

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Steven M. Huffaker, Director

Project W-173-D-20

FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

Annual Project Performance Report



WILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT

July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Prepared by:

Bryan Helmich	Panhandle Region
Jerome Hansen	Clearwater Region
Jerry Deal	Southwest Region
Mark Fleming	Magic Valley Region
Paul Wackenhut	Southeast Region
Steve Schmidt	Upper Snake Region
Greg Painter	Salmon Region

Compiled and edited by: Jeff Gould, Wildlife Habitat Manager

September 2004
Boise, Idaho



Findings in this report are preliminary in nature and not for publication without permission of the Director of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game adheres to all applicable state and federal laws and regulations related to discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, gender, or handicap. If you feel you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, or if you desire further information, please write to: Idaho Department of Fish and Game, PO Box 25, Boise, ID 83707; or the Office of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC 20240.

This publication will be made available in alternative formats upon request. Please contact the Idaho Department of Fish and Game for assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT I – COORDINATION AND ADMINISTRATION..... 1

- Panhandle Region..... 3
- Clearwater Region..... 4
- Southwest Region..... 6
- Magic Valley Region..... 8
- Southeast Region..... 10
- Upper Snake Region..... 12
- Salmon Region 14

PROJECT II – OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE..... 16

- Panhandle Region..... 18
- Clearwater Region..... 20
- Southwest Region..... 22
- Magic Valley Region..... 24
- Southeast Region..... 26
- Upper Snake Region..... 28
- Salmon Region 30

PROJECT III – HABITAT DEVELOPMENT..... 32

- Panhandle Region..... 35
- Clearwater Region..... 37
- Southwest Region..... 39
- Magic Valley Region..... 41
- Southeast Region..... 43
- Upper Snake Region..... 45
- Salmon Region 47

PROJECT IV – SURVEY AND INVENTORY..... 49

- Panhandle Region..... 51
- Clearwater Region..... 53
- Southwest Region..... 55
- Magic Valley Region..... 57
- Southeast Region..... 59
- Upper Snake Region..... 61
- Salmon Region 63

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

PROJECT V – TECHNICAL GUIDANCE 65

 Panhandle Region..... 67

 Clearwater Region..... 69

 Southwest Region..... 71

 Magic Valley Region..... 73

 Southeast Region..... 75

 Upper Snake Region..... 77

 Salmon Region 79

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: Statewide

4. Costs: Actual PR and State Match costs represent payments made through June 30, 2004. Expenditures after June 30, 2004 were not available for this report but will be included in the final financial statement submitted by December 29, 2004.

Source	Budgeted	Actual
Federal: PR	541,213	521,965
State: Match	180,404	173,989
Total Project	721,617	695,954

5. Objectives:

To establish and maintain an efficient and effective workforce organized to fulfill annual project objectives of the Wildlife Habitat Management Program.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Coordination and administration activities are funded by PR, State License, and other Federal grants. Combined expenditures from all funding sources exceeded \$1,215,200, not including leave and overhead costs. Federal assistance funds (including Idaho's funding match) accounted for 46% of the combined expenditures associated with this larger undertaking. There were 42 full-time employees supported by all Habitat Program funds combined during this grant period. Thirty-three permanent employees (242 months) and several seasonal employees (80 months) were supported in part by PR dollars.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

The State Habitat Manager (one) provided habitat program direction, coordinated work plan activities, administered budgets, facilitated recruiting efforts, and provided interagency coordination statewide. Regional Habitat Managers (six) coordinated and administered habitat program activities

at the regional level and supervised 23 Regional Wildlife Biologists and five Utility Craftsmen. Regional Wildlife Biologists administered all habitat program responsibilities within their designated Habitat District and supervised six Wildlife Technicians assigned to specific Wildlife Management Areas or a portion of a Habitat District. Utility Craftsmen coordinated habitat maintenance activities region-wide. Biologists and Utility Craftsmen recruit, train, and supervise temporary employees hired to complete specific assignments.

One Regional Wildlife Manager, two Regional Wildlife Biologists, and three Wildlife Technicians were hired and received training during this grant period. This turnover (six permanent employees) placed a greater demand on existing personnel to cover day-to-day administrative duties of regional habitat programs.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Not applicable

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Idaho Habitat Program Annual Report for FY04

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jeff Gould
Statewide Wildlife Habitat Manager
208-334-2920
jgould@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Panhandle Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: To establish and maintain an efficient and effective workforce organized to fulfill annual project objectives of the Panhandle Region Wildlife Habitat Management Program.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

During the reporting period, the Panhandle Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager (RWHM) was responsible for direct supervision of three regional wildlife habitat biologists and one utility craftsman. Secondary supervisory responsibility existed for nine seasonal positions. In addition to completing ongoing personnel administration duties, two regional wildlife habitat biologists were hired and trained.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Bryan Helmich
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 769-1414
bhelmich@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Clearwater Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, and Nez Perce counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Develop and maintain an effective work force to implement habitat program objectives. Coordinate and administer budgets and training opportunities. Participate on internal IDFG teams and activities to further Department and habitat management objectives. Evaluate and coordinate potential habitat acquisition projects.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Implemented the Clearwater Region Wildlife Habitat Program objectives through regional program personnel, including three habitat biologists, two wildlife technicians, one utility craftsman, one habitat manager, and several seasonal support personnel. Personnel were involved with habitat management activities on three WMAs comprised of 78,297 deeded acres and 38,000 acres under lease of cooperative management agreement, four Wildlife Habitat Areas (WHA) encompassing 437 acres, custodial management of five conservation easements, and management of 51 sportsmen access areas. Coordinated and managed budgets, including both state and federal. Participated in training including a trapping workshop, Supervision I-IV, furbearer snow-tracking workshop, North American Wildlife Conference, and NRCS Technical Service Provider (TSP).
- Coordinated furbearer management in the Clearwater Region. Coordinated annual regional urban Canada goose hunts (four hunts, approximately 100 participants). Participated on the Department's Strategic Planning Team. Participated on the Department's Lands Committee to evaluate potential habitat acquisitions in Idaho. Continued to develop a funding package with other entities to acquire a high priority habitat parcel in the region. Removed one parcel from the existing statewide disposal list.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Draft Department Strategic Plan “The Compass”

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerome Hansen
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 799-5010
jhansen@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Southwest Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Idaho, Owyhee, Payette, Valley, and Washington counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District (west side) and 2nd Congressional District (east side).

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Develop and maintain an effective and efficient work force to implement habitat program objectives; administer project resources; coordinate project activities and share information with internal and external customers; manage the disposal of dead wildlife and control of predators.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Additional license funds were budgeted for this project to provide for operations, maintenance, capital improvements, and a portion of personnel costs throughout the Southwest Region, including Fort Boise, Boise River, Cecil D. Andrus, C.J. Strike, and Payette River WMAs. PR project funds provided a portion of personnel funds for administration and implementation of project objectives. The Southwest Region Habitat Management Program also includes the Nampa habitat District and McCall Sub-region, which are funded entirely through other sources.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Southwest Region Wildlife Habitat Program objectives were met through regional program personnel. Five biologists, two wildlife technicians, one utility craftsman and a variable number of seasonal support personnel in five habitat districts in which PR project funds provided a portion of personnel funds were supervised by the RWHM. A total of 50.75 months of permanent personnel salaries and 14.22 months of temporary personnel salaries were supported with this project.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerry Deal
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 465-8465
jdeal@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Magic Valley Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Blaine, Camas, Cassia, Elmore, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Owyhee, and Twin Falls, counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Maintain contact and liaison with federal, state, and local government and private entities within Magic Valley Region regarding fish and wildlife habitat modifications plus population monitoring. Work with intra-regional staff, reservists, etc., on WMA habitat projects, access sites, isolated tracts, or other public lands projects as needed.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Regional habitat staff held coordination meetings with BLM and USFS regional staff to discuss issues and provide project updates. Regional staff attended County commissioner meetings, NRCS/FSA meetings, and sportsmen organizational meetings and banquets to discuss fish and wildlife habitat modifications and population monitoring in the Magic Valley Region.
- Regional habitat staff worked with intra-regional staff, reservists, and volunteers on numerous projects in the Magic Valley Region. Population monitoring, habitat improvement, and public access projects comprised the majority of work performed.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Mark Fleming
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 324-4359
mfleming@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Southeast Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bannock, Bear Lake, Caribou, Franklin, Power, and portions of Bingham and Oneida counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Establish and maintain an efficient workforce organized to fulfill annual project objectives of the Southeast Region Wildlife Habitat Management Program.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

