

Upper Snake

January, 2011

Introduction

The Wildlife Crediting Forum (**Forum**) was chartered in late 2009 by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (**NPCC**) to provide input on the Council’s Wildlife Crediting Program (**WCP**). NPCC chartered the Forum to provide advice on the quantifying and accounting system (informally known as the **Ledger**) for the wildlife habitat mitigation credits associated with the construction and inundation impacts of the Federal Columbia River Power System (**FCRPS**) within the Columbia River Basin (**Basin**). The database that currently houses the Ledger is called **Pisces**. The WCP was initiated in 1981, and has been modified from time to time (most recently in 2009) by NPCC in updating the overarching Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (**Program**).

The activities of the Forum are documented in a **Forum Summary Report** that is currently in review draft. As requested at the December 2, 2010 meeting of the Forum, four separate sub-regional (see the table below for sub-regions) analyses have been performed to understand the implication of various crediting choices and decisions. These four supplemental analyses reflect the heading structure of the overall Summary Report, but provide more detail to help review each sub-region’s remaining issues with respect to the WCP. *Note: The ratings in the “Level of Agreement” table below were made in consultation with NPCC staff. Although reviewed in draft form by the Forum on December 2, 2010, these ratings have not been concurred in by the Forum.*

Level of Agreement on Issues by Sub-Region

	A. Federal Lands	B. Fish Projects	C. HEP Issues	D. Loss Assessment	I. Ratios	J. Facility Assignment	K. O&M	L. Inundation Gains	M. Pre-Act Mitigation
Lower Four and Lower Snake	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Upper Columbia	High	Medium	High	High	Low	High	Low	Medium	High
Upper Snake	Low	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High
Northern Idaho	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High

The data used here is an updated version of the Ledger of wildlife mitigation data in Pisces and in the Council’s Program.

A. Federal Lands

There are no remaining issues on the use of federal lands for wildlife mitigation projects in this sub-region.

B. Credits for Fish Mitigation

Three potential fish projects on federal land need to be further evaluated. These are Bear Valley, Deer Creek and Elk Creek. The projects were riparian fish projects completed on US Forest Service property may include some wildlife habitat benefits associated with the management actions. These projects are expected to meet the following requirements before inclusion in the credit Ledger:

- Specific wildlife management plans for the project area need to be completed, approved and implemented.
- Long-term operations and maintenance funding for wildlife species/habitats must be in place and “adequate”.
- Appropriate permanent land protections (easements) should be applied, in perpetuity and with adequate protection language.
- The protected wildlife species/populations/habitats should be “priority” and so defined by in-place Federal, state or tribal management or sub-basin plans.

C. HEP Application Variations

The primary source of concern for HEP application is in the loss assessments. The Shoshone-Bannock, Shoshone-Paiute, Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) and CBWFA staff are re-examining the Anderson Ranch, Palisades, Black Canyon, Minadoka, and Deadwood loss assessments for accuracy and consistency relative to other loss assessments across the Basin.

Table C-1: Acres and HU by Manager

Manager	Acres	Current HU	Protected HU	Enhancement HU
IDFG	10,193	14,886	13,059	459
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	5,160	8,028	5,898	1,904
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes	938	557		
Grand Total	16,291	23,471	18,957	2,363

I. Ratio Application

The application of any ratios in the WCP are not agreed on by all Forum members, but are documented in the Forum Summary Report. Table I-1 below documents how projects in this sub-region break out based on the year they were booked to the Ledger.

Table I-1: Dates of Project Credits

Fiscal Years	Parcel Current HU	Percent of Total
1978-2001	19,703	84%
2001-Present	3,768	16%
Grand Total	23,471	100%

J. Facility Assignment

Please note that in Table J-1, a number of projects are combined together and it is not clear how to separate out the portion of HU's assigned. This creates a series of composite projects with multiple facilities listed.

