Interagency Foothills Management Plan















Interagency Foothills Management Plan

Contents

ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS	VII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	S-1
BACKGROUND TO FOOTHILLS OPEN SPACE PLANNING	S-1
PROGRESS ON 2000 PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS	S-2
OVERARCHING DIRECTION OF THIS INTERAGENCY PLAN	S-2
NEED FOR THIS INTERAGENCY PLAN	S-3
PLAN TOPICS	S-4
LIMITATIONS OF THE INTERAGENCY PLAN	S-4
PUBLIC PROCESS	S-5
OPEN SPACE	S-7
VISION FOR THE FUTURE	S-8
MANAGEMENT AREA AND CHARACTERIZATION	S-8
DIRECTION OF PAST PLANNING EFFORTS	S-9
THE INTERAGENCY PLAN ORGANIZATION, PRIMARY GOALS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	S S-12
Part 1: Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations	S-12
Part 2: Background	S-13
REFERENCES	S-14
1. BACKGROUND — ADMINISTRATION:	1-1
1-1 ESTABLISH A LONG-TERM COMMITMENT	1-1
DESCRIPTION OF AGENCIES, JURISDICTIONS, OWNERSHIP, AND ROLES AND RESPONSIBIL	JTIES1-1
2. ENVIRONMENT:	2-1
2-1 GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	2-1
WATER RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS	2-2
SOILS AND GEOLOGY RECOMMENDATIONS	2-3
PLANT COMMUNITIES, RARE PLANTS, AND WEEDS RECOMMENDATIONS	
WILDLIFE RECOMMENDATIONS	2-5
2-2 RESOURCE USE IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND RECOMMENDAT	IONS 2-7
RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS	
HUNTING AND TRAPPING RECOMMENDATIONS	2-12
TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS	2-13
SOLID WASTE RECOMMENDATIONS	2-14
CULTURAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS	2-15
GRAZING RECOMMENDATIONS	2-16
VISUAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS	2-17
2-3 MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, A	ND
RECOMMENDATIONS	2-18
DEVELOP FUNDING PROPOSALS RECOMMENDATIONS	2-19
ENHANCE THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS.	2-20
PRESERVE EXISTING PUBLIC LANDS AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS	2-22
ACQUIRE ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE AS APPROPRIATE TO AGENCY MISSION AND FUNCTION	ON
RECOMMENDATIONS	2-23
ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND WILDFIRE CONCERNS ARE MET RECOMMENDATIONS	2-24
3. BACKGROUND—ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3-1 WATER RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	3-1
WATER RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
WATERSHEDS	3-1

GROUND WATER AND AQUIFERS	
DRINKING WATER	
WATER QUALITY	
GEOTHERMAL WATER	
FLOODING	
THREATS TO WATER RESOURCES	
POLICIES FOR WATER RESOURCES	
GROUND WATER PROTECTION	
FLOODWAYS	
SURFACE WATER	
REFERENCES	3-8
POLICY DOCUMENTS	
INTERVIEWS AND OTHER SOURCES	
3-2 SOILS AND GEOLOGY IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
SOILS AND GEOLOGY IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
GENERAL SOILS	
Granitic Soils	
Lacustrine Soils	
Fluvial Soils	
SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS	
EROSION	
SLOPE	
VEGETATION	
LANDSLIDES	
SLOPE FAILURES	
GEOLOGY	
THREATS TO SOILS AND GEOLOGY	
POLICIES FOR SOILS AND GEOLOGY	
STABILITY AND EROSION POTENTIAL	
Long-term Sustainability	
Coordination	3-16
Revegetation	3-16
REFERENCES	
POLICY DOCUMENTS	
INTERVIEWS and OTHER SOURCES	
3-3 PLANT COMMUNITIES, RARE PLANTS, AND NOXIOUS WEEDS IN THE BOISE FOOTHI	LLS3-18
PLANT COMMUNITIES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
MAJOR VEGETATION TYPES	
Grasslands	3-18
Upland Shrub Communities	3-19
Forested	3-19
Mountain Shrub	3-20
Riparian	3-20
Planted Woodland Groves	3-20
SENSITIVE PLANT COMMUNITIES	
Riparian	3-21
Bitterbrush/Needle-and-thread Grass Community Type	3-21
RARE PLANT SPECIES	3-22
Descriptions	
Status	3-23
NOXIOUS WEEDS	3-24
RESERVES	

THREATS TO PLANT COMMUNITIES	
POLICIES FOR PLANT COMMUNITIES	
PROTECTION OF NATIVE AND SENSITIVE PLANTS	
NOXIOUS WEEDS	
REFERENCES	
POLICY DOCUMENTS	
INTERVIEWS AND OTHER SOURCES	
3-4 WILDLIFE IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
FOOTHILLS WILDLIFE SPECIES	
WILDLIFE HABITAT	
THREATS TO WILDLIFE	
POLICIES FOR WILDLIFE RESOURCES	
HABITAT AREAS	
WILDLIFE CORRIDORS	
THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES	
REFERENCES	
POLICY DOCUMENTS	
INTERVIEWS	
4. BACKGROUND—RESOURCE USE	
4-1 RECREATION IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
RECREATION IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
TRAILS AND TRAILHEADS	
Seasonal Use	
Trail Use Designations	
ADA and Accessibility	
Recreation Surveys	
Private Property and Trail Easements	
Conceptual Trails	
Trail Conflicts	
Trailheads	
Parking	
Restrooms	
PARKS AND OPEN SPACES	
Parks	
Open Space	
Camel's Back Reserve	
Castle Rock Reserve	
Mesa Reserve	
Foothills East Reserve	
Hulls Gulch Reserve	
Military Reserve	
Noble Reserve	
Polecat Gulch Reserve	
Stack Rock Reserve	
Hillside to Hollow Reserve	
Other Lands	
OTHER RECREATIONAL USE	
Competitive Races	
Guiding	
Hang Gliding and Parasailing	4-15
Camping	
Party Spots and Homeless Activity	

USER GROUPS	4-16
THREATS TO FOOTHILLS RESOURCES	4-16
Off-road Use	4-17
Social Trails and Trail Widening	4-17
Displacement of Wildlife	4-18
Soil Compaction and Erosion	4-19
Dog Waste	4-19
Fire	4-20
REFERENCES	
4-2 HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-22
HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-22
HUNTING	4-22
TRAPPING	4-25
FISHING	4-25
SHOOTING RANGES	4-25
HUNTING AND TRAPPING THREATS AND IMPACTS	4-25
INCREASED URBANIZATION	
POLICIES FOR HUNTING AND TRAPPING	4-26
REFERENCES	
INTERVIEWS	
4-3 TRANSPORTATION IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-28
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
PLANNING AREAS	
Western Foothills Planning Area	4-28
Central Foothills Planning Area	
Eastern Foothills Planning Area	4-30
TRANSPORTATION PLANS	
Interim Foothills Transportation Plan	4-31
Communities in Motion 2035 Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan for Ada and Can	von
Counties	
Boise River Trails Coalition Plan	4-32
Ridge to Rivers Trail Strategic Plan	4-32
Cascade Resource Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan	4-33
Boise Front Area of Critical Environmental Concern	4-33
Land and Resource Management Plan for the Boise National Forest	4-34
ISSUES/CHALLENGES FOR TRANSPORTATION	4-34
ACCESS	4-34
AIR QUALITY	4-34
EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION	4-35
TRESPASSING	4-35
WILDLIFE AND SENSITIVE PLANT IMPACTS	4-35
POLICIES FOR TRANSPORTATION	4-35
REFERENCES	4-36
4-4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-38
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-38
4-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-40
CULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-40
IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITHIN THE FOOTHILLS MANAGEMENT AR	EA4-40
Sites on the National Register of Historic Places	4-41
IDAHO STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE	4-42
THREATS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES	4-43
POLICIES FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES	4-43

REFERENCES	4-44
INTERVIEWS	4-45
4-6 GRAZING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-46
GRAZING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	4-46
CURRENT GRAZING PRACTICES	4-46
Idaho Department of Fish and Game	4-47
BLM	4-47
U.S. Forest Service	4-47
PRIVATE LAND	
THREATS TO GRAZING	
POLICIES FOR GRAZING	
REFERENCES	
PERSONAL COMMUNICATION	
4-7 VISUAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
VISUAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS	
VISUAL RESOURCES ANALYSIS	
VISUAL INVENTORY METHODS	
Key Viewpoints	
Landscape Visibility	4-67
Landscape Character	
Landscape Integrity	
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	
THREATS TO VISUAL RESOURCES	
POLICIES FOR VISUAL RESOURCES	4-71
SIMILARITIES	
5. BACKGROUND - MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE	
5-1 FUNDING SOURCES	
AGENCY AUTHORITIES AND FUNDING ACCESS OVERVIEW	
FUNDING SOURCES	
Supplemental Taxing Authority	
Grant Writing	
Dedicated License and Permit Fees	
Public-Private Partnerships	
Volunteer Programs	
Gift and Donation Programs	
Dedicated Local Open Space Foundation or Friends of the Foothills Group	
Public Partnerships	
SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES	
5-2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION	
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION	
PURPOSE	
OPPORTUNITIES	
INTERPRETATION	
EDUCATION AND OUTREACH	
MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES	
REFERENCES	
5-3 PRESERVE EXISTING PUBLIC LANDS AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE	
MANAGEMENT OF LAND EXCHANGES	
AGENCY APPROACH TO LAND EXCHANGES	
PUBLIC EDUCATION	
5-4 ACOUIRE ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE	
THE NEED FOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE	5-11

ACQUISITION AND PRESERVATION TOOLS	
REFERENCES	
5-5 PUBLIC SAFETY AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION	
OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS AND JURISDICTIONS	
WILDFIRE	5-17
Fire Regulation Activities	5-18
Fire Prevention Activities	5-18
LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY	
CONSERVATION	
RECREATION AND OTHER USES	
CONCLUSION	
REFERENCES	

Tables

Table 1 Open space as defined in the Interagency Plan	S-7
Table 2 Listing of public ownership in the Foothills	S-9
Table 3 Average size and length of Foothills gulches geographically from west to east	3-2
Table 4 Slope classification by acreage and percent of total area	3-13
Table 5 Dog waste count	
Table 6 Viewpoint summary	4-54
Table 7 Landscape character description	
Table 8 Authority and use of alternative funding techniques and programs by public agencies	5-1
Table 9 Acquisition alternatives and associated benefits and constraints	
Table 10 Programs and responsibilities for public safety service in the Foothills management area	

Figures

1 Foothills Ownership 2 Flood Hazard Areas 3 Soils 4 Slope/Faults **5** Plant Communities 6 Rare Plants 7 Wildlife Habitat 8 Trails 9 Transportation 10 Visibility **11 Distance Zones** 12 Landscape Types 13 Landscape Integrity 14 Visual Sensitivity Matrix 15 Visual Sensitivity Levels 16 Fire History

Appendices

Appendix A – Animals in the Foothills Appendix B – R2R Memorandum of Understanding

Appendix C – Foothills Serial Levy Ballot Language

Appendix D – Wildfire Memorandum of Understanding

Appendix E – Interagency Memorandum of Understanding

Appendix F – Public Comments

ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern		
ACHD	Ada County Highway District		
ACWPC	Ada County Weed and Pest Control		
APA	Ada Planning Association		
AUM	animal unit month		
BLM	Bureau of Land Management		
BMP	Best Management Practice		
COMPASS	Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho		
DEQ	Division of Environmental Quality		
FACA	Federal Advisory Committee Act		
FACTS	Foundation for Ada-Canyon Trail System		
GIS	Geographic Information Systems		
ICL	Idaho Conservation League		
IDFG	Idaho Department of Fish and Game		
IDWR	Idaho Department of Water Resources		
IDL	Idaho Department of Lands		
INPS	Idaho Native Plant Society		
ITD	Idaho Transportation Department		
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding		
OHV	off-highway vehicle		
ORV	off-road vehicle		
R2R	Ridge-to-Rivers Trail Partnership		
RA	Resource Area		
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office		
SMS	Scenic Management System		
SWIFT	Southwest Idaho Friends of Trails		
SWIMBA	Southwest Idaho Mountain Biking Association		
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load		
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture		
USDI	U.S. Department of the Interior		
USFS	U.S. Forest Service		
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		
VQO	Visual Quality Objective		
VRM	Visual Resource Management		
WMA	Wildlife Management Area		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND TO FOOTHILLS OPEN SPACE PLANNING

The Foothills that rise above Boise offer a remarkable resource: a natural area supporting abundant wildlife, intact ecosystems, "out the backdoor" recreational access, and a distinctive open

space backdrop to Boise's bustling, growing urban life.

With the goal of sustaining and enhancing the values of the Foothills, in 2000, Foothills land managers worked with the public to produce the *Public Land Open Space Management Plan for the Boise Foothills* (2000 Plan). The 2000 Plan established management actions for conservation, education, and public use of open spaces in the Foothills. The 2000 Plan relied heavily on direction from a 15-member community advisory committee with input from the following seven city, county, state, and federal agencies with public land management roles in the Foothills:

- City of Boise
- Ada County
- Boise County
- Idaho Department of Lands (IDL)
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG)
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS)

The catalyst for the 2000 Plan was a 1999 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among the agencies recommending development of an open space management plan. The agencies entered the MOU in response to a policy of the *Boise Foothills Policy Plan (City of Boise)* adopted April 21, 1999 that says "the *Open Space Management Plan* shall be developed in cooperation with all of the agencies and governing bodies that have jurisdiction in the Foothills."

The MOU indicated willingness by the seven public land management agencies to step outside







traditional practices, transcend jurisdictional boundaries, and collaborate to administer public resources in the Foothills. The MOU signatories recognized the interconnectivity between all public

land parcels in the Foothills and the importance of addressing common resource management challenges together.

The 1999 MOU recommended that the agencies do the following:

- Develop and implement an integrated Open Space Management Plan for the Foothills public resources.
- Formalize and demonstrate a long-term commitment.
- Pursue and develop funding sources across jurisdictions.
- Address and understand issues of private landowners.
- Pursue an ongoing and meaningful public involvement and education process.
- Preserve existing public lands as open space.
- Acquire additional open space as appropriate to meet agency mission and function.

PROGRESS ON 2000 PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Much progress has been made on the recommendations of the 2000 Plan. Highlights include:

- Passage of the \$10 million Foothills Serial Levy in 2001, providing a fund to assist with open space protection in the Boise Foothills
- Creation of the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center and environmental education lessons to 10,000 school-aged children annually
- Consistent trailhead signage at all Ridge to Rivers Trailheads
- Annual trail user survey conducted at 12 Ridge to Rivers Trailheads for 12 hours
- Legislative land exchange involving 5,000 acres of Idaho Department of Lands property in the Boise Foothills.
- Open communication between public safety agencies and land management agency personnel
- Creation of the Wildland Urban Interface Wildfire Memorandum of Understanding between BLM, Ada County, City of Boise, City of Eagle, and Idaho Department of Fish and Game

After more than 10 years of progress on goals in the 2000 Plan, the agencies began an updating process in 2012 that resulted in this revised 2014 Interagency Foothills Management Plan (Interagency Plan). Through this process, the agencies again renewed their commitment to work in partnership on Foothills management issues as outlined in the new MOU associated with this Interagency Plan

OVERARCHING DIRECTION OF THIS INTERAGENCY PLAN

As Boise continues to grow, conservation of its Foothills open spaces will depend on the coordination and cooperation between public land management agencies, the public, and private landowners. The 2000 Plan needed to be updated to respond to changing issues, confirm previous directions, offer new approaches necessary to maintain a healthy open space system, and integrate conservation of wildlife, recreation uses, scenic vistas, natural areas, public uses, and cultural resources across public lands.

The overriding goal of the 2000 Plan, and the Interagency Plan, as identified by the agencies in the 2014 MOU (see Appendix E), is as follows:

Local, State, and Federal agencies will cooperate to preserve, protect, enhance, perpetuate, and manage the resources of the Boise Front working together with private landowners.

Idaho Department of Lands is not a signatory of the Interagency Plan because they exchanged out of 5,000 acres (most of their Foothills holdings) in 2008 as a result of a three-way legislative land exchange with BLM and USFS. The Interagency Plan recommends this overriding goal be implemented through the following critical actions:

- Establish a lead agency for Foothills open space stewardship.
- Educate citizens.
- Preserve public open spaces.
- Provide a range of sustainable public recreational opportunities.
- Conserve wildlife and beneficial vegetation.
- Provide for maintenance and conservation of public open space values.
- Work cooperatively with private property owners.

The Interagency Plan, like the 2000 Plan, looks first to establish goals for management of the public open spaces in the Foothills. Second, it identifies important values and recommends management strategies guiding decision makers toward publicly desired conditions. Third, it confirms previous and/or provides new recommendations for achieving and maintaining these conditions. And finally, the Interagency Plan allows for a highly flexible planning process essential to address the evolving needs and desires of the public.

NEED FOR THIS INTERAGENCY PLAN

Economic health and environmental well-being are not mutually exclusive, but are instead interwoven to produce a healthy region where the economy and community thrive. Boise's long-term success as a community relies on the health of its natural environment, economy, and civic culture.

The Community Planning Association estimates that the population of Boise will grow from roughly 205,671 to 290,891 by 2020. Ada County is predicted to grow from 392,365 to 514,844 by 2020 (U.S. Census 2010). The population of Boise County is likely to increase from 7,028 to 19,900 by 2020 (Boise County 2010). Public open space values are affected by population growth. A review of available information suggests the population of the Treasure Valley, including residents of Boise, and emigrating people strongly support maintaining Foothills public lands for wildlife, aesthetic, recreational, cultural, and natural resources. In 2010, the City of Boise's survey showed a majority were in support of a second serial levy to conserve more land in the Foothills.

The Treasure Valley's population growth and economic expansion is driven in large part because of the area's renowned quality of life. This quality of life is enhanced by accessible recreation, abundant wildlife, and dramatic scenic open space resources provided in the Foothills. The Interagency Plan seeks to help preserve the valley's quality of life by developing a common vision for the future of the Foothills among Foothills public land managers and guiding interagency collaboration with private landowners. By undertaking this planning effort for public Foothills resources, Boise also strives to provide better stewardship for the surrounding open space. Urban growth continues to affect public resources in the Foothills. Wildlife habitat, recreational uses, wildfire mitigation, and watershed conservation are just a few of the areas affected by growth. Public comments during the planning process indicate great public interest about whether and how Foothills natural resources can sustain their value in the face of growth and changing land use patterns.

While the Interagency Plan proposes management actions on public lands in the Foothills, it also recognizes the critical role of private landowners in resource conservation efforts since resource management issues address both public and private lands. This Interagency Plan respects private property rights and directs the agencies to work with willing landowners to protect and conserve resource values on private lands.

PLAN TOPICS

Traditional resource management plans, which are generally site specific, often do not consider how proposed actions fit into the context of the ecosystem. Under the Interagency Plan, the frame of reference is much broader. Although site-specific actions are necessary, they should be conducted in a broader ecosystem context and evaluated over a longer period. Because of the broader geographic approach taken by this Interagency Plan, private landowners and Boise County have been involved in its development.

This Interagency Plan specifically identifies goals, objectives, and recommendations for management of public lands in the Foothills. Those lands comprise approximately 47% (38,070 acres) of the total acreage in the Foothills management area (Table 2). This Interagency Plan recognizes that public open spaces provide critical resources for both public use and protection and management of significant natural areas. This Interagency Plan also recommends that public land management agencies and private landowners work together to manage Foothills resources.

Public land management agencies should work collaboratively with citizens and private property owners to implement the Interagency Plan to ensure that long-term healthy conditions are met and that short-term demands are not simply accommodated. Foothills management decisions cannot be made by agencies only. Thus, the Interagency Plan specifically identifies the value and role of public participation in Foothills resource stewardship. While interagency collaboration is essential for conserving resource values in the Foothills, the Interagency Plan acknowledges and respects the responsibilities of each participating agency to follow its existing laws, rules, regulations, and agreements. The Interagency Plan also recognizes and respects the rights of private landowners.

LIMITATIONS OF THE INTERAGENCY PLAN

The Interagency Plan is not a regulatory document. It does not regulate the private property rights of Foothills landowners, nor does it set firm regulatory requirements for individual public landowners. Rather, it seeks to help public agencies collaborate and work with willing private landowners to protect valuable Foothills resources. By working in partnership, the agencies and private landowners can enable the success of the Interagency Plan.

PUBLIC PROCESS

The Interagency Plan was prepared with significant public involvement, extending over two years. The public involvement approach consisted of three iterative steps: (1) interagency partners reviewed the existing plan and discussed and updated plan goals, objectives, and recommendations; (2) sections of the updated draft plan were posted online for public comment and were shared through a series of Open House events hosted in Boise; and (3) public comments received were collected and reviewed by interagency partners and consequent changes were made to the draft plan, as appropriate. For specific examples of how public comments were incorporated into the plan, please see below. The method for receiving public comments entailed four main steps:

1. Public review of "Environment" section of the plan

The online comment period was open for three weeks in September 2012 on the updated draft "Environment" section of the plan. A total of 213 comments were submitted online, most directed toward wildlife concerns. An Open House was held on September 6, 2012 at the Foothills Learning Center. One person attended, provided written suggestions, and talked with interagency partners about the draft goals, objectives, and recommendations for the "Environment" section of the plan.

2. Public review of "Resources" section of the plan

The online comment period was open for three weeks in December 2012 on the updated draft "Resources" section of the plan. A total of 226 comments were submitted online, most directed toward recreation. During the public comment period, an Open House was held on December 13, 2012 at the Foothills Learning Center. Forty-one people attended the Open House where they provided written suggestions and talked with interagency partners about the draft goals, objectives, and recommendations for the "Resources" section of the plan.

3. Public review of "Management" section of the plan

The online comment period was open for three weeks in March/April 2013 on the updated draft "Management" section of the plan. A total of 81 comments were submitted online, most directed at preserving existing public lands as open space and acquiring additional public open space. During the public comment period, an Open House was held on April 4, 2013 at Boise City Hall. The 19 people who attended the Open House provided written suggestions; talked with interagency partners about the draft goals, objectives, and recommendations for the "Management" section of the plan; and left written comments on the "Management" section of the plan.

4. Public review of full draft of the plan

The online comment period was open for two weeks in October 2014 on the full draft of the plan. A total of 47 comments were submitted. During the public comment period, an Open House was held in the Auditorium at the main branch of Boise Public Library on October 15, 2014. The nine people who attended the Open House provided written suggestions and talked with interagency partners about all of the draft goals, objectives, and recommendations in the full plan.

Public comments helped to shape and refine the plan through multiple drafts. During the process, more than 500 comments were submitted online and by hard copy at the Open House events. All of these written comments were shared with and considered by the interagency team during the course of the plan's development.

The final round of public comments followed the release of the fall 2014 draft plan, on September 29, 2014. These comments can be viewed in Appendix F.

The interagency team, in their consideration, reviewed every comment submitted and deliberated about the best response to each comment. Below is an overview of the responses to different categories of public questions and comments. Comments generally fell into three categories:

- 1. Those in line with or demonstrated support for existing plan goals, objectives, and recommendations.
- 2. Those addressing issues outside the scope of this plan.
- 3. Those requesting a specific change in plan goals, objectives, or recommendations.

These comments were addressed in different ways, as appropriate. Examples of public comment in each of these categories are provided below.

• Comments that elaborated on or added emphasis to existing language in the plan, for example:

"Many dog owners don't understand the impact that their dogs create on wildlife and vegetation. Our population is going to grow and this is going to become more and more of an issue. The trails in the foothills are becoming too wide in places and some users don't understand the fragility of the vegetation in our foothills."

No changes to the plan were needed by these types of comments. For this particular subject area, the plan calls for policies to address dog-related impacts. This broad direction will be carried out through more detailed subsequent planning, and through the actions of individual interagency plan team members.

• Comments expressing support, for example:

"I strongly support utilizing volunteer groups to assist with ongoing maintenance needs. I've participated in numerous trail work days including the re-route of Red Cliffs, the construction of the REI connector trail in Eagle, the Deer Point trail, and the all-weather trail in Harrison Hollow, and all of these projects had strong backing from volunteers who were able to complete large amounts of work in a relatively short amount of time."

No changes to the plan were needed by these types of comments. In this particular example, the existing plan calls for expanding the base of support for managing Foothills resources and improving Foothills trails and other infrastructure, working with volunteers, user groups, nonprofits, business organizations, and other partners.

• Comments requesting resolution of issues outside the scope of this plan; two examples:

"I am all for seasonal trail closures. Doing so will allow vegetation and trails to heal. It would reduce degradation, improve safety, and allow wildlife space to breathe." "I know (managing trail use) is difficult because of staffing and resource issues, but it seems like trails get closed unnecessarily when there are only a few puddles that people/bikes could walk through. Or direct people to useable trails that are sandy vs. muddy. There are several of us who like to use the trails year-round. We don't want to damage them and we turn around if they are in fact too muddy to use, but we also feel like they get closed just because of the season and not necessarily due to weather conditions."

No changes to the plan were needed by these types of comments. The plan presents general guidelines regarding the possible need for seasonal trail closures; however, specific decisions on this subject will be made through the upcoming Ridge to Rivers Trails Plan, expected to begin summer 2015.

• Comments requesting a specific change in draft plan recommendations. As each of these comments was considered, some led to changes, some did not. For example:

Recommendations using the term 'Teach' are top down and directed. Perhaps, 'Work to enhance citizens understanding about the importance of maintaining wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.'

Change to the plan was needed. The plan language was edited to replace "teach" with "educate." For example, "Work to educate users about the importance of..."

"Work with ACHD to identify several Slow Vehicle Turnouts that can become dispersed parking areas. This can be accomplished with little investment and it would make existing parking and access in some areas safer."

No changes to the plan were needed. Slow vehicle turnouts are located and designed to allow vehicles to pull over, slow down but not stop, and let other vehicles pass. Attempting to make these areas double as dispersed parking areas could create safety issues. In addition, the limited public budgets available to maintain trailheads (e.g., trash, restrooms, and parking surfaces) argue for concentrating open space access areas rather than creating a more dispersed system.

OPEN SPACE

As defined by the Interagency Plan, open spaces are areas that create our sense of place. They are dedicated to the preservation of our cultural heritage, protection of important resources, and provision of opportunities for recreation and other uses.

The lists in Table 1 clarify what defines public open space as used in this document.

TABLE 1 OPEN SPACE AS DEFINED IN THE INTERAGENCY PLAN¹

Open Spaces Include	Open Spaces Are Not
 Conservation lands that protect natural and wildlife 	 Residential subdivisions, or the scattered
resources	undeveloped parcels "leftover" in subdivisions or
 Lands that provide natural resource-based recreational 	development agreements
opportunities	 Commercial developments
• Lands that conserve high scenic quality and visual exposure	• Golf courses
• Lands that protect natural hazard areas (e.g., cliffs and rock	 Large parcel/40-acre residential developments
outcrops)	 Manicured and urbanized parks
 Lands that protect significant heritage resources 	 Utility easements and rights-of-way

¹ While this Interagency Plan focuses on the larger blocks of public land as outlined in Table 2, it is important to note that lands in other ownerships, including subdivisions, golf courses, easements, and individual private residential properties, can contribute to the goals in this document. For example, residential developments, depending on their design, can have greater or lesser impacts on water quality, habitat, public recreation, or visual quality. Standards that address these issues are covered in local government zoning and subdivision codes.

VISION FOR THE FUTURE

To ensure Foothills open spaces are conserved and available for future generations, the agencies developed this collaborative Interagency Plan. The Interagency Plan consolidates each agency's planning documents into a single unified vision for Foothills public lands. The following statements summarize the collective vision of these agencies:

- We support an interconnected system of natural areas, recreation trails, and wildlife corridors that protect the integrity of public land values in the Foothills.
- We must make a long-term commitment to protect open space to preserve the character and diversity of the Boise Foothills public lands.
- We must commit to conserving and enhancing the ecosystems for wildlife that rely so heavily on the habitat found in the Foothills open space.
- We must commit to protecting and improving a full range of opportunities for the pubic to enjoy Foothills open space, including passive and active recreation.
- We must establish trail user rules and etiquette that protect Foothills resources and encourage good interactions for all trail users.
- We must build partnerships between private and public entities and take mutual responsibility in maintaining open space in the Foothills as an important place for people to learn, recreate, and rejuvenate.
- We must commit to educating open space users about the importance of open space for protection of habitat, water, native plants, soils, wildlife, views, and other conservation values so users understand and help protect these essential open space qualities
- We must commit to addressing a range of specific conservation, resource use, and land management issues ranging from the protection of viewsheds to protection of native vegetation and mitigate invasive species to new standards for trails and trailheads
- We must commit to using the recommendations and policies contained within the Interagency Plan to perpetuate the character of the Foothills. However, we must remain flexible in our planning approach to address situations as they arise.
- We must provide timely input on development applications in the Foothills.
- We must commit to new creative partnerships and strategies that can generate the resources needed to ensure the protection and ongoing use and enjoyment of the Foothills. Work is needed to expand the support and active assistance of the public, volunteers, user groups, nonprofits, and other entities to add to the resources needed to meet the goals presented in the Interagency Plan.

MANAGEMENT AREA AND CHARACTERIZATION

The Foothills open space management area includes approximately 85,000 acres located in both Ada and Boise Counties to the immediate north of Boise, Idaho. The boundaries include Hill Road and Warm Springs Avenue to the south, State Highway 21 to the east, State Highway 55 to the west, and Boise Ridge Road and the Ada County boundary to the north (see Figure 1 for ownership information).

The Foothills are characterized as a transition between the valley floor, recognized by the arid lowlands surrounding the verdant ribbon of the Boise River, and the coniferous peaks of the Boise Ridge. Indigenous vegetation includes bunchgrasses and sagebrush, interspersed with concealed ribbons of riparian vegetation in drainages. The overall elevation gain from the valley floor is 3,965 feet, rising from an elevation of 2,610 feet near Hill Road to more than 6,575 feet mean sea level at Little Deer Point. The average precipitation is 12.1 inches near the valley floor and 18 to 20 inches near the Boise Ridge. Temperatures near the valley floor generally range between 21°F and 36°F for January and 58°F and 90°F for July.

An existing network of roads provides access to public and private lands in the Foothills. Dry Creek, Seaman Gulch, and Pierce Gulch Roads provide access to the western part of the Foothills management area. Eighth Street, Rocky Canyon, Cartwright, Bogus Basin, and Table Rock Roads provide access to the central portion of the Foothills management area. Access to the eastern part of the Foothills management area is seasonally limited on Shaw Mountain and Highland Roads. Approximately 44,000 acres in the Foothills are privately owned and 41,000 acres are held in public trust. Those lands in public ownership are the focus of the Interagency Plan (see Table 2).

Ownership	Acreage	Percentage of Total Foothills
		Foothills Management Area
		Acreage
BLM	14,140	16.56
USFS	12,900	15.1
State of Idaho	496	.6
IDFG	9,212	10.8
Military	282	.3
Ada County	2,931*	3.4
City of Boise	4,075	4.8
Total Public Land	44,135	51.6
Total Private Land	41,310	48.4
Foothills Management Area	85,445	100.0

TABLE 2 LISTING OF PUBLIC OWNERSHIP IN THE FOOTHILLS

*Ada County Active Landfill.

DIRECTION OF PAST PLANNING EFFORTS

Following is a summary of events and past planning activities that contributed to this Interagency Plan.

Mid-1970s. Comprehensive planning for the Foothills started with the inception of the Ada Council of Government's (ACOG) *Concept Plan.*

Mid-1970s. Ada County and City of Boise had comprehensive land use plans, but both plans were becoming outdated. At that time, many projects were developed in the county and later annexed into the city. City and county plans were inconsistent and the city had little control over design for county projects.

1975. The City of Boise area of impact boundary was included in the Local Planning Act of 1975. The intent of the act was to give the city planning control over areas that would be annexed in the future.

1978. The *City of Boise Comprehensive Plan (Metro Plan)* was being developed in 1978. The Metro Plan Steering Committee knew that it was physically impossible to make the downtown the geographic center. However, it could act as the demographic center by increasing densities in the

southeast and northeast areas and by permitting development in the Foothills. Because of controversies centered on Foothills development, the decision was made to "permit Foothills development" instead of encouraging it. Based on the issues and concerns surrounding Foothills development, the Metro Plan Steering Committee recommended policies that were adopted and set forth in the *Metro Plan*.

The major issues facing the Metro Plan Steering Committee were the engineering aspects of Foothills development and the impact from traffic on the built community. Environmental concerns associated with wildlife, wetlands, and public open space were not addressed in detail.

The *Ada County Comprehensive Plan* had addressed the major wildlife concern over deer winter range habitat. The plan left individual projects with little guidance regarding transportation, environmental, aesthetic, recreation, and open space issues.

1984. City of Boise adopted the Foothills Ordinance.

1988. The city and county adopted the Uniform Building Code. The city's *Hillside and Foothill Areas Development Ordinance*, county's *Hillside Regulations*, and *Uniform Building Code* generally protect public safety and mitigate the potential for property damage.

1988. BLM approves the Cascade Reserve Management Plan, which designated 12,800 acres of BLM land in the Foothills as the Boise Front Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) and as the Boise Front Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

1989. The Boise Front Coalition was formed as an association of concerned citizens, private landowners from the Foothills, and governmental agencies responsible for the management of the public lands in the Foothills.

July 1992. IDFG Rare Plant and Riparian Vegetation Inventory of the Boise Foothills produced by Moseley, Mancuso and Hilty.

1992. Citizen efforts to purchase 100 acres and create Hulls Gulch Reserve in the lower Boise Foothills.

February 1993. City of Boise Heritage Preservation Committee, evaluating potential public preservation sites.

1993. The Ada County *Ridge-to-Rivers Pathway Plan* was adopted. The comprehensive pathway plan was designed to improve pathways in Ada County.

1994. The *Foothills Plan Background Report* was completed. The report described the resources associated with the Foothills, their context, and sensitivity.

February 1996. The seven federal, state, and local managing agencies in the Foothills signed a MOU.

August 26, 1996. A human-caused fire consumed 15,300 acres (22 square miles) of the Boise Foothills. The fire encompassed all of Hulls Gulch and a large portion near Bogus Basin. Rehabilitation work started immediately to mitigate possible flooding. The agencies spent \$3.3 million to reduce erosion and restore the watershed. A five-year monitoring program began shortly after rehabilitation efforts.

January 1997. The *City of Boise Comprehensive Plan* was adopted. The plan set forth guidelines for achieving a community vision.

March 1997. The *City of Boise Foothills Policy Plan* was adopted as an amendment to the *City of Boise Comprehensive Plan.* The plan presented policies for continued development in the Foothills. The plan called for open space management to be developed.

July 20, 1998. The City of Boise City Council adopted the *Interim Foothills Transportation Plan* as an amendment to the *City of Boise Comprehensive Plan*.

2000 Public Lands Open Space Management Plan for the Boise Foothills. The 2000 Plan, the earlier version of this Interagency Plan, set planning direction for the open space in the Foothills and focused on conserving natural resource values, educating the public, and providing sustainable recreation and resource use opportunities.

May 2001. \$10 Million Foothills Serial Levy Passes. Revenue collected in 2002 and 2003.

2002. City of Boise City Council created the Foothills Conservation Advisory Committee and the mayor appointed 12 members.

2003. Boise National Forest Plan Revisions.

March 2006. Harris Ranch Wildlife Impact Assessment and Management Plan.

2007. Ada County Comprehensive Plan – includes chapters on natural resources and recreation.

March 2008. Establishment of City of Boise Department of Arts & History.

April 2008. Ada County Open Space Advisory Task Force and Recommendations.

June 2008. Boise River Wildlife Management Area Management Plan completed.

2008. 5,000-acre Legislated Land Exchange involving Idaho Department of Lands, Bureau of Land Management, and United States Forest Service.

Spring 2009. Ada County Open Space and Trail Committee formed.

February 2010. Ada County Planned Community Subarea Development Regulations – (8-8-4A) Minimum Urban Public Service Level Standards, Natural and Developed Open Space.

May 2011. 10th Anniversary of the Foothills Serial Levy – 10,400 Foothills acres protected by donation, acquisition, exchange, and easement for \$10.8 million.

2013. Draft update to Boise River Wildlife Management Plan (waiting to be approved by commission).

2013. Boise's \$34 million Fire, Parks and Open Space Bond falls short of a passing (62% support).

THE INTERAGENCY PLAN ORGANIZATION, PRIMARY GOALS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Interagency Plan is organized into two main parts: the Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations section and Background section.

Part 1: Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations

This section of the Interagency Plan provides an overview of the plan, the principles under which it was developed, and goals, objectives, and recommendations. The proposed goals, objectives, and recommendations address the environment, recreation, and other resource uses; management and maintenance; and administration. The main goals of the Interagency Plan address the areas described below.

Environment

- Protect and restore native, special status, and other desirable vegetation.
- Protect soils to reduce erosion and repair erosion damage.
- Manage watersheds through protection and enhancement of associated resources.
- Protect, enhance, and rehabilitate wildlife habitat to sustain wildlife in the Foothills.

Resource Uses

- Provide the public with a wide range of recreational opportunities compatible with other plan goals at appropriate places, while taking care to protect the ecological diversity of the Foothills.
- Manage the Foothills for safe and sustainable sportsman opportunities (hunting and trapping).
- Work with managing agencies to ensure that transportation plans complement the Interagency Plan.
- Meet municipal solid waste disposal needs of county residents.
- Identify and protect existing cultural sites and educate users about their importance to the history of the area.
- Manage grazing activities to be compatible with established management practices to ensure ecosystem sustainability.
- Retain, preserve, and enhance the natural scenic values of the Foothills.

Management and Maintenance

- Develop funding proposals to supplement limited resources for programs and projects recommended by the Interagency Plan.
- Establish a public involvement and education process.
- Preserve existing public lands and create connectivity between these properties.
- Acquire additional open space as appropriate to agency mission and function.

- Identify private open space parcels that can enhance public environmental, recreational, and visual resource values within the Foothills.
- Ensure public safety and wildfire concerns are met through cost-effective and coordinated efforts in the Foothills.

Administration

- Establish an MOU between the six land management agencies to implement the Interagency Plan.
- Improve Foothills public land administration and oversight.
- Coordinate public agency actions in the Foothills through selection of a lead Foothills stewardship agency.
- Establish clear lines of communication between the public and the agencies.
- Engage citizens, private landowners, and users in Foothills public land decision-making processes.
- Minimize administrative costs to taxpayers.
- Optimize public resources available for Foothills stewardship.
- Maintain and continue to fund the Ridge-to-Rivers Trail Program.
- Comply with all applicable legal requirements.
- Commit to measuring management and stewardship performance.
- Assist agencies, nonprofits, private landowners, and private citizens interested in open space conservation in the Foothills.

Part 2: Background

The second part of the Interagency Plan provides extensive background information as follows.

Environment

Environmental reports address conservation of the natural resources located within the Foothills management area and provide updated information about natural resource values found in the Foothills management area. Natural systems function on many levels. Given urban growth in the region, conserving those features requires higher levels of cooperation and interagency coordination than was needed in the past.

Resource Use

Recreational use of Foothills resources continues to increase, creating new management challenges for the agencies. Public land managers are faced with complex decisions regarding new trail construction, trail use, trail closures, hunting, visual and cultural resource conservation efforts, and conflicts between recreation, wildlife, and other resource uses.

Management and Maintenance

Upkeep, maintenance, and development of resources throughout the Foothills is an ongoing management challenge for the agencies. From funding and resource allocation to trail standards and construction, the maintenance activities discussed in this section are necessary for public resource management in the Foothills.

Administration

The ultimate success of the Interagency Plan depends on the coordination, cooperation, and collaboration among the agencies for Foothills public resource management. This section proposes that the agencies support an open space management program to be administered by a coordinating agency chosen by the seven land management agencies. The agency leading the implementation of the plan would be critical to the successful implementation of the goals, objectives, and recommendations.

Through the established lead agency, the goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Interagency Plan stand a far greater chance of being implemented than if they were left to each agency to administer. One coordinating agency can draw from the knowledge, resources, staff, and success of the participating agencies to implement the plan. The plan also calls for increased citizen participation in the management decision-making process.

REFERENCES

Boise County. 2010. Comprehensive Plan. Available at: http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_00000003036.pdf>. Last accessed: January 14, 2015.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2010.

1. BACKGROUND — ADMINISTRATION: 1-1 ESTABLISH A LONG-TERM COMMITMENT

This section proposes a structure by which local, state, and federal agencies involved in the Boise Foothills would cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage the resources of the Foothills. This section is based on Objective 2 of the 1999 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to: "develop a formal Memorandum of Agreement among local, state and federal agencies to cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage the resources of the Boise Foothills under the auspices of the Interagency Foothills Management Plan."

This section identifies each agency's leadership capabilities and potential. It does not recommend who should take this leadership responsibility. Instead, it provides the information necessary to enable interagency dialogue so that a decision can be made in a public forum. The objectives of the Foothills administration structure will be to:

- Establish an MOU between the six land management agencies to implement the Interagency Plan.
- Improve Foothills public land administration and oversight.
- Coordinate public agency actions in the Foothills through selection and appointment of a coordinating agency to take a lead role in Foothills stewardship.
- Establish better communication between the public and the agencies.
- Engage citizens, private landowners, and users in the Foothills public land decision-making process.
- Minimize administrative costs to taxpayers.
- Optimize public resources available for Foothills stewardship.
- Maintain and continue to fund the Ridge to Rivers Trail Program.
- Comply with all applicable legal requirements.
- Commit to measuring management and stewardship performance.
- Assist agencies, nonprofits, private landowners, and private citizens to facilitate open space conservation in the Foothills.

DESCRIPTION OF AGENCIES, JURISDICTIONS, OWNERSHIP, AND ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Jurisdiction and ownership in the Foothills is divided among the following seven federal, state, and local agencies, all of which are participating in this Foothills planning effort except IDL:

- Ada County
- City of Boise
- Boise County
- Boise National Forest of the USDA Forest Service (USFS)
- Boise District of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Southwest Region of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG)
- Idaho Department of Lands (IDL)

Ada County. Ada County is charged with the administration of the entire land area within its boundaries, except for incorporated cities and state or federally owned lands. In addition to

general administration responsibilities, Ada County is required to establish and implement landuse controls and provide law enforcement services to areas in its jurisdiction.

Fire protection is not a function of the county, but such protection is provided through independent volunteer and professional fire districts within specific areas of the county. Ada County is authorized to make arrangements with other public agencies to perform or obtain services. Within the City of Boise area of impact, Ada County coordinates and implements land-use control. An area of impact is that area within which a city expects to provide services and expand development. Both Ada County and City of Boise coordinate with IDFG for input into land-use decisions involving wildlife and habitat issues in the Foothills.

Ada County's Parks and Waterways Department, under the direction of the Board of County Commissioners, is charged with "...providing water-based recreation facilities, regional and specialized parks, trails, pathways and natural open spaces" to enhance the quality of life of its residents. The department has a staff of seasonal workers and five full-time employees and a total budget of about \$1.4 million for fiscal year 2015. Ada County owns and manages 2,931 acres, including the Hidden Hollow Landfill, in the western Foothills. Ada County's primary interests in the Foothills, therefore, include the provision of public open spaces and recreation, operation of the landfill, public safety, and coordination of urban development with City of Boise.

City of Boise. The City of Boise is established as a charter city by Idaho statute, giving it broader jurisdictional abilities than other general-purpose governments in the state. The City of Boise is charged with the administration of the entire area within its boundaries, including establishing and implementing land-use controls, law enforcement, fire protection, and other administration. Through an agreement with Ada County, the City of Boise also advises the county on land-use controls and implementation in its designated area of impact. In the Foothills area, the City of Boise's area of impact generally includes the mostly undeveloped areas between existing urban development and the northernmost power transmission line below the ridge of the Foothills. The City of Boise is authorized to contract with other agencies to provide or obtain public services.

Through the Boise Parks and Recreation Department, the City of Boise manages 2,605 acres of land for various public park and recreation purposes, of which about 4,000 acres are within the Foothills management area. The mission of the City of Boise Parks and Recreation Department is to:

- Provide parks, open space, and trails systems for Boise residents.
- Offer recreation programs and activities in a safe and efficient manner that meets all needs and desires.
- Enhance the urban appearance and environment using landscaping, trees, and open space.
- Foster and support citizen well-being and healthy community environments.

The Board of Parks and Recreation oversees the department under the direction of the Mayor and City Council. The Boise Parks and Recreation Department has a staff of 151 people and a proposed budget of about \$22.5 million for Year 2015.

Boise County. Boise County, like Ada County, is charged with the administration of the area within its boundaries, with the exception of incorporated cities and state or federal lands. As with

Ada County, Boise County is charged with general administration of its lands, including land-use control and law enforcement. Also like Ada County, special fire districts provide fire protection with specific jurisdictions within the county. Unlike Ada County, Boise County has no administrative function for parks, recreation, or open space. Boise County is authorized to enter into agreements with other agencies to provide or obtain public services.

While Boise County's jurisdiction includes only the northernmost part of the Foothills, comprised mainly of USFS land, the county assists the USFS in its jurisdiction and is responsible for protecting life and property and for enforcing laws in the privately owned areas surrounding the Boise National Forest. Recreationists in this area often require the county sheriff's services. Law enforcement services and land use and development in Boise County will be affected by whatever implementation actions are taken by the agencies involved in the Interagency Plan.

Boise National Forest. The USFS, Boise National Forest's Foothills Management Area Unit lies primarily in Boise County, with small areas within Ada County. USFS jurisdiction extends beyond this unit, though that jurisdiction is outside the Foothills. The entire Mountain Home Ranger District encompasses about 750,000 acres. The total Foothills unit is 12,904 acres. The USFS mission is "...to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept to meet the diverse needs of people". Federal land management agencies are charged with full management of natural resources within their jurisdictional boundaries, law enforcement, and fire protection, though the BLM is responsible for initial attack of wildfires in the Boise National Forest in the Foothills. The USFS is authorized to establish agreements with other public agencies to obtain or provide public services. The interests of the USFS, therefore, include access, use, protection of its lands and resources, and provision of enforcement and emergency services.

Bureau of Land Management. The BLM manages 14,140 acres of the Foothills. This area immediately adjoins private landownership within the jurisdiction of Ada County and the City of Boise area of impact. The Foothills unit is part of the 788,000-acre Four Rivers Field Office, which in turn is part of the 4 million-acre Boise District. The BLM's mission is "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations." The Foothills area has been designated as an area of critical environmental concern (ACEC) due to the sensitivity of the natural resources to human use; therefore, the BLM has established resource-use limitations for the area. The BLM has full responsibility for the area in its jurisdiction, including law enforcement and fire protection. Cooperative agreements, however, exist with City of Boise, Ada County, and independent fire districts in the area for law enforcement and fire protection of its lands and resources, control of access, and provision of emergency services because of the approaching urban interface.

Idaho Department of Fish and Game. IDFG manages the 28,000-acre Boise River WMA (of which IDFG owns about 9,212 acres), divided among four management segments in Ada, Boise, and Elmore Counties. Management is conducted under a Cooperative Resource Management Plan with other state and federal agencies and private landowners. The Boise River WMA provides mule deer winter range, watershed protection, and upland game habitat. About 18,000 acres of the Boise River WMA lie in the far east side of the Foothills. IDFG is under the direction of its commission, the members of which are appointed by the governor. IDFG's primary mission is "to preserve, protect, perpetuate and manage wildlife" throughout the state. Its jurisdiction, therefore, goes beyond the

Boise River WMA. By ordinance, IDFG is required to be consulted regarding development in environmentally sensitive areas in City of Boise, Ada County, and Boise County. This requirement is countywide in Ada County. IDFG's interests in the Foothills, therefore, include impacts of urbanization on wildlife habitat, management of the Boise River WMA, and acquisition of land rights to sustain wildlife.

Idaho Department of Lands. IDL owns and manages 496 acres in the Foothills and is responsible for 2.5 million acres statewide. IDL answers to the State Lands Board, composed of the governor, attorney general, secretary of state, state controller, and superintendent of public instruction. IDL's mission is to "manage the endowment lands in such a manner as will secure the maximum longterm financial return to the institution to which granted." Therefore, IDL's interests in its Foothills properties are for securing maximum long-term financial returns on its lands and the effects of public use on the land's values and for maximizing benefits to other resources. IDL provides law enforcement and fire protection for its lands. Over the last decade, IDL has traded out of most of its land holdings in the Boise Foothills so they have opted not to be a participant in this Interagency Plan.

2. ENVIRONMENT: 2-1 GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Boise Foothills are a diverse and complex ecosystem comprised of natural resources, all dependent on one another for proper function. These resources include the following:

- Water Resources
- Soils
- Vegetation
- Wildlife

Because conservation of these natural resources and consistency in planning efforts is crucial to maintain balance in this ecosystem, this section presents the goals, objectives, and recommendations for conserving the natural resources identified in the Foothills.

As private land uses and ecosystems change, sustainability of ecosystem functions will become more difficult and emphasize collaboration between the public land managers and private landowners across jurisdictional boundaries.

The Goals of this section are:

- Manage watersheds through protection and enhancement of associated resources.
- Protect soils to reduce erosion and repair erosion damage.
- Protect and restore native, special status, and other desirable vegetation.
- Protect, enhance, and rehabilitate wildlife habitat to sustain wildlife in the Foothills.

WATER RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Manage watersheds through protection and enhancement of associated resources.	#1 Develop and implement an integrated watershed plan.	 Establish watershed health standards to create a monitoring scheme using indicator species. Monitor all major Foothills drainages to establish baseline data and continue collecting data regularly to create trend data. Update floodplain data map that illustrates streams in the Foothills as data become available.
	#2 Coordinate with landowners (private and public) to manage watersheds for long-term health.	• Provide a link on City of Boise's website for landowners (private and public) where relevant watershed information (plants, chemicals, and water quality results) is located.
	#3 Protect drinking water recharge areas (work should be completed to identify these areas).	 Keep current on further identification and mapping of recharge areas by the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR). Educate landowners and users about recharge areas and provide a link or a map on City of Boise's website identifying recharge areas.
	#4 Protect ground water from pollutants and contaminants.	 Post on City of Boise's website the IDWR and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) representative responsible for locating, identifying, and monitoring contaminated areas in the Foothills. Educate citizens and user groups about contamination levels of various pollutants and proper storage and disposal of these pollutants.
	#5 Consider watershed values when designing new public facilities.	 Coordinate with public land managers to ensure proper siting of roads, trails, and recreation facilities that respect watershed values prior to commencing work projects; require inclusion of stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs). Identify and map where trails and surrounding features are eroded and/or causing excessive erosion. Consider design modifications, relocation, or closure of identified eroded areas.
	#6 Educate users about the importance of protecting, maintaining, and restoring the proper functioning condition of a watershed.	• Create trailhead signage, brochures, and awareness programs to teach users about watersheds and their function.

SOILS AND GEOLOGY RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Protect soils to reduce erosion and repair erosion damage.	#1 Identify and control erosion and provide for active monitoring and management.	 Identify and list erosion-control methods and tools. Avoid disturbing areas with high erosion potential. Use existing soils and geologic maps to assist in developing trails. Use BMPs to address soil erosion and ground pollution and contamination.
	#2 Avoid geologic hazards, such as landslides and faults.	Map geologic hazard areas in the Foothills.
	#3 Protect native and desirable vegetation.	 Seed disturbed areas with a native and desirable plant mix to prevent erosion. Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to control invasive plant species.
	#4 Use proper trail design techniques.	• Refer to Ridge-to-Rivers 2011 Trail Operations Plan for trail BMPs.
	#5 Reduce impacts on soils and vegetation through proper planning and direct coordination between all public land managers and private landowners.	Develop educational opportunities between private landowners and public land managers to discuss soil management practices.
	#6 Educate users about the importance of restoring, maintaining, and protecting the proper functioning condition of the ecosystem.	 Continue educational outreach programs at the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center. Create a brochure that discusses and illustrates the importance of the major environmental components (including water, soils, vegetation, and wildlife). Use trail signs to illustrate the importance of the major environmental components. Enhance community public relations by teaching Foothills work crews about environmental issues that they can share with the public.
	#7 Reduce the likelihood of new erosion scars or defined geologic features.	• Protect or avoid areas with unique geology, such as rock outcrops and erosive ridgelines that provide scenic values.

PLANT COMMUNITIES, RARE PLANTS, AND WEEDS RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Protect and restore	#1 Inventory and monitor	• Update the composite map identifying the
native, special status,	the composition and	composition and distribution of plant
and other desirable	distribution of plant	communities in the Foothills.
vegetation.	communities in the	Inventory the Foothills to assess rare plant
	Foothills.	populations.
	#2 Maintain biological	• Protect special status species and native plant
	diversity in the Foothills by	communities through new reserves, special
	protecting and improving a	management prescriptions, trail mitigation
	variety of habitats,	measures, or other management actions.
	including native and special	Monitor the composition of vegetation and
	status plant species.	habitat across the Foothills to ensure biological
		diversity.
	#3 Protect native and	• Seed disturbed areas with native and desirable
	desirable plant vegetation	plant mix.
	#4 Educate Foothills users	• Establish a program to teach Foothills users and
	about special status species,	landowners about the protection of special
	native plant communities,	status species, native plant communities, and
	and noxious weed	noxious weed invasions.
	invasions.	• Monitor and demonstrate, through studies,
		progress made to enhance and manage special
		status and native plant communities.
		Create seed mix and list of suppliers for
		desirable native plant species for landscaping
		and restoration projects.
	#5 Manage the spread of	• Develop a coordinated interagency program for
	invasive and noxious weeds	weed management that includes Ada County
	throughout the Foothills.	Weed and Pest Department, public land
		managing agencies, and private landowners.
		Map noxious weed populations on all public
		lands in the Foothills.
		Establish a funding source for noxious weed
		control and look for grant opportunities.
		• Seek opportunities to use IPM tools to control
		known noxious weed populations.

WILDLIFE RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Protect, enhance, and	#1 Manage Foothills open	Identify and quantify vegetation habitat areas
rehabilitate wildlife	space for wildlife habitat.	by size and function.
habitat to sustain		Identify and map wildlife linkage corridors.
wildlife in the Foothills.		Secure open spaces that connect surrounding paties habitat
•	#2 Minimize human	Idelive fidblidt. Secure as many large areas of native habitat as
	disturbance.	nossible when negotiating for purchase or
		exchange of Foothills properties.
		Minimize road construction and trails in areas
		of highly sensitive wildlife habitat as identified
		by agencies.
		Identify and mitigate potential impediments to
		wildlife movements and sources of additional
		Identify and remove unnecessary rangeland
		fences.
		Ensure new fences in wildlife migration
		corridors allow for safe passage of wildlife.
		• Implement seasonal closures of RZR trails in areas of high wildlife value where appropriate
		 Develop and implement a strong dog leash
		policy in the Foothills, to meet plan goals,
		including minimizing recreational conflicts and
		protecting areas designated by IDFG as high
		value to wildlife.
	#3 Educate users about the importance of maintaining wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.	Conduct educational seminars on Foothills wildlife and behitet including energial status
		species
		Create interpretative signage illustrating the
		Foothills ecosystem and corresponding wildlife
		values.
		Create a brochure, complete with illustrations,
		describing wildlife and special status species
		found in the Foothills.
		 Use technology to engage users. Host special on site projects with the public to
		 Host special off-site projects with the public to rehabilitate wildlife habitat
	#4 Promote growth of	Improve forage conditions by establishing
	native and desirable	seedlings or plantings of bitterbrush and other
	grasses, forbs, and shrubs.	palatable shrub species.
		Identify and map winter range in need of
	#5 Ducto at viv aviau	rehabilitation and improve forage conditions.
	#5 Protect riparian,	 Monitor riparian obligate or dependent species. Monitor and avaluate the accelerical condition
	mountain shrub species dependent on these	• Monitor and evaluate the ecological condition of wildlife habitat in the Footbills
		 Provide alternative water sources where
	habitats.	human impacts on natural sources can be
		avoided (such as flood-control ponds, guzzlers,
		and exclosures).
		Identify and monitor sagebrush obligate or near-
		obligate species in the Foothills.
		 Identify and map sagebrush steppe habitat.

GOAL	OBJECTIVES		RECOMMENDATIONS
	#6 Minimize disturbances to wintering big game populations by seasonally limiting access to winter range.	•	Reduce environmental impacts of trail use and impacts on trails by having agency managers close specific trails or trail segments in response to changes in weather, on a seasonal and/or daily basis. Institute permanent or seasonal road closures where problems exist or are expected.
	#7 Take steps to prevent large-scale wildfires that would result in the further establishment of exotic annual grasses and degradation of wildlife habitat.	•	Create an interagency wildland fire prevention agreement and outline annual Wildland Urban Interface mitigation projects in the Foothills.

2-2 RESOURCE USE IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As recreational use of Foothills resources continues to increase, public land managers must strike a balance between sustainable recreational opportunities and traditional uses and natural resource conservation. While use of the Foothills can create conflicts with conservation goals, including protection of water, soil, and wildlife, public activities can also support these goals. Direct support for conservation can occur, for example, through programs that enlist volunteers to help eradicate noxious weeds, or rebuild eroding trails. Indirect support comes, for example, through recreational use of open space that creates a stronger sense of stewardship and greater willingness to support agency policies and funding needed for management of Foothills resources.

The goals, objectives, and recommendations presented in this section provide guidance and focus on the need to balance these conservation efforts across the Foothills through a coordinated process.

The Goals of this section are:

- Provide the public with a wide range of recreational opportunities compatible with other plan goals at appropriate places, while taking care to protect the ecological diversity of the Foothills.
- Manage for safe and sustainable sportsman opportunities (hunting and trapping).
- Work with managing agencies to ensure that transportation plans complement the Interagency Plan.
- Meet municipal solid waste disposal needs of county residents at the Ada County Landfill in the Foothills.
- Identify and protect existing cultural sites and educate users about their importance to the history of the area.
- Manage grazing activities to be compatible with established management practices to ensure ecosystem sustainability.
- Retain, preserve, and enhance the natural scenic values of the Foothills.

RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS
aintain and expand recreational opportunities,
cluding improving access to recreation
estinations, improving trail connectivity, and
oviding better facilities.
ocate and design new trails to meet recreational
eds, create more sustainable trails, and avoid
bitat water quality and aesthetics
when opportunities to conserve property with
ological diversity. Develop ways for the public
interact and learn about the ecological
sources on properties where trails are not
mpatible with resource protection.
ssess existing recreational uses to ensure
mpatibility with ecological diversity (soil,
ants, and wildlife) of conserved property.
ncourage R2R to work with trail user groups on
asonal closures of trails.
ontinue to fund the R2R Program.
everage local volunteer resources for the
aintenance and construction of trails and
ner recreation facilities before considering
ntracting.
neriences (e.g. nedestrians only no dogs and
wnhill mountain bikers).
ncourage a variety of passive trail uses –
ildlife viewing, art classes, and historical and
ological education.
ork with Bogus Basin Resort and Boise
ational Forest to seek opportunities for
onmotorized trail and trailhead expansion.
tablish trail access agreements with willing
ivate landowners to maintain trail connectivity
d prevent unmanaged trail use; partner with
ivate owners to provide trail etiquette
iormation.
ork with heighboring private landowners and
ivate property
lucate trail users about the importance of the
MA, the impacts people can have on these
sources, and why no new trails will be created
ithin or connecting to the WMA.
entify present and future trail users and
volve them in a process of avoiding and
solving conflicts as early as possible.
ek ways for IDFG to become a funding partner
KZK.
ncourage all Foothills land management
encies to conduct user surveys and counts and
ace consult existing and a product of the strength existing of the strength exists and the stren

GOAL	OBJECTIVES		RECOMMENDATIONS
	#3 Guide recreational	•	Identify and implement parking areas that are in
	activities and		scale with the amount of use appropriate for that
	improvements to avoid or		area. Avoid large regional facilities in favor of
	minimize impacts on		smaller, dispersed facilities.
	important resource values.	•	Where appropriate, designate pullouts and
			trailheads for day use activities only, as needed
			to address fire hazards, "partying," or other land
			management issues.
		•	Work collaboratively with developers to provide
			and protect public access into the Foothills.
		•	Monitor the ongoing effectiveness of programs
			implemented (e.g., adopt a trail, volunteer
			rangers, and dogs off-leash).
		•	Coordinate with existing developments to reduce
			multiple unmanaged access routes into the
			Foothills.
		•	Ensure land managers communicate to
			neighborhood and homeowners associations the
			need to access the trail system from access
			points and trailheads only.
		•	Use proper planning, design, education, and
			mitigation measures to minimize the potential
			negative impacts on wildlife caused by Foothills
			users.
		•	Guide Foothills users to stay on designated
		•	Redesign / reroute current erosion-prone trails to
			minimize impacts on resources.
		•	Develop a R2R Trail Management Plan to assist
			managers in maintaining existing trails, plan and
			design new trails/trailheads, guide
			mixed/separated use, and determine parking
			and restroom needs.
		•	Create and publicize policies that address special
			events, over use areas, and organized group trail
			use. Educate the public about the policies.
		•	Provide opportunities for motorized recreation
			in limited areas of the Foothills consistent with
			land management agency direction.
		•	Coordinate with the Idaho Outfitters and Guides
			Licensing Board for those applying for guide
		1	licenses in the Foothills.