PR funding was used to cover permanent and temporary salaries as well as operating funds. All funding sources were used to accomplish the objectives as listed below.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Thirty-three habitat cooperative agreements were reviewed.
- The habitat manager participated in Soda Hills BPA Wildlife Mitigation Area Management Plan meetings/tours with particular attention to implementation of a travel plan for the fall and winter of 2004-2005. This included publicity and site signs to explain proposed travel restrictions.
- Participated in five meetings regarding the recently initiated Mule Deer Initiative and prepared documents outlining plans and assignments for district biologists.
- Prepared seven new acquisition proposals for presentation to the Lands Committee and attended four meetings of the Lands Committee representing the Southeast Region.
- Handled several technical assistance requests and delegated others to regional habitat biologists.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Paul Wackenhut
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 232-4703
pwackenhut@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Upper Snake Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Custer, Fremont, Jefferson, Lemhi, Madison, and Teton counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Develop and maintain an efficient and effective workforce to implement habitat program objectives; administer project resources, coordinate project activities, share information with internal and external customers; and fulfill annual project objectives.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Each of the five habitat districts in the Upper Snake Region has a mixture of funding sources including PR funds and state license funds. Four of the five habitat districts receive federal or other mitigation funding as well. Activities are charged to appropriate funding sources.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Training opportunities were provided for employees including attendance at professional society meetings.
- Conducted the "Basic Training for Temporary Employees" seminar.
- Periodic regional habitat section meetings were conducted to coordinate activities and strengthen teams.
- Attended supervisory training provided by the Idaho Department of Human Resources.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

The Sand Creek WMA project was short-handed most of the past year due to high turnover in permanent wildlife technician and seasonal positions. The wildlife technician position at the Tex

Creek WMA is currently vacant, and the wildlife technician position at the Deer Parks Wildlife Mitigation Unit (WMU) was vacant for 2.5 months.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Annual noxious weed and sharecropping reports.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Steve Schmidt
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 525-7290
sschmidt@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project I – Coordination and Administration, Salmon Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Custer and Lemhi counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Establish and maintain an efficient and effective workforce organized to fulfill annual project objectives of the Wildlife Habitat Management Program

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Some of the WHAs in the Salmon Region are used for fishing and boating access. Three additional budgets (one state and two federal D-J) are used to help manage these areas.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Two seasonal wildlife technicians were supervised in the Region. Their activities were directed at the maintenance and development of 21 access areas and seven backcountry WHAs.
- 65 days were spent on project planning, report writing, payroll, budgets, and other administrative assignments.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Internal timekeeping and State progress reports.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Greg Painter
Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist
(208) 756-2271
gpainter@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: Statewide

4. Costs: Actual PR and State Match costs represent payments made through June 30, 2004. Expenditures after June 30, 2004 were not available for this report but will be included in the final financial statement submitted by December 29, 2004.

Source	Budgeted	Actual
Federal: PR	300,674	236,410
State: Match	100,224	78,803
Total Project	400,898	315,213

5. Objectives:

To operate and maintain buildings, structures, and infrastructure on 31 Wildlife Management Areas and mitigation areas, totaling 370,000 acres, at current levels of use.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Operation and maintenance activities on lands managed by the Department are funded by PR, State License, and other Federal grants. Combined expenditures from all funding sources exceeded \$1,065,300, not including leave and overhead costs. Federal assistance funds (including Idaho's funding match) accounted for 24% of the combined expenditures associated with this larger undertaking.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Habitat personnel maintained approximately 260 miles of roads, 15 miles of trails, 450 miles of fences, 100 parking areas, 55 buildings, 30 restrooms, signs, 130 water control structures, 40 miles of dikes, and equipment used for operation and maintenance. A new well was drilled at Andrus WMA, 4.5 miles of interior fence was removed at Sterling WMA, and new foot and ATV bridges were installed at Sterling WMA.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Six permanent positions were partially vacant during this grant period. Consequently, low priority maintenance needs were deferred another year and actual project cost was \$85,685 less than the total project budget.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Idaho Habitat Program Annual Report for FY04

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jeff Gould
Statewide Wildlife Habitat Manager
208-334-2920
jgould@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Panhandle Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: To operate and maintain buildings, structures, and infrastructure on seven wildlife management areas (WMAs) and 23 smaller parcels totaling 32,581 acres.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

In addition to PR funds, funds originating from the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) as part of the Albeni Falls FERC Hydropower License were utilized to address coordination and administration needs on the Boundary Creek and Pend Oreille WMAs.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

PR funds were utilized to complete routine operation and maintenance activities on roads (15 miles), fences (two miles), parking areas (ten), buildings (seven), restrooms (six), signs (50), water control structures (25), dikes (12), and associated tools/equipment. Major activities include:

- A decrepit farm equipment shed was demolished on the Boundary Creek WMA and a new unit was constructed in the same footprint.
- The McArthur Lake WMA residence was repaired.
- A decrepit storage shed was demolished on the Pend Oreille WMA and a new unit was constructed in the same footprint.
- Approximately 0.5 miles of road were reconstructed on the Pend Oreille WMA.
- Decrepit portions of the Farragut WMA Shooting Range were demolished.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Bryan Helmich
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 769-1414
bhelmich@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Clearwater Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, and Nez Perce counties in Idaho’s 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide quality habitat, public hunting and other wildlife-oriented recreation on over 126,000 acres of WMAs, WHAs, and conservation easements in the Clearwater Region. Operate and maintain buildings, structures and other necessary infrastructure. Conduct routine operation and maintenance on 45 access and fishing areas.

<u>Area</u>		<u>Acres</u>
	WMAs	
Red River		314
Craig Mountain		124,000 ¹
Joseph Plains		1,300
South Fork Clearwater		330
	WHAs	
Aspendale		13
Fir Island		38
Paradise		19
	EASEMENTS	
Anderson (White Bird Creek)		21
Henderson (Lawyer’s Creek)		29
Koehler (Tolo Lake)		16

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Majority of funding for operation and maintenance comes from other sources of funding, including

¹ Includes 78,600 deeded acres, 40,000 acres cooperatively managed with BLM and IDL, and 5,500 acres cooperatively managed with the Nez Perce Tribe.

IDFG license dollars and BPA funded trust funds. Outside grants and partnerships were responsible for funding over 75% of the noxious weed management program.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Maintained 58 miles of road.
- Maintained 80 miles of fence and boundary markers.
- Maintained ten tree/shrub plantings and food plots.
- Treated over 2,000 acres of noxious weeds.
- Maintained water system at Red River WMA, including replacement of one tank.
- Constructed new adjustable stream crossing fence along Red River WMA boundary fence.
- Maintained 12 waterfowl nest structures on Clearwater River islands.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerome Hansen
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 799-5010
jhansen@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Southwest Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Idaho, Owyhee, Payette, Valley, and Washington counties in Idaho’s 1st Congressional District (west side) and 2nd Congressional District (east side).

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Operate and maintain buildings, structures, and other infrastructure on the following regional WMAs, WHAs, and conservation easements, totaling 90,894 acres, to provide wildlife habitat, public hunting, and other wildlife oriented recreation.

<u>Area</u>		<u>Acres</u>
	WMAs	
Fort Boise		1,548
C.J. Strike		13,508
Boise River		33,542
Payette River		920
Cecil D. Andrus		23,608
	WHAs	
Roswell Marsh		676
Ted Trueblood		292
	EASEMENTS	
Rocking M		16,800

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Maintained 110 miles of roads and trails with associated gates, culverts, bridges, and signs.
- Maintained 180 miles of fences and boundary markers.
- Maintained 13 buildings, five restrooms, and eight other structures.

