together. When I can support this, I will lobby to help support this with Shoshone County. When the time comes, I will help get that support. Another thing, for a point of reference, Hoodoo Pass is in Shoshone County.
- I, like others, am uncomfortable with moving into other areas. I'd like to see it remain within the boundaries. I think it makes it simpler. If we move ahead, I think the Commissioners should talk to the Shoshone County Commissioners. The new Forest Plan will have Mallard Larkins as suggested wilderness. I agree that bringing in new tribes, new commissioners, and new counties are an issue – something we could move through, but it's still an issue.
- *If we decide to support Mallard Larkins, I don't think it needs to reopen invitations to the CBC. I do think that shuttle diplomacy needs to occur, and it has happened and started as well. I don't think we need to re-open membership to the CBC.*
- To clarify, our vote was not on County Lines; our vote was on National Forest Lines. We took into consideration the outline of the area. I agree that we have a public review process going on in the Panhandle right now that we don't want to usurp. The proposal by the Subcommittee was the entire Mallard Larkins, unless there were insurmountable political challenges. I would like to see that consideration voiced in this body. In other words, I don't want to discard that

part in the Panhandle just because of the National Forest. It should be contingent upon the Management Process.

- I remember that the Shoshone Commissioners mentioned that we should check with Benewah County because they are really the users. We have such a multi-jurisdictional issue going on, it is very confusing.
- We could grow our collaboration to tremendous sizes if we really start considering everyone who needs to be involved. Perhaps the only thing that really needs to happen is the shuttle diplomacy with the Counties and their Commissioners?
- Personally, drawing a line along a Forest Boundary doesn't make sense to me. It would cut out the best part of the Mallard Larkins. What I see us doing, is not to invite new members, but just to talk about it. It's just on the table for discussion. We understand we have to invite other interested parties into the discussion, but without getting the collaborations support, we can't go any further. We have to have the support of the CBC to move forward.
- In the interest of closing the discussion, we can just determine the boundaries later. It involves a leap of faith, yes. It will make it much easier to extend the boundary on the Nez Perce NF for others.
- People living in the area know, we have suddenly been thrust upon us the opportunity to vote together – so the voting districts are now together. I think it would be good to talk to the Shoshone County Commissioners because it would be good to get them involved.
- I second the boundary deferral. This discussion won't end here. At the national level, they won't be concerned with county and national forest lines as much as they will be with state lines. Boundaries will continue to be adjusted.
- As we talk about boundaries being adjusted, they would be relatively modest boundary line adjustments. It wouldn't result in a 100 acre wilderness.
- If we get insurmountable political obstruction, then we won't go there. What's relevant, if that has to happen, then it will happen.
- Included in the Panhandle Forest Plan, the Pioneer Concept was left in there until such time as a wilderness designation might take place.
- Wyatt Earp was a Marshall in Wallace, Idaho and apparently cornered a guy by the name of Buzzard, hence the name of Buzzard Roost.

Is there agreement by the CBC that an area within “the Mallard-Larkins” should be included in a legislative package (boundaries to be decided later, and contingent upon all pieces of the legislative and administrative package moving forward together)?

Caveats: The Working Group recognizes the complexities associated with including lands outside the Basin; including lands that are mostly within Shoshone County; including an area where users are primarily from Benewah County; including lands that require consultation with the Coeur d’Alene Tribe; including lands in the adjacent Idaho Panhandle National Forests. Inclusion of lands outside the Basin would need to be vetted with Senator Crapo and his staff.

Vote: 11 thumbs up, 3 thumbs sideways, 2 thumbs down

Concerns: Including lands within the St. Joe Basin; having something tangible to offer to those who aren’t in support of Wilderness; desire to include the ENTIRE area; haven’t laid the foundation to include “the entire block.”

Down: I was instructed to vote as I did because of the boundaries.

Down: We may be able get support later, after we have something to bring them in the way of a tangible offer to the communities. Also, the Mallard Larkins has boundary issues. Although I voted no, from the 30,000 foot view, I think it needs to be ultimately included. I think it all needs to be included. I can’t speak for Shoshone County, but I do believe that if we asked them they would support it if we did.

