

Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative
May 15, 2017 – 7:00 p.m.
Board Meeting – University of Idaho Extension Office

Board Members in Attendance:

David Sims, Mayor, City of Bonners Ferry & KVRI Co-chair
Dan Dinning, Boundary County Commissioner & KVRI Co-chair
Gary Aitken, Jr., Chair, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (KTOI) & KVRI Co-chair
Sandy Ashworth, Social/Cultural/Historical Interests
Bob Blanford, Business/Industry
Mary Farnsworth, US Forest Service (USFS), Idaho Panhandle National Forest (IPNF), Forest Supervisor
Ed Atkins Jr., Corporate Agriculture/Landowner
Chip Corsi, (Alt.) Idaho Fish & Game Commission, IDFG
Kennon McClintock, (Alt.) Conservationist/Environmentalist
Tom Daniel, (Alt.) Soil Conservation District/Ag Landowner
Patty Perry, KVRI Facilitator & KTOI
Sherrie Cossairt, KVRI Recording Secretary & KTOI

Agency/Others in Attendance:

Karen Roetter, Senator Mike Crapo's office
Dave Wenk, Boundary County Weed Department
Ed Koberstein, US Forest Service (USFS)
Kevin Knauth, (Alt.) US Forest Service (USFS), Bonners Ferry Ranger District
Greg Hoffman, US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE)
Shoshanna Cooper, US Forest Service (USFS), Idaho Panhandle National Forest (IPNF), Public Information Officer
David Eby, Private Citizen

Opening:

Co-Chair, Dan Dinning opened and welcomed everyone to the meeting; introductions followed.

The April 17, 2017, KVRI meeting draft notes were approved by consensus.

CFLRP Program Review- Patty Perry and Mary Farnsworth

Patty began the CFLRP review explaining that the KVRI Board met with Mary Farnsworth, IPNF Forest Supervisor, on March 23rd to review the program and the targets in detail. This is the one chance offered through the Regional Office to the Washington Office to report how we are doing, what we have done well, where we are coming up short and to adjust targets. Mary explained that this is the first opportunity that anyone has had to make adjustments in their proposals.

After our meeting, Ed Koberstein put together the changes, received comments and made adjustments and prepared a final draft, which was emailed to the Board.

KVRI has been asked as the collaborative to put together a letter to go to Mary that will go to the Regional Office and the Washington office to explain the changes that we would like to propose and why:

Some of those changes are:

- Reforestation-Reforestation can't be done until you harvest, we don't harvest until the sale is sold; not all the sales are sold; not all the sales will be harvested in time to do reforestation to meet the reforestation goals.
- Biomass- The market did not ever materialize as they expected it to in the last 8 years; we won't be able to have the acreages of those we thought we would.
- Helicopter logging-It is very expensive and not as feasible as it was at one time, hard to meet those targets.
- Road Decommissioning- We worked with our community to have the ability to store several of the roads to meet the Grizzly Bear Access Amendment by 2019; the decommissioning is recognized but the road storage isn't in the forest service system so we cannot get credit for the roads that are stored.

In our first proposal, and I was part of that, there was a typographical error that overestimated the roads we planned to decommission. What complicated this issue not long after we started into our project is the Forest Service changed their system on how they would account for and track all of the targets that we said that we would meet.

That contributes to why we need to make the changes. There were also some areas where we excelled and out did ourselves. This is where we are now, and the process we have followed is to send a letter with detailed information to request the changes.

Mary continued with the update as she expressed her thrill in having the opportunity to come visit with the Board and work through this process. It really was a working meeting. It was clear we needed to do a review of things, and as Patty described this is the first time the Washington Office has felt the same need to review and make adjustments.

She stated knowing where the money is spent and where we are with our responsibilities are what's important to her. From her perspective this proposal was remarkably put together; it matched the work we felt that needed to get done even over a period of time and who would have guessed we would meet the timber target and we are on schedule to do that. She is thrilled about that.

We've exceeded the trails target over 700%, those are some good things that have resulted from the partnership that KVRI has with the Forest Service and sticking to the schedules what we need to get accomplished. There are far more positives than the few changes we need to tidy up.

There are those things that we haven't met the mark on, as Patty noted. The road storage is a unique thing. Mary doesn't want it to be perceived as a negative. She explained we get Forest Service credit for work accomplished for roads decommissioned but what we found that a more contemporary practice is Storage. It allows us to do more things later, meet the goal for the Grizzly Bear Access

Amendment and wildlife without doing the whole decommissioning, so it is the better situation from our perspective.

