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# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ArcGIS</td>
<td>A process for working with maps and geographic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibola NWR</td>
<td>Cibola National Wildlife Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMM</td>
<td>Hart Mine Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCR MSCP</td>
<td>Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lidar</td>
<td>Light detection and ranging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGVD29</td>
<td>National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>The acidity or basicity (alkalinity) of an aqueous solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>Less than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µs/cm</td>
<td>Microsiemens per centimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Milligram(s) per liter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this annual report is to summarize all activities that have occurred at Hart Mine Marsh (HMM) from October 1, 2016, through September 30, 2017, which is Federal fiscal year (FY) 2017, and projected activities for FY18. Water usage is presented for the calendar year, January 1 through December 31, 2017, consistent with the Colorado River Accounting and Water Use Report: Arizona, California, and Nevada, Calendar Year 2017 (Bureau of Reclamation [Reclamation] 2018).

1.1 Background

The Cibola National Wildlife Refuge (Cibola NWR) consists of about 16,600 acres of land located along approximately 12 miles of the lower Colorado River in Arizona and California. It was established in 1964 as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife.

The Hart Mine Marsh Management Unit is a subunit of Unit 2, located on the southern end of the Cibola NWR in Arizona. The management unit encompasses approximately 646 acres, with approximately 523 acres that have wetland development potential and classify as “wetlands” according to the Regional Supplement to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2018). Approximately 255 acres within this area now make up HMM.

HMM was a decadent wetland on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) Cibola NWR. The channelization of the lower Colorado River in the vicinity of the marsh caused a drop in the water table, and the marsh became disconnected from the former flood plain. The river’s hydrograph has been altered so that it no longer has large, dynamic overbank flow events that would have likely created and maintained HMM. Subsequently, the marsh was reduced to a much smaller area of open water and emergent vegetation (approximately 20 acres). The surrounding areas were colonized primarily by saltcedar (Tamarix spp.), an invasive, non-native species. For years, the remaining marsh was characterized as having poor water quality, marginal wetland/marsh habitat, and saline soils, which included some areas completely devoid of vegetation. In addition, the design of the marsh’s infrastructure and the way it was managed may have contributed to the decadent state of the marsh by increasing concentrations of salinity and nitrogen.

Surface water inputs to HMM after the channelization of the lower Colorado River were supplied from three main sources: Arnett (drainage) Ditch, the Cibola NWR’s Unit 2 irrigation ditch, and tributary inflows from adjacent alluvial fans. During this period of management, the surface water hydrology of the marsh was
highly dependent on irrigation practices in adjacent farming areas and episodic precipitation events in the uplands. Additionally, all three surface water sources terminated in the marsh, with only limited surface water outflows (Hautzinger et al. 2007).

Prior to restoration activities, there was little existing marsh cover type (open water and emergent vegetation) occupying this site. The majority of the site (80%) was dominated by various classes of saltcedar associations. A portion of the 646 acres defined as the Hart Mine Marsh Management Unit was selected for establishment as a Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (LCR MSCP) conservation area. This area now comprises approximately 255 acres designated as HMM.

HMM was identified as a site with potential for marsh habitat restoration by the USFWS and Reclamation before the implementation of the LCR MSCP. The USFWS’s Lower Colorado River Refuges Comprehensive Management Plan and Ecological Assessment (USFWS 1993) also targeted HMM as a restoration priority. In the mid-1990s, a number of improvements were made, which included the extension of Arnett Ditch past the Hart Mine Marsh Management Unit with the installation of a controlled outflow through the tie-back levee and a series of control structures along this ditch extension. These control structures were designed to allow for drain water from Arnett Ditch to be diverted into the Hart Mine Marsh Management Unit.

With the authorization of the LCR MSCP and the mutual desire of the USFWS and Reclamation to restore HMM, a partnership between the two agencies was formed. As part of the planning effort for the restoration partnership at HMM, the USFWS hosted a Wetland Review at the Cibola NWR. The participants in the review prepared a draft document that included a number of desired features and approaches for restoration of the site – many of which could be incorporated into a restoration design (these are discussed in more detail in the Hart Mine Marsh Restoration Development and Monitoring Plan [LCR MSCP 2009]). Using baseline information gathered and complied by the USFWS, in the Hart Mine Marsh – Existing Conditions Report (Hautzinger et al. 2007) and guided in part by the wetland review process, Reclamation developed an appropriate engineering design and approach that was intended to fulfill both the needs of the Cibola NWR and those of the LCR MSCP.

