
Chapter 7
Glossary





Chapter 7

Glossary

Acre-foot	Volume of water (43,560 cubic feet) that would cover 1 acre land, 1 foot deep.
Algae	Mostly aquatic single celled, colonial, or multicelled plants, containing chlorophyll and lacking stems, roots, and leaves.
Algal bloom	Rapid and flourishing growth of algae.
Alternatives	Courses of action that may meet the objectives of a proposal at varying levels of accomplishment, including the most likely future conditions without the project or action.
Amphibian	Vertebrate animal that has a life stage in water and a life stage on land (for example, salamanders, frogs, and toads).
Aquatic	Living or growing in or on the water.
Archeology	Related to the study of human cultures through the recovery and analysis of their material relics.
Archeological site	A discrete location that provides physical evidence of past human use.
Artifact	A human-made object.
Best Management Practices	Activities that are added to typical operation, construction, or maintenance efforts that help to protect environmental resources.
Carrying capacity	The ability of a resource to accommodate a user population at a reasonable threshold without negatively affecting the resource.
Community	A group of one or more interacting populations of plants and animals in a common spatial arrangement at a particular point in time.
Concentration	The density or amount of a substance in a solution (water quality).
Critical winter range	That portion of big game winter range used during the most severe winter conditions and critical to survival.

Cubic foot per second (cfs)	As a rate of streamflow, a cubic foot of water passing a reference section in 1 second of time. A measure of a moving volume of water.
Cultural resource	Cultural resources are prehistoric, historic, and traditional properties that reflect our heritage.
Drawdown	Lowering of a reservoir's water level; process of releasing reservoir storage.
Endangered species	A species or subspecies whose survival is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.
Erosion	Refers to soil and the wearing away of the land surface by water, wind, ice, or other physical processes.
Eutrophic	A body of water with high nutrient levels.
Facilities	Manmade structures.
Fish and Wildlife Service Species of Concern	Species identified by the FWS for which further biological research and field study are needed to resolve these species' conservation status.
Forebay	The water behind a dam. Also, a reservoir or pond situated at the intake of a pumping plant or power plant to stabilize water levels.
Habitat	Area where a plant or animal lives.
Hydrologic	Pertaining to the quantity, quality, and timing of water.
Indian Trust Assets	Legal interests in property held in trust by the United States for Indian Tribes or individuals, such as lands, minerals, hunting and fishing rights, and water rights.
Intermittent streams	Streams that contain running water longer than ephemeral streams but not all year.
Juvenile	Young animal that has not reached reproductive age.
Mitigation lands	Lands designated for preservation to mitigate for construction of Reclamation projects, such as dams.
National Register of Historic Places	A Federally maintained register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and properties that meet the criteria of significance defined in 36 CFR 63.
Neotropical migrant	Birds that breed in North America and winter in tropical and subtropical America.
Perennial	Plants that have a life cycle that lasts for more than 2 years.
Precipitation	Rain, sleet, and snow.

Public involvement	The systematic provision for affected publics to be informed about and participate in Reclamation decision making processes. It centers around effective, open exchange and communication among the partners, agencies, organizations, and all the various affected publics.
Raptor	Any predatory bird, such as a falcon, eagle, hawk, or owl, that has feet with sharp talons or claws and a hooked beak.
Reptile	Cold-blooded vertebrate of the class Reptilia, comprised of turtles, snakes, lizards, and crocodiles.
Resident	A wildlife species commonly found in an area during a particular season: summer, winter, or year round.
Resource Management Plan	A 10-year plan developed by Reclamation to manage their lands and resources in the study area.
Riparian	Of, on, or pertaining to the bank of a river, pond, or lake.
Runoff	That part of precipitation that contributes to streamflow, groundwater, lakes, or reservoir storage.
Sediment	Unconsolidated solid material that comes from weathering of rock and is carried by, suspended in, or deposited by water or wind.
Songbird	Small to medium-sized birds that perch and vocalize or "sing," primarily during the breeding season.
Spawning	Laying eggs directly in water, especially in reference to fish.
Species	In taxonomy, a subdivision of a genus which: (1) has a high degree of similarity, (2) is capable of interbreeding only in the species, and (3) shows persistent differences from members of allied species.
Threatened species	Any species that has the potential of becoming endangered in the near future and is listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.
Traditional Cultural Property	A site or resource that is eligible for inclusion in the <i>National Register of Historic Places</i> because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community.
Total Maximum Daily Load	The total amount of pollutants that can be discharged to a water body, per day, and not exceed water quality standards.
Water quality limited	A water body that exceeds water quality standards or does not support its designated beneficial use, such as cold water habitat or primary contact recreation.
Wetland habitat	Habitat provided by shallow or deep water (but less than 6 feet deep), with or without emergent and aquatic vegetation in wetlands.

Wetlands	Lands transitional between aquatic and terrestrial systems where the water table is usually at or near the land surface or the land is covered by shallow water. Often called marshes or wet meadows.
Wildlife Management Area	A category of land use. An area of Reclamation-owned land that is managed for wildlife habitat and preservation. The goal is to ensure that wildlife values are preserved as recreation use, residential use, and commercial development increases near recreation sites.

Chapter 8
Bibliography





Chapter 8

Bibliography

- Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc. 1999. “*Ririe Reservoir Resource Management Plan Area, Class I Cultural Resources Inventory*” Report No. 162, Prepared for Bureau of Reclamation, Snake River Area Office - West, Boise, Idaho.
- Barker, R. 1999. “Spaceport could catapult Idaho into next millennium.” Article in the *Idaho Statesman*, July 26, 1999.
- Beals, J. and W. Melquist. 1998. *Idaho Bald Eagle Nesting Report*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program. Threatened and Endangered Species Report. Project E-22-1. Section 6, Endangered Species Act. Boise, Idaho.
- BLM (U.S. Bureau of Land Management). 1984. *Medicine Lodge Resource Management Plan*. Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Idaho Falls District.
- Brennan, T.S., A.K. Lehmann, I. O’Dell, and A.M. Tungate. 1997. *Water Resources Data - Idaho - Water Year 1997. Volume 2. Upper Columbia River Basin and Snake River Basin below King Hill*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Data Report ID-97-2.
- Brown, C. 1981. Spring-Fall Movements and Distribution of Tex Creek Elk in Southeast Idaho. *Tex Creek Wildlife Management Area Management Plan*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- Connelly, J.W., A. Schroeder, R. Sands, and E. Braun. 2000. *In press*. Guidelines for Management of Sage Grouse Populations and Habitats. Submitted to the *Journal of Wildlife Management*.
- EDAW and BCDPR (Bonneville County Department of Parks and Recreation). 1999. Visitor Questionnaire Results at Ririe Reservoir Recreation Sites.
- Groves, C.R., B. Butterfield, A. Lippincott, B. Csuti, and J.M. Scott. 1997. *Atlas of Idaho’s Wildlife: Integrating Gap Analysis and Natural Heritage Information*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program. Boise, Idaho.

- Hall, E.R. 1981. *The Mammals of North America*. Second Edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- IDEQ (Idaho Division of Environmental Quality [currently the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality]). 1998. *1998 303(d) List*. Boise, ID.
- IDEQ. 1997. *Catalog of Storm Water Best Management Practices for Idaho Cities and Counties*. Storm Water Program, Watershed and Aquifer Protection Bureau. Boise, Idaho.
- IDFG (Idaho Department of Fish and Game). 1999. GOS data provided to Reclamation and EDAW by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.
- IDFG. 1998a. *Tex Creek Wildlife Management Area Management Plan*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- IDFG. 1998b. *Cartier Slough Wildlife Management Area Management Plan*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- IDFG. 1996. Fisheries Management Plan 1996 - 2001. <http://www2.state.id.us/fishgame/fishmng.htm> (9 April 1999).
- IDFG. 1990. *Upland Game Management Plan; 1991-1995*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.
- IDPR (Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation). 1997. *State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan*. Boise, Idaho.
- IDPR. 1989. *State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan*. Boise, Idaho.
- IDPR. 1986a. *Governor's Task Force Opinion Survey*. Boise, Idaho.
- IDPR. 1986b. *Idaho Leisure Travel and Recreation Survey*. Boise, Idaho.
- Levine, E., J. Beals, and W. Melquist. 1998. *Idaho Peregrine Falcon Survey and Nest Monitoring: 1998 Annual Summary*. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program. Threatened and Endangered Species Report. Project E-22-1. Boise, Idaho.
- Milligan, James H., R. Ashley Lyman, C. Michael Falter, Edwin E. Krumpe, and John E. Carlson. 1983. *Classification of Idaho's Freshwater Lakes*. Idaho Water and Energy Resources and Research Institute. University of Idaho. Moscow, Idaho.
- Mitchell, V. E. and Bennett, E. H. 1979. *Geologic Map of the Driggs Quadrangle, Idaho*. Idaho Department of Lands Geologic Map Series, scale 1:250,000.
- NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service [formerly the U.S. Soil Conservation Service]). 1981a. *Soil Survey Report for Bonneville County*. U.S. Department of Agriculture.

- NRCS. 1981b. *Soil Survey Report for Madison County*. U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Reclamation (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation). 2001. *Ririe Reservoir Resource Management Plan: Draft Environmental Assessment*.
- Reclamation. 2000. Data provided to EDAW by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.
- Reclamation. 1999. GIS data provided to EDAW, Inc., by the Bureau of Reclamation.
- Reclamation. 1997. *Operations Manual, Mid-Snake River, Upper Snake River*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Pacific Northwest Region, Boise, Idaho.
- Reclamation and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1974. *Ririe Dam and Lake Master Plan*.
- Ruggiero, L.F., and K.S. McKelvey. 1999. *Chapter 1—Toward a Defensible Lynx Conservation Strategy: A Framework for Planning in the Face of Uncertainty*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-30.
- Sather, J. Henry, and R.D. Smith. 1984. *An Overview of Major Wetland Functions and Values*. Western Energy and Land Use Team. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Washington, D.C.
- Savage, C. N. 1961. *Geology and Mineral Resources of Bonneville County, Idaho*. Idaho Geological Survey County Report #5.
- Shelby, B. and T.A. Heberlein. 1986. *Carrying Capacity in Recreation Settings*. Corvallis, OR. Oregon State University Press, 164 p.
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. 1994. *Treaty Rights Seminar [booklet]* Pocatello Idaho May 18-20; Publisher, The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Treaty Rights Seminar Planning Committee.
- Schmidt, D. C., and Mackin, J. H., 1970. *Quaternary Geology of Long and Bear Valleys, West-Central Idaho*: U. S. Geological Survey Bulletin 1311-A.
- Scott, W. E., 1982. *Surficial Geologic Map of the Eastern Snake River Plain and Adjacent Areas, 111° to 115° W., Idaho and Wyoming*, U. S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map I-1372, scale 1:250,000.
- Simpson, J.C. and R.L. Wallace. 1978. *Fishes of Idaho*. The University Press of Idaho. Moscow, ID.
- Thomas, T.R. 1987. *Yearlong Movements and Habitat Use of Mule Deer Associated with the Willow Creek Winter Range in Southeastern Idaho*. Master of Science Thesis. Montana State University. Bozeman, Montana.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Population Statistics. <http://tier2.census.gov/cgi-win/usac/compare.exe> (25 April 2000).