- Maintained 32 gravel parking areas and associated signs.
- Maintained 40 water control structures.
- Maintained eight miles of dikes.
- Constructed retaining wall at Cecil D. Andrus WMA headquarters to protect structure and repaired water damage in headquarters structure (non-project funding)
- Drilled well for improved water supply at Cecil D. Andrus WMA staff residence (non-project funding)

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Construction of washroom facility at C.J. Strike WMA headquarters area was scheduled for completion with non-project funding, but was postponed while evaluating overall facilities needs on WMA.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerry Deal
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 465-8465
jdeal@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Magic Valley Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Blaine, Camas, Cassia, Elmore, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Owyhee, and Twin Falls, counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Operate and maintain facilities, buildings, fences, gates, irrigation water delivery systems, and infrastructure on four WMAs in the Magic Valley Region to provide wildlife habitat, public hunting, wildlife viewing, wildlife conservation education, and other wildlife related recreational opportunities on 6,212 acres of Department land. Magic Valley Region PR funded WMAs:

- Hagerman WMA
- Billingsley Creek WMA
- Centennial Marsh WMA
- Carey Lake WMA

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Maintained 6.5 miles of hiking and horseback riding trails for public access to IDFG managed lands.
- Maintained 15.5 miles of fence and removed one mile of unserviceable fence.
- Maintained 11 miles of unimproved roads.
- Maintained six miles of gated, wheel, and hand-line irrigation pipe.
- Maintained six acres of vehicle parking area and five restrooms.
- Maintained and repaired seven project buildings and project equipment.
- Operated and maintained 28 water structures, six pumps, and one center pivot.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Mark Fleming
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 324-4359
mfleming@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Southeast Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bannock, Bear Lake, Caribou, Franklin, Power, and portions of Bingham and Oneida counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Operate and maintain buildings, structures, and infrastructure on five WMAs, five conservation easement areas, and four access areas not tied to boating or fishing access. Of the 15,000 acres involved, the majority is managed as part of one of the WMAs. The Department is also directly responsible for assisting with the administration of the Soda Hills Wildlife Mitigation Area and private property that is enrolled in the HIP program.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

PR funding was used to cover portions of permanent and temporary salaries as well as operating funds. All funding sources were used to accomplish the objectives as listed below.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Approximately 12 miles of roads or trails and 23 parking areas were maintained through mowing, spraying, and occasional graveling to provide good quality and controlled access.
- The process was initiated to raze two structures. Some appliances were reclaimed and will be used at a different site. All other structures received maintenance as needed.
- Directional and informational signing pertaining to all sites was evaluated and maintained seasonally.
- Seven road vehicles, three ATVs, and four pieces of farm machinery were maintained (generally through other funding). One large truck had a replacement engine installed.
- Roads, trails, and parking areas were maintained routinely. In addition, a series of foot/ATV bridges were completed at Sterling WMA to facilitate access and administration. Also, approximately 2,500 feet of rough, steep road on the Portneuf WMA was water-barred, graded and graveled.

- Considerable effort was expended to implement the initial proposed travel restrictions for the Soda Hills Wildlife Mitigation Area. This included the development and installation of three informational signs, installation of five gates, and installation of 20 additional signs to enforce closure of spur trails. Other signage was ordered to supply needed replacement at Sterling WMA.
- On the Blackfoot River WMA, over 21,000 feet of net wire/barbed wire fencing was replaced by new let-down fencing, and another 1,500 feet of old fencing was replaced by buck and rail fencing. At Sterling WMA, approximately two miles of new fence was constructed to facilitate pasture arrangements and 4.5 miles of unneeded interior fence was removed to facilitate hunter access. Extensive fence work was also completed on a conservation easement property in Oneida County. Additional fence stiles were placed at strategic locations on Sterling WMA, and road closures were reinforced with barriers and signing as needed on the Portneuf WMA.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Efforts to raze the two structures referenced in the plan have not occurred though preparations have begun, and some equipment has been salvaged from the cabin at Georgetown Summit WMA.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Paul Wackenhut
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 232-4703
pwackenhut@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Upper Snake Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Custer, Fremont, Jefferson, Lemhi, Madison, and Teton counties in Idaho’s 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Operate and maintain buildings, informational kiosks, dikes, water control structures, restrooms, parking lots, roads and trails, fences, equipment, vehicles, irrigation systems, and miscellaneous user facilities on Department-managed properties in order to provide wildlife habitat, public hunting and other wildlife oriented recreation. Maintain a safe workplace for Department employees and safe facilities for the public. The Upper Snake Region manages the following properties. These management areas are a mixture of land ownership including IDFG, IDL, BLM, and Bureau of Reclamation (BOR).

<u>Area</u>		<u>Acres</u>
	WMAs	
Cartier Slough		970
Market Lake		5,071
Mud Lake		8,853
Sand Creek		32,215
Tex Creek		31,715
	WHAs	
Gem State		70
Deer Parks		3,173
	WMUs	
Twin Bridges (Allen)		81
	WCAs	
Chilly Slough		<u>1,800</u>
	Total acres administered	<u>83,948</u>

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Funding for the management areas is a mixture of state license dollars, PR funds, and mitigation funds.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Implemented the Upper Snake Region Habitat Management Program objectives as defined in existing long-range Department plans through regional personnel.
- The utility craftsman engineered and helped to construct and maintain projects on all management areas as needed. He also periodically inspected equipment.
- The RWHM conducted a formal inspection of WMAs and facilities with staff.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

The irrigation water delivery system at the recently acquired Chester Wetlands segment of the Sand Creek WMA is in very poor condition. A significant amount of labor, heavy equipment use, and contracted services were required to maintain the water delivery ditch in operating condition. The BOR paid for a new permanent wildlife technician residence, which was located near the Ririe Dam.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Annual WMA inspection report forms are retained in the RWHMs files.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Steve Schmidt
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 525-7290
sschmidt@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project II – Operation and Maintenance, Salmon Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Custer and Lemhi counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Supervise the operation and maintenance of buildings, structures, and infrastructure on seven backcountry WHAs and 21 access areas at current levels of use. These properties provide wildlife and fisheries habitat; fishing, hunting, and boating access; and other wildlife-oriented recreation.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Some of the WHAs in the Salmon Region are used for fishing and boating access. Three additional budgets (one state and two federal D-J) are used to help manage these areas.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Maintenance of the 21 access areas and three WHAs was done.
- Two CXT's were placed at Deer Gulch and one at the 4th of July access area.
- The housing facility was completed on the Loon Creek backcountry WHA.
- The shelter was placed at the Deer Gulch access area.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Internal progress reports.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Greg Painter
Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist
(208) 756-2271
gpainter@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: Statewide

4. Costs: Actual PR and State Match costs represent payments made through June 30, 2004. Expenditures after June 30, 2004 were not available for this report but will be included in the final financial statement submitted by December 29, 2004.

Source	Budgeted	Actual
Federal: PR	466,045	348,649
State: Match	155,348	116,216
Total Project	621,393	464,865

5. Objectives:

1. Improve key wildlife habitats such as big game winter range, waterfowl and upland game production areas, riparian areas, and native plant communities to meet existing wildlife habitat needs on lands managed by the Department.
2. Create additional habitat in areas lacking adequate habitat to support a desired population level.
3. Work with private landowners to enhance wildlife habitat on private property.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Habitat development and enhancement activities are funded by PR, State License, and other Federal grants. Combined expenditures from all funding sources exceeded \$2,548,800, not including leave and overhead costs. Federal assistance funds (including Idaho’s funding match) accounted for 15% of the combined expenditures associated with this larger undertaking. Federal Aid funds were used only for personnel and administrative costs associated with habitat development projects on private land. Farm Bill conservation programs, federal and state conservation programs, and competitive conservation grants typically fund projects on private land.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Objective 1. Habitat personnel manipulated water levels on approximately 6,500 acres of wetlands to provide seasonal habitats for various wildlife, treated over 10,000 acres of noxious weeds through integrated noxious weed control (biological, chemical, mechanical), produced food and nesting cover for waterfowl and upland game birds on over 10,000 acres, and managed livestock grazing on over 30,000 acres of big game winter range. This represents only a partial list of habitat activities conducted during this grant period. Habitat personnel implemented other practices designed to maintain or improve riparian, rangeland, grassland, and forestland plant communities.

