

2007 Performance and Progress Report

State of Idaho
Nonpoint Source Management Program

January 1 through December 31, 2007

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality




Cover photo: Willow planting along Boulder Creek is one of the projects completed for the Cascade Reservoir Watershed Project, Phase 2.

2007 Performance and Progress Report

State of Idaho Nonpoint Source Management Program

February 2008



This photo and next: Deep Creek Bank Stabilization Project volunteers work to stabilize the stream bank.

Acknowledgments

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would like to acknowledge the efforts of those who contributed to the development of this report.

This report was made possible by the fine desktop publishing skills of Dennis Meier, data collection skills of Tina Elayer, and cartography skills of Sean Coyle—all of the DEQ State Office.

Thanks also to the following:

Agencies and Organizations

Balanced Rock Soil Conservation District
Bear Lake Regional Commission
Bear Lake Soil and Water Conservation District
Benewah Soil and Water Conservation District
Benewah Soil Conservation District
Bonner County Soil and Water Conservation District
Canyon County Grange District #2
Caribou County Soil and Water Conservation District
City of Caldwell
Clearwater Soil and Water Conservation District
Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District
Gem County Development Services
Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts
Idaho Department of Lands
Idaho County Soil and Water Conservation District

Idaho Soil Conservation Commission
Idaho State Department of Agriculture
Latah Soil and Water Conservation District
Lewis Soil Conservation District
Nez Perce Tribe
Oneida Soil and Water Conservation District
Owyhee Watersheds Council
Palouse Clearwater Environmental Institute
Portneuf Soil and Water Conservation District
Trout Unlimited
Twin Falls Canal Company
Twin Falls Soil and Water Conservation District
USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service
Valley Soil and Water Conservation District
West Cassia Soil and Water Conservation District

Outstanding Projects Acknowledgments

S023 Upper Rapid Creek Watershed Riparian Project

The current Portneuf SWCD board (Chairman Scott Henderson, Kit Tillotson, David Jackson, Kevin Koester, and John McNabb) wishes to thank the project participants, landowners, and cooperating agencies for their assistance and hard work in successfully implementing the Upper Rapid Creek DEQ NPS section 319 project. Special thanks to Jerry West, Dave Pisarski, and Lynn Van Every of DEQ for their guidance. Many thanks go out to project technical assistance providers including Allan Johnson, Rick Rumsey, Clay Erickson, Kristen May, Brad Duncan, Ron Gill, Justin Krajewski, Ben Evans, Christine Fischer-Waite, Karie Pappani, Elliot Traher, Ron Davidson, Martha Nunez-Hagius, and Amy Jenkins. Thanks also to the Portneuf SWCD administrative staff over the years of this project: Janet Baker, Janet Merzlock, Sara Jo John, and Janet Pacioretty, and to former Portneuf SWCD board members Robert Zinszer, Cole Ellis, and Bill Hart.

S008 Twenty-Four Mile Creek TMDL Implementation Project

The Caribou Soil Conservation District board of supervisors wishes to thank the project participants, landowners, and cooperating agencies for their assistance and hard work in successfully implementing the Twenty-Four Mile Creek 319 Implementation Project. Special thanks go to Jerry West, Dave Pisarski, and Lynn Van Every of DEQ for their guidance. Many thanks go out to project technical assistance providers, including Allan Johnson, Rick Rumsey, Kristen May, Brad Duncan, Bob Kukchka, Justin

State of Idaho Nonpoint Source Program

Krajewski, Ben Evans, Chris Banks, Steve Smith, Christine Fischer-Waite, Amy Jenkins, Larry Mickelsen, Cameron Williams, Bruce Sandoval, Glade Moser, Randy Franks, and Robert McConnaughey. Thanks also to the Caribou SCD administrative staff over the years of this project: Pauline Bassett; current board members Wilder Hatch, Mike Tingey, Rulon Wistisen, George Millward, Harry Ozburn, Vicki Lozier, and Sherman Toone; and former board members Curtis Reed, Lori Anne Lau, and Lee Crockett.