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2000. Public Housing, Section 8 Revised Income Limits for FY 2000. Website address of <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/il/fmr00/sect82.html>, accessed June 29, 2000.

Youngblood, A.P., G. Padgett, and A.H. Winward. 1985. *Riparian Community Type Classification of Eastern Idaho-Western Wyoming*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Publication R4-Ecol-85-01.

Appendix A

Problem Statement for the RMP



Ririe Reservoir/Tex Creek WMA/Cartier Slough WMA Resource Management Plan (RMP) Problem Statement

INTRODUCTION

This Problem Statement has been prepared as a key background document in support of the Resource Management Plan (RMP). It provides a comprehensive review and understanding of the issues, needs and opportunities (including all relevant perspectives) which must be addressed by the RMP. It is derived primarily from input received through the public involvement process, agency and Tribal coordination.

Public input on which the Problem Statement is based has included: (1) comments received at the first public meeting held in Idaho Falls on February 9, 1999, (2) responses to the mail-in response form included with the first (January 1999) RMP Newsbrief, (3) detailed discussions with the RMP Ad Hoc Work Group (AHWG) during the first four of the Work Group's meetings (April 28, July 7, September 22, and October 13, 1999), and (4) other discussions with individuals or agencies.

By documenting all relevant perspectives related to the issues, needs, and opportunities, the Problem Statement serves as a foundation for translating these into either: (1) potential goals, objectives, or actions for the RMP, (2) alternative courses of action to be considered in the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the RMP, or (3) determination that this issue will be removed from the RMP process.

The Problem Statement is organized according to the following major- and sub-topics:

A. Natural and Cultural Resources

(1) Wildlife and Vegetation Management; (2) Fishery; (3) Erosion and Water Quality; and (4) Cultural Resources.

B. Recreation

(1) General; (2) Boating and Other Water Uses; and (3) Shoreline and Other Land-based Activities.

C. Management, Coordination, and Implementation

(1) Access; (2) Other Uses; (3) General Management and Coordination; (4) Surrounding land Use/Management; and (5) Implementation .

A. NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Problem Statements: A.1 – Wildlife and Vegetation Management

Issue Category: A.1.1 – Protection, Conservation, and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitat and Natural Resources

Specific Issue – Protected Species

Planning Team Note: Protection of threatened and endangered species, riparian areas, and wetlands is a requirement under current Federal regulations; the RMP will aim to fulfill these responsibilities in all proposed actions. Both Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will provide guidance in these matters as the planning process proceeds. The Shoshone Bannock Tribe also requests involvement in activities related to protected species.

Specific Issue – Protecting Native Species

Discussion: The IDFG's plans for Tex Creek and Cartier Slough WMAs address protection, conservation and enhancement of wildlife habitat in these areas, with emphasis on native species. These plans can/should be cited and perhaps incorporated by reference in the RMP. They may also provide guidance in determining the proper RMP approach to wildlife and vegetation on lands around Ririe Reservoir and along the outlet channel which are not within a WMA. Relevant excerpts of the Tex Creek Plan include:

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan Objective: Provide diverse habitats in sufficient quantities to fulfill the needs of all native species on Tex Creek WMA.

- *Evaluate and implement habitat improvements for a diverse list of wildlife species using Tex Creek WMA. (Many projects (mentioned in association with winter range and elk/deer management) may help to add diversity to Tex Creek WMA including: treatments, shrub plantings, field management through grain production, haying, grazing or mulching, riparian restoration, erosion control, fire management, noxious weed control fertilization, motorized trail restrictions and limiting the use of pesticides. These projects will enhance habitat for such diverse species as ruffed and blue grouse, gray partridge, waterfowl, neotropical songbirds, bats, amphibians and reptiles, beaver, rodents, raptors, bluebirds and more.)*

In addition to the above considerations, the Tribes have asked what original quotas and goals were established for the Reclamation's Ririe and Teton mitigation lands in the WMAs. Reclamation explains that no specific quotas or numeric goals were established in the mitigation agreements; instead the agreements call for mitigation to be provided for elk, deer and fish and game in general. Given this general intent, the goals stated in the mitigation agreements are being met. The area is being managed primarily for elk, deer, and grouse.

The Tribe suggests that it would be helpful to identify in the RMP the need for a loss assessment to study what the overall goals for the mitigation lands should be, including the optimum number of big game animals and what non-game animals the area should be managed for. The suggestion was made

that we may want to make assumptions on what wildlife values were in the Ririe and Teton areas and then establish goals and objectives for the mitigation lands to manage for those values.

Related to the Tribe's concerns, IDFG indicates that their recently completed Tex Creek WMA Management Plan identifies which wildlife and vegetation values are being managed for in the WMA overall. It is the Idaho Fish and Game Commission which establishes the target population numbers for the big game herds (based in part on population status and sustainability reports prepared by the IDFG). Establishing the optimum number of animals is an important and difficult question. At the present time, the elk herd is thought to be near the maximum which can be sustained by the resources in the WMA; that is why the Department has extended the hunting season for this year to December 10 (vs. the normal December 1 end of season). The hunt is one tool used to manage the size of the herd.

Planning Team Note: Regarding the Tribe's suggestion that a loss assessment be conducted for the Ririe and Teton projects, Reclamation agrees that such an assessment should be performed and that it be planned for as part of the RMP. This assessment will evaluate Reclamation's long-term responsibilities for the mitigation lands and determine if these responsibilities and requirements are being met. Action items to be included in the RMP are: (1) Completion of a loss assessment for the Ririe and Teton Projects; (2) Development of an RMP for the Teton Canyon lands (Reclamation lands near or adjacent to the former Teton Dam and reservoir) to determine how the lands and resources should be managed; and (3) Monitoring of the Teton Canyon lands to provide information on the status of the recovery of those lands (i.e., as input to both the Teton RMP and determination of Reclamation's current responsibilities in the Tex Creek and Cartier Slough WMAs).

Specific Issue – Priority on Native Plantings

Discussion:

Tex Creek WMA: Concerns have been expressed with some of the management practices that IDFG is using on Reclamation mitigation lands such as share cropping, planting alfalfa, etc., as contrasted with re-vegetation of the entire WMA using native plantings. A vegetation map of the WMA should be used to identify how many acres are not in native cover; and the RMP process should explain what the future plans are for vegetation on these lands.

IDFG has responded that the Tex Creek WMA Plan addresses efforts to restore native vegetation communities and the use of agricultural practices. In the first regard, enhancement/restoration of habitat in areas of the WMA which were once used for dry farm crops is a focus of management efforts. These areas are highly erodible. Thus, the first phase of enhancement efforts has been providing a permanent and stable vegetation cover (e.g. Smooth Brome). Ultimately, the goal in many areas is to convert former agricultural lands back to native plant communities. Such conversion may not be feasible or desirable in all areas. Restoration of farmed land to native habitat is very challenging, time-consuming, and costly. Considerable research and testing is required to determine the most effective approach in accomplishing this goal.

In the second regard, the primary purposes behind such practices as share cropping and planting alfalfa are ensuring sufficient food source for the large herds which winter in the WMA, trying to avoid overgrazing of native plant communities, and trying to keep the elk population in the center of the WMA, away from Idaho Falls and surrounding private lands. As long as the herds are near their present size, provision of the supplemental forage provided by agricultural practices may continue to be necessary.

While complete restoration of WMA lands back to native plant communities might be desirable from some standpoints, IDFG's broad goal is to maintain a healthy ecosystem, especially for deer and elk. This intent may best be met by a combination of habitat restoration and limited agricultural practices.

Regarding overall status and trends in vegetation management efforts, IDFG is conducting an extensive vegetation monitoring program, focused on 60 monitoring locations throughout the WMA. Data from these monitoring sites was last gathered in 1997 and is available for review and study. However, the Department has not had the funding to prepare accurate vegetation mapping. The RMP program has developed a draft vegetation map for the WMA, based on interpretation of satellite data. Especially if this mapping can be adequately ground-truthed, it will contribute significantly to better understanding of vegetation patterns and the status of restoration and enhancement efforts. Reclamation will make this mapping available to IDFG, the Tribes, and other concerned entities. Provisions for on-the-ground verification of map accuracy and for map maintenance and updates should be included in the RMP action program.

Ririe Reservoir and Cartier Slough WMA: Reclamation lands around Ririe Reservoir which are not part of the Tex Creek WMA, as well as most of the Cartier Slough WMA, are predominantly in a natural state. As a result, re-vegetation is not a significant concern in these areas of the RMP study area.

Specific Issue – Winter range/Elk management

Discussion: The IDFG Plan for Tex Creek WMA contains extensive and detailed objectives and strategies related to winter range management for elk and deer. The RMP can and should reinforce and support the IDFG's management program related to the following topics described in the Tex Creek WMA plan to the extent appropriate and feasible.

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan priorities in this regard include:

- *priorities for managing different areas of the WMA for different species;*
- *relationships with surrounding farmers and ranchers;*
- *limitations on vehicular access and other human disturbance during the winter season;*
- *protection and enhancement of existing native plant communities,*
- *including Aspen stands and riparian vegetation;*
- *re-establishment of native plant communities;*
- *installation of sediment basins and ponds ;*
- *use of livestock grazing and limited cultivation of grain crops as management tools;*
- *use of controlled burns as a management tool;*
- *erosion control; and*

- *noxious weed control.*

Issue Category: A.1.2 -- Balancing Recreation Development with Wildlife Needs

Specific Issue – Avoiding conflicts and the ability of resources to handle increased recreation use during the winter season

Discussion: The Tex Creek WMA and surrounding lands comprise the last winter range resource in the region to support the needs of the approximately 3,600 animal “Tex Creek elk herd”. Any action or activity which reduces the productivity or usability of this winter range area will result in: (1) the need to reduce the herd size, and/or (2) impacts from overuse by the herd in areas where the animals concentrate (e.g. Reclamation lands) to avoid disturbances from human action or activity. In the latter regard, overuse by deer and elk not only results in reduced carrying capacity for these species in future years, it also causes adverse impact to other important wildlife in the WMA.