Because we don't get the credit for it; this report is the opportunity to explain why that is. This is that opportunity to report on the good work regardless whether or not the database accepts the code; it is the first time we've had the chance to add a narrative.

She personally wants to take the time to gloat over the partnership with this collaborative. There is a field review by the Washington Office, and they will be coming out along with the Regional Office to visit. She would like to get this report to the Washington Office before that field visit so they can be fully informed about what we are talking about. The timing is exemplary. They will be here July 24 and 25. This is a great opportunity.

Patty asked about the future of CFLR as the program comes to a close in 2019.

Mary stated she had heard in the past some thoughts of extending or expanding the Program but has heard nothing in the past 4-6 months. Her impression with the budget is that she wouldn't be surprised if it went away.

Patty stated that if it were to continue, it would be nice to gain the 2 years on the end that we lost in the beginning.

Mary agreed that would be worthy of discussion. From her perspective it would make sense to extend the 2 years, work on implementation on the projects we have already done environmental work on. She struggles with extending it past that and doing more NEPA.

David Sims had a question for Ed about the letter. Noting on page 2, 1st paragraph; it talks about the number submitted in the original proposal of decommission roads; on the footnote it says the number was in error. Wouldn't it be helpful if that is also noted in the narrative?

Ed replied that he could add that in the narrative as well.

Dan D. asked if the miles of road decommissioned, correlated to 8 or 10 years.

Ed replied that the number represents what we needed as a whole, through the Grizzly Bear Amendment.

Patty asked Ed to make the changes, then get it back to her and she will get it on letterhead and get the signatures needed for the letter to be sent.

Patty asked Mary about how this Collaborative compared to the other in the CFLRP Program.

Mary replied that it was her sense that this report and the work done here have been exemplary compared to others. Other Collaboratives struggled with the magnitude of the money in the beginning, we learned from those stories. What she sees is that we are meeting our commitments and we will just be tidying up. I'm thrilled with what this report says; no one can expect to nail something out 8 years perfectly.

Patty stated that we talked about including or referencing the economic report that KVRI had done by the University of Idaho, is that going to be mentioned or going to be part of the report.

Ed replied that it was not. In a follow up discussion with the Regional Office in regards to what they would like captured in this revision process that is something they basically advised to put in at the end.

Mary added that she would like to highlight that report in the field visit.

Patty thanked Mary and her staff for all their help. She agreed that in the beginning there was a lot of hard work that went into it to get it right the first time.

Patty asked for approval from the board to make the changes needed and send the letter and the Board approved.

BOG CREEK UPDATE-Mary Farnsworth

Mary explained that Bog Creek Road was a project that the Forest Service was approached with by US Customs and Border Patrol eight years ago regarding access to the border. Five years ago the Forest Service and Border Patrol entered into agreement to do some environmental work associated with opening Bog Creek Road (It has been closed since 1988). There were two major areas where the road was gone and there was vegetation affecting the road. They were to look at repair and maintenance of the road so there could be trips across the top, to improve the Border Patrol's mission for Homeland Security. It was proposed to do an EA or EIS depending on what effects there would be, and overtime that developed into an EIS based on the impacts to wildlife and other things.

They were about ready to release the draft to the public when the Border Patrol had changes in personnel and administration. They consequently put things on hold while they reassessed whether that project would meet their needs.

Discussion followed.

The group asked if the Border Patrol decided they wanted the road opened again would it be closed to the public. Mary replied that it would depend on if that would meet the Border Patrol needs. She added that if the Border Patrol needed that road for a certain number of trips per season and if they exceeded that number of trips it may cause that to be modeled as an open road. The Border Patrol has indicated that it would not help their mission to have that be an open road to the public.

Mary stated that in looking through the environmental analysis as to effects, number of trips, how much impact to Grizzly Bear and other species, they could develop alternatives. One: the road could be open to everyone, anyone, anytime or two: limited to administrative trips only to meet administrative missions, of which the Border Patrol would have some access to the number of trips on that road.

The numbers of trips are spread between spring, summer and fall, not winter. The Border Patrol would not be the only user with trip counts; there are range permit users, Continental mine owners, and the Forest Service would need to maintain road. All would be included in the trip count. (A trip is one vehicle, 3 vehicles is considered 3 trips)

Mary stated that the Forest Service would partner with the Border Patrol and would only proceed in doing the environmental analysis work to respond to what the Border Patrol needs to meet their vision goals and mandate. She is the one with the authority of the ground disturbance activities, they are not, so it has to be a joint decision, it's a partnership we have been working through for the last 5 years.

