Project Proposal Request for FY 2007 - FY 2009 Funding (Revised Summer 2006)

Proposal 199901600: Protect & Restore the Big Canyon Creek Watershed

Table of Contents

Part 1 of 2. Administration and Budgeting

Section 1: General Administrative Information

Process Information:	Date Proposal Submitted & Finalized	Status	Form Generator
	January 6, 2006	Finalized	Mark D. Reaney, Jr., P.E.

Proposal Type:	Ongoing
Proposal Number:	199901600
Proposal Name:	Protect & Restore the Big Canyon Creek Watershed
BPA Project Manager:	David Kaplowe
Agency, Institution or Organization:	Nez Perce Tribe Dept. Fisheries Resource Management Watershed Division
Short Description:	This project is to protect, restore, and return critical spawning and reareing habitat using a ridgetop to ridge top approach, based on a complete watershed assessment and following the Clearwater Subbasin Management Plan.
Information Transfer:	Data will be housed at the Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resource Management, Watershed Division office. Data will be submitted to StreamNet for information sharing. Data will be presented and summarized in report form and submitted to BPA.

Project Proposal Contacts

Contact	Organization	Address	Phone/Email	Roles	Notes
Form Submitter					
Mark D. Reaney, Jr., P.E.	Nez Perce Tribe DFRM/Watershed Div.	P.O. Box 365 Lapwai, Idaho 83540	*Ph:* 208-843-7144,ext. 3558 *Fax:* 208-843-9192 *Email:* markr@nezperce.org	Form Submitter	Lapwai Creek and Big Canyon Creek Watershed projects
All Assigned Contacts					
Mark D. Reaney, Jr., P.E.	Nez Perce Tribe DFRM/Watershed Div.	P.O. Box 365 Lapwai, Idaho 83540	*Ph:* 208-843-7144,ext. 3558 *Fax:* 208-843-9192 *Email:* markr@nezperce.org	Technical Contact	Lapwai Creek and Big Canyon Creek Watershed projects
Emmit Taylor, Jr.	Nez Perce Tribe DFRM/Watershed Div.	P.O. Box 365 Lapwai ID 83540	*Ph:* 208.843.7144, ext.3544 *Fax:* 208.843.9192 *Email:* emmitt@nezperce.org	Contract Manager	Lapwai Creek & Big Canyon Creek & SE Washington Watershed Projects

Section 2: Project Location

Sponsor Province:	Mountain Snake	ARC Province:	No Change
Sponsor Subbasin:	Clearwater	ARC Subbasin:	No Change

Latitude	Longitude	Waterbody	Location Description	County/State	Subbasin	Primary?
46.3329	-116.3644	Big Canyon Creek and it's tributaries	Big Canyon Creek is a tributary to the Clearwater River, joining it 31 miles east of Lewiston, Idaho and runs through the town of Peck, Idaho.	Lewis & Nez Perce Counties, Idah,	Clearwater	Yes

Section 3: Focal Species

Primary	Secondary	Additional Species
Steelhead Snake River ESU	Chinook Snake River Fall ESU Chinook Snake River Spring/Summer ESU Coho Unspecified Population	

Section 4: Past Accomplishments for Each Fiscal Year of This Project

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2005	IMPLEMENTATION: -Ed/Outreach w/local schools -Road Erosion Report -Transportation Planning Draft -M&E fish dist., abund., comp. -2 barrier replacement designs -Culvert design estimating spreadsheet -2 mi.fence -20 ac. weed control -NRAMP 9 properties
2004	IMPLEMENTATION: -Coord. w/ NRCS, NPCSWCD, NPT Water Resources -Planted 5 acres of vegetation -60 acres of weed control -Ed/Outreach -Stream Crossing Report -M&E fish distribution, abundance, composition PLANNED: 3.5 mi. wetland/riparian fencing

2003	IMPLEMENTATION: -Survey stream crossings -surveyed roads for erosion potential -Prioritize fish barrier projects -Planted 3 acres of vegetation -Collaborated landowners, NRCS, and NPSWCD -Analyze CY2002 biol., chem., and habitat data
2002	IMPLEMENTATION: -Compiled road maps, obtained landowner permission to survey roads -Provided fish passage survey training -Surveyed stream crossings -4 miles of riparian/ wetland fencing -M&E fish distribution, abundance, etc. -Coordination w/NPSWCD
2001	Planned - Survey of all roads within Nez Perce Tribal lands for watershed restoration opportunities. Planned - Final Big Canyon Creek Watershed Assessment Document
2000	Field Check of Watershed Assessment Data 85% of the allocated budget was used to begin a required Clearwater Subbasin Assessment and Plan
1999	Draft Big Canyon Creek Watershed Assessment

