

**Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program
Fiscal Year 2000 Annual Implementation Work Plan
March 2000**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| PART 1 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NORTHWEST POWER PLANNING COUNCIL | 5 |
| (A) GENERAL POLICY AND LEGAL ISSUES INFORMING THE COUNCIL’S RECOMMENDATIONS | 5 |
| (B) CATEGORIES OF PROPOSALS AND GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROCESSES AND RULES OF DECISION FOR EACH CATEGORY..... | 16 |
| (C) SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED BY PROPOSED PROJECTS OR CERTAIN PROJECT TYPES | 23 |
| PART 2 FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROJECTS TABLE | 65 |
| I. FY 2000 PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE COUNCIL..... | 65 |
| II. PROPOSALS THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING PENDING SPONSOR COMPLIANCE WITH ISRP COMMENTS THROUGH BPA’S CONTRACTING PROCESS | 89 |
| III. PROPOSALS THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDED AS ELIGIBLE FOR ONE-TIME GRANTS AS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH PROJECTS FROM ISRP RANK OF 42 (SEE TEXT PART III)..... | 90 |
| IV. BPA NON-DISCRETIONARY TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROJECTS WITH NO FORMAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION..... | 91 |
| V. PROPOSALS THE COUNCIL DID NOT RECOMMEND FOR FUNDING | 92 |
| VI. SUMMARY OF TOTALS FOR FY2000 PROJECT PROPOSALS | 101 |
| PART 3 COUNCIL RESPONSE TO ISRP PROGRAMMATIC RECOMMENDATIONS | 102 |
| PART 4 STATEMENT REGARDING THE COUNCIL’S CONSIDERATION OF THE IMPACT OF OCEAN CONDITIONS ON FISH AND WILDLIFE POPULATIONS | 114 |
| PART 5 “COST-EFFECTIVE MEASURES” DETERMINATION..... | 124 |

Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program Fiscal Year 2000 Annual Implementation Work Plan

March 2000

Introduction

This document contains the recommendations of the Northwest Power Planning Council to the Bonneville Power Administration, pursuant to the Northwest Power Act, for how Bonneville should use its fund in Fiscal Year 2000 for direct expenditures to implement the Council's *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*.

Requirements of the Northwest Power Act

Under the Northwest Power Act, the Council develops the Fish and Wildlife Program to "protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife" affected by the development, operation, and management of the Columbia River basin hydroelectric facilities. Section 4(h)(10)(A) of the Power Act then calls on Bonneville to use its "fund" -- its power revenues -- and other authorities to protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife "in a manner consistent with" the Council's Program. With few exceptions, Bonneville does not implement the Program itself. Bonneville instead funds fish and wildlife projects and activities proposed by others -- primarily but not exclusively the state and federal fish and wildlife agencies and tribes and the federal dam operating agencies -- to implement the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program.

In 1996, Bonneville and four other federal agencies, in consultation with the Council and the region's Indian tribes, executed a Memorandum of Agreement that describes a six-year (1996-2001) budget for all of Bonneville's fish and wildlife funding. Part of the Bonneville budget commitment is to allocate an average of \$127 million per year until 2001 for *direct* expenditures by Bonneville (as contrasted with Bonneville funding to reimburse congressional expenditures) to implement the Council's Program and for other purposes.¹

¹ Bonneville's fish and wildlife budget also funds activities that implement programs other than the Council's. There are a number of ways to categorize Bonneville's fish and wildlife funding obligations. For the purposes here, it is useful to think of three different types of Bonneville funding obligations: (1) direct expenditures by Bonneville to implement the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, including direct capital investments by Bonneville; (2) other direct expenditures, which include certain expenditures required of Bonneville to implement the Endangered Species Act and Bonneville's internal program management costs; and (3) a variety of fish and wildlife activities, some that implement portions of the Council's Program, some that implement other programs that are funded first by congressional appropriations and then reimbursed by Bonneville. The Council's recommendations described in this document are directly relevant to the *first* type of funding action only -- direct Bonneville expenditures to implement the Council's Program. However, Bonneville's direct funding budget category merges the direct funding for the Council's Program and for Endangered Species Act requirements and internal program support. These different types of activities divide the average initial amount of \$127 million that Bonneville allocates to the direct program each year pursuant to the 1996-2001 Bonneville fish and wildlife budget agreement. Thus in describing the projects that will be part of the Bonneville direct fund for Fiscal Year 2000 and in totaling the budget recommendations, this document will include the other direct program activities.