S095 Santa Creek Stream Bank Protection Project

The Benewah SWCD Board of Supervisors (Chairperson Billie Brown, Terry Doupe', Gil Harris, Keith Daman, and Rich Morrison) wish to acknowledge and thank all the agency personnel from the Idaho Soil Conservation Commission, Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, and Natural Resources Conservation Service who made this project successful. Special thanks go to Mark Hogan and Sherry Klaus of the Benewah Soil and Water Conservation District. Without the initial and continual support and cooperation from Dipple Brothers Ranch owner, Mrs. Norma Dipple and her daughter Paula Nelson, this project would not have been possible. The support of the Benewah County Commissioners during the application process was greatly appreciated as well as the cooperation of local contractor Gil Masterson during the construction process.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	v
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xii
Glossary.....	xiii
Section 1. 2007 Performance and Progress Report.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Assessing Program Performance	1
Program and Project Administration	3
Section 2. 2007 Project Field Evaluation Season.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Field Evaluation Process	13
Results.....	13
Section 3. Outstanding Projects of 2007	25
Twenty-Four Mile Creek 319 Implementation Project.....	27
Upper Rapid Creek Riparian Restoration	35
Santa Creek TMDL Implementation Project	51
Section 4. 2007 Evaluation Reports	57
Kinsey Corral Relocation Project.....	59
North Idaho AFO Implementation Phase 2.....	61
Main Perrine Coulee Irrigation Return Flow Treatment	63
Cedar Draw F Coulee Project.....	65
Santa Creek Phase 2.....	67
Boise River Side Channel Project.....	69
Potlatch Water Quality Improvement	71
Gem County Storm water Management Demonstration	73
Mid South Fork Palouse River Restoration.....	75
LQ/LS Wetland	77
Indian Creek Caldwell - Phase 2	79
Owyhee Restoration Incentives	81
Tammany Creek BMP Demonstration (Woods)	83
South Fork Palouse Robinson Park.....	85
Butcher Creek and Three-Mile Creek.....	87
Payette and Middle Snake Rivers Clean Water Project	89
Lower North Fork Clearwater Phase 2	91
Bear River Stream Bank Restoration at Martin Mast Property	93
Milner Lake Shoreline Stabilization.....	95
Cascade Reservoir Watershed Phase 2.....	97
Bear River AFO Relocation	99
West and Middle Fork St. Maries River TMDL Implementation.....	101
Burley/Marsh Creek Nitrate Priority Area Ground Water Improvement Project.....	103
South Fork Clearwater, Kirtner, and Rylaarsdam.....	105
Deep Creek Bank Stabilization Project.....	107
Soldier Creek Rocking Project.....	109
Camas Prairie Ground Water Nitrate Priority Project, Phase 2	111

State of Idaho Nonpoint Source Program

Rock Creek Riparian Fencing.....	113
St. Charles Creek Watershed Restoration.....	115
Bear Ridge River Dingle AFO.....	117
Deep Creek/Bear River Management.....	119
References.....	121
Report Index	123

List of Figures

Figure 1. Currently active nonpoint source program projects in Idaho as of December 31, 2007.....	9
Figure 2. Locations of 31 nonpoint source projects evaluated during 2007.	14
Figure 3. Before (August 2003): meadow pasture with access to stream.	31
Figure 4. After (November 2007): use exclusion fencing eliminates livestock access to streams.....	31
Figure 5. Before (September 2003): animal feed area without containment.	32
Figure 6. After (same area as pictured above, November 2004): waste storage facility under construction.	32
Figure 7. Livestock access to the streambed is limited by this stream crossing (June 2003).....	33
Figure 8. Corral panels and off-site watering facility (May 2003).....	33
Figure 9. Off-site watering facility.	34
Figure 10. Off-site watering facility.	34
Figure 11. Upper Rapid Creek Watershed areas treated with subgrant S023 funding.....	37
Figure 12. Upper Rapid Creek project integration.....	37
Figure 13. Before (May 2005): cattle had access to this stream year round.	41
Figure 14. After (June 2007): recovery after two years of livestock exclusion.....	41
Figure 15. Before (January 2003): old lambing facility with no containment.	42
Figure 16. After (May 2007): lambing facility relocated with containment and off-site water.	42
Figure 17. Before (July 2001): old working corrals and season-long horse/sheep grazing.	43
Figure 18. After (June 2007): relocation of working corrals and implementation of rotational grazing system.	43
Figure 19. Frost-free livestock drinkers (July 2005).	44
Figure 20. Steel water trough from spring development for off-site water (December 2004).	44
Figure 21. Willow cuttings planted with waterjet stinger (June 2005).	45
Figure 22. Containment facility/berm/off-site water development (July 2004).	45
Figure 23. Livestock exclusion fencing and prescribed grazing (October 2005).	46
Figure 24. Santa Creek project phases and sediment reduction.....	53
Figure 25. New exclusionary fencing installed at the upper hard crossing (above). Two strands of barbed wire with two strands of electric fence (below).	54
Figure 26. Exclusionary limits cattle access to the area surrounding the stream bank. Notice the difference in the vegetation present on each side of the fence.....	55
Figure 27. Before the project (above) in 2004; after the project (below) in 2007.....	56
Figure 28. This (above and below) is what the corral and McMullen Creek looked like prior to the relocation.....	59
Figure 29. Above and below: the abandoned corral site three years later. (Overexposure of some photographs of this project evaluation was due to camera malfunction.)	60
Figure 30. Looking from the new location of the AFO down to the previous location in the canyon floor.....	61
Figure 31. Prior to this project, the valley floor was a de-vegetated AFO.....	61
Figure 32. A well was drilled to provide water for the new AFO location.....	62
Figure 33. Prior to this project, this area was an AFO. The creek bottom was barren of vegetation and was covered with manure.	62
Figure 34. This new AFO is located high and dry, away from surface water. Previously, cattle in this area were fed and watered in the creek.....	62

