

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

Proposal 199901700: Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed

Table of Contents

Part 1. Administration and Budgeting

- Section 1: General Administrative
- Section 2: Project Location
- Section 3: Project Species
- Section 4: Past Accomplishments
- Section 5: Relationship to Other Projects
- Section 6: Biological Objectives
- Section 7: Work Elements
- Section 8: Budget
- Section 9: Project Future
- Section 10: Documents

Part 2. Reviews

Part 1 of 2. Administration and Budgeting

Section 1: General Administrative Information

Process Information:	Date Proposal Submitted & Finalized	Status	Form Generator
	December 14, 2005	Finalized	Mark D. Reaney, Jr., P.E.

Proposal Type:	Ongoing
Proposal Number:	199901700
Proposal Name:	Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed
BPA Project Manager:	David Kaplowe
Agency, Institution or Organization:	Nez Perce Tribe DFRM Watershed Division
Short Description:	This project will protect, restore and return critical spawning and rearing fish habitat using a ridge top to ridge top approach, based on a complete watershed assessment.
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?
46.2555	-116.5971	Lapwai Creek and it's tributaries	Lapwai Creek is a tributary to the Clearwater River, joining it 11 miles east of Lewiston, Idaho. From the confluence, main Lapwai Creek runs by the towns of Lapwai, Sweetwater, Culdesac, and Winchester.	Nez Perce & Lewis, Idaho	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. -3 barrier replacement designs -Culvert design estimating spreadsheet -2 mi.fence -80 ac. weed control -NRAMP 10 parce

2004	IMPLEMENTATION: -Coord. w/ NRCS, NPCSWCD, NPT Water Resources -Planted 5 acres of vegetation -60 acres of weed control -Ed/Outreach -Fish Barrier Assessment -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. -Coordinated
2001	Planned - Survey of all roads within Nez Perce Tribal lands for watershed restoration opportunities Planned - Final Lapwai 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 Lapwai Creek Watershed Assessment

Section 5: Relationships to Other Projects

Funding Source	Related ID	Related Project Title	Relationship
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 satellite 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 Program; NPT	This project implements the goals and objectives of this program.
BPA	200207000	Lapwai Cr Anadromous Habitat	This project focuses on habitat restoration and protection implementation on tribal properities and compliments project 200207000 which implements BMPs on private lands to reduce sediment, nutrients, and stream temperature, and improves low summer flows.
Other: Region 10 EPA	n/a	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.

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	18

			priotization. 7. M&E.	
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 BB.	Protect the existing quality, quantity and diversity of native plant communities providing habitat to native wildlife species by preventing the introduction, reproduction, and spread of noxious weeds and invasive exotic plants into and within the subbasin	Clearwater	1. Strategy: Identify and prioritize native plant communities for protection from exotic weeds. 2. Prevent reproduction... 3. ..encourage use of weed free seeds and feeds. 5. Increase public participation - develop education and awareness programs.	44
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.	Clearwater	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 unnatural 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
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 groups with 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 i	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 - support 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
01a: Manage and Administer Projects	Construction Project Management, Coordination and Communication	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$103,529
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		

01b: Coordination	Coordination with federal, tribal, state, local and other interests	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$49,594
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.		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
01c: 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	\$38,068
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		
<i>No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element</i>		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
01d: Create/Manage/Maintain Database	Maintain project installation database	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$35,998
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		
Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
01e: Produce Status Report	Quarterly Reports To BPA	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$28,228
Description				
Produce Status Reports/Pisces				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
<i>No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element</i>		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
01f: Produce Annual Report	Produce Annual Report	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$27,390
Description				
Annual report describes all yearly activities, successes and problems encountered including photos and data collected summarized.				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
<i>No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element</i>		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
02a: Produce Inventory or Assessment	NPT Natural Resource Assessment and Management Plan (NRAMP)	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$179,538
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.		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		

02b: Produce Design and/or Specifications	Prepare Engineering & Technical Designs for Restoration Projects	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$60,054
---	--	----------	-----------	----------

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

No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element

Metrics

No Metrics for this Work Element

02c: Produce Environmental Compliance Documentation	Landowner Approval, NEPA, ESA and Cultural Resource Compliance	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$37,295
---	--	----------	-----------	----------

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

Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.
Environmental Problem 7, Objective U.