Objective 2. Habitat personnel created new or additional habitat at the following areas:

1. Dredged ten acres of an existing wetland (Mallard Pond) on Fort Boise WMA to provide more open water for brood habitat.
2. Developed ten acres of permanent nesting cover at Fort Boise WMA (Roswell Marsh) to improve production of upland game and waterfowl.
3. Established 80 acres of permanent nesting cover at Carey Lake WMA to improve production of upland game and waterfowl. This is part of a continuing project designed to convert 600 acres of irrigated and dry cropland to permanent nesting cover and Centennial and Carey Lake WMAs.
4. Continued restoration on 550 acres of fire-impacted upland habitat at Hagerman WMA to restore native grass/shrub community and increase production of upland game and waterfowl.
5. Created a small .5-acre wetland at Sterling WMA to provide more open water for waterfowl breeding pairs and broods.
6. Reseeded 250 acres of cultivated land to permanent cover at Tex Creek WMA to improve upland game habitat and big game winter range. This is part of a continuing project initiated in 2000 to convert 900 acres of cultivated land to permanent cover.

Objective 3. Habitat personnel worked with private landowners to implement conservation programs designed to restore wildlife habitat on private lands. Overall, approximately 5,300 acres (4,600 uplands, 700 wetlands) were enhanced through 190 Habitat Improvement Program contracts established during this grant period. The top five practices included: stubble management (2,050 acres), nesting cover (1,580 acres), food plots (660 acres), habitat fencing (390 acres), and shelterbelts (245 acres).

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Six permanent positions were partially vacant during this grant period. New habitat development or enhancement projects are typically delayed until vacancies are filled and new employees receive adequate training and job orientation. Consequently, certain activities planned were not accomplished and actual project cost was \$156,528 less than the total project budget.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Idaho Habitat Program Annual Report for FY04; FY04 Habitat Improvement Program Annual Report; Pheasant and Quail Initiative Annual Progress Report-2004.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jeff Gould
Statewide Wildlife Habitat Manager
208-334-2920
jgould@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Panhandle Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Improve key wildlife habitat associated with wetlands and big game winter range located on Department-managed lands. Improve upland game bird and featured non-game species habitat located on Department-managed lands as peripheral opportunities allow. Improve wildlife habitat on private property.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

In addition to PR funds, funds originating from the BPA as part of the Albeni Falls FERC Hydropower License were utilized to address habitat development needs on the Boundary Creek and Pend Oreille WMAs.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

PR funds were utilized to complete management activities on Department-administered lands located within the Panhandle. All 32,581 acres of Department ownership was evaluated for noxious weed infestations and control actions were implemented as appropriate. Approximately 15,090 acres of wetlands were managed to maintain important hydrologic functions, maximize waterfowl production, maintain non-game species habitat, and provide waterfowl hunting opportunities. Approximately 16,468 acres of big game range were managed to promote critical habitat features including winter range and to provide big game hunting opportunities. On the remaining 1,023 acres, habitat improvement activities were completed in a fashion peripheral to facility development and operation.

Habitat development projects completed on Department-managed lands during FY04 include:

- Approximately five acres were planted to native tree and shrub species on the Boundary Creek WMA.
- Two food plots totaling five acres were established on the Boundary Creek WMA.

- A moist soil management strategy was implemented on the 1,000-acre McArthur Lake WMA wetland complex.
- A 60-acre wetland restoration project was completed on the Albeni Cove Segment of the Pend Oreille WMA.
- A 157-acre old growth ponderosa pine restoration project was initiated on Farragut WMA and then placed on hold pending public review.
- Approximately 500 pounds of wild rice seed was harvested on the Coeur d'Alene River WMA and distributed to alternate properties.

Habitat development projects were also be completed on privately-owned property:

- The Department assumed management responsibility for a 620-acre parcel owned by Ducks Unlimited. Wetland development, upland seeding, and noxious weed control efforts were completed.
- Two acres of wetlands were restored on the Labore Property.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

The FY04 Panhandle Habitat Section Project Statement was written in anticipation of assuming management authority for 450 acres of property owned by Ducks Unlimited and completing a series of small habitat improvements on a variety of private ownership. The Ducks Unlimited projection erred and 620 acres were acquired. Work on alternate private ownership reflected public interest in the Department's private lands Habitat Improvement Program (HIP).

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Bryan Helmich
 Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
 (208) 769-1414
 bhelmich@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Clearwater Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, and Nez Perce counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Improve habitat quality and quantity on big game winter and summer range, waterfowl and upland bird production areas, riparian areas, and native plant communities on lands managed by the Department in the Clearwater Region. Assist private landowners enhance wildlife habitat on their lands.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

By combining IDFG HIP funds, funds from outside grants, Landowner Incentive Program (LIP) funds, and NRCS Farm Bill funds, Clearwater staff are able to maximize enhancement of private lands for upland birds and other wildlife species.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Improved wildlife habitat on Department lands.

- Continued shrub planting and grazing exclosure project at Red River WMA, in coordination with on-going BPA funded project. Goal is to establish riparian community where one historically occurred.

Developed wildlife habitat on private lands.

- Coordinated with federal, state, and nongovernmental agencies to develop wildlife habitat on private lands within respective habitat districts through the Farm Bill, competitive grants, and other conservation programs as opportunities were available.
- Implemented Clearwater Pheasant Initiative – Initiated 109 new projects, completed 70. Resulted in 46 acres of food plots, 1,650 acres of stubble, 1,640 acres of nesting cover, 50 acres of winter cover, 190 acres of riparian cover, and 8.5 acres protected.

- Received technical training to become a certified TSP. Completed 22 CRP contracts, resulting in 2,200 acres of CRP either being reestablished or established.
- Continued to develop the 25-acre Chapman Wetland on private land near Weippe.
- Applied for and received a \$19,000 Partner for Wildlife Grant to enhance the wetland. Recently received additional funds to build a Kiosk and develop public parking.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Pheasant Initiative Annual Report

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerome Hansen
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 799-5010
jhansen@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Southwest Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Idaho, Owyhee, Payette, Valley, and Washington counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District (west side) and 2nd Congressional District (east side).

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Improve the quality of key wildlife habitat types such as big game winter range, waterfowl and upland bird production areas, riparian areas and native plant communities to provide for existing wildlife habitat needs on lands managed by the Department in the Southwest Region. Develop additional quantity of wildlife habitat to support increased production on Department-managed lands in the Southwest Region. Assist private landowners to enhance wildlife habitat on their lands.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Wildlife habitat quality was improved on Department lands by the following:

- Management of livestock grazing on 28,000 acres of big game winter range to improve rangeland plant communities.
- Controlled noxious weeds and invasive plant species on 3,087 acres of Department-managed wildlife habitat.
- Managed water levels on 400 acres of ponds and wetlands to improve waterfowl nesting and brood-rearing habitat.
- Maintained 800 waterfowl nest structures.
- Planted and maintained 320 acres of food plots.
- Restored 400 acres of winter range by planting or seeding grasses, shrubs, and forbs.

Additional habitat was developed on Department lands by the following:

- Dredged ten acres of existing developed wetlands on Fort Boise WMA to create nesting islands and improve waterfowl nest security.
- Developed ten acres of irrigated permanent cover for upland wildlife and waterfowl at Roswell Marsh WHA.

Developed wildlife habitat on private lands by the following:

- Coordinated with federal, state, and nongovernmental agencies to develop wildlife habitat on private lands within respective habitat districts through the Farm Bill, competitive grants, and other conservation programs as opportunities became available and varying degrees of partnership occurred throughout the region.
- Developed 11 waterfowl and 31 upland cost-share agreements to develop wildlife habitat on private land using Department HIP funds.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Through use of project funds from sources other than Federal Aid and approved use of available resources, more was accomplished than planned in the areas of waterfowl nest structure maintained, food plots planted, and fire-impacted winter range rehabilitated. More habitat development on private lands was accomplished than planned due to the response to an increased interest in participation and more requests for assistance by private landowners.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerry Deal
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 465-8465
jdeal@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Magic Valley Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Blaine, Camas, Cassia, Elmore, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Owyhee, and Twin Falls, counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Maintain wildlife habitat in the Magic Valley Region to provide wintering habitat for waterfowl and upland birds, nesting habitat for waterfowl and upland birds; brood-rearing habitat for waterfowl; and feeding and foraging areas for waterfowl, upland birds, and shorebirds. Develop wildlife habitat in the Magic Valley Region to provide additional waterfowl and upland bird nesting and security cover areas; increase availability and diversity of winter habitat for waterfowl, upland birds, and big game; and provide additional foraging habitat. Develop and enhance wildlife habitat on privately owned lands in the Magic Valley Region.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Managed water levels throughout winter on 25 acres of water impoundment areas at the Hagerman WMA.
- Maintained 190 acres of wetlands vegetation on the Hagerman and Billingsley Creek WMAs to provide thermal and escape cover for wintering upland birds.
- Maintained six miles of shelterbelts on Carey Lake and Hagerman WMAs to provide cover and food.
- Irrigated 670 acres of herbaceous cover for nesting habitat on Centennial Marsh, Hagerman, and Carey Lake WMAs.
- Maintained 350 artificial nesting platforms for waterfowl on Centennial Marsh, Carey Lake, and Hagerman WMAs.
- Controlled weeds on 6,212 acres on all PR funded WMAs
- Utilized biological weed control of purple loosestrife on 200 acres of wetlands at the Hagerman and Billingsley Creek WMA.