Section 5: Relationships to Other Projects

Funding Source	Related ID	Related Project Title	Relationship
Other: Region 10 EPA	[no entry]	NPT Water Resources Wetland Program Development Grant	This project works cooperatively with the NPT Water Resources Division to assess, protect and restore wetlands and water quality. This project also implements wetland restoration and protection actions as recommended by the NPT Water Resources.
BPA	198335000	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery O&M	This project compliments the hatchery supplementation to restore and recover Snake River Basin salmon stocks by improving habitat quantity/quality.
BPA	198335003	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery M&E	Protection and restoration of fisheries habitat and water quality for fall chinook and coho satelite facility 0.8 miles upstream on Lapwai Creek from confluence with Clearwater River.
BPA	199608600	Clearwater Focus Program-IDSCC	This project implements the goals and objectives of this program.
BPA	199706000	Clearwater Focus Watershed Np	This project implements the goals and objectives of this program.
BPA	199901500	Big Canyon Fish Habitat	This project focuses on habitat restoration and protection implementation on tribal properites and compliments project 199901500 which implements BMPs on private lands to reduce sediment, nutrients, and stream temperature, and improves low summer flows. NPT Fisheries-Watershed works closely with NPSWCD.

Section 6: Biological Objectives

Biological Objective	Full Description	Associated Subbasin Plan	Strategy	Page Nos
Biological Problem 2, Objective B.	Improve anadromous fish productivety and production, and life stage specific survival through habitat improvement.	Clearwater	1. Identify and prioritze primary limiting factors. 2. Evaluate alternative habitat treatments to address limiting factors. 4. Develop indicies to evaluate biological response to habitat improvement. 5. Implement projects following priotization. 7. M&E.	18

Environmental Problem 10, Objective BB.	Protect and restore an additional 300 miles of riparian habitats by 2017.	Clearwater	1. Strategy: Identify and prioritize riparian habitats for protection and restoration. 2. Strategy: Protect and restore riparian habitats through....conservation easements, land exchanges, promotion of BMPs and alternative grazing strategies..	42-43
Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z.	Protect all currently functioning wetlands.	Clearwater	2. Strategy: Protect wetland habitats through ... conservation easements .... public education, promotion of BMPs, promotion of alternative grazing strategies. 3. Strategy: Continue effective activities--continue existing programs	41
Environmental Problem 11, Objective CC.	The introduction of noxious weeds and nonnative plant species into the Clearwater subbasin has negatively impacted native terrestrial focal species.	Clearwater	1. Identify ans prioritize native plant communities for protection from exotic weeds. 3. Encourage the use of weed free seeds and feeds. 5. Increase public participation through education and awareness programs. 6. Prevent establishment of new invaders..	44
Environmental Problem 11, Objective DD.	Reduce the extent and density of noxious weeds	Clearwater	1. Prioritize for treatment - identify and prioritize noxious weed infestations for treatment. 2. Treat Weed infestations - implement methods for reducing weed densities. 3. Encourage best practices- 4. Monitor and evaluate efforts to reduce weeds.	45
Environmental Problem 12, Objective EE.	Reduce the negative impacts of livestock grazing on fish, wildlife and plant poulations in the watershed.	None	1. Identify and prioritize areas impacted by grazing for protection and restoration. 2. Reduce grazing impacts--encourage establishment of riparian pasture, exclusion fences, off-site watering, or riparian conservation easments (Lease Land)	45-46
Environmental Problem 12, Objective FF.	Reduce conflicts between livestock and native wildlife and plant populations.	Clearwater	4. Reduce cattle/elk conflicts--where possible, alter grazing management to minimize cattle/elk conflicts, especially on elk winter range areas. 5. Monitor and evaluate efforts to reduce impacts of cattle on plant and wildlife species.	46-47
Environmental Problem 16, Objective JJ	Reduce the impact of the transportation system on wildlife and fish populations and habitats	Clearwater	Reduce road impacts--implement road closures and decommissioning programs in areas identified in the assessment and Section 4.4 to have high road densities, high sediment production, high surface erosion, and/or landslide prone. Prioritize areas with.....	50
Environmental Problem 7, Objective P.	Reduce number of artificially blocked streams by 2017	Clearwater	Remove or modify human-caused barriers--emphasize alteration/removal of unatural barriers over natural barriers.	32

Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q.	Reduce water temperature to levels meeting applicable water quality standards for life stage specific needs of anadromous and native resident fish, with an established upward trend in the number of stream miles meeting standards by 2017.	Clearwater	3. Restore riparian functions related to temperature--continue efforts aimed at increasing streamside shading where shading has been removed by anthropogenic activities.....Restore watershed functions impacting temperatures.	33
Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	Reduce instream edimentation to levels meeting applicable water quality standards and measures, with an established upward trend in the number of stream miles meeting such criterion by 2017.	Clearwater	4.Reduce sediment--reduce sediment inputs by implementing practices that address problems from logging, mining agricultur and other historic and current sediment producing activities. This work item includes upgrades to road surface and drainage features.	35
Environmental Problem 7, Objective T.	Develop a nutrient allocation plan for the subbasin which investigates the potential benefits to fish and wildlife of nutrient additions or reductions.	Clearwater	1. Inventory and map all potential anthropogenic nutrient inputs including waste water treatment facilities, industrial sources, feedlots, and non-point sources. Define nutrient poor or rich stream reaches throughout the basin.	36
Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.	Improve aquatic habitat diversity and complexity to levels consistent with other objectives outlined in this document, with particular emphasis on recovery of anadromous and fluvial stocks	Clearwater	1. Identify the need--identify habitats that have been simplified to a degree detrimental to anadromous and residential populations. 2. Follow Existing Plans..3. Prioritize Actions...4. Restore complexity...5. Restore ecosystem function..	37
Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.	Improve aquatic habitat diversity and complexity to levels consistent with other objectives outlined in this document, with particular emphasis on recovery of anadromous and fluvial stocks	Clearwater	1. Identify the need--identify habitats that have been simplified to a degree detrimental to anadromous and residential populations. 2. Follow Existing Plans..3. Prioritize Actions...4. Restore complexity...5. Restore ecosystem function..	37
Socioeconomic Problem 18, Objective LL.	Develop programs and project proposals compatible with existing community needs and that integrate with local watershed protection, restoration and management objectives and activities.	Clearwater	1. Involve communities and finer scale efforts in subbasin planning and project planning. 2. Coordinate plan implementation with federal, state, tribal, local to avoid program and project duplication. 3. Seek formal local support for programs/projects.	52
Socioeconomic Problem 18, Objective LL.	Identify high priority habitat areas requiring protection or restoration.	Clearwater	1. Develop a prioritization process to achieve multiple objectives, values, and benefits. 2. Integrate prioritization processes to increase the comprehensiveness of criteria considered, and to increase the strategic effectiveness of programs/projects.	52-53

Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective PP.	Participate in existing, and contribute to the further development of, local watershed and technical advisory groups.	Clearwater	Assist NPSWCD and the WAG and other existing groups to organize project goals and implementation strategies. 2. Assist interested groups with organizing local watershed programs. 3. Facilitate networking of these groupswith technical assistance...	58
Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective QQ.	Maximize social and economic benefits as much as possible while implementing the Clearwater Subbasin Plan.	Clearwater	1. Maximize economic benefits of plan--for land purchases or easements, efforts should be made to minimize loss of local government revenues. 2. Efforts should be made to utilize local labor forces, contractors, and suppliers when implementing habitat....	59
Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective RR.	Increase resource information and education delivery in the subbasin.	Clearwater	1. Promote ridgetop to ridgetop stewardship of natural resources through enhanced local involvement and support. 2. Implement information/education activities identified in subbasin plan. 3. Provide information/assistance to NPSWCD. 4. Provide opport...	59
Terrestrial Problem 6, Objective M.	Increase understanding of the composition, population trends, and habitat requirements of the terrestrial communities of the Clearwater.	Clearwater	1. Collect data--develop a subbasin-wide survey program and database for terrestrial focal, ESA listed, neotropical migrant, and culturally important species. 2. Increase documentation - supoport the efforts of the Idaho Conservation Data Center (CDC)	29

Section 7: Work Elements and Associated Biological Objectives

Work Element Name	Work Element Title	Start Date	End Date	Estimated Budget
1a: Manage and Administer Projects	Project Management, Coordination and Communication	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$51,391

Description

Project Mangement includes coordinating project activities, attending meetings, seeking additional funding, preparing statements of work, managing budgets, completing reports and responding to BPA requests.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective S. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

Work Element Name	Work Element Title	Start Date	End Date	Estimated Budget
1b: Coordination	Coordination with federal, tribal, state, local and other interests	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$21,179

Description

Coordination with federal, tribal, state, local and other interests to avoid program and project duplication, increase cooperation/collaboration, coordinate efforts and education and outreach goals. Involve the community in project planning and implementation including the completion of public meetings for local input and involvement.

