VSP 5 Year Report for Ferry County

Report Period Ending: 3/14/2021 Submitter Name Dave Hedrick Submitter Phone 509-775-3473 ext 105 Submitter Email dave.hedrick@conservewa.net ✓ Yes □ No Has the county work group approved the content and submittal of this report? Date of Approval 3/3/2021 **PROTECTION Goals** ▼ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years. ☐ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years. **ENHANCEMENT Goals** ✓ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years. ☐ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years. Strategies and Performance Metrics, Benchmark Results and Monitoring Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions **Critical Aquifer Recharge** Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 52 - Sanpoil loss of feet or units managed for protection. **Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Status**

Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

<u>Status</u>

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

52 - Sanpoil

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using strategies that provide direct protections to wetlands and buffers.

Accomplishment

The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and hydrology functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff.

The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Status

Exceeded

Exceeded

Exceeded

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met?	Comments		Ac	daptive Manage	ement?
✓ Yes □ No				Yes ☑ No	
	2,666 acres, 1.2 watering acres and 36.8 watering Nutrient and Pest Mana acres. Exceeded by: 7,6 Soil Management: Prote by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management Exceeded by: 2,351 acre Habitat Management: F	agement: Protection objecti 83 acres. ection objective: 3 acres. Ex : Protection objective: 25 ac	7,803 ve: 248 ceeded cres.		
reported data.	oring -2021 NRCS and Conserv (randomly selected sam	, -		g sufficient? □ No	
Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance wetland for net loss of acres manage managed for protection	ed under stewardship pract	ices; no net	Critical Aqui	fer Recharge Lake Roosevelt
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	escription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>			<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Critical Area.

Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Status

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Status N/A

printed 3/13/2021 6:01:24

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using strategies that provide direct protections to wetlands and buffers.

Accomplishment

The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and hydrology functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff.

The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Status

Exceeded

Exceeded

Exceeded

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Ada	otive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support wetland function. The outcome needed for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	es 🗹 No	
	Livestock/Range Management: Protection objective: 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803 acres and 36.8 watering facilities. Nutrient and Pest Management: Protection objective: 248 acres. Exceeded by: 7,683 acres. Soil Management: Protection objective: 3 acres. Exceeded by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Protection objective: 25 acres. Exceeded by: 2,351 acres. Habitat Management: Protection objective: 45 acres, 814 feet, 1 Structure. Exceeded By: 1,513 acres, 22,198 feet and 15 structures.		
Benchmark Monitor	oring Monito -2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes	ring s	ufficient?
reported data.	(randomly selected sample of 10% of reported		NO
Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance wetland functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no s managed for protection.		Critical Aquifer Recharge 60 - Kettle
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchman Critical Area.	Accomplishment ork do not apply to this		<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

<u>Status</u>

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

<u>Status</u>

N/A

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using strategies that provide direct protections to wetlands and buffers. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and hydrology functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	(p.58) that support wetled needed for the Protection 7 (p.59) is as follows: Livestock/Range Manage 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering acres and 36.8 watering Nutrient and Pest Manage acres. Exceeded by: 7,68 Soil Management: Protection by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Exceeded by: 2,351 acres. Habitat Management: Protection of the prot	gement: Protection objective 3 acres. ction objective: 3 acres. Excerning Protection objective: 25 acres.	e: 248 eeded es.	i ptive Managemen i Yes	<u>:?</u>
reported data.	ring -2021 NRCS and Conserva (randomly selected samp	tion District program	Monitoring s	sufficient? No	
Benchmark: 2 - Enro	ricultrual degradation and projects from 2011-2017	nctions (e.g. acres and feet) are suf d maintain baseline conditio -Excluded protection		Critical Aquifer Re 52 - Sanpoil	charge
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>			<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Frequently Flooded 52 - Sanpoil

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Status N/A

Critical Area.

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 benchmarks (estimated annual red

-Excluded protection

Wetlands

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using strategies that provide direct protections to wetlands and buffers.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and hydrology functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Status

Exceeded

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

			aptive Management? Yes ✓ No	
reported data.	ring -2021 NRCS and Conserv (randomly selected same	ation District program	Monitoring ✓ Yes	sufficient? No
Benchmark: 2 - Enro	ricultrual degradation ar projects from 2011-2017	s (e.g. acres and feet) are suf nd maintain baseline condition		Critical Aquifer Recharge 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription k do not apply to this	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Status

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Frequently Flooded

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Accomplishment Strategy/Metric Description

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using strategies that provide direct protections to wetlands and buffers.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and hydrology functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

<u>Status</u> Exceeded

printed 3/13/2021 6:01:25

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	(p.58) that support wetled needed for the Enhance Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows: Livestock/Range Manage 10,633 acres, 13 watering far Nutrient and Pest Manage 2,645 acres. Exceeded by Soil Management: Enhancement objective: acres Habitat Management: Enhancement: Enhancement objective: acres	ement: Enhancement objective: 476 res. Exceeded by: 1. acilities. gement: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Protection objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2, anhancement objective: 476 res. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres.	ble 5-6 in ctive: 9,806 ective: s. 109 acres,	res	
reported data.	ring -2021 NRCS and Conserva (randomly selected samp	2 юштог рт одгалл	Monitoring ✓ Yes	sufficient? No	
Goal: 1 - Protect an	d/or enhance wetland fu	nctions		Critical Aquifer Recharge	9
offset identified agi	ricultrual degradation and projects from 2011-2017	(e.g. acres and feet) are su d maintain baseline condit -Excluded protection	ions, based	60 - Kettle	
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A	<u>i</u>

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Frequently Flooded

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using strategies that provide direct protections to wetlands and buffers.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and hydrology functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support wetland function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806

Exceeded

Status

58) of the plan that support wetland function. The

acres and 25 watering facilities.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u>			Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes		
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support wetland function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:			Yes ♥ No		
	10,633 acres, 13 watering acres and 25 watering fa Nutrient and Pest Manage,645 acres. Exceeded by Soil Management: Enhar Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: acres Habitat Management: En	gement: Enhancement objecty: 5,286 acres. Incement objective: 10 acres. Protection objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,10 Inhancement objective: 476 acres. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres.	806 tive: 09 acres,			
Benchmark Monito	ring	<u>N</u>	/lonitoring	sufficient?		
reported data.	2021 NRCS and Conserva	р 6	Yes	[]] No		
Goal: 2 - Protect an	d/or enhance FWHCA fur	nctions		Critical Aquifer Re	echarge	
	net loss of acres managed managed for protection.	d under stewardship practice	es; no net	52 - Sanpoil		
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>			<u>Status</u> N/A	

52 - Sanpoil

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by restoring or creating new habitat structures.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by limiting trampling of habitat. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, and soil functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective:

10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff (surface water quality).

