



DESERT FISH HABITAT
PARTNERSHIP

CALL FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS

The [Desert Fish Habitat Partnership](#) (DFHP) is requesting submission of project proposals for the 2016 [National Fish Habitat Partnership](#) (NFHP) funding cycle and other potential funding sources. The purpose of DFHP is to conserve aquatic habitat for desert fishes by protecting, restoring and enhancing these unique habitats in cooperation with, and in support of, state fish and wildlife agencies, federal agencies, tribes, conservation organizations, local partners, and other stakeholders. Projects should **directly address the habitat needs of desert fish**, specifically those identified in the DFHP [Framework for Strategic Conservation of Desert Fish](#). On-the-ground habitat conservation or restoration projects for desert fish that include multiple, diverse partners, matching resources (minimum 1 federal:1 non-federal cost share ratio is recommended), and that can be completed within two years will be given the highest priority. Emphasis will be given to projects that address natural habitats rather than artificial refugia (unless the refugia prevent a significant loss to the species). While DFHP recognizes that an important component of protecting and restoring desert fish habitat is to address threats posed by invasive species, proposals where non-native suppression is part of larger habitat restoration efforts will be given preference over “stand alone” non-native species control projects. Proposals must include a viable and effective outreach component that informs the general public about the project, the species, and DFHP.

To apply for funding, proposals and supplemental information must be submitted by **30 September 2016** to the [DFHP coordinator](#). Funding for fish habitat projects through the National Fish Habitat Board and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is expected in summer **2017 and successful applicants will be notified after funding is allotted**. Please use the proposal format (Attachment 1) and carefully review the criteria (Attachment 2) which DFHP will use to rank proposals. Attachment 3 identifies the USFWS Strategic Plan Objectives and Performance Measures that are required components of the proposal and Attachment 4 provides an example of a successful DFHP proposal. Projects not selected for this round of funding, but which meet DFHP priorities, will be maintained in a USFWS database to be considered for funding opportunities that may arise throughout the year.

Submit proposals in the attached format (Attachment 1) and include the following:

- 1) A description of how the project focuses actions on the most under-served, imperiled desert fish species, as identified in the [DFHP Conservation Priorities Matrix](#) (see Strategic Framework page 26). Identify the DFHP Matrix species served by the project, including the DFHP rank.
- 2) A description of how the project protects, maintains, or restores healthy habitats for DFHP species. Habitat elements to address may include:
 - habitat factors that threaten DFHP species
 - restoration and maintenance of flow and water levels
 - restoration of connectivity, while protecting native populations at-risk from nonnative encroachment
 - excessive sediment and nutrient input protection of intact and healthy system.
- 3) The DFHP region in which the project will occur

- 4) The DFHP habitat type served by the project (see page 2 of the [Strategic Framework](#))
- 5) How does the project fit into larger conservation efforts, such as the DFHP Strategic Framework, state wildlife action plans, multi-species conservation plans, habitat conservation plans, recovery plans, or other local plans?
- 6) Identify partner support for the project from private landowners, non-governmental organizations, academia, or local, tribal, state, and federal agencies
- 7) A letter of support or signed documentation from an approving official (e.g. line officer) of the implementing organization AND letter of support from affected landowner (if different from implementing organization) stating their commitment to the proposed project
- 8) Environmental and regulatory compliance (e.g., ESA, NEPA, 404 permits) or other permits as required
- 9) An effective monitoring plan with clear objectives for evaluating success and goals of the project. Include anticipated date for submittal of annual progress report(s)
- 10) A description of an outreach component that informs the general public about the project, the species, and DFHP
- 11) A budget that describes how all funds and match will be used to support the project's goals
- 12) List of USFWS Strategic Plan Performance Measures that project fulfills (see Attachment 3)

Schedule

To be considered for USFWS/NFHP funding anticipated for 2017, proposals and supplemental documents must be submitted by **30 September 2016**. However, proposals will be accepted year round to be matched with funding opportunities as they develop. DFHP receives funding in summer 2017, so project funding will be allocated to successful applicants in fall **2017**. Project start dates should be planned for August or September after funding has been received.

Funding Limitations

In addition to distributing NFHP funding, the DFHP will use this RFP to match proposed fish habitat projects to available funding sources. While matching funds are not a requirement, they are strongly encouraged for this proposal, and matches may be required for other funding opportunities that may come up during the year, such as those solicited by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Therefore, proposals that leverage cash funding or in-kind resources from multiple partners are strongly encouraged (preferred 1 federal:1 non-federal ratio is preferred).