Biological Objectives	Metrics

Socioeconomic Problem 18, Objective LL.		*No Metrics for this Work Element*		
1c: Provide Technical Review	Technical Assistance to NPSWCD, NPT Natural Resources-Water Resources and Forestry Divisions and NP County Road & Bridge Dept.	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$18,613

Description

Technical Assistance to NPSWCD, NPT Natural Resources-Water Resources and Forestry Divisions and NP County Road & Bridge Dept. with design, consultation, technical review of project plans and implementation.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

1d: Create/Manage/Maintain Database	Maintain project installation database	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$20,144

Description

Develop and update database and GIS layers to track project installation location and project specific information over time. This database will be in coordination with the NPWSCD and shared with other agencies as well as BPA's annual RPA reporting.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

1e: Produce Status Report	Quarterly Reports To BPA	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$14,888

Description

Produce Status Reports/Pisces

Biological Objectives	Metrics
No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

1f: Produce Annual Report	Produce Annual Report	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$14,888

Description

Annual report describes all yearly activities, successes and problems encountered including photos and data collected summarized.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

2a: Produce Inventory or Assessment	Natural Resource Assessment and Management Plan	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$54,723

Description

Conduct NRAMP surveys of 10 individual tribal properties per year, assessing stream and management activities. Produce restoration project recommendations utilizing an IDT team. This work element is the primary basis for identifying restoration actions.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

2b: Produce Design and/or Specifications	Prepare Engineering & Technical Designs for Restoration Projects	3/7/2007	2/28/2010	$39,182

Description

Complete surveys to obtain site specific data for the completion of engineering and technical designs. This work includes, but is not limited to, cross-sections, benchmark elevation determination, topographic and photometric surveys. Design package includes surveys, engineering or technical drawings, site maps, construction or installation specifications and material specifications, and cost-estimates. A list of projects is developed each Fall following the filed season and then designs are prepared through the Winter for the highest priority projects. Designs are completed through a coordinated team of professionals including

NPSWCD, Nez Perce County Road & Bridge Dept., local Highway Districts, Idaho Department of Fish & Game, and others.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 16, Objective JJ Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

2c: Produce Environmental Compliance Documentation	Landowner Approval, NEPA, ESA and Cultural Resource Compliance	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$16,822

Description

Secure landowner approval for restoration action implementation. Landowner approval will be from the Nez Perce Tribe, Tribal Allotment owners and BIA. Produce Environmental Compliance documentation for review and approval for all on-the-ground implementation projects and actions. NEPA will occur through BPA's NEPA process checklist and ESA compliance through BPA's HIP BiOp process. Cultural resource surveys and compliance will be contracted to the Nez Perce Cultural Resources Department. In addition, NEPA will be completed through the NPT's process.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective S. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

2d: Install Fish Passage Structure	Replace Fish Passage Barrier Structures	7/15/2007	8/31/2009	$19,772

Description

Due to funding cuts, seek and utilize alternative funding sources to replace barrier culverts with fish friendly structures as recommended and prioritzed by IDT team and NRAMP . Implementation items will include advertisement for bid, site inspection, bid award and notification, contract management and administration, final inspection, and implementation monitoring. Target is to replace 2 structures per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009. This work item is to be a cost-share item with alternative funding sources.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 7, Objective P.	* Does the structure remove or replace a fish passage barrier?: **yes** * Was barrier Full or Partial?: **full**

2e: Develop Alternative Water Source	Create Alternative Water Source for Livestock with Alternative Funding	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$10,460

Description

Where livestock water directly from stream sources or springs, alternative water sources will be developed utilizing alternative funding sources. These water sources include wind, solar and gravity fed systems. Typical components of a water system include a trough and pipeline. Target is to construct 2 off-site watering structures per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009. This work item is to be a cost-share with alternative funding.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z. Environmental Problem 12, Objective EE. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U. Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective QQ.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

