

WSP Indicator Analysis for the Babine Lake Watershed:

Stream Crossing Density

Freshwater Atlas (FWA) Assessment Watersheds

Prepared for:

Lake Babine Nation 225 Sus Ave Burns Lake, BC VOJ 1E0

Prepared by:

Eclipse Geomatics Ltd. 3423 Fulton Avenue Unit 102 Smithers BC VOJ 2N0

May 2024



Note to reader:

These Wild Salmon Policy (WSP) habitat indicator assessment reports are intended as a coarse filter approach to identify watersheds that are potentially at risk of exceeding thresholds for four WSP habitat indicators (Road Density, Stream Crossing Density, Total Land Cover Alteration, and Riparian Disturbance). These reports present the results of GIS-based (Tier 1) methods for assessing the status of a particular freshwater aquatic habitat pressure indicator and determining the watershed indicator "risk" status by comparing the measured values to indicator benchmarks. Pressure indicators are identified by Canada's WSP as proactive measures of identifying potential impacts to salmon habitat within a watershed. Additional information on the WSP is available at https://www.pac.dfompo.gc.ca/fm-gp/salmon-saumon/wsp-pss/ip-pmo/ip-smm-pmo-eng.html#assessment.

The analysis presented in this report was carried out using standardized provincial datasets and did not integrate field-based (Tier 2) information or industry datasets. The results are presented for informational purposes and are not intended to replace operational watershed assessments.

Acknowledgments

[Acknowledgements]



WSP Indicator Analysis for the Babine Lake Watershed

Pressure Indicator: Stream Crossing Density

Assessment Units: FWA Assessment Watersheds

Description of Pressure Indicator

Stream crossings at road intersections present potential barriers to fish passage as well as potential inputs of fine sediment into waterways and interruptions to natural flow regimes (Porter et al., 2019). Fish passage barriers interfere with or block access to upstream spawning or rearing habitats, and thereby decrease the total amount of available salmon habitat in a watershed (Pacific Salmon Foundation [PSF], 2020). The stream crossings indicator is used in this analysis to address the fish passage concern from stream crossings rather than sedimentation (this is addressed by the road density indicator) so stream crossing density is measured here as the number of stream crossings per kilometer of modelled salmon habitat, as opposed to a similar metric which is reported as stream crossings per watershed area. This approach was followed in order to maintain consistency with the methodology used by the PSF in the development of relative thresholds for the Skeena Region (PSF, 2020).

Study Area

The Babine Lake Watershed is situated in the interior of northwest BC and covers an area of $6,555 \text{ km}^2$ (Figure 1). Babine Lake is one of the largest natural lakes in BC and hosts an important salmon spawning and rearing habitat.

This report presents results for BC Freshwater Atlas (FWA) assessment watersheds within the Babine Lake Watershed. FWA assessment watersheds are mesoscale groupings of fundamental watersheds with a target size of between 2,000 ha and 10,000 ha (Province of BC, 2020). A reference map of the study area with FWA assessment watersheds identified is included in Appendix A.





Figure 1: The study area is indicated in red. The grey polygon indicates the outline of the Skeena River watershed.



Methodology

Data layers used to perform the spatial analysis include:

- Digital Road Atlas (BC Ministry of Land, Water and Resource Stewardship [MLWRS], 2024)
- Forest Tenure Road Section Lines (BC Ministry of Forests, 2024)
- Fish Habitat and Road Crossings Model (BC Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy [MECCS], 2024)
- Freshwater Atlas Assessment Watersheds (BC MFLNRORD, 2019)

An updated roads layer was developed for the purposes of this analysis. Overlapping roads within the DRA and FTEN subsets were removed by applying a 30 m buffer to the DRA subset and selecting FTEN roads outside of the buffer. The extracted DRA and FTEN roads were then merged to produce the input roads dataset.

Stream crossing locations were computed through the intersection of the updated roads layer and the streams layer from the Fish Habitat and Road Crossings Model (BC MECCS, 2022). Stream crossings along railways from the crossings layer of the Fish Habitat and Road Crossings Model were added to complete the dataset. The stream crossings were filtered by fish habitat type, with crossings identified within accessible salmon habitat (i.e. with a gradient of less than or equal to 15% and no natural barriers preventing salmon access) retained for use in the stream crossing density analysis (Mount et al., 2011; Norris, 2022). The stream crossing data does not include any culvert information collected directly by the industry.

Modelled accessible salmon habitat length (km) was calculated using the streams layer from the Fish Habitat and Road Crossings Model (BC MECCS, 2022) filtered by accessible salmon habitat.