Contact Information

Please **consult with your Regional Representative** ([map](#), see below) prior to submitting your proposal. Regional Representatives will answer questions and assist with the process.

Submit completed proposals in electronic format to the DFHP Coordinator Stephanie Vail-Muse at stephanie_vail-muse@fws.gov.

Desert Fish Habitat Partnership Coordinator

Stephanie L. Vail-Muse, U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, (928) 338-4288 ext. 26 stephanie_vail-muse@fws.gov

Regional Representatives

Lower Colorado River including Rio Yaqui, Rio de la Concepcion, and Rio Sonoyta

Jeremy Voeltz, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, (928) 338-4288 jeremy_voeltz@fws.gov

Upper Colorado River

Krissy Wilson, Utah Division Wildlife Resources, (801) 538-4756 krissywilson@utah.gov

Basin and Range

Jon Sjoberg, Nevada Department of Wildlife, (775) 688-1530 sjoberg@ndow.org

Rio Grande including Pecos River and Tularosa Basin

Megan Bean, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, (512) 214-3449 megan.bean@tpwd.texas.gov



DESERT FISH HABITAT
PARTNERSHIP

Desert Fish Habitat Partnership – Project Proposal

Name of Project: DFHP

Sub-Region:

Project Latitude/Longitude:

Summary Description: (100 words max)

Anticipated Start/Completion Dates:

State Project Contact (email and phone number:

Local Project Contact (email and phone number):

Federal Project Contact (email and phone number of the USFWS employee who is handling the cooperative agreement and award letter):

Implementing Organization:

Individual and Organizational Partners:

Landowner and/or Initiating Organization Support Documentation: (attach letter)

Total Project Cost: **DFHP Funds Requested:**

Partner Match Total:

- **Federal Match:**
- **Non-Federal Match:**

In-Kind Contributions:

DFHP Strategic Priority Addressed: (see Strategic [Framework](#), page 10)

DFHP Habitat Type (s) Addressed: (bulleted, see Strategic [Framework](#), page 2)

DFHP Species Addressed ([Strategic Framework](#), page 26): (bulleted with rank)

State Wildlife Action Plan, Multi-species Conservations Plans, Habitat Plans, or Recovery Plan
Priorities Addressed: (cite states, bulleted)

NFHP Strategic Goals Addressed (see NFHP [Action Plan](#) goals, page 3):

Need for Project: (250 words max)

Objectives: (250 words max)

Benefits/Expected Results: (250 words max)

Environmental and Regulatory Compliance (*e.g.*, ESA, NEPA, 404 permits) or other permits as required: (200 words max)

Effectiveness Monitoring Plan and Reporting Schedule- Before, during, and after project photos must be included: (200 words max)

Outreach Component:

Methods/Schedule: (bulleted)

Budget: (Indicate expenses such as salaries and equipment and amount of DFHP request and matching funds. Describe all sources of matching funds or in-kind contributions to the project. For equipment and supplies, provide details on what items are to be purchased or supplied.)

Cost	DFHP Request	USFWS Federal Match		Non-USFWS Federal Match		Non-Federal Match		Total
		Cash	In-kind	Cash	In-kind	Cash	In-kind	
Personnel								
Fringe Benefits								
Travel								
Equipment								
Supplies								
Contractual								
Construction								
Other								
Total Direct Charges								
Total Indirect Charges								
USFWS Indirect Cost								
Total								

(Note: Estimated Value of Volunteers In-kind contributions is \$23.56 per hour)

Source: https://www.independentsector.org/volunteer_time

Please attach photos of site habitat proposed for improvement:

IMPORTANT

NFHP/USFWS Funding Information: For consideration for USFWS and National Fish Habitat Partnership funding, select the appropriate Strategic Plan Objectives and Performance Measure (use numerical codes). See Attachment 3.

