

## Project Proposal Request for FY 2007 - FY 2009 Funding

### Proposal 199901900: Restore Salmon River (Challis, Idaho)

#### 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 13, 2005	Finalized	Karma Bragg

Proposal Type:	Ongoing
Proposal Number:	199901900
Proposal Name:	Restore Salmon River (Challis, Idaho)
BPA Project Manager:	Gerald McClintock
Agency, Institution or Organization:	Custer County Soil & Water Conservation District (SWCD)
Short Description:	Passive restoration by securing easements will assist restoration efforts via the Corps 206 Program. The development of side channels will help create a more naturally functioning floodplain, provide a wide array of environmental and ecological benefit.
Information Transfer:	A web-site is currently maintained by the Corps for this project and is listed in the references section within the narrative. Custer SWCD will provide status reports and metrics on completed projects that will be available through Pisces.

## Project Proposal Contacts

Contact	Organization	Address	Phone/Email	Roles	Notes
<b>Form Submitter</b>					
Karma Bragg	Custer Soil and Water Conservation District	P. O. Box 305 Challis, Idaho 83226	Ph: 208-879-4428 Fax: 208-879-5903 Email: cswcd@custertel.net	Form Submitter	
<b>All Assigned Contacts</b>					
Karma Bragg	Custer Soil and Water Conservation District	P. O. Box 305 Challis, Idaho 83226	Ph: 208-879-4428 Fax: 208-879-5903 Email: cswcd@custertel.net	Contract Manager	
Carl Christianson			Ph: Fax: Email: carl.j.christianson@usace.army.mil	Technical Contact	
Angela Dowling			Ph: Fax: Email: aldowling@bpa.gov	BPA Contracting Officer	
Ted O'Neal			Ph: Fax: Email: tdoneal@custertel.net	Administrative Contact	
Rick Philps	Custer SWCD	Challis, Idaho 83226	Ph: 208-879-2770 Fax: Email: noemail@noemail.none	Supervisor	Custer SWCD Contract Officer

## Section 2: Project Location

Sponsor Province:	Mountain Snake	ARC Province:	No Change			
Sponsor Subbasin:	Salmon	ARC Subbasin:	No Change			
Latitude	Longitude	Waterbody	Location Description	County/State	Subbasin	Primary?
044 31	114 10	Salmon River	Stark Easement	Custer, Idaho	Salmon	Yes

## Section 3: Focal Species

Primary	Secondary	Additional Species
Anadromous Fish Chinook Snake River Spring/Summer ESU Sockeye Snake River ESU	Bull Trout Mountain Whitefish Rainbow Trout Resident Fish Westslope Cutthroat	

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

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments

2005	Secured easement of approximately 180 acres. Assisted the Corps in securing cost share to complete feasibility study through 206 Appropriations Bill. Near completion of EA including public involvement/comments. Continued I&E with landowners & stakeholders
2004	Completed updated appraisals for easement property. Invested time in final development of easement language. Continued work with US Army Corps to develop options on at least five properties within the reach. Assisted Corps with NEPA/Development of EA/BA.
2003	Easement language review and development on one property including approximately 180 acres. Funding limitations prevented easement from moving forward, however, continued work with landowners kept landowners interested and willing. Rescheduled to 2004.
2002	Completed Appraisals with two landowners for easement options inclusive of the Corps program to restore side channels and reduce temperatures within the reach. Continued landowner contacts and education of approximately 30 landowners within the reach.
2001	Planning and solicitation for project funds, landowner meetings and easement development with landowners. Continued work with the Corps of Engineers to develop Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem projects.
2000	Temperature monitoring data collected and cross section surveys completed to determine needs for "whole river plan" for this 12 mile reach of the river. Continued landowner contacts and information. Development of a hydrodynamic model of the study reach
1999	Stream-bank protection projects and fencing within the reach with technical support provided by Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Landowner contacts for future work.