Key factors which can pose threats to the carrying capacity of the WMA (by reducing the area usable by the herd or increasing potential for over use due to herd concentration in smaller areas) include:

1. Development on lands immediately adjacent to the WMA – Currently, the herd uses portions of privately owned open range and agricultural lands adjacent to the WMA or these private tracts serve as buffers from disturbance in the WMA itself. However, many of these private lands are in the Conservation Reserve Program and could be sold for development in the future. While the RMP cannot directly address or influence conditions and uses on private lands surrounding the WMA, it can express support for: (1) IDFG efforts to expand the WMA through acquisition where appropriate and if the need is identified, and (2) County land use planning actions which seek to retain winter range values on these lands (see Issue Category C.3.1—Development on Surrounding Lands for further discussion). In the former regard, the IDFG Plan for the WMA contains the following objective and strategies aimed at exploring feasible WMA expansions:

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan Objective: *Acquire additional winter range for the increased number of elk and deer now supported by Tex Creek WMA, a buffer zone around the core winter range to protect it from developmental encroachment and a migration corridor connecting Tex Creek WMA with public lands to the south:*

- *Evaluate properties adjacent to Tex Creek WMA if and when they are for sale for their role in the wildlife management objectives of Tex Creek WMA. Attempt to acquire properties that have exceptional value to wildlife or to protect values currently managed by Tex Creek WMA*
- *Seek cost-share partners to help purchase critical properties.*

2. Winter recreational and other vehicular access/activity, both on lands surrounding the WMA and on WMA lands themselves – Currently, the most pressing problem on and surrounding the WMA is snowmobile use. This activity is permitted on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands to the east; and users frequently enter WMA lands. Unmanaged snowmobile use on private lands adjacent to the WMA, including incursions into the WMA, is also a problem. Specific to the WMA itself, the IDFG Management Plan for the WMA includes an objective and associated strategies for minimizing impacts from vehicular uses:

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan Objective: Ensure optimum wildlife populations for hunting and viewing for generations to come by creating secure habitat to protect wintering big game from unnecessary disturbance and limit depredations:

- Pursue an agreement with Bonneville County to maintain winter road closures through important winter range areas from December 1 through April 15.
- Sign roads that are open to motorized travel. Close unsigned roads to motorized travel.
- Close any new roads created for administrative purposes to motorized travel.
- Consider restricting all human entry (except administrative use) into Tex Creek WMA from December 1 through March 15 as conditions warrant
- Strictly enforce the antler hunting closure from January 1 to May 1.

Pursuant to these strategies, IDFG and Bonneville County cooperate each year in closing most roads in the WMA during the winter season. In fact, all roads except Pipe Creek Road are normally closed; and even Pipe Creek Road is not plowed—it is simply left open for snowmobiles to get across the WMA. IDFG has not yet included Pipe Creek road in its request to the County regarding winter road closures; to date, the limited use of this road by snowmobiles has not caused a significant problem. However, even with this limited use, retaining this road open essentially divides the usable winter range in the WMA into two major parts (east and west of the road, with a zone along the road not fully used by wildlife due to the disturbance caused by snowmobiles and other vehicles). Continuing discussion of this concern as part of the RMP should consider whether Pipe Creek Road should be added to the road closure list in the WMA during the winter season (see Management, Coordination, and Implementation – Access). In any case, the IDFG strongly recommends against any additional roads being open, or any other additional types of access provided, during the winter season.

AHWG discussion of this issue highlighted the need to better coordinate with the USFS regarding snowmobile recreation east of the WMA. The RMP should pursue discussions with the USFS to explore feasible means of reducing incursions into the WMA during the winter closure period. Suggestions in this regard include: [1] establishing a buffer on USFS lands along the WMA boundary, within which snowmobiling is not permitted, [2] installing signage and/or fencing along the WMA boundary, and [3] increasing enforcement efforts. The feasibility of such measures would need to be established, including the availability of necessary funding. Also, related to enforcement efforts, the potential effects of increased activity in/near the WMA due to the presence of enforcement personnel would need to be addressed (i.e., the enforcement presence itself could cause comparable impact to that resulting from snowmobile incursions on the WMA).

AHWG discussion of this issue also highlighted the important roles overall which both education and enforcement should play in reducing the impacts of vehicular access and other disturbance during the winter season.

Specific Issue – Avoiding conflicts and the ability of resources to handle increased recreation use during the other seasons.

Discussion: Outside of the winter season, hunting and non-consumptive outdoor recreation are acceptable and recognized uses within the WMA. The IDFG Plan includes Goals, Objectives and

Strategies related to such activities; these are referenced and included below under Recreation (see Wildlife Viewing Opportunities, Maintain Hunting Opportunities in the Recreation section). In any case, all recreation activity planning and accommodation must consider potential effects on wildlife and vegetation resources.

Regarding [1] Reclamation lands outside of the WMAs and [2] the water surface of Ririe Reservoir, AHWG members note that all potential RMP actions should be reviewed in light of potential impacts on wildlife and vegetation values. An example cited in discussion is the potential impact of boating activities in the Willow Creek arm of the reservoir on nesting bald eagles in this area. Other examples include the effects of recreation activities on riparian and wetland habitats around the reservoir.

Issue Category: A.1.3 -- Tribal Hunting and Gathering Rights/Activities on Reclamation Lands

Discussion: The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have requested that [1] Tribal rights to hunt and fish and gather plants on Reclamation lands be recognized and provided for in the RMP; [2] a separate section on hunting and gathering be included in the RMP, within the Cultural Resources section, and [3] these tribal rights also appear, as uses we will be managing for, in the goals and objectives of specific vegetation and wildlife sections of the RMP.

The Tribe also requests that management of both Tex Creek and Cartier Slough WMAs include actions and programs to ensure the opportunity for hunting and gathering, as part of their treaty right. In this regard, it is noted that some of the game that winter in Tex Creek show up on the reservation, so it is important to maintain the herd at Tex Creek for hunting on the reservation.

Regarding these requests by the Tribe, treaty reserved rights to hunt on “unoccupied” Federal lands are known to both Reclamation and IDFG. Whether or not Reclamation lands in the RMP are considered “unoccupied” and whether these rights extend to fish and gather has not been specifically determined by Reclamation; nevertheless, the RMP will not propose any action which would result in limiting these opportunities. Treaty reserved rights are addressed in the RMP under 3.14 Indian Trust Assets. Additionally, cited within the document is the decision in State of Idaho v. Tinno which is a decision of the Idaho Supreme Court which affirms Tribal members right to take fish off-reservation.

Of particular interest in exploring the implications of Tribal hunting rights is the Tribe’s existing or potential hunting activity in the Tex Creek WMA. The Tribe sets its own hunting season, which ends December 31, rather than the typical December 1 end of season set by the IDFG (this year the season in the WMA ends December 10). The IDFG season ends in early December to ensure that the herds have a protected area in which to winter; hunting (or any other) activity in the WMA after this time increases the chances of displacing the animals from the WMA to surrounding private lands and populated areas. Reaching a concurrence on hunting season ends dates would take further discussion between the Tribe and IDFG; and, ultimately, the Tribal Business Council would decide on any changes in the Tribe’s current season. Under any circumstances, IDFG would request that the Tribe abide by the seasonal road closures and other access restrictions imposed to protect the viability of the WMA as

big game winter range. Further discussion of these concerns is needed, perhaps in a forum outside of the RMP effort (especially given Reclamation's lack of jurisdiction in regulating the activities in question).

For further insight into these concerns, see Issue Category – A.5.1 (Inclusion of Tribes' Snake River Policy in the RMP)

Issue Category: A.1.4 -- Predator Control (Impacts to Wildlife)

Discussion: At present, predator activity is not a significant problem within the RMP area. If this factor becomes a concern in the future, it is the State's responsibility and jurisdiction to address it. Thus, it is not something which is appropriate for attention in the RMP.

Issue Category: A.1.5 -- Noxious Weed Control/Vegetation Management

Discussion: The IDFG plans for the Tex Creek WMA and Cartier Slough WMA include strategies for noxious weed management. Noxious weeds present the threat of replacing native plants and undermining efforts at habitat restoration and enhancement; the spread of these weeds is increased by livestock, pedestrian, and vehicular uses of the areas. Biological, mechanical and chemical methods are used in weed management, with priority/preference placed on finding effective biological methods. Currently, IDFG reports that they are "holding their own" (maintaining status quo) against the weed problem in most of the Tex Creek WMA. However, the problem is more severe at Cartier Slough, where the spread of Leafy Spurge is of particular concern. The RMP should reinforce and support IDFG's weed management programs at Tex Creek and Cartier Slough.

Noxious weed management on Reclamation lands outside the WMAs is the responsibility of Reclamation, with assistance from Bonneville County. Reclamation has recently become a member of a Coordinated Weed Management group for an area which encompasses the RMP study area. The RMP should provide detail regarding Reclamation's activities in this regard; and existing program should be reviewed based on the findings and proposals of the RMP. Integrated Pest Management plans for the RMP areas should be scheduled as part of the RMP actions.

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan priorities in this regard include: strategies for the ... "Control noxious weeds chemically and mechanically along roadways. Use biological control (if available) in rangelands off of roads..."

Problem Statements: A.2 -- Fishery

Issue Category: A.2.1 – Improve Fisheries Management (effects of operations; stocking program; etc.)

Discussion: IDFG has an on-going management plan for the fishery in Ririe Reservoir, including

species composition and stocking programs. Members of the AHWG suggest that a new growth rate study be performed to determine fishery health; the last such study was done in 1992. In this regard, the forage base in the reservoir may be a problem.

Members of the public also suggest that additional attention be directed at the potential for restoring and enhancing the bass fishery in the reservoir. Discussion of this issue suggests that restoration and enhancement of the bass fishery would require modifications to current Reservoir operations (i.e., maintaining more stable water levels during spawning season); while it is understood that the RMP cannot change reservoir operations in major ways due to legal and contractual requirements, it is nevertheless requested that operations be reviewed to determine if a better fit can be accomplished between these requirements and promotion of a better bass fishery.

Related to the above, AHWG members questioned whether enhancement of the bass fishery could have adverse effects on the protected Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout; given that this trout is a native specie and the subject of specific management attention (as discussed below), such impacts should be avoided. RMP team biologists noted, however that the trout are found predominantly in the streams tributary to the reservoir, while the bass are limited to the reservoir pool.

Planning Team Note: The Reclamation Implementation Team has considered the public request to review reservoir operations related to the bass fishery. This review will not be included in the RMP due to previously noted operational requirements. It may be possible for the interested public to continue discussions regarding the status of the bass fishery with the IDFG as part of their ongoing stocking and fishery management program.

Issue Category: A.2.2 – Protect/Enhance Fish Habitat

Discussion: Refer to the following issue categories – Improve Fisheries Management (effects of operations; stocking program; etc.), and Protect/Enhance Native Species.

Issue Category: A.2.3 -- Protect/Enhance Native Species

Discussion: Many members of the public, as well as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and IDFG, place priority on protection and enhancement of native species habitat in resource management plans and programs. The primary concern expressed to date related to native fish species is protection and enhancement of habitat for and populations of Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Within the RMP area, streams within Tex Creek WMA are the focal points for habitat management; maintaining and enhancing riparian habitat and minimizing erosion and sedimentation are the most important areas of attention. The IDFG Management Plan for the WMA addresses this concern:

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan Objective: Maintain and enhance Yellowstone cutthroat trout spawning and rearing habitat:

- Manage/use trade grazing to improve riparian habitat in Willow Creek, Tex Creek and Bull's Fork,
- Work with neighboring landowners to eliminate trespass cattle grazing in Meadow Creek and Indian Fork.