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies to protect fish-bearing streams and limit shoreline and watercourse degradation and enhance shoreline areas and watercourses.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Manageme	<u>nt?</u>
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support wetland function. The outcome needed for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	☐ Yes ✓ No	
	Livestock/Range Management: Protection objective: 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803 acres and 36.8 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Protection objective: 42 acres. Exceeded by: 2,350 acres. Nutrient and Pest Management: Protection objective: 248 acres. Exceeded by: 7,683 acres. Soil Management: Protection objective: 3 acres. Exceeded by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Protection objective: 25 acres. Exceeded by 2,351 acres. Habitat Management: Protection objective: 45 acres, 814 feet, 1 Structure. Exceeded By: 1,513 acres, 22,198 feet and 15 structures.		
Benchmark Monito	oring Monitori	ing sufficient?	
reported data.	-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported	□ No	
Goal: 2 - Protect an	d/or enhance FWHCA functions	Frequently Flood	led
	net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no n managed for protection.	et 52 - Sanpoil	
Strategy/Metric De			Status N/A
	d/or enhance FWHCA functions	Geologic Hazard	
	net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no n managed for protection.	et 52 - Sanpoil	
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	Accomplishment k do not apply to this		<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 52 - Sanpoil loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by restoring or creating new habitat structures.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management enhancement objective: 445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by limiting trampling of habitat. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, and soil functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective:

Status

10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff (surface water quality).

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies to protect fish-bearing streams and limit shoreline and watercourse degradation and enhance shoreline areas and watercourses.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes No Benchmark Monito Monitoring of 2011 reported data.	Comments The key stewardship practices were identified in (p.58) that support FWHCA function. The outco for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table is as follows: Livestock/Range Management: Protection obje 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by acres and 36.8 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Protection objectes. Exceeded by: 2,350 acres. Nutrient and Pest Management: Protection objectes. Exceeded by: 7,683 acres. Soil Management: Protection objective: 3 acres by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Protection objective: 2 Exceeded by 2,351 acres. Habitat Management: Protection objective: 45 feet, 1 Structure. Exceeded By: 1,513 acres, 22, and 15 structures.	n Table 5-6 me needed e 5-7 (p.59) ctive: y: 27,803 jective: 42 ective: 248 s. Exceeded 5 acres. acres, 814	aptive Managemen Yes ☑ No sufficient? No	<u>t?</u>
Sample verification projects).	(randomly selected sample of 10% of reported			
Benchmark: 1 - No	d/or enhance FWHCA functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship portection.	ractices; no net	Frequently Floode 58 - Middle Lake I	
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription Accomplishment k do not apply to this			Status N/A
	d/or enhance FWHCA functions	racticas, no not	Geologic Hazard 58 - Middle Lake I	Poosovolt
	net loss of acres managed under stewardship pomanaged for protection.	actices; no net	56 - IVIIGGIE LAKE I	Rooseveit
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription Accomplishment k do not apply to this			Status N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by restoring or creating new habitat structures.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by limiting trampling of habitat. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, and soil functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective:

Status

10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff (surface water quality).

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies to protect fish-bearing streams and limit shoreline and watercourse degradation and enhance shoreline areas and watercourses.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

reported data.	(p.58) that support wetlaneeded for the Protection 7 (p.59) is as follows: Livestock/Range Manage 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering acres and 36.8 watering forest Understory Managacres. Exceeded by: 2,350 Nutrient and Pest Managacres. Exceeded by: 7,683 Soil Management: Protect by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Exceeded by 2,351 acres. Habitat Management: Profeet, 1 Structure. Exceeded and 15 structures.	gement: Protection objective: 42 D acres. Gement: Protection objective: 248 B acres. Ction objective: 3 acres. Exceeded Protection objective: 25 acres. Otection objective: 45 acres, 814 ed By: 1,513 acres, 22,198 feet Monitor tion District program Yes	Yes	ficient?	<u>t?</u>
projects).	d/or enhance FWHCA fund	·	Γ.,	roguently Floods	a al
Benchmark: 1 - No	net loss of acres managed	under stewardship practices; no r		requently Floode D - Kettle	eu
Strategy/Metric De	managed for protection. scription k do not apply to this	Accomplishment			<u>Status</u> N/A
	1/ 1 700000				
Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net				eologic Hazard O - Kettle	
	managed for protection.				
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription A k do not apply to this	Accomplishment			Status N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by restoring or creating new habitat structures.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by limiting trampling of habitat. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, and soil functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices

Status Exceeded

improving water storage and filtration.

exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff (surface water quality).

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies to protect fish-bearing streams and limit shoreline and watercourse degradation and enhance shoreline areas and watercourses.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes No	Comments The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support FWHCA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows: Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Enhancement objective: 445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres Habitat Management: Enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	Adapt Yes	ive Management? S ✓ No
reported data.	ring -2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported	ring suf	fficient? o
Benchmark: 2 - Enroffset identified ag	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions olled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient ricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, ba projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection ated annual red	to 52	requently Flooded 2 - Sanpoil
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchman Critical Area.	escription Accomplishment Accomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

Geologic Hazard

52 - Sanpoil

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

<u>Status</u>

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Status

Exceeded

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by restoring or creating new habitat structures.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by limiting trampling of habitat.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, and soil functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices

improving water storage and filtration.

exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff (surface water quality).

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies to protect fish-bearing streams and limit shoreline and watercourse degradation and enhance shoreline areas and watercourses.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes	Comments The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support wetland function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows: Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Enhancement objective: 445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres Habitat Management: Enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,	Adaptive ☐ Yes	e Management? ✓ No
reported data.	14,326 feet and 11 structures. ring -2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported	ing suffic	cient?
Benchmark: 2 - Enro	d/or enhance FWHCA functions olled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient tricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, base projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection ated	o 58 -	quently Flooded Middle Lake Roosevelt
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription Accomplishment k do not apply to this		<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

N/A

Status

Critical Area.

