



Critical Habitat Impact Analysis Screening Tool Report

Date of Report: 3/14/2014

Species Name: Canada lynx

FWS Region(s): 1 3 5 6

This report provides information to support the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's economic analysis of critical habitat designation. In particular, this report considers the potential for the proposed rule to result in costs exceeding \$100 million in a single year. This report accordingly summarizes the units and areas where costs of critical habitat designation are anticipated to be minimal.

For some critical habitat rulemakings, additional information may be required to support the determination of whether impacts may approach \$100 million in a given year. For these rules, this report provides information on the proposed units or areas where critical habitat designation may generate substantial impacts. This information may be used to focus additional evaluation of the potential magnitude of economic impacts.

1. AREAS TO FOCUS ADDITIONAL EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

FWS should consider additional evaluation of the potential economic impacts of critical habitat designation in the units and areas described in this section. Responses to the questions indicate that the potential changes in the management of projects and activities in these areas may generate substantial costs. Additional evaluation will support the determination regarding whether these costs may approach \$100 million in a given year, and whether they are concentrated in a particular geographic area or on a particular economic sector.

For the areas identified in this section, the FWS should consider:

- a) What land and water use activities or projects are occurring that will require consultation?
- b) What project modifications may be recommended with respect to these activities to avoid adverse modification of critical habitat?

If no areas are identified in this section, additional evaluation of impacts is likely unnecessary.

For the areas described in this section of the report, consider impacts of incremental conservation recommendations on the following activities with a Federal nexus:

- Agriculture
- Border Protection
- Conservation/Restoration
- Development
- Fire Management
- Forest Management
- Mining
- Oil and Gas
- Recreation
- Renewable Energy
- Silviculture/Timber
- Transportation
- Tribes
- Utilities
- Grazing

● **Additional research on impacts to Tribes and Native populations:**

Native American, Native Alaskan, and Native Hawaiian land and resource use issues are often sensitive. The FWS may consider additional analysis for the following areas that overlap Tribal lands or may otherwise affect Native populations (e.g., by directly or indirectly limiting subsistence activities or activities that provide income and employment). Even where the FWS has indicated critical habitat is unlikely to change types or intensities of activities on Tribal lands, FWS may consider additional consideration of these areas. The additional analysis may also provide information on the socioeconomic characteristics of the Native populations potentially affected by the rule.

Unit	Occupancy	Tribe(s)/Native Group(s)	Acres	Percent	Stream Miles	Percent
1	Occupied	Passamaquoddy Tribe, Penobscot Nation	55680	0.8%		
2	Occupied	Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	49920	1.0%		

3	Occupied	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Nation	236000	3.5%		
---	----------	--	--------	------	--	--

2. AREAS FOR WHICH IMPACTS OF CRITICAL HABITAT ARE EXPECTED TO BE MINOR

This report section summarizes the proposed units and areas where critical habitat designation impacts are most likely minor. Designation of critical habitat in these areas is not expected to result in costs approaching \$100 million in a given year. If no areas are identified in this section, additional evaluation of impacts is recommended for all proposed critical habitat areas, as identified in Section 1. Note that the areas described in this section are not necessarily exclusive of those areas identified in Section 1 as areas may appear in both sections for separate reasons (e.g., no changes in consultations are expected but there is overlap with sensitive Tribal lands. Accordingly, consider all information provided in the complete report to determine whether and where additional research is warranted.

- **Significant impacts are not expected in the following areas that overlap other existing critical habitats or known ranges of listed species:**

The areas identified below overlap existing critical habitats or known ranges of other listed species. The FWS expects that critical habitat designation for the subject species will either: (1) not result in changes in conservation efforts recommended for projects occurring in these areas; or (2) generate only limited additional impacts due to changes in conservation efforts recommended for projects. Additional conservation recommendations in these areas overlapping existing critical habitats or listed species' ranges are not expected to limit the types or intensity of land or water use activities or generate substantial project delays.

Unit	Occupancy	Species/CH Overlapping	Acres	Percent	Stream Miles	Percent	Change
1	Occupied	Atlantic salmon (CH), Eastern prairie fringed orchid, Furbish lousewort	7143680	100.0%	1524		No
3	Occupied	Bull trout (CH), Grizzly bear	6703360	100.0%	897		No
4	Occupied	Bull trout (CH), Grizzly bear, Gray wolf, Northern spotted owl (CH)	1279360	100.0%	56		No
5	Occupied	Grizzly bear	6250240	100.0%			No

● **Significant economic impacts are not expected in occupied critical habitat areas.**

The following units are considered occupied by the species. For areas where the species is present, consultations will occur regardless of critical habitat designation and the FWS expects one of two scenarios is most likely following critical habitat designation. 1) Critical habitat will not generate changes in the outcome of section 7 consultations. In this case, the section 7-related incremental impacts of the designation will be limited to administrative costs in these units. Or, 2) critical habitat may result in incremental conservation recommendations but these recommendations will generate only limited additional compliance costs (e.g., direct costs of purchasing equipment or additional monitoring or reporting) and are not expected to restrict the types or intensity of economic activity, or substantially delay projects.

Unit/Subunit	Area - Acres	Percent - Acres	Area - Stream Miles	Percent - Stream Miles
1	7088000	99.2%		
2	5164160	99.0%		
3	6467360	96.5%		
4	1279360	100.0%		
5	6250240	100.0%		

● **Significant impacts are not expected in areas covered by the following conservation or land management plans:**

The areas identified below overlap conservation or land management plans. The FWS expects that either: 1) critical habitat will not change the conservation efforts implemented through these plans; or 2) critical habitat designation will generate only limited additional costs of implementing these plans (e.g., direct costs of purchasing equipment or additional monitoring or reporting). Additional conservation recommendations in the areas overlapping these management plans are not expected to limit the types or intensity of land or water use activities, or generate substantial project delays.

Unit	Occupancy	Management Plan Name(s)	Acres	Percent	Stream Miles	Percent	Activities Covered	Change?
1	Occupied	NRCS Healthy Forest Reserve Program	603648	8.5%			Some Activities Covered	No
2	Occupied	LCAS, USFS-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, Superior NF Amended Forest Plan	2472960	47.4%			Some Activities Covered	No
3	Occupied	LCAS, USFS-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, BLM-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, NRLMD, Amended Forest Plans, MTDNRC HCP	5711360	85.2%			Some Activities Covered	No

4	Occupied	LCAS, USFS-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, BLM-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, WADNR Lynx Mgmt. Plan	1276160	99.7%			Some Activities Covered	No
5	Occupied	LCAS, USFS-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, BLM-USFWS Lynx Conservation Agreement, NRLMD, Amended Forest Plans, MTDNRC HCP	6057600	96.9%			Some Activities Covered	No

- **The rulemaking is not likely to generate significant indirect impacts:**

This critical habitat rule is unlikely to trigger other regulatory requirements or economic impacts outside of the ESA. That is, the rule is not expected to result in additional or different state or local regulations or permitting and land use management practices.