

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

## Proposal 200200300: Secure & Restore Resident Fish Habitat

### 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 November 30, 2005	Status Finalized	Form Generator Lynn DuCharme
----------------------	--	---------------------	---------------------------------

Proposal Type:	Ongoing
Proposal Number:	200200300
Proposal Name:	Secure & Restore Resident Fish Habitat
BPA Project Manager:	Joe Deherrera
Agency, Institution or Organization:	Salish & Kootenai Confederated Tribes
Short Description:	The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes and Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks will jointly pursue the protection of fisheries habitat through land acquisitions and conservation easements to offset losses due to the construction of Hungry Horse Dam.
Information Transfer:	Aerial photographs and ground surveys used to rank lands proposed for selection will be stored electronically at CSKT or MFWP. Stream lengths used for BPA credits against the NPCC-approved loss statement will be digitized from photos and plat map overlays. Physical locations will be provided as GPS coordinates (UTMs and Lat. Long.) and township and range. Titles and conservation easements will be archived by the signatory agency along with maps and stipulations requested by BPA. Stream miles protected by this project will be

credited to BPA as per the 3-way MOA between MFWP, CSKT and BPA.

## Project Proposal Contacts

Contact	Organization	Address	Phone/Email	Roles	Notes
<b>Form Submitter</b>					
Lynn DuCharme	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation	Highway 93 W P.O. Box 278 Pablo MT 59855	Ph: 406.883.2888 Fax: 406.883.2897 Email: lynnd@cskt.org	Form Submitter	
<b>All Assigned Contacts</b>					
Lynn DuCharme	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation	Highway 93 W P.O. Box 278 Pablo MT 59855	Ph: 406.883.2888 Fax: 406.883.2897 Email: lynnd@cskt.org	Form Submitter Project Lead	
Brian Marotz	Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks	490 N Meridian Rd. Kalispell MT 59901	Ph: 406.751.4546 Fax: 406.257.0349 Email: bmarotz@mt.gov	Form Submitter Project Lead	I am project manager for all MFWP contracts including Libby and Hungry Horse Mitigation, NPCC Mainstem Amendment monitoring and upcoming joint proposal with CSKT for capital funds for land acquisitions and conservation easements

## Section 2: Project Location

Sponsor Province:	Mountain Columbia	ARC Province:	No Change		
Sponsor Subbasin:	Flathead	ARC Subbasin:	No Change		
Latitude	Longitude	Waterbody	Location Description	County/State	Subbasin Primary?
48N	W114	Flathead River	The entire Flathead watershed	Flathead/Lake, Montana	Flathead Yes

## Section 3: Focal Species

Primary	Secondary	Additional Species
Bull Trout Westslope Cutthroat	Mountain Whitefish Northern Pikeminnow	

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

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2005	It took over 5 years from project submittal to signing an MOA with BPA that allowed this project to proceed. To date, this project has purchased property and provided BPA with 2.36 km of credit toward the overall obligation of 125 km

## Section 5: Relationships to Other Projects

Funding Source	Related ID	Related Project Title	Relationship
BPA	199101901	Hungry Horse Mitigation/Flathead	Sister project. CSKT mitigation and monitoring program to offset losses due to Hungry Horse Dam. Restoration costs on acquired parcels also built into this ongoing program to allow BPA/NPCC the discretion of where/how to find restoration actions
BPA	199101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation/Habitat	Sister project. MFWP mitigation program to offset losses due to Hungry Horse Dam. Restoration costs on acquired parcels also built into this ongoing program to allow BPA/NPCC the discretion of where/how to find restoration actions
BPA	199608701	Montana Focus Watershed Coordi	Sister project. This project assists in coordinating with other BPA projects, landowners, and other agencies to avoid duplication and increase efficiency in implementing land protection and restoration activities..

## Section 6: Biological Objectives

Biological Objective	Full Description	Associated Subbasin Plan	Strategy	Page Nos
Improve channel stability	Improve channel stability to a level equivalent to the channel stability habitat restoration score of reference streams	Flathead	Enhance channel stability. When possible, provide long term habitat protection through purchase and conservation easements...	27,28
Improve habitat connectivity	Restore passage to migratory fish by removing potential man-caused barriers, i.e. impassable culverts, hydraulic headcuts, water diversion blockages, landslides, and impassable deltas.	Flathead	Restore connectivity. Provide long term habitat availability through purchase, conservation easements...	31
Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river	Restore the habitat diversity of the mainstem to a level that supports sustainable population levels of focal species that function naturally and may be capable of supporting appropriate forms of human use.	Flathead	Enhance/protect habitat diversity. Provide long term channel stability through purchase, conservation easements...	22,23
Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries	Improve habitat diversity to a level equivalent to the habitat diversity restoration score of reference streams	Flathead	Enhance/protect habitat diversity. Provide long-term channel stability through purchase, conservation easements...	28
Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river	Improve riparian condition to a level that supports sustainable population levels of focal species that function naturally and may be capable of supporting appropriate forms of human use.	Flathead	When possible, provide long term habitat protection through purchase and conservation easements...	21,22

