



DRAFT AGENDA

Roadless Areas Review Task Force Monte Vista – Deliberative Meeting June 8, 2006 Draft Agenda

- **8 June- Present and explore options**
- **22 June- Wildlife and watershed implications and winnowing the options**
- **19 July-Finalizing recommendations**

8:00 Welcome, Introductions

8:05 Agenda/Groundrules /Objectives /Overview

Objective:

Operational metaphor here was setting the table...

- **To present for consideration a number of options for each issue area, and**
- **To hear what the initial issues and concerns are with those options, and identify whether there are any gaps**

8:10 Issue Group Reviews-

Each group will review for the committee their discussions, specifically conveying the following:

Broad/big picture context

How the issue relates to the 2001 Rule; modification of the rule (to clarify application); possible alternatives to the rule

Public comments-overview

Statewide and site specific opportunities or recommendations

As applicable to each issue area- an explanation of under what circumstance should/should not roads be constructed/reconstructed or maintained; under what circumstances would (i.e.) trees be removed; under what circumstances would access for tree removal be allowed

DRAFT AGENDA

Discussion to follow presentations should identify any missing gaps, identify possible or viable options; concerns with those options pursued

Committee member will discuss

- 8:15 Grazing (20 minute presentation; 30 minute discussion)**
- 9:05 Coal, gas, oil (20 minute presentation; 30 minute discussion)**
- 9:55 break**
- 10:05 Utility corridors (20 minute presentation; 30 minute discussion)**
- 10:55 Timber**
- 11:45 Recreation**
- 12:35 Lunch**
- 12:45 Boundaries**
- 1:35 Wildlife**

- 2:00 Adjourn**



**Roadless Areas Review Task Force
Deliberative Meeting #3 - Monte Vista
June 8, 2006
Denver, Colorado
DRAFT Meeting Summary**

AGREEMENTS

1. Glenwood Springs Meeting - Forest Service will be asked to present information on the Travel Management Plan.
2. Grand Junction Public Meeting - John Ellenberger and the International Mountain Bike Association will be invited.
3. Grand Junction Public Meeting - Manti La Sal National Forest, Forest Service representatives will be asked to present.
4. The Task Force will discuss boundary adjustments after the Grand Junction meeting.
5. The Task Force will discuss ski trails after the Glenwood Springs meeting.

ACTION/NEXT STEPS

1. Task Force will send any suggestions/changes/missing information to committee
2. Committees will add/modify papers to address the actions, questions or clarifications raised in the meeting
3. Committees will send revised papers to The Keystone Center (TKC) on Friday, June 16th
4. TKC will consistently format them into one document for the June 22nd deliberative meeting, and email them ahead of time
5. John, Steve & Joe will organize a Fire Panel Session for prior to the Glenwood Springs Public meeting
6. Utility Committee will talk with Forest Service special permit folks regarding current practices
7. Forest Service will provide more language on access for improvements, maintenance, and emergencies
8. Forest Service will help the Timber Committee with definitions of "treatment"
9. Forest Service will resend criteria on reclamation/obliteration
10. Forest Service provide a paper on the Travel Management issues

SCHEDULE CLARIFICATIONS

There will be a public comment period to react to recommendations and then a Task Force conference call to discuss comments (NEED A DEADLINE DATE FOR COMMENTS).

COMMITTEE PAPER CLARIFICATIONS

- They are not decisional; not the final product of the Task Force
- Concern that if the draft papers come out the public may become concerned about a draft idea that may disappear
- Each paper must clearly state they are pre-decisional/Draft for discussion only

DRAFT PURPOSES ONLY

- Each paper must state the status of the document/how it was arrived at (e.g., consensus, not consensus, written by one)
- Need to keep petition requirements in mind – this will be the final screen
- Format: background, discussion of the issues, pros/cons, recommendations and how & why the recommendations were arrived at
- Articulate edits/suggestions used and suggestions not used

COMMITTEES

GRAZING – committee consensus document

Committee Members: Melanie, Dave Ubell & Tom

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Define “valid and existing rights”
- Develop specific clarifying language on permit renewals
- Answer the questions on page 2
- Develop more details for option 3/hybrid

ENERGY/COAL/GAS – not a consensus document

Committee Members: Russ, Steve, John

Agreement: Discuss boundary adjustments after the Grand Junction meeting.