- *Improve riparian zone condition on all portions of Tex Creek WMA through an ongoing program of planting riparian vegetation where appropriate.*
- *Encourage beaver activity in all tributaries to create habitat, store water to maintain downstream flows and reduce sediment loading in spawning areas.*

Another concern related to Yellowstone cutthroat trout is avoidance of competition from and interbreeding with non-native rainbow trout introduced through the IDFG stocking program in Ririe Reservoir. Currently, this concern is addressed by using only “triploid” (sterile) rainbows in the stocking program. This approach should be continued. An AHWG member also noted a concern that bass is a heavy predator which could damage the cutthroat population. It was agreed that this should be watched; however, initial indications show cutthroat in tributaries, not the reservoir.

Issue Category: A.2.4 -- Protect/Enhance Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout

Discussion: Refer to Issue Category – A.2.3 (Protect/Enhance Native Species), above.

Problem Statements: A.3 -- Erosion and Water Quality

Issue Category: A.3.1 – Erosion within Watershed of Ririe Reservoir, Including Work with Surrounding Landowners to Protect Water Quality

Discussion: As noted above, the IDFG Management Plan for Tex Creek WMA addresses erosion concerns on Reclamation lands in the Ririe watershed.

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan priorities in this regard include:

- *Develop additional soil erosion control structures (long terraces or sediment basins for example) when and where they are deemed necessary to recover eroded areas and to collect moisture.*
- *Establish sediment basins in rangelands to control erosion as appropriate pending evaluation of trial project implemented in 1996.*
- *Plant native shrub seedlings where feasible on an ongoing basis.*
- *Plant riparian vegetation where appropriate.*

Discussion has also identified the importance of working with surrounding landowners to control erosion and protect water quality. Both Meadow Creek and Willow Creek have been mentioned as areas of concern in this regard.

Issue Category: A.3.2 – Erosion Along Ririe Reservoir Shoreline

Discussion: Erosion of the reservoir shore could be adversely effecting water quality in the reservoir as well as wetland and riparian habitats along the shore. The severity or extent of this erosion and its effects are not well known. The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) will be preparing a TMDL (total maximum daily load) for sediment in the reservoir pursuant to current Federal regulations. Reclamation should work with DEQ in this effort and implement shoreline erosion control measures if required to meet the TMDL. Pending the TMDL process, the RMP EA will review the potential for adverse effects caused by shoreline erosion.

Issue Category: A.3.3 – Erosion Downstream of Ririe Reservoir (Willow Creek)

Discussion: The AHWG requested further information regarding the issue of erosion downstream of the dam. In prior discussions, it has been made clear that Reclamation does not own the lands stretching from the immediate dam area to the beginning of the flood channel approximately eight miles downstream of the dam. Reclamation noted at the first public meeting that further review is warranted of concerns about erosion of private lands downstream of the dam.

Planning Team Note: Because downstream erosion is directly related to reservoir operations, this issue is not appropriate for the RMP (due to limitations of RMP scope previously discussed). However, pursuant to Reclamation's statements at the first public meeting, Reclamation staff will gather appropriate information regarding the issue and will contact the Corp of Engineers, requesting that the Corps work with affected landowners to determine if Federal action is needed and is feasible. This action will be conducted separate from the RMP process.

Issue Category: A.3.4 – Bank Erosion at Cartier Slough

Discussion: Bank erosion is a concern on the Henrys Fork near Cartier Slough; but is not a significant issue at Cartier Slough itself.

Problem Statements: A.4 -- Cultural Resources**Issue Category: A.4.1 -- Addressing Cultural Resource Responsibilities, Enforcement, and Education – i.e., the Need for Proper Attention to Cultural Resources in All Management Actions**

Discussion: The Shoshone Bannock Tribes have stressed that the RMP is an opportunity to clarify and further define Cultural Resource responsibilities and enforcement, including education to IDFG and other agencies. The Tribe is concerned that some of the actions taking place on Reclamation lands do not have adequate Cultural Resource enforcement (e.g., Categorical Exclusions have been completed for work accomplished, however the Tribe would like to see more on-site enforcement).

In this regard, the IDFG requested that a full survey of the WMA should be done so that they know where the cultural resource sites are and how to properly manage for them. The RMP team noted that a Class I cultural resource survey has been completed for the RMP study area (including the Tex Creek WMA). This information is confidential and will not be distributed outside Reclamation and the involved Tribes. Instead, cultural clearance should be obtained on an action-by-action basis. Given this fact, IDFG requests that clear procedures and guidelines for compliance with Cultural Resource requirements be included in the RMP.

Planning Team Note: Reclamation is required by law to ensure proper protection to cultural resources (including archaeological and historic resources, traditional cultural properties, and Indian

Trust Assets) in all actions on its lands. The RMP will include reference to full compliance with these requirements.

Problem Statements: A.4 -- General (Natural and Cultural resources)

Issue Category: A.5.1 -- Inclusion of Tribes' Snake River Policy in the RMP (i.e., supporting a natural river ecosystem)

Discussion: The Shoshone Bannock Tribes have prepared and adopted a policy statement addressing conservation, protection, and enhancement of natural and cultural resources in the Snake River Basin. Excerpts from this policy document are provided below:

"...the (Snake River) Basin is being viewed, as never before, as a valuable resource contributing to the overall Pacific Northwest regional conservation framework. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes support efforts to conserve, protect, and enhance natural and cultural resources within the Basin and therefore establish this policy...

Since time immemorial, the Snake River Basin has provided substantial resources that sustain the diverse uses of the native Indian Tribes, including the Shoshone Bannock. The significance of these uses is partially reflected in the contemporary values associated with the many culturally sensitive species and geographic areas within the Basin. Various land management practices, such as construction and operation of hydroelectric projects have contributed extensively to the loss of these crucial resources and reduced the productive capabilities of many resource systems. These losses have never been comprehensively identified or addressed as is the desire of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes reserved guaranteed continuous use Rights to utilize resources with the region that encompasses and includes lands of the Snake River Basin. The Fort Hall Business Council has recognized the contemporary importance of these Rights and resources by advocating certain resource protection and restoration programs and by preserving a harvest opportunity on culturally significant resources necessary to fulfill inherent, contemporary, and traditional Treaty Rights. However, certain resource utilization activities, including the operation of federal and non-federal hydroelectric projects effect these resources and consequently, Tribal reserved Rights.

It has always been the intent and action of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to promote the conservation, protection, restoration, and enhancement of natural resources during the processes that consider the operation and management of federal projects and during the land management activities of other entities. This Policy re-emphasizes the Tribes' previous policies with regards to these processes and activities^{1/4}

Statement of Policy: The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes (Tribes) will pursue, promote, and where necessary, initiate efforts to restore the Snake River system and affected unoccupied lands to a natural condition. This includes the restoration of component resources to conditions which most closely represent the ecological feature associated with a natural riverine ecosystem. In addition, the Tribes will work to ensure the protection, preservation, and where appropriate, the enhancement of Rights reserved by the Tribes under the Fort Bridger Treaty (Treaty) of 1868 and any inherent aboriginal rights.

...All cooperating agencies will be expected to utilize all available means, consistent with their respective trust responsibility mandates, to protect Treaty rights and Tribal interests consistent with this policy."

The Tribes would like to see their policy statement included in the RMP as their issue statement on water resources management; and to have this policy considered throughout the RMP process.

Planning Team Note: The above excerpts from the Shoshone-Bannock policy document clearly portray the Tribes' viewpoint and intent regarding the preparation, content, and direction of the RMP. An effort has been made in the above Potential Goals & Objectives to reflect the intent of the Tribes' Policy; however, further discussion may be needed to confirm the most appropriate means by which this policy intent can be incorporated into the RMP.

B. RECREATION

Problem Statements: B.1 -- General

Issue Category: B.1.1 -- General Expansion of Opportunities/Meet Recreation Demand

Discussion: The RMP must consider the area's growth, and plan for future recreation demand.

Planning Team Note: In all planning for recreation facilities, whether new or expanded, it is important to keep in mind that Reclamation is required to have a cost-sharing, non-Federal partner in order to provide funding for such facilities.

Issue Category: B.1.2 -- Recreation Use Conflicts

Discussion: Refer to the following Issue Categories: B.2.1 (Water Use Conflicts) and B.3.2 (Conflicting Uses).

Issue Category: B.1.3 -- Overcrowding (e.g., at boat ramps)

Discussion: Refer to the following Issue Category: B.2.2 (Additional/Expanded Boat Ramps/Docks and Associated Facilities).

Problem Statements: B.2 – Boating and Other Water Uses

Issue Category: B.2.1 -- Water Use Conflicts (Ririe Reservoir)

Specific Issue – Motorized and Non-motorized and Different Types of Motorized Use

Discussion: Conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses are not really a significant concern right now, except on peak weekends. However, conflicts can occur between some uses, such as between power boats/personal watercraft and non-motorized activities such as fishing. The potential for such conflicts may increase if recreational use of the reservoir increases through expansion of access and recreational facilities, as well as simply through growth in the area.

Some members of the AHWG suggest that the RMP should explore the need to designate specific areas of the reservoir for different uses (e.g., areas designated for non-motorized or no-wake boating to accommodate fishing; a similar zone for a proposed dive park (see B.2.3, below), etc.). At present, the degree of conflicts does not appear to warrant such water surface “zoning”; the RMP should nevertheless review the issue. Under any circumstances, regulation of uses on the water surface is within the County’s jurisdiction, not that of Reclamation. In fact, current law establishes a 100 foot no-wake zone in proximity to swimming areas and other boats. If the RMP process identifies existing or potential need to develop other water surface use regulations/zones, such need can be documented in the RMP, along with recommended solutions. Action to implement these recommendations would then need to be requested from the County. Discussion of this process and the potential need for it also highlighted the difficulty of establishing, identifying and enforcing specific water surface “zones”, especially in a reservoir environment where the water surface and shoreline change over time due to reservoir operations.

A related concern in discussing this issue is the potential effect of boating and other recreational activities on wildlife and vegetation at the Reservoir. For example, a bald eagle nest is present in the upper portion of the Willow Creek arm of the reservoir. The RMP should review the potential effects of boating activity on this wildlife resource (e.g., water skiing competitions have been conducted in this area of the reservoir—an activity which may or may not be under permit, dependent upon whether it is a sanctioned event). Also, the RMP process should consider the 1977 Cooperative Agreement developed to guide reservoir management; this agreement designated a wildlife management zone in the Willow Creek arm.

Issue Category: B.2.2 -- Additional/Expanded Boat Ramps/Docks and Associated Facilities

Specific Issue – Breakwater and/or additional boat ramp at Blacktail

Discussion: Overcrowding at boat launch ramps does occur during peak periods. A potential solution to be considered is addition of a ramp at Blacktail, as well as expanding capacity for parking and camping, etc. In this regard, it is noted that a Reclamation development plan for Blacktail, prepared by consultants to Reclamation approximately 10 years ago—but not implemented—shows a second boat ramp and associated parking and other facilities located south of the current developed area; however, the original Corps of Engineers plan for Blacktail did not include facilities beyond those currently present. The RMP should review these prior plans for applicability to the current RMP process.