Sideways: I feel like we’re way ahead of ourselves. I firmly believe, and have for most of my life, that this was already wilderness. But, I just don’t want to see us get ahead of ourselves.

Comments:

- It’s important to recognize that there are a lot of conservationists that will represent the other side of the spectrum. If we reduce it to too small of a size, we will get great opposition.
- Point taken, but the reality of dealing with people is that you cannot force this upon people. They will say no to the whole thing. I spent a lot of time explaining this, and they can accept some of this.
- I suggest that we send a letter to the entities involved just to give them a heads up of what we’re doing and extend the offer to initiate a discussion.
- How long is the list of entities? I think there are political ramifications. I assume that the Senator wants to be involved with other political entities for treaty purposes, or otherwise?

- It's not just treaty rights; it's just that our office believes that all involved parties should be at the table.
- It's all about timing. I would assign this task to the Steering Committee.

Action Item: The CBC Steering Committee will draft a letter that will be sent to Benewah and Shoshone Counties, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe and the Idaho Panhandle National Forests regarding the CBC's desire to include lands north of the Clearwater Basin in the Mallard-Larkins wilderness recommendation.

ARRA Program as Applied to Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests

Susan Graves, US Forest Service

What's been decided on Weitas Creek Bridge? The only decision so far is to close it, due to safety concerns. It was one of three projects that were dropped. It's been applied for Capital Improvement Project Funds. It's closed to foot traffic and all.

I was happy to see the brushing of all the roads. That really helped. The Lolo Motorway rocking project was so good that it made people complain about the other roads.

Did you have a total number of employees hired? We were only able to hire them as term employees, and we only hired about 6 or 7, mostly in the weed department. There were 4 in Engineering and an archeologist and a weed person. We know that the Tribe did some additional hiring.

What about adding all the contractors and IYCC and JCC? I could probably find it. *We get the question a lot, what did the program really bring to our community?* We know that we kept a lot of businesses open as opposed to being closed during the season.

Under the CFLRP we have entered into another agreement with JCC to keep the kids working through the summer. We know that it's worked over the last three years and want to keep it going.

What's the difference between the Idaho Youth Conservation Corps (IYCC) and Job Corps Center (JCC)? IYCC is from the Idaho Dept of Labor, specifically disadvantaged and low income families. JCC is a job training center, an on-the-ground training center. The JCC is a trade school. It works under the US Dept of Labor.

....Lunch.....

Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association, Grant Simmonds

We'd like to congratulate the Collaborative on their efforts to date. When a District Ranger, who was considering retiring, decides to stay on board for your projects that's a considerable compliment.

It has taken 8 years to see the Owyhee Management Act arrive at the President's desk for signature. This dealt with the public lands in second largest county in southern Idaho, which was significantly different than what the CBC deals with here. There were 68 ranchers in that area tied up in court relative to their future. The recreation component was considerable with all the canyons the area dealt with. The Owyhee Commissioners were insightful in taking the bull by the horns after 2001 when Clinton left office and the threat of a national monument had gone away. There was a window of opportunity when the Commissioners brought forth the Owyhee Initiative. I represented the Outfitters and Guides and non-outfitted hunters. At that time, the issue was appropriate access.

There were 517,000 of wilderness that were created, another 316 miles of Wild and Scenic Rivers, a "science review concept" that was funded where ranchers could have decisions reviewed by a scientific board. We proposed outfitter language that didn't happen. After iterations of going back to Washington DC, our language that referred to "shall" was relegated to "may". There was a little disappointment overall. As you know, there is a give and take in this process. Our workgroup has continued in the form of a 501(c)3 initiative – we are now a Board.

We are monitoring implementation by BLM very carefully as they write the Wild and Scenic Management Plans and the Scientific Review Board. We get reports from the managers on a regular basis. We've had some disappointments occur as part of the Owyhee Agreement didn't make it into law, where Ranchers were supposed to be able to continue some practices such as herding cattle with their ATV's and they can no longer do so.

Presentation

Our letter to the CBC explains the two meetings that occurred between representatives of the CBC and the IOGA. There was no support for wilderness as it was proposed at that time. The second letter outlines what the suggestions to the CBC with regards to land-based outfitters and their needs. They need to be able to "get there". They would like to use mechanical means to achieve those needs, for a limited amount of time.