2f: Install Fence	Install Fence to Protect Wetlands/Riparian Areas	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$13,771

Description

Install riparian protection fencing as recommended by NRAMP. Work items include prepare materials list, order and aqcuire materials, install fence using NPT Fencing Crew. Target is to construct 0.5 miles of fence per year in 2007, 2008, and 2009 protecting 1.5 miles of stream.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 12, Objective EE.	* # of miles of fence: **1.0**

2g: Remove vegetation	Treat Exotic Invasive Plant Species	1/1/2007	7/31/2009	$15,021

Description

Implement invasive weed treatment methods before planting as recommended by NRAMP, for reducing weed densities and competition to assist the establishment of native plant communities. Treatments will be completed by mechanical (pulling or by weed eaters) or chemical means. Target is to treat 3 acres per year in 2007, 2008, and 2009. This work element is directly related to the "Plant 3 acres of vegetation per year" work element below. Work will be completed by the Idaho Department of Corrections Prison Crews.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 11, Objective CC. Environmental Problem 11, Objective DD.	* # of acres treated: **5.0**

2h: Plant Vegetation	Plant 3 Acres of Vegetation per year	4/1/2007	7/31/2009	$18,133

Description

Plant vegetation in riparian areas recommended by NRAMP to increase stream shading and habitat diversity and complexity. Trees, shrubs and grasses include only native species and will be certified weed-free. Target is to plant 3 acres of riparian buffer vegetation per year in 2007, '08 and '09.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

2i: Lease Land	Lease Tribal Grazing Lands	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$8,639

Description

Lease Tribal Grazing allotmentswith alternative funding sources as leases expire to eliminate further livestock grazing, as recommended by NRAMP. Target is to lease 250 acres per year in 2007, '08 and '09 with 10 year easements. This work item will be a cost-share items to be used with alternative funding for implementation

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 10, Objective BB. Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z. Environmental Problem 11, Objective DD. Environmental Problem 12, Objective EE. Environmental Problem 12, Objective FF. Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q. Environmental Problem 7, Objective S. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.	* # of acres of new lease: **250.0**

2j: Upland Erosion and Sedimentation Control	Install Upland Erosion and Sediment Control	6/1/2007	7/31/2009	$8,639

Description

Utilizing alternative funding sources, implement erosion control measures such as grassed waterway, terraces, and buffers as recommended by NRAMP to reduce or prevent sediment from reaching the stream. The target is to implement practice on 1 mile of stream per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009. This work item is intended to be a cost-share with other funding sources.

Biological Objectives	Metrics

Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	* # of acres treated: **25**

2k: Create, Restore, and/or Enhance Wetland	Restore and Enhance Wetlands	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$5,886

Description

Implement wetland restoration and enhancement measures as recommended by NRAMP. Target is to restore or enhance 1 acres of wetland per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z.	* # of acres treated: **1.5**

3a: Produce Design and/or Specifications	Bid Package and Contract Development for Road Decommissioning and Improvements	8/31/2007	2/28/2010	$25,918

Description

Produce bid packages and contract documents for 2 miles of road decommissioning and 0.5 mile of road improvement projects each year.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

3b: Decommission Road	Decommission 2 miles of Road Per Year	6/1/2007	9/30/2009	$26,328

Description

Decommission 2 miles of forest road per year. Work items include contract administration and site inspection.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 16, Objective JJ Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	* # of road miles decommissioned : **5.0** * Type of decommissioning: **Recontoured**

3c: Plant Vegetation	Road Decommissioning: Planting/Revegetation	7/1/2007	9/30/2009	$10,129

Description

All decommissioned roads will be revegetated with native grass seed and/or native vegetation.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q.	* # of acres of planted: **25.0**

3d: Improve/Relocate Road	Improve 0.5 mile of road per year	6/1/2007	10/1/2009	$48,440

Description

Improve permanent roads, as specified by 2005 Transportation Plan, by upgrading cross section to a 14' width, with 2" of crushed gravel driving surface and an adequate roadside drainage ditch. Improvements include upgrading cross section and ditch, addition of base and surface aggregates and upgrading inadequate cross drains to reduce erosion from entering the streams.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Biological Problem 2, Objective B. Environmental Problem 16, Objective JJ Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	* # of road miles improved, upgraded, or restored: **0.5**

