



**Independent Scientific Review Panel**  
for the Northwest Power & Conservation Council  
851 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
[www.nwcouncil.org/fw/isrp](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/isrp)

**Memorandum (ISRP 2009-55)**

**December 21, 2009**

**To:** W. Bill Booth, Chair, Northwest Power and Conservation Council

**From:** Eric Loudenslager, ISRP Chair

**Subject:** Final Review of Accord Proposal, Yakama Nation Status and Trend Annual Report (2009-002-00)

### **Background**

At the Council's July 31 request the ISRP began a review of the Accord proposal, *Yakama Nation Status and Trend Annual Report* (STAR) (#2009-002-00). According to the proposal, "The long-term goal of the Status and Trend Annual Report project is to support mitigation described in the 2008 FCRPS Biological Opinion and the obligations of the NPCC Fish and Wildlife Program by annually reporting progress towards salmon recovery efforts relevant to the Columbia Cascade Province and within the Ceded Lands of the Yakama Nation. This work will be in coordination with, and will support other local and regional efforts including but not limited to Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, the State of Washington, NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BPA and the NPCC Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program."

On August 28, 2009, the ISRP released a preliminary review, asking for a response ([ISRP 2009-38](#)). In general, the ISRP stated that production of an annual report on RM&E is a very worthwhile endeavor, and the use of a coordinator dedicated to producing this report annually may be a very reasonable approach. However, the ISRP recommended that the Yakama Nation develop a revised proposal that:

1. clearly documents that there is agreement among the stakeholders that this is a reasonable approach;
2. describes the procedures for coordination with other agencies and organizations doing similar work (regional coordination of anadromous salmon RME for the BiOp, FWP, High Level Indicators, PNAMP implementation monitoring);
3. has objectives and timelines clarified and altered to better reflect what could be accomplished during the initial phase of this project; justifies why only a table of contents will be generated in the first year or describes additional anticipated progress;
4. describes procedures for encouraging and documenting stakeholder input and feedback as part of monitoring and evaluation of STAR.

On November 24, the Council provided us with the Yakama Nation's response which included a cover letter addressing the ISRP's concerns point by point and, as requested, a revised proposal.

The ISRP review of the response follows below and is organized by the four concerns in our preliminary review.

## **ISRP Recommendation**

*Meets Scientific Review Criteria (Qualified)*

Qualification(s):

As a component of contracting the proponents should: 1) establish timelines to complete tasks and work-elements; 2) include an objective and methods to document stakeholder agreement; 3) establish procedures for ongoing coordination with other RME organizations, and solicitation of stakeholder input. An organized and documented process for solicitation of input from the target audience for STAR needs to be included as a work element. This project and resulting products, including the STAR template, should be reviewed after completion of the first contract period. Indications of support and cooperation by RME agencies and organizations and associated stakeholders in the STAR process should be provided as a product of the first contract period.

## **ISRP Comments**

### ***1. Stakeholder agreement***

The proponents stated that they do not have the staff or resources to address this ISRP concern in the proposal, and that stakeholder agreement will be a product of the proposed project. The revised proposal and accompanying letter provided some clarification of the proponent's proposed approach to reaching stakeholder agreement. They indicate that they have a relationship with several stakeholders through the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) and other interactions. The revised narrative includes a work element that states that project personnel will meet with the UCSRB and the Regional Technical Team (RTT) to discuss the STAR proposal and obtain input. The response also indicates that project proponents will coordinate with NOAA, BPA, and PNAMP to develop regional understanding of the proposal and obtain input. If successful, the results of these activities would demonstrate a high level of stakeholder agreement. However, for the purposes of this proposal, letters of support and cooperation for STAR by stakeholders (not provided) would have improved the proponent's response.

### ***2. Procedures for coordination with other RME agencies and organizations***

The proponents stated that they do not have the staff or resources to address this ISRP concern in the proposal, and that coordination will be a product of the proposed work. The revised proposal and accompanying letter provided some clarification of this issue. Perhaps the initial meeting with UCSRB, RTT, NOAA, BPA, and PNAMP will aid in facilitating ongoing coordination with other agencies and organizations.

### ***3. Objectives and timelines for the initial phase of this project***

The proponents revised the project scope, description, and work elements in the proposal narrative (Sections A and F) to address ISRP's concern. The listed objectives are identical to work elements (milestones) but should be stated in terms of the project's goals, such as to monitor and evaluate progress towards salmon recovery efforts in the Columbia Cascade

Province. Timelines are not provided for the initial phase. Estimated start and completion dates for each of the listed milestones or work elements should be developed and included in contracting.

#### ***4. Procedures for encouraging and documenting stakeholder input***

The revised proposal and their accompanying letter provided some clarification of this issue. For example, stakeholder input will be encouraged using the template report produced in the first contract period. Specific solicitation and documentation of all stakeholders' satisfaction should also be conducted each year. In addition the proponents envision a draft annual report would be made available to the public for comments each year. Documentation of comments could serve as further documentation of stakeholder input. The ISRP continues to emphasize that an organized and documented solicitation of input from the target audience for STAR is a necessary work element that was not included in the revision.