With regards to Wild and Scenic Rivers, designation is one thing while actual Management Plans to implement those designations are quite another. We've expressed our concerns previously regarding the Boulder White Clouds. We needed to ensure that our ski helicopter operation continues. There were trails that we did *not* want to see mechanized.

The 1998 Draft EIS with regards to the Frank Church Wilderness cost us greatly to respond. The proposal outlined a 50% cut in use. The IOGA response was that the rivers were in good condition to

begin with. We did not feel there were social concerns with rafting or jet boating the rivers. They assembled their own economists and there was a supplemental EIS that was released that provided better options.

Here, we understand that land-based outfitters are ambivalent regarding wilderness designation. They would like to maintain assigned campsites. This is where an outfitter can take their clients after they deplane from Lewiston. It is through a Special Use Permit. They want to continue to use chainsaws in the Wild and Scenic corridor. They also urge this group to consider utilizing the Wild and Scenic act as the less restrictive of the two acts where you are going to have designated Wild and Scenic they would like to see it take priority over the Wilderness act. This will be controversial, we understand.

Most of you are aware of the trails problem. We have expressed some of our thoughts, relative to trails, and you've also heard from the FS on trails. Even though the Frank Church Wilderness Act *specifies* that trails will be maintained, it should be understood that it is not happening. This is not the fault of the FS, budgets are not there and it's impossible for them to keep up.

If you reach the point that you are lobbying for something in DC, we urge you to put something in there (looking at the Frank Church language) that improves on what's been done already.

Comments:

- *What about the CCC concept?* You could almost dust off the CCC and apply it today. Your Economic groups should be involved. (CCC – Save the Soil, Save the Forests, Save the Young Men) It seems appropriate for this age.
- *The Traditional Skills School seems to fit a lot of these criteria, and could be combined – today, traditional skills are those used in wilderness areas.*
- *Why wouldn't the IF&G Agency offer unused non-resident tags to local residents?* This is something that is set by the Idaho Legislature. This isn't something that the local managing agency can change. There are a lot of "glitches" in there; I think there is the ability for the Director or Commission to alter pricing with very limited ability without the approval of Legislature. The whole fee structure, however, is determined by Legislature.
- *If we could create an action item – in January / February we should meet with Virgil Moore and his staff and we could discuss that. In addition, what we discussed previously in WDC, we met with the New Mexico folks and they had a program similar to the CCC and it gets into the backcountry. We could return to that and explore it some more.*
 - *You're describing the IYCC Program – Federal funds down to the State and out to the forests. There are certain criteria you need to meet to qualify; you need to be*

unemployed, a certain age, etc. The reality is different as far as work ethics are concerned today.

- *Discussions have occurred in the past with the Red River Ranger District and talking about reforming the Dixie Work Camp for use by workers.*
- *What do you think the O&G would need from CBC to move ahead on issues like wilderness? We know that some of you are talking with Outfitters individually, but I would be careful with that. It will take some sort of “guarantee” which may be impossible through legislation, but a place where we can see those percentages in the Clearwater and the Frank to move from low use to higher use. Trails access is critically important. We need some sort of incentive relative to trail maintenance.*
- *I would like to also suggest, short term, consider co-sponsoring “How to Win a Trails Contract with IOGA” either here in Clearwater County or Idaho County.*

The group continued and closed with a discussion of mechanical equipment use within the wilderness.

Action Item: Set up meeting with Virgil Moore (IDFG) and staff when CBC is in Boise in January to discuss in and out of state hunting tags

Action Item: Look into CCC type program and how it can dovetail with the Traditional Skills School (Joyce)

Action Item: Look into co-sponsoring workshops on how to get Trail Maintenance Contracts with IOGA. Set up meeting with Rick Brazell and Carol H to discuss this (Holly and Scott)

CFLRP – Annual Report

We didn't have quite enough matching funds this year, we are about 700,000 short which we don't have to match year-to-year, but we do have to match by the end of the project.

Jobs created did fluctuate after they refined their formula. There will be numbers next year.

We tried to link our goals from the proposal to what we were reporting.

Something unique this year – an accomplishment narrative and we will see the total treatment footprint. They are wanting to see cumulative work each year. 1 mile of road = 1 acre, a formula.