Mary explained in reply to who would pay for road maintenance and repair, that the Border Patrol will repair the road. The Forest Service has a maintenance agreement by which the Border Patrol will put funds into a Forest Service account so they are able to help us maintain the road faster than if the Forest Service could do it. The Forest Service does not have the maintenance funds.

Boulder Creek Restoration Project Update- Mary Farnsworth

Patty introduced the Boulder Creek Restoration Project update explaining that Doug N. gave us a presentation at our last meeting on the Boulder Creek Project; where we were and what we were proposing moving forward. The Forestry Committee met last Friday with the Forest Service staff to explain some changes to that project.

The main change at this point, is the removal of the units that are in the Inventory Roadless Area, most but not all of that was helicopter logging. We had talked as a group whether or not the helicopter units should be in there in the first place and it was decided to put it in only because it would allow us to get the NEPA done on it; so that if down the road and in the lifetime of the NEPA (10 years), it became feasible, or there were a stronger need to do those projects, we would have it covered.

We had a lot of discussion about removing these units at the meeting on Friday. And we understand the rationale there is for litigation if we left the helicopter units in if we did not do an EIS to include those helicopter units, although recognizing those units do meet entirely the Idaho Roadless rule. There is nothing in the Idaho Roadless Rule that would preclude the opportunity that we outlined in the proposal, and we discussed it with Idaho Roadless Commission at their last meeting and they would still like to see us do something with those units.

There is 375 acres in the Roadless Area, off the road to Black Mountain that we are still proposing for ground based operation. Where we left it was that we would encourage Kevin K. to talk to Mary and see if it could be looked at and to reconsider the potential for including those ground based units from the existing road.

Mary stated that she doesn't need to think about that. She has thought about it quite a bit. She would like to speak about it from her world. She explained that periodically through the NEPA process, there are checkpoints where the District comes in to brief her because she is the decision maker for the projects. A month ago, when talking to the Deputy Regional Forester, Dave Schmid, he knew we had some projects in the Roadless areas. He asked that she look at her projects to see how they fit with the Roadless Rule because some projects are being litigated and he wanted her to make sure she was well briefed on these projects on her District.

After the briefing and discussion about Idaho Roadless there were impacts that were challenging and needed to be looked at. Such as if we impact a Roadless area significantly, and that is a subjective yet important word, we have to look at the impact of the ability of that Roadless area to be recommended as wilderness sometime in the future (25-30 years out).

The fact that it is 1600 acres in helicopter units is significant. Its feasibility is shaky and it will affect visuals in that Inventoried Roadless Area. Add to that, the conventional logging were up to 2000 acres in the Roadless. The magnitude of that for the region is far higher than proposals in the past and in the last couple of years has jumped hugely. Treating along roadside, hazardous fuels treatment, treating 100 or less acres along roadside, is different than proposing 2000 acres of treatment in Idaho Roadless Area.

I get nervous when we speak of significance; my issue doesn't have to do with the Roadless rule. It has everything to do with signing a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) for the project. A finding of no significance is no significance. But Kevin says but we are only impacting a small percentage of the Idaho Roadless Area. It is not about only affecting a small percentage. *It is a finding NO significance.* So the bar as a decision maker, is how much risk am I able to take on significance or not. There is nothing to tell me how significant something is or not.

So we have two options: we can do an EIS and I don't have to sign a finding of no significance. I'm would be saying there are affects in this project. It is a classic example why you would go from an EA to an EIS. So I can do an EIS.

Or I can do an EIS for 375 acres but I don't have the people, time or money, to do an EIS for 375 acres of treatment. I'm being blunt, while we could that is my issue.

Kennon asked if it was tractor ground and it is. He asked if Mary considered the fire risk, it's all Lodge Pole and dying, it will burn. He added that it would make sense to take care of the problem and not burn up the rest of the Roadless area. She replied she had considered all of that and to her a FONSI is FONSI. (Finding of No Significant Impact)

Patty stated that it is the difference in how a person looks at significant. To Patty it would be 5, 10, or 20 %; where do you hit significant. Mary is saying to her, her tolerance is zero and as long as her tolerance is zero, it is a non-discussion, we may as well move on. We were just proposing that under an EA, such a small acreage in such a large area, off a road, did not seem to trigger in our common sense world, significant. But we are not in her world, so there is no point to discuss it.