Table J-1: Habitat Unit Assignment to Facilities

Projects	Current HU	Protected HU	Enhanced HU
Anderson Ranch	2,988	1,063	0
Black Canyon	57	57	0
Minidoka	338	112	0
Minidoka, Palisades	3,769	2,576	1,193
Palisades	16,319	15,149	1,170
Grand Total	23,471	18,957	2,363

Table J-2: Loss Assessment by Facilities

Facility	All Habitat Units	Habitat Units (Exc. Gains)
Anderson Ranch	-9,619	-9,619
Black Canyon	-2,094	-2,170
Deadwood	-4,787	-4,787
Minidoka	-5,374	-10,503
Palisades	-37,070	-37,070
Grand Total	-58,944	-64,149

L. Inundation Gains

Six species are included in the adopted 2009 *Program Table C-4* for this sub-region. They are:

Table L-1: Inundation Gains by Species

Species	HU
Black-capped Chickadee	68
Mallard	174
Marsh Wren	207
Redhead	4,475
Western Grebe	273
Yellow Warbler	8
Total	5,205

M. Pre-Act Mitigation

Pre-Act mitigation does not apply to this sub-region.

Parcel Accounting Concerns

The following Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) include parcels that are recorded in Pisces and have a minimum HU not being summed at the WMA level. In some cases the parcel minimum HU is greater than the HEP survey results, in other cases they are simply not be summed in the Pisces database. It appears these should be included in the total, but presently Pisces and the Ledger exclude them.

This data has not been included in the Forum Summary Report yet, but was presented at the December 2010 meeting. These parcels need to be reviewed with managers to understand if these minimum HU's need to be added into the Ledger.

Table 1: WMA's with Current HU and Minimum HU Discrepancies

WMA	HU Difference
Centennial Marsh	1,351
IDFG-Beaver (Kinghorn II)	1,134
Wilson	557
Bannock Creek	226
Boise River WMA	17
Total	3,285

Parcel Data for the Sub-Region

WMA	Parcel Name	Proponent	Current HU	Protected HU	Enhancement HU	Min HU	Purchase Type	Purchase FY	Acreage	Mitigated Dams
Bannock Creek	Bannock Creek	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	226			226	Fee Title	2008	147	Minidoka
Big Cottonwood WMA	Big Cottonwood	IDFG	112	112	0	112	No purchase (enhancement only)	1998	230	Minidoka
Boise River WMA	Krueger	IDFG	57	57	0		Fee Title	1999	166	Black Canyon
Boise River WMA	Smith	IDFG	17			17	Fee Title	2008	59	Anderson Ranch
Camas Prairie	Rice Property	IDFG	1,063	1,063	0		Fee Title	2002	1,364	Anderson Ranch
Centennial Marsh	Bliss Point/Faulkner	IDFG	1,351			1,351	Fee Title	2008	1,802	Anderson Ranch
Deer Parks WMU	Allen	IDFG	215	222	-8		Fee Title	2002	81	Minidoka, Palisades
Deer Parks WMU	Boyle Ranch	IDFG	6,774	7,019	-245		Fee Title	1999	2,556	Palisades
Deer Parks WMU	Horkley	IDFG	339	351	-12		Fee Title	2002	128	Minidoka, Palisades
Deer Parks WMU	Menan (Kinghorn I)	IDFG	371	384	-13		Fee Title	1997	140	Palisades
Eastern Idaho	Palisades Noxious Weed	IDFG	499	499	0	0	No purchase (enhancement only)	1997		Palisades
IDFG-Beaver (Kinghorn II)	Beaver (Kinghorn II)	IDFG	1,134	901	233	901	Fee Title	1998	310	Palisades
Kruse Pine Creek Easement	Pine Creek (Kruse)	IDFG	1,317	813	504		Easement	1997	800	Palisades
Rudeen	Rudeen	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	3,215	2,002	1,213		Fee Title	2000	2,450	Minidoka, Palisades
Soda Hills	Soda Springs Hills	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	4,587	3,896	691		Fee Title	1998	2,563	Palisades
Tex Creek WMA	Quarter Circle	IDFG	1,254	1,254	0	1,254	Fee Title	1998	2,135	Palisades
Wilson	Wilson	Shoshone-Paiute Tribes	557			557	Fee Title	2010	938	Anderson Ranch
Winterfeld Easement	Winterfeld	IDFG	383	383	0		Easement	1997	422	Palisades