

Fraser Salmon & Watersheds Program



Fraser Basin Council



2009/10 FINAL REPORT

FSWP File Number* 07350-35/FSWP 09 D HWRS 4

* Please use the FSWP File Number provided in previous FSWP project correspondence.

1. Project Information

1.1. Project Title

Bonaparte River Watershed Restoration Project

1.2. Proponent's Legal Name

Bonaparte Watershed Stewardship Society

1.3. Project Location

Bonaparte River Watershed

1.4. Contact for this report

Name: Mike Wallis

Phone: 250-573-7838

Email: mikewallis@hughes.net

1.5 Funding Amount

Original Approved Grant Amount:	Total FSWP Expenditures:	Final Invoice Amount:	Final Non-FSWP leveraging, including cash and in-kind:
75,355.00	75,355.00	15,071.00	153,593.90

2. Project Summary

Please provide a single paragraph describing your project, its objectives, and the results. As this summary may be used in program communications, clearly state the issue(s) that were addressed and avoid overly technical descriptions. Maximum 300 words.

The objective of the project was to complete 14 riparian and streambank restoration sites to add to a growing list of nearly one hundred restoration sites now completed within the Bonaparte watershed over the past 9 years by the Bonaparte watershed Stewardship Society and its partners. The restoration projects are developed with landowner cooperation and undertaken under the lead of the BWSS with the intention to incrementally improve fish and fish habitat and promote human education, participation and behaviour change within the context of a long term, watershed scale riparian and streambank restoration program. This watershed sustainability planning process follows the pattern used in the sister Salmon River watershed which is now showing watershed scale success after 17 years of similar activity. The long term goal of the Bonaparte River watershed restoration activity is to reverse a 130 year historical trend of stream and streambank degradation and fish habitat loss marked by lost riparian vegetation, severely eroding streambanks, high summer temperatures, declining salmon

stocks and other issues. A community driven watershed planning process was completed using FSWP funding in 2008, which directs short and long term efforts to 11 focus areas that support watershed sustainability, including riparian area restoration. The 14 restoration sites reported here were completed during the 2009-2010 project cycle using approaches that are becoming familiar to local landowners as demonstration sites, tours and further restoration partnerships develop. This years projects were accomplished with support from FSWP, CP , FRISP, DFO, BIB, landowners and others. Fish habitat improvement was achieved in terms of streambank structure, planted areas, instream complexity, scour pool, invertebrate micro-habitat availability, decreased sediment inputs, as well as a willingness of previously unwilling landowners to try current bioengineering practices to restore property and fish values.

Several important new partnerships with landowners were developed this year, and the funding received from CP was instrumental in undertaking a series of sites, including in particular two large sites that would otherwise have not been possible to complete. This restoration work also ties directly back to ongoing efforts to address improved water management and drought response approaches, within the context of a larger watershed planning process.

OPTIONAL Please give a short statement (up to 100 words) of the most compelling activity or outcome from your project.

The most outstanding outcome of this years work was that it involved new landowners and accomplished significant improvement at degraded sites, including two large sites. These add incrementally to an improved local understanding of bioengineering techniques, beneficial riparian area management practices, their benefits to fish and fish habitat and gathers momentum toward long term watershed sustainability goals.

3.Final Project Results and Effectiveness

3.1 Copy EXPECTED OUTCOMES from your detailed proposal and insert into this section. Add additional rows as needed. Then please list the FINAL OUTCOMES (the tangible end products resulting from this work) associated with expected outcome.

If FINAL OUTCOMES differ from the original EXPECTED OUTCOMES please describe why, and the implications for the project.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES	FINAL OUTCOMES
1. 14 completed restorations sites including pretreatment assessments, as built reports, photos and site and watershed scale mapping	24 sites were prescribed, permitted and completed following standard practices that are becoming more familiar to local landowners, producers and contactors.
2. A report summarizing the effect of these and previous restoration sites including some preliminary monitoring of results such as participant perception and biophysical features of restored and unrestored sites highlighting linkages to WFSP recommendations.	Each site was assessed prior and following restoration. These sites are immediately stabilized and provide measurably improved fish habitat within a year, and based on our experience with other similar sites can generally be expected to continue to mature into higher value habitats over the following decade. Participant perception and awareness of the dual benefit of restoring streambank habitat to restore property and fish value is increasing, and more potential candidates

	<p>are coming forward requesting assistance This restoration work links directly back to ongoing efforts to address improved water management and drought response approaches , within the context of a larger watershed planning process. In the longer term it is expected that continued monitoring will provide evidence of success indicating improvement across several key riparian health features.</p>

3.2 Please evaluate the EFFECTIVENESS of your project in achieving Project Objectives. Please identify the indicators you have used to measure the effectiveness of your project. Please include any notable successes or challenges.