4a: Maintain Vegetation	Maintain Riparian Vegetation Planted in Previous Years	6/30/2007	9/30/2009	$13,398

Description

Maintenance of vegetation planted by controlling noxious invasive weeds. Weed control methods include one or a combination of mechanical (pulling or mowing) herbicide (spot spraying) or biological means as recommended by NRAMP. Target is to implement 25 acres of weed control per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009. Control will be completed by a combination of prision and tribal crews.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q. Environmental Problem 7, Objective S. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U. Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective QQ.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

4b: Operate and Maintain Habitat/Passage	Maintain Previous Years Fence Construction	6/1/2007	10/1/2009	$10,315

Description

Maintain previously constructed fence. Maintanence is required to ensure a properly functioning fence that protects riparian and stream habitat. Target is to maintain approximately 10 miles of fence per year.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z. Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q. Environmental Problem 7, Objective S. Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective QQ.	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

5a: Collect/Generate/Validate Field and Lab Data	Project Compliance and Implementation Monitoring	5/1/2007	12/1/2009	$9,797

Description

Post project monitoring to ensure project specifications were completed. Set up and collect data to evaluate restoration projects to ensure desired outcomes are met. Data collection may include photo points, vegetation plots, cross-sections and post year site inspections.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

5b: Analyze/Interpret Data	Analyze Project Compliance and Implementation Monitoring Data	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$5,328

Description

Analyze project compliance and implementation monitoring data to ensure projects are meeting desired outcomes. Additional work and lessons learned will be incorporated into NRAMP plans.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element	*No Metrics for this Work Element*

6a: Outreach and Education	Outreach and Education	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	$17,040

Description

Provide project specific and general fish habitat protection and restoration information to the public through local news papers, school news letters, radio announcements, public awareness meetings, billboards and educational presentations at the local schools.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective RR.	* # of general public reached: **500** * # of students reached: **250** * # of teachers reached: **6**

Section 8: Budget

Itemized Estimated Budget

Item	Note	FY 2007 Cost	FY 2008 Cost	FY 2009 Cost
Personnel	Salaries& Wages	$74,860	$79,352	$84,113
Fringe Benefits	Employee benefits	$22,458	$23,805	$25,234
Other	Contracts	$23,500	$23,500	$23,500
Travel	Travel/Per Diem	$2,768	$2,768	$2,768
Other	Training	$1,365	$1,365	$1,365
Other	Telecommunicatios	$240	$240	$240
Supplies	Office Supplies	$450	$450	$450
Supplies	Field Supplies/Materials/Hardware	$3,815	$3,815	$3,815
Other	Repairs/Maintenance	$425	$425	$425
Overhead	GSA Vehicle Rent	$2,415	$2,415	$2,415
Overhead	Indirect Administrative Costs	$32,247	$33,978	$35,812
Overhead	Office Rent	$683	$683	$683
	Totals	$165,226	$172,795	$180,819

Total Estimated FY 2007-2009 Budgets

Total Itemized Budget	$518,841
Total Work Element Budget	$518,841

Cost sharing

Funding Source or Organization	Item or Service Provided	FY 2007 Est Value ($)	FY 2008 Est Value ($)	FY 2009 Est Value ($)	Cash or in-kind?	Status
Idaho Transportation Department	Include Fish Friendly Designs in all future Hwy Improvement Projects in the Watershed	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500	In-Kind	Confirmed
Local Hwy Districts, LHTAC	Culvert Upgrades projects to incorporate fish friendly designs. Assist in '05 BMP Manual distribut	$1,250	$1,250	$1,250	In-Kind	Confirmed
Nez Perce County Road & Bridge Department	Design Reviews, Permenant Signing, Traffic Control Plans, Construction Inspection, NPDES Plans	$1,500	$1,590	$1,685	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPSWCD	Coordination, Land Owner Education, Project Oversight, Design Assistance and Review	$7,613	$8,069	$8,553	In-Kind	Confirmed

NPSWCD	Landowner Relationship Building Assistance, Negotiating of Property entry permission	$750	$750	$750	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPT Natural Resources- Forestry Division	Assstance with Transportation Planning, road maintenace recommendations, consultations	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPT Natural Resources-Land Services Division	GIS Data Base data, training, consulting, map printing	$6,250	$-6,250	$6,250	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPT Natural Resources-Water Resources Division	Water Quality Monitoring and Consultation	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
PL 566	In cooperation with NPSWCD, technical assistance and BMP installation cost-share (cash & in-kind)	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	Cash	Confirmed
	Totals	$36,363	$24,409	$37,488		