Improve riparian condition in the tributaries	Restore riparian habitats to a level equivalent to the riparian condition habitat restoration score of reference streams	Flathead	Protect riparian habitats. When possible, provide long term habitat protection through purchase and conservation easements...	26,27
Improve shoreline condition	Restore lake shoreline conditions to a level equivalent to the shoreline condition habitat restoration score of reference lakes	Flathead	Protect/resotre lakeshore habitats. Provide long term habitat protection through purchase, conservation easements...	37
Protect Class 1 waters	Protect and maintain prime, functioning tributary habitat	Flathead	Protect habitat. Provide long term habitat protection through purchase, conservation easements...	32
Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river	Reduce the delivery of fine sediments to a level that supports sustainable populations of focal species that function naturally and may be capable of supporting appropriate forms of human use.	Flathead	Eliminate/reduce sediment sources. When possible, provide long term habitat protection through purchase and conservation easements...	24,25
Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries	Reduce the delivery of fine sediments to a level equivalent to the fine sediment habitat restoration score of reference streams	Flathead	Reduce sediment sources. Provide long-term habitat protection through purchase, conservation easements...	29,30
Reduce lake pollutants	Reduce pollution to a level equivalent to the pollution habitat restoration score of reference lakes.	Flathead	Eliminate/reduce pollutant sources. Provide long term habitat protection through purchase, conservation easements...	38

## Section 7: Work Elements and Associated Biological Objectives

Work Element Name	Work Element Title	Start Date	End Date	Estimated Budget
1: Conduct Pre-Acquisition Activities	Conduct all pre-acquisition activities for potential acquisitions/easements	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	\$811,000
Description				
Conduct all pre-acquisition activities on potential land purchases including negotiations, appraisals, title searches, surveys, etc				
Biological Objectives		Metrics		
Improve channel stability Improve habitat connectivity Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river Improve riparian condition in the tributaries Improve shoreline condition Protect Class 1 waters Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries Reduce lake pollutants		No Metrics for this Work Element		

2: Lease Land	Protect habitat important to resident fish through acquisition and/or conservation easement	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	\$15,000,000
---------------	---	-----------	-----------	--------------

Description

This project will secure habitat through land acquisition and conservation easements

Biological Objectives

Metrics

- Improve channel stability
- Improve habitat connectivity
- Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river
- Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries
- Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river
- Improve riparian condition in the tributaries
- Improve shoreline condition
- Protect Class 1 waters
- Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river
- Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries
- Reduce lake pollutants

*No Metrics for this Work Element*

3: Produce Plan	Develop management plans & habitat restoration plans	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$ 0
-----------------	--	-----------	-----------	------

Description

Once lands are secured by purchase or easement, a management plan will be developed for each parcel or group of parcels. The management plans will include habitat protection measures including fencing, native plant establishment, noxious weed control, riparian/wetland restoration and stock trespass issues. Habitat project plans will be developed to restore and enhance habitats on newly acquired/protected parcels. Restoration activities will be based upon the latest and best available science.

Biological Objectives

Metrics

- Improve channel stability
- Improve habitat connectivity
- Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river
- Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries
- Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river
- Improve riparian condition in the tributaries
- Improve shoreline condition
- Protect Class 1 waters
- Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river
- Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries
- Reduce lake pollutants

*No Metrics for this Work Element*

4: Other	Habitat Improvement Activities as Needed on parcels acquired or protected via conservation easement	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$1,000,000
----------	---	-----------	-----------	-------------

Description

This work element encompasses any habitat restoration or enhancement activities needed on parcels acquired and/or protected via conservation easement under this program. This work was also built into ongoing habitat proposals 199101901 and 199101903 to give BPA/NPCC the choice of funding under this proposal or under ongoing habitat restoration and monitoring projects.

