

SEORAC LWC Sub-Cmte Meeting – March 15, 2017 1pm PDT/2pm MDT  
Notes

RAC members attending:

Dan Morse  
Mia Sheppard  
Don Hodge  
Jim Bishop  
Slim Stout

BLM staff attending:

Brent Grasty  
Todd Forbes  
Chris Bishop

USFWS staff attending:

Aaron Collins

Members of the public attending:

Jim Walls, Lake County Resources  
Nada Culver, The Wilderness Society  
Soren Jespersen, The Wilderness Society

1. Welcome, Intros, Logistics, Notes

- Dan welcome, open, attendance.
- Brent described work that will go on in between today's sub-cmte meeting and the next RAC meeting.

2. RMP process and status overview

- Brent Grasty
  - Lakeview on a parallel track to Vale.
  - Vale has begun the RMP revision procession earnest.
  - Have project support, writer/editor, decision support resources.
  - Inter-disciplinary team has begun meeting and working with contractors.
  - Discussed planning efforts from 2011 forward including the sage-grouse plan and hiatus for the SEORMP.
  - Potential timeline: Draft RMP/EIS to be through District review in 2017 and to be published in early 2018 with FEIS/ROD in Fall 2019.

- Reminder on the RMP amendment process to address the SEORMP settlement.

### 3. Review of LWC sub-cmte task at hand and history

- Dan summarized the history of the ecological characteristics approach to grouping LWC units.
- Brent reminded the group of the long process used to develop the approach.

### 4. Review of the ecological approach to sorting units for considering management

- Dan explained the method is subjective and primarily for the purpose of breaking this large landscape into small, easier to consider chunks. It is not an objective, additive approach and could be conducted numerous other ways. This is one the RAC chose to pursue as useful.
- Brent will be able to bring initial maps of the hydrology, adjacency to other units with wilderness characteristics and vegetation to the next RAC meeting.
  - Brent discussed how these indicators were chosen by the RAC and how values were assigned to each characteristic within each unit.
  - Brent also discussed the RAC's original intent of having a "scoring system" for general values for each LWC unit.
  - Wilderness – low to high score for how many wilderness possessing lands surround a given unit.
  - Hydrology – scoring is based on dominance of perennially flowing streams that are functions.
  - Vegetation – Based on Ecological Site Inventory data and other data sets.

### 5. Review of possible resource and resource use allocations that could be made in each unit and the choices of relative intensity for each that are available

- Dan described the set of resource use/resource allocation categories in Brent's table and Dan's list.
- Jim Bishop commented that the question is how specific the SEORAC's recommendations ought to be.
- Discussion from Jim and Don that the SEORAC providing a recommendation on the degree of management activities/restrictions/allocations for each LWC unit
- Jim Bishop – SEORAC could make a recommendation that was general for management intensity.

6. Discuss 3 example units that represent the full spectrum of the ecological classification approach and how the resource/use allocations could be applied in each
- Mia Sheppard – Should we think about a specific LWC unit to talk about or be more general?
  - Groups decided to talk about a “theoretical set of units”
    - Generally intact ecologically, pristine
    - Generally impacted ecologically, not in pristine condition
  - Group discussion of a “theoretically” pristine unit ensued. *Brent Grasty took notes on the types of resource allocations that might be made in a “pristine unit” to be used as he compile information for the next RAC meeting.*
  - Slim Stout commented that access to commercial timber areas on private lands should be preserved whether via a ROW or otherwise in any type of unit.
    - Slim requested map overlays of commercial timber resources with LWC units.
  - Brent Grasty provided some background information on access to private inholdings and existing ROWs.
  - Slim Stout stated that there needs to be an assurance of existing access to commercial timber lands needs.
  - Mia Sheppard commented that access to commercial harvest might also be addressed through travel management decisions or other allocations as well as an eventual travel and transportation management plan.
  - Mia commented that commercial use allocations could be made for each LWC unit and discussion ensued.
  - Dan suggested that the RAC and sub-cmte need to see the commercial timber resource layer overlaid with the LWC units and then can revisit access and use issues.
  - Todd Forbes asked whether there was a definition to the “theoretically pristine” unit and whether it was based in ecological or wilderness context.
  - The group had a discussion of OHV area allocations and their possible application for different types of LWC units.
  - The group discussed New Facilities and the possible need to break that down by type of facility, ie: grazing, recreation, transportation, right-of-way. There was discussion of the intent of the facility and whether it supported/enhanced wilderness characteristics or not.
  - The group discussed Commercial Uses and the possible need to distinguish between recreation uses (SRPs) and other commercial uses like timber, or communication sites.

7. Determine the process the sub-cmte wants to use to make suggestions to the ID team and to what level of detail in wants to go in doing this work.

- The sub-cmte will complete the draft table of uses that Brent Grasty has been filling out and will work over e-mail.

8. Wrap Up

- Group thought that we made good progress, a good start. Will need to be further work on