With regard to this “direct funding” portion of the Bonneville budget, beginning in 1995, Bonneville, the Council and the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes developed a coordinated annual process for recommending projects to Bonneville for direct funding. The fish and wildlife agencies and tribes review and prioritize the projects proposed for funding. In a public review process, the Council then reviews the agencies and tribes’ funding recommendations for consistency with the Fish and Wildlife Program, engages in a dialogue with the managers and others over those recommendations and forwards its own recommendations to Bonneville for funding. *See* the Council’s *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*, Section 3.1B. The Annex to the Bonneville budget Memorandum of Agreement describes budget allocation procedures and expectations that are built on this project selection process.

Congress amended Section 4(h)(10) of the Power Act in 1996 to add additional procedural and substantive requirements to this project selection and funding process, especially the addition of an independent science review. Congress acted primarily to insulate the funding process from a perceived conflict of interest -- the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes review and prioritize the projects for funding and are also the primary funding recipients. The amendment directed the Council to appoint (from nominations submitted by the National Academy of Sciences) an 11-member Independent Scientific Review Panel “to review projects proposed to be funded through that portion of the Bonneville Power Administration’s annual fish and wildlife budget that implements the Council’s fish and wildlife program.” The Council may also appoint scientific peer review groups to “assist the Panel in making its recommendations to the Council.” The ISRP and any peer review groups are subject to the conflict of interest standards that apply to scientists “performing comparable work” for the National Academy. The ISRP and peer review groups are to review the projects proposed for funding and “submit recommendations on project priorities” to the Council by June 15. The ISRP and review groups “shall review a sufficient number of projects to adequately ensure that the list of prioritized projects recommended is consistent with the Council’s program.” Recommendations of the ISRP are to be based on a “determination that projects: are based on sound science principles, benefit fish and wildlife, and have a clearly defined objective and outcome with provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results.” The ISRP and review groups are also to review annually “the results of prior year expenditures based upon these criteria,” and to submit their findings to the Council.

The amendment further provides that the ISRP’s recommendations must be made available to the public for review and comment. The Council must then “fully consider” the ISRP’s recommendations “when making its final funding recommendations of projects to be funded” by Bonneville. The Council must “explain in writing its reasons for not accepting Panel recommendations.” In making its funding recommendations, the Council also has two additional responsibilities. First, the Council must “consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations.” Second, the Council “shall determine whether the projects employ cost-effective measures to achieve program objectives.”

Fiscal Year 2000 Project Review, Scientific Panel’s Report, and Council Action

This is the third year of implementation of the Power Act amendment procedures for project review and funding recommendations. This year the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) conducted a project specific review of all the project proposals. The fish and wildlife agencies and tribes once again reviewed the projects proposed for funding (through the

institution of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority), submitting a draft work plan with their funding recommendations to the Council and the ISRP by April 16, 1999. The ISRP began reviewing the project information well before receiving the Authority's recommendations. The ISRP submitted its report and recommendations regarding the projects proposed for funding in Fiscal Year 1999 to the Council on June 15, 1999, *Review of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program for Fiscal Year 2000 as directed by the 1996 Amendment to the Northwest Power Act, Report No. ISRP98-1*. The Council put out for public review both the ISRP's recommendations and the Authority's draft work plan. The fish and wildlife managers submitted a revised draft work plan, including a section responding to the project specific comments in the June 15, 1999 ISRP report on August 20, 1999.

As mentioned above, the ISRP conducted an intensive review of each project proposal that was submitted in the solicitation process. The ISRP used five ratings to express its opinion and findings as to whether or not each of the proposals satisfied the review criteria in section 4(h)(10) of the Act. If the proposal as presented met the scientific criteria it was rated as "fund." If the proposal as presented met the criteria but was found to lack an element that would justify its continuation beyond Fiscal Year 2000, it was rated as "fund for 1 year." A rating of "fund in part" was assigned if some portion of the proposal as presented met the criteria, but some portion did not. If the ISRP found that a critical piece of information or clarification was required, but the project otherwise met the statutory criteria, it was rated as "delay" funding. Finally, if the ISRP found that the proposal did not meet the criteria, it was rated as "do not fund."