Biological Objectives

Metrics

- Improve channel stability
- Improve habitat connectivity
- Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river
- Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries
- Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river
- Improve riparian condition in the tributaries
- Improve shoreline condition
- Protect Class 1 waters

*No Metrics for this Work Element*

Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river  
 Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries  
 Reduce lake pollutants

5: Maintain Vegetation	Conduct necessary activities to maintain restored/enhanced conditions of acquired property	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$250,000
------------------------	--	-----------	-----------	-----------

Description

This work element may include activities such as weed spraying, fence maintenance, etc needed to keep habitat on protected properties in tact. This work was also built into ongoing habitat proposals 199101901 and 199101903 to give BPA/NPCC the choice of funding under this proposal or under ongoing habitat restoration and monitoring projects.

Biological Objectives

Metrics

Improve channel stability  
 Improve habitat connectivity  
 Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river  
 Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries  
 Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river  
 Improve riparian condition in the tributaries  
 Improve shoreline condition  
 Protect Class 1 waters  
 Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river  
 Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries  
 Reduce lake pollutants

*No Metrics for this Work Element*

6: Investigate Trespass	Monitor Terms of Conservation Easements	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$20,000
-------------------------	---	-----------	-----------	----------

Description

Monitor the conditions of any conservation easements funded under this project. Land technicians will work with landowners to assure compliance.

Biological Objectives

Metrics

Improve channel stability  
 Improve habitat connectivity  
 Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river  
 Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries  
 Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river  
 Improve riparian condition in the tributaries  
 Improve shoreline condition  
 Protect Class 1 waters  
 Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river  
 Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries  
 Reduce lake pollutants

*No Metrics for this Work Element*

7: Analyze/Interpret Data	Monitor Management Plans and Restoration Efforts	10/1/2007	9/30/2009	\$ 0
---------------------------	--	-----------	-----------	------

Description

Periodic measures will be obtained at five-to-ten-year intervals to compare with baseline information upon purchase or easement. Aerial photographs will be obtained to monitor major shifts in plant communities. The coverage of noxious weeds will be estimated and monitored on all properties

Biological Objectives

Metrics

Improve channel stability  
 Improve habitat connectivity  
 Improve habitat diversity in the mainstem river  
 Improve habitat diversity in the tributaries  
 Improve riparian condition in the mainstem river  
 Improve riparian condition in the tributaries

*No Metrics for this Work Element*

Improve shoreline condition  
 Protect Class 1 waters  
 Reduce fine sediment in the mainstem river  
 Reduce fine sediment in the tributaries  
 Reduce lake pollutants

## Section 8: Budget

### Itemized Estimated Budget

Item	Note	FY 2007 Cost	FY 2008 Cost	FY 2009 Cost
Capital Equipment	Property acquisition	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Personnel	CSKT & MFWP	\$114,000	\$127,000	\$131,000
Supplies	Appraisals, surveys, prelim. title	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000
Other	Restoration Costs	\$ 0	\$500,000	\$500,000
Other	O & M	\$ 0	\$125,000	\$125,000
Fringe Benefits	CSKT & MFWP	\$31,000	\$33,000	\$35,000
Totals		\$5,265,000	\$5,905,000	\$5,911,000

### Total Estimated FY 2007-2009 Budgets

Total Itemized Budget	\$17,081,000
Total Work Element Budget	\$17,081,000

### 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
CSKT	Technical support	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	In-Kind	Under Development
CSKT	facilities	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	In-Kind	Confirmed
Flathead Land Trust/Flathead Lakers	Technical assistance & landowner contacts	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	In-Kind	Under Development
MFWP	facilities	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	Cash	Confirmed
NRCS	grant dollars	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	Cash	Under Development
NRCS	Technical support	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	In-Kind	Under Development
TBD	cost share	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	Cash	Under Development
USFWS	Technical support	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	In-Kind	Under Development
USFWS	Grant dollars	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	Cash	Confirmed
Totals		\$645,000	\$645,000	\$645,000		

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

FY 2010 Est Budget	FY 2011 Est Budget	Comments
--------------------	--------------------	----------

\$5,870,000	\$5,874,000	[Outyear comment field left blank]
-------------	-------------	------------------------------------

Future Operations & Maintenance Costs

O& M costs should decline over time as native vegetation becomes established.

Termination Date	Comments
------------------	----------

Unknown	When Hungry Horse Dam filled, it inundated 125 km of the South Fork of the Flathead River and its tributaries to adfluvial trout. This project will hopefully continue at some level until the mitigation debt has been retired.
---------	--

Final Deliverables

Vast acres of valuable habitat for resident fish protected imperpetuity. BPA or other appropriate entity will hold a perpetual habitat easement on all acquired or protected properties.

