

**Boise-Mores Creek Watershed Advisory Group Meeting
February 15th, 2007**

In Attendance:

Julia Achabal	- DEQ
Bruce Baumhoff	- Concerned Landowner
Oscar Baumhoff	- Mining Interest/Rancher/Concerned Landowner
Russ Hicks	- USFS Mineral Resource Specialist
Lynda Kuwahara	- Medical Provider/Concerned Landowner
Russ Manwaring	- West Central Highlands Resource Conservation District
Lauri Monnot	- DEQ
Mark Rice	- Concerned Landowner
John Roberts	- Idaho Department of Lands
Charlie Swearingen	- USFS, Range Conservationist
Pam Smolczynski	- Trout Unlimited, Water Based Recreation
Hana West	- USFS, Hydrologist
Liz Woodruff	- Idaho Rivers United, Environmental Interest

Review January Meeting Notes

➤ **MOTION:** Minutes approved.

Distributed copies of the WAG approval letter from the SW BAG and DEQ director

Reviewed WAG voting arrangement

- 100% consensus of all in attendance
- If consensus is not reached, official WAG members will vote
- 1 vote per interest group, must decide among members in attendance for that interest group
- From the member vote a majority decision is necessary and any objections are noted

Announcement – Mores Creek Restoration received BPA funding

➤ **CORRECTION:** Hana called Friday February 16th to make an amendment to the meeting notes. The funding has not been secured yet.

Lauri presented the changes made to the PNV TMDL:

1. Reviewed and Adjusted Shade Targets/Curves
 - a. Changed Mixed Conifer vegetation community to Ponderosa Pine community as discussed in January meeting
 - b. Proportionally reduced vegetation community diversity in other vegetation types
 - c. Re-evaluated upper Grimes and Mores vegetation community assignments
 - i. Changed several sections from Conifer or Conifer/Meadow to Meadow to better reflect the natural community
2. Stretch along Highway 21
 - a. Did not make any changes to community assignments or shade curves
 - i. Need to acknowledge that anthropogenic activities have influenced temperatures in these sections
 - ii. We can suggest BMPs during implementation phase
3. Removed Small Tributaries
 - a. Henry Creek
 - b. Washington Gulch
4. Added Missing Major Tributaries
 - a. Thorn Creek, a tributary to Mores Creek
 - b. Clear Creek, a tributary to upper Grimes Creek
5. Margin of Safety
 - a. Added Margin of Safety (MOS) category to maps to clarify load reduction targets
 - i. This category replaced the '-1 to -9' category on the 'Lack of Shade' (figure 4)
6. PVGs (Potential Vegetation Groups) for the Boise National Forest may be used by EPA to create new shade curves. This may result in changes to the existing shade and target shade values.

WAG suggestions for changes to the document:

1. In the narrative (TMDL key findings section and SBA) add language regarding how roads (highway 21 and FS roads) impact shade potential and there is likely little we can do to achieve a target shade.
 - i. Comment from Oscar – the roads have been built on abandoned railroad grades (used from 1914-1928) and the changes created by this have been in place for nearly 100 years. Is this natural condition now? 95% of Highway 21 until it begins to switchback is on old RR grades; Grimes Creek past Centerville is 40-50% RR grade; Granite Creek is 40-50% RR grade; and south of Centerville is 85-90% RR grade. High water events decreased the lower section %'s that used the old RR grades.
 2. Change colors on the figures to increase distinction between shade categories.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Mark and Lauri will assess whether the above changes are warranted/feasible and discuss changes made at the next WAG meeting.

WAG comments/questions regarding the PNV TMDL:

1. Clarification – Implementation goal is to reduce the solar load for each stream.
 2. John Roberts' comment regarding forestry practices
 - i. Will we have to reduce logging on one section because we can't meet the target in another area?
 - ii. Why is Mores Creek calling for a 2% reduction yet has a high excess solar load, also a similar situation in Grimes Creek
 3. Bruce Baumhoff's comment
 - i. Is there an easy way to convert kilowatt hours/day to amount of shade or height and density of vegetation? How can we easily tell people interested in implementation exactly what we need to do to meet the shade targets? Is there a way to put this into the TMDL?
 - ii. Can we break the streams into assessment units and model to determine what height and density of vegetation is necessary to achieve the targets?
- **ACTION ITEM:** Lauri will address these questions at the next WAG meeting.

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, March 15th, 2007

7:00pm

Forest Service Office, Idaho City

- Agenda items: Changes to PNV TMDL and introduction to the SBA watershed characterization