Mary replied that they are currently under litigation, in the Nez Perce Clearwater National Forest. In decision making in her world it is not cut and dry, over time it's not Mary's risk is zero forever. It is assessing the situation that we face right now; she has to weigh a lot of different things that are extremely grey.

It is about people, time and money, litigation risk, a big picture of what the region is seeing. The Regional Office didn't tell her to drop the units, it is a decision she made on the Forest based on her set of slides, for what she sees right now. She can't afford litigation right now and she can't afford to put a team together to do an EIS. If she had the people, time and money, a different place in time where she was not facing 40 plus vacancies and a hiring freeze, it might be very different, but that is what today is. She just wanted to respond to Patty saying that her risk for these things is zero.

Patty replied she meant for this project it was zero. Mary agreed on this project it is zero.

Dan D. added that he understands all of that, but one thing that would be beneficial to any Forest, especially where the recreational person is writing the analysis for a project would be to have training on the Idaho Roadless Rule. There seems to be some misinterpretations of some things.

Mary stated that could very well be, but Kevin is steering this project.

Kevin K. stated that their recreational specialist, Dan Gilfillan, said he could benefit from that training. He had a big chore in trying to take this on for the first time and wrap his head around it, and really struggled with it. Kevin also stated that he thinks to a degree, the Roadless Rule Commission and the Forest Service could all gain from discussion about the challenges each group faces and how it works.

Patty stated that hopefully after the Orogrande project goes through, and two others, if they are successful and go forward, it may put us in a different place than we are right now, they aren't pulling the other two projects, and they are waiting to see the outcome of Orogrande on the Nez Perce Clearwater National Forest.

Deer Creek Update- Kevin Knauth

The Deer Creek Project had 2 objectors; one had a single point, Goshawk, the other objected to everything (AWR). The Regional Office put together a review panel to look at those objection points, and we had a conference call last week to discuss them. After making the adjustments the review panel suggested we were given the go ahead to move forward with a final decision. Kudos to Brett Lyndaker who did a super job on the wildlife points in the review.

Other Updates from the Forest Service-Mary Farnsworth

Mary added a couple of other things she wanted to pass along to the group. The Forest Service is under a hiring freeze. The President lifted it but not the Agency. Currently Agencies have been directed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to develop specific plans of how the Agency will reduce its workforce by 30%. They must submit this plan by June 30. There will be no hiring with the exception of the Fire crews, they have already been hired.

Also the Supervisor Office timber contracting officer, Dave Faulkner, has retired. We are without a Contracting Officer. That is problematic and we are facing challenges with that issue. There are over 40 vacancies to fill and it's critical to get our work done. We will be appointing people to fill those vacancies but have patience with us.

The DRAFT copy of the CFLRP is available on the KVRI website at kootenai.org.

TMDL Committee update: Patty Perry

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) and Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) have been looking at Forest Practices and the relationship between how it is implemented under Forest Practices, how things are done and the effect on clean water. According to the Review the compliance rate is about 97%.

The TMDL Committee is planning a field trip on May 24 and anyone interested is welcome to join us. On the field trip we will be looking at one of the two pilot projects in Boundary County. We are going to be looking at pre-harvest, post-harvest and what the effect is long term in these two projects.

Forest Legacy Program Presentation -Kennon McClinton – The Nature Conservancy

Forest Legacy is a national program for conservation easements on private ground. It's a competitive program and they take applications once a year in May. The Nature Conservancy generally puts an application in once a year. The state ranks their projects individually then it goes to the Forest Service in Washington and then they rank them nationally. We rank fairly well in Idaho, because we meet the program's needs; protecting working forest, we have lots of water and lots of wildlife.

We are looking at about 2400 acres in this year's application in Boundary County, north of town in the north bench area. They are mostly fast growing, vigorous plantations, 10-20 years old, with merchantable timber for the Moyie mill right now.

The University of Idaho puts out a report once a year, describing the industry's health and what it did the year prior. This is interesting because the Forest Legacy Plan deals with private lands and protecting those lands against development and subdivision. That relates directly to the Idaho Forest products industry, because most of the logs that run the mills in Idaho come from private lands.