## Section 10: Project Documents

Document	Type	Size	Date
----------	------	------	------

### Fix-it Loop Documents

<a href="#">200200300 FY07_09 ISRP response</a>	doc	38 kb	7/14/2006
---	-----	-------	-----------

### Documents Originally Submitted with this Proposal:

<a href="#">Narrative for proposal 200200300</a>	doc	99 kb	1/10/2006
--	-----	-------	-----------

## 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):**  
Capitalize acquisition and permanent easement

**Primary Uncertainty for Capitalization:** Land acquisition requirements



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

<b>FY 2007 NPCC Rec</b> \$5,265,000	<b>FY 2008 NPCC Rec</b> \$5,905,000	<b>FY 2009 NPCC Rec</b> \$5,911,000	<b>Total NPCC Rec</b> \$17,081,000
<b>Budget Type:</b>	Capital		
<b>Budget Category:</b>	ProvinceCapital		
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Fund		
<b>NPCC Comments:</b> Funding contingent on Council review of revised proposal, with improved selection criteria and objectives. Revised proposal due end of December, 06. Determine if expense element is needed.			

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

<b>FY 2007 NPCC Rec</b> \$5,265,000	<b>FY 2008 NPCC Rec</b> \$5,905,000	<b>FY 2009 NPCC Rec</b> \$5,911,000	<b>Total NPCC Rec</b> \$17,081,000
<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>	ProvinceCapital		
<b>NPCC Comments:</b> Funding contingent on Council review of revised proposal, with improved selection criteria and objectives. Revised proposal due end of December, 06. Determine if expense element is needed.			
<b>Local or MSRT Comments:</b> Provincial Oversight Group (OG) expects this project to stay with a capital designation.			

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

<b>Recommendation:</b> Not fundable
<b>Comments:</b> The response is not adequate. The sponsors do not seem to understand the nature of a funding proposal. They are defensive about having to supply needed information for a technical evaluation of their project. Reviewers suggest that if their proposal is "substantiated by the science," as the authors say, then it is the obligation to outline that science, as they understand it. Apparently there have been no results from the 2002 funding. Their strategy of land acquisition for ecosystem protection is fine, but the proposal must go beyond that. The response gives statements about what they intend, but these are not given as measurable objectives. It is understandable that they do not want to show their hand on specific properties, but the objectives for a generic property can be given (in the context of the paper cited in the ISRP review, which was intended to be helpful for formulating a response). Development of criteria for selecting properties ought to have been the first objective for the 2002 funding, and given as results in this proposal. Ironically, many of the comments in the response, if presented in proposal format and not as a criticism of the ISRP and its reviewers, could have constituted several elements in a logical proposal and useful response.
As the ISRP commented, this project has elements that make it a very worthwhile. The problem is that the sponsors have inadequately presented it and have shown no progress from the previous funding. These deficiencies give a technical reviewer no justification for recommending it. A defensive response criticizing

the ISRP reviewers is not helpful. Sponsors of this proposal need to organize their approach and thoughts regarding this process and develop a sound, science-based proposal.

Other issues include the lack of justification for acquiring properties based on limiting factors. They need to come with criteria for future acquisitions. What criteria did they use for the 2.36 km of credited property they have already purchased?

## Independent Scientific Review Panel Preliminary Review (June 2, 2006)

[\[Download full document\]](#)

**Recommendation:** Response requested

**Comments:** As submitted this is not a scientifically reviewable project, but it should be. The sponsors plan to acquire properties. The proposal would benefit by including descriptions of the properties to be purchased and the species to benefit, and/or the criteria to be used for selection of the properties targeted for protection. Please provide a response on these issues.

A response is also needed to show how selected properties will help restore fluvial functions (e.g., see Palmer et al. 2005. Standards for ecologically successful river restoration. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 42, 208–217, and cited references). This is basically the same issue raised in our previous review.

Previous ISRP comments were: "Do not fund in its present form. This request is for 'base funding' rather than 'project funding' oriented to specific topics, the norm for most BPA-funded work. The proposal does not include the elements expected in a technically sound program. It should include clear and specific objectives, detailed methods, and how the progress in attaining specific objectives will be tracked and evaluated. The reporting of results is inadequate; progress in past activities of the project need to be included as a basis for continuing similar work. Adaptive management requires data for regular assessments and decisions regarding the project strategy."