- Maintained water levels for 4,200 acres of wetlands on Billingsley Creek, Hagerman, Carey Lake, and Centennial Marsh WMAs.
- Maintained grazing pastures for waterfowl.
- Maintained 25 acres of food producing trees and shrubs on the Carey Lake and Hagerman WMAs.
- Developed 52 HIP projects on private lands in the Magic Valley Region.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Mark Fleming
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 324-4359
mfleming@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Southeast Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bannock, Bear Lake, Caribou, Franklin, Power, and portions of Bingham and Oneida counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Improve key wildlife habitat on four specific big game winter ranges, one waterfowl and upland game production area, and numerous riparian areas and native plant communities to meet existing wildlife habitat needs on lands managed by the Department. Create additional habitat in areas lacking adequate habitat to support a desired population level. Work with private landowners to enhance wildlife habitat on private property.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

PR funding was used to cover portions of permanent and temporary salaries as well as operating funds. All funding sources were used to accomplish the objectives as listed below.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Water levels were monitored and controlled on one waterfowl production area to maximize nesting and brooding habitat and to prevent disease outbreak.
- Personnel consulted with private landowners and Farm Bill administrators to develop wetland projects through cooperative agreements and HIP funds.
- Two riparian fencing projects were initiated with private landowners.
- Approximately one third of artificial nesting structures throughout the region were maintained or replacements installed as necessary.
- Approximately 600 acres were treated to maintain high quality nesting and brooding areas. Methods included grazing, mowing, disking and some chemical treatment. All other acreages were protected from grazing and wildfire to maximize vegetation structure for cover.
- Approximately 300 acres of high-energy grains were provided on Department-administered properties or on private property with HIP funds (19 projects) to serve as food for upland game.

Arrangements were made with a new farming cooperator at Sterling WMA to provide food plots and nesting habitat on 30 acres of irrigated ground.

- One hundred acres of CRP parcels were treated through inter-seeding to improve plant diversity and the quality of brooding cover. Approximately 40 acres of woody cover plantings were established on private property and Department properties (including seven private landowners, Sterling WMA, and Edson Fichter Nature Area) to improve habitat for upland game and non-game. Highly palatable forage species were planted on 104 acres of private property (including six private cooperators and 17,000 seedlings), to increase winter range values for big game and wintering conditions for upland game on CRP lands and native range impacted by 2003 wildfires. Approximately two acres of riparian area and wetlands was planted with woody cover species to improve bank stability and increase forage value for big game at the Blackfoot River WMA.
- Three specific predators (feral house cats, striped skunks, and raccoons) were controlled on Sterling WMA during the nesting season with a private contractor funded through statewide projects.
- Approximately 1,000 acres were directly treated for noxious weeds in cooperation with county weed departments and four CWMA's. In addition, a private contractor was hired with statewide funds to treat 400 acres at Sterling WMA.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Only 100 acres of CRP was inter-seeded in the fall of 2003 due to the increased effort expended to monitor public use at Sterling WMA. Woody cover plantings totaled only 40 acres mainly due to a decrease in the number of qualifying private cooperators. Highly palatable forage species were planted on 104 acres due to limitations on plant materials and manpower. The Department did assist with the acquisition of plant materials for rehabilitation of several hundred acres of BLM lands impacted by 2003 wildfires. The new Mule Deer Initiative proposed by the Fish and Game Commission led to additional meeting time and planning to evaluate current projects and to propose future projects that will benefit mule deer habitat.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

- Planting records: ArcView project, R-5 server @ U:\Habitat\Projects\projects.apr, shapefile-U:\Habitat\Habitat\bitterbrush.shp.
- Nest box records: ArcView project, R-5 server @ U:\Habitat\Projects\projects.apr, shapefile-U:\Habitat\Nestbox\nestbox.shp.
- HIP records: HIP statewide database.
- Weed control records: Statewide weed plan and report.
- Predator control records: Statewide predator removal report.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Paul Wackenhut
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 232-4703
pwackenhut@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Upper Snake Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Custer, Fremont, Jefferson, Lemhi, Madison, and Teton counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Improve and maintain high-quality waterfowl and upland game habitat and high-quality big game transition, migration, and winter range habitats. Improve habitat for mule deer as per the Idaho "Mule Deer Initiative". Pursue projects that benefit sage grouse. Restore or replace habitat on mitigation properties. Provide high quality habitat for wildlife species at risk (T&E, sensitive, etc.). Provide custodial management of the federally threatened Ute's Ladies Tresses on the SCWMA. Manage habitat on Department-administered properties to provide diverse recreational opportunities. Pursue habitat developments on Department-administered properties within the context of healthy ecosystems and landscape management. Assist private landowners in efforts to improve or develop wildlife habitat on private land. Collaborate with public land managers to improve or develop wildlife habitat on public land.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Funding for the management areas is a mixture of state license dollars, PR funds, and mitigation funds.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Investigated opportunities to secure wildlife habitat on private and public lands. Reviewed and developed land acquisition proposals.
- Administered HIP and Adopt-a-Wetland programs on private lands and public lands. Monitored existing HIP agreements, conservation easements, and leases. Helped design habitat improvements on private and public land and provided cost-sharing where appropriate.
- Established regional programs, priorities, and policies regarding habitat development. Reviewed and approved habitat improvement plans. Planted 900 acres of permanent vegetation to improve habitat. Manipulated existing habitat via prescribed fire, mowing, and harvest techniques.

- Administered regional budgets and resources toward habitat development. Administered management agreements and leases.
- Developed Geographical Information Systems (GIS) to provide planning tools and map and evaluate habitats and project proposals.
- Maintained guzzlers to provide water sources and developed three new guzzlers.
- Administered vehicle restrictions. Administered motorized-use plans on WMAs to regulate motorized use.
- Maintained boundary fences to prevent unauthorized livestock grazing on WMAs and coordinated fence maintenance with neighbors. Built three miles of new fence.
- Developed new artificial nesting structures for Canada geese and ducks. Monitored area closures to protect habitats and wildlife. Monitored and protected sensitive plant species. Protected nesting habitats for T&E species. Inventoried and mapped key habitats for wildlife species at risk.
- Treated noxious weeds on 3,202 acres via biological, chemical, and mechanical means. Participated in management activities of CWMAs.
- Monitored water rights and coordinated water delivery to WMAs. Replaced water delivery structures to provide better water level control in marshes and ponds.
- Established food plots on WMAs via sharecrop agreements, volunteer support from NGOs, and through IDFG labor and equipment. Provided standing crops and crop residue on WMAs for wildlife food and cover via three sharecrop agreements.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