Section 9: Project Future Costs and/or Termination

FY 2010 Est Budget	FY 2011 Est Budget	Comments
$485,000	$495,000	Following copletion of all assessment work, this project will be focused on implementation of protection and restoration BPM's. Implementation costs more due to the necessary contracts associated with construction and materials costs

Future Operations & Maintenance Costs

Fence Maintenance annually

Termination Date	Comments
None	Since begining this project, the NPT Fisheries Watershed Division has completed Road Erosion Surveys, Fish Barrier Assessments, Watershed Assessments, etc., throughout the watershed. We are now in an implementation based phase of this project and this proposal includes increased funding associated with implementation.

Final Deliverables

Big Canyon Creek and it's tributariy watersheds will be intact, healthy, and properly functioning so that they are able to support all native anadromous and resident fish species at historical or near-historical levels. Streams within the watershed will meet TMDL and Nez Perce Tribal DFRM Watershed standards.

Section 10: Project Documents

Document	Type	Size	Date

Fix-it Loop Documents

NPT Watershed Div. response to ISRP comments	doc	10.0 M	7/14/2006
NPT DFRM Watershed Umbrella Comments	doc	567 kb	7/14/2006
Mtn Snake NPT DFRM Project Recommendations with comments	xls	49 kb	7/14/2006

Documents Originally Submitted with this Proposal:

Narrative for proposal 199901600	doc	5.2 M	1/10/2006

Part 2 of 2. Reviews of Proposal

Administrative Review Group (ARG) Results

Account Type: Expense	**Location:** **Province:** No Change **Subbasin:** No Change	**Primary Focal Species** No Change
ARG Comments:		

NPCC Final Funding Recommendations (October 23, 2006) [Full NPCC Council Recs]

FY 2007 NPCC Rec $165,000	**FY 2008 NPCC Rec** $165,000	**FY 2009 NPCC Rec** $165,000	**Total NPCC Rec** $495,000
Budget Type:	Expense		
Budget Category:	ProvinceExpense		
Recommendation:	Fund		
NPCC Comments: ISRP fundable in part. Funding in FY 2007 to complete reports on abundance, habitat status and a comprehensive presentation of prioritized restoration projects. Funding for restoration actions in 08 and 09 is conditioned on favorable ISRP and Council review of revised proposal linked to completed reports (per ISRP comments). 2007 Revised Budget: Significant reductions in salaries (FTEs), implementation tasks, land leasing, and NEPA/Cultural consultations. Implementation of proposed tasks at 100% is dependent on the acquisition of supplemental funding.			

NPCC Draft Funding Recommendations (September 15, 2006) [Full NPCC Council Recs]

FY 2007 NPCC Rec $165,000	**FY 2008 NPCC Rec** $165,000	**FY 2009 NPCC Rec** $165,000	**Total NPCC Rec** $495,000
FY 2007 MSRT Rec $ 0	**FY 2008 MSRT Rec** $ 0	**FY 2009 MSRT Rec** $ 0	**Total MSRT Rec** $ 0
Budget Category:	ProvinceExpense		
NPCC Comments:			

NPCC Staff Comments: ISRP fundable in part. Funding in FY 2007 to complete reports on abundance, habitat status and a comprehensive presentation of prioritized restoration projects. Funding for restoration actions in 08 and 09 is conditioned on favorable ISRP and Council review of revised proposal linked to completed reports (per ISRP comments)

Local or MSRT Comments: 2007 Revised Budget: Significant reductions in salaries (FTEs), implementation tasks, land leasing, and NEPA/Cultural consultations. Implementation of proposed tasks at 100% is dependent on the acquisition of supplemental funding.

Independent Scientific Review Panel Final Review (August 31, 2006) [Download fu [Download full document]

Recommendation: Fundable in part

Comments:

The preliminary ISRP review of this proposal principally raised three questions. What was the historic and current status and importance of the steelhead population in the Big Canyon Creek watershed? What are results from habitat restoration undertaken by this project to date? And what is the potential to restore this water and if restored what kind of contribution will the steelhead population contribute to restoring the ESU and providing benefits to the focal species?

