



**Idaho Conservation
Data Center**

**Idaho Department of
Fish and Game
PO Box 25
Boise, Idaho
83707**



Idaho Wetland Conservation Prioritization Plan



Chase Lake Wetland, Photo by Robert Moseley

Lisa Hahn

Chris Murphy

Angie Schmidt

Tamara Fields

Prepared for



December, 2005

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODS	1
Candidate List.....	2
Wetland Ranking Method.....	2
Wetland Ranking Criteria	2
RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	4
Table 1. Criteria rank, score, and final rank for 200 wetlands in Idaho.....	5
GLOSSARY	11
LITERATURE CITED	15
Appendix 1. Ecological systems; rare plants, animals, and plant communities for top ten priority wetlands in Idaho.....	18
Appendix 2. Function and value criteria scoring for habitat and recreation attributes for top ten priority wetlands in Idaho.....	25
Appendix 3. Detailed function and value scoring for recreation attributes for top ten priority wetlands in Idaho.....	26
Appendix 4. Detailed scoring system for water quality threats for top ten priority wetlands in Idaho.....	27
Appendix 5. Detailed scoring system for landuses and landscape threats for top ten priority wetlands in Idaho.....	28
Appendix 6. Detailed accounts of top ten priority wetlands in Idaho.....	29
Appendix 7. Maps of top ten priority wetlands in Idaho	33

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people provided valuable input into the Idaho Wetland Conservation Prioritization Plan. In particular, we thank Rick Just of the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, and the following employees of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game: Dale Allen, Scott Bailey, Bill Bosworth, Kevin Church, Shelley Cooke, Rita Dixon, Diane Evans Mack, Sara Focht, Lauri Hanauska-Brown, Jim Hayden, Michael Mancuso, Jeff Rohlman, Steve Rust, Rob Ryan, Joel Sauder, Tracey Trent, Martha Wackenhut, Paul Wackenhut, and Beth Waterbury.

INTRODUCTION

From 1780 to 1980, approximately 56% [156,200 hectares (386,000 acres)] of Idaho's wetlands were lost to drainage, dredging, filling, leveling, flooding, and other anthropogenic alterations (Dahl 1990). However, in the last 20 years the rate of wetland loss across the nation has decreased significantly (Dahl 2000). Greater recognition of the benefits and functions of wetlands has led to strengthened wetland regulations, policies, and conservation. In particular, the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act (EWRA) (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990) and associated National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP) (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991) provided the framework and guidance for wetlands conservation. The EWRA mandates that to be eligible for Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) states must address wetlands as an important recreation and natural resource in their State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan (SCORTP) in a manner consistent with the NWPCP. Specifically, each state is directed to develop a prioritized list of wetlands that meet three broad threshold criteria: (1) support rare or declining wetland types; (2) experience a high level of threats to wetland functions; and (3) represent a diversity or high levels of important functions and values (including recreation), or especially high value for specific functions (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991). In Idaho, SCORTP is revised and updated at approximately four year intervals by the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR). The Idaho Wetland Conservation Prioritization Plan identifies priority wetlands for conservation as required for SCORTP under EWRA.

METHODS

For this report a wetland is defined as 'a land inclusion that has a predominance of hydric soils; is inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support a prevalence of hydrophytic vegetation; and supports a prevalence of such vegetation under normal circumstances (e.g., marsh, vernal pool, riparian zone, wet meadow, peatland).' We used the Idaho Wetlands Information System (IWIS) and conservation site databases of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) Idaho Conservation Data Center (IDCDC) as the primary sources of spatial and ecological data to generate a candidate list of wetlands for initial consideration. The IWIS is a comprehensive relational database pertaining specifically to wetlands in Idaho. The information consists of wetland classification, size, ownership, potential partners for acquisition, preservation, recreation value, unique feature (e.g., rare plant or animal), potential threat, and public access for each site. These data were initially compiled for the SCORTP process in 1992 (Pfeifer and Towell 1992) and updated by IDFG as additional data become available. By 2002, IWIS included 192 wetlands, excluding relatively narrow riparian habitat.

The conservation site database contains spatial and ecological information on more than 500 sites in Idaho that include a wetland component. Sites represent a variety of ecosystems consisting of intact ecological processes, exemplary native plant communities, unique geologic processes, or important habitat for species (e.g., Important Bird Areas). Conservation site boundaries often include most of the land area

necessary to maintain the ecological processes of interest. Each site record contains information pertaining to location, biological significance, ecological processes and functions, ecological condition and integrity, conservation status, and stewardship.

