

## BIC Access Subcommittee

**Subcommittee Name:** BIC Access

**Meeting Date:** November 2, 2021, 10:30 am - 12:00 pm

**Committee members in attendance:** Jim Hamsher, Marcie Carter, Andy Smith, Anthony Botello, Bill Lind, Christy Cheyney, Lisa Northrop, Nick Goldstein, Paul Anderes, Scott Peckham, Steve Pozzanghera, Susan Roberts, Mark Owens, Bill Harvey, Carl Scheeler, Sam Palmer, Eric Watrud.

**Invited guests participating:**

**Observers:** Billie Jo

**Documents/presentations reviewed:** BIC Access Desired Conditions Final Draft and Baker County Red Lined Desired Conditions

**Key Issues Discussed, Decisions Made, Points of Agreement/Disagreement:**

The BIC Access Subcommittee reviewed the Desired Conditions final draft developed by a subcommittee of the access committee that represented various governmental entities and perspectives. Baker County a red lined version of proposed changes and the committee worked through those red line suggestions in the committee meeting as follows.

**In Background Section:**

*Original Language:* “Research has demonstrated the potential for impacts to water quality...”

*Change proposed:* “Research has demonstrated potential for **some** impacts to water quality...”

*Outcome adopted by consensus:* Adopt proposed change

*Original Language:* “...density and habitat conditions can have negative effects on wildlife...”

*Change proposed:* “...density and habitat conditions **may** have **some** negative effects on wildlife...”

*Outcome adopted by consensus:* Adopt proposed change

**Desired Conditions Section:** There was a discussion about the need to clarify the audience for this document. Some feel that while these are recommendation to the US Forest Service, the public is also an intended audience. Some of the proposed wording changes submitted by Baker county were intended to make it clearer to the public what the committee is recommending. Relatedly, there was a discussion about this document primary purpose as outlining the *desired* conditions not to be a description of current conditions.

Desired conditions were defined as the specific social, economic, or ecological characteristics of the plan area (or portion) toward which management is directed. After this clarification the group agreed on the following changes:

## BIC Access Subcommittee

### **Under Public Use:**

*Original:* “The public is well informed on forest access. A current and comprehensive inventory of all forest roads and trails is displayed on an easily read map which clearly lists status is essential.”

*Change proposed:* “The public **has a desired to be** well informed on forest access, **therefore** a current and comprehensive inventory of all forest roads and **trails on an easily** read map which clearly lists status is essential.”

*Outcome adopted by consensus:* Adopt the propose change

**Administrative Use:** During this section there were concerns about the public use and its access. The 2018 draft plans defines “Administrative access” as: Access for resource management and administrative purposes such as wildfire suppression, cadastral surveys, permit compliance, law enforcement, and military in the performance of their official duty, or other access needed to manage National Forest System lands or uses. Also, there was a suggestion for adding language in this section that includes the tribal/cultural uses of these areas, whether they are administrative or open to hunt, fish or gather. Due to the different issues raced in this section there was not a consensus.

*Original Language:* “Road and trail systems within the managed landscape support safe and effective access for administrative use.”

*Change proposed:* “Road and trail systems within the managed landscape support safe and effective access **and should be open to the public.**”

*Outcome:* Consensus was not achieved on this issue. The original language will remain the same with further input from the BIC.

*Original:* Roads maintained for administrative access but not suitable or available for general public use have appropriate controls (signing, gates, berms, etc.) to prevent inadvertent public use and an effective compliance monitoring plan is in place.”

*Change proposed:* “Roads maintained for administrative access, **should only be closed for projects on temporary basis and** have appropriate controls (signing, gates, berms, etc.) to prevent inadvertent public use and an effective compliance monitoring plan is in place.

*Outcome:* Consensus was not achieved on this issue. The original language will remain the same with further input from the BIC.

**Elk Security:** There was not an agreement on this section. There was a discussion about the importance of considering security as a larger issue in collaboration with different agencies and tribes. It was decided to leave it as the original wording until BIC’s feedback.

## BIC Access Subcommittee

*Original Language:* “Collaboration and coordination occur that benefits these desired future conditions by addressing the many other factors such as predation, hunting, and private land practices that also effect elk distribution while providing year-round recreational and cultural opportunities and limiting agricultural damage on private lands.”

*Change proposed:* “**Coordination with local and tribal governments** that benefits these desired future conditions by addressing the many other factors such as predation, hunting, and private land practices that also effect elk distribution while providing year-round recreational and cultural opportunities and limiting agricultural damage on private lands.”

Outcome: Keep original language

**Set asides:** There was not consensus on this section. There were issues regarding the language as a desired conditions or expression of interest. This was seen no so much as a difference in the desired conditions, since there is agreement on the desired for no new set asides, it was more a question about how to best word this.

*Original:* “Appropriate uses of general forest area are not constrained by new administrative set asides. The subcommittee does not see the need for any additions to set asides. Understanding that the forest service has to evaluate the suitability and eligibility through the forest planning process for future set asides.”

*Change proposed:* “Appropriate uses of general forest area **are constrained** by new administrative set asides, **and the** subcommittee does not see the need for any additions to set asides. Understanding that the forest service has to evaluate the suitability and eligibility through the forest planning process for future set asides **and should only be done through the coordination with local and tribal governments within affected counties.**”

Outcome: Keep the original language.

Changes that were not included in this meeting can be presented to the BIC with 30 days as a comment to the draft or minority report.

### **Potential Areas of Overlap to Other Subcommittees:**

### **Questions or Feedback needed from other Subcommittees:**

### **Issues to elevate for full BIC consideration:**

### **Next Steps:**

- The BIC access subcommittee will present the BIC Access Desired Conditions Final Draft to the full BIC.
- Baker County will present comments on the report regarding administrative use and set asides sections.

**Next Meeting:** TBD based on member feedback