Figure 35. This watering trough allows cattle access to water without polluting the nearby creek 62

Figure 36. Irrigation return flow for the Main Perrine Coulee. This project now diverts 80-90% of flow to a 5 acre settling pond and two wetlands, where the great majority of pollutants are removed prior to discharge to the Main Perrine Coulee and, ultimately, to the Snake River..... 63

Figure 37. Shown above and below are the infrastructure and settling pond associated with this project 64

Figure 38. Project Manager Mary Rosen is examining the upper pond..... 65

Figure 39. Outflow to the second settling pond. 66

Figure 40. One of the settling ponds. 66

Figure 41. Flow from the upper pond to the second pond. 66

Figure 42. This view is from the top of the Santa Creek Watershed. All of the land in this photograph is part of the watershed. The work was conducted in the heavily grazed clearing seen in the distance. 67

Figure 43. Prior to this project, the stream bank was nearly vertical and bare of vegetation. After resloping, established native vegetation was planted. 67

Figure 44. Even though livestock were allowed back into Santa Creek due to partial destruction of fencing by elk and moose, the stream banks and vegetation appear to still be in good shape..... 68

Figure 45. Livestock did not damage the BMPs, which were expertly installed and include considerable amounts of rock hardscape. 68

Figure 46. Although DEQ did find some electric fencing that had been damaged, most of the fencing was still in good shape. 68

Figure 47. When these photographs were taken during spring of 2005, vegetation was just being established. 69

Figure 48. (Above and below) As of July 2007, vegetation has developed very well along the earliest phase of channel development. 70

Figure 49. Much of the grass and all of the woody plants planted by volunteers in 2005 are flourishing. 70

Figure 50. The Potlatch River watershed extends to the mountains in the background of this photograph. All of this agricultural land is highly erosive. 71

Figure 51. A BMP locally known as a "gully plug" has been installed in the shallow valley near the center of this photograph..... 71

Figure 52.(Above and below): direct seeding technique results in preservation of the previous year's crop residue. .. 71

Figure 53. (All photos this page) Direct seed farming results in better yields and less erosion. 72

Figure 54. This is the plan (left) and funding source (right) for the future industrial park located just west of Emmett. The bioinfiltration swales will be installed along the main east-west road shown on the sign on the left. (North is at the top of the sign on the left.) 73

Figure 55. Facing west (above) along the main street. Facing east (right): bioinfiltration swales will be installed along both sides of the street. Ground water is only about three feet below the surface in this area..... 74

Figure 56. These two photographs were taken in the same location as the photographs in Figure 55, almost a year later. These photographs suggest that the only change in that time was the excavation of a shallow ditch and the addition of 4-6 inches of gravel road base. 74

Figure 57. The Palouse-Clearwater Environmental Institute (PCEI) displays public information signs at all of its projects. 75

Figure 58. This corral exclusionary fencing is one of two subprojects included in this overall project. Previously, the corral included the stream (left). The stream bank was entirely denuded of vegetation. This was a major source of stream bacteria and sediment. After just one growing season, the stream bank has made a nearly complete recovery (right)..... 76

Figure 59. To assist with stream bank recovery, coconut fiber logs were installed as needed. 76