A 740-acre parcel has been proposed for acquisition adjacent to the Tex Creek WMA and approved in concept by the Commission. The Upper Snake Habitat Section collectively spent \$129,973 to control noxious weeds on 3,844 acres of Department-administered land in 2003. This total reflects contributions from various funding sources including state license funds, PR funds, BPA mitigation funds, BOR mitigation funds, and from state sponsored CWMAs.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Upper Snake Region – Noxious Weed Control Program for IDFG Managed Lands – Weed Plans and 2003 summaries. May 2004.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Steve Schmidt
 Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
 (208) 525-7290
 sschmidt@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project III – Habitat Development, Salmon Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Custer and Lemhi counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Improve key wildlife habitats such as big game winter range, waterfowl and upland game production areas, riparian areas, and native plant communities to meet existing wildlife habitat needs on lands managed by the Department. Create additional habitat in areas lacking adequate habitat to support a desired population level. Work with private landowners to enhance wildlife habitat on private property.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Some of the WHAs in the Salmon Region are used for fishing and boating access. Three additional budgets (one state and two federal D-J) are used to help manage these areas.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- The irrigation system at the Mormon Ranch WHA was expanded to irrigate an additional two acres.
- One-hundred trees and shrubs were planted along the ditches.
- Noxious weeds were sprayed on two WHAs and 19 access areas.
- In cooperative projects with the BLM, 90 acres were burned in the Challis to enhance bighorn sheep winter range. Similarly, 85 acres of aspen were treated in the Salmon area to rejuvenate aspen clones. The region coordinated weed spraying efforts on 250 acres of federal land through three CWMA's.
- Two shallow water areas were created (four acres total) in the Salmon area on private lands. Trees and shrubs were planted around both ponds. Upland tree and shrub plantings were done on four acres by two private landowners. Thirteen acres of upland were seeded to wildlife habitat by one private landowner.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Internal progress reports.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Greg Painter
Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist
(208) 756-2271
gpainter@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: Statewide

4. Costs: Actual PR and State Match costs represent payments made through June 30, 2004. Expenditures after June 30, 2004 were not available for this report but will be included in the final financial statement submitted by December 29, 2004.

Source	Budgeted	Actual
Federal: PR	120,269	131,654
State: Match	40,090	43,885
Total Project	160,359	175,539

5. Objectives:

1. To collect current public use information on Department-managed lands including recreational use, opinions, hunting success, and harvest.
2. To collect current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information on Department-managed lands.
3. To collect and or obtain current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information for statewide management recommendations.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Survey and inventory activities conducted by habitat personnel are funded by PR, State License, and other Federal grants. Combined expenditures from all funding sources exceeded \$461,000, not including leave and overhead costs. Federal assistance funds (including Idaho’s funding match) accounted for 30% of the combined expenditures associated with this larger undertaking.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Objective 1. Collected visitor use information at most WMAs using traffic counters, random visitor surveys, targeted field contacts, hunter participation check stations, and trailhead surveys.

Objective 2. Wildlife habitat and population information collected on Department-managed lands is site-specific and designed to monitor the primary objectives of each parcel. Survey and inventory activities included vegetation transects on big game winter range and riparian habitats, stream flow and water table monitoring, noxious weed monitoring and mapping, breeding bird surveys, waterfowl brood and pair counts, sage-grouse lek counts, and aerial big game and chukar surveys.

Objective 3. Habitat personnel were involved in survey and inventory activities within their area of responsibility (i.e. Habitat District or Region). Activities were similar to those listed in Objective 2 but included more collaborative work with outside agencies and Department personnel.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Not Applicable

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Idaho Habitat Program Annual Report for FY04

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jeff Gould
Statewide Wildlife Habitat Manager
208-334-2920
jgould@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Panhandle Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: To collect current public use information on Department-managed lands including recreational use, opinion, hunting success, and harvest information. To collect current wildlife habitat and population characteristic information on Department-managed lands. To collect and/or obtain current wildlife habitat and population characteristic information for regional management direction.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

In addition to PR funds, funds originating from the BPA as part of the Albeni Falls FERC Hydropower License were utilized to address survey and inventory needs on the Boundary Creek and Pend Oreille WMAs.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Survey and inventory work completed on Department-managed lands in the Panhandle include:

- Public use surveys were run for a 12-month period on the Boundary Creek and Pend Oreille WMAs.
- A public use survey was initiated on the Coeur d'Alene River WMA.
- Small mammal and passerine bird surveys were completed at Farragut WMA.
- A western grebe colony was monitored on the Pend Oreille WMA.
- Water right use and diversion was monitored on the Coeur d'Alene River and Boundary Creek WMAs.
- Stream flows were monitored on the Boundary Creek WMA.
- Waterfowl breeding pair/brood counts were completed on the Pend Oreille WMA.
- Waterfowl banding will occurred on four WMAs.
- Hunter check stations were operated on three WMAs.

- Noxious weed infestations were monitored on seven WMAs.

In addition to activities on Department-managed lands, the following survey and inventory work was completed on alternate areas to assist with collection of regional data utilized by the Wildlife Population Management Section.

- Bald eagle productivity was monitored throughout the Panhandle Region.
- Pheasant crow counts were conducted.
- Regional wildlife habitat biologists assisted with the operation of deer and elk hunter check stations.
- Regional wildlife habitat biologists assisted with winter aerial surveys for big game.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Bryan Helmich
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 769-1414
bhelmich@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Clearwater Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, and Nez Perce counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Collect current public use information on Department-managed lands, including public use levels, activities and harvest information. Collect current information on wildlife habitat and population characteristics on lands managed by the Department. Assist in collecting regional wildlife population information for statewide population management decisions. Monitor upland game populations in reference to new habitat improvement.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Project funding was combined with other license and federal funds to accomplish objectives.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Quantified visitor and agency use at the Red River WMA facility. Facility use averages 165 people annually with 530 user days.
- Conducted breeding bird survey on Red River WMA.
- Conducted furbearer snow track counts on USFS lands.
- Conducted regional waterfowl survey with wildlife population personnel.
- Spent approximately ten days assisting wildlife population personnel with big game surveys.
- Coordinated and conducted regional pheasant brood route surveys.
- Participated in black bear survey routes.
- Participated in regional wild turkey trapping and translocation activities.
- Conducted multiple crop residual pheasant flushing surveys to measure effectiveness of stubble management program.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Species progress reports, including elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, black bear, upland game, and waterfowl.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerome Hansen
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 799-5010
jhansen@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Southwest Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Idaho, Owyhee, Payette, Valley, and Washington counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District (west side) and 2nd Congressional District (east side).

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Collect current public use information on Department-managed lands, including public use levels, activities, and harvest information. Collect current information on wildlife habitat and population characteristics on lands managed by the Department. Assist in collecting regional wildlife population information for statewide population management decisions.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Work accomplished under this grant was done, in part, in support of regional and statewide wildlife population and habitat survey and inventory projects funded from non-project sources.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Public use information:

- Quantified visitor use on Department-managed areas using car counters in random surveys.
- Monitored indexes of hunter participation and success using annual check stations on opening days of upland and waterfowl seasons on Fort Boise WMA.
- Monitored use and success of hunters on Cecil D. Andrus WMA using season-long hunter check-in procedures.

Wildlife on Department lands:

- Continued progress in developing geographic information systems mapping skills through training, practice, and software support for WMA personnel to document and communicate wildlife habitat and population information on Department lands.
- Conducted annual brood pair counts on WMAs with waterfowl production.

- Measured forage utilization using standard techniques on Department lands with livestock grazing management.

Regional wildlife surveys:

- Trapped and banded migratory birds.
- Conducted counts of sage grouse leks and roadside counts for other game birds, including pheasants and mourning doves.
- Conducted aerial surveys of big game, waterfowl and chukars.
- Collected and analyzed condition and location information for big game traffic mortalities.
- Coordinated with Cooperative Weed Management Areas (CWMA) to inventory and map noxious weed infestations in respective habitat districts.
- Assisted in capture operations for regional mule deer winter survival studies.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerry Deal
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 465-8465
jdeal@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Magic Valley Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Blaine, Camas, Cassia, Elmore, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Owyhee, and Twin Falls, counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Collect current public use information on Department-managed lands including recreational uses, opinions, hunting success, and harvest. Collect current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information on Department-managed lands. Collect and obtain current fish and wildlife habitat and population characteristics information throughout the Magic Valley Region for statewide management recommendations.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Trailhead sign-in registers and random field surveys were conducted to determine visitor use on WMAs.
- Conducted random field checks of hunters on opening day of specific hunts and on weekends.
- Used traffic counters on WMAs to determine motorized access use during different seasons of the year.
- Worked with local Conservation Officers to enforce motorized closures on WMAs.
- Mapped noxious weed infestations and treatment areas using GPS and ARCVIEW software on Department-owned lands.
- Conducted riparian transect surveys and/or historical photo points to document riparian vegetation succession.
- Assisted regional IDFG population biologists, BLM, and USFS biologists with various field projects to determine fish and wildlife presence/absence, distribution, relative abundance, hunter or angler harvest information, and public response/acceptance, etc. to wildlife management programs and policies.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Mark Fleming
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 324-4359
mfleming@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Southeast Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bannock, Bear Lake, Caribou, Franklin, Power, and portions of Bingham and Oneida counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Collect current public use information on five WMAs and four access areas including recreational use, opinions, hunting success, and harvest. Collect current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information on all five WMAs in the region. Collect and/or obtain current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information for statewide management recommendations.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