USFWS Strategic Plan Objectives

Primary:

Secondary:

Performance Measures

Performance Measure	Year					Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	



Desert Fish Habitat Partnership Proposal Evaluation and Criteria Form

DFHP Regional Workgroups and Executive and Steering Committees will consider the following factors in selecting projects for funding:

	DFHP Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points
1.	<p>DFHP Habitat and Species Addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the proposed project address an identified DFHP Habitat (pg 2 Strategic Framework)? b. Are DFHP species (pg 26 Strategic Framework) identified with ranks? Are multiple species involved? 	15
2.	<p>Project Objectives and Measurable Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the proposal protect, maintain, or restore healthy habitats for DFHP species? b. Does the proposal fit into larger conservation efforts, such as the DFHP Strategy, state wildlife action plans, multi- species conservation plans, habitat conservation plans, recovery plans, or other local plans? 	15
3.	<p>Technical Merit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the proposal supported by sound and established scientific, hydrological and biological studies or principles? b. Will the project enhance or sustain species diversity, increase populations of target species, and maintain or increase aquatic ecosystem function? c. Does the project have a high likelihood to provide long-term benefits for DFHP priority species and habitats? d. Does the project applicant and partners have sufficient technical qualifications to complete the project? 	15
4.	<p>Proposal format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the project applicant provide all of the information required by the RFP and in the proper format? 	5
5.	<p>Partnerships/Community Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the project have multiple and diverse partners working in collaboration? b. Are there letters of support or signed documentation from approving officials and/or affected landowners stating their commitment to the proposed project? c. Does the project have a high probability of being completed in the next 2 years if it is funded? 	15

6.	Environmental and Regulatory Compliance (e.g., ESA, NEPA, 404 permits, or other permits as required) a. Has project applicant demonstrated adequate planning to ensure project implementation and completion? b. Which NEPA, 404 or other state and federal permits are needed to execute the project and have they been acquired? If not, when will they be filed and obtained? (Projects with completed NEPA/state permits will receive higher priority).	10
7.	Monitoring and Best Management Practices a. Does the proposal include a monitoring plan with clear objectives for evaluating the success and goals of the project? b. Does the monitoring plan include both pre-and post-project monitoring activities? c. Do the Best Management Practices or conservation actions proposed include a description and timeline of the long-term maintenance responsibilities that assure the project will be successful and the results sustainable?	10
8.	Budget a. Are cost estimates appropriate, focused on actions linked to DFHP objectives, well justified and reasonable? b. Does the project leverage other government or private funding or in-kind resources that work toward a 1 federal: 1 non-federal cost share? c. Is partner funding and/or resources an important element for project implementation? d. Does the project link to or add value to another existing or	10
9.	Public Outreach a. Does the proposal have a viable and effective public outreach component? b. Is the local community involved in the project? c. Are there plans to include electronic outreach? Example: internet website. d. Are there plans to develop an on-site kiosk? e. Will there be media involvement? Examples: newspaper, interviews.	5
TOTAL SCORE		100

Scores for each of the ten criteria can range from the maximum to the minimum using the following scale:

0-20% of the total points for little or no relevant response

21%-45% of the total points for a minimal relevant response

46%-70% of the total points for a well-supported response

71%-100% of the total points for an exceptional response in which the Project Applicant gives evaluators the information they need and is clear and concise with documented support.

USFWS/NFHP Funding Information

For consideration for USFWS funding, including that identified for implementation of the National Fish Habitat Action Plan, please use the following information to select the appropriate Strategic Plan Objectives and Performance Measure. For further guidance, please contact your USFWS Region Fish Habitat Representative.

USFWS Strategic Plan Objectives

1.1.1 Develop and improve long-term partnerships with States, Tribes, other Federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, and other Service Programs to develop collaborative conservation strategies for aquatic resources.

1.2.1 Develop and implement performance measures to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of Fisheries Program resource activities and financial accountability.

1.2.2 Manage Fisheries Program funding to maximize Program performance and to allocate and spend Program funds in a timely and responsible manner.

2.1.1 Facilitate management of aquatic habitats on national and regional scales.

2.1.2 Expand the use of Fisheries Program expertise to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts of habitat alteration on fish and other aquatic species.

2.1.3 Increase the quantity and improve the quality of aquatic and riparian habitat on Service lands.

3.1.1 Maintain diverse, self-sustaining fish and other aquatic resource populations.

3.1.2 Restore declining fish and other aquatic resource populations before they require listing under the Endangered Species Act.