2.0 CONSERVATION AREA INFORMATION

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this project is to restore portions of HMM to functional marsh habitats that support species covered under the LCR MSCP – specifically, Yuma clapper rails (*Rallus longirostris yumanensis* [also known as Yuma
Ridgway’s rail = *R. obsoletus yumanensis*), western least bitterns (*Ixobrychus exilis hesperis*), and Colorado River cotton rats (*Sigmodon arizonae plenus*). It is likely that the creation of a mosaic of marsh habitat will also benefit a host of other species, including California black rails (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*), as well as other wading birds and migratory waterfowl.

### 2.2 Location

HMM is located in Arizona in Reach 4, within the Cibola NWR, approximately 15 miles south of Blythe, California. It is within the historic flood plain of the lower Colorado River and adjacent to River Miles 90 to 93 on the Arizona side (figure 1).

### 2.3 Landownership

The property is owned by the USFWS, who dedicate land and water to Reclamation for habitat development and maintenance of land cover types for the LCR MSCP.

### 2.4 Water

The Cibola NWR has 2nd priority water rights. These include a diversionary entitlement of 27,000 acre-feets per year and a consumptive use entitlement (diversion minus return flow) of 16,793 acre-feet per year. In addition, the refuge has a circulatory (circulation water with minimum consumptive use) water right of 7,500 acre-feet per year. HMM will have an average of 1,258 acre-feet per year (7.23 acre-feet per acre, per year) available when it has been fully developed.

### 2.5 Agreements

A Land Use Agreement for general restoration activities on the Cibola NWR has been executed and is on file. Attachment (2) to Exhibit B of the aforementioned Land Use Agreement, which specifies the activities at HMM, has been finalized and secures the land and water resources at HMM for the 50-year term of the LCR MSCP.

### 2.6 Public Use

Public use on HMM is managed by the USFWS. In cooperation with Reclamation, the USFWS coordinates its public use and related activities so
Figure 1.—General location of HMM.
they are compatible with management of the site for the LCR MSCP. Duck hunting is permitted at HMM from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. during the Arizona State waterfowl season. Other low-impact public uses, such as wildlife watching, sport fishing, and education/outreach, are expected at HMM; however, these uses may be regulated depending on future occupation of listed species.

2.7 Law Enforcement

Law enforcement activities are performed primarily by the USFWS’s Law Enforcement Officer, under the LCR MSCP’s site-specific Fire Management & Law Enforcement Strategy (LCR MSCP 2010). Additional local law enforcement assistance is available through the La Paz County Sheriff’s Office and the Bureau of Land Management’s Yuma Field Office.

2.8 Wildfire Management

The USFWS will provide an appropriate management response to all wildfires that occur within the Cibola NWR. The full range of suppression strategies is available to managers provided that selected options do not compromise firefighter/public safety or cost effectiveness while protecting wildlife habitat (LCR MSCP 2010).

3.0 Habitat Development and Management

Figure 2 shows the established land cover types that are being managed for LCR MSCP covered species.

3.1 Planting

No planting occurred in 2017, as HMM is fully developed.

3.2 Irrigation

Operation and management of HMM primarily relates to the control, manipulation, and management of water on the site. Cells 1 and 2 can be
Figure 2.—Managed acreage at HMM through FY17.
operated independently in terms of surface elevations and inlets and outlets. This is accomplished through a series of gated and/or stoplog-type control structures located on Arnett Ditch and between the cells. HMM is supplied with water from Arnett Ditch through a series of control structures and by using gravity flow through the marsh cells. Currently, this source of water in Arnett Ditch can also be supplemented with Colorado River water by using the Unit 2 pumps and infrastructure. To provide water for HMM using a source other than the ditch (drain water), the conservation area relies on the water conveyance infrastructure associated with the refuge’s Unit 2 management area. This infrastructure includes two electric pumps and a series of buried pipe and concrete-lined supply canals, which is shared by the refuge, contract farmers, adjacent private landowners, and HMM. Currently, the LCR MSCP shares the electrical costs of pumping water through this infrastructure and may also share in the cost of maintenance and repair to the system as is provided for in the existing Land Use Agreement. Since the completion of Phase 3, Colorado River water, unmixed with drain water from Arnett Ditch, can now be supplied to HMM using the Unit 2 delivery canals.