Metrics

No Metrics for this Work Element

02d: Install Fish Passage Structure	Replace Fish Passage Barrier Structures w/ Alternative Funding Sources	7/15/2007	11/1/2009	\$48,063
-------------------------------------	--	-----------	-----------	----------

Description

Replace barrier culverts with fish friendly structures as recommended and prioritized by IDT team, Fish Barrier Assessment and NRAMP . Implementation items will include advertisement for bid of on-the-shelf designs, site inspection, bid award and notification, contract management and administration, final inspection, and implementation monitoring. This work item will be a cost-share item to compliment grant funding from other sources for construction contracts. Target is to replace 2 structures per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009. This work item will be used as cost-share with alternative funding.

Biological Objectives

Biological Problem 2, Objective B.

Metrics

* Does the structure remove or replace a fish passage barrier?:
Yes
* Was barrier Full or Partial?:
Full
* # of miles of habitat accessed:
based on prioritized replacement strategies

02e: Develop Alternative Water Source	Create Alternative Water Source for Livestock	3/1/2007	12/1/2009	\$36,854
---------------------------------------	---	----------	-----------	----------

Description

Where livestock water directly from stream sources or springs, alternative water sources will be developed. 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.

Biological Objectives

Metrics

Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z. Environmental Problem 12, Objective EE. Environmental Problem 7, Objective U. Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective QQ.	<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>			
---	---	--	--	--

02f: Install Fence	Install Fence to Protect Wetlands/Riparian Areas	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$44,410
--------------------	--	----------	-----------	----------

Description
Install riparian protection fencing as recommended by NRAMP. Work items include prepare materials list, order and acquire materials, install fence using NPT Fencing Crew. Target is to construct 1 miles of fence per year in 2007, 2008, and 2009 protecting 0.5 mile of stream.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 12, Objective EE.	* # of miles of fence: 2

02g: Remove vegetation	Treat Exotic Invasive Plant Species	5/1/2007	7/31/2009	\$42,788
------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	-----------	----------

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 10 acres per year in 2007, 2008, and 2009. This work element is directly related to the "Plant 10 acres of vegetation per year" work element below. Work will be completed by the Idaho Department of Corrections Prison Crew.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 11, Objective CC. Environmental Problem 11, Objective DD.	* # of acres treated: target is to treat 10 acres per year

02h: Plant Vegetation	Plant 5 Acres of Vegetation per year	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$41,829
-----------------------	--------------------------------------	----------	-----------	----------

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 5 acres of riparian buffer vegetation per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q.	* # of acres of planted: 10.0

02i: Lease Land	Lease Tribal Grazing Lands	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$25,703
-----------------	----------------------------	----------	-----------	----------

Description
Lease tribal grazing allotments as they expire using alternative sources of funding to eliminate livestock grazing. This work element is for the anticipated cost-share used with other funding sources.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
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 U.	* # of acres of new lease: 500 acres/year

02j: Upland Erosion and Sedimentation Control	Install Upland Erosion and Sediment Control w/ alternative funding sources	6/1/2007	12/1/2009	\$20,478
---	--	----------	-----------	----------

Description

Implement erosion control measures such as grassed waterway, terraces, and buffers as recommended by NRAMP and utilizing alternative funding sources, 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.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	* # of acres treated: 10.0

02k: Create, Restore, and/or Enhance Wetland	Restore and Enhance Wetlands	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$20,106
--	------------------------------	----------	-----------	----------

Description

Implement wetland restoration and enhancement measures as recommended by NRAMP. Target is to restore or enhance 3 acres of wetland per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 10, Objective Z.	* # of acres treated: 3.0 acres target per year

03a: Produce Design and/or Specifications	Bid Package and Contract Development for Road Decommissioning and Improvements	3/1/2007	12/31/2009	\$38,275
---	--	----------	------------	----------

Description

Produce bid packages and contract documents for 5 miles of road decommissioning and 0.5 mile of road improvement projects each year.