The 2009-2010 restoration activity was very effective. The methods and techniques are working well to provide improved fish and riparian habitat, while serving as a common point of interest to unite landowner and public support for fish, riparian habitat, water and other key watershed sustainability focus areas. Before and after photos demonstrate immediate site by site effectiveness, and the sites are expected to continue to mature over the next decade to provide higher value habitat features, adding to a lengthening list of restoration projects. A watershed scale inventory of restoration sites has been initiated to help show long term progress.

Key successes this year were to work with some new landowners who were previously not interested in participating using current bioengineering practices. In addition strong support and participation from the Bonaparte Indian band and Canadian Pacific helped avert a potential issue with a shortfall in materials supply and funding. These efforts made the year a highly successful step toward long term goals. Key challenges are very simple. With the strong lead maintained by the BWSS, partnerships and methodology are not limiting activity on the Bonaparte. The only significant blockage of completing additional sites is availability of timely funding.

Other challenges are found in addressing the equally important aspect of water management of improved water management and drought management responses that must go hand in hand with a successful riparian, streambank and instream fish habitat improvement effort. Both are currently being addressed by the BWSS within the watershed plan.

3.3 REQUIRED: attach all DOCUMENTATION of Final Outcomes, and LIST attachments here. These may include technical reports, maps, photos, evidence of communications, lists of meeting participants, etc.

2008-09 Site photo set
Watershed overview maps
Site inventory Draft Map
Recent slide show : Cache Creek meeting
Hat Creek Historical Society Interpretive trail draft map

3.4 Please describe how the benefits of this project will be sustained and/or be built upon into the future. What are the planned next steps, or recommendations for further work, if applicable?

- **NB: Text Box below will not accept text input due to formatting? Therefore info provided here in point form for Section 3.4**
- **Completion of seriously eroding streambank sites**
- **Continued monitoring of indicators to measure long term effects**
- **Developing stronger linkage to other key sustainability**
- **Focus areas such as improved water management**

3.6 What are the top three lessons learned from this project that could be useful to communicate to others doing similar work in the Basin?

1. secure long term base funding to improve probability of achieving long term goals
2. lead by example, let local successes promote new participation, allow time for people to observe, reconsider their perceptions and change their minds
3. put more effort into simple, long term monitoring result that can prove future success to funders

4. Project Expenditures

In Part A, please list all line-items from your original proposal, and add any additional line-items for costs that were not originally budgeted. Please include more specific descriptions of services or items where possible, (e.g. the name of the company or individual contracted), and actual rates, unit costs, and total expenditures. In Part B, report the original amount budgeted per line item from the detailed proposal, and the actual FSWP and non-FSWP amounts spent. Please **NOTE** that FSWP does not expect actual expenditures to necessarily align with the original budget.