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Address what to do future production (areas where there may be opportunities but no one will say until ready to explore and produce) - should future energy activities be allowed, or are they not compatible? If yes/compatible/allowable, what does that mean – access to whom, what purposes, for how long, what are the standards for reclamation (there are many current examples of standards)
- Provide more information/language about temporary Roads –
 - o Flexibility for temporary roads
 - o Assurances for reclamation of the area to natural condition
 - o Long term enforcement to keep the public out/off
 - o A standard for site specific situations
- Define where there are energy conflicts on National Forests - on what forest in what areas and outline the exact issues on the site specific situations
- Consider current Forest Service processes (e.g., special use permit processes that analysis/consider impacts to wildlife and watersheds)
- Clarify the differences between “existing” at inception of recommendation and “existing” at time of implementation of a rule – the second may create a rush to be “existing” before the rule is implemented
- Address specific sites/hot spots – for example the North Fork and the HD mountains
- Keep in mind things change, new discoveries, new technologies

DRAFT PURPOSES ONLY

UTILITY/WATER ACCESS – not a consensus document

Committee Members: Tom, Russ, Diane, Doug, John, Mike

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Define “reasonable access”
- Define “reasonable” in context of the statement “no reasonable alternative was available” – include the cost/economic component (some terms discussed: feasible, economically feasible)
- Provide more information/language on exceptions for pre-existing leases
- Provide more information/language on permit renewals - If current permit is in IRA, then the IRA should not in/of itself preclude renewals or future permits, although there may be other circumstances that would limit
- Provide more language on access for improvement, maintenance and emergency situations and how it would apply (e.g., utility, ditches etc.) –
 - o ACTION: Forest Service will talk with folks to get more direction on the language to develop for this
- Provide more information/language on temporary Roads for maintaining or replacing structures
- Define/Clarify the terms water conveyances structures versus water retention/diversion structures – are they the same/different
 - o ACTION: Go to Forest Service special permit folks regarding current practice
 - o ACTION: Josh knows of a list of terms regarding water structures
- Look at 2001 rule exceptions
- Find an energy company that has lines in an IRA

TIMBER – not a consensus document

Committee Members: Dave Ubell, Diane, Joe, Steve

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Define treatment - what does it mean (e.g., take individually infected trees or clear cut and how big an area), what are the boundaries of treatment, what are the priorities (e.g., high risk fire area next to development with shaded fuel break cutting versus insect area with individual cutting), under what circumstances should treatment occur (clarify imminent threat and small diameter trees, how big a structure is allowed, how to ensure temporary roads are truly temporary
 - o ACTION: Forest Service will help with the definition of treatment
- Provide more clarity on what is allowable; a clear mandate
- Provide more information/language on enforcement
- Provide more information/language on criteria for reclamation/obliteration
 - o ACTION: Forest Service will resend criteria on obliteration/reclamation

RECREATION – individual document, not consensus

Committee Members: Doug, Steve, Josh Eddie

Agreement: Discuss ski trails after the Glenwood Springs meeting.

DRAFT PURPOSES ONLY

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Clarify whether/how the Travel Management Plan and the IRA process and decisions interact (e.g., does one trump another, does the timing of implementation matter)
- Clarify the ability to reconstruct existing roads – should all existing roads be allowed to be maintained or is this addressed in the Travel Management Plan?
- Clarify/address ski trails, which are different than a recreation trail
- Clarify if and how the Task Force will address trails – ?defer to the Travel Management Plan (providing Task Force addresses ski trails)
- Address roads that were constructed (improved system roads) since the 2001 rule and not included in inventory
- Clarify language on enforcement
- Clarify system and non-system roads
 - o ACTION: Forest Service will assist in this clarification

BOUNDARIES – not a consensus document

Committee Members: Steve, Melanie, Doug, John

Agreement: Discuss boundaries issues after the Grand Junction Meeting.

Clarifications:

- The boundaries the Task Force is using are those outlined in 2001 rule maps and subsequent adjustments by specific forests.
- State law asks the Task Force to make recommendations on management on applicable lands defined as 2001 rule area, may also offer make recommendations on future inventories (as FS revise inventory) and may make management recommendations on other lands.

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Screen other committees' papers from boundary adjustment issues
- Clarify the options – change the boundaries or change the management prescriptions (areas remain/default to IRA when activities are complete)
- Provide language regarding plan revisions allowing for adaptation
- Include the agreement on San Juan between Forest Service and the San Juan Citizens Alliance

WILDLIFE – not a consensus document

Committee Members: Eddie, Dave P, Russ, Joe and Josh

Issues/questions to be addressed:

- Develop agreement on the scope and response to other committees recommendations
- Correction – The 2001 rule is the starting point for discussion, but not a default if the Task Force cannot get 8 votes