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS	
	#4 Develop and implement	Use signage to educate users of recreational	
	a trail signage program	etiquette and guide trail users to appropriate	
	focused on education,	areas.	
	management, trail	• Survey the effectiveness of interpretive signage	
	etiquette, and proper use.	and trailhead/kiosk signage.	
		Create identities for special areas, such as	
		reserves and wildlife management areas, using	
		trailhead and entry signs.	
		Encourage private landowners to use signage	
		and physical barriers to reduce unmanaged off-	
		road activities on private lands.	
		 Educate users about fire and its effect on the 	
		Foothills resources and recreation.	
		• Where possible, provide interpretive (ecological,	
		historical, and cultural) signage to discuss	
		valuable resources in the Foothills.	
		 Work with partner agencies to develop a 	
		commercial use policy in the Foothills.	
	#5 Address seasonal	• Develop and implement seasonal trail closures to	
	closure dates for roads and	minimize trail damage, trailside vegetation loss,	
	trails to mitigate potential	and erosion and protect wintering big game.	
	conflicts at Foothills	• Develop an outreach strategy to educate the	
	resources.	public on seasonal closures.	
		• Enforce seasonal closures when established on	
		Boise WMA to protect wintering wildlife.	
		Provide signage at closed trailheads to provide	
		trail users with other opportunities.	
		• Implement new ways to alert trail users of daily	
		trail conditions prior to them arriving in the	
		Foothills.	
	#6 Address and manage	Review the distribution of dog off-leash, dog on-	
	the Feetbille	leash, and no dog trails across the K2K system	
	uie roouiiiis.	and consider redistribution.	
		Expand the number of animal control officers	
		and enforcement	
		and entorcement.	
		• Create new ways to educate train users/dog	
		waste left in the Foothills	
		 Provide education about the importance of dog 	
		 I rovice education about the importance of dog leash requirements during ground bird posting 	
		season wintering hig game tranning season and	
		along rinarian corridors	
		aiong mpanan comuois.	
GOAL	OBJECTIVES		RECOMMENDATIONS
------	---------------------------	---	--
	#7 Develop and fund a	•	Establish funding for City of Boise reserve
	land management		restoration projects, long-term monitoring, and
	program.		regular management activities and coordinate
			with other public agencies.
		•	Seek new funding opportunities for Foothills
			management.
		•	Hire staff to actively manage the natural
			resources in City of Boise reserves and work with
			neighboring landowners on similar resource
		•	Work with interested citizens to create a <i>Friends</i>
		-	of the Boise Foothills Group to assist with projects
			not easily accomplished by governmental
			agencies.
		•	Create a volunteer base to aid in restoration and
			management activities.
		•	Schedule several restoration-focused volunteer
			projects annually.
	#8 Develop a monitoring	•	Evaluate current experiences and desired vision
	program to regularly		of trail users.
	evaluate programs,	•	Use photographic data (photo point) to evaluate
	restoration projects, and		resource impacts and restoration efforts (such as
	impacts of recreational		plantings, noxious weed control, and trail repair).
	activities on natural	•	Create a position for a professional monitoring
	resource values in the		coordinator to create and oversee a balanced
	Foothills.		scientific program.
		•	Partner with trail users and nongovernmental
			organizations to carry out needed monitoring.
		•	Create a contact list of citizens interested in
			recreational issues in the Foothills to contact
			regularly with updates.

HUNTING AND TRAPPING RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Manage for safe and	#1 Educate the public	• Acknowledge hunting and trapping as an activity
sustainable sportsman	about sportsman practices	to be maintained in the Foothills.
opportunities (hunting	in the Foothills.	• Create different methods to educate the public of
and trapping).		the type, season, and scope of hunting and
		trapping opportunities in the Foothills.
		 Provide links to IDFG's hunting and trapping
		information.
		Work with Ada County to improve public safety
		by restricting discharge of firearms within
		proximity to residential developments.
		Advocate brightly colored clothing by trail users
		during hunting season for public safety reasons.
		• Establish contacts with key representatives of
		hunting and trapping groups using the Foothills.

TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Work with managing agencies to ensure that transportation plans complement the Interagency Plan.	#1 Coordinate with the Ada County Highway District (ACHD), BLM, USFS, and private landowners to reduce erosion from road runoff.	 Monitor and repair erosion on damaged roads. Develop methods for reducing erosion from roads in the Foothills. Consider redesign of designated roads with ongoing erosion concerns.
	#2 Coordinate with ACHD and COMPASS to develop a final Foothills Transportation Plan.	 Work with COMPASS to update the technical data related to the Foothills. Ensure ACHD shares and maintains roads for the safety and benefit of recreationists. Ensure transportation planning efforts are coordinated with Foothills land managing agencies and addresses the effects of new and existing roads on wildlife, cultural resources, vegetation, air and water quality, and recreation.
	#3 Minimize noxious weeds found adjacent to roads.	• Coordinate with public land managing agencies, ACHD, and the Ada County Department of Weed and Pest to prevent and reduce noxious weeds along established or new roads in the Foothills.

SOLID WASTE RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Meet municipal solid waste disposal needs of county residents at the Ada County Landfill in the Foothills	#1 Understand that the active areas of the 2,900- acre Ada County Landfill property is exempt from the Interagency Plan.	 Encourage the landfill to manage buffer areas for protection of wildlife, rare plant populations, cultural resources, and visual quality. Partner with the landfill and USFWS to protect rare plant species occurring within landfill buffer areas. Recognize that human and dog use of buffer area is not compatible with priorities of buffer area; wildlife habitat and plant species of concern. Coordinate with Ada County to ensure that landfill operations do not negatively impact other public lands managed for conservation purposes.
	#2 Educate the public about solid and hazardous waste management in Ada County.	 Encourage more public educational opportunities at the landfill: on-site tours and lessons. Post interpretive signage of landfill operations at trailheads adjacent to the landfill.

CULTURAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Identify and protect existing cultural sites and educate users about their importance to the history of the area.	#1 Consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) early in project planning for any new work projects in the Foothills.	 Identify proposed trail, trailhead, and other facilities involving ground disturbance for review by SHPO and tribes. Coordinate with SHPO before building any proposed roads in the Foothills.
	#2 Teach users about the importance of cultural resources and their protection.	 Develop cultural interpretation signs for trailhead kiosks and along trails as appropriate. Provide public education about cultural resources in the Foothills through programs and lessons at Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center.
	#3 Secure open spaces with known significant cultural resources.	 Conduct cultural resource surveys in the Foothills. Develop a strategy for limiting the probability of vandalism to known cultural resources. Work with landowners and provide incentives for protecting known cultural sites on their lands.

GRAZING RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES		RECOMMENDATIONS
Manage grazing	#1 Coordinate with local,	•	The BLM, USFS, and IDFG are the lead agencies
activities to be	state, and federal		with respect to managing livestock grazing in the
compatible with	agencies.		Foothills. These agencies should share livestock
established			grazing plans with other agencies in the Foothills
management practices			on an annual basis.
to ensure ecosystem		•	Adopt grazing techniques and/or programs with
sustainability.			proven results.
	#2 Manage grazing	•	Manage sagebrush steppes, riparian habitats, and
	activities to be compatible		other sensitive landscapes to prevent
	with natural resources.		degradation from grazing.
		•	Work with agency managers and grazing lessees
			to use practices that limit soil-disturbing
			practices.
		•	Use erosion-control guidelines and techniques to
			stabilize soils disturbed by grazing.
		•	Manage for improvement of native plant
			communities.
		•	Work with volunteers and among land
			management agencies to plant native plant
			species in areas disturbed by grazing, specifically
			riparian corridors.
		•	Incorporate the life cycle key plant species
			important to wildlife into livestock grazing
			management.
	#3 Use grazing in a	•	Set up a pilot project in the Foothills where
	targeted manner to		targeted sheep grazing could be used to reduce
	reduce noxious weeds,		noxious weed populations.
	improve wildlife habitat,	•	Monitor the pilot project with photographs and
	and reduce fuels.		data to be used for future grazing management
			decisions.
		•	Create list of BMPs for different types of targeted
			environmental management-oriented grazing in
			the Foothills.
		•	Use grazing to reduce fuel loads in and around
			"anchor points" in the Foothills. These anchor
			points would be identified by the BLM fire
			managers.
	#4 Educate Foothills user	•	Involve the Idaho Rangeland Resource
	groups about grazing-		Commission in discussions involving rangeland
	related issues.		and grazing education.
		•	Create an environmental education lesson on
			Foothills grazing.
		•	Create and install grazing interpretive signs.
		•	Post information on the R2R website and at
			trailheads about current grazing activity in the
			Foothills.

VISUAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Retain, preserve, and enhance the natural scenic values of the Foothills.	#1 Protect unique and highly valued visual resources.	 Identify scars altering the scenic value of the Foothills. Coordinate restoration and clean-up efforts working with a lead agency, volunteers, and/or private landowners to restore or maintain scenic values. Work with enforcement agencies to deter illegal activity.
		 Incorporate visual resource interpretation into signage.
	#2 Monitor chosen viewpoints from the 2000 Boise Foothills Open Space Management Plan. #3 Coordinate with utility companies to reduce visual intrusions on the landscape.	 Revisit chosen viewpoints for photographic data every two years to determine restoration needs and encourage agencies to make management changes in problem areas. Coordinate with utility companies to mitigate resource damage associated with construction, placement, and maintenance of utilities. Require regrading and reseeding of temporary utility access roads to reduce visual and other environmental impacts.
	#4 Coordinate with road managing agencies when maintaining existing or planning new roads in the Foothills. Use mitigation techniques to reduce the visual contrast created.	 Discourage and/or reduce the visual impacts of new development in highly visible areas, such as ridgelines. Identify roads to be modified or realigned to reduce their visual impact on the landscape and improve their sustainability. Coordinate with road maintaining agencies to reduce fugitive dust contributing to visual air pollution in the Foothills.

2-3 MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the plan focuses on management and maintenance of both the resources and uses of the Foothills. Funding, cooperation, and consistency in planning efforts are key to the success of the Interagency Plan. Therefore, the recommendations presented in this section focus on the groundwork that is involved in maintaining the Foothills as a safe public space.

The five Goals of this section are:

- Develop funding proposals to supplement limited resources for programs and projects recommended by the Interagency Plan.
- Establish a vibrant public involvement and education process.
- Preserve existing public lands and create connectivity between these properties.
- Acquire additional open space as appropriate to agency mission and function.
- Ensure public safety and wildfire concerns are met through cost-effective and coordinated efforts in the Foothills.

DEVELOP FUNDING PROPOSALS RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Develop funding	#1 Provide staffing and	• Seek funding for staff and support activities
proposals to	funding to support	through cost-saving supplemental funding
supplement limited	activities and programs.	programs and projects.
resources for programs		• Seek new partnerships and new relationships
and projects		with current and possible future open space
recommended in the		supporters; work to expand the base of
Interagency Plan.		supporters for open space goals.
	#2 Develop a cost-effective	• Create a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan for
	plan to fund maintenance	the Foothills and research potential new impact
	and development of lands,	fees.
	trails, and facilities	• Encourage the creation of a fund or trust
	provided for public use.	managed by a local nongovernmental
		organization/foundation.

ENHANCE THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
GOAL Establish a vibrant public involvement and education process.	OBJECTIVES #1 Provide public information and outreach, for education and to encourage active support for plan implementation and volunteer programs.	 RECOMMENDATIONS Continue public education programs about the importance of the natural resources in the Foothills, the benefits the Foothills bring to the community, and the need for protection and restoration of open space, and citizen involvement in addressing these efforts. Promote volunteers to actively engage in the implementation of the Interagency Plan; create new and more enticing strategies to enlist volunteers in trail maintenance and other stewardship activities. Involve neighbors and citizens in public forums to discuss management decisions affecting the use of the Foothills to promote consistency in planning efforts, educational opportunities, and public awareness. Work with the business community to actively engage in the implementation of the Open Space Plan; in particular, seek out business partners with a strong stake in the future of the Foothills such as the Chamber of Commerce and outdoor gear business. Continue to evaluate, develop, and update lesson plans for public and private schools that incorporate the concepts of this Interagency Plan. Continue to work with environmental education groups to use public open space areas for environmental instruction. Enhance year-round education programs for the Foothills.
		conservation organizations, user groups and organizations, and "friends" groups throughout the region.
	#2 Provide a one-stop location for information on Foothills natural history, recreational opportunities, upcoming events and programs, and volunteer programs.	 Use the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center to house open space operations, enforcement personnel, environmental educators, maintenance staff, and natural resource specialists. This site will: Serve as the information center for the Foothills where maps, electronic files, and other information could be stored, updated, and disseminated. Serve as an education facility to provide education and environmental awareness programs and demonstration projects about such topics as Firewise and Xeriscape landscaping.

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
		 Provide a location for reporting criminal activity, ecological observations, trail-related issues, maintenance issues, and other concerns. Create new online and social media platforms to share information with the public, both residents and prospective visitors.
	#3 Establish an interpretive program focused on creating resource awareness.	 Identify social trends and how they relate to natural resource management. Develop programs to address social trends. Develop a series of themes for specific purposes, such as at Table Rock or on trail loops. Examples of themes that could be addressed using interpretive signage or other tools include: Table Rock Military Reserve Boise River WMA Castle Rock Shoshone tribes Overland Stage Services Rocky Canyon Toll Road Unexploded ordinance Boise Fires of 1959 and 1996 Fire rehabilitation Poisonous plants Native plants Noxious and invasive plants Wildlife in the Foothills Trailing sheep Urban interface Geothermal resources
	#4 Increase coordination and administration efforts among agencies for public involvement and education.	 vvatersned Organize annual meeting among public agencies, representatives, and partners to heighten awareness of public involvement and education efforts. Schedule annual open house to highlight accomplishments, upcoming projects and management issues, and opportunities for future public involvement.

PRESERVE EXISTING PUBLIC LANDS AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Preserve existing public lands and create connectivity between these properties.	#1 Facilitate the transfer of ownership from state lands to other public agencies to preserve open space.	 Create a prioritized list of IDL parcels with ranked resource values and uses for potential sale or exchange. Work with other public land agencies to identify possible receiving agencies for IDL parcels. Initiate further group discussion with public land agencies on future land ownership scenarios to meet this objective.
	#2 Provide resources as necessary to expedite the land transfer process.	 Identify specific resources to be allocated to facilitate land transfer of IDL parcels including planning, funding, staffing, and mediation. Educate and build partnerships with local non- governmental organizations, interest groups and citizens to create momentum to conserve IDL parcels as public open space.
	#3 Institute additional measures to ensure public open spaces are preserved for future generations as public open spaces.	 Encourage City of Boise leadership to take steps to have third-party conservation easements on all properties where Foothills Levy Funds have been used for long-term open space conservation. Pursue third-party conservation easements on all City of Boise and Ada County-owned properties in the Foothills.
	#4 Acquire public access to existing public open space parcels where compatible with other resource values.	• Work with private landowners to acquire access easements for recreational connectivity.

ACQUIRE ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE AS APPROPRIATE TO AGENCY MISSION AND FUNCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS
Acquire additional open space as appropriate to agency mission and function.	#1 Better understand each agency's priorities for acquisition in the Boise Foothills.	 Use established agency practices and the goals and objectives of the Interagency Plan to clarify criteria for decisions on land acquisitions, exchanges, easements, and other actions that could modify or expand the Foothills public land base. Seek leverage funding from LWCF, new open space grants, NFWF, etc Educate the public about the mixed ownership (public and private) across the Foothills.

ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND WILDFIRE CONCERNS ARE MET RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL	OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS		
Ensure public safety and wildfire concerns are met through cost- effective and coordinated efforts in the Foothills.	#1 Have emergency management services continue mutual-aid efforts to protect public safety through shared resources to enforce laws and manage wildfire concerns.	 Urge agencies to continue to support and fund cooperative agreements for fire protection and law enforcement. Encourage cooperation among local governments and fire protection districts as they evaluate the costs and benefits of acquiring specialized fire suppression equipment and funding supplemental staff during the peak fire season. 		
	#2 Continue to improve interagency coordination, cooperation, and communication to advance public safety and wildfire concerns.	 Encourage public agencies to communicate regularly with public safety and law enforcement representatives and medical personnel serving the Foothills. Provide assistance with emergency response needs and communications as needed, such as gate keys, staging areas, and special trail equipment. Stay engaged with U.S. Army Corp of Engineers on mapping, detection, education, and mitigation of unexploded ordinances in the Foothills. Consider use of trails as potential locations for firebreaks when needed. Encourage agencies to work collectively when seeking funds for wildfire mitigation projects within the Foothills. Update the 2012 Wildfire Mitigation Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) every five years and meet semiannually with MOU signatories to prioritize project ideas and discuss funding options. 		
	#3 Educate the community about public safety and wildfire concerns.	 Encourage homeowners within the Wildland Urban Interface to create defensible space. Provide resources to encourage neighborhoods to become Firewise communities. Create and post signage educating Foothills users about wildfire concerns and the wildfire role in the Foothills environment. Provide nonemergency contact information (police, fire, agencies, and R2R) at designated R2R trailheads and in a variety of media formats. 		

3. BACKGROUND—ENVIRONMENT 3-1 WATER RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Boise Foothills and the water resources they support are an important part of the Lower Boise River watershed. The stream and gulches of the Foothills function as paths for transporting precipitation that falls in the higher elevations down to the Boise River and the valley's aquifers, the primary sources of drinking water for Boise residents. Ground water and surface water flows provide a critical water supply to the area's wildlife and maintain riparian and wetland habitat communities. New information now demonstrates the hydrologic connection between the Foothills and the surrounding aquifers.

Maintaining the subwatersheds of the Foothills in their proper functioning condition is critical to the health of the larger watershed. Not only does the Foothills watershed contribute to Boise's drinking water supply and wildlife survival, but if its natural functions are maintained, it also protects the area from catastrophic flooding. However, these functions can be impaired by major events that alter the landscape as well as by the cumulative impacts of ongoing human activities. Reducing the extent of surface-disturbing activities that reduce the watershed's ability to effectively absorb precipitation can help lessen risks of major flooding.

WATER RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

WATERSHEDS

A watershed is defined as the land surrounding a common set of streams and rivers that drain into a single larger body of water. The Foothills are an important part of the Lower Boise River watershed and recharge the shallow and deep aquifers as well as the Boise River. The Foothills watershed comprises primarily of ephemeral and intermittent streams with a few larger perennial streams, such as Dry Creek and Cottonwood Creek, which support minor irrigation diversions and

healthy riparian zones. Isolated springs recharge some stream channels, providing an important source of surface water to wildlife. Most of the Foothills streams enter engineered structures at the base of the Foothills where they are routed beneath the city to the Boise River. Temperature and precipitation vary across the watershed, but generally precipitation increases with the elevation - from less than 12 inches per year on the valley floor to 20 inches per year at the Boise Ridge while daily temperatures decrease with elevation (Boise Planning and Community Development Department 1994).



Watersheds have three basic landform components: ridges, hillslopes, and drainage channels. These landforms could be used to divide the Foothills watershed into smaller subwatersheds based on how water moves across the surface of the land. Table 3, taken from the 1994 *Foothills Plan* *Background Report*, describes the general size and elevation gain of these subwatersheds, and Figure 2 shows their locations. The proper functioning of each subwatershed is important to the overall health of the larger watershed. A healthy watershed absorbs runoff from precipitation, and this absorption reduces flood potential and stores water throughout the year to support base streamflows and provide the water critical to many plant and animal species. These watershed functions can be changed or impaired by major events or the cumulative effects of less dramatic events such as road and trail construction, urban runoff, gully and rill erosion, overgrazing by livestock, and the gradual loss of the native vegetative cover. To maintain the health of each subwatershed and of the larger watershed, cumulative impacts of existing and proposed land uses must be considered.

Subwatersheds	Size (acres)	Center Line Length (miles)	Elevation Gain (feet)	
Valley Creek	1,585	1.5	515	
Dry Creek Valley	20,096	14.4	4,040	
Daniels Creek	3,950	4.9	2,800	
Goose Creek	984	1.3	610	
Eagle	1,167	1.4	610	
Seaman Gulch	1,311	2.7	650	
Pierce Gulch	1,960	2.9	960	
Polecat Gulch	916	2.0	920	
Stewart Gulch	6,034	7.6	3,310	
Crane Creek	5,502	6.9	3,230	
Hulls Gulch	3,011	6.3	3,120	
Freestone Creek	3,307	4.5	2,830	
Cottonwood Creek	7,990	6.6	2,880	
Table Rock Area	2,018	1.4	930	
Warm Springs Gulch	3,646	4.9	2,740	
Squaw Creek	1,978	3.0	2,410	
Maynard Gulch	1,545	3.6	2,690	
Section 27	390	1.4	1,190	
Highland Bench	1,860	3.3	3,160	
Diversion Dam	1,688	1.7	1,420	
Lucky Peak Reservoir	10,265	5.8	1,900	

TABLE 3 AVERAGE SIZE AND LENGTH OF FOOTHILLS GULCHES GEOGRAPHICALLY FROM WEST TO	EAST
TABLE OTTERAGE GILE AND LENGTH OF TOOTHILLO GEOGRAFINGALLI TROM WEGT TO	LAGI

GROUND WATER AND AQUIFERS

The presence and movement of ground water in the Foothills depends on the surficial geology. Ground water depths vary considerably across the Foothills, depending on the physical characteristics of an area and location within the watershed (Boise Planning and Community Development Department 1994). Several of the gulches (Crane Creek, Hulls Gulch, Freestone Creek, and Cottonwood Creek) are recharge areas for shallow aquifers that ultimately connect to the Boise River and to deeper aquifers that ultimately connect to the Boise River and to deeper aquifers (Squires, pers. comm. 2000). The gulches are paths for surface and subsurface water moving downslope from the ridgetops to the Boise River. Therefore, contaminants entering the gulches could be transported via ground water to areas, such as deep aquifers, not commonly associated with the pollution source. This movement can take many years since ground water flow is often very slow as it moves toward the deep aquifers.

The ground water provides a base flow to many drainages and supports springs, seeps, and wetlands. These areas provide water sources and riparian habitat critical to wildlife populations in the Foothills. To maintain the wildlife and overall health of the Foothills ecosystem, the watershed must be able to absorb precipitation and produce ground water flows that can sustain these areas during the dry summer months. Activities that create impervious surfaces or increase surface runoff should be carefully evaluated for their impacts on the recharge areas and ground water supply.

Sedimentary and volcanic aquifers are found throughout the Boise Foothills. These aquifers contain a mixture of loose gravels, sands, silts, and clays that comprise valley fill aquifers intermixed with areas containing basalt, shale, and sandstone rocks that have a more consistent structure. Various types of aquifers are located throughout the Foothills and in and around the Boise River including confined and unconfined, fractured, sedimentary, and perched. An aquifer is a natural underground area where large quantities of ground water fill the spaces between rocks and sediment. In an aquifer, ground water can move sideways, up, or down in response to gravity, differences in elevation, difference in pressure, and differences in the physical properties of the aquifer. Depending on the aquifer, the water can move from very fast (as much as hundreds of feet per day in fractured rock aquifers) to very slow (as little as a few feet per year in very fine-grained sedimentary aquifers) (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality 2014).

The State of Idaho has embarked upon a planning process known as the Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan (CAMP). One of the anticipated drivers of future needs and supply constraints for water in the eastern Treasure Valley is to provide additional storage capacity to mitigate the effects of altered patterns of runoff from mountain snow packs in and around the Foothills.

The Aquifer Planning and Management Program is designed to provide the Idaho Water Resource Board and Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) with the necessary information to develop plans for managing ground and surface water resources into the future. The program has two phases:

1. A technical component to characterize the surface and ground water resources of each basin.

2. A planning component that will integrate the technical knowledge with an assessment of current and projected future water uses and constraints.

DRINKING WATER

The Foothills watershed contributes to the two primary sources of drinking water for Boise residents: the Boise River and the Boise Valley's deep aquifers. Precipitation falling on the Foothills watershed travels down the Foothills gulches as surface and subsurface flow and ultimately reaches either the Boise River or the deep aquifers. The drainage basins in the southeastern portion of the Foothills management area contribute water to the Boise River above the intake for the water

purification plant at the end of Marden Lane in east Boise. The hydrologic connection between the Foothills watershed and this deep aquifer, which is tapped for most of Boise's drinking water, is still being studied.

United Water and the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) are developing source water programs for protecting drinking water wells under the reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act. Any additional information on the role of the Foothills watershed in Boise's drinking water supply will be incorporated into this report as it becomes available.

WATER QUALITY

The water quality of Foothills streams is not regularly monitored (Stone, pers. comm. 2014). In 1998, Cottonwood Creek, from its headwaters to its confluence with Freestone Creek, was added to the list of streams and rivers that do not meet state water quality standards. In 2011, more monitoring was completed at these two streams and an attempt to remove them from the list of impaired streams was made. The attempt was unsuccessful. These assessments are based on a rapid screening protocol conducted by the DEQ. No timetable has been set for further investigation (Stone, pers. comm. 2014).

GEOTHERMAL WATER

The geothermal aquifer is a fractured media ground water system that produces hot artesian water from the network fractures of the Boise Frontal fault system and the fractured, layered rhyolites and interbedded sediments of the Idavada Group, and from fracture zones within the Idaho batholith. Prior to 1982-1983, the system appeared to have been at or near equilibrium. However, increases in production since that time have resulted in a general decline in recovery levels, and a



pattern indicating interconnection between the Capitol Mall-Reserve Park (below ground level) portion of the aquifer system and the Warm Springs portion is emerging (IDWR 1987).

This geothermal deep aquifer found in the Boise Valley produces water that ranges from 106°F to 175°F. This aquifer is more than 1,000 feet deep and is partially fed by water seeping through deep faults in the Foothills. The geothermal water is used for heating residential and government buildings in downtown Boise and the East End (Boise Planning and Community Development Department 1994).

FLOODING

The Foothills could flood at any time throughout the year, despite the ephemeral nature of many of the streams. Intense summer storms can cause flash flooding in the gulches, a situation that can be aggravated by the loss of vegetative cover or a decrease in soil permeability within a subwatershed. Flooding from rain or snow events can also occur, but such flooding is less frequent and of less magnitude. Floodplains for some Foothills gulches were designated for Federal Emergency Management Flood Insurance Maps dated December 1991. These 100-year flood maps have not been updated (Hortness, pers. comm. 1999). Figure 2 shows the location of these designated flood hazard areas.





with prevailing weather patterns and can absorb precipitation from low- to moderate-intensity storm events. Flood probabilities have been developed based on watershed conditions and the amount and intensity of precipitation. The possibility of flooding could increase with a decrease in the proper functioning of the watershed. For example, the 1996 fire outside Boise dramatically changed watershed conditions by removing the vegetative cover and, in some areas of high burn intensity, reducing the permeability of the soil. Under normal circumstances, precipitation is intercepted by vegetation and absorbed by the soil, reducing and slowing water flow on the surface of the ground. Vegetation losses and reduced soil permeability has increased surface runoff, erosion, and the likelihood of flooding in the affected watersheds.

In 1959, a Foothills wildfire was followed by what is estimated as a 50- to 100-year storm event. The severity of the flood was magnified because the fire had limited the absorption capability of the soil. North and east Boise neighborhoods and the downtown were inundated by mud flowing from Foothills gulches (Interagency Fire Team 1996).

Following the 1996 fire, revegetation and nonstructural techniques were used to repair some of the watershed damage. In addition, structures were built to reduce flooding potential. Flood-control dams and detention basins were constructed in Stewart Gulch, Crane Creek, and Hulls Gulch. The existing flood-control ponds on Cottonwood Creek were modified, and a flood-overflow channel was created in Fort Boise Park.

Other Foothills sediment basins are maintained by Boise Public Works in neighborhoods bordering the Foothills, including lower Stewart Gulch near Hillside Junior High School, lower Crane Creek near Bogus Basin and Hill Roads, lower Hulls Gulch, and Foothills East. A homeowners' association maintains a sediment basin on Crane Creek near the Crane Creek Golf Course (City of Boise Public Works 1999). All of the sediment basins have required increased maintenance and cleaning since the Foothills fire. Damage to the watershed above the City has long-term impacts on flooding potential, sediment movement, and water quality for residents of Boise. Fire is just one of the watershed changes that could increase flooding. Any activities that remove vegetation and expose bare soil reduce the proper functioning condition of the watershed and leaves it vulnerable to increased surface runoff, sedimentation downstream, and the potential for flooding. Impervious surfaces created by development, paving, or extreme soil compaction from recreational use also reduce a watershed's ability to absorb precipitation and increase surface runoff and flood potential. Cut-and-fill



slopes associated with the construction of building sites, roads, and trails increase flood potential because they remove vegetative cover and change the natural contours of the watershed. These changes alter the surface and subsurface flow patterns.

THREATS TO WATER RESOURCES

Surface and ground water resources are at risk from numerous human activities in the Foothills, which could affect the quantity and quality of the water resources.

- Contamination—Many potential sources of contamination (septic systems, pesticides and herbicides, petroleum, fecal material, and sediment from increased erosion) exist. Gulches could conduct such contamination to ground water and the Boise River, which are both used for drinking water.
- Construction in the Foothills—In addition to increasing potential contamination, residential construction introduces impervious surfaces, which increase the rate and concentration of runoff and could cover recharge areas. Development could change the gradient of slopes and expose bare soil, which would further increase erosion and sedimentation.
- Fire—Catastrophic wildfire damages vegetation, impairs the soils' ability to absorb water, and increases erosion.
- Overgrazing—Livestock trampling of streambanks and riparian areas changes stream channels by downcutting the banks and increasing erosion. Fecal matter also contaminates streams.
- Roads and Trails—Construction of roads and trails could impair watershed functions because it creates cut-and-fill slopes and impervious surfaces that change runoff patterns.

POLICIES FOR WATER RESOURCES

Land management agencies work to protect and enhance water resources within the Boise Foothills. Similarities and differences among agency policies are described in this section across four topic areas: ground water protection, floodways and surface water. Recommendations that come out of the Interagency Plan are intended to complement existing policies on agency land. Instead, the recommendations offer an overarching direction for approaching management of water resources in the Foothills as a whole.

GROUND WATER PROTECTION

State water quality standards are used as a baseline by all agencies except Ada and Boise counties. Ada County requires that any planned community application be accompanied by a plan that includes goals, policies, and development standards and administration information. In these cases, Boise and Ada counties require developers to provide descriptions of impacts on the environment, including impacts on ground water quality.

All agencies have established policies addressing ground water pollution and strive to maintain high standards for ground and surface water. Ada County specifically addresses the landfill facility in the Foothills management area and also requires independent studies for subsurface sewage disposal with separate studies for each development.

City and county agencies have specific ground water policies for development on private lands. The Agencies support efforts to maintain and enhance Foothills ground water resources to ensure that those resources are not degraded in the future.

FLOODWAYS

Generally, all agencies require the floodways to be protected for the maintenance of their proper function. Each agency except Boise County requires that any resources within floodways be restored after they have been altered through natural events or human activity, such as floods and fires. Ada County requires that any planned community application be accompanied by a plan that includes goals, policies, and development standards and administration information. The developer must provide a description of impacts on the environment, including impacts on the floodway and appropriate mitigation measures.

To protect resources, public safety, and water quality, City of Boise and Ada and Boise counties prohibit all structural development within the floodway. City of Boise and Ada County specifically require floodways to remain as open space or parks.

City of Boise, and both Ada and Boise counties, require coordination with other agencies and private landowners to ensure that water resources are considered in planning activities.

SURFACE WATER

IDWR and the DEQ manage surface water issues. All agencies require direct coordination with private and public landowners to effectively manage and protect surface water. Each agency provides specific policies and uses best management practices to protect water quality and restore beneficial uses. Beneficial use for the purposes of the Interagency Plan include factors such as coldwater aquatic life and primary and secondary contact recreation. (See State Code; Water Quality Standards 58.01.02.010.08 Beneficial Use.)

For more information on each agency's policies related to water resources in the Foothills management area, visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

POLICY DOCUMENTS

City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department. 1994. Foothills Plan Background Report.

City of Boise Public Works. 1999.

EDAW, CH2M Hill, Jensen-Belts Associates, Zabala Giltzow Albanese Architects. July 18, 1996. Reserves Master Plan (Hulls Gulch/Camel's Back Reserves).

Interagency Fire Team. 1996. Interagency Fire Rehabilitation Report. 43 pp. September.

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2010. Boise National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.
- Waag, C.J. 1987. Evaluation of the Boise Geothermal System. Idaho Department of Water Resources, Boise, ID. December.

INTERVIEWS AND OTHER SOURCES

Hortness, John. 1999. U.S. Geological Survey. Personal communication. December.

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. 2014. Aquifers. Available at: <https://www.deq.idaho.gov/water-quality/ground-water/aquifers.aspx>. Last accessed: September 25, 2014.

Squires, Ed. 2000. Hydro Logic Inc. Personal communication. January.

- Stone, Hawk. 2014. Water Quality Scientist, Idaho Dept. of Environmental Quality. Personal communication. November.
- Weston, Cheyne. 2012. Personal communication with Catherine Chertudi, City of Boise Environmental Program Manager, regarding geothermal aquifers in the Foothills management area. June 27.
- Weston, Cheyne. 2012. Personal communication with Sean Vincent, Hydrology Section Manager, IDWR. July 5.

Weston, Cheyne. 2012. Personal communication with Ed Hahen, Water Quality Manager, DEQ. July 5.

Weston, Cheyne. 2012. Personal communication with Marti Bridges. Stream and Lake Water Quality regarding beneficial uses in the Boise Foothills. July 9.

3-2 SOILS AND GEOLOGY IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Boise Foothills soils are found on predominately rolling to very steep hills. These hills grade to steep and very steep mountains in the northeastern portion of the Foothills. The major drainage in this area is Dry Creek, which originates near Little Deer Point. Numerous smaller streams run south or southwest through the canyons and gulches at regular intervals across the area. The soils of the Foothills can be separated into three major groups: granitic, lacustrine (lakebed), and fluvial soils. The Soil Survey of the Boise Front Project, Idaho, provides the most recent field data and should be the reference for soil maps, soil classifications, and land interpretation. The combination of steep slopes and highly erosive soils in the Foothills makes the area extremely sensitive to rill and gully erosion. Vegetative cover and organic matter in the soil are major factors in reducing erosion potential. Several areas of the Foothills are also susceptible to landslides and slope failures.

A few outcrops of hard rock are found within the Foothills management area. These rock outcrops provide scenic and historic value and unique wildlife habitat. Several faults also underlie the Foothills. Hazards from slope failures triggered by earthquakes should be considered a potential problem in the Foothills.

SOILS AND GEOLOGY IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

GENERAL SOILS

The soils of the Foothills can be separated into three major groups: granitic, lacustrine, (lakebed), and fluvial soils. These soils are moderately deep (20 to 40 inches [50.8 to 101.6 centimeters]) to very deep (more than 60 inches [1.5 meters]) although the soils on southern slopes are generally low in organic content and easily erode (Harkness, pers. comm. 2000).

Granitic Soils

Granitic soils occur at the middle to highest elevations (3,000 to 6,500 feet) of the Foothills. The soils, found on sloping to very steep hillsides, are well drained and moderately deep to very deep. Granitic soils are generally formed from the Cretaceous granitic rocks of the Idaho Batholith (see Figure 4). The surface textures for lower (3,000 to 5,700 feet) granitic soils include gravelly and nongravelly, loamy coarse sand and sandy loams. Surface textures for upper granitic soils (5,700 to 6,500 feet) are gravely



sandy loam and gravelly loams. The primary uses of mountain soils include rangeland, woodland, wildlife habitat and recreation (Collett 1980; Harkness 1997; Interagency Fire Team 1996).

Lacustrine Soils

Lacustrine soils occur at the lower to middle elevations (2,800 to 3,400 feet) and are generally described as nearly level to very steep. These soils are very deep and well drained to excessively drained and are generally formed from deposits of sand or silt (see Figure 4). The surface textures are sandy loams, loams, and silt loams. The primary uses of these soils are rangeland, wildlife habitat, and recreation. A few areas with less slope are cultivated (Collett 1980; Harness 1997; Interagency Fire Team 1996).



The hills in these areas are sometimes capped with arkossic sandstone, lava flows, or fan remnants made of late Pliocene volcaniclastic sediments (see Figure 4). These landforms are associated with landslides and slips (Harkness 1997).

Fluvial Soils

The soils in this group occur at the lowest elevations in the Foothills (below 2,700 feet) on nearly level to sloping alluvial fans, drainageways, draws, and stream terraces. These soils are very deep and somewhat poorly drained or well drained. The surface textures range from silt loam to gravelly sand. The parent material for these soils is recent alluvium from weathered granite and mixed sediments (see Figure 4). The primary uses for these soils are farming, urban development, and recreation (Collett 1980; Harkness 1997).



SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS

The soils in the Foothills are diverse and development depends on factors such as parent materials, elevation, slope, aspect, location, climate, vegetation, and time in place. The Soil Survey of Ada County Area, Idaho (Collett 1980) and Soil Survey of Boise Front Project, Idaho (Harkness 1997) provide detailed analysis of these soils. These surveys include data on soil types, mapping units, conditions, and suitability for different land and engineering uses. The Soil Survey of the Boise Front Project, Idaho (Harkness 1997) provides the most recent field data and should be the reference for soil maps, soil classifications, and interpretations.

EROSION

The combination of steep slopes, sparse vegetative cover on south-facing slopes, and highly erosive granitic and sedimentary soils in the Foothills makes the area highly susceptible to erosion. As a result, any disturbance of vegetation and soil surface leads to rill and gully erosion, which is now evident in the Foothills. Erosion can quickly advance a small rill to a large gully with a heavy climatic event. This type of erosion reduces soil stability, watershed function and values, and ground water recharge potential, and impacts



riparian vegetation. Scars from severe erosion can also reduce the attractiveness of the area as a scenic backdrop for viewers from the Boise vicinity and can reduce the quality of recreational activities (often by degrading trails).

Surface-disturbing activities including unrestricted motorized and nonmotorized vehicle use, unauthorized trails, road construction and maintenance, mineral extraction, certain rights-of-way, overgrazing, fire occurrence, and suppression activities can lead to undesirable vegetative changes and erosion.

No comprehensive documentation of erosion sites in the Foothills exists. Such information is needed to identify areas that need rehabilitation, to prevent further erosion damage, and to provide information that could be used to plan erosion-control areas. In many cases, unauthorized trails, overgrazing, and off-road vehicle use leaves soils exposed to erosion and invasion by noxious weeds (see also Recreation and Grazing chapters).

SLOPE

Slope is a major factor in determining erosion potential in the Foothills. As slope increases, so do the erosion potential and other environmental concerns related to erosion. Disturbance to the soil surface or vegetation increases erosion potential, especially on steeper slopes. The slope classification units and potential for erosion are discussed below (see also Figure 3):

- Slopes of 0 to 8% have fairly low erosion potential. The mapped distribution of this slope unit in the Foothills indicates that flatter areas mostly occur in gulches and on foot slopes and benches (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994; Harkness, pers. comm. 2000).
- Slopes of 8 to 15% are more susceptible to moderate erosion. The mapped distribution of this slope unit in the Foothills indicates that these slopes mostly occur on broad hill summits (City of Boise Planning and Development Department 1994; Harkness, pers. comm. 2000).
- Slopes of 16 to 25% are widely distributed across the Foothills. These areas are susceptible to erosion. Any soil disturbance in these areas requires grading, drainage, and erosion

control. The resulting cuts and fills increase the potential for environmental problems (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994).

• Slopes greater than 25% are considered highly erosive (Interagency Fire Team 1996). A slope angle of 14 degrees (slope grade of 25%) or greater appears to be the critical slope on which landslides can occur in the Foothills (Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994).

A Foothills map is presented in Figure 3 showing slope classification units: 0 to 8%, 8 to 15%, 15 to 25%, and greater than 25%. Table 4 provides a breakdown of Foothills acreage by slope, total area per unit, and percentage of total area.

Percent Slope	Erosion Potential Based on Slope	Total Acres	Percentage of Total Area
0 to 8	Fairly low	7,640	8.94
8 to 15	Susceptible to moderate erosion	11,162	13.06
15 to 25	Susceptible to erosion	19,458	22.77
Greater than 25	Highly erosive	47,175	55.21
Total		85,435	

TABLE 4 SLOPE CLASSIFICATION BY ACREAGE AND PERCENT OF TOTAL ARE.	TABLE 4 SLOPE C	LASSIFICATION BY	ACREAGE AND	PERCENT OF	TOTAL AREA
---	-----------------	------------------	-------------	------------	------------

Based on the data presented in Table 4, high percentages of area in the Foothills contain soils that are highly erosive and susceptible to erosion. Options for addressing erosion control in these areas should be considered a high priority for Interagency Plan.

VEGETATION

Vegetative cover and organic matter in the soil are major factors in reducing erosion potential. Vegetation holds the surface soils in place with roots, slows runoff, and reduces the chance of rill

and gully erosion. Good plant growth also increases the amount of organic matter in the soil, which also reduces erosion potential. Areas in the Foothills where vegetation has been disturbed or removed by fire or that have been overgrazed or affected by vehicles or other recreational activities are susceptible to erosion. Protection of the vegetation in the Foothills should be a high priority to planners to prevent soil erosion.

Aspect affects the vegetation density on slopes and should also be considered



during planning. Steep south- or west-facing slopes are commonly sparsely vegetated, which results in soils with low organic matter accumulations. The lack of vegetation can be attributed to

drought conditions caused by shallow soils, southern exposure, and runoff. The sparse vegetation, combined with slope, makes these soils highly erosive. Conversely, north- or east-facing slopes have deep, dark loamy soils protected by thicker vegetation. Vegetative growth results from the better soil-moisture regime related to a more favorable north or east exposure. These soils are more resilient to erosion because organic matter and vegetation are present.

The difference in aspects reflected through vegetation creates a lower potential for erosion on the north and east slopes than on the south- and west-facing slopes. Based on these observations, aspect is an important characteristic of the Foothills area, and specific standards, based on exposure, might need to be developed for activities that impact soils, (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994; Harkness, pers. comm. 2000).

LANDSLIDES

Several areas of the Foothills have experienced landslides in historic times, and there are several prehistoric landslide areas of uncertain stability. The volcanic materials of the eastern Foothills are particularly susceptible to slope instability; however, sedimentary materials underlying the western Foothills are also subject to slope failure under certain conditions. A slope angle of 14 degrees (slope grade of 25%) or greater appears to be the critical slope on which landslides may occur in the Foothills (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994). See Figure 3 for the location of landslides.

SLOPE FAILURES

Slope failures can be caused by excavating cuts or placing fills; altering drainage of water, drainfields, or wastewater disposal; irrigating landscaped areas; or having water lines that break. More often, movement is triggered by saturation of soils by water during storms or years of unusually high precipitation, such as in 1983 and 1984. Earthquakes can also trigger landslides, although the Boise area has not been subjected to intense shaking that would trigger slope failures within the 120-year historical record (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994).

GEOLOGY

The geology of the Foothills area can be subdivided into three general types: 1) upland areas underlain by the Idaho batholith granitic rock, 2) eastern Foothills partly underlain by volcanic materials, and 3) southwestern Foothills underlain mostly by friable silt and sand sediment. There are a few outcrops of hard rock within the Foothills management area. The most scenic examples are Table Rock, Castle Rock, Rocky Canyon, Dry Creek Valley, Daniel's Creek, and Stack Rock. Two sizable basalt lava flows exist - one east of Table Rock and the other north of Dry



Creek and west of Bogus Basin Road. The rest of the Foothills are rounded, fairly steep hills (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994). These rock outcrops provide scenic value and unique wildlife habitat.

The Foothills contain several faults, some having displacements of a few inches and others having displacements of 100 to 800 feet. Fault movement has occurred in the Boise Valley within the last 500,000 years. There is no evidence that these faults have moved within the last 11,000 years, nor have a significant number of small earthquakes occurred on any of the Foothills faults (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994). While information about faults and landslides is used primarily when planning for residential and other forms of development, it was considered in the plan to aid in planning recreation components such as trails. In many cases, avoidance of these areas is the best action. Figure 3 exhibits the fault lines in the Foothills.

The hazard from seismic shaking from an earthquake in a zone of more active faults, about 30 miles north of Boise, is presented. Hazards from slope failures in the Foothills triggered by earthquakes should be considered a potential problem in the Foothills (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994). These areas are identified and mapped in Figure 3.

THREATS TO SOILS AND GEOLOGY

The Foothills are susceptible to erosion because of existing slope, sparse vegetation, and easily erosive soils. Impacts on soil include activities that disturb the soil surface, deplete vegetation, or channel water that will accelerate erosion. Potential threats to soils are:

- Damage to existing vegetation— Damage to existing vegetation including soil biological crusts, which stabilize soil.
- Construction— Construction, including roads, removes existing soils and creates water drainages that can contribute to soil erosion.

- Improper drainage—Drainages that are not properly installed (such as culverts) can cause scouring and channelization that could develop into rill-and-gully erosion.
- Off-road and off-trail motorized and nonmotorized use—Off-road vehicles and off-trail activities can negatively affect vegetation and soil structure and initiate soil erosion.
- Rangeland livestock grazing—Domestic livestock can have negative impacts on plant populations and decrease soil stability.
- Wildfires—Wildfires remove vegetation and increase the potential for soil erosion.
- Surface disturbances—Surface disturbances such as mining or excavations can initiate soil erosion.
- Weed invasions—Establishment of weeds can increase erosion and affect the natural fire cycle.
- Transportation design—Road and trail placement and construction can increase vulnerability of slopes to erosion.
- Trail use—Overuse or misuse of trails can damage adjacent plant communities that help stabilize soils and prevent erosion.

POLICIES FOR SOILS AND GEOLOGY

Land management agencies work to protect soils within the Boise Foothills. Similarities and differences among agency policies related to stability and erosion potential are described in this section. Recommendations that come out of the Interagency Plan are not intended to supersede existing policies on agency land or policies that may be developed in the future. Instead, the recommendations offer an overarching direction for approaching management of erosion and soil stability in the Foothills as a whole.

STABILITY AND EROSION POTENTIAL

Each agency considers erosion a serious problem. Generally, each agency has policies to address erosion. Federal and state agencies provide a broader approach to erosion control by implementing policies covering all managed lands. City and county agencies have policies that address site-specific requirements for development of public and private lands.

Long-term Sustainability

Boise County, BLM, and USFS have policies to manage resources for long-term sustainability. However, it is generally a goal of all agencies to manage their lands for long-term use.

Coordination

IDFG require open communication with agencies and private landowners to reduce erosion and adjacent property runoff.

Revegetation

City of Boise, Ada County, and BLM require that areas disturbed during construction activities be revegetated. Ada County specifically requires revegetation of disturbed lands within one year.

City of Boise, Ada County, BLM, and USFS require proper design of facilities and developments to reduce erosion and on-site runoff.

For more information on each agency's policies related to soils and geology in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

POLICY DOCUMENTS

City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department. 1994. Foothills Plan Background Report.

Collett, Russell A. 1980. The Soil Survey of Ada County Area, Idaho. U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Harkness, Alan. 1997. Soil Survey of Boise Front Project, Idaho. U.S. Department of Agriculture. 192 pp.

INTERVIEWS AND OTHER SOURCES

Harkness, Alan. 2000. Natural Resource Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Personal communication to David Kordiyak, Special Dynamics. January 20.

Interagency Fire Team 1996.

3-3 PLANT COMMUNITIES, RARE PLANTS, AND NOXIOUS WEEDS IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The plant communities in the Boise Foothills can be divided into six major types: grasslands, upland shrub, mountain shrub, forested, riparian, and planted woodland groves. Grassland and upland shrub communities are found on the lower and mid-elevation slopes, mountain shrub and forested vegetation on the higher elevation slopes, riparian communities on the floodplains and in gulches, and planted woodland groves near the City. The locations of these community types are shown in Figure 5. Besides identifying the range of plant communities in the Foothills management area, there is also the need to identify populations of rare plants and noxious weeds for contrasting purposes.

Plant communities are important because they provide the following:

- Wildlife habitat
- Aesthetic values
- Erosion control
- Cultural values
- Water quality protection

PLANT COMMUNITIES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Foothills consist of predominantly rolling to very steep hills. Gently and moderately sloping stream terraces, draw bottoms, and alluvial fans adjacent to the drainageways at the low elevations grade to steep and very steep mountain. These topographic features provide a variety of conditions that support different native plant communities. Plant communities of the Foothills area can be divided into six major types: grasslands, upland shrub, mountain shrub, forested, riparian, and planted woodland groves. Grassland and upland shrub communities are found on the lower and mid-elevation slopes, mountain shrub and forested vegetation on the higher elevation slopes, riparian communities on the floodplains and in gulches, and planted woodland groves near the City. A general map of the Foothills vegetation is shown in Figure 5.

These plant communities provide wildlife habitat, ecological diversity, an attractant for pollinators, erosion control, and water-quality protection. The ecological condition of the vegetation in the Foothills ranges from poor to excellent. Generally, on the lower slopes of the Foothills, much of the native vegetation has been depleted from heavy grazing that occurred primarily in the late 1800s and early 1900s and more recently by frequent fires. In contrast, the rangelands and forests at higher elevations are more likely dominated by native vegetation. Annual grasses and other weeds have since replaced much of the native vegetation (United States Department of Agriculture 1997).

MAJOR VEGETATION TYPES

The six major vegetation types in the Foothills are described below.

Grasslands

Grasslands are a dominant plant community on the lower elevation slopes and are composed of lacustrine, or lakebed, soils. Grazing and fire on the lower slopes has eliminated much of the former native shrub and grass vegetation, leaving dense stands of annual grasses. These annual grasses

include cheatgrass on sandy soils and medusahead on soils with higher clay content. Exotic species and state-listed noxious weeds have also impacted the grasslands. The most significant noxious forb is rush skeletonweed (Interagency Fire Team 1996).

Remnants of native vegetation remain in some lower Foothills areas where upland shrub and grass communities include bitterbrush, sagebrush, and rabbitbrush as the primary shrub species. Perennial grasses include threeawn, bottlebrush squirreltail, Indian ricegrass, Great Basin wildrye, Thurber's needlegrass, Idaho fescue, Sandberg's bluegrass, and bluebunch wheat grass (Orton, pers. comm. 2014).

Upland Shrub Communities

The sagebrush and bitterbrush upland shrub communities are prevalent on midelevation grazing and fires have altered the native composition of these communities. Thus, the existing shrub communities are represented in a patchwork of remnant native shrub communities. Herb compositions of these shrub communities range from native to exotic species. Upland shrub populations on the northeast aspects appear to be more resilient to burns and weed invasions (Mancuso 1999).



The Interagency Fire Rehabilitation Report (1996) identified shrub communities in good to excellent condition that included big sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass- Thurber's needlegrass on many south aspects and bitterbrush/bluebunch wheatgrass on shallow, rocky areas with south aspects. North aspects supported a big sagebrush/Idaho fescue community type. Vegetation determined to be in poor to fair condition was characterized by increased coverage of threeawn grass, Sandberg's bluegrass, and rabbitbrush. With increasing elevation, granitic soil plant community types become mixed shrub/grassland complexes dominated by rose, ninebark,

buckbrush, chokecherry, and mountain sagebrush. Forb diversity in these transitional communities was high.

Forested

Forested areas are present in the upper elevations of the Foothills on granitic soils. The Interagency Fire Rehabilitation Report (1996) found that plant community compositions in the forested areas included Douglas fir/ninebark communities on the north aspects, while ponderosa pine with understories of bitterbrush, bluebunch



wheatgrass, and Idaho fescue were found on dry or rocky sites.

Mountain Shrub

Mountain shrub areas are frequently adjacent to forested areas in the upper elevations of the Foothills. These shrub communities are dominated by chokecherry, bitter cherry, bitterbrush, and bluebunch wheatgrass. Mountain shrub communities also include aspen, serviceberry, mountain maple, ninebark, and snowbrush.

Riparian

Riparian plant communities are associated with perennial and intermittent streams throughout the Foothills. Lower elevation riparian zones generally have tree canopies dominated by black cottonwood with box elder, elm, water birch, and peach leaf willows. The shrub layer is dominated by willows (coyote and arroyo), golden currant, thin-leaf alder, black hawthorn, red-osier dogwood, poison ivy, honeysuckle, and Woods' rose. Riparian zones in the mid-to upper elevations



generally do not have a tree canopy, but are dominated by the willows and shrubs listed above. Detailed compositions of several riparian plant communities are documented in Moseley et al. 1992.

Emergent wetlands are also found within the riparian zones in the Foothills. Willows, cattails, and sedges generally dominate the vegetation in these areas. Standing water can be found in some areas. Grazing and drought have reduced the extent of the wetlands (*Reserves Master Plan: Hulls Gulch/Camel's Back Reserve and Military Reserve* 1996). National Wetland Inventory maps for the Foothills are available, but were not reviewed for this effort.

Planted Woodland Groves

Planted woodland groves, consisting of exotic tree plantings, are located in the lower Foothills adjacent to the city. Tree species that occur in this mix include black locust, silver maple, tree of heaven, Scotch pine, linden, Norway maple, and oak. One example of this community type is restricted to the flats east of the lower water tank in Hulls Gulch. Introduced trees in the groves show little evidence of regeneration. The understory is primarily a mixture of annual and perennial grasses (*Reserves Master Plan: Hulls Gulch/Camel's Back Reserve and Military Reserve* 1996).



The plant communities described above give a general overview of vegetation diversity in the Foothills. The native communities should be protected to provide native vegetation, wildlife habitat, erosion control, and water-quality functions in the ecosystem. The vegetation map provided in Figure 5 illustrates the locations of the major plant communities in the Foothills and can be used as a tool for open space planning. Further research needs to be conducted to classify existing vegetation in detail. Such an analysis would provide important planning information including locations of important native plant populations, existing high- and low-quality wildlife habitat, potential erosion-control areas, and possible fire hazards.

Additional research would also provide further information on the following climax plant communities, those that are stable and self-perpetuating, that soils data indicate could exist in the Foothills (Boise Front CRMP 1996):

- Basin big sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass
- Basin big sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass-Thurber's needlegrass
- Basin big sagebrush/big basin wild rye
- Basin big sagebrush-bitterbrush/needle-and-thread grass
- Sagebrush-bitterbrush/bluebunch wheatgrass
- Sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass
- Sagebrush/Idaho fescue

The identification of these climax communities would indicate additional areas to preserve.

SENSITIVE PLANT COMMUNITIES

Riparian

The major drainages and numerous smaller drainages support riparian vegetation in the Foothills. The quality, variety, length, width, and distribution of these riparian communities depend on the availability of water, drainage topography, aspect, and extent of surface disturbance in the riparian zone. The best-developed examples are primarily located in longer and deeper Foothills gulches that support perennial streams. Riparian areas are shown in Figures 5 and 12.

Riparian plant communities are ecologically important in the Foothills. Because they provide wildlife habitat, diverse plant communities, water quality protection, and flood control, these communities should be preserved. In the past, the riparian areas in the Foothills have been disturbed by overgrazing livestock, fires, off-road vehicles, recreational uses, and urban development. In addition, riparian vegetation zones that protect streams and provide habitat for wildlife have been lost. This loss is also a concern because of possible impacts on flood control and aquifer recharge (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994).

Bitterbrush/Needle-and-thread Grass Community Type

The bitterbrush/needle-and-thread grass (*Purshia tridentata/Stipa comata*) community type is restricted to the Columbia Basin in Washington, Oregon, and adjacent British Columbia, and is scattered along the northern edge of the western Snake River Plain. Humans have significantly disturbed bitterbrush/needle-and-thread grass communities throughout their range. Therefore, occurrences of high ecological quality are rare. Small ecologically viable stands of this community

could still occur in the Foothills, but Moseley et al. (1992) did not find any large examples in the lower Foothills.

RARE PLANT SPECIES

Three rare plant species, Aase's onion (*Allium aaseae*), Mulford's milkvetch (*Astragalus mulfordiae*), and slick-spot peppergrass (*Lepidium papilliferum*), are found in the Foothills. Wilcox's primrose (*Primula wilcoxianana*), previously considered rare, is now considered *Primula cusickiana*, a very common primrose species in Idaho. In addition, one rare lichen species, Compact earth lichen (*Catapyrenium congestum*) is found in the Foothills. Most of the known populations of these plants occur below the contact between the granitic rocks of the Idaho batholith and the sediments of the lower Foothills. All three rare plant species and the lichen are susceptible to disturbance and do not regenerate easily. Once a rare plant population is disturbed or destroyed, it seldom recovers. Therefore, protecting the existing populations is the best method for conserving these species. The plants are an important biological resource due to their rarity and uniqueness.

Descriptions

Aase's Onion (Allium Aaseae). Aase's onion populations in the Foothills comprise approximately half of the global distribution of the species in terms of both area and numbers. Aase's onion is restricted to steep, well-drained sandy slopes in the lower Foothills between Boise and Weiser. Populations of Aase's onion are found on many of the undeveloped, sandy, south-facing slopes. These populations can be quite dense, but the total area occupied by the onion is relatively small. Habitat loss and degradation caused by development and



other activities are the main threats to this species (Moseley et al. 1992). See Figure 6 for Boise Foothills locations of Aase's onion populations.

Mulford's Milkvetch (Astragalus mulfordiae). Mulford's milkvetch is a deep-rooted member of the pea family found in three widely separated areas in southwestern Idaho and adjacent Oregon. It occurs on sandy south- to west-facing slopes. Habitat loss and degradation caused by development and other activities are the main threats to this species (Moseley et al. 1992). See Figure 6 for Foothills locations of Mulford's milkvetch populations.

Slick-spot Peppergrass (Lepidium papilliferum). Slick-spot peppergrass is one of Idaho's highest priority plant conservation concerns. This small annual and biennial plant species in the mustard family, endemic to southwestern Idaho, was thought to be extinct until the rediscovery in the Foothills in 1972. Its primary range is the western Snake River Plain and adjacent Foothills. Slick-spot peppergrass is restricted to small openings called nitric sites, mini-playas, playettes, or slick spots in the region's sagebrush- grassland ecosystem. Much of the native habitat has been
destroyed or seriously degraded by agricultural conversions, housing developments, weed invasions, wildfires, and pasture seeding (Mancuso et al. 1998). See Figure 6 for Foothills locations of slick-spot peppergrass populations.

Wilcox's Primrose (Primula wilcoxianana). This plant was previously considered rare, but the most updated taxonomic data (2001) no longer supports this as a separate species. It is now considered *Primula cusickiana*, a very common primrose species in Idaho. *Primula wilcoxiana* is no longer recognized by the Idaho Native Plant Society (INPS). Since it is a common and stable species, INPS and IDFG does not track or list *Primula cusickiana* as a rare plant species. However, INPS feels that the Boise Foothills populations of this species grow in a unique habitat compared with other occurrences and that it contains important genetic diversity for the species as a whole. Ultimately, the species is stable and very common through the rest of Idaho.