However, some AHWG members caution that demand for additional facilities should be clearly established before plans for such facilities are seriously considered or pursued. It is noted that [1] Blacktail is within the Tex Creek WMA and potential impacts on the WMA must be considered in any review of recreation expansion needs or opportunities; and [2] expansion of boat launch capacity at Blacktail (or Juniper) could result in increased congestion/overcrowding on the reservoir surface; thus, the carrying capacity of the reservoir must also be considered in addressing the capacity of land-based

facilities.

Planning Team Note: Given the above perspectives, it is probably advisable that the RMP alternatives analysis process consider future options both with and without a second a ramp at Blacktail. Also of note is the fact that the idea of a breakwater at Blacktail was not validated in AHWG discussions; pending further requests for this concept, and information regarding need, it is suggested that it not be carried forward in the planning process.

Issue Category: B.2.3 -- Creation of Dive Park

Discussion: Explore the potential (including alternative sites) for accommodating scuba uses at the reservoir. Ensure that shoreline staging requirements, including parking, are addressed and conflicts with other uses are minimized. Ensure that the diving area within the reservoir is clearly defined, marked and visible to other water recreationists. Identify potential sites.

Planning Team Note: A license agreement with the sponsoring dive club should be explored to cover maintenance and liability issues. Conflicts with other users in the area such as fishermen and boaters must also be addressed.

Issue Category: B.2.4 -- Maintain Fishing Opportunities Including Downstream of Reservoir

Discussion: The following points were raised in discussion of this issue: [1] More support and effort is needed to maintain the viability of the bass fishery in the reservoir (see Issue Category -- Improve Fisheries Management); [2] It would be desirable to re-establish fishing access to Willow Creek below the dam; and [3] The RMP should consider the need and potential for designating specific areas of the reservoir for fishing (i.e., via non-motorized or no-wake designations—see 2.2.1, above, for additional perspective in this regard).

Problem Statements: B.3 – Shoreline & Other Land-Based Activities

Issue Category: B.3.1 -- Need Additional Facilities at Recreation Sites (restrooms, parking, electric power at Blacktail, etc.)

Discussion: Explore both demand and potential for development of new beachfront camping and day use facilities/locations to meet increasing demand. As part of these studies, recognize that both Blacktail and Benchlands are within the Tex Creek WMA; any further development in these areas must consider potential effects on the WMA.

Regarding the Willow Creek area below the dam – continued recreation access to this area should be explored. However, vehicular access is not considered crucial. To the extent that use of this area continues to be restricted through closure or restriction of access, the recreation facility capacity and activities of the area should be replaced elsewhere around the reservoir.

In considering the potential for extension of electric power to Blacktail, concerns to be addressed include:

- Avoiding potential to increase use levels in an area already subject to periods of overcrowding;
- The possibility that availability of power in that area would increase development on private lands adjacent to Reclamation lands;
- Visual impact due to installation of lines (this concern could be addressed by placing the line underground); and
- Consideration of using solar power as an alternative power source.
- Consider providing a light at the boat ramp to facilitate evening take out for fishermen and for safety purposes.

Issue Category: B.3.2 -- Conflicting Uses

Discussion: In planning for trail use (see Issue Category – B.3.4 Creation/Enhancement/Continuity of Trails) consider potential for conflicts between trail use types (i.e., incompatibilities between equestrian uses and others, especially bicycle). Rock climbing activities on the cliffs west of the visitors center can conflict with swimming and “cliff jumping” uses of the area.

Issue Category: B.3.3 -- Provision for Tribal Use of Facilities

Discussion: The RMP process should consider, and if appropriate, include provisions for Tribal members to use the recreation facilities (i.e., at no charge). The Tribe is working on a Memorandum Of Understanding with the Forest Service for tribal members to not pay for camping, based on the tribe wanting to camp on the Salmon River during Chinook harvest season.

Planning Team Note: It has been previously noted that this may be an agency-wide issue and not just applicable to Ririe Reservoir. In addition, Reclamation has reviewed this issue and determined that, at least in this case, the most appropriate mechanism for responding to the Tribe’s request would be a special use permit. Such a permit might be arranged for a special event and would need to be considered on a short-term, case-by-case basis. Reclamation’s existing agreement with Bonneville County to manage the recreation sites relies on user fees to support facilities maintenance; therefore, any waiver of these fees must be carefully examined.

Issue Category: B.3.4 -- Creation/Enhancement/Continuity of Trails

Discussion: Explore opportunities for equestrian, bicycle, and/or hiking trails around the reservoir. Specifically explore potentials for non-motorized trails, including: (1) in the Blacktail area of the reservoir, and (2) off of Skyline Road, leading into the Tex Creek WMA, down the Willow Creek Corridor, and down to Blacktail. In studying these opportunities, however, specific attention must be paid to addressing potential for adverse impacts (e.g., at creek/stream crossings, general habitat degradation, etc.). IDFG also reiterates that any trail development in the WMA portion of the reservoir area must consider impacts on wildlife overall and should focus only on summer season use.

Also relevant in this regard is IDFG's plans for [1] development of a summer-use, non-motorized trail system in the Tex Creek WMA (see B.3.9, below), and [2] an interpretive nature trail in the Cartier Slough WMA, connected with the adjacent Beaver Dick County Park.

Issue Category: B.3.5 -- Impacts of Motorized Vehicles (e.g., ORVs)

Discussion: The primary area of concern in this regard is the Tex Creek WMA. Relevant perspectives are provided in B.3.10 and C.1.1, below.

Issue Category: B.3.6 -- Designate Trails for ORVs

Discussion: Refer to B.3.10 and C.1.1, below.

Issue Category: B.3.7 -- Management of Rock Climbing Near Juniper Park Visitor's Center

Discussion: Rock climbing in the area near the Visitor's Center is an excellent opportunity for novice climbers, especially given its proximity to Idaho Falls. The RMP should accommodate this activity, but must resolve potentials for conflict with other activities in this area of the reservoir (i.e. conflicts with "cliff jumping" and swimming uses at the base of the cliffs).

Planning Team Note: Liability issues must also be explored. Potential solutions could include posting "at own risk" signs and/or issuing permits with the sponsoring climbing organization which clearly addresses liability concerns. In further discussions it has been noted that it would be very difficult to issue permits to all climbers and/or enforce limits of a permit, therefore posting signage may be the best management option.

Issue Category: B.3.8 -- Safety Education for Users

Discussion: Additional discussion of this issue has not occurred.

Planning Team Note: To the extent necessary and appropriate, the RMP will identify and support safety education in conjunction with involved jurisdictions and user groups.

Issue Category: B.3.9 -- Allow for Wildlife Viewing Opportunities

Discussion: AHWG discussions reinforced that opportunities for self-guided interpretive trails/tours in the Tex Creek and Cartier Slough WMAs should be explored. Within the Tex Creek WMA, such non-consumptive outdoor recreation activities as hiking, camping, wildlife viewing, etc. are acceptable and recognized uses outside of the winter season. The IDFG Management Plan for the Tex Creek WMA includes the following goal, objective and associated strategies for accommodating these opportunities:

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan Goal, Objective, and Strategies:

Goal: Provide...non-consumptive wildlife based recreation and public educational opportunities consistent with the mission of Tex Creek WMA.

Objective and Strategies: Improve public access and opportunity for non-consumptive wildlife appreciation (non-consumptive uses of Tex Creek WMA will increase dramatically over the next 20 years; birdwatching, wildlife viewing and photography, wildflower viewing, hiking, horseback riding and related activities are all expected and legitimate uses of Tex Creek WMA):

- *Develop a non-motorized trail system to improve access to unroaded portions of Tex Creek WMA and provide wildlife based recreational opportunity.*
- *Develop, by 1999, an interpretive sign at the Pipe Creek entrance to Tex Creek WMA to describe the area and some of the opportunities available.*
- *Develop interpretive signs for some of the roads and trails.*
- *Develop, by 1999, a wildlife viewing platform on the Indian Fork pond.*
- *Develop one to three photography blinds when and where appropriate as funding allows.*
- *Pursue the development of a variety of outdoor educational programs to be conducted on Tex Creek WMA as funding and manpower allows.*
- *Improve designated campsites by planting native trees for shade and providing a designated fire ring by 1998.*
- *Increase the number of designated campsites from six to as many as nine when and where appropriate as funding allows.*

As noted above, IDFG also plans an interpretive trail in Cartier Slough, connected with the adjacent Beaver Dick County Park.

Issue Category: B.3.10 – Maintain Hunting Opportunities

Discussion: Hunting is regulated by the IDFG. In addition, access routes (i.e. whether open or closed, motorized or non-motorized) are closely regulated by IDFG in the Tex Creek WMA. Overall the Tex Creek WMA Management Plan specifically recognizes hunting as an acceptable and recognized use. The Plan includes the following Goal, Objective and Strategies addressing this use:

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Plan Goal, Objective, and Strategies:

Goal: Provide recreational hunting opportunity...consistent with the mission of Tex Creek WMA.

Objective and Strategies: Provide hunting access and opportunity on Tex Creek WMA:

- *Maintain motorized access on established and open roads for hunters while maintaining a quality hunting experience. Maintain current situation until future conditions warrant change.*
- *Maintain Tex Creek WMA roads in a low maintenance or unimproved status. (These roads may be impassable during inclement weather. Maintenance of roads owned by Bonneville County which run through Tex Creek WMA are the responsibility of the county.)*
- *Maintain some roads and trails as non-motorized use only to provide quality hunting experiences and to protect wildlife security, soils and vegetation.*
- *Maintain and improve working relationships between Tex Creek WMA and neighboring landowners to encourage landowners to allow recreational access to private property.*
- *Periodically reevaluate the demand for and levels of hunter access to Tex Creek WMA. Implement management changes accordingly with input from user groups. (As the demand for hunting opportunity increases, a permitting system may need to be implemented at peak demand periods in*

order to maintain the quality of the hunting experience, protect species from over exploitation and maintain a safe hunting environment).

Concerns have been expressed by members of the public, including the AHWG, regarding IDFG's management of access for hunting, specifically which roads are open to motorized vehicles. In this regard, IDFG's Plan shows a network of roads which are to be open during the summer recreation season and during hunting season; several roads which were historically used by local residents are now closed to motorized vehicles. A map showing which roads are open is included in the July 1999 IDFG Plan. Concerned members of the public note that these closures of previously open roads unduly restrict access by elderly and disabled recreationists and hunters, who cannot access the area except via ATVs or other motor vehicles. However, a review of the specific roads which are the focus of this concern reveals that they are predominantly outside of Reclamation lands and jurisdiction, and therefore, cannot be subject to further review under the RMP.

Issue Category: B.3.11 – Winter Activities---Opportunities and Limitations

Specific Issues – Snowmobile use, cross-country skiing, and snowshoeing.