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Status

Exceeded

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by restoring or creating new habitat structures.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote habitat functions by limiting trampling of habitat.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, and soil functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices

improving water storage and filtration.

exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality and aquatic habitat functions by reducing inputs from runoff (surface water quality).

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies to protect fish-bearing streams and limit shoreline and watercourse degradation and enhance shoreline areas and watercourses.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FWCA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes No	Comments The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support FWHCA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows: Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Enhancement objective: 445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres Habitat Management: Enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	Adaptive Yes	Management? ✓ No
reported data.	oring -2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported	ing sufficion	ent?
Benchmark: 2 - Enroffset identified ag	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions colled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to ricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, bas projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection cated annual red	o 60 - k	uently Flooded Kettle
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchma Critical Area	escription Accomplishment ork do not apply to this		<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Status

Geologic Hazard

60 - Kettle

Wetlands

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance FWHCA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

60 - Kettle

Status

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 52 - Sanpoil loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Critical Area.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 52 - Sanpoil loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Strategy/Metric De	escription escription	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enh	ance FFAs directly.	Key stewardship practices were ide 58) of the plan that support FFA fur and enhancement benchmarks wer in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The the enhancement objective by the Livestock/Range Management enhancement acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceed 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	nction. The protection re exceeded as defined practices exceeded following: ancement objective: Exceeded by: 19,806	Exceeded
	ance acres managed at limit soil compaction itat.	Key stewardship practices were ide 58) of the plan that support FFA fur and enhancement benchmarks wer in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The the enhancement objective by the Livestock/Range Management enhancement and 25 watering facilities. Acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceed 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	nction. The protection re exceeded as defined practices exceeded following: ancement objective: Exceeded by: 19,806 t objective: 476 acres,	Exceeded
using strategies tha quality, hydrology, functions by reduci	soil, and habitat	Key stewardship practices were ide 58) of the plan that support FFA fur and enhancement benchmarks wer in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The the enhancement objective by the Livestock/Range Management enhancement and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceed 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	nction. The protection re exceeded as defined practices exceeded following: ancement objective: Exceeded by: 19,806 t objective: 476 acres,	Exceeded
Benchmark Met?	Comments		Adaptive Managemen	+?
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship pr (p.58) that support FAA	ractices were identified in Table 5-6 A function. The outcome needed for ark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is	☐ Yes ☑ No	<u></u>
	Livestock/Range Mana	gement: Protection objective:		

2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803

Habitat Management: Protection objective: 45 acres, 814

acres and 36.8 watering facilities.

feet, 1 Structure. Exceeded By: 1,513 acres, 22,198 feet and 15 structures.

Benchmark Monitoring		Monitoring :	sufficient?	
Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conserve reported data. Sample verification (randomly selected samprojects).		✓ Yes □	No	
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct	ions		Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage		ices; no net	52 - Sanpoil	
loss of feet or units managed for protection	1.			
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>			Status N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct			Wetlands	
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage	• •	ices; no net	52 - Sanpoil	
loss of feet or units managed for protection	1.			
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment			Status N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct			Critical Aquifer Ro	
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage loss of feet or units managed for protection		ices; no net	58 - Middle Lake	Roosevelt
Strategy/Matric Description	A a a a manali a b ma a mat			Chahua
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment			Status N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct			Fish and Wildlife	
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage loss of feet or units managed for protection		ices; no net	58 - Middle Lake	Roosevelt
· ·				
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment			Status N/A

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Descrip	<u>tion</u>	Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance	FFAs directly.	Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	Exceeded
Protect and/or enhance using techniques that lin or trampling of habitat.	_	Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	Exceeded
Protect and/or enhance using strategies that pro quality, hydrology, soil, a functions by reducing enimproving water storage	mote water and habitat osion and	Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.	Exceeded
✔ Yes □ No The (p.5 the	8) that support FAA	Adaptive Management actices were identified in Table 5-6 ☐ Yes ☑ No If function. The outcome needed for ark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is	nt?
		gement: Protection objective: ng facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803	

acres and 36.8 watering facilities.

Habitat Management: Protection objective: 45 acres, 814

feet, 1 Structure. Exceeded By: 1,513 acres, 22,198 feet and 15 structures.

Benchmark Monitoring Manitoring of 2011 2021 NBCS and Conson			sufficient? No	
Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conserve reported data. Sample verification (randomly selected samprojects).		es 🗆	NO	
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct	ions		Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage loss of feet or units managed for protection		no net	58 - Middle Lake F	Roosevelt
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>			Status N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct			Wetlands	N
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage loss of feet or units managed for protection	• •	no net	58 - Middle Lake F	Rooseveit
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>			<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct			Critical Aquifer Re	charge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage loss of feet or units managed for protection		no net	60 - Kettle	
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment			<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.				N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct	ions		Fish and Wildlife H	labitat
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres manage loss of feet or units managed for protection		no net	60 - Kettle	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment			<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description **Accomplishment** Status Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly. Exceeded Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. Protect and/or enhance acres managed Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded using techniques that limit soil compaction 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined or trampling of habitat. in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. Protect and/or enhance acres managed Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined functions by reducing erosion and in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded improving water storage and filtration. the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. **Benchmark Met? Comments Adaptive Management?** ✓ Yes □ No The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 \Box Yes ✓ No (p.58) that support FAA function. The outcome needed for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:

Livestock/Range Management: Protection objective: 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803

Habitat Management: Protection objective: 45 acres, 814

acres and 36.8 watering facilities.

feet, 1 Structure. Exceeded By: 1,513 acres, 22,198 feet and 15 structures.

Benchmark Monitoring Monitoring	sufficient?
Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data. Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects).	No
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net	60 - Kettle
loss of feet or units managed for protection.	
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A
Cook 2. Duetost and/ou subsuce FFA functions	Wetlands
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions	
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	60 - Kettle
1033 of feet of units managed for protection.	
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual red	52 - Sanpoil
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual red	52 - Sanpoil
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Frequently Flooded

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description **Accomplishment Status** Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly. Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. Protect and/or enhance acres managed Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded using techniques that limit soil compaction 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection or trampling of habitat. and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. Protect and/or enhance acres managed Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded using strategies that promote water 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined functions by reducing erosion and in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded improving water storage and filtration. the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

<u>Benchm</u>	ark Met?	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive</u>	Management?
✓ Yes	□ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support FFA function. The outcome needed for the Ehancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	□ Yes	✓ No
		Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806		

acres and 25 watering facilities.