Compact Earth Lichen. There are only six records of this very rare lichen in Idaho. One of the occurrences is in the Boise Foothills. Otherwise, it has only been found once in Utah and Wyoming. The lichen is a biological crust and occurs in the upland shrub plant community with sagebrush. It is restricted to barren, slightly nitric soil habitat similar to slick-spot peppergrass. This species is currently ranked 'S2' priority by INPS and is a BLM sensitive species. It is currently under threat of livestock trampling and other disturbances to the biological crust layer.

Status

Aase's onion and Mulford's milkvetch are presently listed as federal species of concern and BLM sensitive species. Compact earth lichen is also listed as a BLM sensitive species. A species is listed as a federal species of concern when available information supports tracking the status and any threats to its livelihood. Sensitive species are species of conservation concern for the BLM. As of October 2014, the USFWS considers slickspot peppergrass a proposed species for listing with proposed critical habitat. INPS still considers this a rare and threatened plant species. A species is



designated a candidate species when sufficient biological vulnerability and threat information is on file to support the issuance of a proposed rule to list the species under the Endangered Species Act. Idaho's special status vascular and nonvascular plants are tracked and ranked based on occurrences and threats through the IDFG's Natural Heritage Program.

NOXIOUS WEEDS

Noxious weeds are exotic plant species that invade and displace desirable native vegetation. Noxious weeds in the Foothills are typically spread through the dispersal of seed or plant parts. Wind, water, animals, machinery, and people carry seeds/ plant parts from one location to another, broadening the range where weeds establish. Roads, farming, grazing, logging, urban development, natural erosion, dog waste, and recreation disturb soils in the Foothills. The disturbed soil provides prime habitat for weeds. After taking hold, these weeds aggressively compete with native plants for moisture, nutrients, space, and sunlight. Established weed populations damage the ecosystem because they form monocultures that eliminate diverse native communities, increase erosion, diminish native forage production for herbivores, reduce native wildlife habitats, and alter natural fire frequencies and intensities. In addition,



some species have toxins that harm wildlife. Currently, weeds are spreading in the Foothills; without weed management programs, these aggressive plants will continue to degrade the Foothills ecosystems.

According to Environmental Conservation Services' 2008 report to the City of Boise, infestations of noxious weeds in the Foothills include rush skeletonweed, whitetop, Canada thistle, Scotch thistle, field bindweed, puncturevine, poison hemlock, houndstongue, saltcedar, jointed goatgrass, and purple loosestrife. In addition, the Boise Parks and Recreation Department has identified cornflower/bachelor's button. Of these species, rush skeletonweed is the most pervasive, and causes the most damage to the Foothills ecosystem (Environmental Conservation Services Inc. 2008). Also, exotic grasses such as medusahead and cheatgrass, have proliferated within the Foothills ecosystems and are now the dominate plant species (Environmental Conservation Services Inc. 2008). Cheatgrass and medusahead significantly increase both the frequency and intensity of wildfires by providing annually abundant, continuous, and extremely flammable fuel early in the fire season (Wilbur 1999). Both of these annual grasses thrive in recently burned areas or disturbed areas and quickly establish before native plant communities recover. This sets up a rapid cycle of wildfire (disturbance) and cheatgrass/medusahead advancement across the Foothills. Controlling the spread of noxious weeds is Ada County Weed Control's (ACWC) primary objective. Public land management agencies in the Foothills use ACWC, internal resources, volunteers, and other contractors for weed control, consultation on best practices for dealing with infestations, and population mapping in the Foothills. Currently, the City of Boise employs a number of techniques for managing weeds within the Foothills. These techniques include, but are not limited to, herbicide applications, hand pulling, mechanically removing (e.g., mowing and weed whacking), and strategic grazing.

All of ACWC's vehicles are equipped with GIS/GPS technology to help workers quickly identify and track noxious weed infestations throughout Ada County. Some of the Foothills management area includes Boise County. Spotted knapweed is the most prevalent noxious weed in that county. Spotted knapweed has only been found in small pockets in Ada County such as along Shingle Creek and Highway 21 in the Boise River WMA.

In 2008, the City of Boise conducted a weed survey of eight City-owned reserves/properties totaling 2,547 acres to better understand the variety of species found and their extent on City property. BLM has a program to develop best management practices for the control of rush skeletonweed. Initial studies are using infrared mapping techniques and seed trial plot data to identify infestations. Overall, proper weed management in the Foothills will depend on completion of a weed survey across all public lands and reducing the spread of established species while eliminating the infestations of any new species.

RESERVES

Because of their proximity to Boise, native grassland, upland shrub, and riparian plant communities in the Foothills have been affected by grazing, weeds, fire, and development. Reserves are one way of conserving rare plants and native plant communities to ensure that some quality habitat can be protected. Moseley (1996) designed a system of eight conservation reserves. Five of these are within the boundaries of the Foothills management area. All have high-quality habitat containing large populations of one to three rare species, and except for one, all have public land at their cores and have never been developed. These potential conservation reserve areas are Military Reserve, Hulls Gulch Reserve, Stewart Gulch, Seaman's Gulch, and Cartwright Canyon – Polecat Gulch Reserve. Over the last decade, the City of Boise has protected lands adjacent to Military Reserve and Hulls Gulch Reserve while also protecting lands in Cartwright Canyon, creating a new reserve called Polecat Gulch Reserve.

In another effort, the City of Boise Heritage Committee completed a study in 1993. The ensuing report identified and prioritized parcels that should be preserved as public open space because of available wildlife habitat or because of their unique environmental, recreational, aesthetic, or historical characteristics or value. The study identified 19 parcels associated with rare plants, riparian vegetation, or wildlife habitat in the Foothills that should be considered for preservation. However, the report only identified parcels within the City of Boise Area of Impact of 1993. Refer to the *Potential Public Preservation Sites* report for a description of these sites.

The City of Boise Heritage Committee study and Moseley's 1996 research indicate areas of opportunity for the preservation of native plant communities, rare plants, wildlife habitat, and open

space. These areas have been and should be considered for conservation as City-owned and managed open space reserves.

THREATS TO PLANT COMMUNITIES

Grazing, urbanization, and irrigation have already contributed to the degradation, fragmentation, and conversion of native sagebrush steppe. In addition, development in the Foothills threatens the rare plant populations and native plant communities. The following threats were identified by Moseley (1989), Mancuso and Moseley (1991), Rosentreter (1992), and Moseley et al. (1998) and continue to affect the native plant communities and rare plant populations in the Foothills:

- Off-highway vehicle recreation—Off-road and off-trail activities harm populations of rare species by compacting soils and initiating erosion.
- Residential developments—Building construction, including roads, destroys existing habitat for rare plant species.
- Weed invasions—Competition from weeds, including exotic grasses, reduces vigor and excludes native plant populations. Weeds also contribute to a loss of native wildlife habitats because they compete with native vegetation, increase erosion, displace native species, and affect the natural fire cycle.
- Rangeland livestock grazing and both horseback riding and dogs traveling offtrail—Grazing, trampling, and digging by domestic livestock, horses, and dogs disturb rare plant populations.
- Mining—Populations have been threatened in areas by silica sand mining operations.
- Wildfires—Wildfires convert sagebrush to annual grasslands that replace native communities.
- Mechanical disturbances—Mechanical disturbances to the soil caused by rehabilitation efforts such as tilling and reseeding can harm rare species populations.

POLICIES FOR PLANT COMMUNITIES

Agency Representatives referenced existing agency policies to develop objectives and recommendations for the Interagency Plan. Similarities and differences among agency policies are described in this section across three topic areas: plant communities, rare plants, and weeds. Recommendations that come out of the Interagency Plan are not intended to supersede existing policies on agency land. Instead, the recommendations offer an overarching direction for approaching plant communities in the Foothills as a whole.

PROTECTION OF NATIVE AND SENSITIVE PLANTS

Each agency recognizes the importance of protecting native and sensitive plants for maintaining natural heritage, reducing erosion, protecting water quality, and providing cover for wildlife. The BLM and USFS designate riparian buffer zones and restrict streamside activities to protect water quality and riparian diversity, while allowing activities outside those buffer zones. City of Boise and Ada County encourage the use of native plants in landscaping projects adjacent to Foothills open lands and the protection of existing riparian species.

3. BACKGROUNDENVIRONMENT

All agencies recognize the importance of the riparian areas. However, the BLM and USFS provide specific policies on the protection of this area. The BLM was the only agency identified that requires wetland and riparian areas to meet state and federal standards; however, in its land and resource management plan, the USFS does identify resource standards that meet or exceed state water quality standards. All other agencies, however, have policies that require protection of riparian areas or direct coordination with adjacent landowners for riparian protection.

There are two different interpretations of the riparian buffer zone. The BLM restricts nearly all activities from the riparian area, dependent on the foreseeable risks posed by activities. For example, the BLM does not allow new roads, grazing, or timber harvest activities within 100 feet of streams, nor is mineral extraction or petroleum exploration allowed within 500 feet, though the probability of these activities occurring in the Foothills is low. The BLM withholds areas with endangered, threatened, or sensitive species from agricultural use such as grazing, since such use could further jeopardize those species. The BLM also recommends fencing or artificial off-stream pools for livestock watering to prevent livestock from accessing open waters.

The USFS opposes new road construction within the buffer zone, but allows activities compatible with existing riparian areas. In this way, the USFS embraces multiple uses, with its emphasis on active agency management and use of resources.

IDFG, Boise and Ada Counties, and City of Boise do not recognize or advocate the development and implementation of buffer zones. Rather, activities are reviewed on a site-specific basis.

Boise Parks and Recreation does not currently have a management plan for the 4,000 acres of open space reserves they own and manage. However, a recommendation of the Interagency Plan is to work with the public to create one in the next year or two.

NOXIOUS WEEDS

The city, state, and federal agencies advocate cooperation with county-level agencies on the inventory and identification of noxious weeds and steps for control and eradication. Ada and Boise Counties and the IDFG do not have policies related to noxious weed control, but according to ID Code 22-2407, Idaho property owners carry the primary burden of controlling noxious weeds on their land. County Weed Department staff in Ada and Boise Counties may only treat noxious weeds on private property if the landowner fails to fully mitigate the situation. ACWC has comprehensive and coordinated programs for prevention, eradication, and management of noxious weeds. Boise County teams with the Idaho Department of Agriculture on occasion to fund assistance to area landowners treating knapweed.

Federal agencies recommend close cooperation with other agencies on noxious weed removal and control, including state, county, and local organizations, where applicable. Depending on the plant species and the local environment, recommended means for weed control include physical removal, reintroduction of native plants, and use of herbicides.

For more information on each agency's policies related to plant communities in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

POLICY DOCUMENTS

AdaCounty.id.gov/Weed_Control.

Belnap, J., R. Rosentreter, S. Leonard, J. Kaltenecker, J. Williams, and D. Eldridge. 2001. Biological soil crusts: Ecology and Management. Technical Reference 1730-2. U.S. Government Printing Office, Denver, Colorado.

Boise County.us

- Boise Front CRMP Report. 1996. Report for the Cooperative Development of a Wildlife and Landscape Watershed Analysis for the Boise Foothills. Unfinished draft report.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). March 1999. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. Unpublished report. Boise District Office, Boise, ID.
- City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department. 1994. Foothills Plan Background Report.
- City of Boise Heritage Preservation Committee. February 1993. Potential Public Preservation Sites. 22 pp.
- Debolt, Ann and Roger Rosentreter. 1998. An Illustrated Guide to Sensitive Plants of the Boise District Bureau of Land Management. Technical bulletin. Idaho BLM.
- Department of Fish and Game, Boise. (Idaho Natural Heritage Data is managed within IFWIS, Idaho Fish and Wildlife Information System, Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game).
- Environmental Conservation Services, Inc. 2008. Boise Parks and Recreation Foothills Noxious Weed Inventory.
- https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/page/species-status-lists
- https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/sites/ifwis/files/user/idfgjstrickland/INHP_Tracked_Plant_Species--2014.pdf
- Idaho Fish and Wildlife Information System. Plant Element Occurrence Database. Idaho.

Interagency Fire Team. September 1996. Interagency Fire Rehabilitation Report. 43 pp.

- Mancuso, M. and R. Moseley. 1991. Field Investigation of *Allium aaseae* (Aase's Onion) on the Boise National Forest. Conservation Data Center, Nongame/Endangered Wildlife Program, Idaho Department of Fish and Game.
- Mancuso, M., C. Murphy, and R. Moseley. 1998. Assessing and Monitoring Habitat Integrity for *Lepidium papilliferum* (Slick-spot Peppergrass) in the Sagebrush-Steppe of Southwestern Idaho. Prepared for the State of Idaho, Military Division.
- Moseley, R. 1989. Report on the Conservation Status of *Astragulus mulfordiae* in Idaho. Natural Heritage Section, Nongame Fish and Wildlife/Endangered Species Program, Idaho Department of Fish and Game.
- Moseley, Robert. 1996. Conservation Reserves for Threatened Plants in the Boise Foothills. Unpublished report.
- Rosentreter, R., M. Bowker, and J. Belnap. 2007. A Field Guide to Biological Soil Crusts of Western U.S. Drylands. U.S. Government Printing Office, Denver, Colorado.
- Rosentreter, Roger. 1992. Displacement of Rare Plants by Exotic Grasses. Presented at Symposium of Ecology, Management and Restoration of Intermountain Annual Rangelands. 6 pp.
- Shultz, L. 2012. Pocket Guide to Sagebrush. PRBO Conservation Science.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2010. Boise National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1997. Soil Survey of Boise Front Project, Idaho. 192 Pages.
- Utz, J., M. Pellant, and J. Gardetto. 2013. A Field Guide to the Plants of the Boise Foothills. Healthy Hills Initiative.

INTERVIEWS AND OTHER SOURCES

- Fulkerson, Justin. 2012. Personal communication through the Idaho Native Plant Society to Julia Grant, City of Boise. September.
- Mancuso, Mike. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. December 13, 1999. Personal communication to David Kordiyak, Spatial Dynamics.
- Orton, LaMar. Idaho Native Plant Society. 2014. Personal communication to Julia Grant, City of Boise Foothills and Open Space Manager. October 15.
- Wilbur, Brian. Ada County Weed and Pest Control. December 16, 1999. Personal communication to David Kordiyak, Spatial Dynamics.

3-4 WILDLIFE IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Boise Foothills ecosystem supports populations of more than 290 wildlife species. Among these are large wintering populations of mule deer and elk, migrating raptors and neotropical birds, and several rare or otherwise special status species. More than 200 species of birds use the Foothills at various times of the year. Golden eagles and other raptors hunt in the open sagebrush and grasslands year-round. During winter, bald eagles frequent the Foothills to scavenge on winter-killed carcasses of mule deer and elk.

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game's 1998 aerial survey and the sightability model estimated the number of mule deer using the crucial winter range of the project to be approximately 6,060. Other big game found in the Foothills are Rocky Mountain elk, whitetail deer, black bear, mountain lion, and pronghorn antelope. Critical winter habitat for Foothills big game includes south-facing slopes, ridgetops, saddles, riparian areas, and, for mule deer, areas below 4,500 feet in elevation.

Foothills streams, springs, and seeps, which provide a valuable resource to wildlife, are limited in number and location. Wildlife corridors are located within or adjacent to many of the riparian areas associated with perennial and intermittent streams. However, increased urbanization, intensified recreational activity, and other uses within the Foothills have fragmented habitat, disrupted wildlife travel corridors, eliminated key habitats such as riparian zones, and reduced habitat diversity.

Although certain habitats essential to large numbers of wildlife species are known to exist in the Foothills, no comprehensive scientific evaluation of wildlife habitat has been completed for the Foothills management area.

Nearly 300 species of wild animals can be found in the Foothills during the course of a year. Notable among these are large wintering populations of mule deer and elk; migrating raptors and neotropical birds (those that migrate south to Central America, the West Indies, or South America); lizards; snakes; amphibians; and several rare or otherwise special status species. For wildlife populations to continue to thrive, core habitats that supply sufficient food, security cover, thermal cover, water, and space must be available for them to use every day. Appendix A lists wildlife species known to occur in the Hulls Gulch Nature Preserve and adjacent Foothills.

Wildlife species in the Foothills are sensitive to the impacts of residential development and associated human encroachments into important habitat areas. The size and diversity of Foothills wildlife populations will be influenced by the amount of land that remains undeveloped or that is reserved in large continuous blocks or linear bands and how and when people use the Foothills for recreation. The continued presence of sensitive animal species will be determined by how their habitats are managed, especially core habitat areas such as riparian zones, wetlands, and sagebrush steppe. Protection, improvement, and management of wildlife habitat in the Foothills will be necessary to maintain viable, healthy, and diverse numbers of wildlife species in and around Boise's urbanized area.

FOOTHILLS WILDLIFE SPECIES

From about November to April, the Foothills are a crucial winter range for 6,000 to 8,000 mule deer. The population density of mule deer is greatest near the Boise River WMA in the eastern part of the Foothills management area (see Figure 7). A small number of mule deer are year-round residents of the Foothills; however, the majority migrate from summer ranges as far away as the Sawtooth Mountains. The Highland Valley and Shaw Mountain roads, in the eastern part of the Foothills management area, are closed to motorized vehicles from November 16 until May 1 to protect this population of wintering mule deer.

3. BACKGROUNDENVIRONMENT

A population of Rocky Mountain elk also depends on the Foothills. As with mule deer, the elk primarily use the Foothills during the winter, but the number of year-round residents is increasing. The Foothills winter elk population ranges from a few hundred to several thousand (Bottum, pers. comm. 2012).

Although less common, other Foothills big game include whitetail deer, pronghorn antelope, black bear, mountain lion, and gray wolf (Bottum, pers. comm. 2012).

A great variety of smaller mammals also inhabit the Foothills. These include bobcat, coyote, mink, muskrat, raccoon, weasel, skunk, badger, red fox, yellow-bellied marmot, hare, rabbit, mouse, rat, squirrel, gopher, vole, shrew, and bat. Some of these wildlife species prefer upland sites, while

others often inhabit riparian and wetland areas (EDAW et al. 1996).

Upland game birds found in the Foothills management area include quail, dove, chukar, gray partridge, and grouse. Quail are prevalent throughout the Foothills, especially in urbanized areas. Chukar inhabit rocky areas and grassy hillsides. Blue and ruffed grouse are sometimes found in the mixed coniferous and riparian and sagebrush areas in the upper elevations of the Foothills (City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994).



Approximately 214 species of birds use the Foothills at various times of the year. The variety of vegetation found in the Foothills provides the habitat to support these birds during various stages of their life cycle by providing food and cover. Mountain shrub community habitat along the Boise Ridge is used annually by migrating populations of raptors and neotropical birds. Some Foothills bird species, such as Brewer's sparrow and sage thrasher, require stands of sagebrush for nesting and rearing their young. In addition, various rock outcrops and cliffs, such as the basalt cliffs along State Highway 21 near Lucky Peak Reservoir, provide nesting habitat for raptors and other birds.

The Foothills also support a variety of amphibians and reptiles. Amphibians depend directly upon the riparian wetlands for food, cover, and a place to breed and hibernate. Some amphibians only use the wetlands for one essential segment of their life cycle and then move to other habitats. Reptiles are directly dependent on the water, upland shrub and grass, and woodlands for habitat (EDAW et al. 1996).

Reports indicate that a fishery exists in Mores Creek and the upper, perennial reaches of Dry Creek (Zoellick, pers. comm. 2000). No completed studies quantify or discuss the potential for Foothills fisheries.

A number of rare or otherwise special status species are found in the Foothills at various times of the year:

- Bald eagles are found year-round along the Boise River, where they hunt fish and waterfowl. Bald eagles also scavenge on winter-killed carcasses of big game animals in the open sagebrush areas at the Foothills.
- Though infrequent visitors to the Foothills, migrating ferruginous hawks can be found along the Boise Ridge. Merlin, another uncommon raptor species, is also known to migrate along the Boise Ridge.
- Flammulated owls nest in the Foothills. They prefer to nest in relatively mature stands of conifers near brushy fields.
- IDFG has indicated the presence of the gray wolf in the Foothills and IDFG staff have indicated a dramatic increase in sightings. However, there has been no actual confirmation (that is, no wolves have been found dead, radioed, or trapped) (Rachel, pers. comm. 2000).
- IDFG has indicated the presence of turkeys in the Foothills. Most turkey populations are associated with the upper coniferous and mountain shrub transition zones in the Foothills (Gould, pers. comm. 2000).
- Each spring, populations of long-billed curlew migrate from Argentina to the Foothills area to nest. This large shorebird nests and raises its young in annual grass habitat on open slopes and swales. IDFG has designated this bird as a species of special concern.
- Townsend's big-eared bats roost in caves and rocky outcroppings. They require separate nursery roosts and hibernation roosts. They are adversely affected by disturbances, especially during the winter.
- Other special status species found in the Foothills include lesser goldfinch, Merriam's shrew, western small-footed myotis, pallid bat, and western ground snake.

See Appendix A for a list of wildlife species found in Hulls Gulch Reserve.

WILDLIFE HABITAT

Wildlife species that inhabit the Foothills, either seasonally or year-round, rely on a variety of habitats to provide essential food, water, security cover, thermal cover, nesting or rearing sites, and movement corridors. These habitats largely determine the species, density, season of use, breeding success, and, ultimately, the continued survival of wildlife in the Foothills. Key habitat features are vegetation, slope, aspect, elevation, soil types, topography, and precipitation. The dominant Foothills vegetation communities are shown in Figure 5.

Not all types of vegetation are suitable for every wildlife species. Mule deer seek succulent, easily digestible forage. On winter range, mule deer prefer to browse on shrubs, but also feed on annual and perennial grasses and perennial forbs. Elk are capable of digesting much more coarse forage and in winter will browse on



dried grasses and shrubs. Elk are also able to forage more effectively in deeper snow than mule deer.

Although certain habitat types essential to large numbers of wildlife species are known to exist in the Foothills, no comprehensive scientific evaluation of wildlife habitat has been completed for the Foothills management area. Therefore, in most cases, all parts of the Foothills that could be essential for the continued survival of a particular group of wildlife species have not been conclusively identified.

The most extensive assessment of the Foothills to identify areas of significant wildlife habitat was undertaken for the *Boise Foothills Policy Plan* (City of Boise 1997). In the study report, IDFG identified areas with a combination of characteristics considered important for maintaining (and enhancing) many existing Foothills wildlife populations. These characteristics include south-facing slopes, elevations low enough to remain free of deep snows most of the winter, ridge lines that provide habitat for elk and mule deer, riparian areas, saddles, rock outcrops, and healthy stands of shrubs. Because of a lack of other data, many of the characteristics evaluated to determine habitat significance and identified in the *Boise Foothills Policy Plan* (City of Boise 1997) are those important to wintering big game animals. While these areas are undoubtedly important to other species groups, the assessment of Foothills wildlife habitat remains incomplete.

The results of an IDFG evaluation of big game winter range in the Foothills are shown in Figure 7. This evaluation ranked or prioritized sections of the Foothills management areas according to the following biological information regarding the wintering mule deer and elk populations:

- The entire Foothills management area is considered big game winter range.
- Mule deer densities tend to be highest in the eastern Foothills and become less dense to the west. Elk densities are greatest at the higher elevations in the Foothills.
- Elk can tolerate a wider range of snow and temperatures on their winter range than mule deer.
- Winter range below approximately 4,500 feet is more critical to mule deer survival than winter range above this elevation.
- Because of the relative scarcity of surface water and because they facilitate wildlife movement, riparian zones associated with perennial and intermittent streams are essential components of Foothills big game winter range.
- Areas in which the vegetation is composed of predominantly shrubs and grasses are more important to wintering mule deer than areas composed of only grasses.
- Areas in which the vegetation is composed of predominantly perennial grasses and forbs are more important to wintering mule deer than areas dominated by annual grasses. The perennial grass and forb areas have greater shrub recovery potential.

Based on this information, the *Boise Foothills Policy Plan* divided the Foothills management area into eight big game winter range areas, each prioritized on a scale of 1 to 4. These areas are shown in Figure 7 and their rankings are described as follows:

- 1st Priority All riparian vegetation communities
 - East of 8th Street and below 4,500 feet in elevation
- 2nd Priority East of 8th Street and above 4,500 feet in elevation

- From 8th Street to Bogus Basin Road and below 4,500 feet in elevation
- West of Bogus Basin Road and preferred elk winter range

3rd Priority

- From 8th Street to Bogus Basin Road and above 4,500 feet in elevation
 - West of Bogus Basin Road and below 4,500 feet in elevation

4th Priority • West of Bogus Basin Road and above 4,500 feet in elevation

Critical winter habitat areas for big game are south-facing slopes, ridge tops, saddles, riparian corridors, and areas below approximately 4,500 feet in elevation. Mule deer normally follow the snow line up and down the slopes to graze on shrubs, grasses, and forbs in the winter and spring.

Areas containing well-developed sagebrush or bitterbrush communities or areas capable of supporting these vegetation communities are important for big game. Snow deeper than 14 to 18 inches for extended periods generally makes winter range unusable for mule deer.

In the eastern part of the Foothills, the Boise River WMA is managed by the IDFG to provide habitat for wintering populations of mule deer, elk, and other wildlife. The WMA and adjacent habitat is essential for the continued survival of mule deer that



summer in the mountains north and east of Boise. Mule deer radio collared on the WMA during winter have been found in the mountains above Atlanta in summer, a straight line distance of about 60 miles.

Foothills streams, springs, and seeps are limited in number and location. In the relatively dry Foothills, surface waters are of primary importance to wildlife. In addition, Foothills gulches support a variety of other uses, such as agriculture, livestock grazing, urban development, and recreation. Some uses have degraded the quality of surface water resources. The most apparent problem has been the loss of riparian zones that protect streams and provide habitat for wildlife (Boise Community Planning and Development Department 1994). These riparian areas are found along many of the Foothills' gulches or drainages (see Figure 5).

As in much of the arid West, Foothills riparian areas and associated wetlands make up only a small portion of the landscape (about 2%) but support a tremendous diversity and abundance of wildlife. Riparian-dependent species have very specific habitat requirements, but their required habitats are also valuable to a large number of wildlife species that have less exacting requirements or that only use riparian habitats during a stage of their life cycle. Wildlife biologists estimate that roughly 80% of all animals use riparian areas at some stage of their lives. Additionally, this habitat can harbor from 2 to 10 times as many individual birds as does adjacent nonriparian vegetation (BLM 1998).

Higher quality riparian areas, primarily located in the longer and deeper Foothills gulches that support year-round streamflows during most years, are especially important to wildlife. These gulches, specifically Cottonwood Creek, Hulls Gulch, and Dry Creek, support larger riparian zones and contain more water throughout the year. Riparian vegetation communities are ecologically important for wildlife, water quality, and flood control. The uses that have degraded riparian areas in the Foothills the most are grazing, recreation, and urban development (Moseley et al. 1992), but recent reports have indicated a general increase in the health of riparian areas in the Foothills (Scholten 2000).

Throughout the West, approximately 100 bird species and 70 mammal species can be found in sagebrush habitats (Trimble 1989). Some of these are sagebrush obligates (restricted to sagebrush habitats during the breeding season or year-round) or near-obligate (occurring in both sagebrush

and grassland habitats (Paige and Ritter 1999). Foothills sagebrush habitats are included in the upland shrub communities shown in Figure 5. Within the Foothills management area, sagebrush obligates include sage thrasher, pygmy rabbit, and sagebrush lizard. Near-obligates include lark sparrow, loggerhead shrike, and prairie falcon. These species rely on various sagebrush steppe habitats, where sagebrush is codominant with perennial bunchgrasses. Throughout much of the West, including the Foothills, the ecology of these habitats are threatened by invasion



of nonnative plants, changes in fire regimes, development, excessive grazing, and agricultural conversion (Paige and Ritter 1999).

The interface between the forested and shrub vegetation communities along the Boise Ridge (see Figure 5) is used annually by migrating populations of raptors and neotropical birds. In 1993, scientists discovered that the Boise Ridge is part of a major raptor migration flyway. The Boise Ridge complex was identified as 1 of 12 major habitat areas for migrating birds of prey in the western United States by the Raptor Research Center at Boise State University. Scientific surveys by raptor biologists indicate the area is particularly important to sharp-shinned hawks, Cooper's hawks, goshawks, golden eagles, and American kestrels. The vast habitat edge formed by the juxtaposition of forests, sagebrush steppe, and grasslands along the north ridge of the Foothills provides an important mix of habitat types for resting, cover, and feeding areas.

Though not well documented, wildlife movement corridors in the Foothills are important in connecting noncontiguous habitats. Wildlife move along these corridors seasonally, daily, or irregularly to escape predation, avoid detection, or access additional sources of food, water, or cover. Although the information is incomplete, sensitive wildlife corridors are located within or adjacent to (typically within 100 feet [30.5 meters]) many of the riparian areas associated with perennial and intermittent streams that drain into the Boise River (see Figure 5).

Movement of wildlife up and down the Foothills tends to be associated with riparian areas, talus slopes, ridgelines, proximity to the Boise River and feeding areas. Some corridors are very small, while others can be very large. The movement corridor for cottontail rabbits may be only 300 feet long, whereas yellow-bellied marmots have corridors from the burrow to the feeding area that are usually less than 100 feet long. Beavers have corridors from the stream to feeding areas within the riparian area and sometimes to sites outside the riparian area, ranging from a few feet to several hundred yards. Resident (nonmigratory) mule deer use corridors from the Boise River to locations within the Foothills that are usually less than 0.25 mile long.

Increased residential development, recreational activity, and travel along transportation corridors have impacted wildlife movement. In 2008, 10 agencies and 1 nongovernmental organization collaborated to create the Boise River Wildlife Linkage Partnership (the Partnership) to address the upward trend of vehicle-wildlife collisions along a 22-mile stretch of East Warm Springs Avenue and Highway 21, as animals moved between key pieces of protected wildlife habitat in the Boise Foothills and along the Boise River. The Partnership's goal is to maintain habitat connectivity and reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions through a variety of methods. In 2010, the Partnership accessed federal stimulus money through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The money was used by Idaho Transportation for a shovel-ready project, a wildlife underpass and associated wildlife exclusion fence at milepost 18.2 on Highway 21. Photos taken with wildlife monitoring cameras in the underpass have proven that many species of wildlife use the underpass on a regular basis. The Partnership hopes they are able to create other safe passageways across Warm Springs and Highway 21 in areas identified as roadkill hot spots by IDFG.

THREATS TO WILDLIFE

Potential impacts on or threats to Foothills wildlife are described below.

- Increased urbanization, intensified recreational activity, and other uses within the Foothills have affected wildlife and wildlife habitats. The impacts stem from habitat fragmentation, disruption of wildlife travel corridors, loss of key habitats and food base, reduced habitat diversity, and increased conflict with humans (Boise Front CRMP Report 1996).
- The Foothills have changed significantly over the last 30 years because of development and recreational use. While having



many positive impacts, some of the changes have been viewed as destructive to the Foothills, to the wildlife, and to the quality of life in established neighborhoods at the base of the Foothills (Boise Front CRMP Report 1996).

• During a severe winter when food is scarce, mule deer in the Foothills are especially vulnerable to human disturbances. The basic mule deer winter survival strategy of

minimizing energy expenditure can be upset by disturbance, leading to the loss of fetuses, and can ultimately lead to a deer's premature death.

- Mule deer have been displaced from areas of former winter range in recent years by the activities of recreationists. Hulls Gulch, Military Reserve and Council Springs have seen a drop in the number of wintering deer. Other areas may also have decreased functionality as winter range.
- Many recreationists use the Foothills for hiking, dog walking, cycling, bird watching, horseback riding and hunting. All of these uses have the potential to impact the quality of wildlife habitat. The time of year, time of day, and kind, and amount of activity all influence how much wildlife value an area has.
- Wildlife has also been affected by habitat fragmentation, leaving them with smaller areas to satisfy their needs for food, water, shelter, and space throughout the year. Habitat fragmentation results in a loss of ecosystem function and biodiversity.
- Multiuse concepts, habitat protection, education, and provision of contiguous habitat corridors and buffer zones around sensitive areas are strategies that can reduce the impact of humans on wildlife.
- Deer can be attracted by residential landscaping, which could result in damage to plants and more unwelcome interactions between humans and wildlife.
- Feeding deer or elk in an urban setting can result in injury to wildlife, pets, and people.

POLICIES FOR WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Agency Representatives referenced existing agency policies to develop objectives and recommendations for the Interagency Plan (see Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations). Similarities and differences among agency policies are described in this section across three topic areas: habitat areas, wildlife corridors, and threatened and endangered species. Recommendations that come out of the Interagency Plan are not intended to supersede existing policies on agency land. Instead, the recommendations offer an overarching direction for approaching wildlife in the Foothills as a whole.

HABITAT AREAS

The City of Boise, Ada County, and BLM have established policies that encourage protecting critical habitat from intrusion and buffer it from urban and recreational development, resource extraction, and destruction.

IDFG supports habitat protection that ensures the recreational uses of wildlife, while noting that diverse flora and fauna have intrinsic worth beyond hunting and fishing activities.

The City of Boise, Ada and Boise counties, IDFG, BLM, and USFS all recognize the critical role that habitat plays in maintaining and enhancing wildlife. Typical city and county methods for protecting wildlife include corridors, open space acquisition, planning and zoning. All agencies coordinate with IDFG for management of key habitats and recognize the importance of the WMA. IDFG seeks the preservation and continued use of Idaho wildlife resources. BLM has developed policies for regulated development and multiple uses of rangeland, water resources, and vegetation for game and agriculture. Notably, BLM policy allows development or other uses only in those areas not deemed as critical to the migration or life cycle of wildlife. The City of Boise has adopted the policy of acquiring land to protect habitat and open space, particularly in the Foothills. Boise can use land trusts, conservation easements, serial levies, and other innovative means, as well as making planning and zoning requirements within the development process, to protect those lands. Ada County advocates preserving existing healthy trees and plant populations and minimizing development in or near critical wildlife habitat. Boise County encourages the voluntary designation of conservation easements, but provides no funding or guidelines for defining or protecting these easements. IDFG helps private landowners protect species and habitat and ensures that little private property is lost because of wildlife intrusion. IDFG's role is to perpetuate all wildlife. BLM requires that all development on BLM lands minimize obstruction to wildlife migration and not pose health risks to wildlife, particularly big game. All developments must be approved by BLM to ensure that wildlife and habitat connectivity are addressed in development plans. The USFS's goals are primarily for the augmentation of big game populations through the support and improvement of appropriate habitat.

WILDLIFE CORRIDORS

Wildlife corridors (linkage corridors) are routes that allow the free movement of wildlife to and from various habitat features, water, and food sources. City of Boise and Ada and Boise counties have each established policies for protecting wildlife corridors. City of Boise requires the conservation of sensitive habitat areas and the identification and preservation of wildlife corridors that connect these habitats. Ada County calls for cooperation with IDFG in identifying sensitive habitat and migratory corridors. Boise County encourages the voluntary designation of easements and areas for preservation.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

BLM and Ada County have published policies for protecting threatened and endangered species. Ada County recommends that encroachment of development into sensitive areas be minimized. BLM lists species of concern and identifies methods of protection such as those described in the *Boise District's Resource Management Plan for the Four Rivers Planning Areas.*

For more information on each agency's policies related to wildlife in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

POLICY DOCUMENTS

- Boise Front CRMP Report. 1996. Report for the Cooperative Development of a Wildlife and Landscape Watershed Analysis for the Boise Foothills. Unfinished draft report.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1998. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. Unpublished report. Boise District Office, Boise, ID. March.
- City of Boise. 2011. Blueprint Boise, Boise's Comprehensive Plan.
- City of Boise. 1997. City of Boise Foothills Policy Plan. An amendment to the City of Boise Comprehensive Plan. Boise, ID. March.
- City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department. 1994. Foothills Plan Background Report.
- EDAW, CH2M Hill, and Jensen-Belts Associates. 1996. Reserves Master Plan, Hulls Gulch/Camel's Back Reserve and Military Reserve. July.
- Moseley, R., M. Mancuso, and J. Hilty. 1992. Rare Plant and Riparian Vegetation Inventory of the Boise Foothills, Ada County, Idaho. Conservation Data Center, Nongame/Endangered Wildlife Program, Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Prepared for City of Boise Planning and Zoning.
- Paige, C. and S.A. Ritter. 1999. Birds in a Sagebrush Sea: Managing Sagebrush Habitats for Bird Communities. Partners in Flight Western Working Group, Boise, ID.
- Trimble, S. 1989. The Sagebrush Ocean. University of Nevada Press, Reno.

INTERVIEWS

- Bottom, Ed. 2012. Wildlife Biologist, Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Personal communication to City of Boise, Foothills and Open Space Manager. August 1.
- Gould, Jeff. 2000. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID. Personal communication to Jason Pfaff, Spatial Dynamics. June 20.
- Rachel, John. 2000. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID. Personal communication to Jason Pfaff, Spatial Dynamics. June 20.
- Zoellick, Bruce. 2000. Bureau of Land Management, Boise, ID. Personal communication to Micheal Wissenbach, Natural Resources Consulting. January 18.

4. BACKGROUND—RESOURCE USE 4-1 RECREATION IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

Recreational opportunities in the Boise Foothills are abundant. Hiking, running, biking, and horse riding are just a few of the activities enjoyed by Foothills recreationists. However, recreational use, specifically on trails, has increased dramatically with the growth in the Treasure Valley. This increase requires new trailheads and trail opportunities, more trail and facilities maintenance, and enforcement of policies. The public now looks to land managers to provide additional recreational opportunities while maintaining the integrity of the natural environment. This section identifies the issues land managers face and provides a framework for consistent management for recreational use of the Foothills.

RECREATION IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Foothills offer a variety of recreational activities to the Treasure Valley's residents and visitors. The need for additional recreational opportunities has increased over the years - driven by the growth of Boise's population, increased visitation, new recreation equipment, and for many people, a greater sense of the importance of outdoor activity. While these activities are important for resident quality of life and the area's economy, increased recreational use can adversely impact Foothills resources. As stewards of the Foothills, managers must strike a balance between protecting the resources and providing the public with recreational opportunities. Managers and the public must understand how recreation affects the ecosystem it shares. Unmanaged recreation can degrade natural resources, create potential conflicts with private landowners, and clash with other values of the Foothills besides recreation.

Through the following topics, this section describes many of the recreational opportunities in the Foothills and related impacts. Hunting and trapping are presented separately in the next section of the Interagency Plan.

TRAILS AND TRAILHEADS

Recreational use of the Foothills has long been a topic of discussion between private entities, public landowners, and the broader community.

In the years following World War II, the military's use of the Foothills for training essentially ended and the lands came under administration of the newly minted BLM. The community, even then, recognized the value the Foothills would have as a place for outdoor recreation and discussions began about its possible future.

In 1959, a large fire burned a portion of the eastern Foothills, followed by heavy rains. Several debris flows brought a slurry of mud and rock into the neighborhoods of north and east Boise and what is now Harris Ranch. This event demonstrated the importance of a healthy watershed on Boise residents' health and safety. It also spurred the first large-scale multiagency effort to stabilize the watershed and led to construction of the trenches that are still seen today on Lucky Peak.

During the 1960s, increased motorcycle use in the Foothills caused concern among landowners and homeowners. The Little family helped provide the first hill climb area – called Little Gem Motorcycle Park near Emmett – to focus the impactful activity in a designated area. The BLM also helped by developing the motorcycle parking lot off 8th Street and the associated motorcycle trails, limiting vehicles to a designated trail system.

Managing off-road use by 4x4 vehicles became a tremendous challenge and caused significant damage to the Foothills. The BLM again took action by establishing the gate on 8th Street and closing the upper reaches of the road during wet and muddy conditions. Off-road use impacts

continued nonetheless and was part of the impetus in bringing landowners, citizens, and agency representatives together to help protect the fragile Foothills.

The Boise Front Coalition was formed in the late 1980s to address erosion, impacts from off-road vehicles and bogging, wildfire concerns, and livestock grazing. A number of projects were implemented that have had significant long-term benefits. The coalition's work resulted in a statewide Take Pride in Idaho award as well as the Chevron Award for



Conservation Excellence – one of only five awards given out that year nationally. Land rehabilitation, trail planning, and education helped move protection of public and private lands to the forefront of community values.

One concept conceived by the Boise Front Coalition was the development of an integrated system of trails that would link the city with public lands. The proposal called for the agencies to work cooperatively with private landowners and developers to achieve formalized trail access, allowing for seamless management and maintenance of the Foothills trails. It also would allow landowners and agencies to direct recreational uses to the most sustainable trails, providing an opportunity to close, rehabilitate, reroute, or restore the poorly aligned trails. This trail planning effort was folded into a comprehensive countywide plan for bike lanes, recreation paved paths, and Foothills trails. "The Ridge-to-Rivers Pathway Plan" was adopted in 1993 and updated in 1998. Later ACHD took components of this Interagency Plan to create a bikeways plan and another group focused on the area along the river by writing the Boise River Trail Plan.

Concurrently, the agencies responsible for managing lands in the Foothills came together in 1992 and formed a partnership to collectively plan, implement, and manage an integrated trail system across jurisdictions. This effort, called the Ridge to Rivers (R2R) Trail Partnership, focuses on trails within the Foothills and the Oregon Trail and provides for the pooling of limited resources. While the partnership involves a variety of participants, both informally and formally (through a MOU), the effort is primarily funded by the following agencies:

- City of Boise
- Ada County
- BLM (Lower Snake River District)
- USFS (Boise National Forest)
- IDFG (nonfunding partner)

A signed MOU seeks the cooperation of all parties involved (see Appendix B). The first MOU was created in 1992 and was updated in 2000 and 2010.

The boundaries of public lands in the Foothills are changing today just as they have over the last century. As the various public agencies acquire or dispose of lands according to their respective needs, land ownership patterns change. The boundaries of public land ownership in the Foothills are undergoing one of the most sweeping changes to date due in large part to the City of Boise's Foothills serial levy conservation efforts. The participatory public agencies to this MOU have anticipated this outcome and have planned for the evolution of a coordinated management effort.

(Memorandum of Understanding, December 2010)

Discussions with various user groups and agency managers have indicated that the R2R partnership has taken great strides in planning, creating, managing, and repairing trails. This partnership's greatest strength lies in collaboration between the agencies, which requires constant communication, coordination, cooperation, and trust in working toward a common vision. R2R has had a coordinator since November 1992. The coordinator's office was housed with BLM Four Rivers Field Office staff near the airport, then later moved to the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center (FLC) when it opened in 2005. R2R employs 2 full-time, 2 part-time, and several seasonal staff while also working with a team of 10 volunteer rangers that dedicates four hours per week during the peak use season to patrol the trails, report on trail usage, and talk with users about trail etiquette.

Since R2R's inception, new trails, trail access points, and trailheads have been constructed on private, city, county, and BLM land. The funds to build these trails often come from grant opportunities at the state level – the Recreational Trails Program administered by the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR).

Trails occur across private lands through a variety of tools - easements have been purchased from private landowners, private landowners have donated permanent easements, private landowners have provided temporary revocable trail easements, or the public is illegally trespassing. The easements require the trails to be featured on the R2R map, signed in a manner that makes the user aware they are crossing private land, and maintained. On occasion, R2R is asked to provide feedback on how and where trails may fit when residential Foothills development applications are submitted to the city and county.

Seasonal Use

Though the trails are less busy during winter months (December through March), the number of off-season trail users is growing. Most of the trail use during the winter months is concentrated in the lower Foothills where snow accumulation is infrequent and trails are more sandy. In heavier

snow years, snowmobilers can be found in the area near the Boise Ridge Road, while snowshoers, fat tire mountain bikes, and cross-country skiers can be found in the lower Foothills. Most winter

recreationists use Bogus Basin Ski Resort for downhill, cross-country and skate skiing, snowshoeing, and tubing, or they travel outside the Treasure Valley for winter activities. There are no designated sledding hills in the Foothills due to the native shrubs dotting the hillsides, although during heavy snow events, the public uses the entire face of Camel's Back as a sledding hill, not just the lower irrigated slope or the chute.

When Foothills trails become muddy in the winter months, mountain bikers, hikers, and equestrians are encouraged to switch



to roads, take a break from their activity, or use trails before 10 a.m., at which time the roads typically thaw out. In recent years, R2R has encouraged voluntary closures after 10 a.m. through trail signage, R2R and City of Boise website postings, public service announcements, the Boise Foothills Trail Conditions Facebook website, trail ranger educational outreach, and peer pressure. Compliance with the voluntary closures ranges across the system. R2R has not established

seasonal trail closures for wildlife (e.g., big game migration and nesting birds); however, recent surveys indicate trail users are open to the possibility. The Boise River WMA is closed by IDFG only during a severe winter.

Trail Use Designations

Trail use in the Foothills occurs on both roads and trails. R2R currently uses trail designations, a technique whereby specific use types are assigned to specific trails, to manage trail use. Managers have implemented the following trail use designations in the Foothills (see also Figures 8 and 8a).

Roads and Streets. These roads include established paved roads and streets where vehicles share the road with recreationists (such as Bogus Basin Road). Roads and streets typically provide access to designated trailheads and trail access



points. In addition, many of these roads in the Foothills serve as good alternatives to muddy trails during the winter months. It is unlawful under Ada County code for a dog to be unleashed on any street or alley of the county. This includes the unpaved sections of Rocky Canyon Road, Mountain Cove Road, and Sunset Peak Road (8th Street Extension).

Primitive Roads. These roads include established gravel or dirt roads shared by all. These roads are usually maintained and provide access to trailheads and trail access points. Some recreationists use primitive roads as their primary trail experience because primitive roads are remote, scenic, and do not incur much vehicle use. These roads are subject to seasonal closures, such as Sunset Peak Road (8th Street Extension) and Rocky Canyon Road. Sunset Peak Road is gated seasonally to restrict full-sized vehicle use. The purpose of the restriction is to protect the roadbed when conditions are soft and vehicle use can cause road damage and erosion. Motorcycle use is allowed around the gate; however, this use is discouraged when roadbed conditions are soft. Nonmotorized use is also allowed past the gate.

In the past few years Sunset Peak Road has not been regularly maintained and its condition has deteriorated. Several sections may only be passable by high-clearance, 4-wheel drive vehicles due to large gullies. The road is under the jurisdiction of the BLM and road maintenance is dependent on available funding. Recent budget constraints have limited maintenance on this road. However, in 2013, BLM was able to bring the road to a minimum standard passable by most vehicles. Shaw Mountain Road and Highland Valley Road are administratively closed to vehicular traffic by the IDFG from November 16 to April 30 to protect wintering big game.

Multiple-use 4-Wheel Drive Trails. These trails include primitive dirt trails that are not regularly maintained. These trails primarily provide multiple-use 4-wheel drive opportunities and other off-highway vehicle uses. Multiple-use 4-wheel drive trails within the WMA are administratively closed from January 1 to April 1. These trails may contain steep sections, rocks, or other obstructions that make them difficult for average cars. An example of this type of trail is Lucky Peak #8.

Multiple-use Trails for Motorized Vehicles. These trails provide recreation for motorized 2wheeled vehicles and other users. Many multiple-use trails for motorized vehicles were developed in the 1970s and 1980s as an attempt to reduce impacts and provide motorized opportunities on a designated and maintained system. An example of this type of trail is Femrite's Patrol #6.

Multiple-use Trails for Nonmotorized Vehicles. These trails provide the bulk of recreation for all nonmotorized uses, including hiking, running, biking, and equestrian use. This trail use designation is the most common because it serves a broad range of experiences and user types. An example of this type of trail is Polecat Gulch Loop #81.

Pedestrian Only Trails. These trails provide recreation for pedestrians only. Pedestrian only trails are intended to provide a passive experience. An example of this type of trail is the Hulls Gulch Interpretive Trail #0.

Mountain Bike Only Trails. These trails provide recreation for mountain bikers only; pedestrians, motorized vehicles, and equestrians are excluded. Currently the system does not have this type of trail.

Dog Off-leash Trails. These trails allow for trail users to recreate with their dogs off-leash, within 30 feet of their owner, and under voice control. An example of this type of trail is Red Cliffs Trail #39.

Dog On-leash Trails. These trails provide opportunities for dogs on-leash and recreationists to enjoy trails together. An example of this type of trail is 15th Street Trail #41.

No Dog Trails. These trails allow those who want a dog-free trail experience (e.g., visually impaired, small children, and others) a place to recreate. Other reasoning for this type of trail may be sensitive plant species (rare or riparian) or bird/wildlife population in need of minimal disturbance. The only example of this type of trail is the Story Trail around the FLC.

ADA Accessible Trails. These trails are open to users of all abilities. They require certain design standards so as to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The slope, width, and surface of the trail must meet the standards for ADA design. An example of this type of trail is the Grove Trail #38.

ADA and Accessibility

While it is difficult to achieve accessibility to rugged trails for physically challenged individuals, opportunities do exist – especially for those with Electronic Personal Assistance Mobility Devices (EPAMD), the width of which does not exceed the managed width of the trail. Several of the R2R trails are wide enough to accommodate EPAMDs. The Ridge-to-Rivers Policy on Other Power Driven Mobility Devices lists a number of these trails, which include:

- The Grove Trail #48
- West Highland Valley Trail #11 **
- Homestead Trail #12 **
- Table Rock Trail #15 **Access from Terranativa Subdivision
- The Ponds Loop #21
- Toll Road #27A
- Crestline Trail #28
- Corrals Trail #31/Hard Guy #33 **
- Hulls Pond Loop #34
- Gold Finch Trail #35
- Red Fox Trail #36
- Owls Roost Trail #37

**These trails will require contacting R2R at 493-2953, as the user will need to borrow a key that will allow passage through the gate.

New Outdoor Area Accessibility Guidelines are currently under federal review. Upon approval, they will be published in the Federal Register as final accessibility guidelines for federal agencies (under the 1968 Architectural Barriers Act). These guidelines will be considered best practices for

all public agencies (including nonfederal) and, along with the Forest Service Trail Accessibility Guidelines (FSTAG), provide the framework within which to develop and manage accessible trails.

Recreation Surveys

In the last five years, a trail user survey was conducted by volunteers on a Saturday at 12 trailheads for 12 hours. This survey is similar to one conducted in 2000. The number of trail users responding has ranged from 1,202 to 1,630. Users tend to be evenly split between males and females. The largest age range represented is consistently 31 to 40 years old. Mountain bikers have generally made up one-third of the users while the others have mostly been pedestrians (runners, hikers, and walkers). About 25% to 33% of trail users have dogs with them and most users are on the trails for 1 to 2 hours on a frequent basis.

Also in the user surveys, questions have been asked about designating certain trails for one type of use, directional use on trails by different users, alternating days and users on other trails, and closing trails for wet weather or protecting wildlife. Trail users have generally not supported the idea of alternating days or directional use, but the other management strategies have received resounding support. Overall, the majority (97% to 99%) of trail users find their time in the Foothills enjoyable.

Currently R2R manages 150 miles of trails with plans to bring an additional 25 miles online by the end of 2015.

Private Property and Trail Easements

Some of the R2R trails in the Foothills cross private land. Because landowners do not know what the future holds for their property, they have been reluctant to provide permanent trail easements. As a result, temporary revocable trail easements have been developed with many private landowners that outline the terms under which they are allowing recreational activity to occur. These agreements are between the landowner and either City of Boise or Ada County, depending on the location of the trail.

The agreements allow for signage, posting the trail on the R2R map, assigning the same trail policies as the connecting trail unless the private landowner has other requests, and requiring maintenance to minimize damage to the land. Historically, as a parcel is slated for development, the trail is either removed permanently or realigned and integrated as part of the development. If the trail remains a part of the development, a permanent trail easement may be acquired by R2R if the trail still provides a regional connection. To make this process successful, the development team, agency representatives, and community come together in a cooperative and collaborative manner. Templates of a revocable trail easements are available from the R2R manager. In 2014, the Grossman Family (the largest private landowner in the Foothills) donated approximately 13 miles of permanent trail easements to the City of Boise connecting Hidden Springs to Bogus Basin Road and Stack Rock Reserve to Polecat Gulch Reserve.

Conceptual Trails

To establish and maintain an interconnected trail system throughout the Foothills, proposed conceptual trail links have been identified. The proposed conceptual trail links are important for the following reasons:

- Removing recreation pressure from the Boise River WMA
- Protecting Foothills resources through well-planned trails
- Adding variety and length to the current trail system
- Providing close to home trail opportunities for all Boise citizens
- Dispersing use across the Foothills management area so no one area becomes too busy
- Reducing user conflicts
- Creating a vision for the future

These trail locations are conceptual and must be reviewed individually as routes are considered for property acquisition/trail easements and for impacts on Foothills resources on a site-specific basis. Of the 22 conceptual trails listed in the 2000 Boise Foothills Management Plan (2000 Plan), 12 have been completed. The list below has been provided by the R2R manager and includes some conceptual trails from the 2000 Plan, but also adds others that are of interest (see Figure 8).

- 1. *Dry Creek Trail.* A user-created trail through this corridor already exists and is well used; however, there is no formal trailhead, the trail crosses several different private properties, the trail is not built sustainably, and the trail cuts through a valuable riparian area. Linking Boise Ridge Road with Bogus Basin Road through the Dry Creek area would provide another key link for the trail system.
- 2. *Eastside/Lower Stack Rock Connection.* This trail would provide a shorter trail connection to Freddy's Stack Rock Trail than is currently available from the trailhead at the Bogus Basin Nordic Lodge. The Land Trust of the Treasure Valley has recently acquired revocable trail easements from the private landowners in this area, but the USFS is uncomfortable providing the last link to Bogus Basin Road due to safety and lack of parking infrastructure issues.
- 3. *Watchman Freestone.* This is a nonmotorized version of the current Femrite's Patrol Trail #6. As opposed to the very aggressive route followed by Trail #6, this trail would provide a more contoured trail design, similar to the Watchman Trail.
- 4. *Seamans Gulch Cartwright Road.* This would provide a critical link between two isolated trail systems in the western Foothills the Seamans Gulch trails and the Polecat Gulch Reserve system.
- 5. *36th Street Polecat Gulch.* This trail would link the Harrison Hollow trails to the Polecat Reserve, thereby further perpetuating an east-west trail connection across the Foothills.

Many of the above trails are located west of Bogus Basin Road. Managers see this area as an opportunity to provide the public with additional well-planned trails. A review of ownership patterns in this area indicates that most land is privately owned. Because new opportunities will not come without a price, agency managers must seek access agreements with private landowners and find new sources of funding for long-term maintenance.

Trail Conflicts

While most recreationists using the Foothills seem satisfied with their experiences, trail conflicts do occur, among different trail user groups and within the same trail user group. R2R partners recognize these trail conflicts as a potentially serious problem. However, if trail conflicts

are addressed directly and openly among trail users, they can help strengthen trail constituencies and enhance outdoor educational and recreational opportunities for all trail users.

Prior to the establishment of R2R, the biggest trail conflicts were between motorized and nonmotorized vehicle users. Mountain biking has become increasingly prevalent and conflicts between mountain bikers and other users and among mountain bikers have increased, as well as between trail users with dogs off-leash and other users. Over the last few years, one of the questions on the annual trail user survey asks about overall enjoyment of the trail experience and as noted above, 96% to 99% of trail users surveyed state they have enjoyable experiences. When users were asked in the 2014 survey about specific interactions, those with hikers/runners (99%), mountain bikers (94%), and other user's pets (92%) receive a range of positive feedback.

Managers are using many methods to reduce trail conflicts. These include adding trail etiquette signage on some of the heaviest used trails, providing a range of trail opportunities for all users, and working with trail users and trail user groups to raise awareness about proper trail etiquette. In 2014, an effort called TrailSmart (www.trailsmart.org) was started by two trail users to engage trail users in learning etiquette techniques through short videos and increasing monetary donations to the R2R partnership.

Trailheads

Trailheads provide designated parking for accessing the R2R trail system and have kiosks to post educational information on proper trail use and updated R2R trail maps for reference. There are 21 trailheads with kiosks. Trailheads close to the urban environment are important since they are the last opportunity managers have to educate the public on the upcoming trail experience. Major trailheads are shown on Figures 8 and 8a.

Other than established trailheads, there are also less formal trail access points in the Foothills. Trailheads generally have parking available on a designated site or on a designated section of road right-of-way. Many of the primary trailheads also have restrooms, trash cans, and doggy waste bags available. Trail access points provide entry into the Foothills from neighborhoods that might not have parking available. Some trail access points also have trash cans and doggy waste bags. The R2R staff services 45 trashcans weekly and in some cases more than once a week. There are several other trash cans neighbors have installed and manage regularly to reduce the waste at trail access points in their neighborhoods. These secondary access points provide a valuable means for residents in adjoining neighborhoods to gain access to Foothills resources.

In 2009, R2R built a new maintenance shop on the former McCord property in Hulls Gulch Reserve adjacent to the FLC (completed in 2005). The shop and yard provide R2R with an office, trail maintenance activities staging site, and a storage location for equipment and vehicles.

Parking

Adequate parking is a challenge during peak use times at some of the more busy trailheads. Weekend and after-work use may force people to use on-street parking or to seek opportunities elsewhere. Areas of specific concern for overflow include Military Reserve and Hulls Gulch.

Horse trailer parking in the Foothills is limited. Steep terrain, narrow roads, erosive soils, and minimal pullout space make siting trailheads that can accommodate horse trailers difficult. Presently, horse trailer parking is available to the Grove, Miller Gulch, Freestone, and Cartwright trailheads. Many horseback riders continue to use private property in the Foothills for riding and access those properties from pullouts along roads.

Restrooms

Restrooms are currently provided at the Seamans Gulch, Miller Gulch, Lower Hulls Gulch, Upper Hulls Gulch, Camel's Back Park, Quarry View Park, North Collister, and Freestone Creek trailheads. Vault toilets are used in most cases due to their low maintenance needs and lack of sewer access nearby.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

Parks and open space are often misconstrued as the same thing when in fact they are very different. The following



definitions best describe parks and open space in relationship to the Foothills.

Parks

A park is planned primarily to provide active or structured recreational activities. These areas are usually developed with irrigated grass and play equipment for recreational enjoyment. In some parks, facilities for organized sports are maintained. These facilities are located close to Boise and do not reflect open space values as identified in the plan. However, these areas are ideal locations for educating users about Foothills resources and serve as a gateway into the Foothills. They include (see Figures 8 and 8a):



- Camel's Back Park, neighborhood park (13 acres) North Boise
- Quarry View Park, neighborhood park (10 acres) NE Boise

- Hillside Park, community park (12 acres) with sports complex and horse arena NW Boise
- Stewart Gulch Park, neighborhood park (5.8 acres) NW Boise
- Somerset Hills Park, neighborhood park (7.3 acres) North Boise
- Fort Boise, community park (26 acres) North Boise
- Foothills East, mini-park (0.88 acre) NE Boise
- Aldape Park, mini-park (0.33 acre) NE Boise
- Eagle Sports Complex (85 acres) Ada County

Open Space

Open space is defined as land maintained primarily in its natural condition, with recreation uses potentially accommodated where they do not conflict with other natural resource values. Such lands provide opportunities to observe nature and obtain a higher level of solitude than is found in developed parks. Open space is usually owned or managed by a governmental agency, and some areas may not be readily available to the public due to the natural and cultural resources in need of protection. Lands in this category include wetlands, steep hillsides, sensitive wildlife or plant habitat, riparian corridors, and unique natural or cultural resources.

The 2000 Foothills Open Space Management Plan proposed a vision to ensure one of Boise's signature features, the Foothills, would continue to contribute to the region's high quality of life. As a follow-up to that plan, Boise voters supported a two-year serial levy in 2001 to raise \$10 million for Foothills land conservation efforts. The ballot language (see Appendix C) outlined the funds would be used to protect water quality; preserve wildlife habitat; provide increased recreation areas for walking, biking, and other outdoor activities; limit overdevelopment and traffic; and protect natural vegetation that prevents mudflows and washouts.