FWA assessment watersheds were used as assessment units for the stream crossing density analysis. The total number of stream crossings within the salmon habitat and the total length of the salmon habitat (km) was summed for each FWA assessment watershed. Stream crossing density (stream crossings/km of accessible salmon habitat) was calculated by dividing the total number of stream crossings by the length of modeled salmon habitat within each assessment unit. An overview of stream crossings within fish habitat for the study area is provided in Figure 2.

This analysis follows the methodology set out by the Pacific Salmon Foundation (2020) for stream crossing density with the addition of the intersection calculation using the more accurate updated roads dataset and allows for results comparison with the thresholds published by PSF based on the relative distribution of values across the Skeena Region (Porter et al., 2014). This approach differs from similar stream-crossing analysis



methodology (e.g. the BC Cumulative Effects Framework), which reports stream-crossing density based on watershed area (Provincial Aquatic Ecosystems Technical Working Group, 2020).







Risk Thresholds

Categorical risk thresholds applied were generated by the Pacific Salmon Foundation based on the relative distribution of values across all Skeena River watersheds (Porter et al., 2014) and are tabulated below:

Threshold Rating Stream Crossing Density (crossings / km)

| Low | < 0.20 |
|----------|-------------|
| Moderate | 0.20 - 0.58 |
| High | > 0.58 |

Results of Analysis

A summary of the results of the stream crossing density analysis with categorical risk thresholds for each assessment unit are shown in Figure 3; Figure 4 provides an overview of the results distribution. Detailed results for each assessment unit are tabulated in Appendix B, and the distribution of the assessment results are shown as a series of figures in Appendix C.





Figure 3: Stream crossing density (stream crossings/km) for each boundary in the study area is shown on a study area map. The results are colorized by risk threshold (low risk < 0.2 crossings/km, moderate risk 0.2-0.58 crossings/km, high risk > 0.58 crossings/km).





Figure 4: Distribution of results showing the number (count) of assessment units by stream crossing density. The results are colorized by risk threshold (low risk < 0.2 crossings/km, moderate risk 0.2-0.58 crossings/km, high risk > 0.58 crossings/km).

Stream crossing density of crossings situated within accessible salmon habitat was calculated for a total of 134 FWA watersheds within the study area. Stream crossing density ranged from 0 to 2.38 crossings/km (Figure 4). Stream crossing densities for 52 assessment units were above the upper threshold of 0.58 crossings/km and 16 assessment units had stream crossing densities in the moderate risk threshold rating (Figure 4; Appendix B and Appendix C).

The majority of assessment units with moderate and high stream crossing densities are concentrated in sub-watersheds with accessible salmon habitat adjacent to Babine Lake and Babine River (Figures 2 and 3).



Summary

Stream crossing density for FWA watersheds within the study area ranged from 0 to 2.38 crossings/km. Assessment units with stream crossing densities in the high and moderate risk range were concentrated in the central portion of the study area.

References

BC Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy [MECCS]. 2022. Fish Habitat and Road Crossings Model [Electronic dataset]. Retrieved from https://www.hillcrestgeo.ca/outgoing/fishpassage/data/bcfishpass/outputs/ on May 11, 2024.

BC Ministry of Forests. 2022. Forest Tenure Road Section Lines [Electronic dataset]. Retrieved from https://catalogue.data.gov.bc.ca/dataset/forest-tenure-road-section-lines on May 11, 2024.

BC Ministry of Land, Water and Resource Stewardship [MLWRS]. 2022. Digital Road Atlas (DRA) - Master Partially-Attributed Roads [Electronic dataset]. Retrieved from https://catalogue.data.gov.bc.ca/dataset/digital-road-atlas-dra-master-partially-attributed-roads on May 11, 2024.

BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development [BC MFLNRORD]. 2019. Freshwater Atlas Assessment Watersheds [Electronic dataset]. Retrieved from https://catalogue.data.gov.bc.ca/dataset/freshwater-atlas-assessment-watersheds on Oct. 16, 2019.

Eclipse Geomatics Ltd. 2020. WSP Indicator Analysis for the Kispiox TSA: Stream Crossing Density Freshwater Atlas (FWA) Assessment Units. Prepared for SkeenaWild Conservation Trust.

Mount, C., Norris, S., Thompson, R., and D. Tesch. 2011. GIS Modelling of Fish Habitat and Road Crossings for the Prioritization of Culvert Assessment and Remediation. Streamline Watershed Management Bulletin. Vol. 14/No. 2 Spring 2011 pp. 7-13.

Norris, S. bcfishpass. https://github.com/smnorris/bcfishpass. Accessed May 17, 2024.

Pacific Salmon Foundation. 2020. Methods for Assessing Status and Trends in Pacific Salmon Conservation Units and their Freshwater Habitats. The Pacific Salmon Foundation, Vancouver BC, Canada. Version 1.0.