The average annual mill timber consumption every year is 1 billion board feet of logs (equal to 222,200 log truck loads, 27 tons a load)

The average for the last 20 years is 60-65% from private lands (½ industrial lands, ½ small woodland owners), 30-35% lands owned by IDL, and 0-10% from USFS land. The Moyie mill consumes 80-85 mmbf annually. The only reason the mill is profitable is that 1/3 of the logs are coming from Canada at this time.

Kennon shared maps with the 3 existing projects: Bane Creek, Boundary Connections I, Selkirk/Kootenai Valley and showing this years proposed lands owned by Molpus and Hancock and private lands, Boundary Connections II. Details are on the slide presentation.

Development threatens these lands and the mill. The land has been fragmented so much over the last 30 years; we hope to get more of the land in the Legacy Program. The Program retains rural working resource lands for the benefit of our local & regional resource-based economies.

Highlights of the Boundary Connections II Project:

- 2343 acres of forestland in this project
 - 88% are industrial forestland and the rest in 3 family woodlands
- 70% of the acres are in healthy, vigorous plantations, 10-25 years of age
- Very productive forestlands, well managed over the last 30 years
- area is used heavily by elk for spring calving
- Adjacent conservation easements
- Hancock & Molpus will provide for public access for their forestlands in this project (2067 acres)

Detailed maps and information of Kennon's presentation are available on the KVRI website at Kootenai.org.

Kootenai Basin Water Supply Update and Sturgeon flow Augmentation- Greg Hoffman-USACE

Greg began his presentation with the announcement of the Annual Libby Dam Operations Public Meeting, Thursday, May 18, 2017, 7:00 pm at the Kootenai River Inn.

Greg reported that data through the month of April showed the percent of average precipitation is 139% of normal. The good news is that they are creating a lot of space in the reservoir to capture that water. The projected elevations coming through town are not as high as they were in 2012-13. From Oct to March, the records show practically double the normal precipitation in Bonners Ferry this year, that includes rainfall and snow pack. Most of that is still in the higher elevations.

The data show record precipitation in October and February, and the third wettest March this year. The future climate outlook show equal chances of cooler or warmer weather and the chance of wetter than normal. The predictions for the coming month are looking the same, cooler and wetter.

The Observed Inflow Data indicate that we have seen a peak in the reservoir and a peak low elevation run off, streams are running pretty good and the inflow to the reservoir is about 40,000cfs; a week ago it was down about 15,000cfs.

Greg states that he has not seen the elevation in Lake Koocanusa this low in about 20 years. Full pool is 2459, we are going to get fairly close to full pool, but we really drafted it down and it looks more like a river instead of a reservoir, particularly in the upper section (drafted down to 2359). That should be comforting here in Bonners Ferry because we can capture that runoff when it comes.

They will be at full powerhouse for a week for the first peak of the sturgeon operation, down a week or so, and then back up to full powerhouse again for a week or more for the second peak of the sturgeon operation. After the sturgeon operation, flows will gradually decline to ~ 12 kcfs, and then slowly decline over the summer towards 6 kcfs by September, when KTOI will again be working on habitat projects in the river. Sturgeon spawned historically when the flows were starting to come down and temperatures were starting to warm (10-12 degrees Celsius). They try to mimic the peak of the low elevation runoff and the second target is the peak of the higher elevation runoff.

Bonners Ferry Flood Stage is 1764 and agriculture impacts are noticed at 1758. We will be above 1758 for about a month. The ensemble forecast is composed of 67 years of data as well as current conditions used to predict what may happen in the Basin. There is a 10 % chance we could meet or exceed 1764, depending on the weather temperatures and precipitation. Sturgeon flows are not intended to exceed flood stage.

To try and regulate release temperature at the dam, Greg explained that there is system of gates at Libby Dam like Legos; there is a crane on runners that the Corps uses to put gates in and out slots in front of the draft tubes, which direct water into the turbines. So the higher we have those, theoretically, the warmer water comes over the top of those. Temperature is managed through the year by stacking and unstacking these gates. During winter months we try to make the water as cold as possible for the Burbot Conservation Plan to minimize temperatures for Burbot spawning. This year we did a pretty good job; we actually got to 2 or 3 degrees Celsius for a couple of months.

Greg's full graph presentation is available on the KVRI website at Kootenai.org.