The oversight for spending the funds was given by the mayor to the 12-member Foothills Conservation Advisory Committee. The committee and their staff and the City of Boise's Foothills and Open Space Manager were tasked with the prioritization of parcels, negotiations, partnering with other agencies, and leveraging funds. Since then, 10,750 acres have been conserved through

acquisition, donation, conservation easement, and land exchange. Some of these lands have been added to previouslyestablished open space reserves. Others provide new connections and buffers to significant public land already owned by state and federal agencies. Following are descriptions of the City of Boise Open Space Reserves in the Foothills.

Camel's Back Reserve

The Camel's Back Reserve site is on the northeast side of Camel's Back Park. This land, along with the Camel's Back Park,



was acquired by the city in 1932 from Bernard Lemp, a relative of a former mayor, John Lemp. The reserve portion of the park is approximately 63 acres. The park amenities include hiking and bike trails.

Castle Rock Reserve

Castle Rock Reserve, located in the Foothills behind Quarry View Park, is a 48.5-acre site in

Boise's East End acquired in the mid- to late 1990s. Native Americans who once inhabited the Boise Valley are said to have gathered at a remote site, known as Castle Rock, in the Foothills where an outcropping of rocks dramatically jets out and touches the sky. At that time, nearby geothermal hot springs fed into small creeks and formed bathing ponds frequented by the Shoshone, Bannock, and Paiute tribes. The historically significant site features natural open space and R2R trails. The site is adjacent to the Table Rock trail system, which mostly lies on State of Idaho land.



Mesa Reserve

The 58-acre Boyer-Satz parcel on the southern bench below Table Rock was acquired as part of the serial levy. As part of the build-out of Warm Springs Mesa, the developer is dedicating several parcels to the city (a total of about 200 acres) over time. A few R2R trails cross over the property. The trails can be accessed from a trail access point across Warm Springs Avenue from the Warm Springs Golf Course.

Foothills East Reserve

Foothills East Reserve is a 30.4-acre natural area with trails and is in the northeast Boise Foothills neighborhood. The site was acquired in the 1970s when housing development was occurring in that area. No R2R trails cross the area.

Hulls Gulch Reserve

Hulls Gulch Reserve is a 289-acre site north of downtown Boise at the base of the Foothills. This site was acquired through a communitywide citizen effort over a three-year period from 1991 to 1993. The initial parcel of land – 99 acres – was purchased in the early 1990s through a land trade with United Water, the parent company of Orida Investment Corporation. Additional acres were acquired through grass roots fundraising efforts, City of Boise general funds, Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund dollars, donations from Orida Investment Corporation, and 2001 Foothills serial levy funds. The name "Hulls Gulch" comes from the ephemeral creek that runs from higher up in the Foothills through the middle of this property.

The reserve is home to two trailheads (Grove and Lower Hulls Gulch). The reserve is also home to the FLC, operated by Boise Parks and Recreation. The FLC focuses on education and information about the Foothills and the surrounding high desert environment. The FLC is a place for learning by

direct experience with the outdoors. The heart of the FLC program is school-age education, which offers a wide range of lessons for kindergarten through sixth grade students in their classrooms and at the center. Service learning opportunities for all ages and abilities, and special family and community events are also available year-round.

Military Reserve

Military Reserve is approximately 740 acres reserved for several different uses. The reserve is in the northeast portion of the city. The amenities available in the area are an archery range, an old military cemetery, and trails. The land was purchased from the BLM by the city in March 1956. The access road and cemetery were then transferred to the city to ensure the maintenance for these areas. In 2004, the City purchased the adjacent Hawkins' property linking Military Reserve to BLM land higher up in the Foothills.



The Military Reserve is comprised of natural terrain in the lower Foothills. Flowing through the reserve are sections of Freestone and Cottonwood creeks. From these creek valleys, hill masses rise on moderate to steep slopes to heights of 100 feet or more. The military cemetery is on a hillside approximately ½ mile east of the U.S. Veteran's Administration Hospital. Veterans of the Mexican War, Civil War, Indian Wars, and Spanish American War are interred at the reserve. Several civilian graves are also located at the reserve.

Noble Reserve

A 600-acre parcel around Five Mile Creek above Rocky Canyon Road and below Aldape Summit was donated to the city by Allen and Billie Dee Noble in 2003. This land covers a few prominent ridgetops in the east Foothills. The Nobles have allowed the public to access their land since they purchased it in 1972, thus it is popular with hikers, mountain bikers, and horseback riders. A couple of R2R trails cross through the property.

The reserve is of historic significance as well because the old road from Boise to Idaho City passed through the property. Five thousand dollars from the serial levy funds were spent on land transaction costs.

Polecat Gulch Reserve

The Dry Creek Area/West Boise Foothills is one of the three priority areas identified for Foothills land preservation prior to the passage of the \$10 million Foothills levy in 2001. Polecat Gulch Reserve was created in 2002 with the acquisition from the Blessinger family of 120 acres. Subsequent additions include the purchase of 40 acres from Bluegrass LLC in 2005, 80 acres from Linda Dengler in 2005, a 360-acre BLM parcel acquired in 2008 via a land exchange, and 80 acres from Sterling Savings Bank in 2010, which included a 70-acre conservation easement previously donated to the city. In 2012, the city purchased 154 acres from Bank of the Cascades (formerly owned by Ramon Yorgason) to allow the public access from North Collister Road. The North Collister trailhead was completed in July 2014.

The entire Polecat Gulch Reserve totals 834 acres and is comprised of various public lands between Cartwright and North Collister Roads. Polecat Gulch features 8 miles of trails, provides some amazing views of the Treasure Valley, and is home to mature vegetation that supports mule deer year-round and a substantial population of Aase's onion, a rare plant found in the Foothills. In 2007, a trailhead parking lot off Cartwright Road was built with a \$46,000 grant awarded by the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation. There is currently a small 1930s home on the property where a caretaker lives.

Stack Rock Reserve

In 2010, the City purchased 1,320 acres near Bogus Basin Ski Area for \$1.32 million. Fred Alleman, a Boise citizen and avid R2R trail user, donated \$1 million toward the purchase. The property is about 9 miles from downtown Boise west of Bogus Basin Road in a forested area with steep slopes and old logging roads. The property primarily lies in Boise County and includes the prominent Stack Rock geologic formation. The reserve is a desirable destination for multiple recreational uses, including hiking, mountain biking, and rock climbing. Freddy's Stack Rock Trail is a new loop trail that meanders through the reserve. The loop trail connects with the current R2R trail system in the Shafer Butte area.

Hillside to Hollow Reserve

The Hillside to Hollow Reserve was created in 2013 with the acquisition of 260 acres with serial levy funds. The property is adjacent to Harrison Hollow, which is owned and managed by the Land Trust of the Treasure Valley. In 2014, the City and Land Trust embarked on a joint master planning process for the Hillside to Hollow area. In the next few years, about 12 miles of trails will become part of the R2R system, while many others will be rehabilitated.

Other Lands

Other agencies (IDFG and Ada County) have conserved lands in the Foothills that allow for some recreational users, but have established other priorities for the land.

OTHER RECREATIONAL USE

The following uses do not fit within a certain category but are other recreational uses of the Foothills.

Competitive Races

The R2R partners have historically not allowed mountain bike races in the lower and mid-Foothills. Mountain bike races represent a concentrated high-impact use and are generally seen as not compatible with the long-term goal of providing and maintaining quality sustainable trails in the Foothills. Trails in the lower and mid-Foothills already receive intense public use and are

comprised largely of erosive sandy soils that generally do not hold up well to race impacts.

The R2R partnership has encouraged race promoters to work with Bogus Basin Resort and the Boise National Forest to host races on the R2R trails around Shaffer Butte. Though impacts would still occur, these trails receive lighter use, and the soils on these trails would hold up much better to a race event than the soils found in the lower and mid-Foothills.



R2R currently permits two running races to be held on the R2R trail system annually. These events must comply with a specific set of conditions to be considered. Race promoters are required to submit detailed race proposals to R2R between November 1 and December 31 each year for consideration as one of the two races permitted the following calendar year. The R2R partnership does not process or consider any proposals received between January 1 and October 31. A couple of large running races occur in the Foothills, but they use established roads and not the R2R trail system.

The Owyhee Motorcycle Club has the only competitive motocross track in the Foothills. This nonprofit motorcycle club is located on private property in the Foothills management area.

Guiding

Guiding is controlled and licensed by the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Licensing Board. Trail guiding has occurred in the Foothills on occasion. Currently the USFS and BLM d have a permitting process for guides, while the City of Boise, Ada County, and Boise County do not.

Hang Gliding and Parasailing

Historically, nonmotorized footlaunched flying (hang gliding and paragliding) occurred on Hammer Flat, a 700-acre lot near Lucky Peak and Crow Hill. In 2010, the city purchased this property from the landowner. Hammer Flat was then closed to the public for approximately one year to determine its wildlife habitat value. In March of 2012, the IDFG purchased this property from the city. The property is now part of the Boise River WMA. The IDFG has provided the Boise Area Footlaunched Flight Organization with a special use permit for their activities during a specific time of the year. This permit is renewable on an annual basis, subject to any needed modification of terms.

Camping

Dispersed camping is allowed in the Foothills on BLM and USFS lands for up to 14 consecutive days. Overnight campers are encouraged to use "Leave No Trace" principles to minimize their impacts on the Foothills' sensitive natural resources. The BLM is considering making Rocky Canyon a "Day Use Only" corridor to reduce conflicts between various user groups and reduce the likelihood of wildfire starts in that area.

Party Spots and Homeless Activity

Party spots and homeless activity occur on both public and private lands in the Foothills. Most of the activity is found in areas with heavy woody vegetation, primarily the riparian zone. Though some sites have reoccurring issues, public land managers work with local law enforcement agencies and volunteers to identify and quickly clean up the debris at these sites to reduce the likelihood of an ongoing issue.

USER GROUPS

User groups identified in the Foothills are fragmented. Many of these groups are specific to a user type, volunteer efforts, or have a specific mission. The groups generally do not coordinate with each other on a regular basis and there is no regular list of users to whom Foothills land managers can contact for input. Recently, R2R created the Boise Foothills Trail Conditions Facebook site to better communicate with users on trail closures, maintenance concerns, volunteer efforts, construction projects, and new facilities. The following user groups have been identified as the most active in the Foothills:

- SWIMBA (Southwest Idaho Mountain Biking Association)
- Y-Striders
- Hash House Harriers
- BAMBA (Boise Area Mountain Bike Association)
- Idaho Horse Council
- Boise Trail Runners
- Mountain West Outdoor Club
- Various meet-up groups that schedule regular outings on the trails
- Golden Eagle Audubon Society
- Idaho Hiking Club
- Various equestrian riding clubs
- Treasure Valley Trail Machine Association

THREATS TO FOOTHILLS RESOURCES

Use of the Foothills must balance the benefits of recreational activities with the protection of environmental resources. Specifically, unmanaged and unrestricted recreation can cause impacts on Foothills resources, as described below.

Off-road Use

Unmanaged off-road use is more prolific near Boise Ridge Road and is most apparent along primary roads (8th Street, Bogus Basin Road, Rocky Canyon Road, Highland Valley Road, Boise Ridge Road, and Cartwright Road). Both motorized and nonmotorized vehicles are used in these areas. Though all uses have potential to negatively impact the area, using motorized vehicles is the most damaging recreational activity in the Foothills. The size and power of these vehicles create substantial damage in a short time. Once damage is started, it is difficult to stop because it invites others to continue this type of use. The areas that receive most of this type of use are just off Bogus Basin Road and the Boise Ridge Road.

An Ada County ordinance prohibits the operation of motor vehicles on private lands without permission of the owner, and the federal agencies require operation of motorized vehicles on designated trails only (Ada County Development Services 1996; BLM 1990).

Agencies such as the BLM use signage, citations, fencing, and public service announcements to restrict off-road use. However, enforcement is difficult because of the limited staff.

When directly confronted, many of the users say they were unaware that their activity was either damaging to Foothills resources or illegal. Additional regulations, increased staff presence, better signage, and stronger penalties may be needed to reduce the damage being done.

Social Trails and Trail Widening

A single unmanaged trail has a rather low overall impact on the Foothills. However, the cumulative effects of this type of trail across the Foothills can be extensive. "Social" trails created by users are prevalent in the Foothills, and they cause management concerns when located on steep slopes or within sensitive riparian zones. When these trails are identified within the Foothills management area, R2R staff works with the agency or private landowner to close and/or reroute

the trail. In many cases, social trails are the result of users seeking access to the managed trail system or deviating from designated trails for new recreational experiences. R2R staff spends much of their resources redirecting erosive trails and closing "social" trails using signage, fencing, and education.

Part of the enjoyment of trail use comes with the narrow or single-track experience of being on a trail versus recreating on a road. However, with more users comes trail widening as users want



to walk, run, or bike side by side in the same direction; pass one another by going off-trail; and allow dogs off-leash to wander off and on the trail near their owner. R2R uses a few different techniques to reduce trail widening; planting shrubby vegetation alongside trails, posting closure

signs on the ground, creating trail etiquette messages that speak to these concerns, and placing rocks in key locations.

Displacement of Wildlife

IDFG has indicated that pressure on wildlife is directly related to recreational use, dogs offleash, vehicular traffic on roads, and new housing developments. These impacts include disturbing wintering big game and scaring nongame bird species during critical nesting times. Dogs off-leash, when accompanying trail users, increase the "zone of influence" of a trail. Dogs can disturb nesting birds and chase wildlife. Dogs must be leashed in city limits, except where permitted. They must also be leashed on the WMA year-round.

Increased human activity near the perimeter of the WMA and primitive roads, as well as motorized and nonmotorized vehicle activities in the WMA, has disturbed big game. Off-road vehicle use in the WMA compounds this problem. Currently, seasonal closure dates for motorized vehicles are observed on roads and trails in the WMA from November 16 to April 30. There have been discussions among agency staff of seasonal closures on certain trails that bisect high-priority wildlife habitat



during winter months, but no policies have been enacted.

Rock climbing has potential to create direct and adverse impacts on the nesting activities and productivity of breeding raptors along the Black Cliffs just north of State Highway 21. The following species have been documented as using the Boise River Canyon cliffs as breeding habitat:

- Golden eagle (not documented since 2000)
- American kestrel
- Prairie falcon
- Red-tailed hawk
- Great horned owl
- Barn owl

The IDFG, the Bureau of the Reclamation, and the Boise Climbers Alliance (BCA) (a local nonprofit advocacy and stewardship group comprised of Treasure Valley climbers) have signed a MOU to maintain climbing access and protect nesting raptors and sensitive wildlife.

The BCA implements a seasonal raptor monitoring and protection program from February 1 until August 25. These efforts work to detect and document the presence of nesting raptors and to implement seasonal buffer zones that limit pedestrian and climber disturbances during the critical nesting season. Each year, starting February 1, buffer zones are erected to limit access to cliffs and climbing routes in previously documented raptor nesting territories until nesting activity areas can be verified or disproven. In areas with confirmed nesting raptors, buffer zones are maintained until

all of the young have successfully fledged from the nest. After fledging, buffer zones are lifted until the next year.

The BCA raptor monitoring and protection program is currently advised and implemented by Dusty Perkins, a raptor biologist. Dusty maintains regular contact with IDFG staff regarding closures and monitoring efforts. The monitoring program is supported by a staff of volunteer observers and student interns that assist in monitoring the chronology and productivity of identified nests.

In addition to monitoring and implementing buffer zones, the BCA engages in regular public outreach and education via their website and social media outlets and by distributing brochures. The bulk of these efforts work to inform and educate the public about the importance of protecting nesting raptors, the role of raptors as ecosystem indicators, and how to report nesting raptors.

Soil Compaction and Erosion

Evidence of erosion is most apparent on trails where water is not adequately diverted. This problem is compounded where trails were not properly designed. Currently, a variety of techniques are used to get water off trails. Rolling water bars, drain dips, and outsloping are some of the techniques used for trail maintenance. R2R staff agree that properly located, designed, built, and regularly maintained trails are the best way to provide sustainable trail opportunities and reduce the cost of ongoing trail maintenance.

Use of muddy trails in the winter and spring can intensify rutting and erosion, leading to an increase in the need for trail maintenance. Maintenance efforts have improved the stability of the trails, but these efforts are a never-ending and costly battle. Bikes, motorized vehicles, and equestrian activity can have the most significant impacts on muddy trails. The last few years, R2R has enacted voluntary closures on certain trails after 10 a.m. to discourage inappropriate use. In order to better alert users of trail conditions, R2R staff have posted information on their website and created a Boise Trails Conditions Facebook site to alert users of trail conditions on a daily basis. The present strategy is to discourage muddy trail use through education, signage, and public service announcements.

Dog Waste

Based on recent surveys, 25% to 30% of surveyed trail users have a dog with them. According to the surveys, some trail users think dog waste in the Foothills is fertilizer, not an environmental problem. However, carnivorous animals, such as dogs, do not produce useable manure-fertilizer for plants. Beneficial manure-fertilizer comes from herbivores. On the contrary, native plants in the Foothills are used to low-nitrogen soil and dog waste is high in nitrogen; therefore, high concentrations of dog waste (e.g., near trailheads) changes the soil chemistry and creates a micro-environment favorable to noxious weed species that thrive in nitrogen-rich soil. Also, 1 gram of dog waste contains 23 million fecal coliform, almost twice as much as human waste (van der Wel 1995). Fecal coliform along with strep, roundworms, salmonella, and giardia can all cause disease in other animals and humans. To create a baseline of data on the amount of dog waste in the Foothills, annually the last six years in February, sprinkler flags have been used to count piles of dog waste
left on the ground at key trailheads (Table 5). The range of counts has varied from year to year and location.

	Lower Hulls Gulch		Corrals	Table Rock		
2008	14	11	115	82		
2009	49		142	66		
2010	92		109	50		
2011	80		112	80		
2012	41		82	106		
2013	79	105	13	36		
2014	61	29	104			

TABLE 5 DOG WASTE COUNT

Fire

Fire has a direct impact on recreation. The 8th Street Fire in 1996 impacted many existing trails. The Hulls Gulch bridges were destroyed, and many other trails were not accessible until rehabilitation efforts were completed. Erosion intensified where trail users left R2R trails and traversed burned land. Since that fire, there have been several small (5 acres or less) fires on public lands in the Foothills. All of the fires closed a trail (or more) temporarily while the fire was extinguished. In a few cases, the trails acted as fuel breaks or access corridors for firefighters. Some of the burned areas have been reseeded with native grasses and forbs.



For more information on each agency's policies related to recreation in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

```
Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/four-
rivers_RMP.html.
```

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

Ada County Code 5-7-6-b.

Ada County Development Services. 1996. Ada County Comprehensive Plan.

Ada Planning Association (APA). July 1998. Interim Foothills Transportation Plan.

Breuer, Tim. Land Trust of the Treasure Valley. February 2013. Personal communication to Julia Grant, City of Boise.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Boise District. 1990. Cascade Resource Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Partners in Flight. 1998. Birds as Indicators of Riparian Vegetation Condition in the Western U.S. BLM/ID/PT-98/004-6635. 4 pp.

City of Boise. 2011. City of Boise Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan.

City of Boise. 1997. City of Boise Comprehensive Plan: Goals, Objectives, and Policies.

- City of Boise. March 1997. City of Boise Foothills Policy Plan. An amendment to the City of Boise Comprehensive Plan. Boise, ID.
- Colorado State Parks, Trails and Wildlife Task Force. September 1998. Planning Trails with Wildlife in Mind.
- EDAW, CH2M Hill, and Jensen-Belts Associates. July 1996. Reserves Master Plan, Hulls Gulch/Camel's Back Reserve and Military Reserve.

Federal Highway Administration and National Recreation Trails Advisory Committee. August 1994. Conflicts on Multiple-Use Trails: Synthesis of the Literature and State of Practice.

Moseley, R., M. Mancuso, and J. Hilty. 1992. Rare Plant and Riparian Vegetation Inventory of the Boise Foothills, Ada County, Idaho. Conservation Data Center, Nongame/Endangered Wildlife Program, Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Prepared for City of Boise Planning and Zoning.

Muller, Krista. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. February 2013. Personal communication to Julia Grant, City of Boise.

Perkins, Dusty. Boise Climbers Alliance Stewardship Chair. March 2013. Personal communication to Julia Grant, City of Boise.

Van der Wel, B. 1995. Dog Pollution. The Magazine of the Hydrological Society of South Australia. 2(1)1.

4-2 HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Boise Foothills provide access to hunting for recreational and subsistence use. Information about the amount of hunting and trapping usage within the Foothills is incomplete, varying from one ownership to the next. Areas open to hunting include federal and state lands outside the city limits of Boise. Areas closed to hunting include Ada County lands, City of Boise lands, and all lands within the City of Boise city limits. Outside the city limits, hunting on private land is at the discretion of the landowner.

Hunting in Idaho is regulated by the IDFG. Hunters must possess the appropriate license, tags, stamps, and permits and must abide by state hunting regulations. Information from the Boise River WMA indicates the most popular animals to hunt in the Foothills are mule deer and upland game birds. The estimated number of hunters and the number of animals harvested have fluctuated over the years. This fluctuation is influenced by early or severe winter weather, changes in hunting regulations, and changes in wildlife population densities.

Hunters tend to concentrate close to the top of the Boise Ridge, near Boise Ridge Road, and within the forested lands of the Boise National Forest. Some hunters access public and private land from Bogus Basin Road.

Increased urbanization, intensified outdoor recreational activity, and other uses within the Foothills management area have created the potential for conflicts with hunters and hunting opportunities. These conflicts can result in unsafe conditions where hunting occurs fairly close to other recreationists and Foothills users.

HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

HUNTING

Information about hunting within the Foothills is inconsistent from one ownership to the next. IDFG has fairly good information about the amount of hunting that takes place within the Boise River WMA at the eastern end of the Foothills management area. The IDFG considers hunting the top recreation priority in the WMA. The amount and type of hunting that takes place on private lands in the Foothills is unknown.

In general, the federal and state lands within the Foothills are open to hunting. These lands are managed by the USFS, BLM, IDL, and IDFG. Within the Foothills management area, lands closed to hunting include Ada County lands (concentrated in the Foothills management area), City of Boise lands (including parks and reserves), and all lands within the City of Boise city limits (regardless of ownership). Although hunting is prohibited within the Military Reserve, recreational archery shooting is permissible.

Outside the City of Boise city limits, hunting on private land is at the discretion of the landowner. Hunting, with the permission of the landowner, undoubtedly occurs on some of the private lands within the Foothills, but other parcels are posted for no hunting.

Although Ada County does not regulate or restrict where hunting occurs, it is a misdemeanor for any person to recklessly discharge a firearm, bow and arrow, or crossbow within the county. "Reckless" is defined as conduct that shows a willful and wanton disregard for the safety or property of others and that can cause bodily injury or death to people or domestic animals or damage the property of others.

IDFG regulates hunting of game animals in Idaho. All hunters must obtain the appropriate hunting license, tags, stamps, and permits from IDFG for the type of game they are pursuing. In addition, hunters must abide by state hunting regulations that, among other things, specify the legal seasons, times, methods of take, bag, and possession limits for game species. Some of the statewide regulations are listed below:



• Protected nongame species of

wildlife include bison (buffalo), red squirrels, wolverines, chipmunks, golden-mantled and Idaho ground squirrels, pikas, kit foxes, migratory songbirds, and northern flying squirrels. All hawks, owls, eagles, and vultures are protected.

- All nongame birds in Idaho are protected except starlings, English sparrows, and feral pigeons. Protected nongame birds cannot be hunted, taken, or possessed.
- Coyotes, skunks, weasels, and jackrabbits are classified by Idaho law as predatory and unprotected wildlife. Other unprotected animals include marmots, fox squirrels, porcupines, and Townsend's and Columbian ground squirrels. Holders of valid Idaho licenses can take these species in any amount year-round.
- No person may enter private land to hunt, fish, or trap without permission if the land is either cultivated or properly posted as "No Trespassing." Proper posting means either legible "No Trespassing" signs, 100 square inches of fluorescent orange paint, or an entire fluorescent orange fence post every 660 feet around the property and at reasonable access points.
- It is unlawful to shoot from or across the traveled portion, shoulders, or embankments of any road maintained by any government entity.
- It is unlawful to hunt game from any motorized vehicle.
- Most hunting is limited to the period from one-half hour before sunrise to sunset or one-half hour after sunset.

Additionally, all federally listed threatened or endangered species are fully protected, and no hunting of these species is allowed. No listed species are known to occur in the Foothills management area.

The Foothills management area is part of IDFG'S big game Unit 39 and is included in a number of other annual hunting seasons. The exact dates for the hunting seasons that include the Foothills management area change from year to year, and the bag and possession limits and number of controlled hunt permits can also change. Occasionally, new hunting seasons are added or old

hunting seasons are modified or removed by IDFG, depending on changes in wildlife populations, habitats, and public input.

Based on periodic hunter checks conducted by IDFG for the Boise River WMA, the greatest population of hunted animals in the Foothills are mule deer and upland game birds, such as forest grouse (ruffled and blue), chukar partridge, gray partridge, and California quail (Scholten 2000).

Although not widely pursued, open seasons that apply to all or a portion of the Foothills management area exist for hunting other animals. These animals include black bear, mountain lions, ducks, geese, badgers, bobcats, foxes, and raccoons.

The only portion of the Foothills for which detailed information about the amount of hunting use exists is the WMA, managed by the IDFG. The WMA is composed of several segments, but only one of these segments, the Boise Front segment, is included in the Foothills management area. IDFG reports that approximately half of the hunter use and game harvested within the WMA occurs on the Boise Front segment. Data show the estimated number of hunters and number of animals harvested fluctuates annually. These fluctuations are primarily influenced by such factors as early or severe winter weather, changes in



hunting regulations, and changes in wildlife population densities.

Other sources of Foothills hunting information include the BLM and USFS. The BLM has conducted surveys of recreational use of their lands that consist of observing and interviewing recreationists at several Foothills trailheads and other access points. Preliminary information from these surveys indicates that hunting is a minor component of the recreational use that takes place on BLM lands in the Foothills.

According to the USFS, the Boise National Forest receives more than 1.5 million visitors annually and of these visitors 11% (165,000) are hunters (Agriculture 2009). As this usage data are over the entirety of the Boise National Forest, the number of hunters who visit the Foothills management area is unclear.

Anecdotal information indicates that more hunting probably takes place closer to the top of the Boise Ridge and within the forested lands of the Boise National Forest (Fink 2000; Hagadorn 2000). However, observation of the use patterns in the forest indicates that big game and upland bird hunters tend to concentrate along Boise Ridge Road and in the forested habitats nearby (Fink 2000). It is likely the amount of hunting on Boise National Forest land within the Foothills management area is significantly greater than that on BLM lands at lower elevations in the Foothills. In addition, some evidence suggests hunting use is concentrated along Bogus Basin Road (Scholten 2000), because this road provides ready access to lands open to hunting and because game animals can often be spotted by hunters traveling the road. Approximately 30 to 35 turnouts along Bogus Basin Road provide potential observation or access points.

TRAPPING

Trapping occurs in the Boise Foothills and has for several centuries. IDFG regulates trapping licenses and collects data on animals harvested. Currently, the badger, beaver, bobcat, red fox, coyote, striped and spotted skunks, long-tailed weasel, and raccoon found in the Boise Foothills can be trapped.

FISHING

Fishing opportunities are limited within the Foothills management area. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Robie Creek recreation site is the only public boating and fishing access in the Foothills management area.

However, anecdotal information indicates that some fishing might occur along upper Dry Creek where beaver dams have created small pools.



SHOOTING RANGES

Built in 1960, the shooting range at the end of Mountain Cove Road in Military Reserve has been used as a Boise Police training facility. The Boise Police Association owned the shooting range until in 2008, the City decided to purchase the 8.6-acre site for \$750,000. In 2013, a design for improvements went through the planning and zoning process. It was at that point the public began to show concern about investing \$1.3 million in site improvements when they believed a shooting range in Military Reserve was no longer compatible with the adjacent recreational use on R2R trails. The Boise Police Department has not decided how it will move forward on this project.

Archery Range. A small archery range is located on 5 acres in Military Reserve at 750 N Mountain Cove Road. In recent years, a number of improvements have been made to the range.

HUNTING AND TRAPPING THREATS AND IMPACTS

The following factors can threaten sportsman opportunities in the Foothills.

INCREASED URBANIZATION

Increased urbanization and intensified recreational activity and other uses within the Foothills have increased the potential for conflicts with hunters and hunting opportunities.

Although such incidents of hunter and recreationalist conflict have apparently occurred without further incident, unsafe conditions undoubtedly exist. The potential for such conflicts will continue to increase as residential developments move closer to hunting areas and as other forms of Foothills recreation and use grow in popularity. In recent years, there have been several cases of dogs getting caught in traps in the Foothills management area. The trappers assumed they were in an area with little recreationalist use because no R2R trails are in that area; however, some hikers



and runners like to travel off-trail and take their dogs with them (off-leash). This type of conflict is likely to happen more frequently as trappers have fewer places to go with the R2R trails expanding across the Foothills.

Increased urbanization and intensified recreational activity has also resulted in impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitats. The loss of wildlife and their habitats also reduces the number and diversity of safe and successful hunting and trapping opportunities in the Foothills.

POLICIES FOR HUNTING AND TRAPPING

All agencies coordinate with IDFG to maintain healthy habitat for wildlife. City of Boise, Ada County, and Boise County impose regulations on residential developers to protect the wildlife habitat. The BLM and USFS all work with IDFG to designate open space to protect wildlife habitat (such as the WMA).

Ultimately, IDFG is responsible for viable populations of wildlife. All agencies coordinate with IDFG before undertaking a project in the Foothills. In the last few years, IDFG has reviewed its trapping regulations as a result of several dogs getting caught in traps within the Foothills management area. IDFG has not chosen to alter any of their trapping regulations; however, they are encouraging trappers to use a *warning sign* they can print off of IDFG's website and place on a stake to warn recreational users that traps are in the area. The sign is courtesy of IDFG and the Idaho Trapper's Association.

For more information on IDFG's policies related to hunting and trapping in the Foothills management area visit:

http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/hunt/

REFERENCES

INTERVIEWS

Fink, Laurie. Recreation Technician, Boise National Forest, U.S. Forest Service. February 2000. Personal communication.

Fishandgame.idaho.gov

- Hagadorn, William. Outdoor Recreation Program Lead, Bureau of Land Management, Lower Snake River District. January 2000. Personal communication.
- Scholten, Jerry. Boise River Wildlife Management Area, Idaho Department of Fish and Game. January 2000. Personal communication.

4-3 TRANSPORTATION IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

As development and recreation increase in the Foothills, so does the need for new roads and upgrades to existing roads. Variable topography, steep grades, erosive soils, and significant visual impacts severely constrain opportunities for new roads to meet these demands. In addition, Boise residents, specifically those in the north end, are concerned that increased traffic, hillside development, and transportation system improvements could have adverse effects on their neighborhood. Several major streets (36th Street, 15th Street, Harrison Boulevard, and Warm Springs Avenue) carry more traffic currently than they were originally designed for, which heightens property owners' concerns over safety, increased noise, more vehicle trips, and air pollution. Work needs to continue to find the right balance between the diverse interests of recreationists, developers, and residents.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Agency Working Group established a transportation goal for the Interagency Plan. Specifically, the goal states "Work with managing agencies to ensure the transportation plans complements the *Interagency Foothills Management* Plan."

With this broad goal in mind, the following section describes the existing transportation system, identifies future road plans, analyzes transportation plans, reviews policies of the various signatories of the MOU, and identifies other transportation issues as they relate to management of the Foothills open space. This analysis divides the entire Foothills management area into three distinct planning areas that are consistent with those established by the *Interim Foothills Transportation Plan* and Ada County Highway District (ACHD) (see Figure 9).



- Western Foothills Planning Area—Includes lands west of Bogus Basin Road and east of State Highway 55.
- Central Foothills Planning Area—Bordered by Bogus Basin Road on the west and 8th Street on the east.
- Eastern Foothills Planning Area—Bordered by 8th Street on the west and State Highway 21 on the east.

PLANNING AREAS

Western Foothills Planning Area

The Western Foothills Planning Area is served by collector and arterial roads. This area is comprised largely of private land, including the Hidden Springs development (1,700 acres), the Ada County landfill (2,700 acres), and Polecat Gulch Reserve (834 acres). Primary roads in this area include State Highway 55, Dry Creek Road, Seaman Gulch Road, Pierce Park Lane, Cartwright Road,

and 36th Street. This planning area continues to have new developments stretching east along Dry Creek and Cartwright Roads from Hidden Springs. Upgrading or reconstructing and realigning some of the roads will be needed over time. Roads slated for construction, reconstruction, or realignment include the extension of 36th Street to Cartwright Road and eventually to Bogus Basin Road within the next 20 years. The ACHD five-year work plan outlines the intersection at Hill Road and State Highway 55 (2013); and Hill Road, 36th Street, and Catalpa (2017) are to be rebuilt.

R2R now manages 4.5 miles of trails at Hidden Springs, 8 miles of trails at Polecat Gulch, and 6.8 miles of trails near Veterans Cemetery, Seaman Gulch, and the Eagle Sports Complex. These trails have drawn more cyclists to the roads in the Western Planning Area. Bike commuters and training road cyclists are frequent users of these roads as well.

Central Foothills Planning Area

The Central Foothills Planning Area is the only area with significant land outside Ada County. The northern boundary of the Foothills management area wraps around Bogus Basin Resort and includes lands under the jurisdiction of Boise County. The land ownership is mixed in this planning area. The public lands are owned and administered by the USFS, IDL, City of Boise, and BLM. Public roads in this area include Bogus Basin Road, Boise Ridge Road, and 8th Street/Sunset Peak Road. Bogus Basin Road provides access to Bogus Basin Resort and destinations to the north within the

Boise National Forest. During the summer and fall, Boise Ridge Road carries primarily 4-wheel drive traffic between Bogus Basin Road and Rocky Canyon Road. Boise Ridge Road and 8th Street/Sunset Peak Road are both gravel roads that provide access to trailheads and national forest lands. 8th Street/Sunset Peak Road is closed seasonally to reduce impacts on the roadbed in the winter and early spring. ACHD maintains Bogus Basin Road and lower 8th Street, and the USFS maintains Boise Ridge Road as a Maintenance Level II road (for high-clearance vehicles). No



ACHD capital improvement projects are scheduled for this area in the next 20 years.

R2R now manages about 60 miles of trails in the Camel's Back, Hulls Gulch, and Central Foothills Planning Area. Mountain bikes frequent lower 8th Street and Bogus Basin Road as they travel to trailheads. Road cyclists enjoy the challenge of Bogus Basin Road from spring until late fall. In 2010, an 8-mile stretch of lower Bogus Basin Road was dedicated and signed as the Kristin Armstrong Bikeway after hometown Olympic gold medalist Kristin Armstrong.

In 2002, ACHD worked with representatives from the City of Boise, BLM, and the Boise National Forest to find a solution to the ongoing maintenance issues of 8th Street/Sunset Peak Road. ACHD had hoped to pave the road to reduce safety hazards, maintenance costs, air pollution, and erosion. However, the city and others were concerned that paving the road would lead to cars traveling at faster speeds through Hulls Gulch Reserve and putting recreationists in danger. In the end, Soil-

Sement[®] was added to the road for \$13,000 and subsequent coats will be applied annually. This is considerably less than the almost \$30,000 per year ACHD was spending to maintain the dirt road.

Eastern Foothills Planning Area

The Eastern Foothills Planning Area is bordered on the west by 8th Street/Sunset Peak Road and on the east by State Highway 21. Roads in the area include Warm Springs Avenue, Rocky Canyon Road, Table Rock Road, Highland Valley Road, and State Highway 21. Rocky Canyon Road, a northsouth road, is gravel and one lane. It was part of the original Toll Road between Boise and Idaho City. It is the only road in this area that provides access to Boise Ridge Road, destinations in the Boise National Forest, and the Robie Creek area of Boise County. Spring brings runners to the road as they train for the Robie Creek Race (a half-marathon) held every April. Every summer highclearance vehicles and mountain bikers frequent the road as they access 12.9 miles of R2R trails in Rocky Canyon.

Mountain Cover Road in Military Reserve in another road in this planning area, but it is managed by the City of Boise Parks and Recreation Department, which also owns and manages Military Reserve. The road is graded on average twice a year. Since 2008, when the City of Boise Police Department acquired the shooting range at the end of Mountain Cover Road, the road has received regular use by squad cars as well recreationists and inholding neighbors.

The Eastern Foothills Planning Area includes a large amount of publicly owned land, including parcels administered by the USFS, BLM, IDFG, and USACE. This area supports significant numbers of wintering big game and includes both the Boise Front Area of Critical Environment Concern (ACEC), as designated by the BLM, and the 36,000-acre Boise River WMA, which is administered by the IDFG. Concern for wintering big game and increased erosion can lead to a seasonal closure of East Highland Valley and Council Springs Roads.

IDFG has 32 years of big game mortality data along State Highway 21. Since 1996, annual collisions have resulted in more than 100 mule deer and 5 elk deaths per year, with some harsher winter years exceeding 200 dead animals. In 2007, a collaborative working group called the Boise River Wildlife Linkage Partnership (the partnership) was formed. The mission of the partnership is to actively seek mitigation solutions within the State Highway 21 and Warm Springs Avenue corridor that will maintain habitat connectivity and effectively reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions. In 2010, ITD completed construction of a wildlife underpass and a portion of the wildlife exclusion fence using funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Since it was installed, just a couple of collisions resulting in dead mule deer have occurred. New signage warning travelers about the presence of migrating big game and tallying the annual number of mule deer collision deaths have been installed along the corridor as well.

The Eastern Foothills Planning Area also has R2R trails; therefore, occasionally mountain bikers are seen along Warm Springs Avenue as they travel to access the trails. The Greenbelt runs parallel to Warm Springs Avenue in this planning area, but most road cyclists prefer to ride along the narrow shoulder of Warm Springs Avenue toward Lucky Peak Dam. Vehicle trips continue to increase in the Barber Valley area, with the establishment of a new East Junior High School and new residential developments within Harris Ranch and River Heights. Barber Valley households are projected to increase from 550 in 2009 to 4,462 in 2025. More housing will result in more vehicles

on the road, thus more mitigation measures will be needed to ensure the safety of both the traveling public and migrating wildlife in this area. ACHD has no capital improvement projects outlined for this planning area in the next 20 years.

TRANSPORTATION PLANS

The following is an overview of the various plans guiding the transportation system in the Foothills. Elected officials, citizens, and planners use these plans in evaluating transportation issues associated with specific development proposals in the Foothills.

Interim Foothills Transportation Plan

The Ada Planning Association (APA) Board (now the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho or COMPASS) accepted the *Interim Foothills Transportation Plan* for distribution on July 20, 1998. This plan, a required component of the *City of Boise Foothills Policy Plan*, is a survey of the existing transportation system and recommends changes to the Communities in Motion 2035 Plan *(the COMPASS long-range transportation plan)* for system improvements relative to the Foothills. Although still titled the *Interim Foothills Transportation Plan*, it is the plan of record for the Foothills transportation system and has been adopted by the City of Boise and ACHD. The tenants of the plan are based on a number of assumptions about land use. Those assumptions were derived from an analysis of existing comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances pertaining to the Foothills, including the *Ada County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance*, the 1997 *City of Boise Comprehensive Plan (not Blueprint Boise)*, the *Foothills Policy Plan and Zoning Ordinance*, and approved but unbuilt developments.

Over the last decade, some changes have been made to the Foothills transportation system, which include the following.

Western Foothills

- Upgrading of Cartwright-Dry Creek Road from a rural road to a minor arterial from State Highway 55 to where the 36th Street extension.
- Upgrading Seaman Gulch Road from a rural road to a minor arterial from Hill Road to Dry Creek Road.

Eastern Foothills

• Extending a new collector from Park Center Boulevard bridge to Warm Springs Avenue near the Harris Ranch development

For trails, the *Interim Foothills Transportation Plan* encourages the preservation and development of a public trail system connecting neighborhoods, public parks and lands, schools, and shopping and employment opportunities where possible. The plan also mandates compliance with the *Ridge-to-Rivers Pathway Plan* and 1997 *City of Boise Comprehensive Plan* requirements for trails within new developments. Finally, the plan encourages public acquisition and maintenance of public trails and access to public lands from public roads or trails routed around or through Foothills developments.

Communities in Motion 2035 Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan for Ada and Canyon Counties

The Communities in Motion 2035 Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan for Ada and Canyon Counties (or Communities in Motion 2035) provides regional transportation solutions for the next 20-plus years. The plan evaluates projected population and employment growth, current and future transportation needs, safety, financial capacity, and preservation of the human and natural environment. Communities in Motion offers a vision for land use, known as "Community Choices" and addresses the way land use affects transportation, how investments in transportation influence growth, what an ideal transportation system can achieve, how transportation projects are selected, and how transportation projects serve regional needs.

The plan was developed by COMPASS and adopted by the COMPASS Board of Directors in September 2010. The plan is being adopted by local governments and ACHD so that it can be implemented by those agencies through such tools as ACHD's Five-year Work Plan Program, design policies, comprehensive plans, and zoning ordinances. Road corridors highlighted in Communities in Motion 2035 that fall within the Foothills management area include State Highways 21 and 55, both of which are only scheduled for minor safety investments. The plan also encourages the protection of open space in Chapter 3 as a way to reduce need for new or improved transportation systems. Chapter 9 of the plan addresses protection of both natural and cultural resources.

Boise River Trails Coalition Plan

The Boise River Trails Coalition has a vision of a connected system of paths on land and water on and near the Boise River from Lucky Peak Dam to the Snake River. The coalition is made up of a cross-section of Treasure Valley citizens and representatives of cities, counties, and nonprofit organizations. In 2009, after two years of meetings facilitated by a Rivers, Trails & Conservation Assistance Program grant from the National Park Service, the coalition created the Boise River Trails Coalition Plan. The goals of the plan are:

- Create a land and water trail system that will be supported by community participation.
- Design connected paths for community walking, bicycling, horseback riding, bird watching, river paddling, fishing, and other nonmotorized outdoor activities.
- Connect community trail networks with alternative transportation routes.
- Respect the rights of private landowners and the wishes of donors to the path system.
- Promote the health and wellness benefits of Boise River Trails to Treasure Valley residents and visitors.
- Provide educational opportunities and interpretation of the natural and cultural resources along the land and water trails.
- Promote the economic development of Boise River communities through partnerships, programs, and facilities.

Ridge to Rivers Trail Strategic Plan

R2R anticipates it will expand the current 150-mile Foothills trail system by another 50 miles over the next 10 years. A R2R Trail Strategic Plan is needed to review some of the current management strategies and policies, demographics, uses, and concerns and determine the long-

term direction of the R2R system. The City of Boise and Wells Fargo/National Fish and Wildlife Foundation are funding the plan. The planning process will begin summer 2015.

Cascade Resource Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan

The *Cascade Resource Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan* applies to the Cascade Resource Area and was adopted by the Boise District of the BLM in August 1990. The plan seeks to "achieve multiple-use objectives for the protection of wildlife, watershed, vegetation, livestock, paleontological, cultural, and scenic resources as defined in the 1987 *Cascade Resource Management Plan*, while ensuring the continuation of opportunities for motorized off-road vehicle recreation." To achieve that goal, the plan creates three land classifications for motorized off-road vehicle use. The classifications are *open designation, limited designation*, and *closed designation*. The open designation allows for intensive or extensive use with no special restrictions in areas with no significant resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel. The limited designation is used to meet specific resource management objectives and could restrict the number or type of vehicles, the time or season of use, permitted or licensed use, the existing roads or trails used, the designation restricts all vehicle use to protect resources, promote visitor safety, and reduce user conflicts.

The Foothills contains both a limited designation and a closed designation. The Boise Front ACEC applies to approximately 12,000 acres of public land in the eastern Foothills and limits vehicle use to designated roads and trails to minimize watershed disturbance and allows seasonal closures to protect wintering mule deer. Snowmobile use is unrestricted. The Hulls Gulch National Recreation Trail in the central Foothills includes 5 acres and is closed to all off-highway vehicle (OHV) use to protect recreational values.

Boise Front Area of Critical Environmental Concern

ACECs are established through the planning process, as provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, for "...areas within the public lands where special management attention is required (when such areas are developed or used or where no development is required) to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish and wildlife resources; or other natural systems or processes; or to protect watershed values and critical winter range for 4,000 to 6,000 mule deer." The erosion caused by OHV use and how it affects the watershed is of particular concern.

The following are management guidelines from the Critical Concern Report that affect transportation in the Foothills:

- Limiting motorized and nonmotorized vehicle use to designated roads and trails.
- Closing Highland Valley Road and Shaw Mountain Road to motorized and nonmotorized vehicle use from December 15 to May 1.
- Closing the upper portion of 8th Street to all motorized vehicles during the wet winter months.

The following activities will receive management emphasis to further protect resource values:

- Closing and rehabilitating certain roads and trails.
- Maintaining and reconstructing existing roads and trails.
- Restricting future rights-of-way to ensure minimal erosion and visual intrusion.
- Suppressing fires.
- Rehabilitating burned areas.
- Installing water-control structures to reduce erosion.

Land and Resource Management Plan for the Boise National Forest

The Boise National Forest is responsible for maintaining Boise Ridge Road. The road is classified as a Maintenance Level II road and is maintained for high-clearance vehicles. The USFS is undertaking a comprehensive study of all Maintenance Level I and II roads, but there are no immediate plans to modify or upgrade the existing road beyond the routine maintenance schedule.

ISSUES/CHALLENGES FOR TRANSPORTATION

Recreational use issues associated with the Foothills transportation system include access, air quality, erosion and sedimentation, trespassing, and effects on wildlife and sensitive plants.

ACCESS

The primary function of the Foothills transportation system is to provide access to trailheads and trails, Bogus Basin Resort, Boise National Forest, and public and private lands. Given the large amount of private land and the highly variable topography in the Foothills, access is a key issue. Roads are difficult to build and expensive to maintain because of the topography and the nature of the soils and hydrology in the area. Private landowners require roads to develop their land and public land users require public roads to access recreation facilities in the Foothills. Problems associated with increased use multiply with improved access and include trespassing on private land, dumping and vandalism, increased erosion, illegal camping, and disturbance of sensitive wildlife and plant species on all Foothills land. In addition, inadequate parking facilities at trailheads can cause on-street parking, create conflicts between motorists and recreationists, and affect public safety.

AIR QUALITY

Dirt and gravel roads increase the amount of airborne particulates, which reduces air quality. Impacts on air quality can be reduced by paving roads or treating the surfaces with a binding agent that keeps the particles from becoming airborne (see section above about 8th Street). Pavement is durable but expensive, increases erosion, and allows higher vehicle speeds. Binding agents are less effective and durable than pavement, but they are significantly less expensive and do not increase vehicle speeds or runoff.

EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION

Soils in the Foothills consist primarily of coarse weathered granites that are highly erosive, even when undisturbed. Disturbance of the natural plant cover that binds soils in place increases erosion and stream sedimentation. Poorly built or maintained roads, unrestricted OHV use, and unrestricted bike and foot traffic create or intensify erosion and sedimentation problems in the Foothills. Mitigation of these problems can be expensive and is one of the primary issues associated with increased use in the Foothills.



During field investigations, evidence of erosion was most apparent where water was diverted off roads. Heavy runoff diverted to concentrated areas and then formed gullies that, in some cases, were more than 15 inches deep. While the entire Foothills management area was not reviewed, this type of erosion is evident along all major roads in the Foothills management area, including 8th Street, Rocky Canyon Road, and Bogus Basin Road.

TRESPASSING

Trespassing is an issue for both private landowners and public land managers. Private landowners deal mostly with unauthorized use by recreationists, including OHVs, hikers, and mountain bikers. Trespassing on public land is usually associated with people who use an area that is closed. Unauthorized use of private land disturbs vegetation and can therefore increase erosion and sedimentation. Unauthorized use also increases the difficulty of obtaining valid trail easements for public use.

WILDLIFE AND SENSITIVE PLANT IMPACTS

A large portion of the eastern Foothills has been designated an ACEC by the BLM, and sensitive plant species occur in both the western and central Foothills. These sensitive plant species include Aase's onion and Mulford's milkvetch. Impacts on sensitive plants can include habitat destruction by invasion of exotic plant species and trampling of individual plants by recreationists. In addition, wildlife is affected by habitat destruction and disturbance during the critical winter period when energy reserves are low and food is scarce.

POLICIES FOR TRANSPORTATION

The Agency Working Group reviewed policies to develop objectives and recommendations (see Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations).

4. BACKGROUNDRESOURCE USE

All agencies recognize the importance of the transportation system for moving vehicles and pedestrians through the Foothills safely and efficiently. City of Boise and Ada County have similar policies that require coordination with the ACHD before construction of any new road. City of Boise and Ada County have adopted the *Interim Foothills Transportation Plan* and *Destination 2020 Regional Transportation Plan for Ada County* for identifying the sites of new road improvements.

All agencies seek to use roads as an alternative transportation system for bikes and pedestrians and to link open space and other public areas. In all cases, agencies limit use to designated trails and roads only. People can be cited for unauthorized off-highway use.

City of Boise and Ada County look to the *ACHD Development Policy Manual* for traffic management, maintenance, and improvement information. While federal agencies have specific standards for planning and maintaining roads.

Both the BLM and USFS have policies that closely consider wildlife and watershed resources in planning, maintaining, or closing roads. City of Boise and the county agencies do not have specific policies to protect Foothills resources. In most cases, city and county agencies support growth and development with new roads. State and federal agencies support public and recreational use through the development and maintenance of new roads.

For more information on each agency's policies related to transportation in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest - http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

Ada County Development Services. 1996. Ada County Comprehensive Plan.

Ada Planning Association (APA). 1996. Destination 2015 Regional Transportation Plan for Northern Ada County.

Ada Planning Association (APA). 1996. Ridge-to-Rivers Pathway Plan. Revised edition.

Ada Planning Association (APA). July 1998. Interim Foothills Transportation Plan.

Boise County. 1999. Boise County Comprehensive Plan.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Boise District. 1990. Cascade Resource Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1999. Boise Front Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

City of Boise. 1997. City of Boise Comprehensive Plan: Goals, Objectives, and Policies.

- City of Boise. March 1997. City of Boise Foothills Policy Plan. An amendment to the City of Boise Comprehensive Plan. Boise, ID.
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS). April 1990. Land and Resource Management Plan for the Boise National Forest.

4-4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Solid Waste Management Department is responsible for managing the waste disposal needs of the citizens of Ada County. This department oversees operation of the Hidden Hollow Sanitary Landfill and manages the land surrounding the landfill. Because of prudent planning by the Board of Ada County Commissioners, in 1984 Ada County purchased 2,200 acres of land in the Boise Foothills for landfill purposes. By 2003, the area had increased to 2,655 acres. With this amount of land under the county's jurisdiction, the board ensured that space for waste disposal was available to county residents for the foreseeable future.

Landfill operations change the characteristics of land and its ability to be used for other purposes. Modern landfills are essentially a mountain-building exercise. Depressions are filled and valleys become hills. Topographical features are forever altered.

Operational considerations of the landfill will conflict with much of the plan.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

Federal law requires that the landfill be covered at the end of each operating day with a minimum of six inches of soil. This proved beneficial to the department's operations because each cubic yard of cover soil excavated created a cubic yard of air space for waste disposal. In 1992, the

landfill ceased lateral expansion and instead of expanding out, the landfill began its ascent. No longer was each yard of cover material creating a yard of air space. This change meant that a source of cover material had to be found that was close to the landfill. So, within the county's property, excavation of cover material began. This excavation changes the visual characteristics of the Foothills around the landfill.

With the end of lateral expansion, the landfill increased its vertical height. The



landfill soon crested over the tops of the surrounding hills. Until the landfill reaches its designed capacity and is closed, the landfill will be visible from much of the Boise Valley.

Because the Board of Ada County Commissioners purchased a very large parcel of land for solid waste disposal, the citizens of Ada County will have enough landfill space to last many years. The landfill property is particularly suited for its designated use. The large parcel offers an added benefit to the landfill by preventing residential development from occurring immediately adjacent to the fill site. This buffer zone helps reduce complaints about the landfill.

Even though the landfill property is publicly owned, it is not intended for public recreational use. Although modern landfills are much safer than old burning dumps, hazards are still associated with waste disposal. To eliminate conflicts between Foothills recreation users and landfill operations, the entire landfill property is fenced and posted against trespass.

4. BACKGROUNDRESOURCE USE

As the current landfill nears capacity, plans for a new landfill somewhere else in the county are being prepared.

Numerous regulations from the federal level to the state and local levels govern landfills. Imposition of additional requirements for aesthetic and recreational purposes would affect longrange plans and efforts, including efforts to maintain reasonably priced solid waste disposal.

4-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

Cultural resources—sites, structures, and cultural landscapes—provide an unwritten record of human occupation of an area. These properties reflect human activities over time, from Native American use of the Boise Foothills area to early European-American settlement to modern development. Cultural resources tell the story of the area: variations in the climate, changes in plant and animal resources, and ways in which humans lived on and moved across the landscape.

CULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

Human artifacts can tell a great deal about the society, climate, art, and foods used by people during certain periods. According to records at the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Foothills are scattered with cultural resources that range from artifacts several thousands of years old to historical roads and disappearing agricultural buildings and residences of early European-American settlers.

Early people have left rock alignments and stone flakes and tools. More recent people have left military ammunition, food cans, containers, and other garbage. There are fruit trees, building foundations, mines and quarries, and roadbeds from the historic period. From earliest settlement and use to the present, areas of the Foothills have been used as burial sites. Current residents are putting their own cultural stamp on the landscape: a landfill, roads, recreation trails, power lines, floodcontrol structures, and houses.



No one document contains a good summary and analysis of the archaeology and history of the Foothills because most of the Foothills management area has not been professionally surveyed for historic properties. The cultural resource information that is available is scattered throughout several reports at the SHPO. This report gives a brief overview of the SHPO, the organizations with primary responsibility for cultural resources in the Foothills. Included is a summary of the SHPO's processes for reviewing cultural impacts of federal projects and a listing of designated historic places.

IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITHIN THE FOOTHILLS MANAGEMENT AREA

Only a fraction of the total acreage within the Foothills has been formally surveyed for archaeological and historic properties. The most comprehensive survey was conducted by a federal interagency team following the 1996 8th Street Fire. This investigation focused primarily on public lands. Other surveys include small project-specific work completed by federal agencies and an Ada County survey (Davis and Bauer 1989).

Through this work, more than 130 archaeological and architectural sites across the Foothills have been recorded. The site records are housed at the SHPO. A majority (more than 100) of these sites are archaeological properties with locations that cannot be disclosed, as required by Idaho's Public Records Law, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. Therefore, the specific locations of archaeological properties cannot be included in this, or any other, public document. However, this document can list the types of sites present as well as sites that have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Site types include:

- Historic sites associated with military use
- European-American homesteads or early settlements
- Native American sites

Sites on the National Register of Historic Places

Old Penitentiary. The Idaho State Historical Society operates the Old Penitentiary at the base of the Foothills. The penitentiary was built as a territorial prison in 1870, before Idaho became a state. The prisoners built additional buildings; many of these buildings were constructed with sandstone quarried from Table Rock. In addition, the prisoners raised produce and animals for food (Sevy 1995). The quarry and remnants of a canal, which ran along a contour from about the Diversion Dam to the penitentiary site, are two of the historical sites outside of the walls but are associated with the former prison (King 2000).

Trails lead from the Old Penitentiary into the Foothills. The Idaho Botanical Garden now occupies, through a lease with the Idaho State Historical Society, part of the prison yard and

maintains an extensive interpretive program. In spring 2000, interpretive signs about the geology of the area were installed along the trail from the Old Penitentiary into the Foothills (Swanson 2000). During the annual trail user survey, many Table Rock area trail users commented about the need for more interpretative signage in this area.

Dry Creek Rock Shelter. Using radiocarbon dating, this shelter was estimated to have been used about 3,500 years ago. The shelter is on private land and is not accessible to the public.



Fort Boise Barracks/Military Reserve. The Boise Barracks were originally occupied by the U.S. Army in 1863, were formally established in 1873, and were used for military activities through World War II. By 1927, targets for the 75mm guns had been erected in the Foothills with firing batteries located near the entrance to what is now Skyline Drive. In addition, the Boise Rifle and Pistol Club used a building near what is now the Boise Police Shooting Range in the Military Reserve.

4. BACKGROUNDRESOURCE USE

The Boise Barracks consist of two areas: the main post and a watershed area totaling 7,955 acres. The post area (440 acres) contained all of the facilities to support the former barracks (Penguilly 2012). Today, the post area includes the U.S. Veterans Administration Hospital, a federal building, the state veterans home, Ft. Boise Park and a portion of Military Reserve both owned by the City of Boise, the post cemetery, and other buildings.

In 2002, a removal action was implemented for an area that includes the historic primary target impact area for the 75mm artillery training. The removal action was a surface clearance and a subsurface clearance on different portions of the Military Reserve. No live items were recovered during the surface clearance and one unexploded ordnance (UXO) item, a 75mm projectile, was blown in place during the subsurface clearance.

In 2010, the Seattle District of the USACE conducted the first five-year review of the Boise Barracks. The purpose of the five-year review was to determine if response actions implemented at the site continue to minimize explosives safety risks and remain protective of human health, safety, and the environment. New signs educating users about UXOs were posted on several R2R trails and a couple of trailheads. Before any new trails are built in this area or excavation work is undertaken, the USACE has agreed to do a surface and subsurface survey of the Foothills management area (USACE 2011).

Schick/Ostalasa Farmstead. Located within the Hidden Springs housing development, the Schick/Ostalasa Farmstead is comprised today of a farmhouse and six outbuildings. It has some of the oldest buildings in Ada County and may be the oldest intact farmstead. Construction on the house began in 1864. Other structures, now historic, were added from 1870 to the 1930s. Residents of Hidden Springs formed the Dry Creek Historical Society to fund the site's National Register of Historic Places listing and rehabilitation of the farmhouse and its setting. The farmstead is still standing due to the community's vigilance and interest in its history. The site is now owned by Ada County and is managed by the Dry Creek Historical Society.

IDAHO STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

The SHPO, a division of the Idaho State Historical Society, is the lead historic preservation agency in Idaho. Established in 1971 by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the SHPO fulfills a variety of functions to identify, evaluate, register, and protect Idaho's historic properties. These functions include managing the National Register of Historic Places program; providing federal tax incentives for commercial development of historic properties; coordinating Certified Local Governments, education, surveys, and Section 106 review. The Section 106 review process provides a local voice for history in federal project planning. In meeting all of these responsibilities, the SHPO works closely with federal and state agencies, local governments, tribal governments, citizen groups, and property owners. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on properties listed (or eligible for listing) in the National Register of Historic Places. In the Section 106 review process (36 CFR 800), the SHPO advises federal agencies on:

- How to complete the review process.
- The identification and significance of historic properties in Idaho.
- Ways to avoid or mitigate effects on historic properties in Idaho.

Historical significance of a property is determined by applying criteria established by the National Register of Historic Places. Administered by the National Park Service, the National Register of Historic Places is the official list of the nation's cultural resources that are worthy of preservation.

THREATS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES

In the Foothills, the following factors can threaten cultural resources:

- Housing development can cause land-disturbing activities and encroach upon archaeological sites and historic structures.
- Both existing and proposed roads and trails can disturb cultural resources.
- Unauthorized trail and off-road use can damage cultural resources.
- Erosion caused by human activities can expose cultural resources to disturbance and weathering.
- Wildfire may damage or lead to vandalism of cultural resources.
- Ignorance of laws and policies protecting cultural resources can result in destruction and vandalism of cultural resources.
- Identification and interpretation of sites.

POLICIES FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES

Agency representatives referenced existing agency policies to develop objectives and recommendations for this plan (see Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations).

City of Boise, Ada County, and Boise County have specific policies that call for the protection of cultural resources. IDFG recognizes the importance of cultural resources and coordinate with the SHPO on cultural resource issues on state lands. Federal agencies must consider cultural resources in land management and project development.