Discussion: Explore the potential to increase winter access and recreation opportunities by keeping Blacktail and Juniper open. Such action could provide for access to snowmobiling, cross-country skiing and camping opportunities; however, concerns related to increased vandalism of facilities and the potential for conflicts between uses (e.g. between snowmobiles and cross-country skiers) would need to be addressed. In discussion of this potential for winter recreation, it was also noted that keeping Blacktail open would bring recreationists into the Tex Creek WMA during the season when IDFG is seeking to minimize human disturbance; this is considered to be a very undesirable action from a wildlife standpoint, and is contrary to the purpose of the WMA. IDFG reiterates that their management goals and philosophy for the WMA stress minimizing, and perhaps eliminating, human activity during the winter (i.e. December 1 through March 15—as discussed above in A.1.2).

The same concern surrounds snowmobiling, cross country skiing or snowshoeing in the main body of the WMA apart from the reservoir. Regarding snowmobiling, the issue appears to center on whether or not to keep Pipe Creek road open during the winter, rather than opening other roads to this use (i.e. there is really no significant demand for broad-scale snowmobile access). In any case, IDFG would be opposed to any increase in such activity within the WMA. Regarding cross country skiing and snowshoeing, there is really no demand for these activities at present in the WMA due to its remote location and normally poor snow conditions. As a result, little attention is needed to managing them at present. Nevertheless, the RMP should reinforce IDFG's intent in these regards.

Planning Team Note: It has been determined that winter recreation use of Blacktail Park is not consistent with the management goals of the WMA, because of the high probability of disturbing and displacing wildlife during this season. Therefore, the option of keeping Blacktail open in the winter will not be carried forward in the RMP alternatives.

C. MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Problem Statements: C.1 -- Access

Issue Category: C.1.1 -- Maintain/Do Not Restrict Existing Access/Roads in the Tex Creek WMA

Discussion: During the winter, it is generally agreed that road closures are necessary to protect wintering wildlife and ensure that all or most areas of the WMA are available for wildlife use. As discussed under Issue Category – Balancing Recreation Development with Wildlife Needs, IDFG and Bonneville County cooperate each year regarding the need for road closures; and, generally, all but one road in the WMA is closed; Pipe Creek road is currently the only road which is not closed during the winter. Bonneville County has expressed a willingness to close Pipe Creek road, if informed by IDFG that a problem exists (e.g. if feeding of wildlife is occurring); to date, IDFG has not made this request. The RMP should explore further the implications of both [1] keeping Pipe Creek road open (as requested by some members of the public), and [2] closing this road during the winter season and thus restricting all vehicular access in the WMA (as suggested by the AHWG members which discussed wildlife issues).

Regarding snowmobiles, these sporadically enter the WMA from USFS lands to the east (occurrence estimate: approximately 25 times per season; severity and frequency of incursion varies widely by location). Snowmobile use is also a problem on surrounding private lands. The WMA should continue to be closed to this use. Potential RMP actions to be considered include:

- Working with the USFS to better manage snowmobile use on Service lands adjacent to the WMA;
- Funding for enforcement of the WMA closure;
- Providing signage indicating the boundary of the closure, including boundaries with private owners as well as other agency lands; and
- Providing public education regarding the closure;

(Note: the latter two of these are considered very effective, greatly facilitating deterrence of unauthorized use. Also, the idea of fencing and gates as a deterrent is generally ineffective given that these would likely be buried in snow during most of the winter).

In other seasons of the year, several roads in the WMA are open for hunting and recreational activities. IDFG has specified (on mapping included in their Tex Creek WMA Plan) which roads are open and

which are closed based on [1] overall WMA management activities and goals, and [2] the intent to provide appropriate access for a wide variety of recreational activities, including both motorized and non-motorized. As input to the RMP, a request was made to open Tex Creek Road (designated as closed in the IDFG Plan) for ATV access and to reopen other roads which have historically been used by local hunters. These requests center on permitting aged and disabled residents to have motorized access to areas in which they have historically hunted. The request to reopen Tex Creek Road has been reconsidered by AHWG members due to water quality and resource management concerns. In any case, detailed review of this and other requests for reopening roads within the WMA to motorized access has revealed that much of Tex Creek Road and all of the other roads in question are outside of Reclamation lands (e.g. in the Ritter's Bench area and in the northeast part of the WMA); they are thus not within Reclamation's jurisdiction or the planning scope of the RMP.

Issue Category: C.1.2 -- Maintain Existing Road Closures

Discussion: This comment refers primarily to winter closures in the WMA. See Issue Category – C.1.1 (Maintain/Do Not Restrict Existing Access/Roads in the Tex Creek WMA), above.

Issue Category: C.1.3 -- Improve Access to Reservoir/Recreation Sites

Discussion: Discussion of this issue centered on access at existing locations around the reservoir (see Issue Category – No Additional Access Sites on Reservoir, for perspective on new access locations).

In this regard, opportunities cited include:

- Expansion of Blacktail boat launch facilities (this opportunity carries the caveat of ensuring that any expansion does not exceed the carrying capacity of the reservoir for boating/personal water craft uses)
- At Juniper, allowed uses, access locations, and parking capacities should be reviewed to accommodate appropriate uses and avoid potential for conflicts, especially during peak periods. For example, rock climbing activities on the cliffs west of the Visitors Center can conflict with public swimming and cliff diving activities centered at the base of these cliffs. Also, the Juniper boat launch facility can reach capacity during peak periods.

(Planning Team note: Potential RMP objectives which respond to these points and ideas are included under the Recreation topic, above)

Issue Category: C.1.4 -- No Additional Access Sites on the Reservoir

Discussion: The AHWG is not aware of any need or potential for new recreation access locations on the Reservoir, particularly vehicular access (this comment does not include potential for improvement of access in existing locations such as Juniper and Blacktail opportunities in this regard include the existing construction road at Juniper, near the Visitors Center, which could provide increased reservoir access in this area). Any such proposal would involve very high costs, therefore, unless further evidence of demand/need is identified, the RMP should not pursue new access points to the reservoir.

Issue Category: C.1.5 -- Need Access for the Disabled

Discussion: There is a need to improve access for the disabled public, both at recreation sites around Ririe Reservoir and in the Tex Creek WMA. In the latter regard, this includes access for both general recreation and hunting activities. In planning for such access in the WMA, the need for road closures during the winter is recognized and accepted; and IDFG has designated a network of roads which are to be open outside of the winter season (IDFG also has a permit program which accommodates access needs of the disabled public). The RMP should consider whether improvements to (at least some of) these roads is warranted to better serve the needs of the disabled public. This concern also relates to public desires for the reopening of some roads which are now designated in the Tex Creek WMA Plan as closed to motor vehicles year-round; this issue is discussed above in C.1.1.

Issue Category: C.1.6 -- Address Closure of Road Over the Dam

Discussion: As discussed with the AHWG, vehicular access to and across the dam has recently been closed due to safety and vandalism concerns (pedestrian access remains open). Since this closure, discussion has continued regarding the impact of the closure on recreation users and the necessity of a permanent closure to motor vehicles. The closure has particularly impacted fishing activity (both in the reservoir at the north side of the dam, and in Willow Creek below the dam) and scuba diving activity (i.e. requiring divers to carry all equipment a considerable distance on foot to reach the reservoir); in the former regard, the closure would also eliminate potential for developing an accessible fishing pier on the reservoir at the north end of the dam (a potential which has been considered desirable up to this point). Further, concern has been expressed that the gated closure could be a problem for emergency access if a medical or other emergency occurs for those who walk in to fish, dive, or engage in other recreational activity.

The RMP process should consider both [1] the need for, and impact of, the current vehicular closure, and [2] alternatives for managing access to and across the dam which allow some degree of vehicular access but mitigate the safety and vandalism concerns which precipitated the current closure. Reclamation is currently pursuing with Bonneville County the concept of keeping the road open during daylight hours, with law enforcement/security provided by the County. Such a solution could be successful in responding to public demand for recreation activities at the dam, while mitigating the safety and vandalism concerns which precipitated the closure.

Issue Category: C.1.7 -- Improve Cove Creek Road

Discussion: Improvement of Cove Creek road has been cited as a means of improving disabled access to the Tex Creek WMA. However, this option is considered infeasible by knowledgeable members of the AHWG due to cost and environmental impact concerns; as such, it will not be carried forward in the RMP process.

Issue Category: C.1.8 -- Resolve Legal Access Issue on Cartier Slough Road; Improve Road

Discussion: There is currently a question regarding ownership of portions of the road which borders the Cartier Slough WMA and provides access to portions of the WMA. IDFG has received comments stating that this road should be improved; however, until the ownership question is resolved, responsibility for improvements cannot be determined.

Issue Category: C.1.9 – Improve Winter Access

Discussion: See Issue Categories – A.1.2--Balancing Recreation Development with Wildlife Needs, B.3.11--Winter Activities-Opportunities and Limitations, and C.1.1--Maintain/Do Not Restrict Access/Roads in the Tex Creek WMA.

Problem Statements: C.2 – Other Uses; General Management and Coordination

Issue Category: C.2.1 -- Coordination Among Management Plans (e.g., Reclamation/IDFG coordination of Tex Creek WMA and Cartier Slough WMA)

Discussion: No further discussion has occurred on this issue.

Planning Team Note: This is occurring as part of Reclamation's RMP planning process, and will be accommodated as part of decisions made in the RMP.

Issue Category: C.2.2 -- Coordination Between Reclamation and Adjacent Private Land Owners

Discussion: The AHWG requested additional information regarding any current coordination between Reclamation and private owners regarding grazing activities on Reclamation land. This request centered on Reclamation land surrounding Ririe Reservoir but outside of the Tex Creek WMA. There is currently no grazing on Reclamation lands outside the Tex Creek WMA, however, existing regulations do not preclude that use. Within the Tex Creek WMA, IDFG manages grazing activities as specified in their Management Plan; grazing activities are allowed to the extent that they serve as a management tool in achieving the mission of the WMA.

Another issue is trespass onto private lands by hunters and by unauthorized snowmobilers in the Tex Creek WMA.

Suggested opportunities to be explored for Reclamation/private owner cooperative efforts include:

- Reclamation funding assistance for fencing of riparian areas in private lands in the watershed;
- Signage programs, publication of accurate mapping and enforcement centered on public land boundaries as these relate to trespass hunting and to winter access closures in the WMA; and
- Any cooperative actions which could focus wintering wildlife use on the WMA and reduce

depredations onto surrounding private lands.

Planning Team Note: It should be noted that Reclamation has no authority to expend funds on private lands, therefore, cooperative efforts would need to focus on Reclamation boundaries with private lands.

Issue Category: C.2.3 -- Inclusion of Tribes in Management Plans and Processes

Discussion: The Tribes are participating in the RMP effort and Tribal concerns will be considered throughout the process (see also Issue Category – Addressing Cultural Resource Responsibilities, Enforcement, and Education – Proper Attention to Cultural Resources in All Management Action). If Tribal members or members of the public who voiced this issue were also referring to the IDFG Plans for Tex Creek or Cartier Slough, these Management Plans are completed, are being implemented, and are not being revisited as part of the RMP.