3.1.3 Recover fish and other aquatic resource populations protected under the Endangered Species Act.

3.2.1 Prevent new introductions of aquatic nuisance species.

3.2.2 Minimize range expansion and population growth of established aquatic nuisance species.

3.3.1 Co-manage interjurisdictional fisheries.

3.3.2 Support, facilitate, and/or lead collaborative approaches to manage inter-jurisdictional fisheries.

4.1.1 Enhance recreational fishing opportunities on Service and Department of Defense lands.

4.1.2 Provide support to States, Tribes, and other partners to identify and meet shared or complementary recreational fishing and aquatic education and outreach objectives.

- 4.1.3 Recognize and promote the value and importance of recreational fishery objectives in implementation of other Service responsibilities.
- 4.2.1 Identify the mitigation responsibilities of Federal agencies related to water projects.
- 4.2.2 Meet the Service's responsibilities for mitigating fisheries.
- 4.2.3 Achieve full cost recovery from water project sponsors.
- 5.1.1 Provide technical assistance to Tribes.
- 5.1.2 Identify sources of funds to enhance Tribal resource management.
- 5.1.3 Provide fish for Tribal resource management.
- 5.1.4 Recognize and promote the Service's distinct obligations toward Tribes within the Fisheries Program.
- 6.1.1 Develop and share applied aquatic scientific and technologic tools with partners.
- 6.1.2 Utilize appropriate scientific and technologic tools in formulating and executing fishery management plans and policies.
- 7.1.1 Staff Fisheries Program field stations at levels adequate to effectively meet the Service's goals and objectives in fish and other aquatic resource conservation.
- 7.1.2 Provide employees with opportunities to maintain competencies in the expanding knowledge and technologies needed to improve opportunities for professional achievement, advancement and recognition.
- 7.1.3 Provide employees with access to facilities and equipment needed to effectively, efficiently, and safely perform their jobs.

USFWS Performance Measures

- 5.1.3 Number of habitat assessments completed (not acres)
- 5.1.4 Total number of miles of in-stream and shoreline habitat assessed
- 5.1.10 Total number of in-stream/shoreline miles restored in U.S
- 5.1.11 Total number of fish passage barriers removed or bypassed
- 5.1.12 Number of miles re-opened to fish passage-FWMA
- 5.1.13 Number of acres re-opened to fish passage
- 5.2.4 Total number of population assessments completed

5.3.1.1 Number of all tasks implemented, as prescribed in Fishery Management Plans

5.3.7 Number of applied aquatic scientific and technologic tools developed through publications

7.21.5.1 Number of Recovery Plan tasks implemented by the Fisheries Program

12.2.4 Number of activities conducted to support the management and control of aquatic invasive species

12.2.9 Number of risk assessments conducted to evaluate potentially invasive aquatic species-annual

12.2.11 Number of surveys conducted for aquatic invasive species baseline/trend information for aquatic invasive species

12.2.12 Number of surveys conducted for early detection and rapid response for aquatic invasive species

12.2.14 Number of invasive species partnerships established and maintained

15.4.1.1 Number of all mitigation tasks implemented as prescribed in approved plans

15.4.8 Number of aquatic outreach and education activities and/or events

15.4.12 Total number of visitors to USFWS Fisheries facilities

18.1.6 Number of training session to support Tribal fish and wildlife conservation

18.1.12 Number of consultations conducted to support Tribal fish and wildlife conservation

5.1.3.1 Number of acres of upland habitat assessed

5.1.3.2 Number of acres of wetland habitat assessed

12.2.12.2 Number of activities conducted for rapid response (Aquatic Nuisance Species)

12.2.4.1 Number of activities conducted to address priority pathways (Aquatic Nuisance Species)

12.2.7.1 Number of aquatic nuisance species related outreach/education activities conducted

5.1.10.2 Number of instream miles enhanced

5.1.10.1 Number of riparian miles enhanced

12.2.12.1 Number of surveys conducted for early detection (Aquatic Nuisance Species)

12.2.4.2 Number of technical assistance/coordination activities conducted (Aquatic Nuisance Species)

5.1.3.3 Number of upland acres restored/enhanced

5.1.3.4 Number of wetland acres restored/enhanced



Desert Fish Habitat Partnership – Project Proposal EXAMPLE

Name of Project: Red Rock Cienega Wetland Rehabilitation

DFHP Sub-Region: Lower Colorado

Latitude/Longitude: 32.6927 / -108.7257

Summary Description: Red Rock State Wildlife Area historically had a cienega habitat in the Lakes Pasture area. Recently the cienega has only been seasonal and nonnative *Tamarisk* sp. is invading the area. The New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (Department) is proposing to actively remove *Tamarisk* from the lakes pasture area and excavate a cienega type pond and wetland area. Once this pond is constructed the Department will work with Arizona Department of Game and Fish and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to establish populations of two imperiled fish species, Gila topminnow (*Poeciliopsis occidentalis*) and Gila chub (*Gila intermedia*), within the cienega. The cienega will also provide habitat for birds and other wildlife that frequent the area.