## Section 5: Relationships to Other Projects

Funding Source	Related ID	Related Project Title	Relationship
[Funding Source left blank]	[no entry]	Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project	US Army Corps of Engineers will provide 65% cost share for this project in the development of feasibility, plans and specs and construction. The Corps Project is dependent on this funding to move forward.
BPA	199401500	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement	Installation of criteria screens within the river reach including coordinated effort to consolidate diversions in this reach.
BPA	199401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat	Project area is in the middle section of the Upper Salmon Basin. Projects implemented under this contract will enhance downstream projects. Upstream projects in Stanley and East Fork will enhance this project.

## Section 6: Biological Objectives

Biological Objective	Full Description	Associated Subbasin Plan	Strategy	Page Nos
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg	Increase the number of pieces of LWD in reaches currently deficient, to volumes consistent with PFC rating. Improve pool:riffle ratios, Improve bank stability to property functioning conditions and rehabilitation of stream to reduce temperatures.	Salmon	Strategies 8-B1-3 Return channels to the floodplain/investigate feasibility and effectiveness of bio-engineering, monitor and evaluate actions, 8-C1-3 riparian plantings, ensure re-vegetation efforts, 17C 1-2 Control livestock, conduct land acquisitions	46-47

Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading	Problem: The diversion of water for irrigation and its subsequent return, combined with reductions in riparian shading represent the primary factors contributing to increased temperatures in the mainstem Salmon from the 12-mile section upstream to Challis.	Salmon	Focus rehabilitation efforts on re-establishing properly functioning riparian areas, investigate wastewater management, rehab floodplain connectivity to provide thermal refugia, pasture management, ensure adequate temperature protection for fish.	34 & 47
Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios,	Problem: Channel confinement and develop of riparian ares, from the 12-Mile section upstream to the headwaters, has caused a reduction in the pool:riffle ratio, a reduction in streambank stability, a reduction in shade, and has limited salmonid access to side channels.	Salmon	Strategies 8-B1-3 Return channels to the floodplain/investigate feasibility and effectiveness of bio-engineering, monitor and evaluate actions, 8-C1-3 riparian plantings, ensure re-vegetation efforts, 17C 1-2 Control livestock, conduct land acquisitions.	34, 46-47
Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability	Problem: Channel confinement and develop of riparian ares, from the 12-Mile section upstream to the headwaters, has caused a reduction in the pool:riffle ratio, a reduction in streambank stability, a reduction in shade, and has limited salmonid access to side channels.	Salmon	Ensure continuation of the Salmon River Ecosystem Restoration Project (12-Mile Project)	34, 60
Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect	Problem: Channel confinement and develop of riparian ares, from the 12-Mile section upstream to the headwaters, has caused a reduction in the pool:riffle ratio, a reduction in streambank stability, a reduction in shade, and has limited salmonid access to side channels.	Salmon	Control livestock access to encourage establishment of mature riparian vegetation. Conduct land acquisition and riparian conservation easements where possible and where some measurable benefits will occur.	34, 60

## Section 7: Work Elements and Associated Biological Objectives

Work Element Name	Work Element Title	Start Date	End Date	Estimated Budget
Land Audit	BPA Internal use	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	\$7,500
Description				
This is a BPA Internal-use only Work Element. BPA uses this work element to cover the hazardous material/Phase 1 work performed by BPA's Pollution Prevention and Abatement group, usually in support of land acquisitions.				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		

Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Land Purchase	Obtain Conservation Easements	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$1,186,320
Description				
Obtain Conservation Easements where possible and where some measurable benefits will occur.				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		* Start date of the purchase: <b>9/30/08</b>		
Land Purchase	TBL Work	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	\$18,000
Description				
Appraisal review , escrow, survey				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		* End date of easement: <b>9/30/09</b>		
Produce Environmental Compliance Documentation	Potential easements	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$3,450
Description				
Coordinate with Corps to Complete EC Documents				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Investigate Trespass	Investigate Trespass on Easement Property	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	\$8,000
Description				
Investigate Trespass on Properties secured in easement				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Conduct Pre-Acquisition Activities	Land Acquisition/Conservation Easements	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$60,000
Description				
Secure Appraisals, Title Search, Title Insurance for Easement Properties				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		

Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Coordination	Planning and Coordination	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$108,000
Description				
Planning and Coordination Assistance to Corps and BPA in Project Development				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Identify and Select Projects	Identify Project Opportunities in the 12-Mile Reach	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$32,500
Description				
Identify and Select Project for development and review				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Manage and Administer Projects	Manage and Administer Projects	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$15,000
Description				
Manage and Administer Projects under BPA and Corps program				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Produce Annual Report	FY05 Annual Reporting	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$675
Description				
Produce Annual Reports				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect		<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>		
Produce Pisces Status Report	Reporting	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$1,440
Description				
Produce Pisces Status Reports monthly				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		

Aquatic Objective 8A-D- Reduction in riparian veg Aquatic Objective 16A: Riparian Shading Aquatic Objective 17A: Pool; Riffle ratios, Aquatic Objective 17B-Improve Bank Stability Aquatic Objective 17C: Improve floodplain connect	<i>No Metrics for this Work Element</i>
--	---

## Section 8: Budget

### Itemized Estimated Budget

Item	Note	FY 2007 Cost	FY 2008 Cost	FY 2009 Cost
Personnel	Project Manager	\$33,500	\$33,500	\$33,500
Fringe Benefits	Project Manager	\$10,395	\$10,395	\$10,395
Travel	Project Manager and Board	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Supplies	Office Supplies/Postage	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200
Overhead	Rent/Office Space	\$5,200	\$5,200	\$5,200
Other	Sub-Contracts Survey/Title Search/Appraisals	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
Other	Cost Share, District secured easements	\$406,000	\$406,000	\$406,000
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$480,295</b>	<b>\$480,295</b>	<b>\$480,295</b>

### Total Estimated FY 2007-2009 Budgets

Total Itemized Budget	\$1,440,885
Total Work Element Budget	\$1,440,885

### 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
Corps of Engineers	Feasibility Study, Construction	\$ 0	\$575,000	\$635,000	Cash	Under Review
Corps of Engineers	Feasibility Study	\$1,700,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$1,700,000</b>	<b>\$775,000</b>	<b>\$835,000</b>		

## Section 9: Project Future Costs and/or Termination

FY 2010 Est Budget	FY 2011 Est Budget	Comments
\$300,000	\$300,000	Conservation Easements, O&M and Investigate Trespass on easement properties.

#### Future Operations & Maintenance Costs

Funding will be required for work element "investigate trespass". Additional properties could be secured within the next three years therefore requiring funds for conservation easements into out-year expenses

Termination Date	Comments
unknown	CSWCD will continue to develop proposals for conservation easements as long as landowners express interest, projects are biologically feasible and funds are available.

Final Deliverables

Conservation Easements, Final Reports

## Section 10: Narrative

Document	Type	Size	Date
<a href="#">Narrative for proposal 199901900</a>	doc	71 kb	1/6/2006

## Part 2 of 2. Reviews of Proposal

### Administrative Review Group (ARG) Results

<b>Account Type:</b> Both Capital and Expense	<b>Location:</b> <b>Province:</b> No Change <b>Subbasin:</b> No Change	<b>Primary Focal Species</b> No Change
--	--	---

**ARG Comments:**

### BPA Capital/Expense Review Results (3/14/2006)

**Initial BPA Capital/Expense Determination (Subject to final review):**

Expense -No anadromous fish crediting to meet requirements

**Primary Uncertainty for Capitalization: ---**

### 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
\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Budget Type:</b>	Expense		
<b>Budget Category:</b>	ProvinceExpense		
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Do Not Fund		
<b>NPCC Comments:</b>			

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



<b>FY 2007 NPCC Rec</b> \$ 0	<b>FY 2008 NPCC Rec</b> \$ 0	<b>FY 2009 NPCC Rec</b> \$ 0	<b>Total NPCC Rec</b> \$ 0
<b>FY 2007 MSRT Rec</b> \$ 0	<b>FY 2008 MSRT Rec</b> \$ 0	<b>FY 2009 MSRT Rec</b> \$ 0	<b>Total MSRT Rec</b> \$ 0
<b>Budget Category:</b>	ProvinceExpense		
<b>NPCC Comments:</b>			
<b>Local or MSRT Comments:</b> Project not prioritized			