Issue Category: C.2.4 -- Educate Public on Reservoir Management

Discussion: The RMP should include information and, perhaps, an educational program regarding reservoir operations. It would be beneficial to promote clearer understanding [1] that the primary purposes of the reservoir are flood control, and to a limited extent, irrigation (not recreation or fishery management), and [2] how reservoir operations are dictated by these primary purposes.

The AHWG believes that many, if not most, users of the reservoir understand that operational priorities take precedence over recreational activities (i.e. the County does not get complaints regarding operations impacts on boating). Nevertheless, as part of the RMP process, it is still appropriate to review operational requirements in context with recreation and fishery needs to determine if better coordination can be achieved (for example, see above discussion regarding the bass fishery under Issue Category – A.2.1 (Improve fisheries management) (effects of operations; stocking program; etc.).

Issue Category: C.2.5 -- Agricultural Use/Leases

Discussion: Within the Tex Creek WMA, [1] some general grazing leases exist, all of which expire in mid-to-late 2000; these are managed by IDFG and are not intended to be renewed; and [2] the IDFG Management Plan does recognize sharecropping and grazing on a limited basis as potentially beneficial management tools to be used to achieve the WMA mission. The IDFG plan currently specifies these activities, which will continue to be conducted on a competitive bid basis.

Outside of the Tex Creek WMA, Reclamation does have one agricultural lease for 14 acres of land along the canyon rim near the northwest corner of the reservoir. The lease does not include water rights, nor can the lessee restrict hunting and fishing by the public on leased lands. This 1-year renewable lease began in 1998 and can be extended at the lessee's discretion until 2003.

Issue Category: C.2.6 -- Restrict Livestock Grazing

Discussion: Refer to Issue Category – C.2.5 (Agricultural Use/Leases), above.

Issue Category: C.2.7 -- Irrigation/Flood Control Management

Discussion: Existing requirements, contracts, and Standard Operating Procedures define reservoir operations related to flood control and irrigation deliveries; these will not be modified in any significant way as part of the RMP (see also Issue Category – C.2.4--Educate Public on Reservoir Management). In this regard, AHWG members inquired whether current operations consider the 1977 Cooperative Agreement signed with the Corp of Engineers; the agreement includes flow targets for various months/seasons of the year. Reclamation will review and respond to this question.

Issue Category: C.2.8 -- Fire Management Practices

Discussion: Both Reclamation and IDFG currently contract with the BLM for fire suppression; Reclamation will confirm whether these contracts cover all lands included in the RMP study. Both Reclamation and IDFG retain the authority to close areas to open fires (e.g. campfires) during dry conditions. Regarding management of the Tex Creek WMA, the IDFG plan recognizes controlled burns as a management tool; IDFG will continue to conduct such burns from time to time. All such activities are conducted with the assistance of BLM, using standard fire management practices. These factors should be reflected in the RMP.

Issue Category: C.2.9 -- More Signage Needed

Discussion: The primary focus of discussion regarding signage is on winter closure of the WMA to snowmobiles and other vehicles. See the following Issue Categories – A.1.2 (Balancing Recreation Development with Wildlife Needs), C.1.1 (Maintain/Do Not Restrict Access/Roads in the Tex Creek WMA), and C.2.2 (Coordination Between Reclamation and Adjacent Private Property Owners).

Issue Category: C.2.10 -- Keep Regulation by Government Agencies to a Minimum

Discussion: This sentiment can be recognized by the RMP to the extent that it does not conflict with legal requirements and fulfillment of government responsibilities.

Problem Statements: C.3 – Surrounding Land Use/Management

Issue Category: C.3.1 -- Development on Surrounding Lands

Discussion: Development of private lands surrounding the RMP area is governed by the County Land Use Plan. If RMP related concerns suggest that changes are needed in the County's approach to land use or development on surrounding lands, an amendment to the County Plan should be pursued by those expressing these concerns. It is not within Reclamation's jurisdiction to pursue such an amendment.

Concern has been expressed regarding the potential impact on the Tex Creek WMA of future urban/suburban development on private lands adjacent to the WMA. Perspectives on addressing this concern include:

- The RMP process should identify those areas on surrounding lands where development would have a serious impact on the WMA;
- Based on these RMP findings, Reclamation and/or the IDFG should monitor land use planning actions or proposed development in the County and provide appropriate comment to the County on any proposed development which would have a significant impact on WMA values or viability;
- Within the RMP area itself, Reclamation must consider the impact of its own actions related to inducement of growth and development on surrounding lands. The primary example of this issue discussed to date is the provision of electric power to the Blacktail site; opinions differ regarding whether this action would or would not make adjacent private lands more “developable” (i.e., is the current lack of electric power in this area a major constraint which limits development potential? Would extension of power to Blacktail remove the primary obstacle to economically feasible development on surrounding lands?). Other sources of concern could include any proposed road extensions/improvements or water supply extensions/development.

Issue Category: C.3.2 -- Responsibility for Outlet Channel Management

Discussion: This concern is believed to center on the undeveloped stretch of Willow Creek between the dam and the flood control channel, approximately eight miles downstream of the dam. Private landowners along this stretch have experienced erosion of their lands due to flood control releases from Ririe dam. These owners request a cooperative effort with Reclamation to better understand this issue and study whether operations can be changed to reduce or eliminate this erosion (it is noted that changes in operation are not a part of the RMP; however, Reclamation agreed at the first public meeting to discuss this issue further with affected landowners as part of the RMP process).

Another aspect of this concern may be related to the flood control channel which is part of the RMP study area. Adjacent landowners along the channel have stated that the method (i.e., siphon systems) used by the Corp of Engineers to restore irrigation canal/delivery system connections which were severed by the flood control channel have resulted in major reductions in their irrigation efficiency. Reclamation will need to determine if a review of this concern is appropriate as part of the RMP effort; and further, whether the potential exists for solving any problems found as a result of this review.

Planning Team Note: Because downstream erosion is directly related to reservoir operations, this issue is not appropriate for the RMP (due to limitations of RMP scope previously discussed). However, pursuant to Reclamation’s statements at the first public meeting, Reclamation staff will gather appropriate information regarding the issue and will contact the Corp of Engineers, requesting that the Corps work with affected landowners to determine if Federal action is needed and is feasible. This action will be conducted separate from the RMP process.

Regarding the issue of possible effects on irrigation systems caused by construction of the flood control channel, this is also an operations issue and relates to original construction of the channel. As such, it will be addressed separately from the RMP. Reclamation is working with the appropriate irrigation district(s) to explore the source of the problem and will respond to the district(s) in writing.

Issue Category: C.3.3 -- Address Effects of Trespassing on Private Lands

Discussion: All proposed RMP actions should be reviewed to determine potential effects on adjacent private owners. Potential for adverse effects, including increased trespass should be avoided or minimized.

The primary existing sources of concern related to trespass are snowmobile use and hunting. Related to Reclamation lands under study in the RMP process, these concerns center on uses in the Tex Creek WMA (see the following Issue Categories – A.1.2 (Balancing Recreation Development with Wildlife Needs), B.3.11 (Winter Activities–Opportunities and Limitations), and C.1.1 (Maintain/Do Not Restrict Existing Access/Roads in the Tex Creek WMA)).

Issue Category: C.3.4 -- Impacts of Wildlife/WMA Big Game on Private Lands

Discussion: IDFG maintains active coordination with surrounding landowners related to management of wintering game in and around the WMA. The IDFG Management Plan includes strategies aimed at limiting depredations by the wintering herds; these include: vegetation management to maximize the attractiveness of the WMA to the herds, access restrictions which seek to focus the herds in the WMA, and emergency feeding programs. From the standpoint of the RMP, discussions to date suggest that the primary area of focus in addressing the depredation concern is probably assisting with definition and enforcement of winter access restrictions (i.e., so that the maximum area in the WMA is usable without disturbances which can displace wildlife to surrounding lands).

Issue Category: C.3.5 -- More Fencing Needed

Discussion: More definition of this concern is needed; AHWG members considering the issue were not aware of specific needs for additional fencing on or surrounding Reclamation lands. In general, however, it was noted that surrounding private owners should be encouraged to maintain fencing on their lands to prevent trespass grazing on Reclamation lands. The AHWG notes that the State’s “open range” law applies in this area; this law provides that landowners who do not want cattle grazing on their land need to fence the cattle out (vs. the grazing operators fencing the cattle in).

Problem Statements: C.4 – Implementation

Issue Category: C.4.1 -- Ensure Plan Implementation

Discussion: AHWG discussion identified the following priorities regarding RMP implementation; these are related in many regards to the potential goals and objectives discussed herein regarding cooperation

and coordination between Reclamation and [1] involved agencies and Tribes, and [2] the public, particularly related to:

- Funding for RMP proposals and programs;
- A clear schedule for RMP implementation, including monitoring on a regular basis;
- Clear definition of authority and responsibility (among involved agencies) for implementation of RMP policies, programs, regulations, and restrictions (i.e. Reclamation is not the agency responsible for regulation of some uses/activities which will be addressed in the RMP); and
- Clear definition of authority and responsibility for enforcement of RMP policies, regulations, and restrictions; for example, Reclamation does not have enforcement authority although it does have authority to regulate uses on its lands.

The AHWG stresses the need to explore all feasible means of funding RMP proposals and programs. The potential to use Land and Water Conservation funds is cited as one avenue to explore.

Issue Category: C.4.1 -- Responsibility and Authority for Regulation of Uses

Discussion: Refer to Issue Category – C.4.1 (Ensure Plan Implementation), above.

Issue Category: C.4.2 -- Responsibility and Authority for Enforcement of Policies, Regulations, and Restrictions

Discussion: Refer to Issue Category – C.4.1 (Ensure Plan Implementation), above.

Issue Category: C.4.3 -- Funding for Management and Enforcement

Discussion: Refer to Issue Category – C.4.1 (Ensure Plan Implementation), above.

Issue Category: C.4.4 -- Entrance/User Fees (i.e., limitations and funding implications)

Discussion: User fees are currently charged at Blacktail and Juniper. These include fees (varying by site) for: camping, parking, and moorage. These fees are used by the County to operate, maintain, and improve recreation facilities at the reservoir. The AHWG prefers that the RMP not place limits on fee types or levels; while large increases over present fee levels are not anticipated, future conditions may warrant change due to demand levels, facility improvement or maintenance needs, etc.

A request by a member of the AHWG was made to look into reduced fees for persons with disabilities. Reclamation will research this further and, if appropriate, include in the RMP.

Planning Team Note: Reclamation is required to provide equal access to programs and facilities for persons with disabilities. This includes making sure recreation and other appropriate facilities and programs are accessible and meet the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards. The requirement does not extend to reduced fees at recreation sites and may be considered discriminatory to other users, therefore, it has been determined not to pursue this suggestion.