We considered wetlands from throughout the state, however, large information gaps exist for significant portions of Idaho. For example, data are lacking on wetlands in many of the areas designated as Wilderness in central Idaho, or along Wild, Scenic, and Recreation rivers (e.g., Middle Fork of the Salmon River, main stem of the Salmon River, Snake River in Hells Canyon, Rapid River, Lochsa River, Selway River, and Middle Fork of the Clearwater River).

Candidate List

We identified a list of 200 wetlands using coarse filter analyses on the conservation sites database and the IWIS. First, we removed from consideration wetland related conservation sites with the following attributes: (1) entirely protected by designated Wilderness, National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service Research Natural Areas or Special Interest Areas; (2) entirely surrounded by federal land (unless highly unique and unprotected or juxtaposed a private land in-holding); or (3) containing only narrow riparian habitat, typically found on low-order streams, in geologically confined canyons, or around subalpine lakes. Second, we removed from consideration wetlands ranked in the lower 25 percentile of the previous IWIS (Pfeifer and Toweill 1992), unless they consisted of a uniquely valuable biological attribute (e.g., rare plant community). Third, conservation sites and IWIS wetlands were georeferenced and records that were spatially redundant were eliminated. In addition, conservation sites and IWIS wetlands less than 1 km were considered one wetland. The result was a list of 200 wetlands that was sent to IDFG biologists for their deductive assessments. Based on the input from biologists, it appeared the most significant wetlands were included among the list of 200.

Wetland Ranking Method

Consistent with the intent of NWPCP and previous SCORTP documents, we prioritized the 200 wetlands by ranking each of the three wetland criteria separately, based on each criteria score, and then summed the three criteria ranks and scores. The higher the criteria rank sum, the higher the final rank. In cases of a tie criteria rank sum, the higher criteria score sum results in a higher final rank (Table 1).

Wetland Ranking Criteria

Wetland Type: We used the statewide coverage of ecological systems described in the Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (Idaho Department of Fish and Game 2005 a) to measure landscape level diversity at a mid-scale. "Ecological systems represent recurring groups of biological communities that are found in similar physical environments and are influenced by similar dynamic ecological processes, such as fire or flooding. They are intended to provide a classification unit that is readily mappable,

often from remote imagery, and readily identifiable by conservation and resource managers in the field (Comer et al. 2003).” We assumed that wetlands with the greatest diversity of wetland ecological systems were the most valuable, and were assigned a correspondingly higher value than those with relatively less diversity.

Wetland Function and Value: As required by NWPCP, wetland function and value should be considered during the prioritization process. We independently measured habitat and recreation attributes to determine the function and value for each wetland. Habitat attributes were measured in two ways that placed a greater value on wetlands associated with wetland dependent rare species (plants and animals) and globally rare (G1-G3) wetland plant communities. First, we used the frequency of rare species and rare plant communities (Idaho Conservation Data Center 2005, Idaho Department of Fish and Game 2005 b) to assign a richness score for habitat function and value. Second, we used Class I and Class II wetlands as described in Wetland Conservation Strategies for the state of Idaho (Bottum 2004, 2005; Jankovsky-Jones 1996, 1997 a, 1997 b, 1997 c, 1998, 1999, 2001 a, 2001 b; Jankovsky-Jones and Bottum 2003) to indicate high quality wetland sites. Specifically, we assigned a score of two to wetlands with all or part of it considered as a Class I wetland, one to Class II, and zero to all others. For example, a wetland with three rare species, two rare plant communities, and a Class II designation received a nominal score of seven ($3+2+2=7$).