The outlet works for HMM also allow for flexibility in where the water exiting the marsh and Arnett Ditch can be discharged. Water draining from the marsh and ditch can be routed through Cibola Lake or directly back to the Colorado River through a pair of gated control structures located along Arnett Ditch south of HMM.

### 3.3 Site Management

Since one of the HMM targeted species is the Yuma clapper rail, water elevations will be strictly controlled in Cells 1 and 2. Elevations will be managed in a static condition prior to, and during, the breeding season for this species. These water surface elevations will be held relatively constant from about March 1 through August 31. The projected managed elevations are 217 and 216.5 feet (NGVD29) for Cells 1 and 2, respectively.

The management goal for the marsh is an elevation of 217 feet for the benefit of LCR MSCP covered species in Cell 1. Using the available 20-cubic-foot-per-second pump, the refuge was able to supplement Arnett Ditch to compensate for high evapotranspiration loss and to maintain water levels within 0.2 inch throughout the clapper rail breeding season. Based on past observations, it is doubtful that Cell 2 will be able to be managed at its target design elevation of 216.5 feet. At this elevation, a large portion of Cell 2 would be exposed, increasing weed management intensity. In addition, much of the established habitat would be left without standing water, resulting in the death of much of the planted marsh vegetation. The LCR MSCP expects that a target depth of 216.8 feet may be more practical for sustaining established marsh habitat in Cell 2 and for maximizing ideal water depths.
Management at HMM also includes the management of water quality parameters. Most of these parameters have not been problematic, to date, with the exception of rising salinities throughout the summer months. This problem has been effectively controlled through regular pumping of Colorado River water into the marsh via Arnett Ditch. Although there appears to be a lag before salinities fall, this method has been able to keep salinities below marsh thresholds. Additional future water management actions to control salinities and long-term salinization may also include the dewatering and flushing (refilling with Colorado River water) of Cells 1 and 2. This would also occur outside of the breeding season for Yuma clapper rails and would likely be conducted for one cell at a time to allow some flooded habitats to remain for resident Yuma clapper rails and other species during this management activity.

Long-term management activities may also include the removal of decadent emergent vegetation to improve habitat for Yuma clapper rails. This is expected to be conducted one cell at a time, with a longer interval between vegetation removals at each cell to maintain usable emergent marsh habitats. Vegetation removal may be accomplished through controlled burning or by mechanical means. This management action is expected to be driven and supported by data from monitoring activities or past relevant research and prescribed using the adaptive management process of the LCR MSCP.

The majority of maintenance on the site involves controlling invasive and non-native vegetation species. Currently, the majority of this work is being performed through contracted services. Work is accomplished by frequent site visits to assess the occupation and spread of invasive species followed by control actions, if necessary. Control is performed using crews that employ hand pulling of weeds, using mechanical removal techniques, and through limited herbicide treatments when appropriate. The area that this contract covers includes the perimeter of the entire marsh complex from the wetted edge of the marsh to the tops of the perimeter road surrounding the marsh. The Cibola NWR is responsible for the adjacent areas outside HMM. Other site maintenance includes the upkeep of access roads and the water delivery infrastructure. Access roads specific to HMM are maintained by the LCR MSCP.

The USFWS, in cooperation with the LCR MSCP, performed marsh habitat manipulation using mechanical disturbance in February 2017. Further details and results of this effort can be found in sections 5.0 and 5.1.

### 3.4 Major Construction

No major infrastructure repair activities were conducted at HMM in FY17.
4.0 Monitoring

4.1 Abiotic Monitoring

4.1.1 Water Quality

The USFWS is responsible for monitoring and reporting on many abiotic parameters of the site as part of the interagency agreement with Reclamation. The Cibola NWR continued monthly water quality monitoring at specific points throughout the marsh. Water quality parameters including pH, dissolved oxygen, and specific conductivity (as a measurement of total salinity) were measured throughout the fiscal year. Figure 3 shows the locations (sites) where water quality parameters are measured and collected.