The June 15, 1999 ISRP report had a high degree of concurrence with the April work plan recommendations of CBFWA -- the ISRP agreed that over 140 of the projects proposed in the CBFWA April 16, 1999 work plan should be funded. However, many of the proposals that did not receive a "fund" rating from the ISRP were existing projects representing a substantial block of ratepayer investment in prior years. The Council, in consultation with CBFWA and the ISRP, determined that it was appropriate to provide the sponsors of *existing* projects that were not rated as "fund" by the ISRP an opportunity to respond to the June 15, 1999 ISRP report. These sponsors were asked to provide the information or analysis that the ISRP found lacking in the original proposal. The ISRP was asked to review these proposals again in light of this additional information. This process came to be informally referred to as the "fix-it loop review." The Council determined that proponents of *new* projects rated as "do not fund" would not participate in this second submittal and review. The rationale was that not recommending funding for a new proposal in Fiscal Year 2000 simply means that the proposed activities are not started in that year -- issues such as loss of prior investments and programmatic history that were associated with existing projects were not in issue for new proposals.

Project sponsors were given the opportunity to submit responses to the initial ISRP report in the statutory public comment period, in a special comment period for the "fix-it review," and in a coordinated response from CBFWA on August 20, 1999. The ISRP reviewed the proposals and the additional information, and provided a second report entitled *Response Review of Fiscal Year 2000 Proposals* (ISRP 99-4) on October 29, 1999. The opportunity provided the project sponsors a chance to address the scientific concerns expressed by the ISRP in its initial review produced a dramatic improvement in the ISRP's conclusions about scientific soundness of the projects. Of the 100 projects the ISRP reviewed in the Response Review, only 25 did not receive a "fund" rating from the ISRP.

This introduction and the documents that follow describe the funding recommendations of the Council and how the Council complied with the requirements of Section 4(h)(10) while developing these recommendations.

Following this introduction, the Council's funding recommendation consists of the following five parts:

1. Part 1(a) is a discussion of general policy and legal issues that informed the Council as it developed generally applicable decision rules for proposed new and existing projects. These include considerations related to the expectation that the Fish and Wildlife Program will be opened for amendment, and a new program finally adopted within the next year; the change in the way the ISRP's annual scientific review process will be conducted in Fiscal Year 2001 and beyond; and the apparent consensus among fish and wildlife managers, independent scientists, and entities with planning or regulatory jurisdiction related to Columbia Basin fish and wildlife that fish and wildlife planning and implementation in the future should be organized largely around subbasin plans. Part 1(b) identifies the project categories developed on the basis of the CBFWA and ISRP ratings, and the generally applicable processes and rules of decision adopted by the Council for each of these categories. Part 1(c) identifies and discusses project-specific issues raised in previous years regarding certain projects or specific types of projects, and provides the Council recommendation decision for these projects or project categories. Part 1(c) also includes a discussion of those projects that were not recommended for funding by the ISRP, and provides a written explanation of the Council's decision to fund or not fund those projects.
2. Part 2 is a projects table that groups proposals according to the funding recommendation of the Council, notes the CBFWA recommendation for each proposal, and notes the ISRP rating in the June 15, 1999 and October 28, 1999 reviews. By providing the final ISRP rating and the final Council recommendation, this table shows how the Council responded to each of the project specific recommendations of the ISRP in summary format. However, there are explanations of how ISRP's recommendations were treated by the Council that in Part 1(c) that may elaborate on the summary notation included in the table.
3. Part 3 provides the Council's response to each "programmatic" recommendation of the ISRP, explaining how the Council either incorporated each recommendation into its own funding recommendations or the reasons why it decided not to accept the ISRP's recommendation.
4. Part 4 is a brief paper describing how the Council considered the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations and the implications of this impact for project funding recommendations.
5. Part 5 is a description of how the Council implemented the Power Act requirement to determine whether projects employ cost-effective measures to meet Program objectives.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

PART 1 Recommendations of the Northwest Power Planning Council

(a) General Policy and Legal Issues Informing the Council's Recommendations

A Program in Transition

Two of the primary statutory responsibilities of the Council converge this year in an unprecedented way. First, a major task at hand for the Council and the Region is a Fish and Wildlife Program amendment process. The Council intends to initiate the program amendment process early in the year 2000. The Council will seek to adopt a unifying framework for that program. The state of the science and the current efforts of the fish and wildlife managers indicate that a strong subbasin planning element is likely to be a major component of that program framework. The second statutory task at hand for the Council is to make funding recommendations to Bonneville this fall for projects proposed for FY 2000. The Council must recommend to Bonneville which *existing* projects implementing the currently adopted program should continue to be funded, and also, which proposed *new* projects seeking to begin implementing the currently adopted program should be started in the coming year. However, given that the program will be amended prior to the end of Fiscal Year 2000, these new and existing projects, designed to implement the currently adopted program, will likely outlive that program.