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 16, Objective JJ Environmental Problem 7, Objective S.	<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>

03b: Decommission Road	Decommission 5 miles of Road Per Year	6/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$67,288
------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------	-----------	----------

Description

Decommission 5 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 : 10.0 miles per year * Type of decommissioning: Recontoured

03c: Plant Vegetation	Road Decommissioning: Planting/Revegetation	6/1/2007	10/1/2009	\$23,106
-----------------------	---	----------	-----------	----------

Description

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

Biological Objectives	Metrics
Environmental Problem 7, Objective Q.	* # of acres of planted: 50.0 acres

03d: Improve/Relocate Road	Improve 0.5 mile of road per year	5/1/2007	10/31/2009	\$101,406
----------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	------------	-----------

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: 1.0 miles per year		
04a: Maintain Vegetation	Maintain Riparian Vegetation Planted in Previous Years	5/1/2007	10/31/2009	\$25,238
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 60 acres of weed control per year in 2007, 2008 and 2009. Control will be completed by a combination of prison 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.		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
04b: Operate and Maintain Habitat/Passage	Maintain Previous Years Fence Construction	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$29,211
Description				
Maintain previously constructed fence. Maintenance is required to ensure a properly functioning fence that protects riparian and stream habitat. Target is to maintain approximately 15 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.		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
05a: Collect/Generate/Validate Field and Lab Data	Project Compliance and Implementation Monitoring	3/1/2007	12/30/2009	\$23,727
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		
<i>No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element</i>		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
05b: Analyze/Interpret Data	Analyze Project Compliance and Implementation Monitoring Data	3/1/2007	12/31/2009	\$14,788
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		
<i>No Biological Objectives Associated with this Work Element</i>		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
06a: Outreach and Education	Outreach and Education	3/1/2007	2/28/2010	\$40,044
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		

Environmental Problem 7, Objective S. Socioeconomic Problem 21, Objective RR.	* # of teachers reached: 10 * # of general public reached: 1000 * # of students reached: 500
--	--

Section 8: Budget

Itemized Estimated Budget

Item	Note	FY 2007 Cost	FY 2008 Cost	FY 2009 Cost
Personnel	Project Leader, Engineer - FTE, Plant/Wetland Biologist, Tech II-1/2 FTE	\$154,102	\$163,348	\$173,149
Fringe Benefits	30% Full Time; 15% Tax-free full time; 10% Temp	\$46,231	\$49,004	\$51,945
Supplies	Field and Office Supplies, Repairs	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800
Travel	Training Travel/Per Diem	\$10,195	\$10,195	\$10,195
Overhead	29.64% Admin. Overhead	\$75,183	\$77,147	\$80,923
Supplies	Fencing/Planting/NRAMP Supplies, Materials & Hardware	\$17,030	\$15,635	\$15,635
Overhead	GSA Vehicle Rent	\$12,645	\$12,645	\$12,645
Overhead	Office Rent	\$683	\$683	\$683
Other	Training Conferences/Workshops (tba)	\$4,107	\$4,107	\$4,107
Other	Repairs & Maintenance	\$775	\$775	\$775
Other	Mobile Phones for Field Crews	\$520	\$520	\$520
Other	Computer Services	\$6,250	\$2,250	\$2,250
Other	Consultants/Contracts	\$60,250	\$60,250	\$60,250
Totals		\$389,770	\$398,359	\$414,877

Total Estimated FY 2007-2009 Budgets

Total Itemized Budget	\$1,203,005
Total Work Element Budget	\$1,203,005

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 Soil & Conservation Commission	In cooperation with NPSWCD, engineering design assistance	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	In-Kind	Confirmed

