

than 24 hours) air quality deterioration. However, national and state ambient air quality standards would still be met.

Prescribed and slash burning would be conducted in such a way (size limitations, climatic conditions, time of year, and in coordination with other agency programs) that air quality impacts would not exceed the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) increments for class II areas.

Response 38.10 - The survey method used to evaluate riparian habitat within the Cascade Resource Area was adopted from that developed in 1976 at the BLM Dillon Resource Area, Dillon, Montana. This method is quite extensive and was found to apply to almost all foothills habitats in southwestern Montana. We believe that it is also suited to perennial and ephemeral flow streams in the Cascade Resource Area which support deciduous woody species along the banks. This survey does not apply to closed canopy conifer sites and may be of doubtful value in stands dominated by mature aspen where canopy density impairs reproduction.

The survey area consists of the stream bank within a uniform woody species habitat type. The surveyor walks along the bank area within the identified stream reach, and, at the predetermined step interval, selects and evaluates the highly palatable woody plant nearest the step interval. This process is repeated until a minimum of 100 sample plants are evaluated in the stream reach being surveyed. Palatable species in this survey include willow, aspen, dogwood, maple, alder, birch, and cottonwood. Once a plant is selected it is evaluated according to form class, size class, and coverage class. The stream reach is evaluated for the amount of stream bank erosion. A habitat rating is then determined for the surveyed stream reach by combining the observed values for the stream bank erosion and vegetation parameters. A complete survey methodology can be obtained from the Boise District. See Appendix T for classification criteria.

Response 38.11 - The text has been revised to include the existing habitat conditions within the Payette River watershed.

Response 38.12 - Erosion as the result of ORV activity is site specific. Although the severity of erosion may be great, usually the area of impact is small (exceptions are the Boise Front and designated open cycle parks). Most areas classified as limited in the various alternatives are situated away from the mainstream of usual ORV activity and are not expected to be impacted to any great extent.

The statement in Alternative C (and other alternatives) concerning impacts of ORVs and timber harvesting compared to Alternative A has been changed to more accurately reflect the extent of these impacts. Appendix B identifies the number of acres by alternative that would potentially be affected by ORV activities.

Response 38.13 - Impacts on riparian habitat, aquatic/fisheries habitat, and water quality due to timber harvest activities are discussed under these topic headings by alternative in Chapter 4. The types of impacts would be similar among the different alternatives but would differ in the number of stream miles affected.

Response 38.14 - Future AMPs and management agreements will incorporate rest rotation grazing systems for livestock management, pasture fencing and fencing of streams and important riparian areas, water developments, use adjustments, vegetation manipulation and seedings - as appropriate. New and revised AMPs will be prepared as agreements are reached with permittees and as funding and staffing permit. Changes or adjustments in grazing management such as rest rotation and fencing will be a high priority since many permittees are favorable to the idea or are requesting it. New and revised AMPs will be prepared and implemented over the next 10-15 years.

Response 38.15 - Overall management objectives would be to try and avoid road construction on high erosion hazard lands. If it becomes necessary to cross these lands then additional measures would be incorporated. These measures would be identified in an activity plan and could include such measures as ditch construction with culvert installations. References such as the State of Idaho - Best Management Practices for Road Construction will be used as technical guides.

Response 38.16 - The Stream Survey Form and the Stream Habitat Inventory Form have been included in Appendix U. These forms were used to evaluate the aquatic habitat of streams. The habitat rating was conducted during the summer of 1985 by ocular determination only and by biologists experienced in on-the-ground stream habitat feature measurements on southwest Idaho streams. Staffing levels and time were extremely limited for this survey. However, we feel that the information is accurate and meets the needs of this land use planning effort.

Response 38.17 - This appendix has been revised to reflect the correct information.

Response 38.18 - The table in Appendix H identifies aquatic habitat improvement projects and conditions which corresponds with Map 8 and Map 3-7. Appendix I identifies riparian habitat conditions and corresponds with Map 3-6. The information in Appendix H and I and on Maps 8, 3-6 and 3-7 is correct.

Streams were chosen for improvements on the basis of several factors. The more important factors were existence of a perennial water source, public visibility, potential for improvement, ease of access, and manageability.

Response 38.19 - Appendix P has been revised to incorporate more detailed information regarding water quality and riparian monitoring. Current guidance on all programs including riparian area management and monitoring has been incorporated in this final document. Additional and more detailed guidance and state-of-the-art technology will be incorporated in activity plan efforts.