There is a need to harmonize these statutory duties this year -- on the one hand, the Act directs the Council to advise Bonneville to fund projects that are consistent with the program, and implement it in a cost-effective manner over the next year. On the other hand, the Council is considering a schedule that would lead to adopting major amendments to the program within the next 8 to 10 months that may dramatically change its organization and content. In such a case, there is a real risk that projects proposed for funding in Fiscal Year 2000 designed to be consistent with the existing program will outlive that program and not be consistent with the program that will be adopted and in place by the end of 2000. The Council believes that it would be imprudent, and perhaps even violative of the Act's cost-effectiveness provisions, to make Fiscal Year 2000 project funding recommendations without consideration of the fact those projects will outlive the term of the existing program.

The Council believes that the region is truly confronted with a critical transition period in Fiscal Year 2000. It is necessary to make funding decisions for Fiscal Year 2000 projects, while at the same time, minimizing the risk that projects approved for funding will become orphans when a new program is adopted next year. Orphaned projects translate into limited ratepayer funds spent unwisely and expectations of project implementers dashed. This result does not benefit fish and wildlife, ratepayers, project implementers or the credibility of the program as a focused, cost-effective plan for funding fish and wildlife restoration and mitigation. Further, the term of the current Bonneville funding MOA is nearing an end. If the region is to expect continued support for funding the program, it will be necessary to demonstrate that the program is a focused and effective plan. The Council and the region cannot afford to waste any time in developing that type of program.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

What is the desired end state”?

The “desired end state” discussed below is a look beyond the life of the existing program, and an attempt to put forth for the region some ideas and proposals for how the *next* program and project selection process may be organized and implemented in a manner that will secure support within and outside of the region. As was emphasized when the concepts were introduced this fall, the “desired end state” is a proposal to the region. It does not have what one may call an independent “regulatory effect,” and it is not a final decision on how the program will be amended. When it comes to program amendments, the Council will follow the applicable statutory procedures. Further, the proposal is not intended to define or limit the roles and authorities of fish and wildlife managers, CBFWA, Bonneville, or others that participate in Program development and implementation.

This desired end state proposal is being informed by many elements. They include various scientific reviews conducted over the last several years, the Multi-Species Framework Project, ISRP reports, discussions with stakeholders and agencies and tribes, and an apparent regional consensus that fish and wildlife restoration planning and mitigation is best focused at the subbasin scale. The proposal will undoubtedly evolve and mature as the region engages on this topic and through the rulemaking process.

A Description of the Desired End State

The ISRPI has strongly indicated in this and previous year’s reports that one of the highest priorities ought to be completion of subbasin assessments and subbasin plans. The Council has also already indicated that a major restructuring of its fish and wildlife program is needed, and that it intends to adopt a unifying “framework” for that program, which will likely include a subbasin planning element.

The Council recognizes that other entities and processes also have a need for, and interest in, such planning, as well as responsibilities to meet their respective obligations, statutory or otherwise. The goal is to harmonize these processes around the task of subbasin planning and develop a basis for ecologically sound decision-making.

Subbasin level objectives, derived from subbasin plans, are just one level of the contemplated biologically based framework of the type of fish and wildlife program contemplated in the desired end state. However, the importance of this element is emphasized in the discussion of the desired end state in this document because subbasin level objectives and plans are most directly related to project selection and implementation.

Here, for discussion purposes, is an attempt to outline where the Council’s Fish and Wildlife program may be in the near future -- the “desired end state”. The following material highlights the importance of the subbasin planning work. First, as indicated in item 1 immediately below, we envision that the program will be amended in the near future and include specific criteria for subbasin plans. Second, as discussed in item 2, there is a desire to actually develop and adopt subbasin plans into the program over the next few years. Finally, item 3 indicates that annual project review and selection for funding will focus on implementing the adopted subbasin plans. Given the strong consensus and scientific support for developing

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

subbasin plans, the Council's expectation is that a program can be adopted within the next year with subbasin plans filling these three roles.

The remainder of this part 1(A) explains the changes that the Council anticipates may be made in the structure and content of the program through the upcoming amendment process, as well as the changes that it will implement in the way the annual independent scientific review of proposals is conducted. It is useful to understand at a conceptual level elements of these initiatives because these possible programmatic changes were taken into account by the Council in determining the way in which it would conduct its project review and recommendations for Fiscal Year 2000.