Idaho Transportation Department	Include Fish Friendly Designs in all future Hwy Improvement Projects in the Watershed,	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
Local Hwy Districts, LHTAC	Culvert Upgrades projects to incorporate fish friendly designs, only	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	In-Kind	Confirmed
Nez Perce County Road & Bridge Department	Design Reviews, Permanent Signing, Traffic Control Plans, Construction Inspection, NPDES Plans	\$4,251	\$4,506	\$4,776	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPSWCD	Coordination, Land Owner Education, Project Oversight, Design Assistance and Review	\$15,225	\$16,139	\$17,107	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPSWCD	Landowner Relationship Building Assistance, Negotiating of Property entry permission	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPT Natural Resources- Forestry Division	Assistance with Transportation Planning, road maintenance recommendations, consultations	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPT Natural Resources-Land Services Division	GIS Data Base data, training, consulting, map printing	\$12,500	\$12,500	\$12,500	In-Kind	Confirmed
NPT Natural Resources-Water Resources Division	Water Quality Monitoring and Consultation	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
PL 566	In cooperation with NPSWCD, technical assistance and BMP installation cost-share (cash & in-kind)	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
Totals		\$78,976	\$80,145	\$81,383		

Section 9: Project Future Costs and/or Termination

FY 2010 Est	FY 2011	Comments
Budget	Est Budget	

\$685,329	\$705,889	Implementation of Protection and Restoration BMP's
-----------	-----------	--

Future Operations & Maintenance Costs

Following completion of Fish Passage Assessment, Road Erosion Survey and Assessment, NRAMP & SVAP Habitat Assessments, M&E Fish Distribution, Abundance, and Composition Data Collection, and other studies and assessments, the NPT will have a full prioritized list of Protection and Restoration implementation projects that will require increases in funding to achieve increased fish populations. Other anticipated work elements include: Annual fence maintenance; Annual Weed Control; Annual Implementation Monitoring

Termination Date Comments

None Since beginning 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

Lapwai Creek and its tributary 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	10.8 M	7/14/2006
Revised Narrative	doc	4.1 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 199901700	doc	1.3 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	FY 2008 NPCC Rec	FY 2009 NPCC Rec	Total NPCC Rec
\$389,765	\$389,765	\$389,765	\$1,169,295
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 \$389,765	FY 2008 NPCC Rec \$389,765	FY 2009 NPCC Rec \$389,765	Total NPCC Rec \$1,169,295
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) [\[Download full document\]](#)

Recommendation: Fundable in part

Comments: This is an ISRP response to the fix it loop for proposal 199901700 Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed (NPT) and 200207000 Lapwai Creek Anadromous Habitat (NPSWCD) – integrated sister projects to address habitat restoration and protection on Lapwai Creek on tribal and private land, respectively.

The sponsors addressed the questions raised by the ISRP in the preliminary review. The adequacy of the answers varied by question. The ISRP thanks the sponsors for the time and effort in producing the revised proposal narrative and explanations of the projects’ history.

The ISRP had many questions for the sponsors, so the evaluation of the response to each is beyond the space and time available in this fix it loop review. Briefly, the proposal(s) were to execute tasks related to both inventory and assessment of fish populations and habitat, and habitat restoration implementation. From the proposal it was not clear to the ISRP how important to the focal species the watershed was; the focal species current status in the watershed; the role the watershed could contribute to the focal species’ status if restored; if the watershed could be restored; and how long it would take.

Replies were provided to the ISRP’s questions and a revised narrative was produced. The answers to the questions and the narrative revision go a long way to clarifying for the ISRP the status and progress of anadromous fish species (primarily steelhead) and restoration potential in this watershed. Much more is needed however, before the ISRP can confidently assess whether the proposed activities in the Lapwai Creek system are scientifically sound, have quantifiable biological objectives that are measurable, and will benefit fish and wildlife (A-run steelhead).

