

Appendix 83

Reasons for not using the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) model as our assessment tool

The Flathead Aquatic Technical Team considered the use of two aquatic assessment tools: the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) model and the Qualitative Habitat Assessment Tool (QHA). The team decided not to use EDT because:

- Its use would have required more time and cost substantially more money than was available for the aquatic assessment.
- The status of the initial EDT data sets in the Mountain Columbia Province was classified as coarse scale and unreviewed, which means we would have needed to spend more time reviewing and documenting information than was available, and our confidence in the model outputs would have been low.
- We feared stumbling into a “model quagmire” with EDT. The model could have ended up requiring more time than the predicted eight to nine months and possibly more money.
- There were many streams for which there was little or no data in the Flathead Subbasin. According to Mobrاند staff, to run EDT we would have needed to do a great deal of extrapolating from streams for which there was data. This raised further concerns about the validity of model outputs.

As an alternative to EDT, Mobrاند Biometrics, Inc., the developer of EDT), created the QHA spreadsheet tool. The Technical Team reviewed QHA and found that it would meet our subbasin planning needs and so selected it as the primary assessment tool.