1. The Council has adopted a framework and a new program

- Based on a province-level scale;
- Defined goals and strategies;
- Defined principles for artificial production (through Artificial Production Review);
- Explicit criteria described for subbasin plans;
- A comprehensive, regional monitoring and evaluation program is in place;
- Describes procedures and standards for project review and funding recommendation, including budget allocations;
- Developed consistent with requirements of Power Act;
- Program fulfills ESA requirements where applicable;

In developing a major program amendment that includes a scientifically based organizing framework, the Council seeks to meet the requirements of the Act mandating sound biologically based objectives. This organizing framework is also intended to be responsive to criticisms expressed by the *Return to the River* report, various scientific reviews (including three ISRP reports), and the Ninth Circuit opinion in NRIC et al. v. NPPC. Summed up, a major criticism of the program by these bodies and others is that the existing program is a collection of various fish and wildlife measures or desired activities, rather than a discreet fish and wildlife restoration and mitigation plan designed around biologically based goals and objectives. In addition, in order to meet the requirements of the Act, and also to secure and sustain the support for funding the next program within the region and without (it should be remembered that the current funding MOA expires soon) it will be necessary to show that it is a cost-effective plan focused on results measured in terms of fish and wildlife benefits.

The success of the next program depends upon a decisive response to the criticisms of the current and prior programs. The Council suggests that making the above elements a foundation of a new program would provide that response. The Council is hopeful that the current participation and assistance provided by the region in processes such as the Artificial Production Review and the Multi-Species Framework will translate into a consensus that the next program should be organized around them.

2. Subbasin assessments/plans are complete or in progress

- Assessment of existing and historical conditions completed for each subbasin;
- 10-15-year plans developed for each subbasin;

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

- Each subbasin plan includes production and habitat strategies and proposed actions, tied to mainstem and estuary improvements where relevant;
- A three-year rolling ISRP review will provide peer review of activities in each province and subbasins within the province;
- Council sets guidelines for participation in subbasin planning and implementation for purposes of fish and wildlife program and Bonneville funding. Plans will be evaluated for consistency with systemwide and province-level goals, objectives, policies and strategies adopted into an amended program;
- Collaboration with fish and wildlife managers in designing subbasin planning effort is important to making that effort successful;
- Considers and integrates where possible other activities, purposes and obligations outside the Council's program;
- Consistent with trust and treaty rights and obligations; also recognizes and respects state and federal law;
- Where possible, the Council adopts into the Program a subbasin plan developed according to these principles.

If there is a consensus in the basin at this time, it is in the belief that fish and wildlife planning and restoration activities should be organized around a strong subbasin planning effort. This regional consensus and the ongoing Framework process lead the Council to believe that subbasin plans will be an important component of the biologically based framework and objectives of the amended program. While much has been done in the way of subbasin planning, more work is still needed. The lack of an apparent, distinct subbasin plan or coordinated restoration strategy in several watersheds or subbasins was the basis for many of the ISRP's findings this year that projects proposed for funding did not pass the scientific review criteria of the Act or meet conditions of the program.

Who actually does the subbasin planning is a topic of interest. First, while it is probable that the Council will assist in the development of subbasin planning standards and adopt them during the program rulemaking, it is clearly not the Council's role to actually develop subbasin plans. Similarly, while the ISRP may assist in providing advice on subbasin planning standards, and perhaps review plans once they are completed, it is not the role of the ISRP to actually develop subbasin plans. Subbasin plans must be developed at the local level. The fish and wildlife managers in the subbasins will be very central figures in actually developing subbasin plans.

In fact, a subbasin plan developed without significant involvement and contribution from the fish and wildlife managers in any particular subbasin would not meet standards in section 4(h)(6) of the Act for being adopted as part of the program. The work on subbasin plans captured in the August 20, 1999 CBFWA Draft Annual Work Plan demonstrates the considerable work and expertise of the managers in this endeavor, and the information therein will be helpful foundation material for a system-wide subbasin planning initiative. The Council concurs with CBFWA's recognition that there needs to be additional work in subbasin planning, that existing plans may need to be improved, and that this initiative should be pursued with at least the involvement of the managers, Council, Bonneville, and independent scientists.