Figure 60. A watering trough was added to the corral to discourage horses from congregating at this one hardened crossing on the stream. This crossing can be blocked off if necessary. However, the watering trough appears to be working because horses (like people) do not like standing in water if given a choice. 76

Figure 61. This is one of three cells associated with the settling pond complex. 77

Figure 62. Water flowing from cell 1 to cell 2 of the settling pond complex. 78

Figure 63. Finished water is being discharged to the Snake River. 78

Figure 64. The Indian Creek project covers a six-block area of the downtown core of the City of Caldwell. 79

Figure 65. In the early 1900s, Indian Creek was concealed in some places and pushed over into a restricted channel in other places (left). Caldwell has launched a major campaign to undo all of that by eliminating some old

State of Idaho Nonpoint Source Program

buildings and reestablishing the stream channel through the heart of Caldwell (right)	80
Figure 66. Where necessary, utilities are being encased in concrete to protect them from the overlying new creek channel. The steel arches (right) salvaged from one of the old buildings will be used to construct a new foot bridge over the creek.	80
Figure 67. At project completion, the entire six-block section of Indian Creek will look similar to this one-block section that was completed in 2006. This part of the project includes an enhanced stream bank and a storm water treatment BMP. The water wheel was paid for through other funding.....	80
Figure 68. For generations, ranchers in this area used whatever methods they could to dam up creeks to create irrigation flows. If left as shown (left and right) this crude dam would have failed, flushing a large volume of sediment downstream. Funding from the 319 program was used, along with the required 40% match from the rancher, to install a properly engineered concrete weir and diversion.	81
Figure 69. We revisited the site one year later, after the new weir and head gate were installed.	81
Figure 70. Concrete structures, like the ones shown above and below, are not subject to erosion and associated surface water pollution commonly created by earthen structures. Concrete structures also allow better regulation and less waste of irrigation water.	82
Figure 71. This section of Tammany Creek was resloped, stabilized, and replanted. However, the entire area has been overtaken with noxious weeds since this photo was taken in spring 2006.	83
Figure 72. This settling pond (left) catches polluted runoff from a small livestock feeding area. (Right) There is considerable labor involved in stream bank restoration.	83
Figure 73. With the exception of some areas of heavier noxious weed invasion, the areas shown in the previous photographs taken during and shortly after construction looked like this during the June 28, 2007 evaluation.....	84
Figure 74. This area, now used as a popular park by local residents, used to be a reservoir.	85
Figure 75. Soil from the foreground up to the large trees (left and right) consists of sediments that were deposited in the reservoir since its creation in the early 1900s. With time, the reservoir completely filled with sediment. Once the dam was breached, annual spring runoff began flushing vast quantities of sediment into the South Fork of the Palouse River.	86
Figure 76. This project involved resloping near-vertical stream banks and planting riparian vegetation. Plastic tubes protect young plants from deer, elk, beaver, and burrowing animals.	86
Figure 77. Meander curves, where high energy flows could cause further erosion, required additional fortification like these coconut fiber logs anchored to the toe of the bank.....	86
Figure 78. The photographs depict the area as of June 2007. Vegetation has matured, and the stream banks are stable.	86
Figure 79. The farmer has agreed to keep this pasture (left) in hay to reduce erosion. The watering trough (right) allows cattle to get to water without getting into the nearby creek.	87
Figure 80. This concrete pad is used to store manure during the winter months, keeping nutrients, bacteria, and other pollutants from entering ground water and the nearby creek.	88
Figure 81. One of many irrigation diversion head gates being constructed. Properly constructed head gates save irrigation water and reduce sediment and nutrient loading to water being returned to the river.	89
Figure 82. A panoramic view across the Snake River into Oregon, showing two farmhouses and what appear to be sources of agricultural pollution.....	89
Figure 83. The lift station for irrigation water pumped from the Snake River (left). Part of the filtering system to allow water to be sprinkler applied (right). Sprinkler application uses far less water and causes less surface water pollution than flood irrigation.	90
Figure 84. Some of the hundreds of sprinkler-irrigated acres of crops associated with this project.	90
Figure 85. Another aspect of this project is that all irrigation return flow is captured in elongated settling ponds and, whenever possible, reused for irrigation.	90
Figure 86. Project Manager Kellie Rosellini stands beside one of the numerous temporary logging road closures completed through this project. Restricting vehicle access when logging roads are not needed reduced erosion and sediment in streams.	91
Figure 87. Logging roads that are currently in use need heavy armament to eliminate erosion (left). A former road cut has been eliminated in an obliterated section of road (right).....	92
Figure 88. This barrier (left) is meant to temporarily exclude vehicular traffic. The culverts shown below came from a road that was temporarily closed.	92
Figure 89. Watering tanks have been installed throughout the project area to help keep livestock from damaging	

nearby creeks. 92

Figure 90. Prior to this project, the shoreline was eroding at a very high rate. Work involved resloping this section of stream bank on the Bear River. The bank was knocked down to a 3:1 or 4:1 angle. Riprap was placed at the toe of the slope; rock barbs were keyed into the bank; and vegetation was planted along the slope to assure stability. 93