The sponsor replies that because there was a paucity of data on fish and their habitats the first few years of the project were spent determining fish distribution and abundance and performing stream and riparian habitat assessments. The sponsor reports that the field collections for these assessments are completed and that reports are presently being finalized. In the interim period the sponsor has undertaken habitat improvement in areas thought to be "hot spots." It is not clear whether these are areas that have outstanding potential to produce fish if improved, or if they are areas that are especially degraded. There is an intent announced to remove possible barriers in the form of agricultural equipment crossings that are very high in the tributaries for $1-2 million, but no biological justification was advanced.

The ISRP is uncomfortable agreeing with the sponsors that this is a stronghold for steelhead based on earlier surveys, when the sponsors themselves argued that more abundance information was needed to initiate habitat actions. Further, until the reports from the fish abundance and habitat surveys are completed it is not possible to conclude that the watershed has the potential to contribute to improving the status of the focal species and provide fish and wildlife benefits. Although the response shows significant effort in its preparation, the response provided does not constitute an adequate reporting of satisfactory results.

Based on this situation, the project is Fundable in Part for FY07 to complete the reports on fish abundance, habitat status, and a comprehensive presentation of prioritized restoration projects.

For full comments on "restore and protect" type projects, please see heading “General comments concerning Nez Perce Tribe proposals to protect and restore various watersheds” at the beginning of the ISRP comments on project # 199607702, Protect & Restore Lolo Creek Watershed.

Independent Scientific Review Panel Preliminary Review (June 2, 2006) [Download full document]

Recommendation: Response requested

Comments: A response is needed regarding three issues: (a) priority and feasibility of restoration, (b) results to date, and (c) watershed assessment.

(a) Several principal questions are not sufficiently addressed. Was this watershed ever substantial (important) spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead - or was it a peripheral satellite region? Is it a critical independent population now? Can the watershed be restored in a reasonable timeframe at a reasonable cost?

Sponsors indicate that this is one of the top producing steelhead populations on the Nez Perce Reservation. But the citation is from 1986. What has happened in the intervening 20 years? And, what does this population contribute to the productivity, abundance, spatial structure, and diversity of the ESU. How important is this population?

Discussion of the NOAA Biological Opinion Remand (2004) reports that Big Canyon is listed as a primary fish-producing area for the steelhead subpopulation along with Lapwai Creek, Little Canyon Creek, and the Potlatch River. Reference is made to Lapwai Creek producing significant numbers in recent history, but is currently depressed. Does this mean that Big Canyon Creek is not depressed, or does it mean it has not produced significant numbers in recent history? Providing the numbers is important for a transparent proposal.

According to the summary, Big Canyon Creek has "medium" potential to increase the population and to improve ecological conditions. This needs to be placed into the full context. How many categories were there and how many streams were evaluated. Is this the location most likely to improve to a threshold that will contribute to recovery (ESA) and eventual self-sustaining populations (Fish and Wildlife Program), or is it one of the worst. The proposal needs to be clear about the status of recovery/restoration potential both for steelhead and for the coho reintroduction.

(b) Results to date need to be reported. How do we know this is working? Summarize the realized benefits to anadromous fish. An explanation is needed as to why project funding is being used to perform work on Lapwai Creek as indicated on p 24.

(c) Some watershed assessments have been completed, but the results and implications of these analyses are not adequately summarized in the proposal. The Big Canyon Creek Environmental Assessment (1995) and Big Canyon Creek Watershed Assessment ("expected completion 2001") are identified as related projects. It seems this project should be designed and based on the assessments provided by those efforts. Also, why is Big Canyon Creek Watershed Assessment still listed as expected completion 2001 in 2005/6? Is the assessment completed and released yet? If not, how is ii being used to develop the work elements in this proposal.

Regarding the 2005 Road Erosion Survey and the 2004 Fish Passage Assessment, a short discussion on the management and restoration recommendations from these projects is needed. How much sediment is coming off the roads, how many miles need to be obliterated? How many miles need to be repaired? How is the obliteration and repair prioritized? Same for the passage problems - how many are there, where are they, what can be done about them, how much is it going to cost, and how long will it take?

Finally, in the response loop, the ISRP recommends that the Nez Perce Tribe suggest a priority and rank of the numerous proposals submitted under the titles “protect” and “restore.” Where do habitat actions and protection in the Clearwater offer the most potential benefit?