While the role of the managers in developing these plans is evident, it should be equally evident that a subbasin plan should seek to include the input of land management agencies, local

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

watershed groups and others to ensure that the plans enjoy the widest support. This is so not only for the obvious reason that the input of these participants would offer a more comprehensive perspective, but also because fish and wildlife managers often have little or no way to influence land use or other activities likely to have an effect on fish and wildlife and their habitats.

Council and CBFWA staffs have been working collaboratively to advance the subbasin planning initiative in order to develop plans that are ultimately adopted into the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. The participants in these discussions have identified that subbasin plans should have, at a minimum:

- A watershed assessment providing a description of historical and existing conditions;
- A clear and comprehensive description of existing projects and past accomplishments;
- A 10-15 year management plan with biological objectives and detailing habitat needs with a description of management intent and rationale tied to the objectives and needs;
- An implementation plan that includes:
 - 3-year balanced budget tied to specific tasks (projects)
 - 10-year estimated budget
 - recommendations to other resource managers

The first three items noted above would constitute the subbasin plan. Each component, of course, requires additional detail. For example, the participants recognize that there must be agreement on what constitutes a complete and comprehensive state-of-the-science watershed assessment. For another example, the objectives in the 10-15 year management plan should be consistent with the policies and standards in the final Artificial Production Review report, and will also have to comply with ESA requirements if they are to be expected to be implemented.

The Council and CBFWA staffs have discussed the need to ensure that the “template” that is developed for subbasin plans for program purposes should be consistent with similar state, tribal and federal watershed and basin planning efforts. The goal is not necessarily to satisfy the needs of every planning effort underway, but the desire is to create a template and subbasin plan that is as consistent and coordinated as possible with other processes. The Council and CBFWA are planning to seek the input from those with expertise in developing such assessments.

The participants in the discussions recognize that the management plan component (at least) will require fish and wildlife agencies and tribes and local interests to confront and attempt to resolve difficult policy issues. Disagreements over these policy issues in the past have prevented the successful completion of management plans in some subbasins, and in several instances the disagreements have led to litigation. The Council is hopeful that the agencies, tribes and others parties find the potential benefits associated with coming to agreement on subbasin plans a strong incentive to do so. One of the obvious benefits is the implementation advantage that should be expected to accrue to projects that implement subbasin plans that are adopted as part of the program.

However, for fish and wildlife program adoption and annual project selection and funding purposes, if agreement is not achieved, the Council will require that the management entities provide a clear and distinct “fork in the road” where management objectives and

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

strategies diverge. Where there are points of divergence, the Council will be required to decide which course to follow as it adopts subbasin plans into the program and/or makes its yearly funding recommendations to Bonneville.

While subbasin plans will be the guiding blueprint for activities at that geographic scale, it is not enough simply to develop and adopt them into the program without some unifying standards designed to make their collective implementation a systemwide restoration and mitigation plan. The Act mandates that the program treat the Columbia Basin as a system. Therefore, and as is being discussed in the Multi-Species Framework Project, there must be a vertically graduated organizing framework moving from “systemwide” goals and standards, to “province-level” goals and standards, and finally to subbasin-level goals and standards. Under such a framework, the goals and standards of each level “nest together” and must be consistent with the higher-order goals and standards. The Council, with the input of the region, will seek to establish systemwide and province-level goals and objectives in the upcoming program amendment process.

A final point to be made here is that the Council takes seriously the Act’s specific mandate regarding consistency with the legal rights of Indian tribes and others. Congress took pains in crafting the Act’s provisions to ensure that these rights be recognized and protected. The status of many of the basin’s tribes as dominant landholders and key fish and wildlife managers will make them influential participants in subbasin planning. This key status should be reflected in the policies and objectives of the subbasin plans that they help develop. In addition, the recommendations of Indian tribes and state and federal fish and wildlife managers are afforded deference in the program amendment process. The result is that the region’s Indian tribes will be uniquely positioned to contribute substantially to both the “top down” systemwide and province-level goals, and the “bottom up” subbasin goals and standards.

3. Project selection

- Based on rolling, province-level visits and in-depth peer reviews, not an annual process;
- Projects need to be implementing subbasin plans for approval for funding;
- Reviews may identify where new projects are needed and incorporate ideas for projects from interested parties;
- When a new proposal is being started, selection of a project implementer may be based on a response to Request for Proposals (RFP) or other similar method;
- Multi-year approval with defined project termination dates where appropriate;
- Supplementary process for consideration of emergency needs and similar unanticipated needs may be used;
- Annual consideration of programmatic or basin-wide issues where necessary.
- The project will provide for annual reporting on both biologic results and fiscal management.