Appendix B

Agency and Tribal Consultation/Coordination



Appendix B-1

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation/Coordination



Appendix B-2

Tribal Consultation/Coordination



APPENDIX B-2: TRIBAL CONSULTATION/COORDINATION

Letters and Meetings with Tribes

1998

- September 22, 1998 Letter to the Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes asking if the Tribes are interested in completing a Traditional Cultural Property Inventory for Ririe Reservoir/Tex Creek Wildlife Management Area
- December 4, 1998 Meeting with the Tribal Council of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes to discuss several projects including Resource Management Plans
- December 17, 1998 Meeting with staff of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to discuss interest in completing a Traditional Cultural Property Inventory for Ririe and Cascade Resource Management Plans
- December 28, 1998 Letter to the Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes requesting January 7, 1998 meeting to discuss several important initiatives

1999

- January 7, 1999 Meeting at Fort Hall with the Chairman and Council Members of the Fort Hall Business Council, and Staff of Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to discuss several important initiatives
- February 17, 1999 Meeting with the Tribal Staff of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to discuss potential Tribal issues in the Ririe Resource Management Plan study area
- March 9, 1999 Letter to the Chairman of the Tribal Council, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes Summarizing the December 4, 1998, meeting where several projects were discussed, including Resource Management Plans
- April 30, 1999 Letter to the Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Summarizing the January 7, 1999 meeting where several important projects were discussed including Resource Management Plans

- June 10 & 11, 1999 Field Trip to Ririe Reservoir and Tex Creek WMA and meeting with Tribal Staff of the Shoshone Bannock Tribes to discuss potential Tribal issues in the Ririe Resource Management Plan Study Area
- September 8, 1999 Letter to Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes requesting a meeting to discuss several important projects
- September 9, 1999 Letter to the Chairperson of the General Council of the Burns Paiute Tribe, requesting a meeting to discuss several important projects
- September 9, 1999 Letter to the Chairman of the Tribal Council of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, requesting a September meeting to discuss several important projects including Resource Management Plans
- September 24, 1999 Letter and Agenda to Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council of the Shoshone- Bannock Tribes concerning a tentative meeting date set for October 15, 1999
- October 15, 1999 Meeting with the Fort Hall Business Council and Staff of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to discuss several important projects including Resource Management Plans
- November 30, 1999 Meeting with the Executive Committee of the Nez Perce Tribal Council Members and Staff to discuss several important issues

2000

- February 29, 2000 Meeting with Commission Members, Director of the Department of Fisheries and staff of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes concerning the Ririe and Cascade Resource Management Plans
- March 17, 2000 Meeting with the Tribal Council of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes to discuss Tribal issues and Reclamation projects including Ririe and Cascade Resource Management Plans
- July 17, 2000 Meeting with the Tribal Council of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes to discuss tribal issues. The status of Ririe and Cascade Resource Management Plans was reported
- October 6, 2000 Government to Government Meeting with Shoshone-Bannock Business Council and staff to discuss several important issues including Ririe and Cascade RMPs

- December 5, 2000 Letter to Chairman of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribal Council Transmitting the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Ririe Reservoir Resource Management Plan, requesting comments and a meeting to discuss the RMP
- December 5, 2000 Letter to Chairman of the Shoshone-Bannock Business Council Transmitting the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Ririe Reservoir Resource Management Plan, requesting comments and a meeting to discuss the RMP
- December 5, 2000 Letter to Chairman of the Chairman of the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee Transmitting Draft Environmental Assessment for the Ririe Reservoir Resource Management Plan and requesting comments.

2001

- February 7, 2001 Meeting with Tribal Council of Shoshone-Paiute Tribes and staff to discuss Ririe and Cascade Draft EAs and other Reclamation projects and proposals
- February 15, 2001 Meeting with the staff of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes concerning the Draft EA of the Ririe and Cascade RMP's
- February 17, 2001 Letter from the Habitat, Parks, Fish & Game Department of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes commenting on Draft EA of the RMP
- February 20, 2001 Letter from Fish & Wildlife Coordinator, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes commenting on the Ririe and Cascade Reservoir RMP's

Appendix C

IDFG Fishery Management Goals



APPENDIX C: IDFG FISHERY MANAGEMENT GOALS

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) has identified objectives and programs for managing the fishery at Ririe Reservoir in their Fisheries Management Plan (IDFG 1996). The objectives, listed below, apply to Ririe Reservoir and to the reservoir tributaries.

Ririe Reservoir

Objective: Maintain a satisfactory salmonid fishery through the following programs:

- Continue stocking hatchery rainbow trout at a size and on a schedule which provides high quality fishing and maximum economic efficiency.
- Stock other salmonids such as brown trout, lake trout *Salvelinus namaycush*, or splake for non-game fish control and fishery diversity if trials prove the efficacy of such actions and risk to cutthroat trout in the drainage is deemed acceptable.
- Work to improve habitat and streamflow protection and/or enhancement to provide adequate spawning area for reservoir salmonids.

Objective: Maintain a satisfactory smallmouth bass fishery through the following programs:

- Monitor the bass population, primarily with data provided by organized tournament bass anglers and regularly scheduled creel surveys.
- Implement management actions (regulations such as more restrictive rules) if the actions are determined to have a high probability of significantly improving some aspects of the bass population and/or fishery and the actions are acceptable to the public.
- Work with organized bass anglers to minimize the biological and social impacts of bass tournaments.
- Develop bass habitat in cooperation with bass angler clubs.

Objective: Increase utilization of and appreciation for abundant yellow perch through the following program:

- Continue a comprehensive effort to educate the public about the positive aspects of having what is now a very well established yellow perch population in the reservoir, (quality table fare, catchability, and a numerical abundance well suited to consumptive angling).

Reservoir Tributaries

Objective: Restore native fluvial cutthroat trout populations through the following programs:

- Phase out put-and-take hatchery rainbow trout stocking which could be deleterious to cutthroat trout through competition, hybridization, and by attracting elevated levels of consumptive angling pressure.
- Maintain restrictive harvest rules for cutthroat trout and a late (July 1) season opener in principal spawning tributaries.
- Critically evaluate both agency and private stockings of fish in the drainage for possible negative effects on native cutthroat, restrict and/or comment on accordingly.
- Work to improve habitat and streamflow protection and/or enhancement.

Objective: Restore put-and-grow brown trout fishery, particularly in the Gray's Lake Outlet, as possible without harming the native cutthroat trout stock through the following programs:

- Continue stocking of fingerling brown trout in the outlet area, maintain fish quality and stocking conditions to maximize utility.
- Work to improve habitat and streamflow protection and/or enhancement.

Appendix D

IDFG Tex Creek WMA Management Plan Goals, Objectives, and Strategies



Appendix E

**IDFG Cartier Slough WMA
Management Plan Goals,
Objectives, and Strategies**



Appendix F
Legal Mandates



Legal Mandates Potentially Applicable to the EA and RMP

Reclamation is required to comply with a number of legal mandates in the preparation and implementation of the RMP. The following is a list of the environmental laws, executive orders, and policies that may have an effect on the RMP or Reclamation actions in the implementation of the plan:

Law, Executive Order, or Policy	Description
Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities – Reclamation Policy (November 18, 1998)	Established a Pacific Northwest regional policy to assure that all administrative offices, facilities, services, and programs open to the public, utilized by Federal employees, and managed by Reclamation, a managing partner, or a concessionaire, are fully accessible for both employees and the public.
American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978	Provides for freedom of Native Americans to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religion, including access to important sites.
Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, as amended	Ensures the protection and preservation of archaeological sites on Federal land. ARPA requires that Federal permits be obtained before cultural resource investigations begin on Federal land. It also requires that investigators consult with the appropriate Native American groups before conducting archaeological studies on Native American origin sites.
Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974	Provides for the preservation of historical buildings, sites, and objects of national significance.
Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1974, as amended*	Provides for protection of water quality.
Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970	Provides for protection of air quality.
Department of Defense (DoD) American Indian and Alaska Native Policy, October 20, 1998	The policy supports Tribal self-governance and government-to-government relations between the Federal government. It specifies that DoD will meet its trust responsibilities to Tribes and will address Tribal concerns related to protected Tribal resources, Tribal rights, and Indian lands.
Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended	Provides for protection of plants, fish, and wildlife that have a designation as threatened or endangered.
Executive Order 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership, October 26, 1983	Establishes "regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with state, local, and Tribal governments on Federal matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities."

Law, Executive Order, or Policy	Description
Executive Order 12898, February 11, 1994, Environmental Justice	Requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of its programs and policies on minority and lower income populations.
Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands	Directs all Federal agencies to avoid, if possible, adverse impacts to wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands.
Executive Order 13007, Indian Sacred Sites, May 24, 1996	Provides for access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites on Federal lands used by Indian religious practitioners.
Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Government, November 6, 2000 (revokes EO 13084)	<p>The EO builds on previous administrative actions and is intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of Federal policies that have tribal implications. • Strengthen government- to-government relations with Indian tribes; and • Reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates upon Indian tribes.
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) of 1958	Requires consultation and coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Indian Trust Assests Policy (July 1993)	Requires that Reclamation provide protection and continuation of Tribal hunting, fishing, and gathering Treaty Rights.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended	Provides protection for bird species that migrate across state lines.
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969	Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA specify that as part of the NEPA scoping process, the lead agency "...shall invite the participation of affected Federal, State, and local agencies, any affected Indian tribe,..." (1501.7[a]1."
National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended	Section 106 of the NHPA requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of any actions or programs on historic properties. It also requires agencies to consult with Native American Tribes if a proposed Federal action may affect properties to which they attach religious and cultural significance.

Law, Executive Order, or Policy	Description
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990	Regulations for the treatment of Native American graves, human remains, funeral objects, sacred objects, and other objects of cultural patrimony. Requires consultation with Native American Tribes during Federal project planning.
Presidential Memorandum: Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments, April 29, 1994	Specifies a commitment to developing more effective day-to-day working relationships with sovereign Tribal governments. Each executive department and agency shall consult to the greatest extent practicable and to the extent permitted by law, with Tribal governments prior to taking actions affecting Federally recognized Tribal governments.
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title V, Section 504	Provides for access to Federal or Federally assisted facilities for the disabled. The Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) or the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), whichever is the more stringent, are followed as compliance with Section 504.
Title 28, Public Law 89-72, as amended	Provides Reclamation with the authority to cost-share on recreation projects and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities with managing partners on Reclamation lands.

*A permit may need to be required for construction related activities.

Appendix G

Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-1

Fiscal Year 2002
(October 2001 - September 2002)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-2

Fiscal Year 2003
(October 2002 - September 2003)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-3

Fiscal Year 2004
(October 2003 - September 2004)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-4

Fiscal Year 2005
(October 2004 - September 2005)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-5

Fiscal Year 2006
(October 2005 - September 2006)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-6

Fiscal Year 2007
(October 2006 - September 2007)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-7

Fiscal Year 2008
(October 2007 - September 2008)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-8

Fiscal Year 2009
(October 2008 - September 2009)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-9

Fiscal Year 2010
(October 2009 - September 2010)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix G-10

Fiscal Year 2011
(October 2010 - September 2011)
Annual Reports and Activities