Habitat Management: Enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Monitoring		Monitoring s	sufficient?	
Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conserve reported data.	vation District program	✓ Yes	No	
Sample verification (randomly selected samprojects).	ple of 10% of reported			
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct	ions		Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement unit offset identified agricultrual degradation a on: -Implemented projects from 2011-201 benchmarks (estimated annual red	nd maintain baseline cond	litions, based	52 - Sanpoil	
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment			Status
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.				N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct	cions		Wetlands	
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement unit offset identified agricultrual degradation a on: -Implemented projects from 2011-201 benchmarks (estimated annual red	nd maintain baseline cond	litions, based	52 - Sanpoil	
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment			Status
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.				N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA funct	cions		Critical Aquifer Ro	echarge
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement unit offset identified agricultrual degradation a on: -Implemented projects from 2011-201 benchmarks (estimated annual red	nd maintain baseline cond	litions, based	58 - Middle Lake	Roosevelt
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment			Status

Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

-Excluded protection

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 benchmarks (estimated annual red

-Excluded protection

Frequently Flooded

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly.

Accomplishment

Status Exceeded Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.

58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective:

10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that limit soil compaction or trampling of habitat.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

acres and 25 watering facilities.

Benchmark Met?

 \sqcup No

✓ Yes

Comments

Adaptive Management? ✓ No

The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support FFA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:

Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Habitat Management: Enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data.

✓ Yes □ No

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported

projects).

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this
Critical Area.

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

N/A

Critical Area.

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Aquifer Recharge

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

<u>Status</u>

Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

60 - Kettle

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Frequently Flooded

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description **Accomplishment Status** Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly. Exceeded Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. Protect and/or enhance acres managed Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded using techniques that limit soil compaction 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection or trampling of habitat. and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures. Protect and/or enhance acres managed Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded using strategies that promote water 58) of the plan that support FFA function. The protection quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined functions by reducing erosion and in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded improving water storage and filtration. the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres,

Benchm	ark Met?	Comments	<u>Adaptive</u>	Management?
✓ Yes	□ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support FFA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	□ Yes	✓ No
		Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806		

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

acres and 25 watering facilities.

Habitat Management: Enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Monitoring		Monitoring	sufficient?	
Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conserreported data. Sample verification (randomly selected samprojects).		✓ Yes □	No	
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA func	tions		Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement uni offset identified agricultrual degradation a on: -Implemented projects from 2011-201 benchmarks (estimated annual red	and maintain baseline condi	itions, based	60 - Kettle	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment			Status N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance FFA func	tions		Wetlands	
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement uni		ufficient to	60 - Kettle	
offset identified agricultrual degradation a on: -Implemented projects from 2011-201 benchmarks (estimated annual red				
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment			Status N/A
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.				N/A

Status

52 - Sanpoil

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote natural groundwater filtration functions.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote hydrology functions by improving water conservation.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14.326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	(p.58) that support CAR. for the Protection bench is as follows: Nutrient and Pest Mana acres. Exceeded by: 7,68 Soil Management: Prote by: 523 acres.	ection objective: 3 acres. Exceeded: Protection objective: 25 acres.	Adaptive Mai	nagement? No
reported data.	oring -2021 NRCS and Conserva (randomly selected samp	ation District program 🗹 Yes	ring sufficient? □ No	2
Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA fund net loss of acres manage managed for protection	ed under stewardship practices; no		Wildlife Habitat poil
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchman Critical Area.	escription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Benchmark: 1 - No		ed under stewardship practices; no	-	tly Flooded poil
Benchmark: 1 - No loss of feet or units Strategy/Metric De	net loss of acres manage managed for protection	ed under stewardship practices; no	-	
Benchmark: 1 - No loss of feet or units Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmark Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No	net loss of acres manages managed for protection escription rk do not apply to this	ed under stewardship practices; no Accomplishment ctions ed under stewardship practices; no	net 52 - Sanp Geologic	Status N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 52 - Sanpoil loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote natural groundwater filtration functions.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres, 14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote hydrology functions by improving water conservation.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14.326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No		Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
reported data.	Dring L-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported	ng sufficient?
Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no ne s managed for protection.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat et 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Stratogy / Matrio Da	A consultation	
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchman Critical Area.	rk do not apply to this	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal and Benchman Critical Area.	rk do not apply to this	N/A
Goal and Benchman Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no ne	N/A Frequently Flooded
Goal and Benchman Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No loss of feet or units	nd/or enhance CARA functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no ness managed for protection.	N/A Frequently Flooded
Goal and Benchman Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No loss of feet or units Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchman Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar	nd/or enhance CARA functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no ness managed for protection. escription Accomplishment rk do not apply to this	Frequently Flooded 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt Status N/A Geologic Hazard
Goal and Benchman Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No loss of feet or units Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchman Critical Area. Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA functions net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no ness managed for protection. escription Accomplishment rk do not apply to this	Frequently Flooded 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt Status N/A Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Status

60 - Kettle

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote natural groundwater filtration functions.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote hydrology functions by improving water conservation.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14.326 feet and 11 structures.

printed 3/13/2021 6:01:26

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	(p.58) that support CARA for the Protection benchr is as follows: Nutrient and Pest Managacres. Exceeded by: 7,683 Soil Management: Protect by: 523 acres.	etices were identified in Table 5-6 function. The outcome needed mark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) ement: Protection objective: 248 3 acres. tion objective: 3 acres. Exceeded Protection objective: 25 acres.	Adaptive Manageme ☐ Yes	ent?
reported data.	oring -2021 NRCS and Conservat (randomly selected sample	ion District program Yes	ing sufficient? □ No	
Goal: 4 - Protect ar Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA functi net loss of acres managed managed for protection.	ons under stewardship practices; no r	Fish and Wildlife net 60 - Kettle	e Habitat
Strategy/Metric De		accomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A
Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA functi net loss of acres managed managed for protection.	ons under stewardship practices; no r	Frequently Floo net 60 - Kettle	ded
Strategy/Metric De		ccomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A
Benchmark: 1 - No	nd/or enhance CARA functi net loss of acres managed managed for protection.	ons under stewardship practices; no r	Geologic Hazaro net 60 - Kettle	I
Strategy/Metric De	escription A	ccomplishment		<u>Status</u>