The recreation attributes were measured in two ways. First, we determined the presence or absence of recreational opportunities (e.g., boating, camping, environmental education, fishing, hiking, hunting, swimming, nature observation) based on 1. a geospatial data compilation of managed areas by various federal and state agencies, 2. BLM recreation sites (U. S. Bureau of Land Management 2005), 3. private land access points (Idaho Department of Fish and Game 2005 c), 4. IWIS recreation designation (Pfeifer and Toweill 1992), 5. maps and atlases. Second, as a measure of accessibility to human populations we assigned a score of one to all wetlands less than 80 kilometers (km) (less than 50 miles) to an urban center (high intensity urban ecological system or towns and cities with a population greater than 1000) (NatureServe 2004). Wetlands greater than 80 km received a score of zero. For example, if the same wetland as mentioned in the habitat example also had facilities specifically for boating and camping, was managed to provide hunting opportunities (e.g., IDFG Wildlife Management Area), and was less than 80 km to an urban center it was assigned a score of four ($3+1=4$). As a result, the overall score for the function and value of the wetland in this example is eleven [$(3+2+2)+(3+1)=11$: (habitat) + (recreational) = sum score for wetland function and value].

Wetland Threat: The NWPCP requires threat assessments for wetlands. We measured the threat for each wetland based on water quality, land use, and watershed processes and hydrologic connectivity. The frequency of water quality impairments (e.g., ammonia, bacteria, dissolved oxygen, flow alteration, habitat alteration, metals, organic pollutants, sediment, pesticides) as a threat to function and value for each wetland was derived from the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) that exceeded water quality standards (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality 2005). The percentage of a

wetland in urban and agricultural land uses (geospatial data) (percent normalized by dividing by 10), and the density of roads associated with a wetland (geospatial data) (length / wetland area and normalized by multiplying by 10) were used as a surrogate measure of the potential threat of these environments (e.g., wetland drainage, filling, dredging, stream channelization and diversion, and alteration of the natural hydrologic regime). Last, we used the frequency and impact of dams and diversions in the vicinity of a wetland (Idaho Department of Water Resources et al. 2002) to indicate potential disruption of watershed processes and hydrologic connectivity at the landscape level.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

We used a variety of wetland related data, GIS analyses, and refined criteria to prioritize wetlands in Idaho. The results are limited by the quality and accuracy of the data available at present time. A cursory examination of the top ten wetlands indicates the results are representative of the diversity of wetlands found throughout Idaho (Table 1). Moreover, the data of the top ten wetlands in Idaho (based on criteria in this report) are summarized to facilitate different synthesis based on a variety of objectives (Appendices 1-5). Detailed narratives and associated maps for the top ten wetlands supports the conclusion that wetlands of all types found throughout Idaho have the potential to be extremely valuable depending upon the context (Appendices 6 and 7).

Wetlands are highly valued by the citizens of Idaho for their habitat and recreational functions and values. Many wetlands are threatened by a variety of factors. This Plan identified and ranked 200 wetlands for conservation actions based on NWPCP and EWRA criteria.

Table 1. Criteria rank, score, and final rank for 200 wetlands in Idaho.

