Idaho Forest Practices Act - Timber Sales
Best Management Practice Reviews
Summary 1990-2004
Caribou-Targhee National Forest

Background:
In the mid-1970's, the State of Idaho initiated Rules Pertaining to the Idaho Forest Practices Act, IDAPA 20, Title 02, Chapter 01. These rules have been modified over the years in subsequent revisions in 1975, 1978, 1985, 1988, 1990, 1992 and so on. A Water Quality Memorandum of Understanding with State of Idaho was initiated in the late 1980's and finalized in 1994. The MOU defined roles, responsibilities and authorities of State and Federal agencies active in the nonpoint source program. The appendices in the MOU provide specific tasks and processes for implementing water quality provisions in the resource areas.

As the designated management agency, the Forest Service is responsible for implementing 1) nonpoint source (NPS) pollution control; and 2) the Idaho State Water Quality Standards on National Forest System Lands. The basis of the Forest Services' nonpoint source pollution control policy stems from the: National Nonpoint Source Policy (December 12, 1984); Forest Service Nonpoint Strategy (January 29, 1985); and the USDA Nonpoint Source Water Quality Policy (December 5, 1986). The Forest Services' water quality policy is to: 1) promote the improvement, protection, restoration and the maintenance of water quality to support beneficial uses on all national forest service waters; 2) promote and apply approved best management practices to all management activities as the method for control of NPS pollution; 3) comply with established state or national water quality goals; and 4) design monitoring programs for specific activities and practices that may affect or have the potential to affect in-stream beneficial uses on National Forest System lands.

The Forest Service also coordinates all water quality programs, on National Forest System land within its jurisdiction, with the local, state and federal agencies, affected public lands users, adjoining land owners, and other affected interests.

In the Appendix to the Memorandum of Understanding, the Federal Agencies Agree: 1) To comply with the water quality protections provisions of the IFPA Rules and Regulations; 2) To conduct internal reviews of Best Management practices by annually examining a representative sample (target 10%) of timber related projects on lands they administer and prepare written BMP evaluation reports. Summaries of these reports will be provide to IDL and IDHW (now DEQ), for inclusion in the annual Forest Practices Water Quality Management Plan Report.

BMP's have been assessed for implementation and effectiveness. Implementation monitoring essentially asks: "Were BMP's implemented as stated in the NEPA document and in the Timber Sale Contract?" Effectiveness monitoring evaluates the overall effectiveness of any given BMP in controlling or maintaining water quality, aquatic and riparian attributes, and stream channel stability. "Has erosion been controlled and has

sediment been delivered off-site to a stream course?" Even more importantly: "Have the designated beneficial uses of the water in affected stream courses been maintained?"

If a BMP is found to be ineffective or not as effective as desired or anticipated, then further evaluation is required to determine if the BMP was inadequate for a specific site condition, or if the BMP itself was inadequate over a large range of site conditions. If the latter situation occurred, then the practice would be brought to the review team, who, together, would examine the practice to determine if it needs to be modified or eliminated.

Results:

BMP monitoring began on the Caribou portion of the Caribou/Targhee in 1990. Since that time, 24 timber sales have been reviewed on both the Caribou and Targhee portions of the Forest, far in excess of the "10%" mandated in the MOU. The purpose of the reviews was to: 1) Determine how BMPs were addressed throughout the timber sale planning process and applied on-the-ground; 2) Identify Issues and Concerns generated by the public scoping process and subsequent resource protection and mitigation requirements needed to address those issues and concerns; 3) Evaluate on-the-ground implementation of applied BPMs; and 4) Determine the effectiveness of applied BMPs in protecting and maintaining water quality and aquatic resources.

Each evaluation was conducted by a multi-disciplinary team consisting of Forest Personnel consisting of the Forest Hydrologist, Soil Scientist, Timber program Manager, Resources Staff Officer, District Ranger, Sale Administrator, Landscape Architect and Engineering. Not all disciplines attended each review, but most of the disciplines were represented each time. Also in attendance were personnel from the State of Idaho, including the Department of Lands, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Fish and Game and Department of Water Resources. The timber purchaser also attended when available, along with several interested individuals and organizations, such as the Greater Yellowstone Coalition.

Findings were recorded on the State of Idaho's Best Management Practices Silvicultural Nonpoint Source Task Force Field Form. This form has changed somewhat over the years. However the context of the form has remained constant. The form consists of a general project identification cover sheet, followed by an evaluation of each IFPA Rule and a summary evaluation of overall effectiveness.

Findings:

Of the 24 Timber Sales reviewed:

- 14 sales had Good implementation of appropriate BMPs and had Good Effectiveness at protecting water resources;
- 8 sales had Partial implementation of appropriate BMPs and Good to Adequate Effectiveness at protecting water resources;

- 1 sale had Fair Implementation of appropriate BMPs and Fair to Adequate Effectiveness at protecting water resources; and
- 1 sale had Partial Implementation of appropriate BMPs and Poor Effectiveness at protecting water resources.