PR funding was used to cover portions of permanent and temporary salaries as well as operating funds. All funding sources were used to accomplish the objectives as listed below.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Traffic counters were placed on all parking areas on Sterling WMA to obtain a total count of user visits throughout the hunting season. Information was correlated to more detailed information collected from interviews conducted through stratified random surveys. On all areas except Montpelier WMA, information was gathered at voluntary sign-in stations to gather opinions and information on types of use. Several days were expended monitoring use and compliance with the new travel management imposed on the Soda Hills Wildlife Mitigation Area.
- Established vegetation transects were surveyed on four big game winter ranges in order to document forage utilization and changes in plant condition and species composition. GPS and ArcView software was used to map plant communities and track noxious weed infestations. Department personnel coordinated closely with seven county weed departments and four CWMA's to share information.
- Sharp-tailed grouse lek surveys were conducted on the Portneuf WMA. Waterfowl pair counts and brood surveys were conducted on Sterling WMA.

- Habitat personnel assisted with aerial surveys, lek surveys, biological check stations, and research projects to monitor movements and population trends of waterfowl and big game.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

User information was not gathered at Montpelier WMA due to manpower limitations and increased focus on monitoring of use in the Soda Hills Wildlife Mitigation Area.

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

- User survey records: Summarized for Blackfoot River WMA, Georgetown Summit WMA, Portneuf WMA and Sterling WMA with internal regional memos.
- Waterfowl production records: Summarized for Sterling WMA in an internal regional report.
- Sharp-tailed grouse lek records: Summarized for Portneuf WMA in an internal regional report.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Paul Wackenhut
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 232-4703
pwackenhut@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Upper Snake Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Custer, Fremont, Jefferson, Lemhi, Madison, and Teton counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Collect public use information on Department-managed properties to determine public use levels, user activities, and harvest information. Collect information on wildlife habitat on public land. Collect information on wildlife populations on public land.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Funding for the management areas is a mixture of state license dollars, PR funds, and mitigation funds.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Public use information was collected via traffic counters, incidental personal contact surveys, and some stratified random surveys per regional protocol.
- Wildlife habitat was monitored on managed properties with permanent vegetation transects, photo points, and GIS mapping. An emphasis was placed on mapping noxious weeds and control operations.
- Wildlife populations were monitored in a wide variety of methods including lek survey routes, hunter harvest reports, aerial surveys, goose pair counts, point count surveys, wing barrels, brood counts, and direct observations of individuals and groups of animals.
- Piezometers were installed at the Sand Creek WMA to monitor water tables in order to determine effects on the federally threatened Ute's Ladies Tresses.
- Monitored habitat on some public land via field tours with federal and state agency personnel and through independent inspections of grazing allotments and proposed timber and range projects.

- Inspected sites for proposed subdivisions and reported findings in comment letters to county planning and zoning officials. Inspected proposed conservation easements submitted by the Teton Regional Land Trust (TRLT) as requested and reported findings to TRLT personnel.
- Assisted with trapping and banding of geese, ducks, and mourning doves. Assisted with trapping and radio-collaring of deer fawns and other big game for survey purposes.
- The RWHM was part of a statewide team to develop a new Department Strategic Plan (“The Compass”) which used focus groups and a random public survey to assess issues and concerns.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Results from wildlife population surveys and monitoring are published in PR reports prepared by the wildlife populations staff. Other survey data is recorded and kept in regional files.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Steve Schmidt
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 525-7290
sschmidt@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project IV – Survey and Inventory, Salmon Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Custer and Lemhi counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Collect current public use information on Department-managed lands including recreational use, opinions, hunting success, and harvest. Collect current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information on Department-managed lands. Collect and/or obtain current wildlife habitat and population characteristics information for Statewide management recommendations.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Assisted three CWMA's to inventory and map noxious weeds on critical habitat areas.
- Conducted three elk, one goat, one bighorn sheep and two deer surveys. Spring goose pair counts were conducted from Challis to North Fork. All sage-grouse lek routes were run four times, the data compiled and stored in regional databases.
- Assisted with fawn mortality studies in Units 36B and 30, sage-grouse telemetry in Unit 30, and conducted bear bait transects in Unit 36B.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Data from the surveys were incorporated into the appropriate PR reports and Department Management Plans.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Greg Painter
Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist
(208) 756-2271
gpainter@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: Statewide

4. Costs: Actual PR and State Match costs represent payments made through June 30, 2004. Expenditures after June 30, 2004 were not available for this report but will be included in the final financial statement submitted by December 29, 2004.

Source	Budgeted	Actual
Federal: PR	75,169	78,892
State: Match	25,056	26,297
Total Project	100,225	105,189

5. Objectives:

1. To provide current wildlife habitat and population information, concerns, and recommendations to state, federal, and private parties contemplating projects with the potential to affect wildlife.
2. To provide technical habitat and population management advice to public and private landowners and other agencies in order to sustain or enhance wildlife resources.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Technical guidance provided by habitat personnel to outside entities is funded by PR, State License, and other Federal grants. Combined expenditures from all funding sources exceeded \$130,700, not including leave and overhead costs. Federal assistance funds (including Idaho’s funding match) accounted for 63% of the combined expenditures associated with this larger undertaking.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Habitat personnel dedicated more than 700 days to implement the technical guidance project. Objectives were often met by working cooperatively and collaboratively with other state and federal agencies, private parties, and non-governmental organizations. Examples of how these objectives

were met include the following: hydropower relicensing, urban-wildland development, forest practices, livestock grazing management, range rehabilitation, noxious weed control, wetland and riparian enhancement, transportation projects, wind-power development, and wildlife habitat improvements on private property.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds.

Not applicable

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Idaho Habitat Program Annual Report for FY04

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jeff Gould
Statewide Wildlife Habitat Manager
208-334-2920
jgould@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Panhandle Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: To provide current wildlife habitat and population information, concerns, and recommendations to state, federal, and private parties contemplating projects with the potential to affect wildlife. To provide technical habitat and population management advice to public and private landowners and other agencies in order to sustain or enhance wildlife resources.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Panhandle Habitat Section staff met regularly with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), Farm Service Agency (FSA), Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Idaho Department of Lands (IDL), Idaho Department of Water Resources, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, and Idaho Department of Agriculture. Additionally, contact was maintained with the major private landowners throughout the Panhandle including timber companies, large farmers/ranchers, and hydropower operators. As requested by private entities and as deemed prudent with public entities, Panhandle Habitat Section Staff reviewed project proposals and provided input to reduce, eliminate, and/or mitigate for potential wildlife impacts associated with land management activities.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Bryan Helmich
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 769-1414
bhelmich@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Clearwater Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, and Nez Perce counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide current information on wildlife populations and habitat and provide recommendations to federal, state, and local government agencies, industry, and private parties regarding potential wildlife impacts and mitigation actions related to projects that they are proposing within the Clearwater Region. Work closely with the public, including private landowners, to maintain and improve habitat on both public and private lands. Provide technical assistance to the NRCS through the TSP program. Provide outdoor recreational opportunities. Share information with internal and external customers.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

TSP funding and support from the NRCS expanded landowner contacts and our ability to affect large acreages of habitat for upland game and other wildlife species.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Responded to an estimated 25 requests for comment on proposed projects within respective habitat districts or the Clearwater Region. Provided information on wildlife habitat, probable species impacts, and recommended mitigation measures using current available sources.
- Provided TSP services to NRCS. Completed 21 Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) contracts, eight Continuous CRP eligibility determinations, and 25 status reviews. Made contact with over 280 landowners in regard to NRCS programs, the LIP program, and the Department's HIP program and Pheasant Initiative.
- Participated on the Tri-State Weed Management committee; the Clearwater Weed Management committee; the Clearwater Elk Initiative; Senator Crapo's Elk Collaborative committee; the Dworshak Land Management committee; the Meadow Face Stewardship Monitoring Team; USFS Forest Plan Wildlife committee; the Cow Creek, Potlatch Creek, and Palouse River

Watershed Advisory Groups; NSWCD Conservation Priority Working Group; Palouse Technical Priority Working Group; and Nez Perce and Latah County AFO and EQUIP Technical committees. Worked with Latah SCD to establish a shared LIP Coordinator position. Provided wildlife habitat input to Bureau of Reclamation for the Mann Lake Wildlife Management Plan. Provided wildlife and habitat input on Northwest Power Planning Council's Salmon and Snake Sub-basin Plans. Wrote habitat related articles for newspaper or other public media outlets.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Elk Collaborative Report to Senator Crapo

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerome Hansen
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 799-5010
jhansen@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Southwest Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Idaho, Owyhee, Payette, Valley, and Washington counties in Idaho's 1st Congressional District (west side) and 2nd Congressional District (east side).