Federal agencies are required by the National Historic Preservation Act and other federal laws to consider cultural resources in their land planning and project development. In Idaho, there is no state law that requires state agencies to protect cultural resources, except for the Idaho Protection of Graves Act (see below). Some cities and counties have ordinances that call for the consideration or protection of cultural resources. If a site cannot be protected, the City of Boise and Ada County may try to purchase the land or easements to protect the site.

All nonfederal land in Idaho, including private land, is subject to the Idaho Protection of Graves Act (1984), which requires that discovery of human skeletal remains be reported to the Idaho SHPO. Otherwise, there are no legal requirements for private landowners to report cultural resources.

For more information on each agency's policies related to cultural resources in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1982. Southwestern Idaho Cultural Resources Overview, Boise and Shoshone Districts.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1987. Class II Cultural Resource Inventory of the Boise District BLM Owyhee, Bruneau, Jarbidge and Cascade Resource Areas. Prepared by John M. Young. Revised 1986 to include the Cascade Resource Area data.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1999. Boise Front Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

- City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department. 1994. Foothills Plan Background Report.
- City of Boise Heritage Preservation Committee. February 1993. Potential Public Preservation Sites. 22 pp.

Davis, B. and B. Perry Bauer. Ada County Historic Resources: A Reconnaissance Survey. Report prepared for the Ada County Historic Preservation Council. Boise, Idaho.

EDAW, CH2M Hill, Jensen-Belts Associates, Zabala Giltzow Albanese Architects. 1998. Eighth Street Fire Addendum to the Reserves Master Plan: Hulls Gulch/Camel's Back Reserve and Military Reserve, 1996.

Interagency Fire Team. September 1996. Interagency Fire Rehabilitation Report. 43 pp.

- Sevy, Jil M. 1995. Old Idaho Penitentiary 1870-1973: Walking Tour Guide. Idaho State Historical Society.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). September 2011. Final Local Initiatives Implementation Plan for Former Boise Army Barracks, Ada and Boise Counties, Idaho, Project #F10ID010304. Prepared by: USACE, Seattle District. Prepared for: USACE, Kansas City District.
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS). April 1990. Land and Resource Management Plan for the Boise National Forest.

INTERVIEWS

Jones, Larry, Idaho State Historical Society Library. February 2000. Personal communication.

- King, Glenda. Archaeologist and Ethnobotanist, Idaho State Historic Preservation Office. January 2000. Personal communication.
- Nilsson, Patricia. Ada County Development Services. February 2000. Personal communication
- Penguilly, Suzi. Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Idaho Historical Society. September 2012. Personal communication.
- Reed, William. Regional Heritage Service Team Cultural Resources Specialist, Boise National Forest. January 2000. Personal communication.
- Shaw, Dean. Cultural Resource Specialist, Bureau of Land Management. January 2000. Personal communication.
- Swanson, Ken. Administrator, Idaho Historical Museums, Idaho State Historical Society. February 2000. Personal communication.

4-6 GRAZING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

Livestock grazing has occurred in the Boise Foothills since the 1880s. Historically, ranchers as far away as Nevada have been known to graze their livestock in the Foothills. The Military Reserve area was used to feed military horses from the Boise outpost. Between 20 and 30 times as many cattle and sheep historically grazed, unregulated, in this area than are currently allowed to graze the Foothills (Little 2000).

With grazing came damage to the Foothills watersheds. Identified problems such as erosion and overgrazing have been of concern since the early 1900s (Scholten 2000). Flood and mudflows in Boise's North End and the Barber Valley following a large wildfire in the fall of 1959 made watershed problems quite evident. The Soil Conservation Service dug contours and successfully seeded perennial grasses that stabilized the soil on Shaw Mountain following the wildfires and mud flows to reduce soil erosion.

For most of the past century, IDL and the BLM were the primary public land agencies owning land in the Foothills, but neither was actively managing their land for resource protection and enhancement. Over time, a combination of wildfires, concentrated cattle grazing, and unauthorized off-trail use by 4WD vehicles caused the loss of native plants, soil erosion, and watershed damage in the Foothills. This led to the agencies taking on a more active role in managing their lands in a trial and error fashion. In the last few decades, the ownership of the East Foothills gradually came under the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). Starting in the 1970s, sheep grazing was reduced and more focus was given to winter forage for big game species. Historically, privately held lands have been unregulated (Scholten 2000; Duffner 2000; Clark 2000; Little 2000). As of 2014, the Foothills are lightly grazed by several bands of domestic sheep in the spring and the fall, and by cattle sporadically during the year.

The BLM, USACE, USFS, State of Idaho, and IDFG began actively managing grazing on public lands in the early to mid-1970s and, through a process of trial and error, present-day techniques evolved. Historically, privately held lands have been unregulated.

Riparian corridors along Hulls Gulch, Cottonwood Creek, Dry Creek, Five Mile, Orchard Gulch and Crane Creek have not received much grazing pressure in decades. Riparian vegetation is robust in all of these creek corridors. Today, the predominant use along these riparian corridors is recreation.

Although native vegetation communities have been lost in portions of the Foothills, hundreds of volunteers participating in community events have restored plant communities in some burn areas with sagebrush and bitterbrush plantings and seedlings. Many areas of severe erosion from old 4WD vehicle scars have been reseeded and blockaded from further access. In addition, conditions for grazing and rangeland are better today than in the past (pre-1970s) as a result of better-managed grazing practices. In the last few years, the City of Boise has used goat grazing as a wildfire mitigation technique and to control certain invasive weeds.

GRAZING IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

CURRENT GRAZING PRACTICES

Cattle, sheep, horses, and goats are grazed on public and private lands in the Foothills. Public lands are managed under grazing leases regulated by agencies; private land is managed by the landowner. The government agencies manage their properties independently. The grazing responsibilities of land managers from the various departments and agencies are described below.

Idaho Department of Fish and Game

The IDFG actively manages cattle and sheep grazing leases on state and federal land in the Boise River WMA. Watershed values are used to establish grazing guidelines, and grazing practices are modified to provide wildlife habitat.

IDFG allows grazing by cattle from April 15 to the end of July in a nine-pasture rotation. To protect water quality and wildlife habitat, IDFG has fenced off the riparian areas. Jerry Scholten noted that the Boise River WMA has better forage production today than when the IDFG initially implemented the grazing plan nearly three decades ago.

BLM

Like IDFG, the BLM requires grazing permits. The BLM grazes nine allotments in the Foothills between April and July. Grazing permits are valid for 10 years, with each lease based on a set amount of animal unit months (AUMs). To change the permit allotment, the BLM must identify specific concerns or management problems based on range or utilization study. Several smaller allotments located adjacent to private property may be grazed from March to October or are unrestricted as long as the range is not damaged. These variations depend on the wording of the individual permit and the conditions of the terrain.

The BLM is currently reassessing the grazing capacities of its lands through an interdisciplinary team, including a range conservationist, soil scientist, ecologist, and wildlife biologist. The process uses the team to assess the health of plants, soil, and watersheds of the allotment according to the *Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management* (BLM 1997). The entire management area will be surveyed within 10 years and will be inventoried in order of concern.

U.S. Forest Service

The USFS has regulated grazing by permit in the Boise National Forest since the early 1900s. The rangeland includes forest, sagebrush, grasslands, and meadow habitat.

The *Forest Service Allotment Management Plans* outline the use and development of each allotment on a long-term basis. Operating plans outline yearly management direction. USFS personnel inspect allotments for the use, condition, and compliance with grazing permits, the *Allotment Management Plan*, and the *Annual Operation Plan*. The permit holder is responsible for herding, salting, and maintaining livestock, as well as for the cost sharing on range improvement construction and for maintenance of all structural improvements of the allotment.

The USFS is involved in a program called Change on the Range, which was initiated at the national level and is designed to provide more emphasis on the multiple-product values associated with rangelands. One of the major tasks has been, and currently is, associated with the administration and management of livestock grazing programs. Therefore, a general association between the terms "range management" and "livestock management" has emerged.

Today, however, the benefits of the range management are recognized to go well beyond AUMs of forage. General awareness and appreciation for all uses and resources from rangelands have brought about a concerted interest for multiple-product management of these lands.

To meet the new challenges, the USFS is proposing changes in some of its past objectives and policies. In the new range management procedures, techniques are being implemented that measure the effectiveness of management of watershed values, wildlife and fish habitat, recreational opportunities, general aesthetics, and livestock forage. Methods and terminology are being developed that reflect how well we are managing our public rangelands in relation to their full capabilities.

Livestock grazing of range forage will continue. However, along with the production of livestock products, there will be a shift in management practices so that livestock grazing becomes a tool for promoting other resource values as well.

PRIVATE LAND

Private property is grazed in the Foothills. Several cattle operations graze private and public lands in the Foothills, including the following:

- Charlie Gibson (a BLM lease)
- Randy Harris (grazes private land and some state land using an IDFG lease)
- Wilder Sheep Rancher Frank Shirts (trails sheep east and west across private and public property in the Foothills each spring and fall.)

Individual property owners regulate grazing on private land. Generally, large tracts of grazed lands are assumed to be managed appropriately to keep the land in production.

Areas of particular concern are smaller, private tracts that are fenced and intensively grazed, removing vegetation and compacting soil. Damage to these areas can also affect adjacent lands and watersheds. Though public agencies do not regulate private lands, private landowners must adhere to state and federal water quality standards.

At the present, no accurate method exists for assessing how private lands are used. A voluntary participation survey of the landowners would provide useful information about private grazing programs.

Responsible grazing can be a beneficial tool for land managers. Management enhances the benefits of grazing and minimizes its detrimental effects:

- It can help increase mule deer winter range habitat.
- It can be used to control excess fire fuel.
- Targeted grazing can be used as a tool to control the spread of cheatgrass and noxious weeds with a long-term objective of restoring native vegetation.
- Sheep can be used to prepare sites for reseeding efforts in areas where soils have been glazed or have a hydrophobic crust.

THREATS TO GRAZING

• Development of the Foothills might block trailing routes and therefore create access problems for those grazing livestock on public lands. Open space lands preserved for wildlife and recreation also can benefit from livestock grazing travel corridors.

• Increased recreation may cause conflict between the public and livestock (such as dogs chasing livestock, livestock chasing people, and livestock guard dogs chasing people and other dogs). The Idaho Rangeland Resource Commission Care-Share public outreach program has been addressing these conflict issues on an ongoing basis with trailhead signage, news media reports, and Internet communication with recreationists on key websites to give advance notice when sheep and guard dogs are on their way through the Foothills each spring.

POLICIES FOR GRAZING

Grazing on public lands in the Foothills is managed by the individual agency whose land is being grazed.

Ada County, the BLM, and USFS are actively managing the grazing on their lands. Grazing practices have been used as a tool for wildlife habitat improvement and reduction of fire fuels, and resource plans now identify rotation cycles that have significantly improved the ecosystem over the years.

State, federal, and local agencies use grazing as a management tool. The City of Boise does permit sheepherders to run sheep across City open space reserves, but goats are used frequently to control site-specific noxious weeds or reduce fuel loads in areas prone to wildfire.

For more information on each agency's policies related to grazing in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

REFERENCES

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1997. Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1997. Soil Survey of Boise Front Project, Idaho. 192 pages.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Clark, Mary. 2000. Personal communication.Duffner, Tim. 2000. Personal communication.Little, Brad. 2000. Personal communication.Scholten, Jerry. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 2000. Personal communication.

4-7 VISUAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Foothills provide a scenic backdrop to the City of Boise, as well as remote areas for recreation, relaxation, and renewal. For these reasons, many people are becoming increasingly concerned about changes to the aesthetic quality of the Foothills. Human modifications to both private and public lands have altered the Foothills, changing the appearance of the natural landscape. Development, new roads, unmanaged trail and off-road vehicle use, and emergency activities have affected visual resources. Therefore, the public looks to land managers to protect these important visual resources and mitigate the effects of activities that might impact this important Foothills role.

VISUAL RESOURCES IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

The Foothills provide the scenic backdrop to the Treasure Valley and serve to remind citizens and visitors of the rugged and remote characteristics of southern Idaho. The quality of the visual environment has become increasingly important, and visual intrusions have inspired a sense of urgency for protecting the aesthetic quality of the Foothills. This plan recognizes the importance of visual resources and considers them on an equal basis with other open space values.

People rely on natural-appearing landscapes to serve as psychological and physiological "safety valves" for the following reasons:

- The Treasure Valley's urban population pressures are increasing.
- Urban pressures are demanding more land for development.
- Once natural-appearing landscapes are becoming scarcer.
- People seek out landscapes with little to no development to recreate, relax, and recharge

An analysis was conducted in 2000 specifically to analyze visual resources. The purpose, methodology, and findings are presented below.

VISUAL RESOURCES ANALYSIS

The visual analysis was completed for all lands in the Foothills, both private and public. Specifically the visual analysis:



- Identified particularly important visual resources for protection (such as rock formations, riparian areas, and unique landforms).
- Identified areas where human activities have affected visual resources.
- Established mitigation measures for reducing visual contrasts and improving scenic integrity.

- Used the results to help managers plan trails and other artificial elements so scenic integrity is maintained or improved.
- Worked with local, state, and federal governments to effectively manage visual resources.

While the assessment looked at both public and private lands, recommendations from the visual assessment were specific to public lands.

VISUAL INVENTORY METHODS

In 2000, a visual resources committee addressed the complex issues surrounding visual resources. Each committee member was chosen for his or her professional experience, knowledge of visual resource issues, and understanding of both private and public property owner concerns. The committee met several times at various locations in the Foothills to review existing visual information and to establish criteria for assessment. In addition, the committee was responsible for creating recommendations for visual resources and activities having an impact on visual resources.

Methods used in conducting the visual assessment inventory included site visits, aerial photo interpretation, interviews, and a review of existing public visual assessment methods. Both the USFS and BLM have methods for assessing visual information: the USFS uses Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) and, more recently, the Scenic Management System (SMS); and the BLM uses the Visual Resource Management system (VRM). Since neither agency considers the urban environment in its assessment methods, a hybrid approach was developed to address all lands on an equal basis.

The inventory consisted of the following components:

- *Key viewpoints inventory.* Where does the public view the Foothills and have the most concern for change?
- Landscape visibility. What Foothills areas are most visible from key viewpoints?
- Landscape character. What are the different types of landscapes in the Foothills?
- Landscape integrity. Is the landscape visually intact or has it been altered?

The following subsections outline the method for determining key viewpoints, landscape visibility, landscape character, and landscape integrity.

Key Viewpoints

The visual resources committee established key viewpoints from which people view the Foothills. Types of viewpoints included the following:

- *Roads and other travel routes.* Roads and highways that are used primarily by origin/destination travelers and that include proposed or designated scenic byways and recreation destination roads.
- *Trails.* Viewpoints primarily used by recreationists.
- *Overlooks and vistas*. Pullouts and pedestrian overlooks that people use to view the Foothills or City of Boise.

• *Public gathering places and events.* Parks and other gathering areas (such as the Idaho Shakespeare Festival Amphitheater) where the public is concerned about visual change.

All inventoried viewpoints were prioritized based on the following criteria:

- *Number of users.* Traffic counts, survey information, and visual observations were used to determine the number of users. Concern for change to the landscape increases as the number of viewers increase.
- *View duration.* Concern for change to the landscape is greater as view duration increases beyond just a quick glance. These durations are typically associated with vistas and destination points.
- *Viewer concern.* The specific concern for visual changes to the landscape was also considered. The higher the concern, the greater the sensitivity of the viewer.

Since this analysis does not assess the impacts of a specific project, but rather establishes sensitivity levels and priority for protection, only the viewpoints that resulted in viewpoint rankings were carried forward through the analysis.

Residences and other private viewpoints were not considered in the study. These areas did not represent the public concern for visual resources. Table 6 describes each of the viewpoints inventoried in the Foothills management area, ranking criteria, and overall sensitivity of each viewpoint.

TABLE 6 VIEWPOINT 2UMMARY

VIEWPOINT SUMMARY							
			Viewp	oint C	riteria		
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING	
_	LINEAR	FEATURES (ROADS and TRAILS)					
Highway 55		Highway 55 / Payette River Scenic Byway is traveled by a high number of people each day. This road is the main link between northern and southern Idaho and provides travelers with some of the most dramatic scenery Idaho has to offer. Discussions with the Payette River Scenic Byway Committee have indicated a high concern for maintaining the aesthetic quality along the road. This is one of the gateways in to the Treasure Valley from the north.	High	Moderate	High	Н	
Capitol Blvd		Capitol Blvd provides excellent views of the Capitol Corridor with the Foothills as the backdrop. One of the gateways into the Downtown Boise Area from the south.	High	High	High	Н	
The Connector		Commuters, residents and visitors view the eastern and central portions of the Foothills as they travel on the Connector. This road is considered one of the gateways into the Boise Downtown Area from the west.	High	Moderate	High	Н	
Crescent Rim Road		Crescent Rim Road, which sits above Ann Morrison Park, provides some vast views of the eastern and central portions of the Foothills. Few sidewalks and primarily a residential street reduce the viewpoint ranking for this road. Opportunities do exist to provide an excellent overlook along this road for viewing the Foothills and adjacent park system.	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	M	

	V	VIEWPOINT SUMMARY Viewpoint Criteria				
Viewnoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Federal Way		Federal Way provides some expansive views of the Foothills and lower valley area from SE Boise. ACHD has recently improved the road with landscaping, sidewalks and an overlook. Making this an excellent viewpoint for visitors and locals alike.	High	High	High	н
Mountain View Road		Mountain View Road west of Ustick has homes along the rim obstructing the view, but east of Ustick sidewalks provide opportunities for safe pedestrian use and a clear view of Bogus Basin.	High	High	High	Н
Typical Views from Downtown Boise (The Grove)		Views from downtown Boise are typically focused inwards. However, some buildings are skylined by the Foothills (i.e. Capitol Building). In most cases, vegetation and tall buildings screen foreground and middleground views. Some background views of the higher portion of the Foothills are present.	High	Moderate	Moderate	М
Warm Springs Ave / Hwy 21		Warm Springs Avenue and Highway 21 provide foreground views of the Foothills. Since the roads travel along the base of the Foothills, there are minimal opportunities for open views.	High	Moderate	High	н
	VIEWPOINT SUMMARY					
------------------------------	-------------------	--	----------------------	---------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Highway 21 (eastern portion)		Highway 21 provides excellent views of the eastern portions of the Foothills. Seen as a recreation destination road, a commuter route and a visitors' gateway into Boise, it receives many vehicle trips. Highway 21 resulted in a high viewer sensitivity.	High	Moderate	High	н
1-84		I-84 is by far the most traveled road in the study area. High travel speed and distant views of the Foothills lowered the overall viewer priority.	High	Low	Moderate	М
Broadway Avenue		Broadway Avenue provides a view corridor to the Foothills and has some great views before the road drops below the bench. This road is considered one of the gateways into Boise, but limited view duration and views screened by vegetation and buildings, lowered the viewer priority.	High	Moderate	Moderate	М
Bogus Basin Road		This road is traveled primarily by recreationists, going to the Bogus Basin Ski Resort and Ridge to Rivers trails in the Foothills. Travelers are usually seeking a rural experience, and are sensitive to visual change. Many residents use this road as a scenic tour for visitors to the valley. Many pullouts and overlooks are provided along this stretch of road.	High	High	High	Н

	VIEWPOINT SUMMARY Viewpoint Criteria						
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING	
Veterans / Curtis		Veterans and Curtis are traveled by many people each day. Views are most spectacular on the bench above Garden City heading NE, but last only a short time because with the road drop below the bench most views are screened by vegetation.	High	Moderate	Moderate	Μ	
Chinden Road		Chinden Road provides a minimal amount of opportunities to view the Foothills. Some of these views are located near Hewlett-Packard on the west bench where the central and western portion of the Foothills dominate. Since view duration is short, and travelers' field of view is parallel with the Foothills, it received a lower viewpoint sensitivity.	High	Moderate	Moderate	М	
8 th Street Extension / Sunset Peak Road		8 th Street Extension/Sunset Peak Road is similar to the Bogus Basin Road. Recreationists frequently use this road to gain access to the Ridge to Rivers trail system or the Ridge Road. Since most users are seeking a rural and passive experience, they are concerned with visual changes to the landscape. Therefore this road received a high viewpoint sensitivity rating.	Moderate	High	High	Н	
Americana Blvd		Americana Blvd. is travelled mostly by locals and commuters. Good views of the Foothills are available when heading north. However, due to short duration of the views this road was considered less sensitive than others in the study area.	High	Moderate	Moderate	М	

	V	/IEWPOINT SUMMARY	Viewr	ooint C	riteria	
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Boise Ridge Road		This primitive road forms part of the Foothills management area's northern boundary. It is used primarily by recreationists and hunters. People are sensitive to visual change from this road, however lower number of travelers made this road less sensitive than other roads found in the management area.	Low	Moderate	High	М
Cartwright Road		This road is located entirely within the northwest Foothills. It provides diverse views of Foothills landscapes. With the development of Hidden Springs, Avimor and Dry Creek Ranch, this road is receiving more use by commuters to and from downtown Boise.	High	Moderate	Moderate	М
Corrals Trail		Corrals trail provides good views of the Foothills. It sees a moderate amount of use by hikers, bikers and horseback riders, though it is not as busy as trails in Hulls Gulch, Military Reserve and Polecat Gulch. Users are sensitive to changes in the surrounding landscape.	Moderate	High	Moderate	М
Hulls Gulch National Trail		This trail has been federally listed as a national trail. This trail is on BLM land and surrounded by mostly public lands. It receives a high amount of use from recreationists concerned with change to the visual environment. Several vistas offering panoramic views of the Foothills and downtown can be found on this trail. A large portion of this trail is within the Hulls Gulch drainage, which limits expansive views.	High	High	High	Н

		VIEWPOINT SUMMARY	Viewp	oint <u>C</u>	riteri <u>a</u>			
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING		
Shane's Loop	Shane's Trail After	Since the City acquired the Hawkins property, expanding the Military Reserve, Shane's Loop is now a more heavily used Ridge to Rivers trails. It provides excellent views of the Foothills with high diversity in landscapes. Considered one of the best trails to view the Foothills. Provides excellent vantage points. People are concerned about changes to the Foothills landscape.	Moderate	High	High	Н		
Hill Road		Hill Road provides extreme foreground views of the Foothills. It is heavily used by commuters from Eagle and NW Boise as they drive to and from downtown Boise. Since the road travels along the base of the Foothills, there are minimal opportunities for open views.	Moderate	High	High	Н		
	VIEWF	UINTS (Overlooks, Vistas, etc.)						
Ann Morrison Park		This regional park receives a high amount of use due to Zoo Boise, special events and the Greenbelt running through it. However, it received a lower viewer sensitivity rating because views are almost entirely screened by vegetation.	High	Moderate	High	М		

	,	VIEWPOINT SUMMARY	Viewp	oint C	riteria	
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Kathryn Albertson Park		Kathryn Albertson Park is typical with most of the parks found along the Boise River. Dense vegetation and inward facing views reduce any visibility to the Foothills.	High	Moderate	High	М
Julia Davis Park		Julia Davis Park is typical with most of the parks found along the Boise River. Dense vegetation and inward facing views reduce any visibility to the Foothills.	High	Moderate	High	М
Rose Garden		The Rose Garden, located adjacent Julia Davis Park is frequented by a high number of visitors. Views are focused inwards toward the garden. Except for catching the ridges of the Foothills, views outward are screened by adjacent vegetation.	High	Moderate	High	М
Warm Springs Golf Course		The Warm Springs Golf Course, located on the North side of the Boise River, has excellent views of the Foothills. When interviewed, golf recreationists frequented the course to experience the Foothills, Boise River and natural beauty created by both. A high number of users with a concern for visual resources allowed for a high viewer sensitivity.	High	High	High	Н

		/IEWPOINT SUMMARY				1
Vioumoint Name	Dhoto	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Portions of the Greenbelt (see map)		Greenbelt views of the Foothills is almost entirely screened by vegetation until recreationists reach the Warm Springs area. At that point, recreationists are presented with some excellent foreground view of the eastern portion of the Foothills. A high amount of use and high degree of concern for visual change gave this linear feature a high rating.	High	High	High	н
Oregon Trail Overlooks	ANT DY ANT OF	This portion of the Oregon Trail is located on the first bench between Surprise Valley and Columbia Village subdivisions. Interpretive signage and overlooks are focused on the Foothills, with education materials discussing the history of the Foothills, and the vision the settlers and travelers had in the past. Views of the eastern portion of the Foothills are excellent and viewers are very concerned with change to the landscape. Many people from the adjacent developments as well as visitors come to these overlooks to view the Oregon Trail and the Boise Valley.	High	High	High	Н
Shakespeare Theater (photo by Hardee)		The eastern Foothills backdrop the Shakespeare stage. Many people come to this location for the outdoor experience and solitude it provides. People are concerned with visual changes to the landscape, specifically those that would detract from their experience.	High	High	High	Н
Table Rock Overlook		This Overlook receives a high amount of use. People specifically use this Overlook to view downtown, the Boise Valley and the Foothills. While some amount of development has occurred in the immediate foreground, people are still highly sensitive to changes in the landscape.	High	High	High	Н

VIEWPOINT SUMMARY						
			Viewp	oint C	riteria	
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Military Reserve	Children Barris	Most views in this area are focused inward toward the Reserve. Some tremendous views of the Foothills and downtown present themselves along ridgeline trails in the Reserve.	High	High	High	Н
Simplot Athletic Fields		Simplot Athletic Fields in SE Boise are used by locals and visitors for active recreation opportunities. While most of the views are focused on the events taking place, there are clear views of the eastern Foothills because the fields sit up on the bench.	High	High	Moderate	М
Quarry View Park		Quarry View Park is located at the base of the Foothills. Most views of the Foothills are in the foreground to middleground. Castle Rock Reserve, Table Rock with its geologic texture and the State lands surrounding this park provide quite a backdrop. With new homes on some of the ridgelines the Old Pen visitors have a concern for visual change, because it is not compatible with the historical atmosphere provided by the current facilities and land.	Moderate	High	High	Н
Idaho Botanical Garden / Old Penitentiary		Idaho Botanical Garden and the Old Penitentiary host many public events and offer foreground views of the Foothills. In recent years more homes have been built on surrounding ridge lines.	High	High	High	Н

	VIEWPOINT SUMMARY					
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive to visual Change	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Hyatt Wetlands		This new City of Boise property provides excellent views of the western and central portions of the Foothills, which dominate from the upper bench (southern) portion of this park.	Moderate	High	Moderate	М
Boise Depot		The Boise Depot has the most captured view of the State Capitol and downtown with most of the Foothills as background. Many people use this area for passive recreation, special events, and bring visitors to the city here for its cultural significance and views.	High	High	High	Н
Veterans Park		Veterans Park (State and Veterans Parkway) is typical with most of the parks found along the Boise River. Dense vegetation and inward facing views reduce any visibility to the Foothills.	High	High	Moderate	М
Private Residence		Since the Interagency Plan can only make recommendations for public lands, only public viewpoints were considered. A large portion of the viewer sensitivity model considered number of viewers as extremely important. Because of this, a residence was considered as private, and represented a very small amount of viewers. While the views do have a high degree of concern for visual change in the Foothills, on a priority basis public viewpoints, which consistently receive a large amount of viewers were considered higher.	Low	High	High	м

	I.	/IEWPOINT SUMMARY	Viour	oint C	nitonio	
Viewpoint Name	Photo	Description	Number of Viewers	View Duration	Viewers sensitive	VIEWPOINT RANKING
Camel's Back Park		This urban park provides excellent foreground views of the Foothills. Excellent foreground and background views are obvious from the top of Camel's Back Hill. Over the last decade restoration of the erosion scars on Camel's Back Hill have made it more visually appealing.	High	High	High	Н
Sandy Point Beach / Lucky Peak Dam & Reservoir		This destination recreation area receives a large amount of visitors. Recreation activities include swimming, boating and fishing. The east Foothills and the Lucky Peak Dam provide the backdrop to this site.	High	High	High	Н

4. BACKGROUNDRESOURCE USE

TABLE 7 LANDSCAPE CHARACTER DESCRIPTION

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE	РНОТО	CHARACTER DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDATIONS
Developed Areas		These landscapes consist of modified terrain and structures, which dominate views. Strong site lines have been created by roads and sidewalks. Textures and colors vary between structures. Most vegetation is non- native and consists of shrubs, groundcovers and trees, which reside near structures or near roadways by way of planting strips. In many cases vegetation provides displays of seasonal color.	These areas lend themselves well to accept man-made features into the landscape. New structures, utilities, trails, roads, parking areas, pullout, signage and other man-made features can be introduced into these landscapes with minimal visual impact to the surrounding landscapes. However, since these landscapes are private and this plan focuses on public lands only, specific recommendations will not be developed for these areas.
Agriculture		These areas can best be described as cultural modifications to the landscape. The landscape is characterized by flat to gently rolling hills where crops and orchards have been planted. These areas are mostly found in the valleys (i.e. Dry Creek) where there is a presence of water and productive soils. Vegetation creates diversity in color, and in many cases texture. Since these landscapes are now part of the historical landscape, they are considered a not displeasing landscape character. Typically structures and other man made modifications are minimal.	These landscapes can allow for a moderate amount of change. New trails, roads, parking areas, kiosks and signage can be blended into these landscapes with great success. However, since these landscapes are private and this plan focuses on public lands only, specific recommendations will not be developed for these areas.
Grasslands		These landscapes are characterized by grass covered hillsides. These landscapes have typically been altered by fire, and have lost some of its native character. When viewed from a distance of 1/4 mile and beyond, these areas look like gently rolling hills and provide a great deal of harmony and flow. Diversity is minimal, which makes this landscape susceptible to scarring and visual contrasts.	These landscapes have minimal screening capability. Small changes in the landscape can result in highly visible scars from great distances. New linear features such as trails must be carefully planned as new linear features can create new linear features and disrupt the harmony of this landscape. New man made features should be carefully planned to blend form, line, color and texture to reduce visual scarring. Results of the visibility analysis (GIS) should be used to hide man made features into landscapes with a minimal visibility potential.
Sagebrush covered Hillsides		These landscapes are characterized by sagebrush and grass covered hillsides. These landscapes have typically not been altered by fire, and retain much of its natural character. When viewed from a distance of 1/2 mile and beyond, these areas look like gently rolling hills and provide a great deal of harmony and flow. Diversity is minimal, which makes this landscape susceptible to scarring and visual contrasts.	These landscapes have minimal screening capability. Small changes in the landscape can result in highly visible scars from great distances. New linear features such as trails must be carefully planned, as new linear features can disrupt the harmony of this landscape. New man made features should be carefully planned to blend form, line, color and texture to reduce visual scarring. Results of the visibility analysis (GIS) should be used to hide man made features into landscapes with a minimal visibility potential.

4. BACKGROUNDRESOURCE USE

LANDSCAPE	РНОТО	CHARACTER DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDATIONS
CHARACTER TYPE		These landscapes are characterized by linear bands of dense woody vegetation, associated with drainages and springs. These landscapes can be found both high and low in the Foothills. The bands of vegetation create an oasis type presence when encountered in those arid grassland type landscapes. Fall colors are dramatic where deciduous vegetation turns brilliant reds and oranges. During the winter months, the vegetation loses its color diversity, however still	These landscapes do a moderate job in screening some man made features such as trails, bridges and signage. However, loses some of its screening ability in the winter months when vegetation is no longer present.
Mountain Shrub		These landscapes provide a transition between the grass and conifer types. This landscape is characterized by deciduous shrubs and some conifer vegetation ranging from 2' - 15' high. This vegetation provides a diversity on color and form, with green vegetation contrasting with the tan soils found	These landscapes have a moderate screening capability, and can screen many man made introductions (i.e. trails, kiosks, trail signage). However large alterations like clearings, new structures, mining and fire can create scars, which result in visual contrasts. These contrasts are a result of lighter
Conifer Covered		These landscapes are characterized by large stands of conifer vegetation, which covers hillsides and peaks. The dense green vegetation creates a dramatic contrast to the tan colored hillsides found lower in the Foothills. This landscape is associated with elevation and the upper ¼ of the Foothills management area.	Colored soils being exposed. These landscapes have a high screening capability and can screen man made introductions into the landscape extremely well. Trails, pullouts, kiosks and small parking areas can usually be screened with the dense coniferous vegetation. However, timber clearcuts, insect or disease outbreaks, mining activities and fire can create scars. These activities are not so much a matter of scale as they are contrast. The dense green vegetation, when removed sharply contrasts with the lighter
Hillsides Rock Outcrops		These landscapes are characterized by unique, weathered rock landforms, which dominate the landscape. These unique areas provide a great amount of diversity to the surrounding Foothills landscape. Bands of red, brown, tan and black can all be found in these areas. Vegetation is sporadic, and usually found in pockets in and around rock features. Two major rock formations were identified in the management area (see map).	colored soils below. These rock formations can moderately screen new elements into the landscape. However scaring as a result of rock removal is very apparent and should be avoided where possible.

Landscape Visibility

Landscape visibility is essentially a component of two elements – visibility and distance zones.

Visibility - Once key viewpoints were identified, they were incorporated into the Geographic Information Systems (GIS). GIS was then used to identify what Foothills landscapes were visible from each viewpoint.

A map was then made that showed the number of times an area was seen from different viewpoints. This step in the process was important because it represented the areas that were visible by the highest number of viewpoints. The more a landscape is seen by different viewpoints, the higher the concern for protection. (Figure 10 shows each of the viewpoints, what lands were visible, and how often.) The results were divided into four classes:

- *High Visibility.* Seen by 10 or more viewpoints
- *Moderate Visibility.* Seen by 3 to 9 viewpoints
- Low Visibility. Seen by 1 or 2 viewpoints
- *Not seen.* These areas were not seen by any of the viewpoints inventoried.

Distance Zones – Once the visibility was performed for each of the viewpoints, distance zones were then developed. Landscapes seen close-up are more visually sensitive than those seen in muted detail at greater distances. Three distance zones were developed:

- *Foreground (0.0-0.5 miles).* At a foreground distance, people can distinguish small features, such as vegetation texture, small rock features, streams, and animals. At this distance, people can also distinguish other sensory elements, such as movement and sound.
- *Middleground (0.5-4.0 miles)*. The middleground is predominantly the distance zone at which most lands in the Foothills are seen, except for areas where vegetation and landforms do not allow. At this distance, people can distinguish individual trees. Large middleground is crucial: the viewer is able to see human activities from this perspective, in context with the overall landscape.
- *Background (4.0-10 miles).* At a background distance, people can distinguish stands of trees, large areas of color, and larger rock formations. Here, landform ridgelines and horizon lines are the dominant visual characteristic. (In this document, a minimal number of background views were identified in the Foothills.)

These distance zones were mapped using GIS (see Figure 11).

Landscape Character

Along Bogus Basin Road, the landscape's character changes dramatically. Rolling grass-covered hills near Boise change into conifer-covered hillsides toward Boise Ridge Road. Pockets of sagebrush, riparian areas, and rock outcroppings contribute to the diversity and richness of the landscape.

Landscape character gives the Foothills their visual and cultural image and is a combination of physical, biological, and cultural attributes that make each landscape identifiable or unique.

The committee spent much time in the field, looking at the landscape character in the Foothills and in context with regional landscapes. Aerial photography, vegetation analysis, and slope analysis were used to divide the landscape into separate units. Table 7 describes each landscape character type found in the Foothills.

In a typical visual analysis, landscapes are ranked based on their aesthetic appeal. Diversity in form, line, color, and texture are all attributes used to divide and rank these units. After a review of all information, many field visits, and a review of secondary information, the visual resources committee determined that the Foothills landscape is viewed as a whole, with discernable

landscapes that are all of equal value. No one landscape was rated as higher than or lower than another. Rather, the visual resources committee ranked landscapes based on their landscape integrity (i.e., visually intact landscapes).

It was determined that those landscapes still visually intact and not modified by humans were considered more desirable than those with modifications.



Landscape Integrity

Landscape integrity indicates a degree of intactness and wholeness of the landscape character. Human alterations can sometimes raise or maintain integrity. More often, landscape integrity is lowered depending on the degree to which the landscape varies from the original aesthetic character. The following levels of scenic integrity were found in the Foothills management area (see Figure 13).

- *High (unaltered landscapes).* High landscape integrity refers to landscapes where the scenic integrity is intact. These areas are natural appearing, with natural-appearing vegetation patterns and features, water, rock, and landforms. Some direct human alterations might have occurred (such as trails), but these alterations do not detract from the landscape setting.
- *Moderate (moderately altered).* Moderate scenic integrity refers to landscapes where the valued landscape character "appears moderately altered." Deviations usually remain subordinate to the landscape character being viewed and include agriculture areas and areas dominated by unmanaged recreation use.

• *Low (heavily altered).* Low scenic integrity refers to landscapes where the valued landscape character "appears heavily altered." Deviations might strongly dominate the valued landscape character and typically do not borrow from the existing form, line, color, and texture of the landscape being viewed.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Upon completion of the visual inventory, a visual analysis was performed. Landscape visibility and scenic integrity were combined to determine the overall visual sensitivity level (see Figures 14 and 15). The analysis established visual sensitivity and identified those lands where people are the most concerned about visual changes to the landscape. In the analysis, four levels of sensitivity were developed:

- *Sensitivity 1.* These areas have the highest priority for visual protection. Modifications to the landscape should be carefully planned to match the existing landscape character and should not be evident. These landscapes are highly visible, and any modification might be noticed from many of the key viewpoints. (Human modifications should be moved to lower-sensitive landscapes, where possible.)
- *Sensitivity 2.* In these areas, changes to the landscape should remain subordinate to the landscape character, and modifications should match the existing form, line, color, and texture of the surrounding landscape. These landscapes are moderately visible from key viewpoints, and any modification might be noticeable. (Human modifications that alter the landscape character should be moved to lower-sensitive landscapes, where possible.)
- *Sensitivity 3*. In these areas, human modifications might have dominated the landscape setting or are not visible from inventoried key viewpoints. However, any modifications should match the existing scale and borrow from the surrounding form, line, color, and texture. If these areas are located on public lands, mitigation should be considered to improve the landscape integrity. Though these areas are not visible from key viewpoints, changes to the landscape from many other less-sensitive viewpoints might be noticeable.
- *Sensitivity 4*. These areas have typically been heavily altered by human activity and have the lowest visual priority for protection. If these areas are located on public lands, mitigation should be considered to improve the landscape integrity (such as mitigating terracing, trenches, and redundant trails, and closing roads). Where possible, any new elements introduced into the landscape should match the surroundings.

Land managers can use these sensitivity levels to better describe and understand scenic value as one consideration in decisions affecting visual resources. This information can be used to identify opportunities for land managers to protect and improve scenic integrity. Where scenic integrity is improved, sensitivity levels might change; rehabilitation, revegetation, and proper mitigation can significantly improve modified conditions in the Foothills. (See Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations for more information.)

THREATS TO VISUAL RESOURCES

Roads. New road construction can cause a significant visual intrusion on the landscape. New roads add a new linear feature, create a contrast in soil color, and when located on steep slopes, can create cuts and fills, causing the landform to change. This type of visual impact is apparent from great distances.

Unmanaged off-road use. Unmanaged off-road use, as seen near Aldape Summit, also contributes to visual impacts. However, these impacts are not so much linear intrusions as large visual contrasts created by random and destructive use.

Trails. To a degree, trails can cause visual impacts similar to those of roads. The visual impact of trails is most apparent where trails are placed on steep slopes and cause erosion. Unmanaged trails can have the greatest impact because these trails are not rehabilitated, creating the potential for erosion, removal of vegetation, and further visual contrasts.

Development. Developments create strong visual contrasts and dramatically change the character of the landscape. By changing the natural topography and introducing artificial features, new color contrasts, exotic vegetation, lights, and impervious surfaces are added to the landscape. Because slopes in the Foothills are severe, development requires access roads and disturbs soils and vegetation during construction. This type of visual impact is apparent from a long distance, particularly where houses are built on ridgelines.

Utilities. Utilities, such as transmission lines, substations, water towers, and microwave towers, all can impact visual resources. These structures, coupled with disturbance from access roads, can be seen from great distances and are difficult to mitigate. However, through proper planning, such as placement of structures, color, and proper access road construction, impacts can be minimized. Any new utilities in the Foothills should be carefully planned to reduce visual impacts.

Fire. Though fire is a natural process, burnt vegetation and scorched soils can substantially alter the visual quality in any given area. Over time, the visual impact is lessened as vegetation

grows back. However, mature stands of coniferous vegetation that was once destroyed by fire require substantial time to recover. This impact is most evident in forested lands burnt by the 8th Street Fire, where stands of ponderosa pine were destroyed near Boise Ridge Road.

Emergency activities. Emergency activities caused by the 8th Street Fire have impacted visual resources. Deep trenches were cut to reduce flooding. As a result, long linear bands visible from many locations in the Treasure Valley were



created. Long-term visual impacts have also resulted (such as the 1959 fire terraces) where the earth dams created additional changes in the physical landscape. These impacts are screened in most cases and are only visible to Foothills trail users.

POLICIES FOR VISUAL RESOURCES

Recommendations that come out of the Interagency Plan are not intended to supersede existing policies on agency land. Instead, the recommendations offer an overarching direction for approaching visual resources in the Foothills as a whole.

SIMILARITIES

The BLM and USFS use visual assessment inventory programs to manage visual resources on their lands. The BLM uses the VRM system and the USFS uses VQOs. Both programs are similar and are used to determine the acceptable limits of visual modifications (such as roads and trails). Their systems rate landscapes based on aesthetic quality, visibility, and sensitivity of viewers, and their rankings range from areas that must be preserved with no new modifications to areas that can receive higher degrees of modification.

Both the BLM and USFS view the visual resources in the Foothills as having similar aesthetic quality; therefore, they recommend similar management strategies. Descriptions of each strategy are as follows:

- *USFS VQO Partial Retention.* Modifications might be visually evident but must be integrated into and visually subordinate to the surrounding landscape. Activities might introduce form, line, color, and texture not common in the surrounding landscape, but these activities should not attract attention.
- *BLM VRM Class II.* Changes in any basic elements (such as form, line, color, and texture) caused by management activities should not be evident in the characteristic landscape. A contrast might be seen but should not attract attention.

City of Boise and Ada County also have programs to manage visual impacts pertaining to development and infrastructure associated with development. City of Boise provides the most detailed policies, whereas Ada County is more general. In City of Boise, specific and thorough requirements have been placed on developers who wish to develop in the Foothills. Ada County relies more heavily on a review process and determines visual quality on a case-by-case study. City of Boise and Ada County use mitigation to reduce the visual impacts associated with development; however, neither agency monitors mitigation to ensure that visual guidelines are followed.

No consistent standard between federal and local governments exists for managing visual resources, and what is considered scenic to one agency might not be scenic to another. City of Boise and Ada County consider views from the Boise Valley floor to be the most important, whereas the USFS and BLM (which does not consider the urban environment) instead look at travel routes and trails as having the most important views of the landscape.

The USFS is the only agency that seeks to identify and mitigate areas not meeting VQOs. Boise County and IDFG have no policies relating to visual resources.

For more information on each agency's policies related to visual resources in the Foothills management area visit:

Ada County -

https://adacounty.id.gov/Portals/0/PrkWW/Doc/8%20ParkOpen%20Space%20And%20Trail%20Plan.pdf

Boise County -

http://www.boisecounty.us/Content/Site101/Articles/01_01_2008/222Comprehensiv_000000 03036.pdf

Boise National Forest -

http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/boise/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5394192.

Bureau of Land Management - http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/fourrivers_RMP.html.

City of Boise - http://pds.cityofboise.org/planning/comp/blueprint-boise/

Idaho Department of Fish and Game - http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/wma

5. BACKGROUND - MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE 5-1 FUNDING SOURCES

This section is based on MOU Objective 3. It assesses opportunities and constraints for funding maintenance and management of the Foothills and identifies appropriate recommendations for implementation.

AGENCY AUTHORITIES AND FUNDING ACCESS OVERVIEW

Like public land managers nationwide, land managers in the Boise Foothills face tight budgets, limited staff, increased competition for grants and volunteers, and growing service demands. The agencies also have limited funding tools from which to choose, depending on regulatory authority and mission. Seeking options to supplement traditional funding sources (e.g., grants, partnerships, donations, and volunteers) can help advance certain plan recommendations that call for increased service levels or new programs to address needs in the Foothills management area. Table 8 provides an overview of the types of supplemental funding programs the agencies are implementing or have authority to implement within the Foothills management area.

Agency	Supplemental Taxing Authority	Grant Writing	Dedicated License or Permit Fees	Public— Private Partnerships	Volunteer Program	Gifts and Donation Program	Public Partnerships
Ada County	III	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	III	Ι
BLM		II	Ι	Ι	II	III	Ι
City of Boise	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι
Boise County	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
IDFG		Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	III	Ι
IDL		III	Ι	III	III	III	Ι
USFS		III	Ι	Ι	II	III	Ι

TABLE 8 AUTHORITY AND USE OF ALTERNATIVE FUNDING TECHNIQUES AND PROGRAMS BY PUBLIC AGENCIES

I—Agency currently implements a program or has exercised authority to do activity and provides dedicated funding for necessary inhouse personnel and operations.

II—Agency currently supports program activity through indirect means but does not provide dedicated funding for in-house personnel and operations (i.e., contributes project funding, equipment, supplies, technical expertise, and other means). III—Agency has authority to implement but does not actively seek to use.

FUNDING SOURCES

Supplemental Taxing Authority

Local governmental agencies can implement certain supplemental tax-based funding programs subject to requirements and limitations prescribed by Idaho law. Supplemental tax funding tools that could be applied in the Foothills management area include local improvement or service districts, voter-approved bonds or serial levies, local option sales tax, and franchise fees on public utility services. The use of special taxing authority is often constrained by public support. To use these tools, local governments must seek broad popular support and demonstrate a clear need for public demand of the service. The City of Boise reserves a portion of their dedicated tax funds for neighborhood reinvestment grants. Funding under these programs can be used to construct and improve trails, rehabilitate damaged natural areas, address drainage problems, and provide safety and amenity improvements to public parks, open spaces, and rights-of-way.

Grant Writing

All of the agencies are involved in some type of grant writing. Some agencies may pursue grant opportunities more aggressively than others. For the most part, all grant programs have others competing for limited funds. Most grant programs have a clear focus or mission. Grants are most often awarded for applications that provide for leveraged funding of projects or programs where an applicant can also show a clearly demonstrated need that fits the grantor's program focus. An agency's ability to pursue grants is affected by funding availability, staffing, mission, planning activities, and creative leveraging mechanisms. City of Boise and IDFG have full-time paid professionals whose normal duties include grant writing. Various public and private grant programs could be used for the studies, projects, programs, and services suggested in the Interagency Plan. Possible government-sponsored grant programs include the recently approved Land and Water Conservation Fund, Idaho Parks and Recreation Department grants, Transportation Enhancement Act for the 21st Century match grants, and others. Private and quasipublic grants that could be used for the Foothills include the Albertson Foundation, Hewlett Foundation, Bullitt Foundation, Wilburforce Foundation, Gates Foundation, University of Idaho Cooperative Extension Program, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation/Wells Fargo, and others.

Dedicated License and Permit Fees

License fee implementation authority, or permit-based funding tools that provide dedicated funding for reinvestment in environmental or recreational uses within a specific jurisdiction or unit area, is relatively common among the agencies. The use and success of such programs varies among agencies. Dedicated permit and license fee programs typically come with narrow limits on how the funds can be used. For example, the IDFG and Ada County Parks & Waterways Department fund much of their operations, maintenance, and capital development activities through license and permit fees. City of Boise assesses park impact fees that can only be used to offset demand for certain types of park and recreation facilities necessitated by growth.

The Recreation Fee Demonstration Program was enacted by Congress in 1996. In December 2004, Congress enacted the Recreation Enhancement Act, which gave federal agencies a 10-year multiagency recreation fee program. Campground fees, parking fees, and other day-use fees come with some enforcement challenges. Local and state implementation of user fee programs seems to enjoy greater acceptance and success than that experienced by federal agencies. User fees might work in the Boise Foothills; however, the cost and benefits of implementing a user fee program in the Foothills area should be evaluated.

Public-Private Partnerships

All of the agencies can participate in public-private, or public-nonprofit partnerships. These agencies typically enter into such arrangements to defray operation and maintenance costs, reduce costs, reduce costs of facilities development, or enhance maintenance to public lands or facilities. IDFG has taken full advantage of the numerous wildlife, conservation, and sportsmen organizations to help fund support for volunteer activities and improvements on lands important to the department's mission. The City of Boise's Foothills program has built up these types of

partnerships in recent years by working with groups on adopt-a-trail programs, the master

planning process, service learning events, and donor-leveraged land acquisitions and FLC facility improvements.

Volunteer Programs

Volunteer programs are supported by most of the agencies. Support for such programs varies widely, depending on staffing, operational funds, and importance to the agency mission. City of Boise, IDFG, and the R2R program actively seek and use volunteers to accomplish many tasks, such as trail maintenance and development, revegetation, and litter removal. A



cooperative funding arrangement and establishment of a clearinghouse for coordination of volunteer opportunities and project dates could benefit all agencies in the Foothills management area. Aside from fiscal benefits of volunteer programs, such activities could also help agencies build a positive image of their activities with constituents and future supporters, as well as educate and help promote social awareness

Gift and Donation Programs

All of the agencies can seek gifts and donations; however, only City of Boise has programs and staff for seeking gifts and donations from private individuals, businesses, and nonprofit organizations. Boise maintains and publishes a gift catalog. It also funds Boise Parks and Recreation Department staff whose duties include actively seeking donations from service clubs and businesses. The Boise Parks and Recreation Department also has a successful track record with its Heritage Fund program, which allows individuals and groups to donate cash for various activities and projects. Last year, the creation of the TrailSmart program provided another opportunity for regular donations to the Ridge to Rivers trail system.

Dedicated Local Open Space Foundation or Friends of the Foothills Group

A step beyond gift and donation programs is development of an established local open space foundation or friends group, dedicated to raising funds, leveraging volunteer resources, and actively supporting the mission of public open space management agencies. This option is increasingly common around the U.S. A local foundation can be more proactive and nimble in fundraising than a typical public agency. By committing that any money raised by donations to the foundation will go directly to open space goals, a foundation can appeal to donors who might hesitate to donate to public agencies. Established open space foundations can generate significant funds to supplement agency resources.

Public Partnerships

Public partnerships typically provide for pooled funding and sharing of professional services and maintenance staff, equipment and facilities, and data. The most notable program in operation in the Foothills is the R2R program. All land management agencies in the Foothills management area participate at some level in this partnership. However, partnerships are not without challenges since they require effective communication and ongoing commitment by the signatories. Major challenges can occur when budgets, priorities, or commitment of one or more partner organizations decreases. In these instances, organizational leadership, creativity, receptivity to change, and resourcefulness are particularly valuable to the survival of a partnership.

Another type of public partnership arrangement focuses on intergovernmental agreements that address conservation or resource use activities and coordination needs. This type of partnership helps smooth relationships, typically spells out procedures and processes for developing projects in or around sensitive sites, and presents opportunities for supplemental funding such as one-time appropriations for education programs, studies, monitoring activities, or research activities. An example of this type of partnership is the Rare Plant Conservation Agreement between the BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, City of Boise, and USFS.

A third type of public partnership agreement is short-term and typically project- or programbased. These partnerships can provide for one-time funding of projects on lands managed by another agency. Such public partnership arrangements have been used for fire restoration, resource inventory and monitoring activities, and riparian area development. Opportunities exist for successful short-term public partnership, particularly with agencies that have no land management responsibilities but have resource-based program responsibilities. These agencies include the Natural Resource Conservation Service, Ada Soil Conservation Service District, SW Idaho Resource, Conservation & Development Council, Boise State University, Idaho Department of Water Resources, AmeriCorps program, and others.

SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES

Use and implementation of supplemental funding programs and techniques is enhanced by funding for dedicated staffing; clearly identified needs, opportunities, and constraints; and funding to support and nurture the projects initiated under the various programs and techniques discussed. Development of the Interagency Plan could increase agencies' abilities to use the funding tools discussed to obtain supplemental funding. The agencies should consider cooperatively funding a volunteer clearinghouse program for the Foothills to take advantage of the nearby urban population base. To streamline administrative costs and efforts in the Foothills, a lead agency could be designated to manage supplemental funding efforts and facilitate grants, volunteer activities, partnerships, donations, and other related activities. Agencies that do not actively seek funding opportunities should support each other in seeking, funding, and securing both short- and long-term agreements for projects and maintenance activities on their lands.

5-2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION

This section is based on MOU Objective 5. It establishes a collaborative approach that effectively integrates citizen and private interests in resource management activities along the Foothills. In addition, this section provides public involvement and education strategies in all facets of Foothills resource management, including volunteers, peer education, project development, implementation, and fire prevention.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION

PURPOSE

Not all Foothills lands can or should be protected or enhanced through public acquisition and public management. Reaching public goals for the Foothills as a whole will require an active partnership with all parties affecting this area, including private property owners, developers and builders, schools, Foothills users, and others. This broader effort needs to be based on community involvement and education. Open space managers must build and support a strong communication network among citizens, nonprofits, and user groups so everyone works together to plan for the future of the Foothills, establish stewardship programs, and create new opportunities for sustainable use. Only through a broad, ongoing, and inclusive outreach process can both privately and publicly held open space be managed in a manner that reflects the sensitivity of Foothills resources and responds appropriately to growing and changing interests in how the Foothills are used.



Building regional communication networks around programs related to open space issues is vital to the successful implementation of the Interagency Plan and building awareness of management options. As citizens augment their understanding of open space issues, they increase their ability to become active partners in future community development plans, periodic reviews of this plan, and other land management agency plans.

With a long-term commitment to establishing effective communication with user groups and environmental and natural resource communities, open space managers are encouraged to take a broad approach and work to ensure that the public has a greater awareness and understanding of the open space in the Foothills. To this end, agency representatives will work with staff and volunteers at the FLC to develop education and volunteer programs, create and distribute educational materials, and assist any community group with outreach relating to the protection and use of the natural resources in the Foothills. Public involvement and education programs should be designed to attract a wide range of participants from different neighborhoods, different ages and incomes, and with varying interests and perspectives on the future of the Foothills.

OPPORTUNITIES

Currently, there are many ways local, county, state, and federal agencies engage environmental groups, neighborhood associations, citizens, and user groups, but each agency does it independently of each other. This type of outreach is done through volunteer projects, public planning workshops, enewsletter lists, special events, and social media/facebook sites. This independence causes some duplication and does not ensure that the widest range of individuals are kept current on Foothills resource issues. This plan seeks to improve the collaborative approach for outreach and educational opportunities among agencies and the public.

INTERPRETATION

Currently, only a handful of self-guided interpretive opportunities are available in the Foothills. They include the Hulls Gulch Interpretive Trail, the Idaho Bird Observatory, the trail around the FLC and the Trail #15 to the top of Table Rock. Managers and the public agree that the Foothills need more extensive interpretive strategy, including trailside signage, face-to-face programs with user groups, guided walks or bike rides, and hardcopy and web-based materials. Though many improvements have been made to R2R trailhead kiosks and trail numbering/naming markers, and new trail etiquette and wildfire education signs, there is still a need for signs about the ecology and history of the area. Trail users have provided feedback on the annual trail user surveys on the specific types of subjects they would like to learn about.

In 2010, the Story Trail opened on the FLC perimeter trail. It features a different nature-related storybook each month. The trail is open sunrise to sunset, seven days a week. It was based on the Storywalk® program in Vermont. The staff at the FLC worked in partnership with staff at the Boise Public Library to pick out the books. Volunteers switch out the stories, make repairs to the reading platforms and prepare the books for display. Many citizens have come to the Foothills for the first time as a result of learning about the Story Trail. Expansion of the Story Trail to other parts of the Foothills is possible in the future.

The BLM replaced the interpretive sign panels on the Hulls Gulch National Recreation Trail a few years ago. These signs provide information and images on birds, wildlife, fire, fire reclamation, weeds, Lake Idaho, riparian zones, and nature-inspired poems.

As a result of a 2009 fire that charred 200 acres in the West Foothills, a group of interested land managers and scientists saw the need to restore the area and partnered with the City of Eagle and Ada County to form the Healthy Hills Initiative. Besides working to nurse this area back to life, the group has created several interpretive signs on native and rare plants, invasive weeds, geology, wildlife, erosion, fire-prone ecosystems, and defending your home. A few of these signs have been reworked and placed along frequently visited trails in Military Reserve and Hulls Gulch Reserve.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

One of the objectives in the 2000 Boise Foothills Open Space Management Plan was to provide one location for information such as education, upcoming events, and volunteer programs. The FLC opened in 2005 on the site of the former McCord house in Hulls Gulch. The FLC was made possible through federal funds and many local businesses and nonprofits providing their goods and services. The building has many sustainable features including: Forest Stewardship Council certified wood; "smart" thermal windows; a passive solar system including southerly orientation, eaved clerestory windows, and dark-stained concrete floors; an active solar system of photovoltaic cells; heating and cooling via a ground-source heat pump; fluorescent lighting throughout the center, with several rooms on motion-detection systems; and zoned thermostats. The grounds are landscaped with native and drought-tolerant plants.

Operated by the City of Boise Parks and Recreation Department, the FLC invites students and community members to get out into the Foothills and better understand the surrounding natural environment. The main focus of the FLC is school-age education programs. There are currently 24 different lessons for teachers to choose from. In 2013, more than 10,000 students were served through those programs. The FLC promotes its events using an email list of close to 1,800 names.



The FLC also offers service learning and volunteer opportunities for all ages and abilities. All programs are interactive and are designed to give participants a new look at our local environment and ways to reduce our impact on the planet. Every month are second Saturday events that are free and family-friendly events. Often the guest speakers at the Second Saturday events are from other land management agencies or nonprofits in the community. From May through July, the FLC hosts Sunset Series, educational, or inspirational evening programs more geared for adults.

One of the ways the IDFG has engaged and educated many community members is through extensive volunteer projects. The IDFG accesses their list of volunteers in southwest Idaho to build fences, remove debris, plant bitterbrush, perform surveys, help others discover wildlife, and teach fishing and hunting skills.

Another unexpected avenue for educating homeowners adjacent to the Foothills has been the Harris Ranch development. The Harris family and the developer of Harris Ranch proactively initiated a comprehensive Wildlife Assessment and Mitigation Plan. Part of that plan requires every homeowner in Harris Ranch to pay a \$300 conservation fee when they buy their home – they can get \$200 of it back if they take part in a wildlife educational or volunteer program. This incentivizes homeowners to learn more about the Foothills resources.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Public land managers, organizations, and special interest groups have identified several management challenges involving education and public involvement. A few of these challenges are discussed below.

- **Coordination among agencies.** Though the coordination among agencies and nonprofits has improved the last decade, there are plenty of opportunities for further coordination. Agencies have made suggestions for lessons they would like to see taught at the FLC in the future.
- Volunteers. The number of volunteer hours spent in the Foothills has increased this past decade. R2R uses volunteers for their trail ranger program, adopt-a-trail, trail surveys, and trail maintenance opportunities. The FLC uses volunteers for improvements on the grounds (gardens, Story Trail, and restoration projects); teaching; and special event help. IDFG uses volunteers on a regular basis as mentioned above. There are plenty of opportunities for BLM, Ada County, and USFS to also use volunteer labor, and perhaps the agencies that have successfully used volunteers in the past can help these agencies in their future efforts. Other organizations, such as SWIMBA and REI, would like to assist with volunteer trail projects, organizing events to repair and develop new trails. One of the drawbacks for all of the agencies is the amount of time needed to dedicate to soliciting and managing volunteer programs, particularly one-day volunteer projects. Having a designated multiagency volunteer coordinator for the Foothills through whom all projects would be organized would be a tremendous asset.
- **Open space clearinghouse for public use**. An open space clearinghouse for public use will be a compilation of updated information regarding the Foothills. Public access to a current database of open space resources could be used to teach property owners and

public land managers about resources important for conservation and identify other important resource use issues and opportunities. The database could also be used by conservation organizations and land trusts in pursuing conservation options with property owners, by developers in preparing master plans and Planned Unit Development applications, and by public land agencies in prioritizing lands of higher resource value as new information becomes available. To be effective, GIS maps and studies will continually need to be updated. Also, managers must maintain this information in one location to remain consistent with the goals of this Interagency Plan.