Sponsors indicate that it became apparent early in the project history (1999) that insufficient data existed to effectively address improving the status of anadromous fish in Lapwai Creek. Little was known about the status of the fish or the habitat. In the intervening period the sponsors state they have treated "hot spots" of habitat degradation, and nearly completed inventories of habitat conditions and fish population status. They report that inventory work will be completed in 2006 and that evaluation and analysis should be prepared in 2007.

In the current revised narrative the biological objectives are tasks. The sponsors provide an ultimate goal: "to protect and restore the ecological and biological functions of the Lapwai Creek Watershed to assist in the recovery of anadromous and resident fish species," and this is reasonable. What is needed is a specific goal, with a timeframe for changes in habitat conditions and fish population abundance and productivity. Sponsors clarify for the ISRP their understanding of compliance and effectiveness monitoring, and inform the ISRP that they appreciate the necessity of effectiveness monitoring, but that it is beyond the willingness of Council and BPA to fund those data collections and analysis. The ISRP understands the constraints placed on sponsors, but also believes sponsors need to be creative in developing methods to determine whether their restoration efforts are providing a benefit. Can riparian habitat be evaluated by photopoints or aerial photography and be cost effective, how can stream flow and stream temperature be monitored? How can adult fish in and smolts out be measured?

Sponsors indicate that stream habitat and watershed inventories, and fish population abundance will be completed soon and final assessments available in 2007. Based on that commitment, these projects are Fundable in Part (incrementally). In 2007, fundable only for completion of the inventory and assessments. Possibly fundable in 2008 and 2009 for restoration actions contingent upon a proposal narrative that uses those assessments to establish biological objectives, strategies and actions to get to those objectives, and an approach to measure whether progress is being made in achieving the objectives.

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: Proposals 199901700 (NPT - Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed) and 200207000 (NPSWCD - Lapwai Creek Anadromous Habitat) are for companion projects on the same creek (Lapwai) for activities on NPT tribal lands (199901700) or private ranch lands (200207000). They use the same format for the entire proposal and much of the text is copied verbatim in each proposal.

Despite previous positive reviews, the ISRP is becoming concerned. Between this and its sister SWCD project, many millions have been spent over the past 7 years and there is no end in sight. Project accomplishments are so minimal that the two projects should not be continued without a thorough programmatic review. Such a review is recommended as a condition of future funding. The response requested here is to produce a revised proposal that addresses the problems identified in this assessment and to include responses to requests for additional information, and incorporates the recommended changes in structure.

The on-the-ground work here may have potential of producing measurable results, but there still is no comprehensive assessment and prioritized prescriptions, nor evidence of a fish response from accomplishments to date, nor plans to provide such evidence.

In general the proposal is difficult to follow; the organization does not efficiently communicate the historic and contemporary status of the focal species, the historic and contemporary status of the habitat, or the desired future state of the ecosystem (habitat) or the focal species.

There are general statements on the status of each of these elements, but not specific detail. Because the detail is not present it is not possible to evaluate the reasonableness of the proposal. Simultaneous with a lack of sufficient detail is considerable redundancy of general statements. This creates a proposal that is too long and difficult to follow.

For example, in spite of presenting a 12-page Technical and Scientific Background, the sponsors never report how many kilometers/miles of streams exist in the watershed, broken down by the main creek and tributaries. They never identify which tributaries and reaches are believed to be the historic production areas, which are currently producing fish, and which are believed to be essential for achieving the production needed to be "recovered." This section needs a brief one-paragraph description of the stream system. Including the kilometers of stream by tributary. A brief summary of the watershed assessments and how they form the basis for the proposal should be provided. These are given in the existing proposal, but the evaluation is overly vague -- summer low flow, sediment, etc. are problems. The summary of the watershed assessments should identify a priority list of stream segments that have degraded ecosystem functions and identify the management actions that will be used to remedy these altered conditions.