Wetland	Criteria rank (Criteria score)				Final Rank
	Type +	Function +	Threat =	Sum	
Upper Snake River/Lower Henrys Fork	199.5 (10)	199.0 (55)	170.5 (13.22)	569.0 (78.22)	1
Big Lost River Valley	164.5 (6)	186.5 (29)	197.0 (17.94)	548.0 (52.94)	2
Bear Lake Wetlands	164.5 (6)	194.0 (35)	170.5 (12.70)	529.0 (53.70)	3
Lake Walcott/Lake Channel Canyon	164.5 (6)	190.5 (30)	170.5 (12.51)	525.5 (48.51)	4
American Falls Reservoir/Fort Hall Bottoms	164.5 (6)	197.0 (37)	154.0 (11.60)	515.5 (54.60)	5
Teton Basin	164.5 (6)	177.0 (24)	170.5 (12.84)	512.0 (42.84)	6
Clark Fork River Delta	164.5 (6)	173.5 (23)	170.5 (12.98)	508.5 (41.98)	7
Silver Creek	164.5 (6)	158.0 (19)	182.5 (13.57)	505.0 (38.57)	8
Lower Coeur d'Alene River Valley	164.5 (6)	136.5 (15)	194.5 (16.55)	495.5 (37.55)	9
Hoodoo Lake/Lambertson Lake/Kelso Lake Wetlands	184.0 (7)	190.5 (30)	108.5 (6.81)	483.0 (43.81)	10
Blackfoot Reservoir/Wilson Flat	164.5 (6)	186.5 (29)	131.0 (10.23)	482.0 (45.23)	11
Grays Lake Wetlands	196.5 (9)	171.0 (22)	114.5 (8.24)	482.0 (39.24)	12
Lolo Creek Canyon	184.0 (7)	127.5 (14)	170.5 (12.72)	482.0 (33.72)	13
Camas Creek (Jeffereson County)/Mud Lake	133.0 (5)	190.5 (30)	154.0 (11.80)	477.5 (46.80)	14
Pack River	164.5 (6)	152.5 (17)	154.0 (11.72)	471.0 (34.72)	15
North Fork Clearwater River	199.5 (10)	195.5 (36)	72.5 (2.58)	467.5 (48.58)	16
McArthur Lake	164.5 (6)	180.5 (25)	122.5 (8.78)	467.5 (39.78)	17
Pahsimeroi River Valley	90.5 (4)	180.5 (25)	182.5 (13.92)	453.5 (42.92)	18
Salmon River Bottoms	133.0 (5)	164.0 (20)	154.0 (11.75)	451.0 (36.75)	19
St. Joe River	184.0 (7)	164.0 (20)	102.5 (6.21)	450.5 (33.21)	20
Middle Snake River Springs	90.5 (4)	177.0 (24)	182.5 (13.73)	450.0 (41.73)	21
Henrys Lake	196.5 (9)	177.0 (24)	72.5 (2.54)	446.0 (35.54)	22
Upper Priest Lake Wetlands	196.5 (9)	200.0 (72)	48.5 (2.28)	445.0 (83.28)	23
Kootenai National Wildlife Refuge	133.0 (5)	152.5 (17)	154.0 (12.38)	439.5 (34.38)	24
Priest River Wetlands	133.0 (5)	198.0 (41)	102.5 (6.46)	433.5 (52.46)	25
Payette River/Birding Islands	90.5 (4)	144.0 (16)	194.5 (17.05)	429.0 (37.05)	26
Moyie River Valley	133.0 (5)	186.5 (29)	108.5 (6.99)	428.0 (40.99)	27
North Fork Payette River - McCall to Cascade Reservoir	133.0 (5)	164.0 (20)	131.0 (9.81)	428.0 (34.81)	28
Lower Selway/Middle Fork Clearwater River	193.0 (8)	158.0 (19)	72.5 (2.84)	423.5 (29.84)	29
Billingsley Creek/Hagerman Valley	90.5 (4)	144.0 (16)	188.0 (14.78)	422.5 (34.78)	30
Thurmon Creek	184.0 (7)	144.0 (16)	94.0 (4.92)	422.0 (27.92)	31
Lake Fork Creek	133.0 (5)	99.5 (12)	188.0 (14.72)	420.5 (31.72)	32
Twin Lakes	133.0 (5)	164.0 (20)	122.5 (9.47)	419.5 (34.47)	33
Bismark Meadows	133.0 (5)	193.0 (31)	85.0 (3.83)	411.0 (39.83)	34
C.J. Strike Reservoir	53.5 (3)	186.5 (29)	170.5 (13.41)	410.5 (45.41)	35
Hixon Preserve	184.0 (7)	171.0 (22)	48.5 (2.37)	403.5 (31.37)	36