The Council and the region have three full years of experience in implementing the process mandated by the 1996 amendment to the Act. The Council believes that this review and selection process has brought, and will continue to bring, additional credibility to the Program and its implementation. However, the Council believes that portions of this process can be improved.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

First, the Council believes that it may be neither appropriate nor desirable to have an annual project solicitation and recommendation process that essentially treats the program as if it were subject to complete revision each year. That is, under the current project selection format every year a general proposal solicitation goes out to the region as if all of the funds available within the direct- fund category are available for funding new projects or for complete reallocation among existing multi-year projects. Under this fiction, hundreds of proposed projects are received by Bonneville, their sum total exceeding the funds available for that fiscal year by several times. This format has Bonneville, CBFWA, the ISRP and the Council all sorting through far more project proposals than can possibly be funded. The fact of the matter is that a significant portion of the funds in any fiscal year is going to be dedicated to *existing projects and programs* that have been approved in previous years, and are in various stages of development or implementation. This unlimited solicitation procedure raises expectations about opportunities for funding new projects, and it detracts from having a focused and discreet fish and wildlife program with a measure of longevity and stability. As discussed above, the Council is proposing that future solicitations be geared toward discreet needs identified in the subbasin planning and review processes.

A second proposed change in the project selection process relates to the use of the ISRP. In the past three years, the ISRP reviewed *proposal forms*, rather than the actual projects within their subbasin or provincial context. The Council suggests that this may not be the model that best serves the goals of the Act and the needs of those that implement the program. There seems to be a desire shared by the Council, the ISRP, and the managers to increase the interaction between the project proponents and the ISRP, and to increase the level of review of actual *projects and programs* within their subbasin context. Again, and linking the proposed approach to subbasin plans, the Council believes that the ISRP review should include in-depth and on-site reviews of *projects* being proposed to implement subbasin plans. In future years, in those cases where subbasin plans have been adopted into the program (as discussed in 2. above), the ISRP's review may largely focus on the consistency of the projects proposed in that review cycle with the adopted subbasin plan.

On this second point, it bears repeating that the Council is not proposing that the ISRP go into subbasins or provinces and actually develop or define the subbasin plans. Subbasin planning involves policy and legal decisions that are not within the ISRP's expertise or authority. While it is likely that ISRP may be called upon to review subbasin plans to determine if they are premised upon sound scientific principles, they should not revisit policy and legal decisions incorporated into the plans.

The last major shift envisioned within this section is a strong move to multi-year funding. After the ISRP reviews a collection of subbasin plans within a province, identifies with the appropriate entities new needs (if any), and finds the projects proposed to be consistent with an approved subbasin plan, the projects proposed will likely be recommended for funding for several years (the thinking is currently about three years), without the need for additional ISRP review until the funding cycle is due to expire.

Summed up, the Council believes that in-depth, on the ground scientific review of actual projects implementing approved subbasin plans that are consistent with systemwide and province level goals and standards, coupled with multi-year funding, will add certainty and stability at both the project and overall program level. The usefulness and quality of the scientific review

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

should be increased. These objectives, if realized, will serve the collective need to prove that the program is credible and cost-effective.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

- Regional monitoring and evaluation plan in place;
- Coordinated data specifications, collection, management, and access;
- Regular analysis.
- Annual reporting and analysis of results.

The program's success cannot be measured and demonstrated without an adequate monitoring and evaluation framework. It is anticipated that a more regimented program framework will facilitate the design of a more robust and effective monitoring and evaluation program. The Council firmly believes that this should be a major objective for the next program. In addition, there is a need to better coordinate with the numerous data collection and management activities and institutions in the basin. There is a need to better coordinate and normalize monitoring and evaluation activities whether they occur as part of the program or otherwise.

Near Term Modifications to the Project Selection and Independent Scientific Review Process

The region may or may not ultimately decide in the course of the program amendment process that the "Desired End State" as described above provides for the type of program format desired. Notwithstanding the uncertainty about what a future program may look like, the Council, the ISRP, and the fish and wildlife managers have all expressed a desire to change the project review process to a model that provides a more useful, in-depth independent review. Therefore, the Council is proposing to modify the review model as described below beginning in the Fiscal Year 2001 process in response to requests from the managers and the ISRP and to better meet its own needs. The goal in charting a course for a new review model is to find a process that will work well whether or not the Desired End State is reflected in the amended program. Simply stated, the following project review and selection model is *not* dependant upon the region's decision to adopt the Desired End State, but it will work well if that does come to pass. The Council intends to change the project review model along the lines described below, and is discussing this with CBFWA representatives and others.