- **Funding.** Improve funding to meet public expectations.
- Awareness of upcoming events. The agencies need a way to better communicate with the public about upcoming events and projects. There is no common public information officer,



so it takes significant level of coordination among the various agencies to put out information to the public. It would be beneficial to have a designated website, a regularly scheduled open house, a newsletter, or a listserv that could be shared among all agencies to publicize future happenings.

• **Staff.** During the recent downturn in the economy, a few agencies had to reduce their staff through layoffs or not hiring for open positions. At the same time, the agencies have seen an increase in Foothills use and higher public expectations for management, public involvement, and facilities.

REFERENCES

bee.cityofboise.org

Gordon, David. Ridge-to-Rivers Trail Coordinator. March 15, 2013. Personal communication.

Grant, Julia. Foothills & Open Space Manager, City of Boise. April 5, 2013. Personal communication.

harrisranch4wildlife.com

http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/about/volunteer/

Michael Young, Volunteer Coordinator, Idaho Department of Fish and Game. April 5, 2013. Personal communication.

5-3 PRESERVE EXISTING PUBLIC LANDS AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

This section is based on MOU Object 6. It assesses the benefits, constraints, and criteria for conducting land exchanges that contribute to preserving and perpetuating open space land opportunities within Foothills public lands. The Interagency Plan identifies those agencies currently negotiating land exchanges. The plan also identifies conditions and criteria necessary to encourage further efforts that contribute positively toward making the Foothills a sustainable and viable open space management area for future generations to use and enjoy.

MANAGEMENT OF LAND EXCHANGES

AGENCY APPROACH TO LAND EXCHANGES

Land exchange in the Foothills involves trading property with high resource value for land situated elsewhere that has a corresponding value to its seller. An agency could have surplus property in an area inappropriate to its mission or function that would be better served by exchanging that parcel with another public agency. Unfortunately, the surplus property might not meet criteria necessary to warrant agency involvement in the exchange process.

Under the objectives of the MOU, the Interagency Plan will help agencies cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage the resources of the Foothills. This management includes facilitation of land exchanges if such exchanges enhance management opportunities through the area. Various funding sources could also facilitate exchanges by paying for staffing, due diligence, or negotiating costs if these factors are inhibiting progress in this direction. A mediator could also facilitate completion of exchanges. An appointed lead agency could initiate and facilitate negotiation of "win-win" exchanges if these exchanges meet the goals, objectives, or recommendations of the plan.

Agencies interested and previously involved in land exchanges within the Foothills include IDFG, City of Boise, BLM, IDL, and USFS.

Agencies' approach to land exchanges are summarized as follows:

USFS. Allows for divesting of lands located within the Foothills.

BLM, Cascade Resource Area. Is receptive to land exchanges that meet all necessary agency criteria (including big game wildlife habitat, areas of substantially known rare and endangered species, critical access points, and parcels connecting with existing BLM properties).

City of Boise. Is considering another levy or bond for open space in the Foothills and possibly other areas of Boise.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Education and outreach about the land exchange process will help the public better understand and support land exchanges that perpetuate open space management values.

5-4 ACQUIRE ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE

This section is based on MOU Objective 7. It assesses the benefits and constraints of acquiring additional open space lands as appropriate to agency mission and function.

Several acquisition and planning tools are available for carrying out the actions of this plan. These tools range from government ownership options, transfer of title options, nonprofit purchase, and ownership options to voluntary land-conservation techniques and existing land development regulations. Other tools include capital infrastructure planning and development that encourage and guide land development toward areas identified as better suited for development while preserving environmentally sensitive lands and lands identified as valuable and important to the community for open space.

THE NEED FOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

The BLM estimates that approximately 1 million people use the Foothills annually. The Foothills management area encompasses approximately 85.445 acres across the Foothills. Of this land, approximately 41,310 acres are privately owned and the rest are publicly owned. Areas for possible acquisition need to be evaluated for access and connection to public lands as well as for preservation of big game wildlife habitat, upland birds and small game habitat, rare and endangered plant species, streamside areas, important trails and trail connections, and other conservation, recreation, and open space objectives. The City of Boise, Ada County, and the state can use open space acquisition methods to help secure sensitive open lands or important recreation properties from willing private landowners, as directed under the plan. The federal agencies will help facilitate and support acquisition activities for which the group collaboratively identifies as important for meeting the vision of the agreement and objectives of the *City of Boise Foothills Policy Plan*.

ACQUISITION AND PRESERVATION TOOLS

There are various methods for acquiring additional parcels of land. One method would be for one agency to purchase and manage all public lands in the Foothills. However, financial resources are limited, the Foothills area is large, and agency missions reflect appropriate varied range of management goals and objectives. In most cases, methods must address costs for both acquisition and maintenance. In today's financial climate, public-private partnerships can add support for acquiring land. The City of Boise has been successful in leveraging their Foothills Serial Levy Fund to protect 10,740 acres of Foothills land through donations, permanent easements, fee-title acquisitions, bargain sales, and land exchanges. Of the original \$10 million allocated for Foothills land conservation efforts, \$1.75 million remains. Several options are available to public agencies, nonprofit organizations, and private landowners who want to acquire additional open space properties (see Table 9).

Available Tools	Description	Benefit	Constraint
Free Simple Purchase	Outright purchase of full title to land and all rights associated with land.	Owner has full control of land. Might allow for permanent protection and public access.	Acquisition could be costly. Removes land from tax base. Ownership responsibility includes liability and maintenance.
Installment Sale	Agreement between landowner and purchaser whereby the landholding agency either pays for the land in annual installments or buys a portion of the lands each year.	Financial advantage to landowner is that the income is spread over a number of years, which could allow the owner to spread the taxable capital gains over a period of years and minimize the amount of tax that must be paid.	Weaknesses include the long- term financial commitment to a mortgage and owner's lien right on the land.
Conservation Easement	A partial interest in property transferred to an appropriate nonprofit or government entity either by gift or purchase. As ownership changes, the land remains subject to the easement restrictions.	Less expensive for purchasers than fee simple. Landowner retains ownership and property remains on tax rolls, often at a lower rate because of restricted use. Easement could allow for some development. Potential income and estate tax benefits from donation.	Range of options for degree of development constraints and public access allowed and the terms of a specific easement; option for public access requires landowner approval. Easement must be enforced. Restricted use might lower resale value.
Fee Simple Leaseback	Purchase of full title and leaseback to previous owner or other. Subject to restrictions.	Allows for comprehensive preservation program of land banking income through leaseback. Liability and management responsibilities assigned to lessee.	Leaseback would not necessarily provide public access. Land must be appropriate for leaseback.
Lease	Short- or long-term rental of land.	Low cost for use of land. Landowner receives income and retains control of property.	Lease does not provide equity and affords only limited control of property. Temporary nature of lease does not assure permanent protection.
Undivided Interest	Ownership is split between different owners, with each fractional interest extending over the whole parcel.	Prevents one owner from acting without the consent of the other(s).	Several landowners can complicate property management issues, especially payment of taxes.
	Tra	ansfer of Title Options	
Outright Sale	Land is sold at a price equivalent to its value at highest and best use.	Highest sale income (cash income) to seller.	Expensive to acquire.
Bargain Sale	Property is sold at less than fair market value.	Tax benefits to seller since difference between fair market value and sale price. Sale price is considered a charitable contribution. Smaller capital gains tax. Allows for permanent protection without direct public expenditure. Tax benefits to seller since property's fair market value is considered a charitable contribution.	Seller must be willing to sell at less than fair market value. Bargain sale price might be high.
Other Donation	A donation by landowner of all or partial interest in the property.	Management responsibility for acquiring entity often deferred until donor's death. (Reserved Life Estate: Landowner retains use but receives tax benefits from donation.)	A receiving agency of a donation must be willing to accept donation and be capable of management responsibilities.
Escrow Commitments	Several neighbors donating conservation easements together. This allows tentative commitment but does not finalize until neighbors also commit.	Can place conservation easements in escrow.	Can be a significant waiting period and relies heavily on neighboring commitment.
Tax Foreclosure	The right of the government to take private property for public purpose upon payment of just compensation.	Limited government expenditure.	High acquisition costs. Can result in speculation on target properties. Potentially expensive and time-consuming litigation.
Agency Transfer	Government acquires land by tax payment default.	Agency transfers limit the need for expenditure for open space acquisition.	Land acquired from tax foreclosure might not be appropriate for public open space, but can be sold to provide funds for open space acquisition. Cumbersome process.

TABLE 9 ACQUISITION ALTERNATIVES	S AND ASSOCIATED	BENEFITS AND CONSTRAINTS

Available Tools	Description	Benefit	Constraint			
Restricted Auction (Nonprofit)	Certain government agencies might have surplus property inappropriate for their needs that could be transferred to parks for open space use.	Property still sold to highest bidder but restriction lowers price and competition.	Surplus property available might not be appropriate for open space use or the owning agency might want to sell to a private party to generate revenue.			
Payment in Lieu of Dedication	Government can restrict the future use of sale property to open space.	New construction pays for its impact on open space.	It could be difficult for a nonprofit to convince the government that a restriction will serve to benefit the public. Purchase price might still be expensive.			
Special Assessment District	Local government requires developers to pay an impact fee to a municipal trust fund for open space acquisitions. Special tax district benefited by an open space project.	Users finance acquisition and management.	Acquisition funds dependent on development. Might be lack of accountability for funds. Legality of methods depends on relationship of open space to new development. Increases taxes. Timely and costly to implement.			
Serial Levy	A proposed tax that would raise approximately \$10 million over a two-year period for purchase or preservation of important habitat, conservation easements, access, and connection to significant public land parcels from existing Foothills landowners.	A proposed tax that would raise \$10 million toward the protection of important Foothills resources.	Would cost Ada County homeowners approximately \$90 over a two-year period. Companies throughout the city and county would pay more than half of the \$10 million tax. The levy dollars would need to be carefully allocated to ensure significant wildlife and riparian areas are used to greatest public benefit possible.			
Tax Return Check Off	On state income tax forms, a filer could appropriate a small amount of taxes owed toward revenues for natural acquisitions.	Convenient and successful means of generating sufficient financial resources.	Vulnerable to competition from other worthwhile programs.			
Other Funds/Taxes	Taxes on sales and natural resource exploitation as well as revenue from fees and licenses can be used toward park acquisitions.	With income from fees and licenses for boat, off-road vehicle and snowmobile use, park entry/parking and hunting, users pay for resources they use.	Revenues from taxes can be easily diverted from other uses unless firmly dedicated to park and recreation purposes. Fees create pressures for money to be spent on special interest uses.			
Transfer of Development Rights	Under an established program, an owner can sell development right to another landowner whose property can support increased density designated lands.	Cost of preservation absorbed by property owner who purchases development rights.	Difficult to implement within the community. Preservation and receiving areas must be identified.			
Sale of Transfer of Tax Default	Sale of tax default property can provide a fund for open space acquisition. Also, if site meets criteria, it can be transferred to appropriate agency for park use.	Funds are acquired with little cost to taxpayers.	Need to ensure that sale proceeds are specifically allocated to open space acquisition. Might not provide a significant income. Very political process.			
Nonprofit Purchase and Ownership Entity Options						
Nonprofit Acquisition/ Conveyance to Public Agency	A nonprofit can help to implement government programs by acquiring and holding land until a public agency is able to purchase.	Nonprotit can help to implement government programs by acquiring and holding land until a public agency is able to purchase.	Must have a public agency willing and able to buy within a reasonable time frame.			

REFERENCES

City of Boise. 1994. City of Boise Comprehensive Park and Recreation System Plan: Goals, Objectives and Policies.

City of Boise. 1997. City of Boise Comprehensive Plan: Goals, Objectives and Policies.

City of Boise Community Planning and Development Department. 1994. Foothills Plan Background Report.

City of Boise Planning and Development Department. May 1998. The Boise Foothills: Principles and Strategies for Open Space Preservation. Discussion draft to the Mayor and City Council.

5-5 PUBLIC SAFETY AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

This section is based on MOU Objective 8. It assesses services, opportunities, and constraints for continuing and enhancing coordination and funding of public safety-related activities in the Foothills. The Interagency Plan contains several objectives addressing life, health, and safety needs, as well as provisions for natural resource conservation and public use of the Foothills. The agencies need to ensure that issues of wildfire, law enforcement, public safety, and resource conservation keep pace with the region's growth and increased use of the Foothills, particularly on public lands.

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS AND JURISDICTIONS

Because the Foothills management area is near urbanized areas, interwoven rural lands, and suburban residential development, and because recreational use is growing, public safety and resource protection for all lands in the Foothills management area must be addressed. The Foothills management area's relative isolation, relatively low level of law enforcement presence, closeness to urban areas, and relative ease of access provides opportunities for inappropriate and illegal activities to occur. Therefore, existing provisions for public safety services to address threats to public life, health, and safety must continue. However, limited personnel, higher priority service area, and relatively low numbers of people using the Foothills mean that agencies can only afford to provide a limited enforcement presence to address public safety and conservation issues.

Various interagency agreements already exist related to fire, law enforcement, and accidentinjury rescue services within the Foothills. Existing cooperative programs for public safety should continue to be supported and funded, since they provide a coordinated, cost-efficient delivery of services. Though the number of people carrying cell phones has helped improve fire, law enforcement, and injury rescue reporting, public safety would likely be improved if an enhanced presence by a public agency were implemented.

Table 10 provides a general overview of the types of public life, health, and safety services provided by each agency within the Foothills management area.

Services Agency	Fire	Law Enforcement	Resource Conservation	Rescue	Other	Comments
BLM	Ι	Ι	Ι			Resource use, grazing, and monitoring programs
USFS	Ι	Ι	Ι			Resource use, grazing, and monitoring programs
IDFG	II	Ι	Ι			Enforces wildlife protection and hunting laws, Unit 39 WMA
IDL	II					
Ada County		Ι		Ι	Ι	Emergency Management Disaster Program, animal control
Boise County		Ι		Ι	II	Volunteer Fire District
City of Boise	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	Ι	Open Space Reserves, flood-control facilities, water quality programs, animal control
Special Districts ¹	Ι		Ι	Ι	I	Flood District 10 facilities and programs, Ada Soil Conservation District programs

TABLE 10 PROGRAMS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICE IN THE FOOTHILLS MANAGEMENT AREA

Key: I—Agency operates services and programs in accordance with charter with dedicated funding for personnel and equipment. II—Agency funds activity through interagency agreement or by cooperative agreements. ¹ Special Districts include: Whitney Fire Protection District, Eagle Fire Department, North Ada County Fire & Rescue, Ada Soil

Conservation District and Flood District #10.

WILDFIRE

Fire is a threat at any time of year in the Foothills, but the threat peaks from July to September when fuel-moisture is low, vegetation is fully grown, and recreational use is greatest. The ecosystems surrounding Boise are historically fire-prone, but they were adapted to a natural wildfire regime that no longer exists in much of the Foothills (Humphreys n.d.). Cheatgrass and other invasive species have infiltrated the Foothills ecosystem in the last 100 years. These annual grasses are highly flammable and have resulted in an increase in the frequency, size, and intensity of wildfires. Burned areas are then overrun by these rapidly growing species and native plants are squeezed out of the ecosystem (BLM 2013). Areas that used to burn once every 25 years may now burn every 5 years or less. This problem of increased fire frequency is exacerbated by more people living and recreating in the wildland urban interface, as approximately 86% of fires in the Foothills are started by humans (see Figure 16).

Many factors influence the extent and intensity of wildfires, including weather, topography, fuel-load, fuel-moisture, fuel-type, and response time of firefighters (when fires are quickly reported and attacked, quick containment and suppression are more likely). Most fires are stopped before any serious damage occurs; however, not all fires can be quickly contained. Therefore, a serious and immediate threat from wildfire exists to people living or recreating in the Foothills.

Wildfires not only threaten human life/property, but also damage resources and the environment. The loss of vegetative cover and soil-binding roots due to wildfire increases the risk of flooding, debris-flow, erosion, and other forms of environmental degradation. Wildfires displace both wildlife and recreation trail users from affected areas until public safety, vegetative cover, and natural resource protection measures are reestablished.

Since most wildfires are small and



relatively inexpensive, each agency is responsible for the cost of firefighting and recovery efforts on its respective lands. However, agencies make exceptions to this policy on especially large and intense fires, such as the 1996 8th Street Fire. In that fire, federal emergency recovery funding was sought to reduce the financial burden on each managing agency.

All agencies in the Foothills management area (except Boise and Ada County) participated in the *Boise Front Watershed Interagency Agreement and Operating Plan of 1997*. The agreement covered the eastern half of the Foothills management area, lands generally located between Bogus Basin Road and Highland Valley Road and continuing up to Boise Ridge Road. The purpose of the agreement was to provide a cooperative basis for efficient and cost-effective fighting of wildland fires in the Foothills. The Lower Snake River District Office of the BLM maintained this agreement and coordinated an annual meeting of participating agencies to review and discuss costs, operational procedures, and need (Boise County fire suppression efforts are managed by several volunteer fire districts). Key provisions of the agreement included the following:

- Annual coordination of operating plans
- Mutual aid, communications, and cooperative training
- Sharing of facilities, equipment, and support services

The increasing number of homes constructed in the wildland urban interface is of great concern to all fire protection agencies and districts. The priority for all firefighting efforts is to protect life. However, urban firefighters specialize in quick suppression of structure fires, whereas wildfire suppression efforts are focused on containment of fires to minimize burn extent and damage to the environment. Calling wildfire personnel and equipment to assist urban firefighting efforts and to protect structures during a wildfire reduces resources for the wildfire suppression effort, which can allow a wildfire to grow much larger, increasing the threat of fire exposure to more homes and property.

Fire Regulation Activities

The City of Boise and Ada County have adopted a ban on use of fireworks within the Foothills to help reduce the potential for wildfire. The BLM, USFWS, and state agencies have adopted corresponding bans on their lands. Open fire pits are allowed on USFS lands in the Foothills management area, but open fire pits are not allowed on any other public lands in the Foothills management area. Private landowners within Boise or Ada Counties must secure a burn permit from the respective fire protection jurisdiction for any type of open fire.

Fire Prevention Activities

The City of Boise recognized the increasing hazard of wildfire within the Foothills and has begun to address these issues through a series of initiatives passed in 2011 within the Ada City-County Emergency Management Hazard Mitigation Plan, City of Boise Annex. The City of Boise Wildfire Mitigation Team was formed in 2011 with representatives from Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development Services, and Fire to oversee the progress of the initiatives. Meeting the City of Boise Annex initiatives involves large, complex, multiagency, dynamic projects to be completed. In 2011, shortly after the creation of the wildfire mitigation team, a MOU between Ada County, the BLM, City of Boise, City of Eagle, and Idaho Department of Fish and Game was signed with the intent to "formalize their collective approach to managing vegetation within the WUI" (MOU 2011; see Appendix D). The wildfire mitigation team realized the City of Boise needed a plan to guide the progress of reducing wildfire risk according to the City of Boise Annex, MOU, and serve as the City of Boise Wildfire Mitigation Strategic Plan. The plan outlines the goals of wildfire mitigation efforts within the City, the benefits of these goals, and the mitigation projects and strategies desired to accomplish these goals (City of Boise Wildfire Mitigation Team 2013).

Wildfire mitigation projects commenced in 2011 and have continued at different locations around the Foothills since. Examples of projects include goat grazing, herbicide application, and native plant reseeding in Military Reserve, Oregon Trail Reserve, Castlerock Reserve, and Polecat Gulch among others. Numerous wildfire educational opportunities have been used, along with public wood chipper programs, and other wildfire mitigation projects throughout the Foothills.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Because the management area is near urbanized areas, interwoven rural lands, and suburban residential development, and because recreational use is growing, public safety and resource protection for all lands in the management area must be addressed. The management area's relative isolation, relatively low level of law enforcement presence, closeness to urban areas, and relative ease of access provides opportunities for inappropriate and illegal activities to occur.

These factors place a great strain on Boise County resources when Ada County residents require rescue or law enforcement response in the upper portions of the Foothills management area that are located within Boise County. Trespass, particularly illegal off-road use, vandalism, inappropriate firearms use, littering, violation of seasonal closures, underage drinking, and dogs off-leash are a few of the more common complaints that law enforcement and conservation personnel receive when working in the Foothills. Much of the effects from motorized off-road use have been reduced, or pushed out of the Foothills to other areas, through ongoing enforcement efforts.

Limited personnel and equipment, coupled with the need to respond both to higher-priority calls and relatively low-threat incidents, affect service levels in the Foothills management area. The federal agencies provide a very limited enforcement presence and, therefore, try to focus their activities at times of the year when certain types of illegal activities typically occur. For example,

the Mountain Home Ranger District and the Boise District of the BLM have a combined seven full-time professional law enforcement staff to patrol the many thousands of acres under their control. The Ada County Sheriff's Department has one deputy dedicated to Foothills patrol, and this deputy patrols the area primarily between Memorial Day and Labor Day, with a focus on weekend patrol. In addition, the Ada County Sheriff's Department operates trail motorbike patrol, providing an example of targeted enforcement activity aimed at controlling



illegal off-road activities. The BLM provides some funding to Ada County for increased patrol of their lands.

Law enforcement services and activities in the Foothills management area are necessary to protect lives and property, respond to emergency situations, and maintain laws and social order. Ada County maintains an Emergency Response 911 program that handles most emergencies and law enforcement calls that occur in the Foothills management area. Police, sheriff, fire, and ambulance services are dispatched through this system, based on available staffing and the seriousness of the threat to life or public safety.
The Ada County Sheriff's Department has the largest jurisdiction in the Foothills management area, covering the majority of public lands in the Foothills management area. The City of Boise Police Department, City of Boise Fire Department, Boise County Sheriff's Department, and full-time law enforcement officers for the IDFG, BLM, and USFS also have jurisdiction in the management area. The law enforcement community works cooperatively to ensure a quick response to emergency situations.

In addition to professional law enforcement staff, the BLM, USFS, and IDFG have uniformed staff that are trained and have limited authority to enforce rules and issue citations for illegal activities occurring on their lands. These staff members are unarmed and have principal duties other than law enforcement. Nevertheless, they do provide increased presence when they work in the area, which can promote protection of people and public lands.



In the management area, Ada County Paramedics is the lead agency charged with responding to emergency calls involving injury accidents that occur within the Foothills. These calls are dispatched from the Ada County Paramedics station (located at 17th and Ridenbaugh Streets). Ada County Paramedics have 4-wheel drive ATVs loaded on trailers and available to respond to injury accidents occurring in the Foothills. Occasionally, emergency response crews must walk to an accident site because access can be limited by factors such as trail access, cliffs, and wet conditions.

In an average year, paramedics are called to about 20 emergency medical incidents in the Foothills management area. Ada County Paramedics are responsible for determining whether to call for helicopter life flight services. The typical cost to the injured party for paramedic rescue is about \$1,000; if helicopter life flight is needed, the cost of rescue can increase to \$12,000.

CONSERVATION

Relatively little environmental monitoring is conducted in the Foothills, though anecdotal evidence and limited photo trend data suggest that degradation of natural resources is occurring in the area. This degradation is believed to be caused primarily by a combination of insufficient maintenance, insufficient management and increased recreational usage.

Ada County and City of Boise have been working on a joint conservation agreement with the USFWS for Aase's onion, Mulford's milkvetch, and slick-spot peppergrass, which are rare or threatened plants found in the Foothills the last five years. However, the agreement has not been finalized due to changes in staff at USFWS. The focus of these conservation agreements is to protect and monitor species through cooperation and shared professional resources. The agreements provide for no specific additional funding for the agencies. Only sporadic monitoring of a few rare plant sites has been conducted since a comprehensive inventory of sites occurred in 1992.

The IDFG undertakes an annual count of big game animals using the Foothills winter range and participates in an ongoing raptor study that has a capture station located near the Boise Ridge off Lucky Peak. At this time, the only vegetation monitoring activity occurring in the Foothills is the monitoring of revegetation test plots associated with the 8th Street Fire recovery efforts. This monitoring is being directed by the BLM. Water quality in the area is not monitored to determine whether watersheds are improving or declining, though the IDFG has assessed the streams within the WMA to see whether they are functioning properly.

The BLM, USFS, and IDFG impose seasonal road and recreation closures on roads and trails in their respective jurisdictions to protect wintering big game and to minimize damage to the roadbed of 8th Street Extension/Sunset Peak Road. Seasonal closures generally go into effect between mid-

December and May, though more work is needed to help recreation users understand which trails are closed and when they are closed because the closure dates vary from location to location. Managers can consider developing daily and seasonal closure policies that are more consistent across the Foothills.

The spread of invasive and noxious weeds (such as medusahead rye, whitetop, and cheatgrass) is a problem that threatens the quality and suitability of habitats needed by various wildlife species.



While all agencies attempt to monitor the various aspects of environmental health on their lands, such efforts are usually secondary to higher priorities. The identification of key environmental features, which can serve as effective indicators of ecological health in the Foothills, will help managers and agencies to determine the status and priority for action.

RECREATION AND OTHER USES

Recreation is the dominant use of the Foothills, and is likely to continue to increase as population in the Treasure Valley grows. Trailhead surveys are one helpful means of understanding the character of this use, but a more complete and comprehensive monitoring program would help to better understand recreation trends and issues. This in turn could provide valuable insights into strategies to meet recreational needs while minimizing impacts on Foothills resources.

CONCLUSION

A uniform public information and signage plan for trailheads and trails in the Foothills management area is needed to improve public safety and reporting of conservation challenges. An alternative might be to provide emergency phones at trailheads. However, the costs of installation, operation, maintenance, vandalism, and liability would have to be met for this alternative to be feasible. Fire, police, and Ada County Paramedics indicated support for implementing a uniform signage program for all R2R trails and trailheads to help people better report the location of fires, accident victims, and activities requiring quick law enforcement or emergency response. Every year the R2R trail map is updated and republished. It is then shared with all R2R agency partners as well as the City of Boise Fire Department, Ada County Paramedics, Air St. Luke's, and St. Alphonsus Life Flight.

Greater public presence in the Foothills is needed to address increased improper use of public lands in the Foothills. The costs and benefits of expanding existing public safety patrols and services versus starting a Foothills conservation program can be evaluated by the agencies. Creation of a Foothills conservation program could increase public presence and comprehensively address needs for maintaining Foothills open space lands and trails, promoting user safety and communications, providing user and resource educational opportunities, conducting resource monitoring, and encouraging adherence to area rules and guidelines for appropriate use. Using uniformed employees would likely increase public presence in the Foothills management area.

REFERENCES

Ada County Government. 2011. Ada City County Emergency Management Hazard Mitigation Plan.

- Bureau of Land Management. 2013. Flames of Change. Retrieved 09 16, 2014, from U.S. Department of the Interior: http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/visit_and_play/places_to_see/four_rivers_field/ridge_to_rivers_trail/hulls_gulch_national0/fire.html. April 5.
- City of Boise Wildfire Mitigation Team. 2013. City of Boise Wildfire Mitigation Strategic Plan. Draft.
- Humphreys, M.K. No Date. The Boise Foothills Fires: A History of Devastating Loss and Remarkable Discovery. Boise, ID: City of Boise Office of the Historian.
- MOU. 2011. Memorandum of Understanding. Ada County, Bureau of Land Management, Boise District, City of Boise, City of Eagle, Idaho Department of Fish and Game.
- Society of American Foresters. 2004. Preparing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan: A Handbook for Wildland Urban Interface Communities.

APPENDIX

ANIMAL SPECIES COMMONLY FOUND IN THE BOISE FOOTHILLS

List of mammal species found in the Hulls Gulch Nature Preserve and adjacent Boise Front, Boise, ID.

Season of use (R = resident, B = breeder, M = migrant, W = winter visitor, V = erratic visitor), abundance (1 = abundant. 2 = common. 3 = uncommon, 4 = occasional or rare, 5 = rare, 6 = vagrant or hypothetical, 7 = unknown), and preferred habitat (b = building, c = coniferous woodland, d = deciduous woodland or riparian, g = grassland or sagebrush, w = on or near water, marsh) are also given.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Season/Abundance
		Habitat
Masked shrew	Sorex cinereus	R2cdgw
Merriam's shrew	Sorex merriami	R3g
Dusky shrew	Sorex obscurus	R3cdgw
Northern water shrew	Sorex palustris	R3w
Vagrant shrew	Sorex vagrans	R2w
California myotis	Myotis californicus	B7bd
Long-eared myotis	Myotis evotls	R7b
Little brown myotis	Myotis lucifugus	B7b
Small-footed myotis	Myotis subulatus	R7b
Fringed myotis	Myotis thysanodes	R7b
Long-legged myotis	Myotis volens	R7bd
Yuma myotis	Myotis yumanensis	R7b
Silver-haired bat	Lasionycteris noctivagans	B7bd
Hoary bat	Lasiurus cinereus	B7cd
Big brown bat	Eptesicus fuscus	B7, W7bd
Western big-eared bat	Pfecotus townsendi	R7b
Black bear	Ursus americanus	V6cd
Raccoon	Procyon lotor	R3cdw
Shorttail weasel	Mustefa erminea	R3dw
Longtail weasel	Mustefa frenata	R3cdgw
Mink	Mustefa vison	V6w
Badger	Taxidea taxus	R4g
Spotted skunk	Silogafe putorius	R3dgw
Striped skunk	Mephitis mephitis	R2dgw
Coyote	Canis latrans	R3dgw
Red fox	Vulpes fulva	R3dgw
Mountain lion	Felis concolor	V6dw
Bobcat	Lynx rufus	V5gw
Yel!owbelly marmot	Marmota flaviventris	V4g
Townsend ground squirrel	Citellus townsendi	R3g
Golden-mantled squirrel	Citellus lateralis	V5dg
Forest chipmunk	Eutamias minimus	V5cd
Yellow pine chipmunk	Eutamias amoenus	V5dg
Fox squirrel	Sciurus niger	R2cd
Northern pocket gopher	Thomomys talpoides	R3cg
Great basin pocket mouse	Perognathus parvus	R2cg
Ord's kangaroo rat	Dipodomys ordi	R2g

Montain vole	Microtus montanus	R7dw
Western harvest mouse	Reithrodontomys megalotis	R2gw
Deer mouse	Peromyscus maniculatis	R2dg
Desert wood rat	Neotoma lepida	R7g
Meadow vole	Microtus pennsylvanicus	R2dgw
Richardson vole	Microtus richardsoni	R3w
House mouse	Mus musculus	R3bdgw
Porcupine	Erethizon dorsatum	R3cdw
Beaver	Castor canadensis	V6w
Snowshoe hare	Lepus americanus	V7cdw
Blacktail jackrabbit	Lepus californicus	R7g
Mountain cottontail	Sylvilagus nuttalli	R3dgw
Pygmy rabbit	Sylvilagus idahoensis	R4g
Rocky mountain elk	Cervus elaphus	W4cdgw
Mule deer	Odocoileus hemionus	W3cdgw

List of bird species found in the Hulls Gulch Nature Preserve and adjacent Boise Front, Boise, ID.

Season of use (R = resident, B = breeder, M = migrant. W = winter visitor, S = summer visitor, V = erratic visitor), abundance (1 = abundant, 2 = common, 3 = uncommon, 4 = occasional or rare, 5 = rare, 6 = vagrant or hypothetical), and preferred habitat (c = coniferous woodland, d = deciduous woodland or riparian, g =grassland or sagebrush, w =on or near water, marsh) are also given. Species indicated by an asterisk (*) have been sighted in areas adjacent to Hulls Gulch Nature Preserve (season, abundance, and habitat used are given in parentheses), however, their use of the preserve area is hypothetical at this time.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Season/Abundance
		Habitat
Great blue heron	Ardea herodias	R4w
Mallard	Anas platyrhynochos	R2w
Cinnamon teal	Anas cyanoptera	R3w
Turkey vulture*	Cathartes aura	V (B3, W6gc)
Bald eagle*	Haliaeetus leucoephalus	V (B5, M3, W3wcd)
Northern harrier	Circus cyaneus	R2wg
Sharp-shinned hawk	Accipiter striatus	R3gdc
Cooper's hawk	Accipiter cooperii	R3gdc
Northern goshawk	Accipiter gentilis	R4cd
Red-tailed hawk	Buteo jamaicensis	R2gdc
Golden eagle*	Aquila chrysaetos	V (R3gd)
American kestrel	Falco sparverius	R2cdg
Merlin	Falco colunbarius	W5d
Peregrine falcon*	Falco peregrinus	V (B?5, M5, W5wc)
Prairie falcon	Peico mexicanus	B2,W3gc
Gray partridge	Perdix perdix	R3g
Ring-necked pheasant	Phasianus colchicus	R2g
California quail	Callipepla californica	R1cdgw
Virginia rail	Rallus limicola	B3w
American coot	Fulica americana	R3w
Killdeer	Charadrius vociferus	R2, B3w
Spotted sandpiper	Actitis macularia	R6w
Common snipe	Gallinago gallinago	R4w
Ring-billed gull*	Larus delawarensis	V (R1fw)
California gull*	Larus californicus	V (B1, W4w)
Rock dove	Columba livia	R1dc
Mourning dove	Zenaida macroura	B2, M2, W3gdc
Common barn-owl	Tyto alba	B3cdg
Western screech-owl	Otus kennicottii	R3cd
Great horned owl	Bubo virginianus	R3, B3cdg
Northern pygmy-owl	Glaucidium gnoma	W5cd
Long-eared owl*	Asio otus	S (R3d)
Northern saw-whet owl*	Aegolius acadicus	W4 (R4dc)

Common nighthawk	Chordeiles minor	S4gdc
Black-chinned humminghird	Archilachus alexandri	B3a
Anna's hummingbird*	Calvote anna	S (M5, W5d)
	Stellula callione	M3da
Rufous hummingbird	Selasphorus rufus	S2cd
Belted kingfisher	Cervle alcvon	R3wd
Denea kingharier		
Lewis' woodpecker	Melanerpes lewis	M3cd
Red-naped sapsucker	Sphyrapicus varius nuchalis	M4cd
Downy woodpecker	Picoides pubescens	R2. B3dc
Hairy woodpecker	Picoides villosus	R3. B4dc
Northern flicker	Colaptes auratus	R2. B3dcg
Olive-sided flycatcher	Contopus borealis	B3, M3cd
Western wood-pewee	Contopus sordidulus	B3. M3cd
Willow flycatcher	Empidonax traillii	B2d
Say's phoebe*	Savornis sava	S (B2qd)
Western kingbird	Tyrannus verticalis	B3cdg
Eastern kingbird*	Tyrannus tyrannus	S (B3d)
0		
Tree swallow*	Tachycinata bicolor	S4cdw
Violet-green swallow	Tachycineta thalassina	B2, M1gw
Northern rough-winged swallow	Stelgidopteryx serripennis	M3gw
Bank swallow*	Riparia riparia	S4 (B3, M2wg)
Cliff swallow	Hirunda pyrrhonota	B2, M2gw
Barn swallow	Hirunda rustica	B2, M2gw
Steller's jay	Cyanocitta stelleri	W3cd
Blue jay*	Cyanocitta cristata	W4d
Clark's nutcracker	Nucifraga columbiana	W4cd
Black-billed magpie	Pica pica	R1cdg
American crow	Corvus brachyrhynchos	R2cdg
Common raven	Corvus corax	M4dg
Black-capped chickadee	Parus atricapillus	R2cd
Mountain chickadee	Parus gambeli	R4cd
Red-breasted nuthatch	Sitta canadensis	W4cd
White-breasted nuthatch*	Sitta carolinensis	V3cd
Brown creeper	Certhia americana	R3cd
Rock wren*	Salpinctes obsoletus	V (B2, W5g)
House wren	Troglodytes sedon	R3, B4d
Winter wren	Troglodytes troglodytes	W4d
Marsh wren*	Cistohorus palustris	V (R3w)
Golden-crowned kinglet	Regulus satrapa	W3cd
Ruby-crowned kinglet	Regulus calendula	R32cd
Blue-gray gnatcatcher*	Polioptila caerulea	S4 (B4d)

The second secon	Marada ata a tauring a nali	
I ownsend's solitaire	Myadestes townsend	VV4cd
A	Truck of an investories	
American robin	Turdus migratorius	R1, B2cdg
O (1 1 *	0	
Sage thrasher*	Oreoascoptes montanus	V (B2g)
Bohemian waxwing	Bombycilla garrulus	W2cd
Cedar waxwing	Bombycilla cedrorum	R3, W3cd
Northern shrike	Lanius excubitor	W3gd
Loggerhead shrike	Lanius Iudovicianus	B3dg
European starling	Sturnus vulgaris	R1,B2cdg
Solitary vireo*	Vireo solitarius	S4 (B3cd)
Warbling vireo	Vireo gilvus	B4cd
Orange-crowned warbler	Vermivora celata	M3cd
Nashville warbler	Vermivora ruficapilla	B3dc
Yellow warbler	Dendroica peyechia	B2d
Yellow-rumped warbler	Dendroica coronata	R4cd
MacGillivray's warbler	Oporornis tolmiei	B3d
Wilson's warbler	Wilsonia pusilla	B3, M3d
Yellow-breasted chat	Icteria virens	B3d
Western tanager	Piranga ludoviciana	M2cd
Black-headed grosbeak	Pheucticus melanocephalus	B4d
Lazuli bunting	Passerina amoena	B3, M3cd
Rufous-sided towhee	Pipilo erythrophthalmus	S3dg
American tree sparrow	Spizella arborea	W4gd
Chipping sparrow	Spizella passerina	W4cd
Lark sparrow	Chondestes grammacus	B5g
Fox sparrow	Passerella iliaca	B4, M4, W5cd
Song sparrow	Melospiza melodia	R2, B3wd
White-crowned sparrow	Zonotrichia leucophrys	R2, B3gdc
Harris' sparrow	Zonotrichia querula	W4gd
Dark-eyed junco	Junco hyemalis	R2, B3dcg
Red-winged blackbird	Agelaius phoeniceus	R2gdw
Western meadowlark	Sturnella neglecta	R2, B3g
Yellow-headed blackbird*	Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus	V (B1,W4w)
Brewer's blackbird	Euphagus cyanocephalus	R3qcd
Brown-headed cowbird	Molothrus ater	S3dg
Northern oriole	Icterus galbula	B2d
Cassin's finch	Carpodacus cassinii	R4, M3cd
House finch	Carpodacus mexicanus	R2dc
Red crossbill	Loxia curvirostra	W4cd
Pine siskin	Carduelis pinus	R2cd
American goldfinch	Carduelis tristis	R3dq
Evening grosbeak	Coccothraustes vespertinus	R4 W2dc
		,
House sparrow	Passer domesticus	R1 B2cda
nouse spanow		ITT, DZOUY

List of fish, amphibian, and reptile species found In the Hulls Gulch Nature Preserve and adjacent Boise Front, Boise, ID.

Preferred habitat (c = coniferous woodland, d = deciduous woodland or riparian, g = grassland or sagebrush, w = on or near water, marsh) and abundance (1 = abundant, 2 = common, 3 = uncommon, 4 = occasional or rare, 5=rare, 6 = unknown) are also given.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Season/Abundance
		Habitat
<u>Fish</u>		
Bluegill	Lepomis macrochirus	w
5		
Amphibians		
Long-toed salamander	Ambystoma macrodactylum	gw2
Western toad	Bufo boreas	cgw2
Woodhouse's toad	Bufo woodhouiseii	cgw3
Pacific treefrog	Hyla regilla	cgw2
Striped chorus frog	Pseudacris triseriata	cgw2
Bullfrog	Rana catesbiana.	w6
Northern leopard frog	Rana pipiens	w2
Great Basin spadefoot toad	Spea intermontanus	w6
Reptiles		
Mohave black-collared lizard	Crotaphytes bicinctores	6
Western skink	Eumeces skiltonianus	cdgw3
Longnose leopard lizard	Gambelia wislizenii	g6
Short-horned lizard	Phyrnosoma douglassi	cg4
Sagebrush lizard	Sceloporus graciosus	cd3
Western fence lizard	Sceloporus occidentalis	cdg2
Side-blotched lizard	Uta stansburiana	dg2
Rubber boa	Charina bottae	cdgw3
Western whiptail	Cnemidophorus tigris	
Racer	Coulber constrictor	dgw3
Western rattlesnake	Crotalus viridus	cdwg3
Ringneck snake	Diadophis punctatus	cdgw3
Striped whipsnake	Masticophis taeniatus	cdgw3
Gopher snake	Pituophis melanoleucus	cdg3
Wandering garter snake	Thamnophis elegans vagrans	cdgw2
Common garter snake	Thamnophis sittalis	dw2

APPENDIX A ANIMALS IN THE FOOTHILLS APPENDIX B R2R MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

AGREEMENT NO. 8810

FS Agreement No. 10-MU-11040202-003

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING Between The BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BOISE DISTRICT ADA COUNTY CITY OF BOISE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME And The U.S. FOREST SERVICE BOISE NATIONAL FOREST

This MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) is hereby made and entered into by and between the City of Boise, hereinafter referred to as City, Ada County, hereinafter referred to as the County, the State of Idaho, Department of Fish and Game, hereinafter referred to as Fish & Game, USDI, Bureau of Land Management, Boise District, hereinafter referred to as BLM, and the USDA Forest Service, Boise National Forest, hereinafter referred to as the Forest Service. The aforementioned entities are collectively referred to as "the Agencies". This MOU supersedes MOU #04-MU-11040202-018 dated December 22, 2003, which expires December 31, 2009.

BACKGROUND: The boundaries of public lands in the Boise Foothills (Foothills) are changing today just as they have over the last century. As the various public agencies acquire or dispose of lands according to their respective needs, land ownership patterns change. The boundaries of public land ownership in the Foothills are undergoing one of the most sweeping changes to date due in large part to the City's Foothills serial levy conservation efforts. The participatory public agencies to this MOU have anticipated this outcome and have planned for the evolution of a coordinated management effort.

Management coordination has long been a guiding principle by which public agencies in the Foothills operate. The Ridge to Rivers Pathway Plan, the Boise River Wildlife Management Area Plan and the 1999 MOU authorizing the development of the Public Lands Open Space Management Plan are examples of the progressive coordination for planning and management between the agencies.

The 1999 and 2003 (#04-MU-11040202-018) MOUs between the agencies calls for the development of a formal Memorandum of Agreement among local, state and federal agencies to cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage the resources of the Boise Front under the auspices of the Open Space Management Plan. These documents were developed collaboratively by the land management agencies in the Foothills and a steering committee of private property interests including numerous Foothills private property owners. The vision of a lead entity to serve as the focal point for the community originated from this broad-based committee and is well-documented throughout the Public Lands Open Space Management Plan.

FS Agreement No. 10-MU-11040202-003

This instrument is a continuation of the vision of past planning efforts and is intended to improve management efforts to meet increased public demand for coordinated management.

<u>Title:</u> Public Land Management – Boise Foothills

I. **PURPOSE:** The purpose of this MOU is to provide a framework for cooperation to establish a structure by which local, state, and federal agencies with public land management responsibilities in the Foothills, will cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage the resources of public Foothills lands. In order to meet growing community expectations for land management, the County, BLM, City, Fish & Game, and Forest Service will form an Agency Coordinating Committee.

This Agency Coordinating Committee shall:

- A. Coordinate public agency actions in the Foothills through selection and appointment of a Lead Coordinating Partner to take a lead role in Foothills stewardship.
- **B.** Establish clear lines of communication between the public and the agencies.
- **C.** Facilitate the participation of citizens, private landowners, and users in providing recommendations to the Lead Coordinating Partner regarding Foothills public land management decisions,
- **D.** Minimize administrative costs to taxpayers.
- E. Optimize public resources available for Foothills stewardship.
- F. Comply with all applicable legal requirements.
- G. Commit to measuring management and stewardship performance.
- **H.** Assist agencies, nonprofits, private landowners, and private citizens interested in public lands resource management in the Foothills.

II. STATEMENT OF MUTUAL BENEFIT AND INTERESTS:

The public agencies with land management responsibilities in the Foothills enter into this MOU to formalize their pursuit of a collective approach to managing public lands in this area. The Agencies recognize:

- A. The Foothills represent a unique natural and recreational resource to the community,
- **B.** The agencies have a long history of cooperation in resource management in the Foothills,
- **C.** As the amount of land in public ownership increases, a community expectation for cooperative management also increases,
- **D.** Coordinated public land management provides multiple benefits to both the public and land management agencies,

- E. Each agency has its own unique mission, legal authorities, and finite resources for achieving its mission,
- F. The agencies are committed to delivering streamlined, efficient management, and
- G. Collaboration, cooperation, and public land management efficiency is the intent of this MOU.

In consideration of the above premises, the agencies agree to the responsibilities outlined in Section III.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES:

- A. The Agencies of this MOU agree to appoint one member from each agency to serve on the Agency Coordinating Committee, which will synchronize management efforts in a manner consistent with the statement of Purpose (see Section I above). The Agency Coordinating Committee shall meet once per calendar quarter and shall have the responsibility of coordinating the activities of the Lead Coordination Partner Agency in order to better foster:
 - 1. <u>Communication, Education and Public Outreach:</u> Recognizing that public input and support is vital to resource management outcomes, a coordinated public involvement strategy must be developed for all facets of resource management in the Foothills.
 - 2. <u>Development of Partnerships:</u> The development of public and private partnerships serves to leverage the capacity of the five Agencies in achieving resource management goals.
 - 3. <u>Funding Strategies for Capital Projects:</u> The development of trailhead facilities, interpretive signs and other capital assets necessitates collaborative funding efforts in order to maximize capital dollars of each individual agency.
 - 4. <u>Implementation of Foothills Open Space Management Plan:</u> The Foothills Open Space Management Plan is a collaborative effort of public and private interests in resource management in the Foothills. The Plan contains detailed recommendations for improving coordination of resource management.
 - 5. <u>Response to Private Property Owner Concerns over Public Land</u> <u>Management in the Foothills:</u> Private land owners in the Foothills are partners in resource management. Concerns over how public lands are managed in relation to adjacent private property are of concern to all agencies and effective and timely communication is vital for private property owners.

B. In order to carry out this agreement:

1. ADA COUNTY SHALL:

a. have the Director of Recreation and Event Services serve as a member of the Agency Coordinating Committee.

FS Agreement No. 10-MU-11040202-003

b. contingent upon the availability of funds, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.

2. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BOISE DISTRICT SHALL:

- a. have the Four Rivers Field Manager serve as a member of the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- b. contingent upon the availability of funds and legal authority for their expenditure, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.

3. CITY OF BOISE SHALL:

- a. have the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department serve as a member of the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- b. contingent upon the availability of funds, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.

4. IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME SHALL:

- a. have the Southwest Region Wildlife Habitat Manager serve as a member of the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- b. contingent upon the availability of funds, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.

5. USDA FOREST SERVICE - BOISE NATIONAL FOREST SHALL:

a. have the Mountain Home District Ranger serve as a member of the Agency Coordinating Committee.

- b. contingent upon the availability of funds, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- C. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES.** The Agencies and their offices will handle their own activities and utilize their own resources, including the expenditure of their own funds, in pursuing these objectives. Each agency shall carry out its separate activities in a coordinated and mutually beneficial manner.

IV. LEAD COORDINATING PARTNER

This MOU recognizes the need to establish a Lead Coordinating Partner from amongst the agencies. The responsibilities of the Lead Coordinating Partner shall be to develop priorities and recommendations for:

- a. Communication, Education and Public Outreach
- b. Development of Partnerships
- c. Funding Strategics for Capital Projects,
- d. Implementation of the Public Lands Open Space Management Plan for the Foothills, and
- e. Respond to Private Property Owner Concerns over Public Land Management in the Foothills.

The City agrees to serve the role of Lead Coordinating Partner. The Boise City Foothills & Open Space Manager shall serve as the point of contact with the Agency Coordinating Committee and whose responsibility it will be to implement responsibilities of the Lead Coordinating Partner Agency, subject to necessary approvals by the Boise City Mayor and City Council.

V. IT IS MUTUALLY UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES THAT:

A. <u>APPLICABILITY</u>. This agreement recognizes that other intra-governmental management agreements exist for public lands in the Foothills. Cooperative agreements, such as those for fire suppression, law enforcement, noxious weed management and the Boise River Wildlife Management Area, are not superseded by this MOU. Similarly, planning and zoning issues are not within the scope of this MOU. The intent of this agreement is to gain efficiencies in areas where additional cooperation is beneficial to the public.

Each agency to this MOU agrees to designate a member of that agency to serve on an Agency Coordinating Committee. The Agency Coordinating Committee shall approve the tasks to be completed by the Lead Coordinating Partner consistent with the area of responsibilities described above and subject to review and approval by the Boise City Council. Each agency shall retain its respective legislative mandates and legal authorities. B. <u>PRINCIPAL CONTACTS</u>. Individuals listed below are authorized to act in their respective areas for matters related to this instrument.

Boise City Program Contact	Ada County ProgramContact
Name: Jim Hall, Director	Name: Bob Batista
Boise Parks & Recreation Department	Ada County Recreation & Event Services
Address: 1104 Royal Blvd	Address: 4049 South Eckert Road
City, State, Zip: Boise ID 83706	City, State, Zip: Boise, ID 83716
Telephone: (208)384-4060 ext 312	Telephone: (208)287-5656
FAX: (208)384-4127	FAX:
Email: jhall@cityofboise.org	Email: bbatista@expoidaho.com

Principal Contacts:

BLM Program Contact	Fish & Game Program Contact
Name: Michael O'Donnell	Name: Ed Bottum
Acting Four Rivers Field Manager	Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist
Bureau of Land Management	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Address: 3948 Development Ave.	Address: 13000 E. SH21
City, State, Zip: Boise, ID 83705	City, State, Zip: Boise, ID 83716
Telephone: (208)384-3300	Telephone: (208)334-2115
FAX:	FAX:
Email:	Email: ebottum@idfg.id.gov

Principal U.S. Forest Service Contacts:

U.S. Forest Service Program Contact	U.S. Forest Service Administrative Contact
Name: Stephaney Church, District Ranger Mountain Home Ranger District	Name: Brenda Williams, G&A Specialist SW Idaho & Nevada Acquisition Center
Address: 2180 American Legion Blvd.	Address: 1249 S. Vinnell Way, Ste 200
City, State, Zip: Mountain Home, ID 83647	City, State, Zip: Boise, ID 83709
Telephone: (208)587-7961	Telephone: (208)373-4322
FAX: (208)587-9217	FAX: (208)373-4294
Email: schurch@fs.fed.us	Email: brendawilliams@fs.fed.us

- C. <u>NON-LIABILITY</u>. The Agencies do not assume liability for any third party claims for damages arising out of this MOU.
- D. <u>NOTICES</u>. Any communications affecting the operations covered by this MOU given by the Agencies is sufficient only if in writing and delivered in person, mailed, or transmitted electronically by e-mail or fax, as follows:

To the agency's principal contacts, at the address specified in the MOU.

Notices are effective when delivered in accordance with this provision, or on the effective date of the notice, whichever is later.

FS Agreement No. 10-MU-11040202-003

- E. <u>PARTICIPATION IN SIMILAR ACTIVITIES</u>. This MOU in no way restricts the Agencies from participating in similar activities with other public or private agencies, organizations, and individuals.
- F. <u>ENDORSEMENT</u>. Any agency contributions made under this MOU do not by direct reference or implication convey Forest Service endorsement of the Agencies' products or activities, and does not by direct reference or implication convey the Agencies' endorsement of Forest Service products or activities.
- G. <u>NONBINDING AGREEMENT</u>. This MOU creates no right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity. The Agencies shall manage their respective resources and activities in a separate, coordinated and mutually beneficial manner to meet the purposes(s) of this MOU. Nothing in this MOU authorizes any of the Agencies to obligate or transfer funds. Specific projects or activities that involve the transfer of funds, services, or property among the Agencies require execution of separate agreements and are contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds. These activities must be independently authorized by statute. This MOU does not provide that authority. Negotiation, execution, and administration of these agreements must comply with all applicable law. Each agency operates under its own laws, regulations, and policies, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Nothing in this MOU is intended to alter, limit, or expand the agencies' statutory and regulatory authority.
- H. <u>MEMBERS OF U.S. CONGRESS</u>. Pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 22, no United States member of, or United States delegate to, Congress shall be admitted to any share or part of this MOU, or benefits that may arise therefrom, either directly or indirectly.
- FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA). Public access to MOU or agreement records must not be limited, except when such records must be kept confidential and would have been excepted from disclosure pursuant to Freedom of Information regulations (5 U.S.C. 552).
- J. <u>TERMINATION</u>. Any of the Agencies, in writing, may terminate this MOU in whole, or in part, at any time before the date of expiration.
- K. <u>DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION</u>. The Agencies to this MOU shall immediately inform the Forest Service if they or any of their principals are presently excluded, debarred, or suspended from entering into covered transactions with the federal government according to the terms of 2 CFR Part 180. Additionally, should the Agencies or any of their principals receive a transmittal letter or other official Federal notice of debarment or suspension, then they shall notify the Forest Service without undue delay. This applies whether the exclusion, debarment, or suspension is voluntary or involuntary.

- L. <u>MODIFICATIONS</u>. Modifications within the scope of this MOU must be made by mutual consent of the Agencies, by the issuance of a written modification signed and dated by all properly authorized, signatory officials, prior to any changes being performed. Requests for modification should be made, in writing, at least thirty (30)days prior to implementation of the requested change.
- M. <u>COMMENCEMENT/EXPIRATION DATE</u>. This MOU is executed as of the date the last agency executes this MOU and is effective through **December 31**, **2014**, at which time it will expire, unless extended by an executed modification, signed and dated by all properly authorized, signatory officials.

VI. AUTHORITIES

Ada County is authorized by Section 67-2332, Idaho Code, to enter into agreement with one or more public agencies to perform any governmental service, activity, or undertaking, which each public agency entering into the agreement is authorized to perform.

The Bureau of Land Management is authorized under BLM Manual Section1786, Memorandums of Understanding, Section 1786.3, Section 307(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. 1737 (b).

City of Boise is authorized by Sections 67-2328 and 67-2332, Idaho Code, to enter into agreement with one or more public agencies to perform any governmental service, activity, or undertaking, which each public agency entering into the agreement is authorized to perform.

Idaho Department of Fish and Game is authorized by Idaho Code Section 36-104(b)(8) to enter into cooperative agreements with local, state and federal agencies to promote wildlife conservation.

The U.S. Forest Service is authorized under the provision of the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960.

FS Agreement No. 10-MU-11040202-003

VII. <u>AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES</u>.

By signature below, each party certifies that the individuals listed in this document as representatives of the individual Agencies are authorized to act in their respective areas for matters related to this MOU. In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this MOU as of the last date written below.

12/22/09 Date 12/15/09 ADEN SEIDLITZ, DISTRICT, MANAGER BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BOISE DISTRICT test FRED TILMAN, CHAIRMAN ADA COUN COMMISSIONERS 12/10 DAVID HABIETER, MAYOR CITY OF BOISE 12/17/09 SCOTT REINECKER, SOUTHWEST REGIONAL SUPERVISOR IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME CECILIA R. SEESHOLPZ, FOREST SUPERV DR U.S. FOREST SERVICE, BOISE NATIONAL FOREST The authority and format of this instrument has been reviewed and approved for signature. BRENDAL WILLIAMS Julland U.S. Forest Service Grants & Agreements Specialist Burden Statement According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0596-0217. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 3 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all Its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age. disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call toll free (866) 632-9992 (voice). TDD users can contact USDA through local relay or the Federal relay at (800) 877-8339 (TDD) or (866) 377-8642 (relay voice). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

APPENDIX C FOOTHILLS SERIAL LEVY BALLOT LANGUAGE

Explanation of Foothills Ballot Language

Ballot language for the Foothills special Levy election was developed consistent with state law and past practice by the City.

A working team made up of members from the Boise City Clerk's Office, Budget, Legal, Parks & Recreation and the Mayor's Office met in late March and early April to finalize the process for holding a special election including ballot language development. The ballot language, which was submitted to the team by the Boise Foothills Open Space Campaign, was carefully reviewed and then approved by the team following a review by election officials from Ada County and the State.

For the special election held for Parks back in 1994, a similar working committee was responsible for drafting and approving the ballot language. The language back in '94 was not taken to the City Council for approval because such an action was not then, and is not now, required by Idaho State Election Law.

SPECI	AL ELECTION	
SAMPLE BOISE CITY, BALLOT M	ADA COUNTY, IDAHO	BA BA
READ ALL INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE VOTING	OFFICIAL SPECIAL ELECTION BALLOT	
Punch Out Ballot Card ONLY With Punching Stylus, Which Is Attached to Chain; Never With Pen or Pencil.	For the purpose of preserving land in the Boise Foothills as open space and natural areas, shall the City of Boise establish a Foothills Open Space Protection Trust Fund with a \$5 million property tax override levy for each of two years, subject to a review by a citizens committee and an annua independent audit?	Lp. d
TO BEGIN VOTING	SUMMARY Proposed Open Space Protection Trust Fund would acquire open space and natural areas in the Boise Foothills. Approved levy funds will:	8
	 Protect water quality; Preserve wildlife habitat; 	
TURN PAGE	 Provide increased recreational areas for walking, biking, and othe outdoor activities; 	er
INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS: To vote on the following question, punch through the ballot card in the space to the	 Limit overdevelopment and traffic; and Protect natural vegetation that prevents mudflows and washout 	
right of the words "For the Foothilis Open Space 1 rust rund or "Against the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund", according to the way you desire to yote on the question. All marks	Buying open spaces for public use will balance private development in th Boise area.	he
otherwise made are forbidden. All distinguishing marks are forbidden and make the ballot void. If you, by mistake or accident, mark, tear, deface or otherwise mutilate this ballot, return it to the election judges and obtain another ballot.	Cost of the levy is \$2.33/month for each one hundred thousand dollars o assessed home value, for two years only.	of
Do not write on the ballot itself.	For the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund	
SPECIAL ELECTION	Against the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund	7
TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2001	END OF BALLOT	

SAMPLE BALLOT

DAVID R. FRAZIER Box 5242 Boise, ID 83705 342-9250

May 1, 2001

Boise City Council City Hall Boise, Idaho

Dear Council Members,

At the April 24 meeting, Council Member Sara Baker said she would not object to considering ballot language from the oppenents of the Foothills Levy.

As an avid conservationist but an opponent of this levy, I would like the following language included in the May 22 ballot:

OPPONENTS SUMMARY

--Traffic considerations will not be addressed by the levy and traffic may increase. --Capitol City Development Corp. will receive about \$90,000 for development yearly. --Development will not be halted. It may be concentrated with increased density. --No wildlife or open spaces are identified for any portion of the city except "Foothills." --Water quality may be degraded. No link between the levy and water quality exists.

As you can see by the attached Open Space Campaign flyer, their partisan message mirrors the ballot language. I feel this is grossly unfair and ask the council to offer the above points to voters along with the bailot.