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 60 - Kettle loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Exceeded

Critical Aquifer Recharge

52 - Sanpoil

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote natural groundwater filtration functions.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote hydrology functions by improving water conservation.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The

protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchm	nark Met?	Comments	Ada	ptive	Management?
✓ Yes	□ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support CARA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows: Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres	Y	'es	✓ No
Benchm	nark Monito	oring Monito	oring s	uffici	ent?
reported	d data. verification	-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported		No	
Goal: 4	- Protect ar	nd/or enhance CARA functions		Fish a	and Wildlife Habitat
offset id on: -Im	dentified ag plemented	rolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient ricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, ba projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection nated annual red		52 - 9	Sanpoil
		escription Accomplishment rk do not apply to this			<u>Status</u> N/A
Cool: 1	Duotost su	ad/av anhance CADA functions		Гиоли	usuth. Flooded
Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance CARA functions Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to		tto		uently Flooded Sanpoil	
offset id on: -Im	dentified ag plemented	projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection atted annual red		<i>J</i> 2 .	ounpoil .
		escription Accomplishment rk do not apply to this			<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance CARA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

<u>Status</u>

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge
58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Status

Exceeded

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

-Excluded protection

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote natural groundwater filtration functions.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote hydrology functions by improving water conservation.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The

protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchm	nark Met?	Comments	Adaı	otive	Management?
✓ Yes	□ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support CARA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows: Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres	□ Y	es	✓ No
Benchm	nark Monito	oring Monito	oring s	uffici	ent?
reporte	d data. verification	-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program ✓ Yes (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported		No	
Goal: 4	- Protect ar	nd/or enhance CARA functions		Fish a	and Wildlife Habitat
offset ic on: -Im	dentified ag plemented	rolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient ricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, bat projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection nated annual red		58 - 1	Middle Lake Roosevelt
		escription Accomplishment rk do not apply to this			<u>Status</u> N/A
		nd/or enhance CARA functions		-	uently Flooded
offset ic on: -Im	dentified ag plemented	rolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient ricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, ba projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection nated annual red		58 - I	Middle Lake Roosevelt
		escription Accomplishment rk do not apply to this			<u>Status</u> N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> <u>Accomplishment</u>

Status N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Wetlands

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance CARA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> <u>Accomplishment</u>

Status N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance CARA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description **Accomplishment**

Status Exceeded

Critical Aquifer Recharge

60 - Kettle

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote natural groundwater filtration functions.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to promote hydrology functions by improving water conservation.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support CARA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Habitat Management enhancement objective: 476 acres, 8,686 feet and 5 structures. Exceeded by: 1,082 acres,

14,326 feet and 11 structures.

Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes	(p.58) that support CAI for the Enhancement by (p.59) is as follows: Nutrient and Pest Man 2,645 acres. Exceeded Soil Management: Enh Exceeded by: 516 acre	ancement objective: 10 acres. s t: Enhancement objective: 267	5	aptive Yes	Managemen ✓ No	<u>t?</u>
Benchmark Monito	oring			suffici	ent?	
reported data.	-2021 NRCS and Consert (randomly selected same			□ No		
	d/or enhance CARA fun				and Wildlife	Habitat
offset identified ag	ricultrual degradation a projects from 2011-201	s (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficier nd maintain baseline conditions, by -Excluded protection		60 - K	(ettle	
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	escription ok do not apply to this	Accomplishment				<u>Status</u> N/A
	d/or enhance CARA fun				uently Flood	ed
offset identified ag	ricultrual degradation a projects from 2011-201	es (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficier nd maintain baseline conditions, b 7 -Excluded protection		6U - K	Cettle	
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	escription k do not apply to this	Accomplishment				<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance CARA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment

<u>Status</u>

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

N/A

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance CARA functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

Geologic Hazard

60 - Kettle

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Accomplishment

<u>Status</u>

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Critical Area.

Accomplishment

<u>Status</u>

N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net 52 - Sanpoil loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Accomplishment

Status

Critical Area.

N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

Adaptive Management?

Status

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Commonts

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support GHA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:
Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective:
10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Denominar it in cer	- tuaptive managemen					
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support GHA function. The outcome needed for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	□ Yes	✓ No			
	Livestock/Range Management: Protection objective: 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803 acres and 36.8 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Protection objective: 42 acres. Exceeded by: 2,350 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Protection objective: 248					

Soil Management: Protection objective: 3 acres. Exceeded by: 523 acres.

Irrigation Management: Protection objective: 25 acres.

Exceeded by 2,351 acres.

acres. Exceeded by: 7,683 acres.

Benchmark Monitoring

Renchmark Met?

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data.

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects).

•		
•	Vac	NIA

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Status

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Status

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

Adantive Management?

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Status

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Commonts

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. Exceeded 58) of the plan that support GHA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Denemian Wice.	<u>comments</u>	raaptive	management.
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support GHA function. The outcome needed for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	□ Yes	✓ No
	Livestock/Range Management: Protection objective: 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803 acres and 36.8 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Protection objective: 42 acres. Exceeded by: 2,350 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Protection objective: 248 acres. Exceeded by: 7,683 acres. Soil Management: Protection objective: 3 acres. Exceeded by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Protection objective: 25 acres. Exceeded by 2,351 acres.		

Benchmark Monitoring

Renchmark Met?

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data.

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects).

		•	• -	.			.cc:	-:-		
ı١	νlα	n	το	rII	ng	SU	ıffi	CIE	וחי	Γ!

√ ∨	Δς.	No

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Status N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this N/A

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Critical Area.

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Status

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Critical Area.

Accomplishment Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Status

N/A

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

Adaptive Management?