Anticipated Start/Completion Dates: 2007-2009

State Project Contact: Stephanie Carman, NMDGF, 505 476-8092, stephanie.carman@state.nm.us

Local/Other Project Contact: Yvette Paroz, NMDGF, 505 476-8092, yvette.paroz@state.nm.us

Federal Project Contact: Jennifer Fowler-Propst, 505 555-9348, Jennifer_FowlerPropst@fws.gov

Implementing Organization: New Mexico Department of Game and Fish

Partner Organizations: Arizona Game and Fish Department, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Landowner and/or Initiating Organization Support Documentation: (attach letter)

Total Project Cost: \$90,000 DFHP Funds Requested: \$60,000

Partner Match Total:

- **Federal Match:**
- **Non-Federal Match**

In-Kind Contributions: USFWS and NMDGF have provided the planning (arch surveys, engineering, NEPA), Arizona Game and Fish Department is providing fish.

DFHP Strategic Priority Address: *Strategy 2: Restore and maintain flow and water levels*

A cienega is a permanently watered, spring-fed marshland found in mid-elevation (1000-2000 m) semidesert grasslands. As oases in the desert, cienegas have been subject to a great deal of development and degradation over the course of human history, to the extent that currently few functioning cienega habitats remain. By restoring this cienega to its natural state, this project will assist in repairing the natural hydrological function of the Gila River basin. Additionally, it will provide habitat for two imperiled fish species unique to cienega habitat in the Gila River basin.

DFHP Habitat Addressed: Cienega
Landownership: New Mexico State Game Commission

DFHP Species Addressed: Gila topminnow (2.00)
Gila chub (2.11)

Wildlife Action Plan Priorities Addressed:

New Mexico Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy – Gila Watershed: Prioritized Conservation Actions (pg 293):

1. Collaborate with federal and state agencies and affected publics to re-establish perennial cienega habitats along riparian corridors.
2. Work with federal, state, and private agencies and institutions to remove non-native species and restore Gila topminnow in appropriate perennial spring habitats.
4. Collaborate with federal and state agencies and affects publics to create awareness and understanding of perennial marsh/cienega/spring/seep functions, services and values.
7. Collaborate with federal and state agencies and affected publics to implement the recovery plan for the Gila chub

NFHP Strategic Priority Addressed: This project will *Increase the quality and quantity of fish habitats that support a broad natural diversity of fish and other aquatic species.*

Need for Project: Freshwater sites in the Chihuahuan desert region are relatively rare and often threatened by groundwater pumping, diversions, grazing and development. The Desert Fishes Habitat Partnership was formed to focus on the imperiled, unique aquatic habitats of deserts. Among those habitats specifically recognized by the Partnership as important are cienegas. The Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico also identifies perennial marsh/spring/seep habitats, including cienegas, to have one of the highest risks of being adversely altered and in need of protection. The proposed project would enhance critical wetland habitat in the Gila River Basin, part of the lower Colorado River Basin. The lakes pasture area historically had permanently watered wetlands, which have recently become ephemeral due to a deepening water table aggravated by the presence of noxious weeds including *Tamarisk*, bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), and musk thistle (*Carduus nutans*).

The proposed project would also aid in recovery efforts of two federally threatened species, Gila topminnow and Gila chub. The Gila topminnow has been extirpated from New Mexico, but resides in Arizona. The Gila chub is currently found in the Turkey Creek watershed within New Mexico, but recent wildfires in the upper reaches of Turkey Creek threaten this population. Establishment of additional populations of these species in New Mexico is a priority identified in state and federal recovery plans.

