

At its 11-18-2011 meeting, PFC members agreed that they were unlikely to reach consensus on Alternative #5 or modifications to Alternative #5 because the following issues divide them. The PFC will explain its inability to reach a consensus position on Alternative #5 and call attention to the barrier issues in its comment letter to the Payette national Forest.

Cost/Benefit (Road Obliteration and Bull Trout)

Consider alternatives to road obliteration (such as seasonal road closures)

There exists a need for a cost analysis evaluating keeping roads open/long-term maintenance vs. closure (including obliteration)

Some PFC members contend that Alternative #5 provides too little additional benefit for Bull Trout to justify the additional expense

Long-term Management of Roads

Directly related to issue of elk security

Integrity of IRA (Entirety of IRA)

Per original PFC draft letter

Add word "entire"

Achieving Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS)

Some PFC members indicated that they do not support the Payette National Forest pursuing its ACS given current description of methods for doing so

Recreational Use & Public Access

*Deseret Cabin vault toilet (an issue that prevents the Backcountry Horsemen from supporting either Alternative #2 or Alternative #5 – though the Backcountry Horsemen did not challenge consensus on alternative #2)

*Vault toilet at Five Corners (per Alternative #5).

3' path on decommissioned roads (as a basis of a future non-motorized trail system)

Maintain passage on historic routes

Work with permittees when making road decommissioning decisions (unclear whether this is an issue dividing PFC members/preventing consensus or simply reflects an assumption the Forest needs reminding to do so)

Include ATV map in FEIS (RS 2477)

*Not that snowmobile/ATV advocates and Backcountry Horsemen advocate for different vault toilet locations (one or other would not satisfy both constituencies)

Meeting Notes : Payette Forest Coalition 11-17-2012

Submitted by: Mike DeGrosky, Facilitator

Brainstorming: New Meadows Additional Stakeholders

Note: Mike Paradis (Adams County) has a previously developed list. It was suggested that PFC post current ideas for additional stakeholders on a forum at the Spatial Interest website for comment.

USFWS (Forest Service contact)

Nez Perce Tribe (Emmett Taylor) (Note: Desirable, but lack of current MOU may prevent)

Western Watersheds

Livestock permittee (possibilities include Stan B. Eddie Osborne, Ernie Robinson)

OSC

BPA

RV users (dispersed recreation campers)

IDL (if State land in project area)

Mountain bikers

TNC

Irrigators

Meeting Review

Sustain

Maps

Forest Service personnel/specialists

Great food service_

Improve

More structure to discussion (consider using Robert's Rules of Order)

More light/better lighting

15-20 minutes on organizational learning (another participant suggested incorporating OL principles into process/work vs. separate training element). Steering Team take up.

There are concerns that PFC members do not understand their role/function/purpose in relation to NEPA process and that PFC needs to address this issue to avoid FACA concerns