Response 38.20 - Your agency will have an opportunity to review our draft monitoring plans as they are developed. You will receive a copy of the Record of Decision when it is released to the public.

Response 38.21 - Monitoring plans will be developed with the implementation of those decisions that require monitoring. They will normally be developed at the activity level planning stage.

Response 38.22 - Monitoring programs will be coordinated among the various programs whenever practicable.

Response 38.23 - Funding for implementation of the RMP decisions rests with the annual priorities established by the national BLM office and the Congress. Over the past two years, monitoring has been a high priority and in all current budgetary/program assessments it appears to be a priority for the next few years. In the Boise District monitoring is considered a top priority.

Response 38.24 - The Resource Management Guidelines, Public Land Management section has been revised to reflect this comment.

Response 38.25 - In areas designated as limited ORV use, ORV use would be restricted either seasonally or to existing or designated roads and trails. Indiscriminate off-road (cross-country) use would be prohibited. The use of ORVs on the designated or existing roads and trails would not have adverse impacts on the sensitive or significant resources. The Boise District will use a combination of public information brochures, public announcements, and meetings, to educate the public concerning areas with limited (and closed) restrictions. In addition, selected areas may be signed to indicate the ORV use restriction. Law enforcement capabilities are also available if needed. The limited use area referenced in your comment pertains to land management intensity and not ORV use. ORV use may be designated as open in some limited use areas.

Response 38.26 - The text has been revised to clarify the intent to improve all riparian habitats that occur in areas where AMPs are being prepared.

Response 38.27 - The management guidelines for the Boise Front include use limitations and management emphasis which should provide adequate protection for the resource values identified. In addition, at the end of 20 years, livestock use on nearly 6,000 acres would be reduced 23% from the 5-year average license use. Livestock use on approximately 5,000 acres would be allowed to increase 5%. No additional soil disturbing activities requiring use limitations to protect resource values have been identified.

Response 38.28 - The text has been revised to include fish and wildlife habitat and water quality as important wetland functions to be considered by future management actions. Specific measures to protect, preserve, or restore wetland functions will be addressed during development of activity plans and project specific proposals.

Response 38.29 - The text has been revised to clarify this guideline. The high priority habitats will be identified in activity plans with the aid of this land use plan.

Response 39.1 - The fenced areas along streams will not be available for livestock grazing. Water gaps will be incorporated into the fences to provide adequate water availability for livestock in pastures and allotments. Management on adjacent lands is expected to remain the same in most cases. Maintenance and costs will be addressed in site specific analyses. Time

controlled grazing and water developments will also be addressed in site specific analyses (AMP-EA). Time controlled grazing (rest rotation), an alternative to fencing, requires enough pastures to allow this system to work.

Response 39.2 - Two of the existing AMPs are also CRMPs. Not all AMPs lend themselves to CRMP formats since other entities (U.S. Forest Service, State agencies) may not be involved or a coordinated plan may not be necessary. Any CRMPs considered in the future will be coordinated with your agency.

Response 39.3 - Long-billed curlew winter in coastal areas and nest and brood inland. Historically, pairs would nest in the valleys but due to increased agriculture, their habitat decreased. Historically, this area was covered with sagebrush and bitterbrush stands. Year after year, wildfires would burn a part of this area. These fires and overutilization of the range have reduced the shrub component. The invasion of annual grasses has allowed this area to develop into a major nesting area. Overall, the long-billed curlew population in the United States has decreased substantially and there is evidence that they are still declining in parts of their range. The proposed ACEC area supports the largest nesting population in western United States.

Response 39.4 - See Response 38.10.

Response 40.1 - Ecological site condition change is the change in kind, amount, and proportion of the vegetative community.

Response 40.2 - A proposed cooperative agreement in 1976 stated "Motorcycle use will not be allowed to occur on lands adjacent to the Park boundaries." The cooperating parties in this agreement were to be Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Gem County, Little Gem Motorcycle Park Council, Mr. David Little, and BLM. That agreement was never made final or signed by any of the cooperators. We have no record of any other agreement entered into by Little Cattle Company and BLM in this matter. Following completion and approval of the Cascade Resource Management Plan, site specific activity plans will be developed. During the preparation of an ORV plan for the Little Gem Cycle Park we will consider the need for restrictions on lands adjacent to the park. Any restrictions would be based on established objectives for the park and adjacent areas. These objectives will be developed with input from the entities that participated in the original agreement effort and other interested parties.