Objectives: The primary objective of the project is to restore the natural cienega at Red Rock State Wildlife Area. The Department has begun this process by working with engineers and hydrologists from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service to draft designs of the cienega wetland. Test holes have been dug revealing that the water table is less than three feet deep and soils appear to have high clay content, making the area a good location for a pond. The Department has water rights ample to augment the pond with water as needed from a pump site near the pasture.

The next step in restoring the cienega is to restore native vegetation in the area. This will involve removing noxious plants from the area, including *Tamarisk*, by mechanical and/or chemical methods. Native willows and cottonwoods will then be planted to provide replacement cover for those species currently using the *Tamarisk*. The cienega will then need to be deepened, creating a pond area approximately 5 to 7 acres with a variety of depths to create a diversity of habitats. An electric pump on a nearby water well will be used to supplement water to the wetland during dry seasons via an underground pipe.

Once the cienega area is established, the Department will collect Gila chub from the Turkey Creek population and work with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Arizona Game and Fish Department to secure adequate stock of Gila topminnow for patriation. Public access would be developed to the area via an interpretive trail and viewing platform on the wetland to enhance visitor experiences to the area, particularly for bird watching.

Benefits/Expected Results: The proposed project would restore a permanently watered wetland/cienega in the lakes pasture area. As a result, Gila topminnow and Gila chub could be reared within the cienega on a permanent basis and not be threatened by dry conditions. The abundance of *Tamarisk*, bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), and musk thistle (*Carduus nutans*) would be reduced, which would promote the re-establishment of native vegetation. The abundance of native mesquite (*Panicum spp.*) would also be reduced in surrounding upland areas to enhance structural diversity. Overall, this would result in an increased use of the area by neo-tropical migrant birds, migratory waterfowl, and native resident wildlife such as mule deer and javelina.

Environmental and Regulatory Compliance (e.g., ESA, NEPA, 404 permits) or other permits as required: (200 words max) Topographical and archeological surveys, as well as NEPA documentation, including Section 7 reports, have been completed.

Outreach Component: There will be a kiosk built that informs the public of the area, the species, and DFHP. We will also have site tours, provide brochures, and get the local community/schools involved in the project.

Effectiveness Monitoring Plan: To document the success of the project, NMDGF will complete regular monitoring at the site. This will include at a minimum annual surveys of vegetation, fish and birds. Additionally, NMDGF will monitor the public use of the area as part of its Gaining Access Into Nature program which encourages nonconsumptive use of State Game Commission lands.

Schedule:

Completed

2006 – Site Visit

2007- Test Holes, Archeological Survey, Topographical Survey, NEPA Documentation

Anticipated

Spring 2008 – Soil Samples
 Summer 2008 – Refine Pond Design – Begin Vegetation Control
 Fall 2008 – Continue Vegetation Control
 Winter 2008 – Construct Pond
 Spring 2009 – Continue Vegetation Control/Plant Native Vegetation
 Summer/Fall 2009 – Stock Gila Topminnow and Gila Chub in pond;
 Continue Vegetation Control/ Native plant restoration

Progress reports will be submitted annually by 30 December until project is completed

Budget: Indicate expenses such as salaries and equipment and amount of DFHP request and matching funds. Describe all sources of matching funds or in-kind contributions to the project. For equipment and supplies, provide details on what items are to be purchased or supplied.

Cost	DFHP Request	USFWS Federal Match		Non-USFWS Federal Match		Non-Federal Match		Total
		Cash	In-kind	Cash	In-kind	Cash	In-kind	
Personnel		\$15,000		\$15,000				\$ 30,000
Fringe Benefits								
Travel	\$ 5,000							\$ 5,000
Equipment	\$ 30,000							\$ 30,000
Supplies	\$ 10,000							\$ 10,000
Contractual	\$ 5,000							\$ 5,000
Construction	\$ 10,000							\$ 10,000
Other								
Total Direct Charges								
Total Indirect Charges								
USFWS Indirect Cost								
Total								90,000

Please attach photos of site habitat proposed for improvement:



NFHP/USFWS Funding Information: For consideration for USFWS funding, including that identified for implementation of the National Fish Habitat Partnership, select the appropriate Strategic Plan Objectives and Performance Measure (use numerical codes). See Attachment 3.

USFWS Strategic Plan Objectives

Primary: Facilitate management of aquatic habitats on national and regional scales.

Secondary: None specified

Performance Measures

Performance Measure	Year					Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	
7.21.5.1	4	4				8
5.1.3.4		7				7