Service	# of People	Daily Rate	Total # of Days	Total Project Expenditures	Original FSWP Budget (from detailed proposal)	Total FSWP Expenditures	Cash	In-Kind
Project Biologist	1	370	24	8,880.00	8,880.00	8,880.00		
Tech Assistant	1	265	36	9,685.00	5,300.00	4,485.00		5,200.00
DFO/MOE Tech Support	1	400	15	6,000.00				6,000.00
EFP/FRISP/CP	1	425	16	6,800.00				6,800.00
other (skilled)	1	200	8	1,600.00				1,600.00
other (unskilled)	1	120	30	3,600.00				3,600.00
Labour Sub-Total				36,565.00	14,180.00	13,365.00	0.00	23,200.00
Materials, Supplies & Equipment								
Item	# of Units	Unit Cost	Total Project Expenditures		Original FSWP Budget (from detailed proposal)	Total FSWP Expenditures	Total Non FSWP Contribution Cash	In-Kind
Excavator	203	129	26,103.00		12,150.00	12,474.00	13,629.00	
Rock	139	294	40,866.00		22,720.00	20,286.00	20,580.00	
Trucking	27.5	29	791.50		940.50	581.50	210.00	
Wood	40	206	8,256.50		3,900.00	2,254.50	6,002.00	
Plantings	1215	11	12,850.00		1,241.00	7,950.00	4,900.00	
Hardware(cable,epoxy,stap)	780	7	5,845.12		3,060.00	2,131.19	3,713.93	
Equip rental	30	47	1,410.50		1,840.00	472.50	938.00	
Local equipment	30	61	1,840.00					1,840.00
Fencing	1020	3.42	3,487.00		2,448.00	2,448.00	1,039.00	
Mileage	9360	0.55	5,135.81		2,187.00	2,948.81		2,187.00
Monitoring	1	4255	4,255.00		4,500.00	4,255.00		
misc field supplies	60	6	360.00		360.00	360.00		
Materials, Supplies & Equipment Sub-Total			111,200.43		55,346.50	56,161.50	51,011.93	4,027.00
Administration & Overhead								
Item	# of Units	Unit Cost	Total Project Expenditures		Original FSWP Budget (from detailed proposal)	Total FSWP Expenditures	Total Non FSWP Contribution Cash	In-Kind
Bookeeeping/ Admin staff	1	950	950		950.00	950.00		
Volunteer Insurance	1	800	800		800.00	800.00		
Phone	1	700	700		700.00	700.00		
Office	1	962.5	962.5		962.50	962.50		
mater, supplies	1	2200	2200		2,200.00	2,200.00		
print, copy	3125	0.069	216.00		216.00	216.00		
Administration & Overhead Sub-Total			5,828.50		5,828.50	5,828.50	0.00	0.00

FUNDING SUMMARY - DO NOT FILL - FSWP STAFF USE ONLY

4.1 If you have had any significant differences in spending in comparison to your original budget, please provide an explanation. Significant differences could include costs that exceed 20% of a line-item or budget category (labour, materials, administration), and new items or services that were not originally budgeted, exceeding 10% of total FSWP contribution.

NB Table below will not accept text therefore info for 4.2 inserted here.
 Planting costs were higher than planned because a large planting project was undertaken that was not originally planned , but the additional cost of cuttings was offset using CP funding to keep FSWP budget on track

4.2 Please describe all non-FSWP project contributions, cash and in-kind:

Non-FSWP Contribution Sources	Letter of Confirmation Attached (Y/N)	Cash (\$)	In-Kind(\$)	Total(\$)
See above				

5. Project Promotion

Please describe how you have communicated project activities and results within local and basin-wide communities, across organizations or to decision makers.

Please include copies of (or links to) any communications materials from these efforts that you have not previously submitted.

BWSS Directors and public meetings
 Onsite discussions with landowners
 Local community meetings (Cache Creek, Hat Creek)
 Slide shows (Cache Creek)
 Water Act modernization workshop participation (Kamloops)
 Drought Response workshop participation (Kamloops)

6. Further Comments

Please provide any further comments including recommendations for future efforts and suggestions for helping partners to meet the goals of the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program.

Reduce reporting requirements for proponents on balance with ensuring that FSWP staff members holding project files are resourced to come to the field for at least one onsite visit per project per year. Staff can collect photos and information, ask questions while on the site and see first hand what is being accomplished reducing the need for time consuming reporting by proponents and increasing the field value derived from FSWP funds.

7. DECLARATION

Please complete the following declaration:

I, Harold Ridgway, President BWSS, hereby declare that:

- 1) The information provided in this report, including all attachments is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I am authorized to sign on behalf of the stated proponent organization;
- 2) the information contained in the above financial statement submitted by us to PSF, is accurate in all material respects and is net of any GST Input Tax Credit received or receivable by us and that the funds were used exclusively for the project as originally proposed or as formally amended by PSF;
- 3) **Any funds previously paid to the Proponent by the Foundation have been used to fund project expenditures approved by the Foundation and in full compliance with the Regulation on the Use of PSF Grant Funds and Reporting Procedures set out in the Application for Funding submitted by the Proponent to the Foundation;**
- 4) **The balance of any funds previously paid to the Proponent which were not used as set out in item 3 have been returned to the Foundation;**
- 5) **Any additional funds paid to the Proponent by the Foundation will be used in this manner.**

Signature: _____ March 31, 2010 _____

(Authorized Signatory)

Name: Harold Ridgway
(Print Name)

8. Appendices

REQUIRED: attach all **DOCUMENTATION** of Final Outcomes, listed above in section 3.3. These may include technical reports, maps, photos, evidence of communications, lists of meeting participants, etc.