Status

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Comments

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support GHA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following:

Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective:

10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

✓ Yes	□ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support GHA function. The outcome needed for the Protection benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	☐ Yes	✓ No
		Livestock/Range Management: Protection objective: 2,666 acres, 1.2 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 27,803 acres and 36.8 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Protection objective: 42		
		acres. Exceeded by: 2,350 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Protection objective: 248 acres. Exceeded by: 7,683 acres.		
		Soil Management: Protection objective: 3 acres. Exceeded by: 523 acres. Irrigation Management: Protection objective: 25 acres.		

Benchmark Monitoring

Benchmark Met?

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data.

Exceeded by 2,351 acres.

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects).

	• •		-		
IOIVI	nito	rıng	rsuff	icie	nt:

J	Yes	NIO
V	Yes	No

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

Status

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Frequently Flooded

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

52 - Sanpoil

Geologic Hazard

Adaptive Management?

Status

Exceeded

Strategy/Metric Description

Banchmark Mat2

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Commonts

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support GHA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

✓ Yes

□ No

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Deficilitian R Wice:	<u>comments</u>	Auaptive	ivianagement:
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support GHA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	☐ Yes	☑ No
	Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Enhancement objective: 445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres		
	Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267		
	acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres		
Benchmark Monite	oring Monito	ring suffici	ent?

printed 3	/13/2021	6:01:26

reported data.

projects).

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

<u>Status</u>

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Frequently Flooded

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Geologic Hazard

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Status

Exceeded

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Accomplishment

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support GHA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive</u>	<u>: ivianagement?</u>	
✓ Yes □ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support GHA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	□ Yes	✓ No	
	Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective:			
	10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.			
	Forest Understory Management: Enhancement objective:			
	445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective:			
	2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres			
	Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres			
	Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267			
	acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres			
Benchmark Moni	toring Monito	oring suffic	ient?	

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data.

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects).

N	<u>/I</u>	<u>0</u>	ľ	11	τ	<u>0</u>	r	<u>n</u>	g	<u>S</u>	u	T	TI	C	<u>ıe</u>	n	ľ	1

✓ Yes □ No

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Wetlands

58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Critical Aquifer Recharge

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017

-Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

60 - Kettle

Frequently Flooded

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

N/A

Critical Area.

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based

on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection

benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Exceeded

Geologic Hazard

60 - Kettle

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using strategies that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk and improving water storage and filtration.

Key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p. 58) of the plan that support GHA function. The protection and enhancement benchmarks were exceeded as defined in Table 5-7 (p.59) of the plan. The practices exceeded the enhancement objective by the following: Livestock/Range Management enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities.

Forest Understory Management enhancement objective:

445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres

Nutrient and Pest Management enhancement objective:

2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres

Soil Management enhancement objective: 10 acres.

Exceeded by: 516 acres

Irrigation Management enhancement objective: 267

acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres

Benchmark Met?		<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive	Management?
✓ Yes	□ No	The key stewardship practices were identified in Table 5-6 (p.58) that support GHA function. The outcome needed for the Enhancement benchmark as shown in Table 5-7 (p.59) is as follows:	☐ Yes	☑ No
		Livestock/Range Management: Enhancement objective: 10,633 acres, 13 watering facilities. Exceeded by: 19,806 acres and 25 watering facilities. Forest Understory Management: Enhancement objective: 445 acres. Exceeded by: 1,974 acres Nutrient and Pest Management: Enhancement objective: 2,645 acres. Exceeded by: 5,286 acres Soil Management: Enhancement objective: 10 acres. Exceeded by: 516 acres Irrigation Management: Enhancement objective: 267 acres. Exceeded by: 2,109 acres		
Benchm	ark Monito	oring Monito	ring suffici	ient?

Monitoring of 2011-2021 NRCS and Conservation District program reported data.

Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects).

	• •				
Mor	nito	ring	suffi	cien	Č:

✓ Yes □ No Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g. acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultrual degradation and maintain baseline conditions, based on: -Implemented projects from 2011-2017 -Excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual red

Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this

Critical Area.

Goal Results		
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Wetlands
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 💆 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Wetlands
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 💆 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Wetlands
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
	Protection and enhancement henchmarks were met	□ Ves ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Frequently Flooded
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 🔽 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Frequently Flooded 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 🔽 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Frequently Flooded
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Geologic Hazard
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 💌 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Geologic Hazard
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 💌 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Geologic Hazard
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 🔽 No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No

Goal: 1 - Protect a	nd/or enhance wetland functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Wetlands
Goal Met? ✓ Yes	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	52 - Sanpoil Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Wetlands
Goal Met? ✓ Yes	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Wetlands
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	60 - Kettle Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Frequently Flooded 52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes

Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Frequently Flooded 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met? ✓ Yes	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Frequently Flooded
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	60 - Kettle Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Geologic Hazard
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	52 - Sanpoil Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Geologic Hazard
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Geologic Hazard
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 2 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FWHCA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No

Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Wetlands
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Wetlands
	.,	58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Wetlands
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 💆 No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 🔽 No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 💆 No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Frequently Flooded
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 🔽 No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Frequently Flooded
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No

Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Frequently Flooded 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Geologic Hazard
Goal Met? ✓ Yes	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	52 - Sanpoil Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Geologic Hazard
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Geologic Hazard
Goal Met? ✓ Yes	Comments Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	60 - Kettle Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 3 - Protect a	nd/or enhance FFA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Wetlands 52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No

Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Wetlands
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 🔽 No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Wetlands
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 💆 No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Frequently Flooded
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Frequently Flooded
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Frequently Flooded
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 🛂 No

Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Geologic Hazard
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Geologic Hazard
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	□ Yes 🛂 No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Geologic Hazard
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 4 - Protect a	nd/or enhance CARA functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
		60 - Kettle
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Wetlands
		52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Yes No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Wetlands
		58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
✓ Yes □ No	Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	☐ Yes 🛂 No

Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Wetlands 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No Goal: 5 - Protect a	Comments Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	52 - Sanpoil Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No Critical Aquifer Recharge
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	Comments Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt Adaptive Management? Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Frequently Flooded 52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Frequently Flooded 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met? ✓ _{Yes} □ _{No}	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Frequently Flooded 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ _{Yes} □ _{No}	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (erosion hazard) functions	Geologic Hazard 52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ✓ No

Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (eros	sion hazard) functions	Geologic Hazard 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhance	ement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (ero	sion hazard) functions	Geologic Hazard 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhance	ement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (eros	sion hazard) functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 52 - Sanpoil
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhance	ement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (ero	sion hazard) functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 58 - Middle Lake Roosevelt
Goal Met? ✓ Yes No	<u>Comments</u> Protection and enhance	ement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes No
Goal: 5 - Protect a	nd/or enhance GHA (ero	sion hazard) functions	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 60 - Kettle
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No		ement benchmarks were met.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
·	trategies and Perfo	Producers in the County watershee	ds: 178
protection and/or watershed level. Benchmark: 3 - Su	enhancement benchmar	ks and protect critical area function	rcial agricultural operators (farmers
for key stewardshi VSP checklists subr producer participa	escription umber of units reported p practices, number of mitted and sufficient tion necessary to meet nancement benchmarks.	Accomplishment The key stewardship practices (ide critical area values and functions in Livestock/Range Management, For Management, Nutrient and Pest M Management, Irrigation Management Management had a total of 44,735	n Table-5-6 (p.58)) of rest Understory Janagement, Soil ent and Habitat

facilities/structures and 23,012 feet implemented which met protection and enhancement benchmarks in WRIAs 60,53,58,51 and 52. There were 11 VSP Checklists submitted.

Goal: 6 - Promote producer participation in voluntary stewardship of agricultural lands and critical areas to meet the protection and/or enhancement benchmarks and protect critical area functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Benchmark: 4 - Passive participation by commercial and non-commercial agricultural land (including but not limited to those listed in Table 5-6 (p.58) and Appendix C, Attachment 2 (p C.2-1)).

Strategy/Metric Description

Measured through mapping and aerial photo evaluation and/or rapid watershed assessment of practices in place and random sampling of farmers and ranchers in the field by technical assistance providers with willing landowners.

Accomplishment

Of the 178 agricultural producers, 34 reside outside the county. The FCD has 14 site visits since the VSP Plan was approved in 2018. NRCS also inspects the practices they fund. The majority of the agricultural land in the County is visible from public roads and concentrated in relatively small areas. Rapid watershed assessments were done to verify practices on these areas. The County has a high rate of participation in conservation activities that are both cost-shared and self-funded.

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted the ability to make site visits and verify practices. The local health department asked that very conservative measures be observed. This was due to the fact that Ferry County has very limited medical facilities and patients would have to be transported to Spokane 110 to 150 miles away.

Status

Met

Goal: 6 - Promote producer participation in voluntary stewardship of agricultural lands and critical areas to meet the protection and/or enhancement benchmarks and protect critical area functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Benchmark: 5 - Technical assistance and outreach is provided to agricultural producers to encourage stewardship practices and VSP participation.

Strategy/Metric Description

Technical assistance and outreach is provided to agricultural producers to encourage stewardship practices and VSP participation.

Accomplishment

In-person events are the key to outreach in the county. The Ferry CD maintains a booth at the Ferry County Fair which is one of the more popular fairs in eastern Washington, attended by around 1500 people per day, and VSP was the focus of the exhibits in 2019. The FCD also hosts a spring Conservation Fair that is attended by 100 to 150 people with VSP again being the centerpiece in 2019. There have been three newsletter mailings to promote VSP which went to over 1200 people each time. An advertisement called "Fun Ag Facts" has been placed each week to promote VSP in the local weekly newspaper with a circulation of over 700. Staff made calls to 26 key producers to give direct information about VSP.

The COVID-19 pandemic caused the cancellation of the 2020 Spring Conservation Fair, County Fair and three "Saturday Moring Live" events that were geared toward VSP. Presenters would have been Dr. Patricia Talcott of WSU, Guy Gifford of DNR and Ken Bevis of DNR. There was also a joint event with the Weed Board that was cancelled. Ferry County also has very little internet and cell phone coverage which hinders outreach.

Goal: 7 - Data Entry Error

Benchmark: 3 - Sufficient active participation by commercial and non-commercial agricultural operators (farmers and ranchers) over 10 years that achieves the protection of critical area functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment Status Data entry error Data entry error N/A

Goal: 8 - Data Entry Error

Benchmark: 3 - Sufficient active participation by commercial and non-commercial agricultural operators (farmers and ranchers) over 10 years that achieves the protection of critical area functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Data entry error	Data entry error	N/A

Critical Area Monitoring

Status

Met

Monitoring Activity: Ecology 303(d) water quality tools to assess changes in Category 2 through 5 listings (2018 to 2021)

Included Critical Area(s):	
Wetlands	
Critical Aquifer Recharge	
Frequently Flooded	
Geologic Hazard	
Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas	
Type of data 303d listings	
Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)	ECY data base last updated in 2016
Desired accuracy of the Analysis 0	Observed mean 0
Number of samples drawn from existing data	40 Observed standard deviation 0
What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)	N/A
Is the observation statistically significant? \qed Yes	✓ No
Did the underlying data meet statistical test assump	tions (e.g., normality)? \square Yes $\boxed{\hspace{-2.5cm}\checkmark\hspace{-2.5cm}}$ No
Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations	Water quality data from the Washington Department of Ecology was examined for impairments of total phosphorus, bacteria, dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH, since these parameters may be related to agriculture in some cases (see Ferry County VSP work plan, Appendix B-4). Ecology's current 303(d) list has 40 Category 4 and 5 listings documented in Ferry County and no Category 2 listings. Categories 1 and 3 were excluded from this analysis since they do not indicate impaired water quality. Of the 40 Category 4/5 listings, five (12.5%) have moved from a

dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH, since these parameters may be related to agriculture in some cases (see Ferry County VSP work plan, Appendix B-4). Ecology's current 303(d) list has 40 Category 4 and 5 listings documented in Ferry County and no Category 2 listings. Categories 1 and 3 were excluded from this analysis since they do not indicate impaired water quality. Of the 40 Category 4/5 listings, five (12.5%) have moved from a lower category to a higher one since VSP began in 2011. Two of those five listings are on public land sites and are being managed under a Colville National Forest TMDL plan. Notes from the Ecology website indicate that two additional listings—pH excursions in WRIA 60, the Kettle River watershed—may be due to natural conditions and need further investigation. The final listing that moved from a lower to a higher category is a Category 5 listing for temperature in the Columbia River/Lake Roosevelt waterbody, which has been highly altered from its natural state by the Grand Coulee Dam and covers a large geographic area that extends outside the boundaries of Ferry County. It is unlikely that the excursion can be attributed to agriculture or the effects of any particular geographic area.