Figure 91. The entire slope was reshaped from near vertical to a 3:1 slope. Riprap and keyed rock barbs were added. 93

Figure 92. (Above and below) The project was completed by adding native vegetation within the riprap. 94

Figure 93. This portion of Milner Lake is adjacent to the project area. The riprap and filter strip vegetation were installed several years earlier and is good evidence that these BMPs are an effective means of shoreline stabilization. 95

Figure 94. This is the project area. The cultivated field in the foreground is a potential source of eroding sediment and nutrients, so a vegetative filter strip is being planted between the field and the shoreline. Riprap has been installed along the shoreline. 96

Figure 95. After one growing season, the new project area will be just as stable as this adjacent area. 96

Figure 96. At the time of this site visit, the fieldwork had just begun. One section of exclusionary fencing was all that had been accomplished. Fencing livestock out of surface water bodies is one of the most effective means of water protection in ranch country. 97

Figure 97. With the assistance of a hydraulic tool, willow stalks were imbedded 4-5 feet in the creek bank. The stalks sprouted roots and are now living. Willows and spruce were planted along several hundred feet of this landowner's section of Boulder Creek. 98

Figure 98. Willow planting along Boulder Creek (left). A buried irrigation pipeline reduces surface erosion (right). 98

Figure 99. A pressure release and drain for the irrigation pipeline (left). Exclusionary fencing (right) funded by the 319 grant. 98

Figure 100. Sheep have been allowed total access to this Bear River tributary for generations. 99

Figure 101. A typical example of how livestock have been confined in the past. This project will separate livestock from surface water through the use of exclusionary fencing. 100

Figure 102. It is easy to understand why this 303(d)-listed stream has elevated nutrients, sediment, and bacteria. This project will involve moving the corral away from the creek and reestablishing riparian vegetation. In a few years, this stream will become unrecognizable due to riparian growth and good water quality. 100

Figure 103. Spring runoff in the northern high country of Idaho can be heavy. One aspect of this project involves installation of numerous large (6-8 foot diameter) culverts on logging roads. 101

Figure 104. All of the culverts installed are fish-friendly. The road base for all roads must be sufficient to support fully loaded logging trucks. 101

Figure 105. (Left and right) This fish-friendly culvert is 6 feet in diameter. 101

Figure 106. A typical logging road in this project area. Roads must be able to hold up to heavy logging truck traffic over many years. 102

Figure 107. Shown are two of the sediment traps installed for monitoring purposes along recently upgraded logging roads. 102

Figure 108. This state-of-the-art project involves controlling sprinkler irrigation and fertilizer application rates over 31,000 acres through the use of computerized soil sensors connected to pivot sprinklers. 103

Figure 109. There are 16 similar moisture sensing sites connected to pivot sprinklers spread over this project area. 104

Figure 110. Prior to this project, the entire area was irrigated with flood irrigation, which is highly wasteful. In addition to wasting water, flood irrigation forces nutrients below the crop root zones and into ground water. Because of this project, the farmer has been able to save money by greatly reducing fertilizer application and water use. 104

Figure 111. Many of the people involved in PCEI projects are local Job Corp volunteers. 105

Figure 112. After all the work is done, it's time for nature to take over to allow vegetation to mature. 105

Figure 113. Shown above is the livestock and equipment crossing. Below :now that grazing has been restricted, this farmland will no longer be a major source of sediment, nutrient, and bacterial contamination to the South Fork Clearwater River. 106

Figure 114. Over 1,900 feet of stream bank was knocked down from near vertical to a 3:1 slope. Much of the work was conducted by volunteer labor from the AmeriCorps. 107

Figure 115. (Left) Tributaries to Deep Creek also need work. (Right) Fencing was installed to keep cattle off the creek. 107