In general, water quality varied from site to site and across seasons. Because very high salinities can affect vegetation, and, in turn, impact wildlife species, management activities at this time only targeted specific conductivity. Salinities were effectively controlled by pumping Colorado River water into HMM via Arnett Ditch. Figures 4–6 illustrate the variation in specific conductivity throughout the year and show the drop in salinities at each site when management action (February pumping, flushing, and refilling) has occurred. They also depict the values for dissolved oxygen and pH at each sampling site and show the fluctuations in water quality between these sampling intervals. A complete water quality dataset for the fiscal year is posted internally on the LCR MSCP SharePoint site and is available upon request.

4.2 Avian Monitoring

Avian monitoring in FY17 was conducted at HMM for marsh birds.

4.2.1 Marsh Bird Surveys

Presence surveys for California black rails, western least bitterns, Virginia rails (*Rallus limicola*), and Yuma clapper rails were conducted in marsh habitat at HMM in three survey sessions during March and April: March 23, April 7, and April 22, 2017. Two LCR MSCP covered marsh bird species were detected: western least bitterns and Yuma clapper rails. Three western least bitterns and eight Yuma clapper rails were detected during the first survey session (March 23). Fourteen western least bitterns and six Yuma clapper rails were detected during the second survey session (April 7). Eight western least bitters and 10 Yuma clapper rails were detected during the third survey session (April 22) (Ronning and Kahl, Jr. 2017).
Figure 3.—HMM water quality monitoring locations.
Figure 4.—HMM specific conductivity in microsiemens per centimeter (µs/cm), FY17.

Figure 5.—HMM pH, FY17.

Figure 6.—HMM dissolved oxygen in milligrams per liter (mg/L), FY17.
5.0 HABITAT CREATION AND CONSERVATION MEASURE ACCOMPLISHMENT

5.1 Vegetation Monitoring

Vegetation data were collected in FY17 using light detection and ranging (lidar). Lidar measures the vegetation structure and provides the ability to identify structural diversity and successional growth stages. Conservation area vegetation will be evaluated on a periodic basis using lidar to ensure the habitat is meeting species’ requirements. A procedure to analyze and provide vegetation structure metrics will be developed, and the results will be presented in future reports.

Preliminary analyses suggest that airborne lidar may not provide the necessary detail for evaluating marsh habitat. Alternative techniques will be explored.

Baseline vegetation data were collected using unmanned aerial systems equipped with multispectral and photographic sensors. The data from the sensors will be used to create three-dimensional models of the vegetation to describe structure and species composition.

5.2 Evaluation of Conservation Area Habitat

The Final Habitat Creation Conservation Measure Accomplishment Tracking Process was finalized in October 2011 (LCR MSCP 2011). All areas within HMM were designed to benefit covered species at the landscape level. The water depths are managed during the breeding season for Yuma clapper rails and to meet the species conservation measure as defined in the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) (LCR MSCP 2004).

In 2017, the percent of open water and marsh was delineated using aerial imagery in ArcGIS. The marsh continues to fill in the open water as expected by design.

To meet species habitat creation requirements, the HCP provides goals for habitat creation based on land cover types. A total of four species with habitat creation goals have creditable acres at HMM. These species, including their corresponding conservation measure acronyms, are: Yuma clapper rail (CLRA1), California black rail (BLRA1), western least bittern (LEBI1), and Colorado River cotton rat (CRCR2) (table 1).
Table 1.—Species-specific habitat creation conservation measure creditable total acres for 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species-specific habitat creation conservation measure</th>
<th>CLRA1</th>
<th>BLRA1</th>
<th>LEB1</th>
<th>CRCR2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creditable acres in 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0¹</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, including previous years</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Reclamation is in the process of determining the land and water interface and the method for delineating California black rail marsh habitat at <1 inch deep. Once this has been determined, HMM will be evaluated.

6.0 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Adaptive management relies on the initial receipt of new information, the analysis of that information, and the incorporation of the new information into the design and/or direction of future project work (LCR MSCP 2007). The Adaptive Management Program’s role is to ensure habitat creation sites are biologically effective and fulfill the conservation measures outlined in the HCP for 26 covered species and if they potentially benefit 5 evaluation species. Post-development monitoring and species research results will be used to adaptively manage habitat creation sites after initial implementation. Once monitoring data are collected over a few years, and then analyzed for HMM, recommendations may be made through the adaptive management process for site improvements in the future.

There are no adaptive management recommendations for HMM at this time.
LITERATURE CITED