Wetland	Criteria rank (Criteria score)				Final Rank
	Type +	Function +	Threat =	Sum	
Summit Creek	133.0 (5)	173.5 (23)	94.0 (5.26)	400.5 (33.26)	37
Sheridan Creek	184.0 (7)	60.0 (9)	154.0 (11.80)	398.0 (27.80)	38
Lower Boise River Valley/Fort Boise	53.5 (3)	144.0 (16)	199.0 (18.84)	396.5 (37.84)	39
East Fork Salmon River	196.5 (9)	127.5 (14)	72.5 (2.82)	396.5 (25.82)	40
Upper Coeur d'Alene River	193.0 (8)	113.0 (13)	85.0 (4.17)	391.0 (25.17)	41
Rose Lake	133.0 (5)	152.5 (17)	102.5 (6.06)	388.0 (28.06)	42
Hauser Lake	133.0 (5)	113.0 (13)	140.0 (10.78)	386.0 (28.78)	43
Duck Creek	133.0 (5)	136.5 (15)	114.5 (8.21)	384.0 (28.21)	44
Salmon River (Squaw Bar to Lucile)	184.0 (7)	127.5 (14)	72.5 (2.51)	384.0 (23.51)	45
Rock Creek	90.5 (4)	99.5 (12)	191.5 (16.00)	381.5 (32.00)	46
Eighteenmile Creek	164.5 (6)	113.0 (13)	102.5 (5.60)	380.0 (24.60)	47
Chase Lake/Lee Lake	133.0 (5)	195.5 (36)	48.5 (2.34)	377.0 (43.34)	48
Hotel Creek	164.5 (6)	127.5 (14)	85.0 (4.20)	377.0 (24.20)	49
Owyhee Canyonlands	90.5 (4)	190.5 (30)	94.0 (5.32)	375.0 (39.32)	52
Cocolalla Slough	133.0 (5)	88.0 (11)	154.0 (12.43)	375.0 (28.43)	50
Thomas Fork Valley	133.0 (5)	88.0 (11)	154.0 (12.14)	375.0 (28.14)	51
Hill City Marsh	90.5 (4)	144.0 (16)	140.0 (10.65)	374.5 (30.65)	53
Marsh Valley	90.5 (4)	113.0 (13)	170.5 (12.97)	374.0 (29.97)	54
Kalispell Bay Fen	133.0 (5)	152.5 (17)	85.0 (4.27)	370.5 (26.27)	55
Upper Blackfoot River (Upper Valley/Lanes Creek)	184.0 (7)	113.0 (13)	72.5 (2.83)	369.5 (22.83)	56
Texas Creek	90.5 (4)	164.0 (20)	114.5 (7.58)	369.0 (31.58)	57
Portneuf River Valley	164.5 (6)	7.0 (4)	197.0 (17.89)	368.5 (27.89)	58
Lower St. Joe River/River in a Lake	133.0 (5)	113.0 (13)	122.5 (8.72)	368.5 (26.72)	59
Boise River (Barber to Boise)	27.5 (2)	158.0 (19)	182.5 (13.97)	368.0 (34.97)	60
Hughes Meadows	193.0 (8)	152.5 (17)	21.0 (1.08)	366.5 (26.08)	61
Stanley Basin	90.5 (4)	152.5 (17)	122.5 (9.15)	365.5 (30.15)	62
Island Park Reservoir	164.5 (6)	127.5 (14)	72.5 (3.40)	364.5 (23.40)	63
Bear Valley	133.0 (5)	182.0 (26)	48.5 (1.73)	363.5 (32.73)	64
Banner Creek Fen	164.5 (6)	177.0 (24)	21.0 (.73)	362.5 (30.73)	65
Coeur d'Alene Lake (Wolf Lodge, Beauty, and Blue Creek Bays)	164.5 (6)	75.0 (10)	122.5 (8.64)	362.0 (24.64)	66
Upper Blackfoot River (Lower Valley/Woodall Springs)	90.5 (4)	99.5 (12)	170.5 (12.54)	360.5 (28.54)	67
Payette River/Montour Valley	90.5 (4)	136.5 (15)	131.0 (10.27)	358.0 (29.27)	68
Lamb Creek Meadows	133.0 (5)	152.5 (17)	72.5 (2.56)	358.0 (24.56)	69
Robinson Lake/Round Prairie	164.5 (6)	144.0 (16)	48.5 (1.92)	357.0 (23.92)	70
Burgdorf Meadow	133.0 (5)	144.0 (16)	72.5 (3.01)	349.5 (24.01)	71
Muskrat Lake	133.0 (5)	45.0 (8)	170.5 (13.04)	348.5 (26.04)	72
Coeur d'Alene Lake (Spokane River Outlet)	90.5 (4)	60.0 (9)	197.0 (18.27)	347.5 (31.27)	73
Morton Slough	133.0 (5)	60.0 (9)	154.0 (11.61)	347.0 (25.61)	74