Sincerely, David R. Frazies

David R. Frazier

Pub. May 16, 18, 2001	BOISE CITY, ADA COUNTY, IDAH TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2001	SPECIAL ELECTION	return if to the election judges and obtain another ballot.	otherwise made are forbidden. All distinguishing made forbidden and make the ballot void. If you, by mista accident mark tear deface or otherwise mutilate this l	or "Against the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund", according to the way you desire to write on the question. All the	institut, include the postills Open Space Tright	TURN PAGE			TO BEGIN VOTING	Punch Out Ballot Card ONLY With Pu Stylus, Which is Attached to Chain; Never With Pencil	READ ALL INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE VOTING	SAMPLE BOISE C	A49709 05/16/01 05/18/01 unassigned -Black
Ð	O Against the Foothilfs Open Space Trust Fund (7 END OF BALLOT	For the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund 45	Cost of the levy is \$2,33/month for each one hundred thousand d assessed home value, for two years only.	is are Buying open spaces for public use will balance private developm ake or Boise area. ballot,	ording • Protect natural vegetation that prevents mudflows and warks	to the Limit overdevelopment and traffic; and Find?	 Provide increased recreational areas for walking, biking, owing owing 	 Preserve wildlife habitat; 	 Protect water quality; 	SUMMARY Proposed Open Space Protection Trust Fund would acquire open and natural areas in the Boise Foothills. Approved levy funds will	Inching natural areas, shall the City of Boise establish a Foothills Open Sp Protection Trust Fund with a \$5 million property tax override levy for end for Pen Or of two years, subject to a review by a citzens committee and an ann independent audit?	OFFICIAL SPECIAL ELECTION BALLOT QUESTION For the purpose of preserving land in the Boise Foothills as open space a	HTY, ADA COUNTY, IDAHO SAMI MAY 22, 2001 BALI	PECIAL ELECTION
10388	J	↓ 	llats of	nt in the	shouts.					pace	<u>8</u> S ² C	ā.		

 \oplus

LES 'ON ŀ. 9

....

 \oplus

MASI:8 1005.31.YAM

BOISE CITY, ADA COUNTY, IDAHO TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2001	Do not write on the ballot itself.	return it to the election judges and obtain another ballot.	to the way you desire to vote on the question, and analytic of the way and are forbidden. All distinguishing marks are forbidden and make the ballot void. If you, by mistake or forbidden and make the ballot retrained mutilate this ballot.	right of the words "For the Footnins Open Space Lives rund or "Against the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund", according	INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS: To vote on the color will a space to the question, punch through the ballot card in the space to the	TURN PAGE			TO BEGIN VOTING	Punch Out Ballot Card ONLY With Punching Stylus, Which is Attached to Chain; Never With Pen or Pencil	READ ALL INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE VOTING	SAMPLE BOISE CITY, ADA BALLOT MAY 2	SPECIAL ENT
Against the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund 17	For the Foothills Open Space Trust Fund 15	Cost of the levy is \$2.33/month for each one hundred thousand dollars of assessed home value, for two years only.	Buying open spaces for public use will balance private development in the Boise area.	 Protect natural vegetation that prevents mudflows and washouts. 	 Limit overdevelopment and traffic; and 	 Provide increased recreational areas for walking, biking, and other outdoor activities; 	 Preserve wildlife habitat; 	 Protect water quality; 	SUMMARY Proposed Open Space Protection Trust Fund would acquire open space and natural areas in the Boise Foothills. Approved levy funds will:	natural areas, shall the City of House establish a routine Open open Protection Trust Fund with a \$5 million property tax override levy for each of two years, subject to a review by a citzens committee and an amnual independent audit?	OFFICIAL SPECIAL ELECTION BALLOT QUESTION For the purpose of preserving land in the Boise Foothills as open space and	2, 2001 SAMPLE BALLOT	ELECTION

. . .

.



APPENDIX D WILDFIRE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

RESOLUTION NO. 21557

BY THE COUNCIL:

CLEGG, EBERLE, JORDAN, MCLEAN, QUINTANA AND THOMSON

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY CLERK TO EXECUTE AND ATTEST TO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ("MOU") FOR MANAGING VEGETATION WITHIN THE WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE ("WUI") WITHIN ADA COUNTY BY AND AMONG THE CITY OF BOISE CITY, BY AND THROUGH ITS DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION; ADA COUNTY, IDAHO; THE CITY OF EAGLE, IDAHO; THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BOISE DISTRICT ("BLM"); AND THE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME ("IDFG"); SETTING FORTH THE BACKGROUND OF THE MOU: PROVIDING FOR A STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: ESTABLISHING AN AGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE AND PROVIDING FOR ITS COLLECTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES; APPOINTING THE BLM AS THE LEAD AGENCY; RECOGNIZING **OTHER COOPERATIVE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS AND PROVIDING THAT SUCH** ARE NOT **SUPERSEDED** AGREEMENTS BY THE MOU; **APPOINTING REPRESENTATIVE CONTACTS FROM EACH AGENCY: PROVIDING THE MOU** DOES NOT CREATE ANY RIGHT, BENEFIT OR TRUST RESPONSIBILITY BY ANY PARTY TO ANY OTHER PARTY TO THE AGREEMENT; PROVIDING THAT THE MOU IMPOSES NO FISCAL OR FUNDS RESPONSIBILITY ON ANY PARTY; PROVIDING FOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE MOU; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERM OF THE MOU; PROVIDING FOR TERMINATION OF THE AGREEMNT BY ANY PARTY WITH SIXTY (60) DAYS WRITTEN NOTICE; SETTING FORTH THE AUTHORITY FOR EACH AGENCY TO ENTER INTO THE AGREEMENT; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BOISE CITY, IDAHO:

Section 1. That the Memorandum of Understanding (Wildlife Urban Interface) by and among the City of Boise City, Idaho; Ada County, Idaho; the City of Eagle, Idaho; the Bureau of Land Management, Boise District, and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, be, and the same is hereby, approved both as to form and content.

Section 2. That the Mayor and City Clerk be, and they hereby are, authorized

respectively to execute and attest said Memorandum of Understanding for and on behalf of the City of Boise City.

Section 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its adoption and approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Boise, Idaho, this <u>10th</u> day of January 2012.

APPROVED by the Mayor of the City of Boise, Idaho this <u>10th</u> day of January 2012.

APPROVED:

But

David H. Bieter Mayor

ATTEST:

4 Dorph

Debbie Broughton Ex-Officio City Clerk



BLM-BDO-ID-011-005-9211

AGREEMENT NO. 9587

Representative MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

ADA COUNTY BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BOISE DISTRICT CITY OF BOISE CITY OF EAGLE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

This **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)** is hereby entered into by Ada County ("County"), the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Boise District ("BLM"), the City of Boise, an Idaho municipal corporation, the City of Eagle, an Idaho municipal corporation, and the State of Idaho, Department of Fish and Game ("IDFG"), all of whom collectively may be referred to as "the Parties."

RECITALS

The Parties join in this MOU to formalize their collective approach to managing vegetation within the wildland urban interface (WUI). This cooperation serves the mutual interest of the Parties and the public. Accordingly,

Whereas, wildland fires know no boundaries; and

Whereas, wildland fires have historically occurred in the WUI; and

Whereas, the frequency and potential adverse consequences of wildland fires in the WUI has increased as the population in the WUI has increased; and

Whereas, the native vegetation communities and special status species found in the WUI have been disturbed over the years and, in some areas, replaced by nonnative invasive species increasing the wildland fire risk; and

Whereas, the WUI deserves protection and preservation of its ecological integrity; and

Whereas, the WUI, with its expanding urban interface of homes and businesses, is subject to increased wildland fire risk and fire suppression demands; and

Whereas, various public and private landowners and stakeholders have interests, responsibilities, and concerns regarding their investments within and near the WUI; and

Whereas, the Parties have limited resources to address the challenges of vegetation management and wildland fire mitigation and seek to pool their resources; and

Whereas, sustaining the ecosystems, resources, and human populations in the WUI will require strong collaborative partnerships among research and land management organizations and local governments; and

10/31/11 FINAL Ada County Wildland Urban Interface Management MOU

Whereas, each party has its unique mission and finite resources that it will attempt to leverage in the best interest of achieving the mission of this MOU.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above premises, the Parties agree to accept the responsibilities set forth in Section II below.

BACKGROUND

As the population of the Boise metropolitan area grows, the WUI has become more important as a place of recreation and relaxation for local residents. The area continues to be important for a variety of wildlife and special status plant species and the associated vegetation communities that support them. However, the area remains vulnerable to wildfire. An average of 23 fire starts occurs annually within the WUI in Ada County. Approximately 83% of those are human-caused. While many fires are controlled quickly, some result in significant losses of life, property, and natural resources.

Management coordination has long been a guiding principle by which public agencies in the WUI operate. The Ridge to Rivers Pathway Plan, the Boise River Wildlife Management Area Plan, the Ada County Wildfire Response Plan, the Ada County Wildfire Mitigation Plan, and the 1999 MOU creating the Public Lands Open Space Management Plan are examples of the progressive coordination for planning and management between the Parties.

The Parties have only begun to take steps to reduce the fire hazard potential by managing hazardous fuels including noxious and invasive weed species, by planting fire-resistant species, and/or by restoring native plant communities. This instrument is a continuation of the vision of past cooperative efforts and is intended to improve efforts to meet increased public demand for vegetation management to reduce the threat of fire and improve habitat for wildlife.

WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE MANAGEMENT IN ADA COUNTY

I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this MOU is to provide a framework for cooperation to establish a structure by which local governments and state and federal agencies with land management responsibilities in the WUI of Ada County will cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage vegetation and conserve native fish, wildlife, and plant resources. In order to meet growing community expectations for land management, the County, BLM, the cities of Boise and Eagle, and IDFG will form an Agency Coordinating Committee and strive to achieve the following objectives:

- A. Coordinate public agency actions in the WUI through selection and appointment of a Lead Agency to take a lead role in WUI stewardship.
- B. Establish clear lines of communication between the public and the Parties.
- C. Reduce fire risks in the WUI by reducing fire starts, reducing hazardous fuel loads, and planting fire-resistant species and/or by restoring native plant communities.

- D. Facilitate the participation of citizens and private landowners in providing recommendations to the Parties regarding WUI management decisions and priorities.
- E. Assist Parties, nonprofits, private landowners, and citizens interested in vegetation management in the WUI.
- F. Educate the public about the importance of managing vegetation in the WUI.
- G. Minimize administrative costs to taxpayers.
- H. Optimize public resources available for foothills stewardship.
- I. Comply with all legal requirements.
- J. Commit to measuring management and stewardship performance.
- K. Ensure that hazardous fuels management and vegetation restoration actions are consistent with the conservation of special status species including slickspot peppergrass (*Lepidium papilliferum*), Aase's onion (*Allium aaseae*), and Mulford's milkvetch (*Astragalus mulfordiae*).

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. The Parties shall appoint members to serve on the Agency Coordinating Committee comprised of Agency Coordinators and technical support staff, which will organize management efforts in a manner consistent with the Statement of Purpose. The Agency Coordinating Committee shall meet at least twice a year and technical support staff shall meet as needed to better foster:
 - 1. <u>Communication, Education, and Public Outreach</u>: Recognizing that public comment, participation, and support are vital to successful vegetation management outcomes, a coordinated public involvement strategy should be developed for all facets of vegetation management in the WUI.
 - 2. <u>Development of Partnerships</u>: The development of public and private partnerships serves to leverage the capacity of the Parties to achieve vegetation management goals.
 - 3. <u>Funding Strategies for Projects</u>: The reduction of hazardous fuels, restoration of wildlife habitat, public outreach, and other projects necessitates collaborative funding efforts in order to maximize capital dollars of each individual agency.
 - 4. <u>Implementation of Fire and Open Space Management Plans</u>: Considerable planning efforts have been completed related to vegetation management, as well as fire suppression and prevention. The Parties, the general public, and private landowners should work cooperatively to implement the recommendations of the plans listed in Section IV.
 - 5. <u>Response to Private Property Owner Concerns over Agency Management in the</u> <u>WUI</u>: Private landowners in the WUI are partners in resource management. How lands are managed in relation to adjacent private properties are of concern to all Parties. Effective and timely communication is vital for private property owners.
- B. Ada County shall:
 - 1. Authorize the Director of Parks and Waterways to serve as the County's Agency Coordinator and authorized representative of the County; and

- 2. Contingent upon the availability of funds and legal authority for their expenditure, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- C. Bureau of Land Management shall:
 - 1. Authorize the Four Rivers Field Manager to serve as the BLM's Agency Coordinator and authorized representative of the BLM; and
 - 2. Contingent upon the availability of funds and legal authority for their expenditure, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- D. City of Boise shall:
 - 1. Authorize the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department to serve as the City's Agency Coordinator and authorized representative of the City; and
 - 2. Contingent upon the availability of funds and legal authority for their expenditure, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- E. City of Eagle shall:
 - 1. Appoint the Mayor to serve as the City's Agency Coordinator and authorized representative of the City; and
 - 2. Contingent upon the availability of funds and legal authority for their expenditure, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.
- F. Idaho Department of Fish and Game shall:
 - 1. Authorize the Southwest Region Wildlife Habitat Manager to serve as the IDFG Agency Coordinator and authorized representative of the Idaho Fish and Game Commission; and
 - 2. Contingent upon the availability of funds and legal authority for their expenditure, to provide technical assistance and financial support for tasks identified by the Agency Coordinating Committee.

III. LEAD AGENCY

This MOU recognizes the need to establish a Lead Agency. The Lead Agency shall facilitate the Agency Coordinating Committee in developing priorities and recommendations for implementing the programs outlined in Section II.A, above.

The BLM shall serve as the Lead Agency. The BLM shall designate a Project Manager to serve as the point of contact with the Agency Coordinating Committee and will implement responsibilities of the Lead Agency.

10/31/11 FINAL Ada County Wildland Urban Interface Management MOU

IV. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

- A. Strategy Identify appropriate elements from the following documents to help guide vegetation management and public outreach activities in the WUI:
 - Public Lands Open Space Management Plan (2000)
 - o Ada County All-Hazards Mitigation Plan, Wildfire Chapter (2006)
 - BLM Foothills East Environmental Assessment (2008)
 - o F.I.R.E.-Up Occluded Spaces Wildland Fire Hazard Survey (2009)
 - Ada County All-Hazards Mitigation Plan (2011)
 - F.I.R.E.-Up Boise WUI Zone and home surveys (2011)
 - Boise District BLM Fire Mitigation Plan (updated annually)
 - Boise District BLM Fuels Program of Work (updated annually)
- B. Continue public outreach programs to educate homeowners about the importance, roles, and responsibilities of Firewise landscaping and construction practices in the WUI.
- C. Initiate a publicity campaign to educate the community about vegetation management efforts to improve community safety, enhance wildlife habitat, and restore desirable vegetation in open spaces.
- D. Conduct pilot hazardous fuels reduction projects in cooperation with other Parties and landowners.
- E. Complete wildfire risk assessments of priority WUI areas in Ada County.
- F. Base treatment areas and projects on a variety of factors including but not limited to: hazardous fuels surveys, resource concerns, local support, and/or strategic locations.
- G. Educate public on existing ordinances and provide suggestions to agency members regarding development and implementation of new ordinances to address hazardous fuels management and Firewise landscaping and construction practices in the WUI.
- H. Actively pursue funding opportunities to implement projects in the remaining WUI.
- I. Plant fire-resistant species and/or restore native plant communities (grasses, forbs, and shrubs).
- J. Reduce and control exotic annual invasive species and noxious weeds.

V. APPLICABILITY

A. This MOU recognizes that other inter-governmental management agreements exist for public lands in the WUI. Cooperative agreements, such as those for fire suppression, law enforcement, noxious weed management, and the Boise River Wildlife Management Area, are not superseded by this MOU. Similarly, planning and zoning issues are not
within the scope of this MOU. The intent of this agreement is to gain efficiencies in areas where additional cooperation is beneficial to the public.

- B. Each Party to this MOU agrees to designate members of that Party to serve on an Agency Coordinating Committee. The Agency Coordinating Committee shall approve the tasks to be completed by the Lead Agency or other members consistent with the area of responsibilities described above and subject to review and approval by the appropriate jurisdictional agency. Each agency shall retain its respective legislative mandates and legal authorities.
- C. <u>AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE CONTACTS</u>. Individuals listed below are authorized to act in their respective areas for matters related to this instrument.

Agency	Ada County	BLM	City of Boise	City of Eagle	IDFG
Lead		Terry Humphrey	Jim Hall	Jim Reynolds	Ed Bottum
Agency					
Coordinator			2		
Position	Director of Parks	Four Rivers Field	Director, Boise Parks	Mayor	Regional Wildlife
	and Waterways	Manager	and Recreation		Habitat Biologist
			Department		
Address	4049 S. Eckert	3948 Development	1104 Royal Blvd	660 E. Civic Ln.	13000 E. SH21
	Rd	Avenue	Boise, ID 83706	Eagle, ID 83616	Boise, ID 83716
	Boise, ID 83716	Boise, ID 83705			
Phone	208-577-4575	208-384-3430	208-608-7609	208-938-6813	208-334-2115
FAX	208-577-4579	208-384-3326	208-608-7648	208-938-3854	
E-Mail		thumphrey@blm.g	jhall@cityofboise.org	nbaird@cityofeag	edward.bottum@idfg.i
		ov		le.org	d.gov

- D. <u>**TECHNICAL SUPPORT CONTACTS</u>**. The Parties shall develop and maintain technical support contact lists as necessary.</u>
- E. **<u>NOTICES</u>**. Any communications affecting the operations covered by this MOU given by the Parties is sufficient only if in writing and delivered in person, mailed, or transmitted electronically by e-mail or fax, as follows:
 - a. To the Party's authorized representative, at the address specified in the MOU.
 - b. Notices are effective when delivered in accordance with this provision, or on the effective date of the notice, whichever is later.
- F. <u>NON-LIABILITY</u>. The Parties do not assume liability for any third party claims for damages arising out of this MOU.
- G. ESTABLISHMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY. This MOU is not intended to, and does not create, any right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity, by a party against the United States, Ada County, the City of Boise, the City of Eagle, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, their agencies, their officers, their departments or any person or entity.

- H. <u>**RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES.</u>** The Parties will handle their own activities and utilize their own resources, including the expenditure of their own funds, in pursuing these objectives. Each party will carry out its separate activities in a coordinated and mutually beneficial manner.</u>
- I. <u>PARTICIPATION IN SIMILAR ACTIVITIES</u>. This MOU in no way restricts the Parties from participating in similar activities with other public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals.
- J. **FISCAL/FUNDS OBLIGATION.** This MOU is neither a fiscal nor a funds obligation document. Any endeavor or transfer of anything of value involving reimbursement or contribution of funds between the Parties to this MOU or between the Parties to this MOU and others will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations and procedures, including those for government procurement and printing. Such endeavors will be outlined in separate agreements that shall be made in writing by representatives of the Parties and shall be independently authorized by appropriate statutory authority. This MOU does not provide such authority. Specifically, this MOU does not establish authority for noncompetitive awards to the cooperator of any contract or other agreement. Any contract or agreement for training or other services must fully comply with all applicable requirements for competition.
- K. <u>MEMBERS OF U.S. CONGRESS</u>. Pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 22, no United States member of, or United States delegate to, Congress shall be admitted to any share or part of this MOU, or benefits that may arise therefrom, either directly or indirectly.
- L. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA). Public access to this MOU, associated agreement records, or any information furnished to the Bureau of Land Management under this instrument must not be limited except when such records must be kept confidential and would have been excepted from disclosure pursuant to Freedom of Information regulations (5 U.S.C. 552). Access to this MOU, associated agreement records or other information maintained by Ada County, the City of Boise, the City of Eagle, and IDFG are subject to the provisions of Idaho's Open Meeting Law Idaho Code §§ 67-2340 et seq. and Idaho's Public Records Law, Idaho Code Title 9, Chapter 3 et seq.
- M. **DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION.** The Parties to this MOU shall immediately inform the BLM if they or any of their principals are presently excluded, debarred, or suspended from entering into covered transactions with the federal government according to the terms of 2 CFR Part 180. Additionally, should the Parties or any of their principals receive a transmittal letter or other official Federal notice of debarment or suspension, they shall notify the BLM without undue delay. This applies whether the exclusion, debarment, or suspension is voluntary or involuntary.
- N. <u>MODIFICATIONS</u>. Modifications within the scope of this MOU must be made by mutual consent of the Parties, by the issuance of a written modification signed and dated by all properly authorized, signatory officials, prior to any changes being performed.

 ~ 1

Requests for modification should be made, in writing at least thirty (30) days prior to implementation of the requested change.

- O. **EFFECTIVE DATE/TERM.** This MOU is shall be effective on the date the last agency executes it and shall terminate December 31, 2016, unless extended in writing by the Parties.
- P. TERMINATION. Any signatory agency to this MOU may terminate the MOU, in whole or in part, by providing a 60-day written notice to all other signatory parties.

VI. AUTHORITIES

Ada County, the City of Boise, the City of Eagle, and IDFG are each authorized by Idaho Code §§ 67-2326 through 67-2333, to enter into agreement with one or more public agencies to perform any governmental service, activity, or undertaking, which each public agency entering into the agreement is authorized to perform.

The Bureau of Land Management is authorized under BLM Manual Section1786, Memorandums of Understanding, Section 1786.3, Section 307(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. 1737 (b).

VII. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES.

By signature below, each party certifies that the individuals listed in this document as representatives of the signatory agencies are authorized to act on behalf of his or her agency for matters related to this MOU.

In witness whereof, the Parties hereto have executed this MOU as of the last date written below.

For Ada County, Idaho

RICK YZAGUIR ADA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS Att ort Cle-k Ast. for Real

For the Bureau of Land Management

ADEN SEIDLITZ, DISTRICT MANAGER BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BOISE DISTRICT

For the City of Boise

But 1/10/12 DAVID H. BIETER, MAYOR Date CITY OF BOISE ATTEST: 1/10/12

Debbie Broughton,

For the City of Eagle

JAMES D. REYNOLDS, MAYO CITY OF EAGLE

For the Idaho Department of Fish and Game

6 8

SCOTT REINECKER, SOUTHWEST REGIONAL SUPERVISOR IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

12-15-2011 Date

Date



12.5-11



James R. Hall Director

Parks & Recreation 1104 Royal Boulevard Boise, Idaho 83706-2840

Phone 208/384-4240

Fax 208/384-4127

TDD/TTY 800/377-3529

Web www.cityofboise.org/parks

Mayor David H. Bieter

City Council President Maryanne Jordan

Council ProTem Elaine Clegg

Vernon L. Bisterfeldt David Eberle Alan W. Shealy Jim Tibbs

Boise Parks & Recreation

	TO:	Mayor David H. Bieter Members of the City Council
	FROM:	James R. Hall Director
	RESOLUTION	NUMBER: R-10-12
	DATE:	December 27, 2011
and a second sec	SUBJECT:	Wildland Urban Interface Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU")

ACTION REQUIRED: Approval of R-10-12.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council approve and the Mayor sign R-10-12 and the Wildland Urban Interface Memorandum of Understanding.

BACKGROUND:

Following the Oregon Trail fire on September 3, 2008, the Mayor's Office asked representatives from Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development Services and the Boise Fire Department to come together and collaborate on efforts to make the City of Boise less at risk for this type of a disaster in the future. Since that time staff from these departments has been making progress through various projects. The list below highlights those projects:

- 1. Summer 2009 FIRE UP risk assessment and rating of 137 homes in Boise Heights neighborhood.
- 2. Fall 2009 PDS maps City of Boise Wildland Urban Interface (WUI).
- 3. Summer 2010 Fire Prevention Code amendment approved by City Council adding a Chapter 49 Wildland Urban Interface Code.
- 4. **Summer 2011** FIREWISE staff visit Boise, Hagerman and Twin Falls to view different FIREWISE communities, Boise City representatives participated in the field trip.
- 5. Summer 2011 FIRE UP risk assessment, rating and associated GIS layer of 581 Homes in Foothills East neighborhood.

- 6. Summer 2011 City of Boise representatives submit WUI goat grazing grant application for several properties owned by City of Boise.
- 7. Fall 2011 Bureau of Land Management ("BLM"), Warm Springs Mesa Homeowners Association, Boise City volunteers reseeding effort.
- 8. Fall 2011 BLM produces MOU to formalize a collective approach to managing vegetation within the WUI.
- 9. Winter 2011 BSU Service Learning Student works with PDS to create a GIS layer of FIRE UP 2009 data.
- 10. Winter 2011/2012 Follow-up questionnaire sent to 137 homeowners in Boise Heights neighborhood inquiring if they have made changes as a result of Summer 2009 risk assessment.

Item 8 above refers to the document requiring City Council approval in order for the Mayor to sign for the City. Ada County, City of Eagle, BLM, and Idaho Department of Fish and Game have signed the MOU. These partner agencies will be meeting at least twice a year to address the goals of the MOU and the support staff will be meeting more frequently to move the joint projects forward. Some of the projects the partners will be working on in 2012 include: reduction of organic fuels surrounding Warm Springs Mesa, teaming with Agricultural Research Service on native plant test plots in Military Reserve and using goats to reduce fire risk in the foothills.

ATTACHMENTS: R-10-12 and Wildland Urban Interface Memorandum of Understanding.

APPENDIX E INTERAGENCY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This Memorandum of Understanding is made and entered into among the:

City of Boise Ada County Boise County State of Idaho Department of Fish and Game Bureau of Land Management – Four Rivers Field Office Forest Service – Boise National Forest (hereby referred to as 'the agencies")

The agencies with land use management responsibilities within the Boise Front area share this Memorandum of Understanding to formalize their pursuit of a collective approach to managing public lands in the area. The agencies recognize

- *Whereas*, the Boise Foothills offers a unique natural and recreational resource and serves as the backdrop to Idaho's Capital City
- *Whereas*, the Boise Foothills is increasingly affected by visitors, recreation, and urban development.
- Whereas, the Boise Foothills deserves protection and preservation of its ecological integrity
- Whereas, the Boise Foothills is a key link to maintaining wildlife populations
- *Whereas*, the Boise Foothills, with expanding urban interface, is subject to increased wildland fire risk and fire suppression demands
- *Whereas*, the various public and private landowners and stakeholders have interests, responsibilities, and concerns regarding the Boise Foothills
- *Whereas*, agencies have limited resources to address the challenges and seek to pool their resources
- *Whereas*, the *Interagency Foothills Management Plan* creates an opportunity to coordinate management of the area
- *Whereas,* the agencies agree to explore ways to streamline management of public lands in the Boise Foothills
- *Whereas*, each agency has its unique mission and finite resources that it will attempt to leverage in the best interest of achieving the mission of this MOU

The agencies will pursue implementation of this initial MOU based on a shared vision that states:

VISION

Local, State and Federal agencies will cooperate to preserve, protect, enhance, perpetuate, and manage the resources in the 85,000 acre Boise Foothills Management Area, working together with private landowners.

The agencies will achieve the vision by implementing the following objectives:

OBJECTIVES

1. Develop and implement an integrated *Interagency Foothills Management Plan* (an update to the 2000 Foothills Open Space Management Plan for Public Lands).

The local, state and federal agencies shall cooperate in the development of an *Interagency Foothills Management Plan*. The plan shall address interconnectivity of wildlife habitat, recreational trails, parks, and open space areas. The plan will also address the relationship of the urban interface concerning environmental, recreation, wildlife, and wildfire-related issues.

2. Formalize and demonstrate a long-term commitment

Develop a formal Memorandum of Agreement among local, state and federal agencies to cooperatively oversee and efficiently manage the resources in the Boise Foothills under the auspices of the *Interagency Foothills Management Plan*.

3. Pursue and develop funding sources

Develop multi-jurisdictional funding proposals to supplement existing limited sources of funding to enhance management goals while protecting watershed, botanical, and wildlife values in the Boise Foothills. Seek opportunities to pool and leverage resources to accomplish these goals.

4. Address and understand issues of private landowners

Recognizing that 48% of the Boise Foothills Management Area is privately owned and that private property owners have legal rights in and to their land, work to develop a strategy to ensure a collaborative approach to effectively integrate private landowner interests, rights and concerns into resource management activities in the Boise Foothills.

5. Pursue an ongoing and meaningful public involvement and education process

Recognizing that the public has a legitimate interest in the future use of both the public and private land holdings in the foothills, work to develop a strategy to ensure a collaborative approach to effectively integrate citizen and private stakeholder interests and concerns into resource management activities in the Boise Foothills. Develop a strategy for public involvement and continue to offer environmental education opportunities for all ages in the Boise Foothills including volunteer projects, special events, adult and student focused programming, habitat restoration development and implementation, and wildfire mitigation projects.

6. Preserve existing public lands as open space

Help preserve existing public lands as open space and create connectivity between these public lands.

7. Acquire additional open space as appropriate to agency mission and function.

The City, County, and State utilize open space acquisition methods such as donations, bargain sales, conservation easements, serial levies, wildlife mitigation funds and other similar innovative means to help secure sensitive open lands from willing private landowners, as directed under the *Interagency Foothills Management Plan*. The federal agencies will help facilitate and support that activity where, during this process, the group collaboratively identifies key properties that they want to acquire to meet the vision of this agreement.

AUTHORITY

- A. The City of Boise is authorized by Sections 67-2328 and 67-2332, Idaho Code, to contract with one or more public agencies to perform any governmental service, activity, or undertaking, which each public agency entering into the contract is authorized to perform.
- B. Ada County is authorized by Sections 67-2328 and 67-2332, Idaho Code, to enter into agreement with one or more public agencies to perform any governmental service, activity, or undertaking, which each public agency entering into the agreement is authorized to perform.
- C. Boise County is authorized by Sections 67-2328 and 67-2332, Idaho Code, to enter into agreements with one or more public agencies to perform any governmental service, activity, or undertaking, which each public agency entering into the agreement is authorized to perform.

- D. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game is authorized by Idaho Code Section 36-104 (b)(8) to enter into cooperative agreements with local, state and federal agencies to promote wildlife conservation.
- E. The Bureau of Land Management is authorized under Section 307(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of the 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. 1737.
- F. The U.S. Forest Service is authorized under the provision of the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960.

ADMINISTRATION

- A. This instrument is neither a fiscal nor a funds obligation document. Any endeavor involving reimbursement or contribution of funds between the parties to this instrument will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures including those for Government procurement and printing. Such endeavors will be outlined in separate agreements that shall be made in writing by representatives of the parties and shall be independently authorized by appropriate statutory authority. This instrument does not provide such authority. Specifically, this instrument does not establish authority for noncompetitive award to the cooperator of any contract or other agreement. Any contract or agreement for training or other services must fully comply with all applicable requirements for competition.
- B. Modifications within the scope of this instrument shall be made by the issuance of a bilaterally executed modification prior to any changes being performed.
- C. Either party(s), in writing, may terminate the instrument in whole, or in part, at any time before the date of expiration.
- D. This instrument is executed as of the last date shown below and expires on December 31, 2024, at which time it will be subject to review, renewal, or expiration.
- E. Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be so construed or interpreted to commit or obligate any of the agencies to unlawfully expend funds that have not been appropriated or budgeted.
- F. Pursuant to section 22, Title 41, United States Code, no member of, or Delegate to, Congress shall be admitted to any share or part of this instrument, or any benefits that may arise therefrom.
- G. The principal contacts for this instrument are:

....., Director....., DirectorBoise Parks & Recreation DepartmentAda County Parks & Waterways

1104 Royal Blvd. Boise, ID 83705 208-608-7600

....

Idaho Department of Fish & Game 3101 S. Powerline Road Nampa, ID 83686 208-465-8470

....., Four Rivers Field Office Manager Lower Snake River District Bureau of Land Management 3948 Development Boise, ID 83705 208-384-3430

BOISE CITY-PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT

By:_____

David Bieter, Mayor, Boise City

ADA COUNTY PARKS AND WATERWAYS

BOISE COUNTY

Ву:_____

....., Boise County Commissioners

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

By:_____

6/28/2012/P:\5300 projects\5364 Boise Foothills Management Plan Writing-Editing\2014 December Edited Sections\Appendices\Appendix E MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING 1114.docx/mcl

4049 S Eckert Road Boise, ID 83716 208-577-4575

....., Commissioner Boise County 415 Main Street Idaho City, ID 83635 208-392-6636

....., District Ranger USDA Forest Service Mountain Home Ranger District 3080 Industrial Way Mountain Home, ID 83647 208-587-7961

Date:_____

Date:_____

Date:_____

Date:_____

....., Southwest Regional Supervisor, Idaho Department of Fish and Game

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT - FOUR RIVERS FIELD OFFICE

By:	Date:
, Manager, Bureau of Land Management – Four Rivers Field Office	
FOREST SERVICE – BOISE NATIONAL FOREST	

Date:_____

By:_____, Supervisor, Boise National Forest

APPENDIX F PUBLIC COMMENTS

Boise Foothills Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations



1. Select which county you currently live in:

Response Count	Response Percent	
43	91.5%	Ada
3	6.4%	Boise
0	0.0%	Gem
1	2.1%	Canyon
1	Other (please specify)	
47	answered question	
0	skipped question	

2. Zip Code:	
	Response Count
	47
answered question	47
skipped question	0

3. Please select which goal you would like to comment about:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Recreation	40.4%	19
Water and Watershed Function	6.4%	3
Develop funding proposals	6.4%	3
Enhance the public involvement & education process	8.5%	4
Preserve existing public lands as public open space	8.5%	4
Acquire additional open space as appropriate to agency mission	2.1%	1
Ensure public safety and wildlife concerns are met	4.3%	2
Hunting & Trapping	2.1%	1
Transportation	6.4%	3
Solid Waste	0.0%	0
Cultural Resources	0.0%	0
Grazing	0.0%	0
Visual Resources	0.0%	0
Soils	0.0%	0
Vegetation	8.5%	4
Wildlife	6.4%	3
	answered question	47
	skipped question	0

4. Objective: Develop and implement an integrated watershed plan. Recommendations: • Establish watershed health standards to create a monitoring scheme using indicator species • Regularly monitor streams within the watershed in developing the baseline and collecting trend data • Update floodplain data map that illustrate streams in the Foothills when new data becomes available. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count	
0	
0	answered question
47	skipped question

5. Objective: Coordinate with all landowners (private and public) to manage watersheds for long-term health. Recommendations: • Provide a link on Boise City's website for landowners (private and public) where relevant watershed information (plants, chemicals, water quality results) is located. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

6. Objective: Protect drinking water recharge areas (work should be completed to identify these areas). Recommendations: • Keep current on further identification and mapping of recharge areas by the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR). • Provide a link or a map on Boise City's website identifying recharge areas. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

7. Objective: Protect ground water from pollutants and contaminants. Recommendations: • Post on Boise City website the Idaho Department of Water Resource (IDWR) and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) representative responsible for locating, identifying, and monitoring contaminated areas in the Foothills. • Teach citizens and user groups about contamination levels of various pollutants and proper storage and disposal of these pollutants. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

8. Objective: Consider watershed values when designing new public facilities. Recommendations: • Coordinate with public land managers to ensure proper siting of roads, trails, and recreation facilities that respect watershed values prior to commencing work projects; require inclusion of stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs). • Identify and map where trails and surrounding features are eroded and/or causing excessive erosion. • Consider design modifications, relocation, or closure of identified eroded areas. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

9. Objective: Teach users about the importance of restoring, maintaining, and protecting the proper functioning condition of a watershed. Recommendations: • Create trailhead signage, brochures, and awareness programs to teach users about watersheds and their function. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

10. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

Response PercentResponse CountDone50.0%1Return to Beginning of Survey50.0%1Current11<			
Done50.0%1Return to Beginning of Survey50.0%1answered question2skipped question45	Response Count	Response Percent	
Return to Beginning of Survey 50.0% 1 Image: Stress of the st	1	50.0%	Done
answered question 2 skipped question 45	1	50.0%	Return to Beginning of Survey
skipped question 45	2	answered question	
	45	skipped question	

11. Objective: Identify and control erosion and provide for active monitoring and management. Recommendations: • Identify and list erosion control methods and tools • Avoid disturbing areas with high erosion potential • Use existing soils and geologic maps to assist in developing trails • Utilize best management practices to address soil erosion and ground pollution and contamination. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

12. Objective: Avoid geologic hazards, such as landslides, and faults. Recommendations: • Use existing mapping to avoid geologic hazards. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

13. Objective: Protect native and desirable vegetation. Recommendations: • Seed disturbed areas with a native and desirable plant mix to prevent erosion - ongoing. • Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to control invasive plant species. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

14. Objective: Use proper trail design techniques. Recommendations: • Refer to Ridge to Rivers 2011 Trail Operations Plan for trail management best practices. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

15. Objective: Reduce impacts to soil and vegetation through proper planning and direct coordination between all public land managers and private landowners. Recommendations:
Develop educational opportunities between private landowners and public land managers to discuss soil management practices. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

16. Objective: Teach users about the importance of restoring, maintaining, and protecting the proper functioning condition of the ecosystem. Recommendations: • Continue educational outreach programs at the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center. • Create a brochure that discusses and illustrates the importance of the major environmental components (including water, soils, vegetation and wildlife) • Use trail signage to discuss and illustrate the importance of the major environmental components. • Enhance community public relations by teaching Foothills work crews about environmental issues that they can share with the public. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

17. Objective: Reduce the likelihood of new erosion scars or defined geologic features. Recommendations: • Protect or avoid areas with unique geology, such as rock outcrops and erosive ridgelines that provide scenic values. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	n O
skipped question	n 47

18. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

Response Count	Response Percent	
0	0.0%	Done
1	100.0%	Return to Beginning of Survey
1	answered question	
46	skipped question	

19. Objective: Inventory and monitor the composition and distribution of plant communities in the Foothills. Recommendations: • Update the composite map identifying the composition and distribution of plant communities in the Foothills. • Visit new sites in the Foothills to assess rare plant populations. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

20. Objective: Maintain biological diversity in the Foothills by protecting and improving a variety of habitats, including native and special status plant species. Recommendations: • Protect special status species and native plant communities through new reserves, special management prescriptions, trail mitigation measures, or other management actions. • Monitor the composition of vegetation and habitat across the Foothills to ensure biological diversity. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

21. Objective: Teach Foothills users about special status species, native plant communities, and noxious weed invasions. Recommendations: • Establish a program to teach Foothills users and landowners about the protection of special status species, native plant communities and noxious weed invasions. • Monitor and demonstrate, through studies, progress made to enhance and manage special status and native plant communities. • Create seed mix and list of suppliers for desirable native plant species for landscaping and restoration projects. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

22. Objective: Manage the spread of invasive and noxious weeds throughout the Foothills. Recommendations: • Develop a coordinated interagency program for weed management that includes Ada County Weed and Pest Department, public land managing agencies and private landowners. • Map noxious weed populations on all public lands in the Foothills. • Establish a funding source for noxious weed control and look for grant opportunities. • Seek opportunities to use intergrated pest management tools to control known noxious weed populations. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	44

23. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	50.0%	2
Return to Beginning of Survey	50.0%	2
	answered question	4
	skipped question	43

24. Objective: Manage Foothills open space for wildlife habitat. Recommendations: • Identify and quantify vegetation habitat areas by size and function. • Identify and map wildlife linkage corridors. • Secure open spaces that connect with surrounding native habitat. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	45

25. Objective: Minimize human disturbance. Recommendations: • Secure as many large areas of native habitat as possible when negotiating for purchase or exchange of Foothills properties. • Minimize road construction and trails in areas of highly sensitive wildlife habitat as identified by agencies. •Identify and mitigate potential impediments to wildlife movements and sources of additional habitat fragmentation. • Identify and remove unnecessary rangeland fences. • Ensure new fences in wildlife migration corridors allow for safe passage of wildlife. •Implement seasonal closures of Ridge to Rivers trails in areas of high wildlife value where appropriate. • Develop and implement a strong dog leash policy in the Foothills, to meet plan goals, including minimizing recreational conflicts and protecting areas designated by Idaho Department of Fish & Game as high value to wildlife. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Respons Count	
answered question	
skipped question 4	

26. Objective: Teach users about the importance of maintaining wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors. Recommendations: • Conduct educational seminars on Foothills wildlife and habitat, including special status species. • Create interpretative signage illustrating the Foothills ecosystem and corresponding wildlife values. • Create a written brochure, complete with illustrations, describing wildlife and special status species found in the Foothills. • Use technology to engage users in learning about wildlife in the Foothills. • Plan and execute special onsite projects with general public to rehabilitate wildlife habitat. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	45

27. Objective: Promote growth of native and desirable grasses, forbs, and shrubs. Recommendations: • Improve forage conditions by establishing seedlings or plantings of bitterbrush and other palatable shrub species. • Identify and map winter range in need of rehabilitation and improve forage conditions. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count	
1	
1	answered question
46	skipped question

28. Objective: Protect riparian, sagebrush steppe, and mountain shrub species dependent on these habitats. Recommendations: •Monitor riparian obligate or dependent species.
•Monitor and evaluate the ecological condition of wildlife habitat in the Foothills. •Provide alternative water sources where human impacts on natural sources can be avoided (such as flood-control ponds, guzzlers, and enclosures). •Identify and monitor sagebrush obligate or near-obligate species in the Foothills. •Identify and map sagebrush steppe habitat.
Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count	
2	
2	answered question
45	skipped question

29. Objective: Minimize disturbances to wintering big game populations by seasonally limiting access to winter range. Recommendations: • Reduce environmental impacts of trail use and impacts on trails by having agency managers close specific trails or trail segments in response to changes in weather, on a seasonal and/or daily basis. • Institute permanent or seasonal road closures where problems exist or are expected. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

30. Objective: Take steps to prevent large-scale wildfires that would result in the further establishment of exotic annual grasses and degradation of wildlife habitat. Recommendations: • Create an interagency wildland fire prevention agreement and outline annual Wildland Urban Interface mitigation projects in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

31. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	50.0%	1
Return to Beginning of Survey	50.0%	1
	answered question	2
	skipped question	45

32. Objective: Manage recreation uses to meet growing and changing public recreation needs and be compatible with the natural resources found in the Foothills. Recommendations: • Maintain and expand recreational opportunities, including improving access to recreation destinations, improving trail connectivity, and providing better facilities. •Locate and design new trails to meet recreational needs, create more sustainable trails, and avoid compromising sensitive plant species, wildlife habitat, water quality, and aesthetics. •Seek opportunities to conserve property with ecological diversity. Develop ways for the public to interact and learn about the ecological resources on properties where trails are not compatible with resourceprotection. •Assess existing recreational uses to ensure compatibility with ecological diversity (soil, plants, and wildlife) of conserved property. •Encourage R2R (R2R) to work with trail user groups on seasonal closures. Implementation Actions • Continue to fund the R2R Program. •Leverage local volunteer resources for the maintenance and construction of trails and other recreation facilities before considering contracting. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	8
answered question	8
skipped question	39

33. Objective: Manage trails and trailheads to maintain and improve recreational opportunities while protecting Foothills resources, taking nonwildlife-based recreational pressure off the Boise River WMA, and reducing trail conflicts. Recommendations: •Provide opportunities for a variety of trail experiences (e.g., pedestrians only, no dogs, and downhill mountain bikers). •Encourage a variety of passive trail uses – wildlife viewing, art classes, and historical and ecological education. •Work with Bogus Basin Resort and Boise National Forest to seek opportunities for nonmotorized trail and trailhead expansion. •Establish trail access agreements with willing private landowners to maintain trail connectivity and prevent unmanaged trail use; partner with private owners to provide trail etiquette information. •Work with neighboring private landowners and the public to encourage Foothills users to respect private property. •Educate trail users about the importance of the WMA, the impacts people can have on these resources, and why no new trails will be created within or connecting to the WMA. Implementation Actions •Identify present and future trail users and involve them in a process of avoiding and resolving conflicts as early as possible. •Seek ways for IDFG to become a funding partner of R2R. •Encourage all Foothills land management agencies to conduct user surveys and counts and collaborate in decision making. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	8
answered question	8
skipped question	39

34. Objective: Guide recreational activities and improvements to avoid or minimize impacts on important resource values. Recommendations: •Identify and implement parking areas that are in scale with the amount of use appropriate for that area. Avoid large regional facilities in favor of smaller, dispersed facilities. •Where appropriate, designate pullouts and trailheads for day use activities only, as needed to address fire hazards, "partying," or other land management issues. •Work collaboratively with developers to provide and protect public access into the Foothills. •Monitor the ongoing effectiveness of programs implemented (e.g., adopt a trail, volunteer rangers, and dogs off-leash). •Coordinate with existing developments to reduce multiple unmanaged access routes into the Foothills. •Ensure land managers communicate to neighborhood and homeowners associations the need to access the trail system from access points and trailheads only. •Use proper planning, design, education, and mitigation measures to minimize the potential negative impacts on wildlife caused by Foothills users. •Guide Foothills users to stay on designated routes. •Redesign/reroute current erosion-prone trails to minimize impacts on resources. Implementation Actions •Develop a R2R Trail Management Plan to assist managers in maintaining existing trails, plan and design new trails/trailheads, guide mixed/separated use, and determine parking and restroom needs. •Create and publicize policies that address special events, over use areas, and organized group trail use. Educate the public about the rule. •Coordinate with the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Licensing Board for those applying for guide licenses in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	5
answered question	5
skipped question	42

35. Objective: Develop and implement a trail signage program focused on education, management, trail etiquette, and proper use. Recommendations: •Use signage to educate users of recreational etiquette and guide trail users to appropriate areas. •Survey the effectiveness of interpretive signage and trailhead/kiosk signage. •Create identities for special areas, such as reserves and wildlife management areas, using trailhead and entry signs. •Encourage private landowners to use signage and physical barriers to reduce unmanaged off-road activities on private lands. •Educate users about fire and its effect on the Foothills resources and recreation. •Where possible, provide interpretive (ecological, historical, and cultural) signage to discuss valuable resources in the Foothills. Implementation Actions •Work with partner agencies to develop a commercial use policy in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	44

36. Objective: Address seasonal closure dates for roads and trails to mitigate potential conflicts at Foothills resources. Recommendations: •Develop and implement seasonal trail closures to minimize trail damage, trailside vegetation loss, and erosion and protect wintering big game. •Develop an outreach strategy to educate the public on seasonal closures. •Enforce seasonal closures when established on Boise WMA to protect wintering wildlife. •Provide signage at closed trailheads to provide trail users with other opportunities. •Implement new ways to alert trail users of daily trail conditions prior to them arriving in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	6
answered question	6
skipped question	41

37. Objective: Address and manage for the presence of dogs in the Foothills. Recommendations: •Review the distribution of dog off-leash, dog on-leash, and no dog trails across the R2R system and consider redistribution. •Expand the number of animal control officers and partner amongst agencies on policy language and enforcement. •Create new ways to educate trail users/dog owners on impacts of off-leash dogs and dog waste left in the Foothills. •Provide education about the importance of dog leash requirements during ground bird nesting season, wintering big game, trapping season, and along riparian corridors. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	7
answered question	7
skipped question	40

38. Objective: Develop and fund a land management program. Recommendations: Implementation Actions •Establish funding for City of Boise reserve restoration projects, long-term monitoring, and regular management activities and coordinate with other public agencies. •Seek new funding opportunities for Foothills management. •Hire staff to actively manage the natural resources in City of Boise reserves and work with neighboring landowners on similar resource goals. •Work with interested citizens to create a Friends of the Boise Foothills Group to assist with projects not easily accomplished by governmental agencies. •Create a volunteer base to aid in restoration and management activities. •Schedule several restoration-focused volunteer projects annually. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	7
answered question	7
skipped question	40

39. Objective: Develop a monitoring program to regularly evaluate programs, restoration projects, and impacts of recreational activities on natural resource values in the Foothills. Recommendations: •Evaluate current experiences and desired vision of trail users. •Use photographic data (photopoint) to evaluate resource impacts and restoration efforts (such as plantings, noxious weed control, and trail repair). •Create a position for a professional monitoring coordinator to create and oversee a balanced scientific program. •Partner with trail users and other community recreation groups to carry out needed monitoring. •Create a contact list of citizens interested in recreational issues in the Foothills to contact regularly with updates. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	7
answered question	7
skipped question	40

40. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	75.0%	9
Return to Beginning of Survey	25.0%	3
	answered question	12
	skipped question	35

41. Objective: Teach the public about sportsman practices in the Foothills. Recommendations: •Acknowledge hunting and trapping as an activity to be maintained in the Foothills. •Create different methods to educate the public of the type, season, and scope of hunting and trapping opportunities in the Foothills. •Provide links to hunting and trapping information and the range of unit 39, which encompasses portions of the Foothills. •Work with Ada County to improve public safety by restricting discharge of firearms within proximity to residential developments. •Advocate brightly colored clothing by trail users during hunting season for public safety reasons. •Establish contacts with key representatives of hunting and trapping groups using the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	44

42. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	25.0%	1
Return to Beginning of Survey	75.0%	3
	answered question	4
	skipped question	43
43. Objective: Coordinate with the Ada County Highway District (ACHD), BLM, and USFS to reduce erosion from road runoff. Recommendations: •Monitor and repair erosion on damaged roads. •Develop methods for reducing erosion from roads in the Foothills.
•Consider redesign of designated roads with ongoing erosion concerns. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

44. Objective: Coordinate with ACHD and COMPASS to develop a final Foothills Transportation Plan. Recommendations: •Work with COMPASS to update the technical data related to the Foothills. •Ensure ACHD shares and maintains roads for the safety and benefit of recreationists. •Ensure transportation planning efforts are coordinated with Foothills land managing agencies and addresses the effects of new and existing roads on wildlife, cultural resources, vegetation, air and water quality, and recreation. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

45. Objective: Minimize noxious weeds found adjacent to roads. Recommendations: •Coordinate with public land managing agencies, ACHD, and the Ada County Department of Weed and Pest to prevent and reduce noxious weeds along established or new roads in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

46. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	100.0%	2
Return to Beginning of Survey	0.0%	0
	answered question	2
	skipped question	45

47. Objective: Understand that the active areas of the 2,700-acre Ada County Landfill property is exempt from the 2000 Boise Foothills Management Plan. Recommendations:
•Encourage the landfill to manage buffer areas for protection of wildlife, rare plant populations, cultural resources, and visual quality. •Partner with the landfill and USFWS to protect rare plant species occurring within landfill buffer areas. •Recognize that human and dog use of buffer area is not compatible with priorities of buffer area; wildlife habitat and plant species of concern. •Coordinate with Ada County to ensure that landfill operations do not negatively impact other public lands managed for conservation purposes. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

48. Objective: Educate the public about solid and hazardous waste management in Ada County. Recommendations: •Encourage more public educational opportunities at the landfill: on-site tours and lessons. •Post interpretive signage of landfill operations at trailheads adjacent to the landfill. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count	
0	
answered question 0	
skipped question 47	

49. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	0.0%	0
Return to Beginning of Survey	0.0%	0
	answered question	0
	skipped question	47

50. Objective: Consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) early in project planning for any new work projects in the Foothills. Recommendations: •Identify proposed trail, trailhead, and other facilities involving ground disturbance for review by SHPO and tribes. •Coordinate with SHPO before building any proposed roads in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

51. Objective: Teach users about the importance of cultural resources and their protection. Recommendations: •Develop cultural interpretation signs for trailhead kiosks and along trails as appropriate. •Provide public education about cultural resources in the Foothills through programs and lessons at Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count		
0		
0	answered question	
47	skipped question	

52. Objective: Secure open spaces with known significant cultural resources. Recommendations: •Conduct cultural resource surveys in the Foothills. •Develop a strategy for limiting the probability of vandalism to known cultural resources. •Work with landowners and provide incentives for protecting known cultural sites on their lands. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

53. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	0.0%	0
Return to Beginning of Survey	0.0%	0
	answered question	0
	skipped question	47

54. Objective: Coordinate with local, state, and federal agencies. Recommendations: •The BLM, USFS, and IDFG are the lead agencies with respect to managing livestock grazing in the Foothills. These agencies should share livestock grazing plans with other agencies in the Foothills on an annual basis. •Adopt grazing techniques and/or programs with proven results. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

55. Objective: Manage grazing activities to be compatible with natural resources. Recommendations: •Manage sagebrush steppes, riparian habitats, and other sensitive landscapes to prevent degradation from grazing. •Work with agency managers and grazing lessees to use practices that limit soil disturbing practices. •Use erosion-control guidelines and techniques to stabilize soils disturbed by grazing. •Manage for improvement of native plant communities. •Work with volunteers and among land management agencies to plant native plant species in areas disturbed by grazing, specifically riparian corridors. •Incorporate the life cycle key plant species important to wildlife into livestock grazing management. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

56. Objective: Use grazing in a targeted manner to reduce noxious weeds, improve wildlife habitat, and reduce fuels. Recommendations: •Set up a pilot project in the Foothills where targeted sheep grazing could be used to reduce noxious weed populations. • Monitor the pilot project with photographs and data to be used for future grazing management decisions. •Create list of BMPs for different types of targeted environmental management oriented grazing in the Foothills. •Use grazing to reduce fuel loads in and around "anchor points" in the Foothills. These anchor points would be identified by the BLM fire managers. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

57. Objective: Teach Foothills user groups about grazing related issues. Recommendations: •Involve the Idaho Rangeland Resource Commission in discussions involving rangeland and grazing education. •Create an environmental education lesson on Foothills grazing. •Create and install grazing interpretive signs. •Post information on the R2R website and at trailheads about current grazing activity in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

58. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	0.0%	0
Return to Beginning of Survey	100.0%	1
	answered question	1
	skipped question	46

59. Objective: Protect unique and highly valued visual resources. Recommendations:
Identify scars altering the scenic value of the Foothills. •Coordinate restoration and cleanup efforts working with a lead agency, volunteers, and/or private landowners to restore or maintain scenic values. •Work with enforcement agencies to deter illegal activity.
Incorporate visual resource interpretation into signage. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

60. Objective: Monitor chosen viewpoints from the 2000 Boise Foothills Management Plan. Recommendations: •Revisit chosen viewpoints for photographic data every two years to determine restoration needs and encourage agencies to make management changes in problem areas. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

61. Objective: Coordinate with utility companies to reduce visual intrusions on the landscape. Recommendations: •Coordinate with utility companies to mitigate resource damage associated with construction, placement, and maintenance of utilities. •Require regrading and reseeding of temporary utility access roads to reduce visual and other environmental impacts. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

62. Objective: Coordinate with road managing agencies when maintaining existing or planning new roads in the Foothills. Use mitigation techniques to reduce the visual contrast created. Recommendations: •Discourage and/or reduce the visual impacts of new development in highly visible areas, such as ridgelines. •Identify roads to be modified or realigned to reduce their visual impact on the landscape and improve their sustainability. •Coordinate with road maintaining agencies to reduce fugitive dust contributing to visual air pollution in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	47

63. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	0.0%	0
Return to Beginning of Survey	100.0%	1
	answered question	1
	skipped question	46

64. Objective: Provide staffing and funding to support activities and programs. Recommendations: •Seek funding for staff and support activities through cost-saving supplemental funding programs and projects. •Seek new partnerships and new relationships with current and possible future open space supporters; work toexpand the base of supporters for open space goals. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count	
4	
4	answered question
43	skipped question

65. Objective: Develop a cost-effective plan to fund maintenance and development of lands, trails, and facilities provided for public use. Recommendations: •Create a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan for the Foothills and research potential new impact fees. •Encourage the creation of a fund or trust managed by the Friends of the Foothills and the Idaho Community Foundation. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

Response Count	
2	
tion 2	answered question
ion 45	skipped question

66. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

Response Count	Response Percent	
2	40.0%	Done
3	60.0%	Return to Beginning of Survey
5	answered question	
42	skipped question	

67. Objective: Provide public information and outreach, for education and to encourage active support for plan implementation and volunteer programs. Recommendations: •Continue public education programs about the importance of the Foothills, the benefits the Foothills bring to the community, and the need for protection and restoration of open space, environmental challenges, responsible stewardship, and citizen involvement in addressing these issues. •Promote volunteers to actively engage in the implementation of the Open Space Plan; create new and more enticing strategies to enlist volunteers in trail maintenance and other stewardship activities. •Involve neighboring communities in public forums to discuss management decisions affecting the use of the Foothills to promote consistency in planning efforts, educational opportunities, and public awareness. •Work with the business community to actively engage in the implementation of the Open Space Plan; in particular, seek out business partners with a strong stake in the future of the Foothills such as the Chamber of Commerce and outdoor gear business. •Continue to evaluate, develop, and update lesson plans for public and private schools that incorporate the concepts of this 2014 Plan. •Continue to work with environmental education groups to use public open space areas for environmental instruction. •Enhance year-round education programs for the Foothills. •Establish partnerships with public and private landholders, community land trusts, conservation organizations, user groups and organizations, and "friends" groups throughout the region. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	44

68. Objective: Provide a one-stop location for information on Foothills natural history, recreational opportunities, upcoming events and programs, and volunteer programs. Recommendations: •Use the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center to house open space operations, enforcement personnel, environmental educators, maintenance staff, and natural resource specialists. This site will: Serve as the information center for the Foothills where maps, electronic files, and other information could be stored, updated, and disseminated. Serve as an education facility to provide education and environmental awareness programs and demonstration projects about such topics as Firewise and Xeriscape. Provid a location for reporting criminal activity, ecological observations, trail-related issues, maintenance issues, and other concerns. •Create new online and social media platforms to share information with the public, both residents and prospective visitors. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	45

69. Objective: Establish an interpretive program focused on creating resource awareness. Recommendations: •Identify social trends and how they relate to natural resource management. •Develop programs to address social trends. •Develop a series of themes for specific purposes, such as at Table Rock or on trail loops. Examples of themes that could be addressed using interpretive signage or other tools include: •Table Rock •Military Reserve •Boise River WMA •Castle Rock •Shoshone tribes •Overland Stage Services •Rocky Canyon Toll Road •Unexploded ordinance •Boise Fires of 1959 and 1996 •Fire rehabilitation •Poisonous plants •Noxious and invasive plants •Wildlife in the Foothills •Trailing sheep •Urban interface •Geothermal Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

70. Objective: Increase coordination and administration efforts among agencies for public involvement and education. Recommendations: •Organize annual meeting among public agencies, representatives, and partners to heighten awareness of public involvement and education efforts. •Schedule annual open house to highlight accomplishments, upcoming projects and management issues, and opportunities for future public involvement. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	44

71. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	33.3%	1
Return to Beginning of Survey	66.7%	2
	answered question	3
	skipped question	44

72. Objective: Facilitate the transfer of ownership from state lands to other public agencies to preserve open space. Recommendations: •Create a prioritized list of IDL parcels with ranked resource values and uses for potential sale or exchange. •Work with other public land agencies to identify possible receiving agencies for IDL parcels. •Initiate further group discussion with public land agencies on future land ownership scenarios to meet this objective. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	45

73. Objective: Provide resources as necessary to expedite the land transfer process. Recommendations: •Identify specific resources to be allocated to facilitate land transfer of IDL parcels including planning, funding, staffing, and mediation. •Educate and build partnerships with local non-governmental organizations, interest groups and citizens to create momentum to conserve IDL parcels as public open space. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	ı 3
skipped question	ı 44

74. Objective: Institute additional measures to ensure public open spaces are preserved for future generations as public open spaces. Recommendations: •Encourage City of Boise leadership to take steps to have third-party conservation easements on all properties where Foothills Levy Funds have been used for long-term open space conservation.
•Pursue third-party conservation easements on all City of Boise-owned properties in the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	4
answered question	4
skipped question	43

75. Objective: Acquire public access to existing public open space parcels where compatible with other resource values. Recommendations: •Work with private landowners to acquire access easements for recreational connectivity. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	44

76. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Done	40.0%	2
Return to Beginning of Survey	60.0%	3
	answered question	5
	skipped question	42

77. Objective: Establish a permanent Foothills Council consisting of public and citizen representatives. Recommendations: •Use established agency practices and the goals and objectives of this 2014 Plan to clarify criteria for decisions on land acquisitions, exchanges, easements, and other actions that could modify or expand the Foothills public land base. Considerations in such decisions include impacts on goals for conservation, recreation and othe uses, fiscal health, and changes in service requirements; a particular consideration is features that cross lands under multiple ownership such as drainage, trail, and wildlife corridors. •Educate the public about the mixed ownership (public and private) across the Foothills. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	4
answered question	4
skipped question	43

78. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

Response Count	Response Percent		
0	0.0%	Done	
4	100.0%	Return to Beginning of Survey	
4	answered question		
43	skipped question		

79. Objective: Have emergency management services continue mutual-aid efforts to protect public safety through shared resources to enforce laws and manage wildfire concerns. Recommendations: •Urge agencies to continue to support and fund cooperative agreements for fire protection and law enforcement. •Encourage cooperation among local governments and fire protection districts as they evaluate the costs and benefits of acquiring specialized fire suppression equipment and funding supplemental staff during the peak fire season. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	46

80. Objective: Continue to improve interagency coordination, cooperation, and communication to advance public safety and wildfire concerns. Recommendations: •Encourage public agencies to communicate regularly with public safety and law enforcement representatives and medical personnel serving the Foothills. •Provide assistance with emergency response needs and communications as needed, such as gate keys, staging areas, and special trail equipment. •Stay engaged with U.S. Army Corp of Engineers on mapping, detection, education, and mitigation of unexploded ordinances in the Foothills. •Consider use of trails as potential locations for firebreaks when needed. •Encourage agencies to work collectively when seeking funds for wildfire mitigation projects within the Foothills. •Update the 2012 Wildfire Mitigation Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) every five years and meet semiannually with MOU signatories to prioritize project ideas and discuss funding options. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	45

81. Objective: Educate the community about public safety and wildfire concerns. Recommendations: •Encourage homeowners within the Wildland Urban Interface to create defensible space. •Provide resources to encourage neighborhoods to become Firewise communities. •Create and post signage educating Foothills users about wildfire concerns and the wildfire role in the Foothills environment. •Provide nonemergency contact information (police, fire, agencies, and R2R) at designated R2R trailheads andin a variety of media formats. Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above objective/recommendations:

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	45

82. Are you done or would you like to return to the beginning of the survey to comment on other goals?

Response Count	Response Percent	
1	20.0%	Done
4	80.0%	Return to Beginning of Survey
5	answered question	
42	skipped question	

Page 1, Q1. Select which county you currently live in:

1 anchorage

Oct 10, 2014 4:17 PM

Page 1, Q2. Zip Code:				
1	83707	Oct 20, 2014 9:38 AM		
2	83705	Oct 18, 2014 11:08 PM		
3	83709	Oct 18, 2014 6:38 PM		
4	83716	Oct 17, 2014 10:38 PM		
5	83713	Oct 17, 2014 9:58 PM		
6	83702	Oct 17, 2014 9:57 PM		
7	83709	Oct 17, 2014 9:12 PM		
8	83702	Oct 17, 2014 9:15 AM		
9	83631	Oct 16, 2014 4:23 PM		
10	83709	Oct 16, 2014 4:07 PM		
11	83706	Oct 16, 2014 1:23 PM		
12	83701	Oct 16, 2014 12:02 PM		
13	83702	Oct 15, 2014 5:37 PM		
14	83646	Oct 15, 2014 3:51 PM		
15	83706	Oct 15, 2014 10:42 AM		
16	83702	Oct 15, 2014 10:41 AM		
17	83702	Oct 15, 2014 10:35 AM		
18	83706	Oct 15, 2014 10:12 AM		
19	83709	Oct 15, 2014 10:05 AM		
20	83703	Oct 15, 2014 9:24 AM		
21	83706	Oct 15, 2014 8:15 AM		
22	83704	Oct 15, 2014 8:11 AM		
23	83706	Oct 15, 2014 8:02 AM		
24	83702	Oct 15, 2014 7:43 AM		
25	83709	Oct 15, 2014 6:50 AM		
26	83702	Oct 15, 2014 5:57 AM		
27	83714	Oct 15, 2014 5:50 AM		

Page 1	, Q2. Zip Code:	
28	83716	Oct 14, 2014 11:31 PM
29	83702	Oct 14, 2014 9:47 PM
30	83712	Oct 14, 2014 9:32 PM
31	83706	Oct 14, 2014 8:57 PM
32	83705	Oct 14, 2014 8:22 PM
33	83705	Oct 14, 2014 7:44 PM
34	83714	Oct 14, 2014 6:56 PM
35	83712	Oct 14, 2014 5:54 PM
36	83706	Oct 14, 2014 5:12 PM
37	83706	Oct 14, 2014 11:15 AM
38	83702	Oct 13, 2014 8:57 AM
39	83716	Oct 13, 2014 12:29 AM
40	83703	Oct 12, 2014 9:44 PM
41	99517	Oct 10, 2014 4:17 PM
42	83703	Oct 9, 2014 9:01 AM
43	83702	Oct 8, 2014 7:13 AM
44	83714	Oct 7, 2014 5:12 PM
45	83704	Oct 7, 2014 12:41 PM
46	83622	Oct 7, 2014 6:21 AM
47	83711	Oct 3, 2014 8:14 PM

Page 3, Q1. Objective: Identify and control erosion and provide for active monitoring and management.