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

**Recommendation:** Not fundable

**Comments:** This project has changed so much since the ISRP site visit and previous review that it is unrecognizable. Previous ISRP comments were "Fundable in part for study of the importance of temperature as the potential limiting factor in the proposed study reach and to pursue passive activities such as purchase of priority easements and fencing projects. Temperature modeling similar to that alluded to in items 5 & 6 of the response, as well as additional physical and biological watershed assessment, will be crucial in assessing potential benefits of the project, including components of the heavy construction work. It is clear that the agencies involved have indeed done a nice job in getting local landowners poised to 'collaborate on a single vision and to consider the reach in a holistic sense.' Unfortunately, it is not clear to the ISRP that enhancement of anadromous fish populations will necessarily follow from all of the tasks. A watershed assessment should indicate the priorities of tasks in this project. For example, if high stream temperature generated upstream is the key limiting factor, the heavily engineered approach proposed in the project may be secondary in priority. Evidence that this reach provides a number of high quality thermal refuges and assessment of the potential to provide more should be given. The proponents are referred to the programmatic section of this report on Monitoring, the specific comments on Aquatic Monitoring and Evaluation, and the specific comments on Terrestrial Monitoring and Evaluation."

Reviewers were concerned that extensive (expensive) active restoration efforts in this 12-mile section might be ineffective because of overwhelming water temperature constraints. Apparently some temp modeling was done, but no results seem to be given. Instead this has evolved to be a 35% cost-share for a heavily engineered rehab program with the US Army Corps of Engineers. The proposal lays out some benefits to control flooding, but the link to fish and wildlife is tenuous.

Although the sponsors did temperature monitoring in 2002, they didn't analyze the data to justify the proposal. In other words, they've ignored the ISRP's recommendation from the province reviews and are seeking to acquire easements without assurance that benefits will accrue to fish and wildlife. Are reviewers to assume that they going to exclude grazing?

What are they going to construct? What are their methods? What are they going to monitor? Is monitoring/project assessment left to others not mentioned here? Monitoring remains in the planning process.

Apparently, to date (since 1999) \$800k of BPA money has been spent and one 180-acre easement has been secured.

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

**Recommendation:** Not fundable

**Comments:** This project has changed so much since the ISRP site visit and previous review that it is unrecognizable. Previous ISRP comments were "Fundable in part for study of the importance of temperature as the potential limiting factor in the proposed study reach and to pursue passive activities such as purchase of priority easements and fencing projects. Temperature modeling similar to that alluded to in items 5 & 6 of the response, as well as additional physical and biological watershed assessment, will be crucial in assessing potential benefits of the project, including components of the heavy construction work. It is clear that the agencies involved have indeed done a nice job in getting local landowners poised to 'collaborate on a single vision and to consider the reach in a holistic sense.' Unfortunately, it is not clear to the ISRP that enhancement of anadromous fish populations will necessarily follow from all of the tasks. A watershed assessment should indicate the priorities of tasks in this project. For example, if high stream temperature generated upstream is the key limiting factor, the heavily engineered approach proposed in the project may be secondary in priority. Evidence that this reach provides a number of high quality thermal refuges and assessment of the potential to provide more should be given. The proponents are referred to the programmatic section of this report on Monitoring, the specific comments on Aquatic Monitoring and Evaluation, and the specific comments on Terrestrial Monitoring and Evaluation."

Reviewers were concerned that extensive (expensive) active restoration efforts in this 12-mile section might be ineffective because of overwhelming water temperature constraints. Apparently some temp modeling was done, but no results seem to be given. Instead this has evolved to be a 35% cost-share for a heavily-engineered rehab program with the US Army Corps of Engineers. The proposal lays out some benefits to control flooding, but the link to fish and wildlife is tenuous.

Although the sponsors did temperature monitoring in 2002, they didn't analyze the data to justify the proposal. In other words, they've ignored the ISRP's recommendation from the province reviews and are seeking to acquire easements without assurance that benefits will accrue to fish and wildlife. Are reviewers to assume that they going to exclude grazing?

What are they going to construct? What are their methods? What are they going to monitor? Is monitoring/project assessment left to others not mentioned here? Monitoring remains in the planning process.

Apparently, to date (since 1999) \$800k of BPA money has been spent and one 180 acre easement has been secured.