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide current wildlife population and habitat information, express concerns, and provide recommendations to federal, state, and local government agencies, industry, and private parties regarding potential wildlife impacts of projects which they are planning within the Southwest Region. Provide technical advice on wildlife habitat and species information to private parties and public entities to assist them in decisions on management activities which will sustain or enhance wildlife resources.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Regional habitat personnel responded to requests for technical assistance regarding potential impacts of proposed projects as requested either through individual evaluations and comment or participation in cooperative groups:

- In response to approximately 80 requests for comment on proposed projects within the Southwest Region, biologists provided information on wildlife habitat, probable species impacts, and recommended mitigation measures using current available sources resulting in 62 written responses.
- Participated in interagency and intradepartmental technical and advisory groups for species recovery, hydropower development, and regional planning.

Wildlife habitat program personnel responded as requested in person, via telephone, or letter to approximately 90 direct inquiries regarding methods and recommendations for management of wildlife habitat on private and public lands within the Southwest Region.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Jerry Deal
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 465-8465
jdeal@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Magic Valley Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Blaine, Camas, Cassia, Elmore, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Owyhee, and Twin Falls, counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide current wildlife habitat and population information, concerns, and recommendations to state, federal, and private parties contemplating projects with the potential to affect fish and wildlife resources in the Magic Valley Region. Provide technical habitat and population management advice to public and private landowners and other agencies in order to sustain or enhance wildlife resources.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Worked with BLM, USFS, FSA, NRCS, and similar entities by providing information regarding resident and migratory wildlife populations within the Magic Valley Region and how proposed land management practices or treatments may affect those resources directly and indirectly.
- Provided 97 written comments regarding proposed land management practices to city, county, state, and federal agencies.
- Provided technical assistance to 62 private landowners in the Magic Valley Region wishing to improve habitat for wildlife resources.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work. - NA -

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Mark Fleming
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 324-4359
mfleming@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Southeast Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bannock, Bear Lake, Caribou, Franklin, Power, and portions of Bingham and Oneida counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide current wildlife habitat and population information concerns, and recommendations to state, federal, and private parties contemplating projects with the potential to affect wildlife. Provide technical habitat and population management advice to public and private landowners and other agencies in order to sustain or enhance wildlife resources.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

PR funding was used to cover portions of permanent and temporary salaries as well as operating funds. All funding sources were used to accomplish the objectives as listed below.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Habitat staff worked closely with the regional Environmental Staff Biologist to gather and provide input or otherwise represent the Department on 26 projects, tours or meetings.
- Staff continued to monitor Farm Bill rules, assess potential impacts to wildlife values on CRP plantings, and provide input as requested including justification for Conservation Priority Areas and recommended dates to describe "primary nesting season".
- Provided technical advice for the development of management plans by land management agencies, including the Curlew Nat'l. Grasslands Management Plan (USFS), Greater Curlew Valley Sage Grouse Working Group Conservation Plan, the Caribou Forest Travel Plan (USFS), and the Soda Hills Wildlife Mitigation Area Management Plan (BLM, Shoshone Bannock Tribes).
- Provided technical assistance to approximately 75 private landowners for the improvement or development of wildlife habitat through the Habitat Management Program. This included the

development of 33 cooperative agreements as well as the improvement of 240 additional acres of private land (12 additional cooperators) at no cost to the landowner.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Greater Curlew Valley Sage Grouse Working Group Conservation Plan

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Paul Wackenhut
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 232-4703
pwackenhut@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Upper Snake Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Custer, Fremont, Jefferson, Lemhi, Madison, and Teton counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide wildlife habitat and population information, concerns, and recommendations to local, state, and federal agencies proposing projects or considering actions with the potential to affect wildlife. Provide assistance to private landowners who have interests in improving wildlife habitat on their property. Provide technical assistance which will sustain or enhance wildlife resources and which will help alleviate wildlife problems or concerns.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project.

Funding for the management areas is a mixture of state license dollars, PR funds, and mitigation funds.

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

Technical assistance was provided in written form, verbally, in person, and onsite.

8. Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -

9. List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.

Project comment letters are kept on file in the regional office.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Steve Schmidt
Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager
(208) 525-7290
sschmidt@idfg.state.id.us

**FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION
ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

1. State: Idaho

Grant number: W-173-D

Segment number: 20

Grant name: Wildlife Habitat Management

Project number and name: Project V – Technical Guidance, Salmon Region

2. Report Period: July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

Report due date: September 30, 2004

3. Location of work: All work was accomplished in Custer and Lemhi counties in Idaho's 2nd Congressional District.

4. Costs: See statewide summary for estimated costs.

5. Objectives: Provide current wildlife habitat and population information, concerns, and recommendations to state, federal, and private parties contemplating projects with the potential to affect wildlife. Provide technical habitat and population management advice to public and private landowners and other agencies in order to sustain or enhance wildlife resources.

6. If the work in this grant was part of a larger undertaking with other components and funding, present a brief overview of the larger activity and the role of this project. - NA -

7. Describe how the objectives were met.

- Provided 31 written comments to various federal, state, county agencies and cities addressing our wildlife concerns on proposed land management/development projects. This required attendance at 22 agency/interagency meetings. Created a template letter which addresses grazing issues in the Salmon Region.
- Continued participating as a steering committee member in the FCRONR Noxious Weed Management Area. Attended two meetings and one field trip on the Lemhi CWMA. Attended the Challis Stewardship LSGWG monthly meetings. Represented the Department on the Upper Salmon Sub-basin Watershed Planning Team. Represented the Region on the Department's TRD team which addressed the state's white-tailed deer management plan.
- Represented the Region on the Department's Statewide Lands Committee and the Challis Experimental Stewardship team. Met with SNRA personnel and evaluated recreational access needs in Stanley Basin. As a result, we cooperated in the development of one recreational site which now allows the fish planting truck access to Valley Creek. Access signs were also ordered (\$1,200.00) and will be placed this spring to better guide the public to fishing access areas on Valley Creek and the Salmon River.

8. **Discuss differences between work anticipated in grant proposal and grant agreement, and that actually carried out with Federal Aid grant funds. - NA -**
9. **List any publications or in-house reports resulting from this work.**

All response letters are kept in the region's archives. The letters and verbal responses at meetings are kept in various federal and state documents.

Name, title, phone number, and e-mail address of person compiling this report:

Greg Painter
Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist
(208) 756-2271
gpainter@idfg.state.id.us

Submitted by:

Bryan Helmich

Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager

Jerome Hansen

Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager

Jerry Deal

Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager

Mark Fleming

Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager

Paul Wackenhut

Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager

Steve Schmidt

Regional Wildlife Habitat Manager

Greg Painter

Regional Wildlife Habitat Biologist

Approved by: IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Dale E. Towell
Wildlife Program Coordinator
Federal Aid Coordinator

James W. Unsworth, Chief
Bureau of Wildlife

FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

The Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Program consists of funds from a 10% to 11% manufacturer's excise tax collected from the sale of handguns, sporting rifles, shotguns, ammunition, and archery equipment. The Federal Aid program then allots the funds back to states through a formula based on each state's geographic area and the number of paid hunting license holders in the state. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game uses the funds to help restore, conserve, manage, and enhance wild birds and mammals for the public benefit. These funds are also used to educate hunters to develop the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to be responsible, ethical hunters. Seventy-five percent of the funds for this project are from Federal Aid. The other 25% comes from license-generated funds.