Recommendations:

- Identify and list erosion control methods and tools
- Avoid disturbing areas with high erosion potential
- Use existing soils and geologic maps to assist in developing trails

• U...

1 Examples of restoration techniques would also be helpful. Perhaps that is in the Oct 16, 2014 11:42 AM first recommendation?

Page 3, Q3. Objective: Protect native and desirable vegetation.			
Recommendations: • Seed disturbed areas with a native and desirable plant mix to prevent erosion - ongoing. • Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to control invasive plant species.			
Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards t			
1	Be cautious about creating new trails through large undisturbed stands of native vegetation. Use an analysis protocol to help make objective decisions about adding new trails that may be placed in or through healthy native veg areas. This would include looking at mitigating measures that could still allow the trail to be built so it has the least impact.	Oct 16, 2014 11:42 AM	

Page 4, Q1. Objective: Inventory and monitor the composition and distribution of plant communities in the Foothills.

Recommendations:

- Update the composite map identifying the composition and distribution of plant communities in the Foothills.
- Visit new sites in the Foothills to assess rare plant p...

1	We need to protect native a	species but not	iust focus on rare s	necies	Oct 14 2014 7:01 PM
			just iocus on raie s	pecies	00114,20147.01 FW

Page 4, Q2. Objective: Maintain biological diversity in the Foothills by protecting and improving a variety of habitats, including native and special status plant species.

Recommendations:

• Protect special status species and native plant communities through new reserves, special management prescriptio...

1 Someone needs to get serious about controlling noxious weeds like Rush Oct 14, 2014 7:01 PM Skeleton weed and White Top or you can forget about natives species.

Page 4, Q3. Objective: Teach Foothills users about special status species, native plant communities, and noxious weed invasions.

Recommendations:

• Establish a program to teach Foothills users and landowners about the protection of special status species, native plant communities and noxious weed invas...

1 you can't just focus on educating the public on noxious weeds. The government Oct 14, 2014 7:01 PM needs to start taking care of their own weeds.

Page 4, Q4. Objective: Manage the spread of invasive and noxious weeds throughout the Foothills.

Recommendations: • Develop a coordinated interagency program for weed management that includes Ada County Weed and Pest Department, public land managing agencies and private landowners. • Map noxious weed			
	1	More needs to be done about controlling weeds. Rush Skeletonweed has significantly increased its presence in the lower foothills, and it is definitely being spread by foothills users.	Oct 15, 2014 10:05 AM
	2	YES	Oct 14, 2014 7:01 PM
	3	Weed species abundance appears to be increasing each year in the foothills. Even noticed spotted knapweed for first time in Dry Creek area. This increase affects recreation, aesethic, and native plant community resource values, as well as increasing propensity for wildfire. Weed control will be one of the most difficult challenges facing foothill managers. I hope to see weed control recommendations listed above be a high priority and taken seriously.	Oct 14, 2014 11:25 AM

Page 5, 0	21. Objective: Manage Foothills open space for wildlife habitat.	
Recommendations: • Identify and quantify vegetation habitat areas by size and function. • Identify and map wildlife linkage corridors. • Secure open spaces that connect with surrounding native habitat.		
Please p	rovide your com	
1	Specifically state that winter range is the most important value to manage for in the WMA. Recreation activities are allowed that are compatible with the wildlife management goals for the area.	Oct 16, 2014 11:51 AM
2	consider NOT putting in recreation trails in acquired open space to keep human impact at a minimum. Don't connect main trail areas.	Oct 9, 2014 9:14 AM

Page 5, Q2. Objective: Minimize human disturbance.

Recommendations:

• Secure as many large areas of native habitat as possible when negotiating for purchase or exchange of Foothills properties.

• Minimize road construction and trails in areas of highly sensitive wildlife habitat as identified by agenc...

1	'strong dog leash policy'. It seems this may conflict with another	Oct 16, 2014 11:51 AM
	recommendation of 'create a variety of experiences' that might include no dog	
	(and presumably dog off leash trails and dog on leash trails). Unless 'strong'	
	means air tight and not confusing.	

Page 5, Q2. Objective: Minimize human disturbance.

Recommendations:

• Secure as many large areas of native habitat as possible when negotiating for purchase or exchange of Foothills properties.

• Minimize road construction and trails in areas of highly sensitive wildlife habitat as identified by agenc...

2 how do you define "highly sensitive wildlife habitat"? Keep human impact to Oct 9, 2014 9:14 AM minimum or none.

Page 5, Q3. Objective: Teach users about the importance of maintaining wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.

Recommendations:

• Conduct educational seminars on Foothills wildlife and habitat, including special status species.

• Create interpretative signage illustrating the Foothills ecosystem and ...

1	'Teach' is top down and directed. Perhaps, 'Work to enhance citizens understanding about the importance of maintaining wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.' Embrace the work of the Foothills Learning Center on these matters.	Oct 16, 2014 11:51 AM
2	Many dog owners don't understand the impact that their dogs create on wildlife and vegetation. Our population is going to grow and this is going to become more and more of an issue. The trails in the foothills are becoming too wide in places and some users don't understand the fragility of the vegetation in our foothills.	Oct 9, 2014 9:14 AM

Page 5, Q4. Objective: Promote growth of native and desirable grasses, forbs, and shrubs.

Recommendations:

• Improve forage conditions by establishing seedlings or plantings of bitterbrush and other palatable shrub species.

- Identify and map winter range in need of rehabilitation and improve forage c...
 - 1 Don't destroy vegetation in the first place. The foothills are meant for wildlife and Oct 9, 2014 9:14 AM minimal human impact.

Page 5, Q5. Objective: Protect riparian, sagebrush steppe, and mountain shrub species dependent on these habitats.

Recommendations:

•Monitor riparian obligate or dependent species.

- •Monitor and evaluate the ecological condition of wildlife habitat in the Foothills.
- •Provide alternative water sources ...

	1	I presume if monitoring indicates a negative trend that some sort of	Oct 16, 2014 11:51 AM
--	---	--	-----------------------

Page 5, Q5. Objective: Protect riparian, sagebrush steppe, and mountain shrub species dependent on these habitats.

Recommendations: •Monitor riparian obligate or dependent species. •Monitor and evaluate the ecological condition of wildlife habitat in the Foothills. •Provide alternative water sources		
	recommendation would result?	
2	Sounds good, but what do you use that information for to benefit the foothills environment at the same time allow people to use the trails. What about a surcharge for foothills users and/or allow users only a certain amount of days per year they can use the trails. Hard to regulate, maybe users would appreciate the foothills and trails more though if they had to be more conscience of how many days they use the trails.	Oct 9, 2014 9:14 AM

Page 5, Q6. Objective: Minimize disturbances to wintering big game populations by seasonally limiting access to winter range.

Recommendations:

• Reduce environmental impacts of trail use and impacts on trails by having agency managers close specific trails or trail segments in response to changes in we...

1 Seasonal closures for big game is important. Closures for muddy trails in certain Oct 16, 2014 11:51 AM areas may be needed. Seems tricky to implement.

Page 5, Q7. Objective: Take steps to prevent large-scale wildfires that would result in the further establishment of exotic annual grasses and degradation of wildlife habitat.

Recommendations:

• Create an interagency wildland fire prevention agreement and outline annual Wildland Urban Interface mitigat...

1 reduce the amount of people in the foothills and let nature take its course. Oct 9, 2014 9:14 AM

Page 6, Q1. Objective: Manage recreation uses to meet growing and changing public recreation needs and be compatible with the natural resources found in the Foothills.

Recommendations:

• Maintain and expand recreational opportunities, including improving access to recreation destinations, improving tra...

1	More groups than 'trail user groups' may be interested in seasonal closures.	Oct 16, 2014 10:02 AM
2	Agree.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
3	Look to enhance connectivity between different areas of the foothills. Specifically, enhance trail connectivity between military reserve and Table Rock, and look to develop a more useful and sustainable trail network in east Boise near Harris Ranch. Existing trails there are primarily steep roadbed.	Oct 15, 2014 10:03 AM
4	Trails are one way to get people to connect with nature. Active management does not mean closures or not building trails. The Boise Foothills need to be actively managed.	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
5	Maintain current trail use designations.	Oct 15, 2014 6:59 AM
6	I am a frequent user and neighbor of foothills trails and HEARD NOTHING ABOUT THIS PLAN. I have another event to which I am committed on Wednesday. BAD JOB OF OUTREACH!	Oct 14, 2014 9:34 PM
7	I worry that there is not enough volunteer emergency services or cell phone coverage as this plan pushes into Boise County.	Oct 13, 2014 12:33 AM
8	Please increase the number of hiker/walker trails relative to cycling trails. There is little respite from cyclists who ride the great majority of trails. Not only does this limit walkers' peaceful enjoyment, it is a safety hazard and also degrades the vegetation, wildlife, and trail condition.	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q2. Objective: Manage trails and trailheads to maintain and improve recreational opportunities while protecting Foothills resources, taking nonwildlife-based recreational pressure off the Boise River WMA, and reducing trail conflicts.

Recommendations:

•Provide opportunities for a variety of tra...

1	Broad and transparent community conversation is needed around the topic of single use trails (which I assumed was the genesis of the first recommendation). There are good reasons to consider such action and good reasons to be cautious. The agencies job is to do both. And to listen and understand the community's perspectives. Then attempt to gain consensus. This is a hot topic that can blow up quickly if done unilaterally or in a top down manner.	Oct 16, 2014 10:02 AM
2	Agree, although I would like to see any "pedestrian-only" trails be okay for dogs.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
3	Expand pedestrian only offerings in the lower foothills, especially parallel or in close proximity to multiple use trails to reduce user conflicts, social trails, and trail widening.	Oct 15, 2014 10:03 AM
4	IDFG is not likely to become a funding partner due to their budget constraints elsewhere throughout the agency and state.	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
5	Support.	Oct 15, 2014 6:59 AM
6	Build a mountain bike specific downhill only trail. This trail would encourage users to climb on any number of trails, but descend on one specific trail. This type of trail would be open to all users, but signed to designate it a mountain bike downhill trail. User conflicts and other trail issues would decrease if there was a specific trail with alluring features for riders.	Oct 14, 2014 5:59 PM
7	And uphill mountain bikers.	Oct 13, 2014 8:57 AM
8	Please, more trails for pedestrians. Cyclists are a danger to leashed dogs, pedestrians, and wildlife. Cyclists rarely yield. Many trails are narrow, thus forcing pedestrians and their dogs to yield (get out of the way) by stepping off the trail. This can occur numerous times in one hour. We deserve to have peaceful enjoyment. We paid into the levy also.	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q3. Objective: Guide recreational activities and improvements to avoid or minimize impacts on important resource values.

Recommendations:

•Identify and implement parking areas that are in scale with the amount of use appropriate for that area. Avoid large regional facilities in favor of smalle...

	1	A growing challenge has become creating safe and adequate trail head parking. An array of options should be consider in terms of size (small = 5, medium = 8- 10, large =14+?) . Restrooms may be needed at some parking areas. But not all parking areas need restrooms. The first recommendation that having several several dispersed facilities is important, but not necessarily at the expense of larger facilities. We need both. Creating a medium to large parking facility Near the trail to stack rock is challenging due to topography and ownership. Along Bogus Basin Road there are several areas that could be made safer simply by eliminating 'slow vehicle turnouts' in 2 or 3 locations and installing signs such as 'congested area'. This is a common approach at National Parks and Monuments. If coupled with one medium sized area the parking needs could be met. In the urban core, some on street parking should be considered in some limited circumstances as it is much less expensive and space for larger parking lots can be limited. Shared parking with other public and private entities should be encouraged as one community goal is to minimize the amount of surface parking. Lastly, with federal agency funding tight, Boise City - as the Lead Coordinating Agency - should assume the development and ongoing maintenance costs of these parking areas. While non-profit and private funding might help in capital improvements, commitment to ongoing maintenance is critical.	Oct 16, 2014 10:02 AM
	2	Agree.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
	3	good	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
	4	Maybe I am missing something here but I don't see a single word regarding motorized vehicle (OHV) use. What used to be the number one (by far) use of the foothills has now been completely erased from discussion. OHV use is the fastest growing use of public lands and provides the most money. Compared to the financial contribution of hikers and bikers OHV users provide (by far) the greatest number of dollars to trail development and maintenance. Why are we not included in this "mixed use" plan? Please provide equal access to this resource to OHV users.	Oct 15, 2014 8:10 AM
ļ	5	Example: Polecat. Heavily used by runners, bikers, dogs, and pedestrians. The parking lot can be very full. It is no fun to bike the trail when bikes or upleashed	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q4. Objective: Develop and implement a trail signage program focused on education, management, trail etiquette,

and proper use.

Recommendations:

•Use signage to educate users of recreational etiquette and guide trail users to appropriate areas. •Survey the effectiveness of interpretive signag...

1	Agree.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
2	Good	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
3	There was excellent interpretive signage in Hulls Gulch. Such signs deteriorate over time due to weather, sun, occasionally vandalism. These signs, although wonderful, may drain your monetary resources.	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q5. Objective: Address seasonal closure dates for roads and trails to mitigate potential conflicts at Foothills resources.

Recommendations:

•Develop and implement seasonal trail closures to minimize trail damage, trailside vegetation loss, and erosion and protect wintering big game.

•Develop a...

1	The trail conditions report is a valuable tool. Nice job.	Oct 16, 2014 10:02 AM
2	I know this is difficult because of staffing and resource issues, but it seems like trails get closed unnecessarily when there are only a few puddles that people/bikes could walk through. Or direct people to useable trails that are sandy vs. muddy. There are several of us who like to use the trails year-round. We don't want to damage them and we turn around if they are in fact too muddy to use, but we also feel like they get closed just because of the season and not necessarily due to weather conditions.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
3	Perhaps more effort to truly enforce seasonal closures. Every spring it seems like there is more and more abuse of muddy trails.	Oct 15, 2014 10:03 AM
4	Seasonal closures for wildlife should apply to all foothills visitors, not just motorized visitors.	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
5	Agree but how will enforcement be funded.	Oct 15, 2014 6:59 AM
6	Please do. I am all for seasonal closures. Doing so will allow vegetation and trails to heal. It would reduce degradation, improve safety, and allow wildlife space to breathe.	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q6. Objective: Address and manage for the presence of dogs in the Foothills.

Recommendations:

 •Review the distribution of dog off-leash, dog on-leash, and no dog trails across the R2R system and consider redistribution. •Expand the number of animal control officers and partner amongst agencies 			
	1	Agree, although I reiterate my comment above that any pedestrian trails should also allow dogs. Preferably off-leash. I think the vast majority of dog owners know if their dog needs to be leashed.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
2	2	I find the behavior of many dog owners and their dogs to be reprehensible, and the negative behavior only seems to have increased. I do encounter plenty of perfectly polite dog owners and dogs, but many are completely aloof. Aside from the waste issue, some of the more pressing issues are off leash dogs that are not trained to heel on command and dart every which way when called, owners who disregard the 30 foot rule and let their dogs run hundreds of feet away from them, both on trail and off, and people who bring multiple dogs into the foothills, all without leashes and all untrained. I've had numerous close calls with dogs who have run across a trail that I have been descending without any warning and whose owners are nowhere in sight.	Oct 15, 2014 10:03 AM
3	3	Dogs off leash present more of a wildlife impact than any other use in the foothills and can lead to visitor conflicts. Keep dogs on leases outside of dog parks.	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
2	4	More trash cans for waste collection.	Oct 15, 2014 6:59 AM
Ę	5	Possibly create a specific dog walking trail loop of 1-2 miles. People will know that their dogs are always welcome on this trail.	Oct 14, 2014 5:59 PM
e	6	Create an on-going process of engaging dog owners and dog groups to identify dog-related problems and develop collaborative new solutions to them. [Enforcement will become much less important when dog owners are included in the processes that generate and implement solutions]	Oct 13, 2014 8:57 AM
7	7	Great ideas. Provide enough trash cans and pick-up bag stations. Have surprise patrols on frequently soiled trails. Rather than a fine, assign pick-up poop duty. An often soiled area is the Camel Back trails leading to the top.	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q7. Objective: Develop and fund a land management program.

Recommendations:

Implementation Actions

•Establish funding for City of Boise reserve restoration projects, long-term monitoring, and regular management activities and coordinate with other public agencies. •Seek new funding opport...

1	Develop a trail maintenance and management system that details what is being done now and how much is it costing. And what is needed and what additional funds are needed. The BPR parks maintenance impact statement may be helpful to emulate. The non-profit Land Trust of the Treasure Valley is also a good resource to turn to for help. We are interested in assisting in a variety of ways. Not only do we have funds in hand to assist, we have the track record of success to find additional private funds. We enjoy our current informal partnership with Ridge to Rivers staff as well as the federal agency staff. We have provided Land Trust staff and funds to help with projects. We are interested in expanding and growing that effort to leverage the public funding. The Land Trust and others are also good partners in working with neighboring landowners. We strongly encourage reaching out beyond government efforts and engage NGO's and the community in more meaningful ways.	Oct 16, 2014 10:02 AM
2	Agree. I have expressed support in the annual foothills survey for paying a fee for foothills usage.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
3	I strongly support utilizing volunteer groups to assist with ongoing maintenance needs. I've participated in numerous trail work days including the re-route of Red Cliffs, the construction of the REI connector trail in Eagle, the Deer Point trail, and the all weather trail in Harrison Hollow, and all of these projects had strong backing from volunteers who were able to complete large amounts of work in a relatively short amount of time. However, there is need for an ongoing professional maintenance crew as these volunteer groups often lack the perception to properly slope trails for water management.	Oct 15, 2014 10:03 AM
4	Good	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
5	More outreach to garner volunteer recruitment.	Oct 15, 2014 6:59 AM
6	 "Coordinate with public agencies" and private organizations. "Work with interested citizens" and existing groups 	Oct 13, 2014 8:57 AM
7	Establishing and effectively using a volunteer base are excellent strategies for creating responsible participation. I am in favor of restoration, having walked on many deeply rutted and mud puddled trails. Again, reduce the number of biking trails. Things are out of control now. I think cyclists will cooperate when they see their trails' condition improve.	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 6, Q8. Objective: Develop a monitoring program to regularly evaluate programs, restoration projects, and impacts of recreational activities on natural resource values in the Foothills.

Recommendations:

•Evaluate current experiences and desired vision of trail users. •Use photographic data (phot...

1	Ecological monitoring is important. Especially things like goat grazing and restoration efforts. A contact list is important.	Oct 16, 2014 10:02 AM
2	Agree.	Oct 15, 2014 10:54 AM
3	The data will set you free. Any kind of data that you can collect on trail use, maintenance needs, etc, will be useful. Specifically, user counts, soil makeup, and rainwater interaction information on trails that require ongoing active maintenance, like Bucktail which has seen excessive "cupping" could help to inform better trail building and preventative maintenance regimens.	Oct 15, 2014 10:03 AM
4	Good	Oct 15, 2014 8:16 AM
5	Support additional position if include duties besides monitoring.	Oct 15, 2014 6:59 AM
6	Great!	Oct 13, 2014 8:57 AM
7	All good. From where will you acquire the monetary resources. Will those resources be sustainable over time?	Oct 7, 2014 5:50 PM

Page 7, Q1. Objective: Teach the public about sportsman practices in the Foothills.

Recommendations:

Acknowledge hunting and trapping as an activity to be maintained in the Foothills.	
Create different methods to educate the public of the type, season, and scope of hunting and trapping	
opportunitie	

1	Trapping in the foothills seems misguided. If this must continue on federal or state IDFG land, perhaps establishing a distance from any road, trail or parking area. Trapping should be banned on any city or county land. Long range rifle hunting in the foothills also seems like a bad idea. Stick to muzzle loaders, bow or shotgun.	Oct 16, 2014 11:30 AM
2	No shooting or trapping should be allowed on the Boise Front. People are out there recreating all over the Boise Front. They are not only on the trails. People do target shooting even during non-hunting time. The use of firearms near where people are recreating is dangerous. And about trapping: I have heard of dogs being caught in leg snare traps on the Boise Front. Fish & Game videos show that a large pliers are needed to free a dog. Who carries those while hiking? They say the pliers on a Leatherman are not strong enough. This is incredulous. Leg snare traps should be banned where so many people and pets are recreating.	Oct 15, 2014 5:33 PM
Page 7, Q1. Objective: Teach the public about sportsman practices in the Foothills.

Recommendations:

Acknowledge hunting and trapping as an activity to be maintained in the Foothills.
Create different methods to educate the public of the type, season, and scope of hunting and trapping opportunitie...

3	Work to regulate trapping so as to significantly reduce the possibility of users	Oct 15, 2014 10:14 AM
	dogs becoming ensnared. This could include prohibitions of traps being set	
	within 100-150 feet of a signed trail. I frequently see dogs running off trail.	

Page 8, Q1. Objective: Coordinate with the Ada County Highway District (ACHD), BLM, and USFS to reduce erosion from road runoff.

Recommendations:

Monitor and repair erosion on damaged roads.
Develop methods for reducing erosion from roads in the Foothills.
Consider redesign of designated roads w...

1 Encourage ACHD to address storm water runoff and erosion that is becoming a growing problem. Consider better places to dispose of swept up sand. Currently sand is dumped over the side of the road in various spots that could find its way into Dry Creek, which is home to native red band trout.

Page 8, Q2. Objective: Coordinate with ACHD and COMPASS to develop a final Foothills Transportation Plan.

Recommendations:

•Work with COMPASS to update the technical data related to the Foothills. •Ensure ACHD shares and maintains roads for the safety and benefit of recreationists. •Ensure transpor...

1 "Work with ACHD to identify several Slow Vehicle Turnouts that can become dispersed parking areas." This can be accomplished with little investment and it would make existing parking and access in some areas safer. Combining these small dispersed sites with a larger mid- elevation and a larger upper- elevation parking area can help consolidate parking while providing greater parking spots than can be built in any one large facility. Attempting to close pullouts to parking will be difficult and counterproductive. Not to mention a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Page 11, Q3. Objective: Use grazing in a targeted manner to reduce noxious weeds, improve wildlife habitat, and reduce fuels.

Recommendations:

•Set up a pilot project in the Foothills where targeted sheep grazing could be used to reduce noxious weed populations.

Monitor the pilot project with photo...

Page 11, Q3. Objective: Use grazing in a targeted manner to reduce noxious weeds, improve wildlife habitat, and reduce fuels.

Recommendations:

•Set up a pilot project in the Foothills where targeted sheep grazing could be used to reduce noxious weed populations.

• Monitor the pilot project with photo...

The way the sheep graze by trailing through could be very effective if done well.

Page 13, Q1. Objective: Provide staffing and funding to support activities and programs.

Recommendations:

•Seek funding for staff and support activities through cost-saving supplemental funding programs and projects. •Seek new partnerships and new relationships with current and possible future open s...

1	The Land Trust of the Treasure Valley is very interested in formalizing our involvement in the foothills with the public agencies. We own land, hold easements and have funding to assist in conservation and recreation initiatives. We look forward to exploring how to achieve mutually beneficial results through collaboration and partnering. In other community conservation efforts across the country, land trusts and local/state/federal agencies are strong partners in achieving success.	Oct 16, 2014 10:22 AM
2	Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax money, NOT uses it!	Oct 15, 2014 10:42 AM
3	What about allowing more race events in the foothills? Towns such as Bend, Or use races as a cornerstone of their tourism industry. The events not only bring in money from promoter fees, but also help the local economy through increased hotel occupancy, restaurant visits and shopping	Oct 14, 2014 5:53 PM
4	Buy-in, new resources, and funding will all emerge out of an approach that actively seeks to involve interested individuals, organizations, and agencies in decision-making. Don't seek funding partners, seek decision-making partners. They will bring funding to the extent their voices are heard and they have built a personal stake in the next steps selected.	Oct 13, 2014 9:04 AM

Page 13, Q2. Objective: Develop a cost-effective plan to fund maintenance and development of lands, trails, and facilities provided for public use.

Recommendations:

•Create a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan for the Foothills and research potential new impact fees. •Encourage the creation of a fund o...

1 The Land Trust has established permanent endowments and temporarily	Oct 16, 2014 10:22 AM
---	-----------------------

Page 13, Q2. Objective: Develop a cost-effective plan to fund maintenance and development of lands, trails, and facilities provided for public use.

Recommendations:

•Create a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan for the Foothills and research potential new impact fees. •Encourage the creation of a fund o...

restricted funds to assist with trail development and maintenance. Perhaps adding: - Collaborate with the Land Trust of the Treasure Valley in efforts to fund maintenance and development of trails and facilities.

2 Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax Oct 15, 2014 10:42 AM money, NOT uses it!

Page 14, Q1. Objective: Provide public information and outreach, for education and to encourage active support for plan implementation and volunteer programs.

Recommendations:

•Continue public education programs about the importance of the Foothills, the benefits the Foothills bring to the community, ...

1	The Foothills Learning Center staff do an awesome job! The Land Trust's Stewardship program is exploring opportunities to assist in connecting students with nature in collaboration with the Learning Center and other agency staff.	Oct 16, 2014 10:30 AM
2	Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax money, NOT uses it!	Oct 15, 2014 10:43 AM
3	The way to ensure support for plan implementation is to make sure the plan is not created by the city and then "informed" to the public. Integrate the city's many interest groups into the decision-making processes. Don't "educate" the public; honestly engage the public and be open to what you hear; then make decisions collaboratively.	Oct 13, 2014 8:49 AM

Page 14, Q2. Objective: Provide a one-stop location for information on Foothills natural history, recreational opportunities,

upcoming events and programs, and volunteer programs.

Recommendations:

•Use the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center to house open space operations, enforcement personnel, envir...

1	Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax money, NOT uses it!	Oct 15, 2014 10:43 AM
2	Integrate the site with those of all related interest groups. When "one-stop" sites	Oct 13, 2014 8:49 AM

Page 14, Q2. Objective: Provide a one-stop location for information on Foothills natural history, recreational opportunities,

upcoming events and programs, and volunteer programs.

Recommendations:

•Use the Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center to house open space operations, enforcement personnel, envir...

fail it is because they just assemble great information without also putting effort
into tying that information into the many existing ways people look that kind of
information.

Page 14, Q3. Objective: Establish an interpretive program focused on creating resource awareness.

Recommendations:

Identify social trends and how they relate to natural resource management.
Develop programs to address social trends.
Develop a series of themes for specific purposes, such as at Tab...

1	Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax	Oct 15, 2014 10:43 AM
	money, NOT uses it!	

Page 14, Q4. Objective: Increase coordination and administration efforts among agencies for public involvement and education.

Recommendations:

•Organize annual meeting among public agencies, representatives, and partners to heighten awareness of public involvement and education efforts. •Schedule ann...

1	This is an area with great upside potential. Engaging the community in a meaningful way is the foundation that foothills conservation has been built upon since the 1980's. We would encourage the agency partners to explore ways of increasing more frequent and meaningful public involvement. Do more than tell citizens about your accomplishments and upcoming projects. Ask what citizens want to see and experience. Establish clear process and protocol for advancing citizen-generated ideas. This should include clear decision making protocol, including appeals, similar to any development proposal through City / county development review process or 'NEPA-lite'. And consider making the R2R partnership more approachable.	Oct 16, 2014 10:30 AM
2	Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax money, NOT uses it!	Oct 15, 2014 10:43 AM
3	When your hammer is to "educate," "heighten awareness," and "highlight," you will mis-hit the community support nail every time. "Schedule annual open	Oct 13, 2014 8:49 AM

Page 14, Q4. Objective: Increase coordination and administration efforts among agencies for public involvement and education.

Recommendations:

•Organize annual meeting among public agencies, representatives, and partners to heighten awareness of public involvement and education efforts. •Schedule ann...

house" to ask for new ideas and suggestions for improvement. Organize an annual meeting to get the agencies' perspectives on current and future trends, identify the problems they see, and discuss ways to involve the community in solving those problems.

Page 15, Q1. Objective: Facilitate the transfer of ownership from state lands to other public agencies to preserve open space.

Recommendations:

•Create a prioritized list of IDL parcels with ranked resource values and uses for potential sale or exchange. •Work with other public land agencies to ident...

1	Don't crowd the foothills. Let's keep Boise a special place to live.	Oct 15, 2014 8:19 AM
2	Public lands are key to a healthy population. Boise's public lands/parks/open spaces allow every regardless of income level to enjoy the outdoors.	Oct 14, 2014 9:01 PM

Page 15, Q2. Objective: Provide resources as necessary to expedite the land transfer process.

Recommendations:

•Identify specific resources to be allocated to facilitate land transfer of IDL parcels including planning, funding, staffing, and mediation.

•Educate and build partnerships with local non-g...

1	The Land Trust would be happy to be part of a partnership to conserve any lands of high conservation and recreation value in the foothills.	Oct 16, 2014 11:17 AM
2	Don't be slaves to the all mighty dollar. How do you put a price on quality of life. Rather than build new homes, provide incentive for developers to renovate existing homes and disinsentive to disturb previously undisturbed lands.	Oct 15, 2014 8:19 AM
3	The public good is served by educating everyone about the available resources.	Oct 14, 2014 9:01 PM

Page 15, Q3. Objective: Institute additional measures to ensure public open spaces are preserved for future generations as public open spaces.

Recommendations:

•Encourage City of Boise leadership to take steps to have third-party conservation easements on all properties where Foothills Levy Funds have...

1	The Land Trust is qualified to hold conservation easements. We are curious to learn more about the need and if we can help in some way.	Oct 16, 2014 11:17 AM
2	This should be the biggest issue to work on! We would not want to jeopardize all that has been accomplished in preservation thus far.	Oct 15, 2014 5:28 PM
3	Don't be slaves to the all mighty dollar. How do you put a price on quality of life. Rather than build new homes, provide incentive for developers to renovate existing homes and disinsentive to disturb previously undisturbed lands.	Oct 15, 2014 8:19 AM
4	I would like to see conservation easements for the lands acquired by the levy fund.	Oct 14, 2014 9:01 PM

Page 15, Q4. Objective: Acquire public access to existing public open space parcels where compatible with other resource values.

Recommendations:

•Work with private landowners to acquire access easements for recreational connectivity.

Please provide your comments/suggestions in regards to above obje...

1	This is a perfect role that the Land Trust can assist the government agencies with. The Land Trust currently owns land and hold easements in the foothills and are pursuing additional opportunities for recreational connectivity. We would be pleased to work more closely with the agencies in this regard.	Oct 16, 2014 11:17 AM
2	the more the better, people are out there using it already, may as well make it legal	Oct 15, 2014 5:28 PM
3	The private landowners should be compensated for damages.	Oct 14, 2014 9:01 PM

Page 16, Q1. Objective: Establish a permanent Foothills Council consisting of public and citizen representatives.

Recommendations:

•Use established agency practices and the goals and objectives of this 2014 Plan to clarify criteria for decisions on land acquisitions, exchanges, easements, and other ac...

1	A Foothills Council is an interesting idea. Would this be a product of Boise City or would other agencies participate in its creation? What about the FACA rules that pertain to federal agencies? Will this council provide input to the federal agencies or only local / state entities? Would these be appointed seats? Care must be taken that this Council be open and transparent. And not take the place of community involvement and public process. It should also have a role in guiding foothills policy recommendations. Leaving this to the Boise Parks and Recreation Commission seems like overloading that body and not giving foothills topics the attention needed. The recommendations here do not seem to support the Objective. But here's feedback on the recommendations: Consider the benefits of working with a non-government entity like the Land Trust of the Treasure Valley in acquisition efforts. Joint funding, private fundraising, quick and quiet negotiations, non-government tools all can be provided to add value to government agency acquisition efforts. The Land Trust has raised money to purchase important open space lands, has built permanent endowments for stewardship and is building an acquisition fund. We believe our efforts are best advanced in collaboration with government agency acquisition efforts.	Oct 16, 2014 11:27 AM
2	Public involvement here would be nice. As an informed, involved resident, I still feel too much happens behind closed doors.	Oct 15, 2014 5:36 PM
3	Utilize zoning ordinances or strategic acquisitions that would effectively prevent the development of prioritized private land, making it an effective acquisition. This could mean "landlocking" private land by surrounding it with public resources, or by effectively negating access by eliminating the potential for road development due to impassable topography. Unfortunately the secret is out and the opportunities for acquiring private land in the foothills at bargain basement prices have largely evaporated.	Oct 15, 2014 10:12 AM
4	I believe Boise City managers should agressively aquire as much Foothills land as possible for wildlife, recreation, and general presservation. Once it's gone, it's gone for ever. Keep Boise a special place, don't put development first. Encourage rebuilding/remodeling existing homes in areas like The Bench, SE Boise, etc.	Oct 15, 2014 8:15 AM

Page 17, Q1. Objective: Have emergency management services continue mutual-aid efforts to protect public safety through shared resources to enforce laws and manage wildfire concerns.

Recommendations:

•Urge agencies to continue to support and fund cooperative agreements for fire protection and law enfo...

1	prevent over-spending on salaries and equipment	Oct 9, 2014 9:00 AM
---	---	---------------------

Page 17, Q2. Objective: Continue to improve interagency coordination, cooperation, and communication to advance public safety and wildfire concerns.					
Recommendations:					
•Encourage public agencies to communicate regularly with public safety and law enforcement representatives and medical personnel serving					
1	Consider the use of mowing along trail corridors. The cost of this vs grazing goats should be analyzied to see if one is more cost effective than another. Goat grazing is some areas has left the land in a beat up condition. The use of what appears to be chemicals along the trail near Castle Rock has left a large swath of bare dirt. Firewise actions are important but as some point the impacts need to be part of the analysis.	Oct 15, 2014 3:32 PM			
2	good	Oct 9, 2014 9:00 AM			
Page 17, Q3. Objective: Educate the community about public safety and wildfire concerns.					
Recommendations:					
•Encourage homeowners within the Wildland Urban Interface to create defensible space. •Provide resources to encourage neighborhoods to become Firewise communities. •Create and post signage educat					
1	Boise City managers need to aquire as much land as possilbe to preserve for native wild life/plants.	Oct 15, 2014 8:15 AM			
2	good	Oct 9, 2014 9:00 AM			



Idaho Conservation League PO Box 2308, Sandpoint, ID 83864 208.265.9565

Julia Grant City of Boise Jim Hall Foothills Learning Center P.O. Box 500 **Boise**701-0500 jgrant@cityofboise.org

October 20, 2014

Re: 2014 Interagency Foothills Management Plan

Dear Julia,

Thank you for considering our comments on the 2014 Interagency Foothills Management Plan. Since 1973, the Idaho Conservation League has advocated for the protection of Idaho's clean water, wilderness and quality of life. The Idaho Conservation League has a long history of advocating for the conservation and sustainable management of the Boise Foothills. As Idaho's largest statewide conservation organization, we represent over 9,500 members who have a deep personal interest in protecting and restoring habitat for wildlife, providing sustainable recreation opportunities, protecting public lands from noxious weed infestations, reducing hazardous fuels, and restoring native plant communities. We have attached our specific comments at the end of this letter.

The Boise Foothills are a tremendous asset to our community but also have significant natural resource management issues, including noxious weeds which can drive uncharacteristic wildfires. We recommend that the Foothills managers establish a baseline survey of existing environmental conditions, identifying areas of intact habitat in good condition and as well as areas with the most significant restoration needs. We believe that the managers need to prioritize opportunities accordingly and protect intact areas from future disturbance, restore areas where there is a likelihood of success, and adapt to potentially permanently altered landscapes through a Firewise-style approach.

Managers also need to prioritize efforts to prevent the initial introduction of noxious weeds, avoid disturbance of soils, and control the vectors for the spread of weeds. We also recommend the further development of a local Cooperative Weed Management Area. In addition, managers should work with homeowners to control noxious weeds and reduce hazardous fuels on private property. Education should be a key component of these programs. We believe that partnering with local community groups on restoration activities could become a key component of this program. It is critical that all managing entities (City of Boise, private property owners, BLM, etc.) compare and integrates plans and strategies to the maximum extent practicable.

Our specific comments are attached. Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance in the crafting and implementation of the Foothills Plan.

Sincerely,

John Robison

John Robison Public Lands Director jrobison@idahoconservation.org 208.345.6942 x13

Idaho Conservation League comments on the 2014 Interagency Foothills Management Plan

Recreation

The Boise Foothills are a tremendous asset for recreation. The amount of recreational use can provide strong public support for protecting this resource but also warrants increased management to prevent negative impacts on soils, vegetation, wildlife as well as conflicts among user groups. We support all the recommendations to establish a public involvement and education process, particularly with regard to programs about the protection and restoration of open space; environmental challenges; responsible sterwardship; and citizen involvement in addressing these issues.

Water and Watershed Function

Maintaining proper watershed function and water quality are critical roles that the Foothills serve. More work needs to be done in improving watershed function to protect soils and native vegetation and reduce the likelihood of mudslides. Even if a disturbance event occurs, properly functioning watersheds are more resistant to these events and more resilient in recovering. The managers should assemble all existing data, identify any research gaps, and develop a comprehensive assessment of the watershed functioning and restoration needs.

We particularly appreciate the work that the City has done to restore single track trails from twotracks, especially when two tracks have resulted from irresponsible or uneducated users. Single track trails can provide higher quality of user experiences and reduce trail impacts compare to two tracks. Additional work is needed to protect and restore single track trails when appropriate. We also appreciate directing different trail users to different trails to reduce conflicts in high recreation areas, particularly between pedestrians with dogs or small children and high-speed mountain bikers. We do understand that having duplicate trails may not always be possible or desirable. In fact, the City should consider closing, consolidating or rerouting trails in sensitive areas and decreasing the overall trail density in areas with particular wildlife or watershed concerns.

Develop funding proposals

We appreciate looking at all possible funding sources and for looking at ways to leverage funding. Another component that should be examined is the overall economic benefit of conserving open space in the Boise Foothills to the City of Boise and larger community.

Enhance the public involvement & education process

We support all recommendations for enhancing public involvement and education. Providing an education component to the Foothills management plan can help with the long-term sustainability of the Foothills as an ecologically functioning open space that can continue to provide recreation opportunities and critical ecological functions far into the future. The Boise-managed properties are adjacent to several outstanding BLM resources including the Boise Front ACEC, the Hulls Gulch ACEC as well as IDFG's Boise River Wildlife Management Area. As such, we believe there are outstanding opportunities for interagency partnerships regarding public education. We encourage the managers to develop educational and stewardship programs with local school

Idaho Conservation League Comments on the Foothills Restoration EA

districts, community groups, sporting groups, and conservation organizations to accomplish many of the stated goals. Please let us know if we can assist in any of these efforts.

Preserve existing public lands as public open space

Our supporters and staff are strongly committed to preserving public open space, regardless of the controlling agency or organization. If the City acquires additional lands it would be ideal for the City to have a governing body, plan, and staff in place to facilitate the additional acquisitions and their long-term management.

Acquire additional open space as appropriate to agency mission

The public should have a sense of how properties being considered for acquisition fit within the City's objectives regarding recreational, wildlife, watershed or other needs. As the city acquires more open space, we would like to see a prioritization for properties with strong conservation values and the criteria included in the 2001 foothills levy: visual priority areas, sensitive plant species occurrences, riparian corridors, forest and shrub vegetation communities and lands adjacent to public lands or existing trails. These values may include habitat for rare plants such as Aase's Onion, winter range for big game, or key properties for watershed protection or restoration. Each proposal for acquisition should come with an idea of how this space will be managed and for what specific goals. We recommend looking at the entire portfolio of City-managed Foothills properties to see which components (recreation, wildlife, etc.) are over or under-represented when examining new properties. The costs of maintaining, restoring and managing acquired properties should also be assessed.

Ensure public safety and wildlife concerns are met

We believe that more work can be done on protecting wildlife and wildlife habitat. We recognize the importance of off-leash areas for dog owners and their pets. However, one potential concern is unleashed dogs chasing elk and deer on winter range. We recommend consulting with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and seeing what measures may be warranted such as certain restrictions during the day, seasonal closures, or on-leash requirements. The City should work with dog owners, wildlife advocates and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game on developing, implementing and adapting this program as needed.

Hunting & Trapping

The Foothills provide outstanding opportunities to hike with dogs in both on-leash and off-leash areas. However, individual trapping efforts have increased significantly throughout Idaho in recent years. Over the last 8 years, trapping has increased dramatically in Idaho, driven largely in part by higher fur prices in Asia and by the opening of areas to wolf trapping. There has been a corresponding increase in domestic dogs and non-target species such as mule deer and wolverine trapped as a result, sometimes with lethal results for non-target animals.

We have significant concerns over potential conflicts between trapping activities and recreationists who are hiking or running with dogs. According to State regulations, leg hold and conibear (body gripping) traps can be set adjacent to public trails with only a 5-foot offset from the centerline of the trail. This offset is well within the length of most leashes. In addition, traps often have scents designed to attract animals.

Because of the high potential for conflict with recreationists, we recommend the complete closure of the Foothills to both recreational and commercial trapping. We note in certain places in that Wyoming and other states, high-intensity recreational areas such as the Foothills have been closed

to trapping.

If trapping should be necessary for compelling wildlife management or public safety needs, it should be limited to offending individual animals and be limited in time and location. We recommend the use of non-lethal traps which make it easier to prevent harm to non-target animals, posting signage warning the public about trapping in the area, and providing information on how to open traps to release pets.

Solid Waste

We advocate for promoting Leave No Trace approach throughout the Foothills. Additional programs are needed to prevent illegal dumping, burning, and littering. Programs encouraging the public to pick up dog waste should be continued and violators of this policy should be educated, warned and cited as appropriate.

Grazing

Grazing can be used as a noxious weed management tool and we may be able to support the use of grazing as a biological control under certain conditions. However, the City of Boise should utilize this type of treatment very cautiously as grazing activities can contribute to the spread of noxious weeds and can be detrimental to ecosystem health. Livestock can transport weed seeds in their hooves, hair and in their digestive tract. One method of minimizing such spread is to avoid grazing during flowering and seeding stages. Livestock should also be allowed ample time to pass all seeds through their digestive systems before being released into uninfested areas.¹

The City needs to recognize the relationship between livestock grazing and the spread of noxious weeds and consider the cumulative impacts of grazing and associated management activities on native vegetation, water quality, soil conservation, and ecosystem integrity. The City must carefully consider a variety of factors when deciding how, where, and when to utilize grazing as a biological control including the species of livestock to be used, season, and intensity and duration of grazing, all of which significantly impact the effectiveness of livestock grazing at controlling noxious weed infestations.

Alternatives should include measures to control and prevent infestations that stem from grazing activities. Grazing on wetlands and in riparian areas should be restricted, and the City should establish appropriate buffer zones to protect streams from sedimentation and to maintain riparian ecosystem integrity. Livestock operators may need to take special steps to ensure that guard dogs do not pose a threat to recreationists or their pets.

Hazardous fuels

We believe that significantly more attention needs to be given regarding reducing hazardous fuels in the Wildland Urban Interface and working with all land managers on creating defensible spaces. The City of Boise should coordinate fuel reduction efforts with the BLM and private property owners. Without a coordinated effort to reduce fuels accumulations on private property, efforts on public lands will not be effective. The City should consider the strategic and judicious use of fire breaks, fire-resistant vegetation and Firewise landscaping in close coordination with other land managers. The City should also plan a fire restoration program, including desired seed mixes emphasizing native plants, as part of planning efforts for when a wildfire occurs and

¹ Frost, R. A. and Launchbaugh, K. L. Prescription Grazing for Rangeland Weed Management: A New Look at an Old Tool. *Rangelands* 25(6):43-47.

reseeding efforts are needed. The City should take into account the fact that multiple years of restoration efforts are often necessary for successful reseeding efforts.

Wildlife

We recommend that the City focus on maintaining, improving and restoring habitat for wildlife such as mule deer. Other species to be considered include song birds and reptiles. We support locating habitat improvement projects that will provide greater connectivity for existing species and restore habitat for rare or sensitive species. As a component of managing wildlife habitat, the City should consider impacts of recreation activities, trail densities, availability of winter range, and habitat fragmentation.



Idaho Native Plant Society

www.idahonativeplants.org P.O. Box 9451 Boise, Idaho 83707

15 October 2014

Julia Grant Foothills and Open Space Manager City of Boise 1104 Royal Boulevard Boise, Idaho 83706-2840

Subject: Draft 2014 Interagency Foothills Management Plan

Dear Julia,

This letter includes the Idaho Native Plant Society's (INPS) comments on the Draft 2014 Interagency Foothills Management Plan prepared by the City of Boise with input from the community advisory committee consisting of individuals from City of Boise, Ada County, Boise County, Idaho Department of Lands (IDL), Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and U.S. Forest Service (USFS).

INPS is a non-profit organization with over 500 members working to protect Idaho's native plant heritage and preserve it for future generations. INPS commends the effort that has gone into describing and discussing the vegetation types, rare species, sensitive plant communities, critical habitat, and the threats posed to the native plant communities such as invasion of noxious weeds. And we truly appreciate the opportunity to be involved in the process. As they relate to this plan, the first priority of the INPS is to ensure that native plant communities are preserved and protected from future degradation and secondarily restoration efforts take place under situations where degradation or disturbance can not be avoided.

INPS would like to comment on the following portions of the plan. Please consider these comments for inclusion in your final Interagency Foothills Management Plan.

- Pg. 13, S-3- change from conserve wildlife and beneficial vegetation to conserve natural habitat consisting of wildlife and native vegetation
- Pg. 15, S-5- add native plants to the following statement, "We must commit to educating open space users about the importance of open space for protection of habitat, water, soils, wildlife, views, and other conservation values so users understand and help protect these essential open space qualities"
- Pg. 28 , 2-3- add a bullet, as shown below, under recommendations Objective #3 Protect native and desirable vegetation.
 - Protect intact native plant communities and soil biological crusts.
 - Seed disturbed areas with a native and desirable plant mix to prevent erosion.
 - Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to control invasive plant species.
- Pg. 46, 2-21-Plants native to the Foothills could be included under Examples of themes that could be addressed using interpretive signage or other tools include:
- Pg. 64, 3-15- Under threats to soil, reword as Damage to existing vegetation including soil biological crusts which stabilize soil-Damage or removal of existing vegetation increases soil erosion potential.
- Pg. 66, 3-17- Native plant materials suitable to the site should be used for revegetation/restoration projects.
- Pg. 68, 3-19- add ecological diversity and attract pollinators to the list under Plant communities are important because they provide the following:
- Pg. 68, 3-19- include a discussion of upland areas, such as sagebrush steppe and native bunchgrasses similar to *Riparian Areas* in the box section
- Pg. 68, 3-19 -include the compact earth lichen, *Heteroplacidium congestum*, under rare plant species found in the Foothills
- Pg. 69, 3-20 (footer missing)- add multiple native grasses, such as needle and thread grass, Idaho fescue, bottlebrush squirreltail, Indian ricegrass, Thurber's needlegrass, and Great Basin wildrye to the list of perennial grasses
- Pg. 73, 3-24- Please add the following statement to the paragraph titled Status. As of October 2014, the USFWS considers slickspot peppergrass a proposed species for listing with proposed critical habitat. In addition please add that Idaho's special status vascular and non-vascular plants are tracked and ranked based on occurences and threats through the IDFG's Natural Heritage Program (<u>https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/sites/ifwis/files/user/idfg-jstrickland/INHP_Tracked_Plant_Species--2014.pdf</u>).
- Pg. 77, 3-28- This plan does not mention the use of goats to control noxious weeds, however, goat grazing has occurred in Military Reserve. Can you address this in the plan? The INPS is concerned about the effectiveness of goat grazing in the Foothills. Is there sufficient monitoring pre- and post-grazing to determine whether or not goat grazing is reducing

noxious weeds long-term? While INPS concurs that control and eradication of noxious weeds is critically important, this method needs to be evaluated further.

• Pg. 77, 3-28- Please considering including the following in your References section.

<u>References</u>

Belnap, J., R. Rosentreter, S. Leonard, J. Kaltenecker, J. Williams, and D. Eldridge. 2001. Biological soil crusts: Ecology and Management. Technical Reference 1730-2. U.S. Goverment Printing Office, Denver, Colorado.

Idaho Fish and Wildlife Information System. Plant Element Occurrence Database. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise. (Idaho Natural Heritage Data is managed within IFWIS, Idaho Fish and Wildlife Information System, Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game)

https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/sites/ifwis/files/user/idfgjstrickland/INHP_Tracked_Plant_Species--2014.pdf

https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/page/species-status-lists

Rosentreter, R., M. Bowker, and J. Belnap. 2007. A Field Guide to Biological Soil Crusts of Western U.S. Drylands. U.S. Government Printing Office, Denver, Colorado.

Shultz, L. 2012. Pocket Guide to Sagebrush. PRBO Conservation Science

Utz, J., M. Pellant, and J. Gardetto. 2013. A Field Guide to the Plants of the Boise Foothills. Healthy Hills Initiative

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. Please add our local Pahove Chapter, Pahove.Chapter@gmail.com, to your distribution list for future correspondence. You can contact Karie Pappani, Pahove Chapter President, at that email address if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

LaMar N. Orton President Idaho Native Plant Society

Public Comments Highlights from October 15th 2014 Public Open House:

- 9 people at Open House
- Overall confirmation of broad directions of draft plan; handful of emphasized themes
 - o Desire for managed trail use, managed recreation use
 - o Concern re: protection of wildlife, vegetation; such as impact of roads, construction of trails
 - o Land Trust wants to help. Add to management resources through more partnerships.
- Conservation
 - o Page 5, Q7. "Reduce the amount of people in the foothills and let nature take its course."
 - Page 3, Q3. Use an analysis protocol to help make objective decisions about adding new trails that may be placed in or through healthy native veg areas
 - o Page 4, Q1 We need to protect native species but not just focus on rare species
 - o Page 4, Q3. The government needs to start taking care of their own weeds.
 - Page 4, Q4. Weed species abundance appears to be increasing each year in the Foothills. Even noticed spotted knapweed for first time in Dry Creek area.

Possible changes:

- Page 5, Q1. Specifically state that winter range is the most important value to manage in the WMA. – LEAVE AS IS
- Page 5, Q3. 'Teach' is top down and directed. Perhaps, 'Work to enhance citizens understanding about the importance of maintaining wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.' Change to "Work to educate users about the importance of..."
- Recreation
 - Page 6, Q1 Look to enhance connectivity between different areas of the foothills. Specifically, enhance trail connectivity between military reserve and Table Rock, and look to develop a more useful and sustainable trail network in east Boise near Harris Ranch. Existing trails there are primarily steep roadbed.
 - Page 6, Q1. Trails are one way to get people to connect with nature. Active management does not mean closures or not building trails. The Boise Foothills need to be actively managed.
 - Page 6, Q2A number of comments requesting pedestrian only trails, full time or on scheduled basis
 - "Please increase the number of hiker/walker trails relative to cycling trails. There is little respite from cyclists who ride the great majority of trails. Not only does this limit walkers' peaceful enjoyment, it is a safety hazard and also degrades the vegetation, wildlife, and trail condition
 - Polecat. Heavily used by runners, bikers, dogs, and pedestrians. The parking lot can be very full. It is no fun to hike the trail when bikes or unleashed dogs come around a corner going downhill fast. Suggestion: designated days for users, e.g., Monday, Wednesday, Friday for bikers; Tues, Thurs, Sat for pedestrians and dogs. Or, every other weekend for pedestrians. I know there can be a solution. Right now, the situation on trails is out of control. It is no fun to be a pedestrian. I feel sad and angry about this.
 - o Page 6, Q5. Seasonal trail closures representative comments
 - I know is difficult because of staffing and resource issues, but it seems like trails get closed unnecessarily when there are only a few puddles that people/bikes could walk through. Or direct people to useable trails that are sandy vs. muddy. There are

several of us who like to use the trails year-round. We don't want to damage them and we turn around if they are in fact too muddy to use, but we also feel like they get closed just because of the season and not necessarily due to weather conditions.

- I am all for seasonal closures. Doing so will allow vegetation and trails to heal. It would reduce degradation, improve safety, and allow wildlife space to breathe.
- o Page 6, Q6 Dogs representative comments
 - I find the behavior of many dog owners and their dogs to be reprehensible, and the negative behavior only seems to have increased
 - Create an on-going process of engaging dog owners and dog groups to identify dogrelated problems and develop collaborative new solutions to them.
- o Page 6, Q7 Land management program
 - The non-profit Land Trust of the Treasure Valley is also a good resource to turn to for help. We are interested in assisting in a variety of ways. Not only do we have funds in hand to assist, we have the track record of success to find additional private funds
 - I strongly support utilizing volunteer groups to assist with ongoing maintenance needs

Possible changes:

- Page 6, Q3 Add reference to OHV's Objective 1: Continue to manage the large majority
 of public lands in the Foothills for non-motorized use. Limit motorized use to the existing
 designated trail network. USFS and BLM to finalize language.
- Page 4-2: clarify language on history of (non-motorized) management decisions (City of Boise)
- Agencies to provide link to BLM and USFS websites that show current OHV access areas. Objective 2: Provide opportunities for a variety of non-motorized trail experiences (e.g., pedestrian only, no dogs, and downhill mountain bikers). Maintain existing designated motorized routes as identified in management agencies plans and decisions. –USFS and BLM to check language.
- Page 6, Q5 Add language clarifying intent to use R2R plan to address single use trails; trail user fees, trail closures – LEAVE R2R LANGUAGE AS IS
- Page 7, Q1.Hunting, Trapping representative comments
 - Trapping in the foothills seems misguided. If this must continue on federal or state IDFG land, perhaps establishing a distance from any road, trail or parking area. Trapping should be banned on any city or county land. Long range rifle hunting in the foothills also seems like a bad idea. Stick to muzzle loaders, bow or shotgun.
 - No shooting or trapping should be allowed on the Boise Front. People are out there recreating all over the Boise Front. They are not only on the trails. People do target shooting even during non-hunting time
 - o "Hunting and trapping should be prohibited in the foothills"

Possible changes:

 Add language that clarifies hunting/trapping policies on lands in different ownerships – Provide links to Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Search entire document for use of term "teach" and replace with "educate."

- Other issues
 - o "all new housing be built where it is not visible from most locations"
 - Public Open house: Create a pathway from WMA to the river near Harris Ranch to wildlife can get a drink without getting hit by a car and eating everyone's gardens
 - o Page 8, Q2.
 - "Work with ACHD to identify several Slow Vehicle Turnouts that can become dispersed parking areas."
 - o Page 13, Q1. Objective: Provide staffing and funding to support activities and programs.
 - The Land Trust of the Treasure Valley is very interested in formalizing our involvement in the foothills with the public agencies. We own land, hold easements and have funding to assist in conservation and recreation initiatives. We look forward to exploring how to achieve mutually beneficial results through collaboration and partnering. (In Interagency Plan document – Work with user groups, business organizations, NGOs and other organizations. Remove reference to specific organizations (e.g., Friends of the Foothills).
 - What about allowing more race events in the foothills? Towns such as Bend, Or use races as a cornerstone of their tourism industry. The events not only bring in money from promoter fees, but also help the local economy through increased hotel occupancy, restaurant visits and shopping
 - o Page 14, Q2.
 - Allow housing / businesses to build on this land so that it PRODUCES tax money, NOT uses it!
 - o Page 14, Q4. Coordination and administration
 - When your hammer is to "educate," "heighten awareness," and "highlight," you will mis-hit the community support nail every time. "Schedule annual open house" to ask for new ideas and suggestions for improvement. Organize an annual meeting to get the agencies' perspectives on current and future trends, identify the problems they see, and discuss ways to involve the community in solving those problems.
 - o Page 15, Q2. Objective: Provide resources as necessary to expedite the land transfer process.
 - Don't be slaves to the all mighty dollar. How do you put a price on quality of life. Rather than build new homes, provide incentive for developers to renovate existing homes and disincentive to disturb previously undisturbed lands.