Response 40.3 - The 3,000 acres of BLM lands within the boundaries of the area called Little Gem Cycle Park contains two areas (Sand Hollow - 500 acres and Pearl - 400 acres) that contain sensitive plant species. These two areas contain over 90% of the known populations of wild onion (Allium aaseae), a candidate plant species of federal and state concern. These are the areas of special designation referenced in your comment letter.

Response 40.4 - We feel that excluding salt and water from the ridgelines would reduce concentrated livestock use in these areas and would better protect the category 2 candidate plant species found there. The 6 miles of fence is the total among the Rebecca Sandhill, Peraphyllum Rock, and Buckwheat Flats special management areas.

Response 40.5 - The text has been revised to incorporate this information and more clearly reflect the existing situation.

Response 40.6 - Any type of vegetative cover (grass, forbs, or shrubs) helps to protect soil from the impact of rain drops, the overland flow of water, and wind. Shrubs also act as snow catch areas allowing slow release of this stored moisture. The referenced section of the document contains the resource management guidelines that are applicable for managing the soil resource. The use of shrubs in conjunction with wildlife management is discussed in the Wildlife Resources section of the Resource Management Guidelines.

Response 40.7 - The term "60/40 ratio of forage area to cover area" means that 60% of a given area contains plant species used for foraging (forage area) and 40% contains plant species used for thermal protection and hiding (cover area).

Response 41.1 - See Response 12.1.

Response 41.2 - See Response 12.2.

Response 41.3 - See Response 12.3.

Response 41.4 - This site of 80 acres has been included in all alternatives, including the preferred alternative, and contains the sensitive plant species Ceanothus prostratus.

Response 41.5 - We have been consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on this matter and will continue to do so in the future. Further studies and inventories concerning this species are planned. We would appreciate any assistance that The Nature Conservancy could provide.

Response 41.6 - See Response 12.4.

Response 41.7 - The text has been revised to reflect the correct information.

Response 41.8 - Allium aaseae has been collected and still occurs along the Hulls Gulch trail. Refer to the College of Idaho (Carol Prentice's collection) for documentation.

Response 41.9 - The text has been revised to reflect the correct information.

Response 41.10 - See Response 12.4.

Response 41.11 - The text has been revised to reflect the correct information.

Response 41.12 - See Response 12.4.

Response 41.13 - The maps have been revised to reflect the correct information.

Response 42.1 - See Response 11.1.

Response 42.2 - See Response 33.1.

Response 42.3 - BLM currently administers lands bordering Crane Creek Reservoir. These lands provide public access from the south side of the reservoir. The Boise District has, in years past, approached private land owners around Paddock Reservoir to try to obtain access to the reservoirs. To date, the land owners have not been receptive with the exception of the current developments which are maintained by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. The BLM lands that exist around the reservoir are either non waterfront or to steep to be developed for recreation facilities. The Boise District is interested in obtaining access on the east or north side of the reservoir for the development of recreation facilities. The plan does not identify specific land parcels but does identify the need to seek acquisition.

Response 42.4 - See Response 23.1. The two areas you identified, one area south of Dodson Pass and the other area between Crane Creek Reservoir and the Weiser River, were inventoried for Wilderness Study Area characteristics in 1978. The recommendation following that inventory was that both units be carried forward from the Initial Inventory to the Intensive Inventory. The units were subsequently eliminated from further consideration for wilderness study in light of the following factors: poor configuration, presence of roads and/or ways, range developments, impaired naturalness, and topographic and vegetative screening which does not provide opportunities for solitude and recreation that are considered outstanding.

### COPIES OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

All letters received were considered in the preparation of this proposed RMP/Final EIS. Although all public input will be considered when management decisions for the Cascade Area are made, only substantive comments that presented new data, questioned the adequacy of the impact analysis or raised questions or issues bearing directly upon the Draft RMP/EIS have been responded to in this document. All letters received are reprinted on the following pages. The letters are numbered chronologically in the order in which they were received during the public comment period. Each substantive comment contained in the letters is also numbered. The BLM response to each specific substantive comment is located in the previous section (pages 5-9 through 5-26) and is numbered to correspond with the appropriate comment found in the letter.