The second handout shows you where the dollars went – what contractors got what. This just gets at where the contracts are going. Can we identify where contracts are going? What communities are benefiting from this program? How well is it being distributed around the region?

In addition to that report, we participated in a National effort to report on CFLRP.

Community Forest Trust – A Pilot Project

We have not heard that SRS is succeeding on any front. There is no money and it's causing difficulty accomplishing the task. Rural Economies is to the point that we either have welfare dollars not to work, or figure out a solution to move forward to put people to work. It has to be putting people to work producing something, not just government dollars to push paper. The CFLRP project is great, but is not a long-range solution. This takes the approach, "how can we feasibly bring our main industry back to life" and this is a Pilot Project to see if it can be done with 200,000 acres. It's just a drop in the bucket, but if we pick up and are successful in having the FS identify those 200,000 acres and the State manages them – what are the holes and what are the problems with going forward?

This is one way to potentially solve the problem. The State manages acres for endowments, and this would be essentially the same for the benefit of the counties. If and when SRS is not reauthorized, it will devastate the Counties.

Comments:

- *I would love to hear how IDL supports this. I'd like to hear how F&G would respond to this. When I go back to Washington DC, we'll be supporting SRS. This isn't on the table back there. What's the vehicle for us to continue discussing this?*
 - The Land Board is in favor of this.
 - There was a concept as part of the reauthorization that something like this is attached to some Bill. It's a good conversation because it will be attached somewhere.
- *How many acres in the basin? It would be best to identify acres that will actually produce product that is viable. Won't they need to know where those acres are? The FS needs to take the first step of identifying those acres. I kept bringing maps to the FS and we kept hearing about streams, etc.*
- *What area are you looking at? We will get a list for you.*
- *What is the reality that we need to face here? That's a difficult question to answer. In backing up, in talking about what the FS is selecting – they are looking for partners to work with. The Legislative realities in DC cannot really be answered. This isn't the only great idea, some counties in Oregon want the railroad lands back so they can auction them off – hopefully to timber interests who will log it and hopefully bring the money back into communities.*

- Right now, there are no agreements. With help, we can figure out how to make it happen. Right now, the Senate is focusing on reauthorization of SRS, with a 5% reduction every year. The House's Resource Committee is saying there needs to be resource utilization in any proposal. The House Resource Chair has been floating a similar concept. If we step out and float it first, and it's palatable to both sides, it could succeed. We've sent letters to all sorts of entities requesting suggestions. Two came back with a no-go. Then we go to what Oregon is doing where we start to sell things off. When the economy hits rock bottom, then we will begin taking land protections secondary.
- *Would all 50 states have to agree on one plan?* This is just one tool of many. The FS has 10 year contracting authority, and we can combine things that are independent of the whole and start getting people to work. This is one way of getting out of the dogfight in the hallway. In limited time, we don't want a huge legislative front.
- *As an interim, can Idaho and Clearwater counties do MOU's with the Forests to make them whole?* This would be a State wide effort. This would be a State Agreement.
- *I think the vehicle is Stewardship Contracting.* It's an MOU for the vehicle - it's just a way to move forward.
- *We are not asking for a vote on this – it's too vague, it's just to get the discussion moving. It's just an idea of what to do.*
- *SRS has already expired, and there will be one more check.* What happened last time? There was a lapse of one year; we are actually operating in a deficit already. Layoffs will occur next year. When we budget in July, we'll know.
- *Does this effort have a staff, or is there someone collecting all this?* Yes, someone is organizing it. If you want to learn more, talk to the County Commissioners.
- *I would like to know the feeling of the group.* The Rural Economies are working on things to include in legislation. We need to know how you guys are feeling about this.
- *If the Forest Service does an MOU with Idaho Dept of Lands, is it the same structure as one that would occur with the Nez Perce Tribe or others? What would be different than what is now, legislatively, exempt from NEPA?* I understand this part. In the interim, we have about 6 months to figure out how to get cash into the Counties to keep them afloat.

Generally, the group was very supportive of coming up with an idea to offset the lack of SRS funds should they not be reauthorized.

By Friday, the 2nd, email questions relating to this subject to Heather so they can begin to circulate to the group.