State of Idaho Nonpoint Source Program

Figure 116. These AmeriCorps volunteers were enjoying hard work for a good cause.	108
Figure 117. This hardened crossing (above) limits cattle and equipment to this narrow, low sediment-producing spot of crossing and watering. This allows the stream banks below to become revegetated and stable.....	108
Figure 118. Electric fences can be very effective for excluding cattle from steam banks.....	108
Figure 119. This project primarily consists of rocking road surfaces and adding ditched and properly sized fish-friendly culverts on logging roads.	109
Figure 120. The trucks carrying road gravel for this project are about the same size and weight as the logging trucks that these roads are being prepared for.	109
Figure 121. Typical high quality road construction on this project. Roads constructed to these standards minimize sedimentation of adjacent creeks.....	109
Figure 122. Sediment boxes like these are used to verify that minimal sediment is being created by these roads. ...	110
Figure 123. Culverts must be installed in such a manner that they cause minimal damage at their points of discharge.	110
Figure 124. Eileen Ronan (in pit) from the Lewis SWCD is explaining the benefits of no-till farming techniques. No-till techniques result in healthier soil, due to more microorganisms and earthworms.	111
Figure 125. This healthier soil from no-till farming results in better precipitation infiltration and better root uptake of water and nutrients. This results in better crop yield requiring less fertilization.	112
Figure 126. The bottom line is more yields at a lower cost over the thousands of acres surrounding these people. .	112
Figure 127. (Left) Prior to this project, exclusionary fencing was intermittent and poorly maintained, resulting in considerable livestock-caused damage to the riparian environment and discharge of nutrients and bacteria to Rock Creek. (Right) One of the new watering troughs installed for livestock. (Photographs for this project evaluation were accidentally overexposed.).....	113
Figure 128. Some of the 3,100 feet of exclusionary fencing installed on one of two subprojects within this overall project area.	113
Figure 129. Although livestock was scarce during the evaluation, there are several hundred head of cattle plus other varieties of critters in the project area during certain times of the year.	114
Figure 130. Over 6,500 feet of exclusionary fencing was installed within the overall project area.	114
Figure 131. Looking north of the area used for winter feeding. Specifically, the grassy area that extends from the left of the picture to a significant distance in the background is underwater in the spring. Months of manure deposition are flushed into St. Charles Creek when waters are released in the spring.....	115
Figure 132. Looking north up the valley where livestock are wintered. Over 1,200 acres are used as winter feeding grounds then flooded in the spring.	115
Figure 133. Looking northwest toward Paris Peak. Fencing can be seen weaving in and out of the swales along St. Charles Creek.	115
Figure 134. Looking north at the terminus of the fencing project. This BMP is 95% complete and should be totally completed by early summer 2008. Over 2.5 miles of riparian exclusionary fencing is planned here.	115
Figure 135. This corral will be abandoned, and the animals will be watered via a trough.	117
Figure 136. This corral will be pulled back away from Paris Creek and will have a single watering point. The corral will be bermed on the stream side to prevent contaminants from entering the stream.	117
Figure 137. This corral (left and right) will be abandoned.	117
Figure 138. The rancher is standing in front of the pipeline that will be buried for protection to take drinking water to cattle watering troughs that are far removed from Paris Creek.	118

List of Tables

Table 1. Budget summary for active projects during 2007, including projects that were closed during 2007.....	5
Table 2. Projects closed during 2007.	10
Table 3. Active or recently completed nonpoint source projects field evaluated during the summer/fall of 2007.	15
Table 4. Estimated load reductions, Upper Rapid Creek Subwatershed.....	39

Glossary

303(d), 303(d) list	Impaired waters, or the list of impaired waters
AFO	Animal Feeding Operation
BAG	Basin Advisory Group
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAFO	Confined Animal Feeding Operation
CRP	Conservation Reserve Program
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
IASCD	Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts
ISCC	Idaho Soil Conservation Commission
ISDA	Idaho State Department of Agriculture
LID	Low Impact Development
LNFCRS	Lower North Fork Clearwater River Subbasin
NPS	Nonpoint Source
PCEI	Palouse-Clearwater Environmental Institute
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation
SAWQP	State Agricultural Water Quality Program
SCD	Soil Conservation District
SECI	Stream Erosion Condition Inventory
SRF	State Revolving Fund
SWCD	Soil and Water Conservation District
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
WAG	Watershed Advisory Group
WQPA	Water Quality Program for Agriculture