It should be noted that all five relevant water quality listings lack recent data, with the last reported data on the relevant Ecology web pages dating from 2000-2006.

Due to the lack of evidence in these data for water quality

degradation within the context of VSP, the workgroup concludes that agriculture has not had a significant effect on Ferry County impaired waters (as designated by Ecology) since 2011. Of the 255,216 acres of agricultural landcover, only 5,551 acres is farmed, and the rest is rangeland (Table 2-2 p.10). Hay is nearly the exclusive crop as the nearest grain elevator is 80 to 100 miles away. Hay is tilled infrequently (every 4-8 years) and uses minimal herbicides, pesticides and fertilizer.

Adaptive Management needed? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Monitoring Activity: DOH groundwater quality data trends
Included Critical Area(s):
Wetlands
Critical Aquifer Recharge
Frequently Flooded
Geologic Hazard
Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
Type of data DOH
Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly) As needed/time frame varies by wellhead
Desired accuracy of the Analysis 0 Observed mean 0
Number of samples drawn from existing data 0 Observed standard deviation 0
What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)
Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ✓ No
Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations VSP staff communicated with DOH staff about known agricultural contamination of Group A water system wells in Ferry County. DOH staff indicated that there was no such contamination that had been detected during the reporting period. Workgroup my change to a regulatory backstop because of the difficulty of determining any correlation to agriculture.
Adaptive Management needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Monitoring Activity: Hydrology monitoring of USGS flow gauges Included Critical Area(s): Wetlands Critical Aquifer Recharge Frequently Flooded Geologic Hazard Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas Type of data USGS Timeframe/season for field sampling or data Low Flows (July 15 to September 15 annually) collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly) 1 Desired accuracy of the Analysis Observed mean 0 Number of samples drawn from existing data 30 Observed standard deviation 0 What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, Paired t-test ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.) ☐ Yes ✓ No Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ✓ No Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations: Both USGS gages with enough data to analyze did implementation contributed to the observations not show statistically significant differences in low flow averages before and after the VSP program began (P values for Ferry and Laurier gages were 0.1569 and 0.6587, respectively). Note that the USGS data from these years were classified by the agency as "fair" or "poor" in many cases and that 2020 data were still classified as provisional. Due to these results and the likelihood that broader conditions such as climate and weather affect low flow levels, the workgroup concludes that at this time there is a lack of evidence that agriculture is significantly affecting low flows in the Kettle River watershed. ✓ No

Included Critical Area(s): Wetlands Critical Aquifer Recharge Frequently Flooded Geologic Hazard Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas Type of data NRI Timeframe/season for field sampling or data Data has not been updated since 2011 baseline collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly) 0 Desired accuracy of the Analysis Observed mean 0 0 Observed standard deviation Number of samples drawn from existing data 0 What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, N/A ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.) ☐ Yes ✓ No Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ✓ No Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring NRI data has not been updated since 2011 baseline. Wildfire has and why VSP implementation/lack of been the biggest factor related to erosion with 301,992 acres burned in areas in the County covered by VSP. The workgroup implementation contributed to the observations may use a regulatory backstop for this indicator.

Monitoring Activity: NRI soil fucnction indicators related to erosion, soil functions and fertility.

Monitoring Activity: Habitat indicators for PHS and wetlands

Included Critical Area(s):

Wetlands

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Frequently Flooded

Geologic Hazard

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Input datasets used	Google Earth, WDFW PHS, USFWS Wetlands Mapper		
Year of map/imagery	for comparison with 2011 baseline	2016	
Spatial accuracy of lea	ast accurate input layer 65	Units for spatial accuracy	Meters
Classification accuracy	y of least accurate input layer	0	
Field verification of ov	verall accuracy: Ommission	0	
Field verification of ov	verall accuracy: Commission	0	
Field verification of ov	verall accuracy: Kappa	0	

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

This monitoring approach was intended to provide qualitative information about the extent and general trends of agricultural land and critical areas in the county. Consistent with other findings, there appeared to little affect by agriculture relative to other impacts. Visual inspection of identified wetlands showed no change in function. PHS data related to rangeland was seen to mostly be affected by wildfire with data provided by the USFS and DNR.

More detailed and quantitative spatial analysis such as that described on pp. 62-63 of the Ferry County VSP work plan was difficult to perform because of a lack of suitable publicly available imagery and staff resources to perform the analysis. However, based on FCD's knowledge of county-wide agricultural conditions and trends, it is unlikely that quantitative aerial imagery monitoring will find significant changes to critical areas caused by agriculture relative to 2011 baseline conditions. Ferry County's relatively limited extent of agriculture on lands that fall within the scope of VSP also suggests that it is unlikely that agriculture has had more of an impact on the landscape scale than natural factors and other land uses in the relevant reporting period. Workgroup wants to see when WDFW HRCD will be available in the County before proceeding with non-publicly available data. The Workgroup also has concerns regarding PHS and agricultural viability. Mapped PHS covers 40% of the 255,216 of agricultural land cover with 99% of it being important winter range for whitetail and mule deer and habitat for dusky grouse (p. 23). While wolves require no priority habitat, they are a state listed endangered species in Ferry County. "Predation of livestock by

wolves" is one of the identified threats to agricultural viability in

Table 3-4 (p.30). Wolves, in combination with development pressure from migration from urban areas, have become a primary threat to agricultural viability.

"In Ferry County, the primary agricultural product is livestock, which is entirely dependent on public rangelands for grazing" (p. 29). Currently there are two lawsuits related to public grazing that would effectively end the practice on the Colville National Forest. One is directly related to wolves.

WDFW requires the use of non-lethal measures including range riders, increased herd supervision, calves being 300 pounds before turn-out on federal allotments and others. While the Region 1 Director of WDFW said "there is a cost to producers", they have no data as to what the costs are since the VSP benchmark year of 2011. Even though WDFW offers compensation for certain practices, few producers are able or willing to participate. This is mainly due to not having the capacity in terms of hours in the day to add more work, the cash flow to wait for reimbursements (which can take months) and the lack of a seasonal workforce that has the tools or the training to do the job.

The net affect is potential agricultural land conversions to other uses and the loss of PHS function.

Adaptive Management needed?	\square Yes	✓ No
Adaptive ividilageillelli liceded:	103	