Wetland	Criteria rank (Criteria score)				Final Rank
	Type +	Function +	Threat =	Sum	
Crystal Springs	27.5 (2)	136.5 (15)	182.5 (13.51)	346.5 (30.51)	75
Gamlin Lake/Beaver Lake South	133.0 (5)	164.0 (20)	48.5 (2.26)	345.5 (27.26)	76
Birch Creek Valley	53.5 (3)	177.0 (24)	114.5 (8.35)	345.0 (35.35)	77
Robinson Creek	184.0 (7)	88.0 (11)	72.5 (2.73)	344.5 (20.73)	78
Kelly Park (Soda Springs)	53.5 (3)	99.5 (12)	182.5 (14.37)	335.5 (29.37)	79
South Fork Boise River (Featherville to Pine)	133.0 (5)	127.5 (14)	72.5 (2.77)	333.0 (21.77)	80
Pole Creek Meadows	133.0 (5)	171.0 (22)	21.0 (1.29)	325.0 (28.29)	83
St. Maries River	133.0 (5)	88.0 (11)	102.5 (6.31)	323.5 (22.31)	84
Tule Lake/Warm Lake	90.5 (4)	183.5 (28)	48.5 (2.42)	322.5 (34.42)	85
Coeur d'Alene Lake (Windy Bay)	90.5 (4)	75.0 (10)	154.0 (11.94)	319.5 (25.94)	86
Sand Creek	133.0 (5)	75.0 (10)	108.5 (7.16)	316.5 (22.16)	87
Coeur d'Alene Lake (Rockford Bay)	90.5 (4)	30.5 (7)	191.5 (16.03)	312.5 (27.03)	88
Henrys Fork/Flat Ranch	90.5 (4)	127.5 (14)	94.0 (5.19)	312.0 (23.19)	89
Carey Lake	53.5 (3)	75.0 (10)	182.5 (14.18)	311.0 (27.18)	90
Fernan Lake	133.0 (5)	75.0 (10)	102.5 (6.31)	310.5 (21.31)	91
North Fork Payette River Meanders/North Beach Payette Lake	133.0 (5)	127.5 (14)	48.5 (1.96)	309.0 (20.96)	92
Beaver Creek Fen	133.0 (5)	152.5 (17)	21.0 (.86)	306.5 (22.86)	93
Oxford Slough/Swan Lake	27.5 (2)	164.0 (20)	114.5 (8.22)	306.0 (30.22)	94
Hobo Creek Cedar Grove	133.0 (5)	88.0 (11)	85.0 (3.91)	306.0 (19.91)	95
Bear Creek Fen	90.5 (4)	164.0 (20)	48.5 (2.23)	303.0 (26.23)	96
Blue Lake	90.5 (4)	127.5 (14)	85.0 (3.85)	303.0 (21.85)	97
Packer Meadows	164.5 (6)	113.0 (13)	21.0 (.66)	298.5 (19.66)	98
Perkins Lake	90.5 (4)	183.5 (28)	21.0 (1.45)	295.0 (33.45)	99
Soda Springs Natural Scenic Area	9.0 (1)	113.0 (13)	170.5 (13.05)	292.5 (27.05)	100
Westmond Lake	90.5 (4)	30.5 (7)	170.5 (12.61)	291.5 (23.61)	101
Boyer Slough	90.5 (4)	30.5 (7)	170.5 (12.56)	291.5 (23.56)	102
Chester Wetlands/Henrys Fork	90.5 (4)	60.0 (9)	140.0 (10.59)	290.5 (23.59)	103
Keyser's Slough	53.5 (3)	45.0 (8)	191.5 (16.06)	290.0 (27.06)	104
Bruneau River/Jarbidge River	53.5 (3)	164.0 (20)	72.5 (3.34)	290.0 (26.34)	105
Salmon River (Allison Creek Island)	53.5 (3)	113.0 (13)	122.5 (9.43)	289.0 (25.43)	106
Red River Meadows	90.5 (4)	88.0 (11)	108.5 (6.66)	287.0 (21.66)	107
Lake Lowell	53.5 (3)	99.5 (12)	131.0 (10.50)	284.0 (25.50)	108
Little Wood River/High Five	27.5 (2)	99.5 (12)	154.0 (12.36)	281.0 (26.36)	109
Willow Creek (Valley County)	90.5 (4)	18.5 (6)	170.5 (12.81)	279.5 (22.81)	110
Coeur d'Alene Lake (Cougar Bay)	90.5 (4)	88.0 (11)	94.0 (5.15)	272.5 (20.15)	111
Spirit Lake	133.0 (5)	45.0 (8)	94.0 (5.47)	272.0 (18.47)	112
Duck Valley Indian Reservation	53.5 (3)	144.0 (16)	72.5 (3.23)	270.0 (22.23)	113
Walsh Lake	90.5 (4)	7.0 (4)	170.5 (13.07)	268.0 (21.07)	114