Further Comments:

- *I don't think we're even far enough along to consider, but interestingly enough I thought it wouldn't go at all, but now after hearing about it being described a little, I am more interested in learning more.*
- *I'm sure you all know that this will be controversial if this suspends environmental laws. I only say this because anything controversial is not going to go sailing through Congress. So, I do think that we need to come up with alternatives while this makes its way along.*

The reality is that the ideas the Counties are going to present, we understand the realities of having a gap. We don't know how to fill that gap yet. We still need to get SRS reauthorized. We ask that your organizations please support this effort.

Steering Committee

We are continuing to plan for our trip to Washington DC the first week of December. There are lots of meetings schedule with the Hill, Agency and Departments.

There will be no Working Group Meeting in December. There will be a Working Group meeting in January. Early in February we will attend the IFRP in Boise, will attempt to schedule time with the Governor. We will have a Working Group Meeting in February towards the end of month.

North/South Route Proposal is in front of the Steering Committee for review and discussion during its development.

The CFLRP Monitoring Coordinator RFP will be further in its development over the next month.

Website updates are being completed.

Public Comment

Round Robin

Meeting dismissed

Table of Contents

Bryan Ricker, Senator Mike Crapo’s Office	1
Prior Meeting Notes and Action Items	1
Forest Health & Function	2
MOU Meeting – November 17, 2011.....	2
Missoula Meeting.....	3
Rural Economies	3
National Guard Youth Challenge Program.....	3
Other	3
Recreation.....	4
Regional Office Meeting	4
Potlatch Corporation / North South Route.....	4
Land Allocation	5
Wilderness Report and Discussion.....	6
Special Introduction.....	6
The Great Burn.....	7
Mallard Larkins.....	10
ARRA Program as Applied to Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests	14
Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association, Grant Simmonds	15
CFLRP – Annual Report	17
Community Forest Trust – A Pilot Project.....	18
Steering Committee.....	20
Public Comment.....	20
Round Robin.....	20

Decisions and Action Items

DECISIONS

- Is there agreement by the CBC that an area in within “the Great Burn” should be included in a legislative package (boundaries to be decided later and contingent upon all pieces of the legislative and administrative package moving forward together)? **12 support, 2 “live with,” 1 non-support. Those who had less than full support did not cite any issues in addition to those already recorded in previous votes.**
- Is there agreement by the CBC that an area within “the Mallard-Larkins” should be included in a legislative package (boundaries to be decided later, and contingent upon all pieces of the legislative and administrative package moving forward together)?

Caveats: The Working Group recognizes the complexities associated with including lands outside the Basin; including lands that are mostly within Shoshone County; including an area where users are primarily from Benewah County; including lands that require consultation with the Coeur d’Alene Tribe; including lands in the adjacent Idaho Panhandle National Forests. Inclusion of lands outside the Basin would need to be vetted with Senator Crapo and his staff.

11 support, 3 “live with,” 2 non-support. Concerns: Including lands within the St. Joe Basin; having something tangible to offer to those who aren’t in support of Wilderness; desire to include the ENTIRE area; haven’t laid the foundation to include “the entire block.”

ACTIONS

- Kelli will send the call in number for tomorrow’s (November 17) Landscape Health Subcommittee meeting .to all working group members.
- Dale will take the lead finding/assigning support for the Landscape Health Subcommittee in implementing responsibilities associated with implementation of the MOU. He will also work with the Forest Service to identify an individual with responsibility for coordinating implementation of the MOU.
- Dale and Ryan will have a discussion regarding Ryan’s short- and long-term involvement with the CBC.
- The County Commissioners have a discussion topic for the January Working Group agenda.
- Chris Ryan and Garry Edson from the Regional Office will make a presentation regarding trails and trail maintenance to at the February Working Group meeting.

- Individuals who have creative ideas regarding a “catchier” name for the North-South Route should submit them to Holly.
- Recreation subcommittee will evaluate the need to write a letter to Rick and Leslie regarding the importance of the trails program and coordination efforts.
- The CBC Steering Committee will draft a letter that will be sent to Benewah and Shoshone Counties, the Coeur d’Alene Tribe and the Idaho Panhandle National Forests regarding the CBC’s desire to include lands north of the Clearwater Basin in the Mallard-Larkins wilderness recommendation.