The sponsors could identify important stream reaches for protection and restoration on maps. The sponsors have completed a road assessment and a barrier assessment, but the recommendations from these assessments are not communicated in the technical background. How many barriers are there, which are believed critical to gaining access to productive habitat? Where is road condition worst? Where is it recommended to begin road decommissioning and renovation? Some of this is buried in the work elements - it needs to be in the technical section. The technical section should not exceed 5 pages (could be 3 or 4).

The Rationale and Significance to Subbasin Plans section is too long and ineffective. It should be reduced to no more than 2 pages. There is a bulleted list of justifications for Lapwai Creek watershed restoration. Most of these may not in fact be adequate justification. For example - "...presence of at-risk wild A-run steelhead" is justification only if this is a core remnant population essential for recovery identified in the interior Columbia Basin TRT independent population reports and the updated NOAA status review for steelhead. From what is presented it is not clear that this stream is particularly important.

Lapwai/Sweetwater creeks were identified by NOAA BIOP (draft) as the historical source population for A-run steelhead in the Lower Clearwater Basin. This is justification only if these creeks are still likely to serve as the contemporary and future source population for A-run steelhead in the Lower Clearwater.

Clear evidence from the Clearwater subbasin plan is needed that the focal species of this project are identified as focal species, that the strategies for restoration are consistent with the plan, and that the Lapwai Creek and tributaries are identified as a priority area. This should only require a short paragraph and table.

Clear evidence is also needed to show Lapwai Creek is identified in federal recovery documents (the TRT independent population report, steelhead status review, and possibly the hydrosystem BiOp).

Identifying every element of the subbasin plan that may apply to these proposals, and identifying every BiOp RPA that may apply is a distraction and does not serve to communicate how this proposal will serve to fulfill the obligations of the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program or the ESA recovery actions.

The section of the Mission-Lapwai Creek Watershed plan produced in 1990 and updated in 1994 and 2000 needs clarification. It simply restates what has been said over and over again in the proposal, "... improve flow, enhance riparian, and reduce sediment." The priority locations recommended by this plan need to be identified and tied to specific objectives in the proposal.

There are lists of accomplishments, but there are no management implications identified. No data on fish abundance are provided. This appears to be the only accounting of the project's results. In response, please provide evidence of benefit to focal fish populations.

The work element descriptions are confusing and difficult to follow and understand. Identifying each subbasin plan relationship is distracting. The organization is not helpful. The ISRP suggests beginning this section by identifying in general terms what needs to happen in the next three years. Is more field inventory

needed, and if so why? Is more analysis of the past inventory data needed, if so why? What are the priority areas and strategies for activities? Finally, what are the specific methods - in general terms - so they can be identified as appropriate and consistent with current scientific thinking?

The proposal contains rather prescriptive declarations to implement BMPs (for example decommission 10 miles of road, fix one more mile of road, fix 2 barriers, fence 2 miles of stream, etc.). Yet in earlier work elements, there is considerable effort expended on more inventory, planning, and project design. How can it be at this juncture that the appropriate mix is 10 miles of road decommissioning and 2 miles of fence when the assessments are not yet complete? In response, please clarify the rationale for these prescriptions.

The explanation of monitoring for compliance and effectiveness needs to be clarified. The effectiveness monitoring plan should be peer-reviewed during this funding cycle to ensure it is using the same methods and metrics recommended by PNAMP and CSMEP.

At the local level of communicating with landowners and stakeholders the sponsors appear to perform admirably. In communicating with the extended scientific and management community, it appears there is room for much improvement. As an example, these proposals do not provide maps and summaries from the stream inventories, fish barrier assessment, and road analysis. Until a clearer picture of the amount of work and time needed to bring this watershed into a reasonable state of productivity is given, it is difficult to assess the likely benefits to the focal fish species. It is not possible to assess whether the restoration will take 10 or 200 years, given the information supplied in the proposal.

The funding request appears to have increased significantly. What is the basis for that?

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?