Idaho Fish and Game Updates-Chip Corsi-IDFG

IDFG would like to clear up the rumors circulating concerning MacArthur Lake that are saying they are going to pull the dam. There has been no decision made to remove the dam at MacArthur Lake, but removal is being considered as an option to improve wetlands for more ducks and to create better conditions for waterfowl hunting, which is why IDFG owns and manages the property. It would also improve water quality in Deep Creek.

There will be a process to go through if removal looks feasible and would produce desired results for waterfowl, fish and people. IDFG would have to demonstrate that they could do it, that they could find the dollars to do it, and that they have the public support to do it.

Idaho Fish & Game Biologist

Idaho Fish and Game has a new biologist stationed at McArthur Lake and also responsible for Boundary/Smith WMA, Evan DeHamer. Jim Derrig is now working for Kootenai Electric. Evan understands the need to work with the community on things like Boundary, Smith and MacArthur, and had been working on the mule deer initiative down south which involved working with landowners. He has a skill set that will apply well up here.

MacArthur Lake Highway Corridor Timber Sale

The MacArthur Lake Highway Corridor Timber sale is cruised. They still need right of ways from adjacent landowners but will be harvesting timber there this summer, along the tracks and near the highway.

MacArthur Lakefront Update

Apparently the grain/corn that spilled when the train wrecked in Sagle has been deposited at the BSNF property near MacArthur lake area in a wildlife corridor. It will not be so amusing when an intoxicated large wild animal wanders out into the highway and won't get out of the way. They are not sure what will happen.

IDFG Commission Meeting

The Idaho Fish & Game Commission Meeting will be July 26 and 27, 2017. We are planning to have it here in Bonners Ferry but are in need of a venue. Wednesday, July 26, is the evening public meeting and Thursday, July 27, is the Commission agenda meeting.

They use the input from the public meeting to help in their decision making. They are also looking at a possible Field Tour also. The Field Tour may include the WMA's (Wildlife Management Areas), the collaborative work with Kootenai Tribe on the Kootenai River; the nutrient work, tank farm, river restoration etc. Chip will visit with Brad and let us know more details.

Scotchman's Peak Update

There has been controversy swirling around our Commissions current position of not favoring the Scotchman's Peak Proposed Wilderness bill. This has been largely due to their dissatisfaction with a court interpretation of what IDFG believe is the Wildlife Management Authority that they felt was granted in other wilderness acts. There is activity towards trying to find a language to be inserted in the Scotchman's Peak bill to help resolve that issue. They will see how that plays out.

Grizzly Bear Field Station at Boundary Creek

Chip reported that Wayne Kasworm will have a crew at the Boundary Creek field station along the border. His crew will be live trapping grizzly bears at three sites to put on GPS collars. One site will be on the WMA (Wildlife Management Area) and the other two sites will be off the WMA. It will be good to understand the risks associated with the Selkirk bears in the valley. Knowledge is good. Wayne has a press release out, he will post areas around the traps, 100 yard perimeter and the bears will be kept in the culverts until fully recovered. Just to be aware.

The Forest Service Field Review July 24 and 25- Kevin Knauth

Patty stated that the Board is interested in helping with the Field Review visit and she asked the Forest Service to let KVRI know if there is anything we can help with.

West Nile Disease Time- Dan Dinning

Dan announced that it is mosquito season and time for horse inoculations to prevent West Nile disease.

Next KVRI MEETING June 19- Patty Perry

Discussion about the next KVRI Meeting followed:

- The possibility of 2 presentations maybe only 1.
- Mitch Silvers will be here visiting.
- Sue has offered a Hatchery tour for any of the Board that has not seen the new hatchery and would like to do that. We can send out an email to see if anyone would like to take the tour.
- Sue would like to give us an overview of the projects that the Kootenai Tribe plans for this year and the habitat work.
- Marcel will be here from Western Transportation Institute to give us the final report on the animal detection system that started at MacArthur Lake, then went to Camp 9 and is being looked at for caribou on Hwy. 3 in Canada. He was hired to do the third party validation for that system, present his finding and that final report. The Nature Conservancy and the Kootenai Tribe are splitting the cost of his visit.

- We could move Sue's presentation to July, send out email, if not much interested in the tour, do our regular meeting.

Patty will consider the ideas, check for interest in an email and then complete the agenda for the next meeting.

Gary Aitken stated that he would like to recognize the importance of the Burbot Committee, their success and let everyone check it out on a tour. It is going very well.

The next KVRI meeting will be on June 19, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Sherrie Cossairt,
KTOI/KVRI Admin. Assistant