Province of BC. 2020. Freshwater Atlas Assessment Watersheds. https://catalogue.data.gov.bc.ca/dataset/freshwater-atlas-assessment-watersheds. Accessed May, 2020.

Provincial Aquatic Ecosystems Technical Working Group. 2020. Interim Assessment Protocol for Aquatic Ecosystems in British Columbia – Standards for Assessing the Condition of Aquatic Ecosystems under British Columbia's Cumulative Effects Framework. Version 1.3



(December 2020). Prepared by the Provincial Aquatic Ecosystems Technical Working Group – Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy and Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development. 51 pp. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resourcestewardship/cumulative-effects/protocols/cef-aquatic-ecosystems-protocol-dec2020.pdf. Accessed November 15, 2022.

Porter, M., Pickard, D., Casley, S., Ochoski, N., Bryan, K. and S. Huang. 2014. Sockeye Habitat Report Cards: Spawning Conservation Unit (CU). Pacific Salmon Foundation Skeena Salmon Program. https://www.psf.ca/document-library/sockeye-habitat-report-cards-spawning-cu. Accessed Dec. 16, 2019.

Porter, M., Casley, S., Pickard, D., Snead, E., Smith, R., and K. Wieckowski. 2017. Version 3.4, March 2019. Watershed Status Evaluation Protocol (WSEP): Tier 1 – watershed-level fish values monitoring. Report prepared by ESSA Technologies Ltd. for BC British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and BC Ministry of the Environment (MOE), Victoria, BC. 27 p.

Stalberg, H.C., Lauzier, R.B., MacIsaac, E.A., Porter, M., and Murray, C. 2009. Canada's policy for conservation of wild pacific salmon: Stream, lake, and estuarine habitat indicators. Can. Manuscr. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2859: xiii + 135p.



Appendix A: Reference Maps















Appendix B: Results Tables



| Assessment Unit | Sub- Watershed Name | Salmon Accessible Stream Length (km) | Stream Crossings | Stream Crossing Density (Crossings per km) | Risk |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------|
| 287 | | 23.77 | 29 | 1.22 | High |
| 288 | | 30.05 | 15 | 0.50 | Moderate |
| 289 | Tsezakwa Creek | 16.15 | 8 | 0.50 | Moderate |
| 290 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 291 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 292 | Heal Creek | 23.55 | 26 | 1.10 | High |
| 293 | | 1.02 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 294 | Five Mile Creek | 75.02 | 36 | 0.48 | Moderate |
| 295 | | 52.02 | 38 | 0.73 | High |
| 296 | | 49.17 | 59 | 1.20 | High |
| 297 | | 12.96 | 6 | 0.46 | Moderate |
| 298 | | 27.98 | 24 | 0.86 | High |
| 299 | | 62.31 | 74 | 1.19 | High |
| 300 | | 55.45 | 51 | 0.92 | High |
| 301 | | 40.92 | 25 | 0.61 | High |
| 302 | | 24.94 | 9 | 0.36 | Moderate |
| 303 | | 31.86 | 20 | 0.63 | High |
| 304 | | 30.64 | 36 | 1.18 | High |
| 305 | | 36.72 | 52 | 1.42 | High |
| 306 | Morrison Creek | 103.22 | 33 | 0.32 | Moderate |
| 307 | | 98.76 | 90 | 0.91 | High |
| 308 | | 56.50 | 46 | 0.81 | High |



| Assessment Unit | Sub- Watershed Name | Salmon Accessible Stream Length (km) | Stream Crossings | Stream Crossing Density (Crossings per km) | Risk |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------|
| 309 | | 45.00 | 37 | 0.82 | High |
| 310 | Tahlo Creek | 97.16 | 38 | 0.39 | Moderate |
| 311 | | 58.05 | 11 | 0.19 | Low |
| 312 | | 41.01 | 12 | 0.29 | Moderate |
| 313 | | 45.47 | 22 | 0.48 | Moderate |
| 314 | Tahlo Creek | 73.90 | 47 | 0.64 | High |
| 315 | Tahlo Creek | 102.18 | 50 | 0.49 | Moderate |
| 316 | Haul Creek | 54.62 | 43 | 0.79 | High |
| 317 | | 23.36 | 34 | 1.46 | High |
| 318 | | 17.46 | 23 | 1.32 | High |
| 319 | Fulton River | 28.75 | 21 | 0.73 | High |
| 320 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 321 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 322 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 323 | Nicholson Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 324 | Broughton Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 325 | Guess Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 326 | Doray Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 327 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 328 | Betty Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 329 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 330 | Guess Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 331 | Guess Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 332 | Byron Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |



| Assessment Unit | Sub- Watershed Name | Salmon Accessible Stream Length (km) | Stream Crossings | Stream Crossing Density (Crossings per km) | Risk |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------|
| 333 | Tanglechain Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 334 | Tanglechain Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 335 | Bristow Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 336 | Fink Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 337 | McKendrick Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 338 | Little Joe Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 339 | Cronin Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 340 | Nata Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 341 | Bristol Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 342 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 343 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 344 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 345 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 346 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 347 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 348 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 349 | Fulton River | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 350 | Tachek Creek | 102.78 | 113 | 1.10 | High |
| 351 | | 43.02 | 31 | 0.72 | High |
| 352 | Strimboldh Creek | 44.34 | 22 | 0.50 | Moderate |
| 353 | | 26.22 | 30 | 1.14 | High |
| 354 | Big Loon Creek | 56.12 | 51 | 0.91 | High |
| 355 | | 4.01 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |



| Assessment Unit | Sub- Watershed Name | Salmon Accessible Stream Length (km) | Stream Crossings | Stream Crossing Density (Crossings per km) | Risk |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------|
| 356 | | 26.59 | 31 | 1.17 | High |
| 357 | | 11.55 | 3 | 0.26 | Moderate |
| 358 | Pierre Creek | 9.62 | 6 | 0.62 | High |
| 359 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 360 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 361 | Twain Creek | 2.86 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 362 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 363 | | 0.23 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 364 | | 44.89 | 49 | 1.09 | High |
| 365 | Cross Creek | 1.59 | 2 | 1.26 | High |
| 366 | Donalds Creek | 2.20 | 4 | 1.82 | High |
| 367 | Pinkut Creek | 2.54 | 1 | 0.39 | Moderate |
| 368 | Marlin Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 369 | Henrietta Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 370 | Coldwater Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 371 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 372 | Henrietta Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 373 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 374 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 375 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 376 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 377 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 378 | Ling Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |



| Assessment Unit | Sub- Watershed Name | Salmon Accessible Stream Length (km) | Stream Crossings | Stream Crossing Density (Crossings per km) | Risk |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------|
| 379 | Pinkut Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 381 | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 382 | Pinkut Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 383 | Pinkut Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 384 | Pinkut Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 385 | Gullwing Creek | 56.67 | 10 | 0.18 | Low |
| 386 | Four Mile Creek | 1.68 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 387 | | 0.80 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 388 | Sutherland River | 25.36 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 389 | | 28.57 | 48 | 1.68 | High |
| 390 | Shass Creek | 1.36 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 391 | Shass Creek | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 392 | | 9.81 | 8 | 0.82 | High |
| 393 | | 2.21 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 394 | Duncan Creek | 140.30 | 135 | 0.96 | High |
| 395 | Sutherland River | 48.80 | 0 | 0.00 | Low |
| 396 | Sutherland River | 31.07 | 4 | 0.13 | Low |
| 397 | Sutherland River | 39.94 | 12 | 0.30 | Moderate |
| 398 | Sutherland River | 35.47 | 7 | 0.20 | Low |
| 399 | Sutherland River | 155.43 | 129 | 0.83 | High |
| 400 | Babine River | 43.45 | 54 | 1.24 | High |
| 401 | Babine River | 45.48 | 47 | 1.03 | High |



| Assessment Unit | Sub- Watershed Name | Salmon Accessible Stream Length (km) | Stream Crossings | Stream Crossing Density (Crossings per km) | Risk |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------|
| 402 | | 38.69 | 25 | 0.65 | High |
| 404 | | 56.36 | 72 | 1.28 | High |
| 405 | | 24.17 | 23 | 0.95 | High |
| 406 | | 24.78 | 59 | 2.38 | High |
| 407 | | 26.55 | 14 | 0.53 | Moderate |
| 408 | | 48.87 | 48 | 0.98 | High |
| 409 | | 119.03 | 165 | 1.39 | High |
| 410 | | 49.19 | 43 | 0.87 | High |
| 411 | | 51.60 | 45 | 0.87 | High |
| 412 | | 29.96 | 48 | 1.60 | High |
| 413 | | 11.98 | 27 | 2.25 | High |
| 414 | | 27.10 | 18 | 0.66 | High |
| 415 | | 45.17 | 44 | 0.97 | High |
| 416 | | 27.24 | 23 | 0.84 | High |
| 417 | | 32.77 | 30 | 0.92 | High |
| 418 | | 43.55 | 38 | 0.87 | High |
| 419 | | 8.45 | 4 | 0.47 | Moderate |
| 420 | | 4.33 | 8 | 1.85 | High |
| 421 | | 20.83 | 16 | 0.77 | High |
| 422 | | 8.39 | 8 | 0.95 | High |



Appendix C: Results Distribution



Results are colourized by risk threshold (low risk < 0.2 crossings/km, moderate risk 0.2-0.58 crossing/km, high risk > 0.58 crossings/km).