For the purposes of this evaluation:

- Good Implementation means – All NEPA listed BMPs and appropriate IFPA BMPs were implemented;
- Partial Implementation means – All NEPA and most IFPA BMPs were implemented;
- Fair Implementation means – One or more NEPA and/or IFPA BMPs were not implemented;
- Good Effectiveness means – No sediment in streams and no channel adjustments observed;
- Adequate Effectiveness means – some sediment observed, but no degradation of Beneficial Uses or aquatic habitat observed and no channel adjustments observed;
- Fair Effectiveness means – some sediment and minor degradation of Beneficial uses and/or aquatic habitat observed and no channel adjustments observed; and
- Poor Effectiveness means – Beneficial Uses and/or aquatic habitat degradation observed and/or channel adjustments occurring.

The following is a summary of the timber sales reviewed and results: Some sales were reviewed more than once, as indicated below:

Idaho Forest Practices Act
Best Management Practices
Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring

Timber Sale Name	***Year Monitored***	***Results Summary***
Nounan	1990	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Adequate (minor sediment observed in stream)
Brockman	1990	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Adequate (minor sediment observed in stream)
Overlook	1990	Implementation – Partial Effectiveness – Good
Diamond Flat	1991	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Diamond Flat	1992	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good

Alder Flat	1992	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Poor (road built next to channel)
Huckleberry Basin	1993	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Upper Fossil	1993	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Diamond Flat	1995	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
North Pebble	1996	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Adequate (minor sediment delivered to stream)
Franklin Basin	1996	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
M. Fork Bloomington Cr.	1997	Implementation - Fair Effectiveness – Fair (wind blow down across channel during sale)
Pebble Creek	1997	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Pole Canyon	1997	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
St. Charles	1997	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Pole Canyon	1998	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Fair (sediment in ephemeral drainage)
Bloomington	1998	Implementation - Fair Effectiveness – Fair (wind blowdown across channel)
South Fork Timber Cr.	1998	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Fair (some sediment from road)
Coop	1998	Implementation - Good Effectiveness – Fair (heavy snowpack & wet weather)
Bloomington (Mariah)	1999	Implementation - Partial Effectiveness – Fair (wind blowdown across channel)
Mariah (Bloomington)	2000	Implementation - Good Effectiveness – Good (wind blowdown across channel)
Willow Creek	2000	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Campbell	2000	Implementation - Partial

		Effectiveness – Fair/Good (LWD inadequate; silt fence in disrepair)
Alpine	2001	Implementation - Fair Effectiveness – Adequate (no live water within sale)
Alpine	2002	Implementation - Fair Effectiveness – Adequate (no live water within sale)
Swan Flat	2002	Implementation - Good Effectiveness – Good
Beacon Basin	2003	Implementation - Good Effectiveness - Good
Miles Canyon	2003	Implementation - Good Effectiveness – Good (some minor road rutting)
Upper Dry Canyon	2004	Implementation - Mostly Effectiveness – Good (some wet road rutting – minor sediment in ephemeral channel)

Conclusions:

Of the 24 sales reviewed:

- The greatest disturbance within the timber sale areas is from roads, skid trails and landings rather than the harvesting units themselves;
- Where BMPs are appropriately identified and applied, aquatic resources are adequately protected;
- Problems can and have occurred when BMPs are either not applied and prescribed or inadequately implemented;
- The BMP Review process is working well on the Caribou/Targhee National Forest and will be continued on an annual basis.

R L Leffert
Forest Hydrologist
April 29, 2005

Upper Dry Canyon Harvesting Unit 7 – Harvested 2003

Upper Dry Canyon Harvest Unit 6 – Harvested 2004

Skid trail in Unit 6 that use was suspended by the Timber Sale Administrator due to wet weather conditions.
Ruts are about 2” – 4” deep

Upper Dry Canyon Harvest Unit 5 – Harvested 2003

Un-authorized “short-cut” through an ephemeral drainage. Operator repaired damage.

Culverted road crossing – upstream view

Culverted road crossing – downstream view. Minor sediment observed but not affecting downstream Water Quality

Upper Dry Canyon Harvest Unit 4 – Harvested 2003. Excellent residual ground cover

Upper Dry Canyon Harvest Unit 2 Slash will be piled next summer when seed cones open to provide a natural seed source for regeneration. – Harvested 2004

Upper Dry Canyon Timber Sale - Obliterated road. Over 5 miles of old roads were obliterated with monies generated from the timber sale. The roads were re-contoured and will be nearly invisible within a few years once vegetation is re-established.

Miles Canyon Timber Sale Landing Site – Harvested 2003
Road will remain open but will be drained using waterbars and rolling dips
The landing site will be ripped, seeded and covered with slash
Slash piles will be burned winter 2004/5

Miles Canyon Timber Sale Harvest Unit – Harvested 2003
Seed Tree Cut. Good ground cover and large woody debris

Miles Canyon Timber Sale Skid Trail Closure. Excellent job