1. Start ISRP reviews by province

The Council believes that the change in the way that the science review is conducted should be started expeditiously. This is important because of the expected timing of the program amendment process and the need to begin the development and ultimate institutionalization of subbasin plans. While the 1996 amendment to the Act established substantive review standards for the ISRP, the amendment did not prescribe in detail the process by which the ISRP must conduct its review. This flexibility provides an opportunity to modify the review, with a shift to a model more like that discussed above and outlined here. These elements are a conceptual level proposal, and the Council may ultimately may choose to modify them:

- ISRP would conduct an intensive review of each ecological province (or other sub-regional unit) and its subbasins (2-3 provinces first year, 3-4 second year, 3-4 third year),

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

with rolling review thereafter;

- Existing documents, proposals and plans would be components of the review until formal subbasin plans are adopted;
- Process would be iterative, with site visits and other contacts with subbasin participants;
- Review would include “reimbursable” activities as well as “direct program” activities;
- ISRP reviews may be coordinated with some elements of the artificial production evaluations (e.g. consistency with policies) called for in the Artificial Production Review;
- Similar rolling review would be established for system-wide activities, including system-wide research, data management, and monitoring and evaluation activities;
- ISRP would also provide each year a programmatic review, summarizing major issues and achievements

One of the first tasks in restructuring this review process is to fix a schedule for the rolling reviews. The Council, CBFWA, and ISRP are in the process of developing a proposed sequence and expect to finalize a proposed sequence early in 2000. Beyond sequencing is the question of substance-- what will a review entail? The following are some conceptual elements that have been discussed by the Council and CBFWA:

- 1) **Ongoing projects** submit project summaries that include plans for next the three years, descriptions of results to date, and briefings on background documents. Ongoing projects will also submit all relevant planning, research, and background documents. Bonneville submits accounting, reports, and other documentation related to ongoing projects. **New projects** submit proposals. **All projects** must be tied to a subbasin summary proposal and ultimately to an approved subbasin plan.
- 2) ISRP review of documents and subbasin/province visits with project sponsors, managers and others. The ISRP may conduct a site visit prior to time proposals are developed in order to offer guidance. In addition, the ISRP may conduct project specific visits on an ad hoc basis.
- 3) ISRP produces a draft report on proposals recommended for funding, including specific questions, following its review and provides it to project sponsors for comments, reactions and revisions.
- 4) Managers and project sponsors respond to the draft report.
- 5) ISRP issues final report to Council.
- 6) Council makes written, three-year recommendations to Bonneville.

Finally, it is suggested that the following assumptions should be applied as this new review model is considered:

- 1) The reviews include reimbursable projects.
- 2) Mainstem projects will fit with other province level reviews and may also constitute their own province.
- 3) Systemwide projects will be treated separately.
- 4) EDT analysis from the Framework, the Council’s amended fish and wildlife program, subbasin plans produced as a result of this process, and the Artificial Production Review will be incorporated as they become available.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

5) The Artificial Production Review will provide performance standards to evaluate artificial production projects.

2. Cascading funding decisions based on the more thorough ISRP reviews

- In collaboration with fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and others, the Council would prepare annual budgets, with placeholders for new activities;
- Council would make funding recommendation decisions on a province basis, and recommend funding for new projects within a province in conjunction with the review of that province;
- Council would make written, three-year recommendations to BPA for activities within each province.

The Council's intention to revise the annual fish and wildlife project selection process to reflect province planning will require a transition in the procedures to allocate Bonneville's fish and wildlife budget. The challenge is to devise a funding process in the initial years of province planning that continues to fund projects selected under the existing system while also ensuring that sufficient resources will be available to support project needs that will arise out of the new annual province reviews.

The transition period will begin with Fiscal Year 2001 and extend through Fiscal Year 2003. This coincides with the ISRP's schedule of reviewing three of the nine geographic provinces every year. Beginning with the Fiscal Year 2004 project selection process, each of the provinces will have been reviewed once and the transition will be complete. The Fiscal Year 2000 process, which we completed, will not require significant revisions in funding procedures because the ISRP's review of the first provinces will not be finished until later in the year. The two to three initial province reviews will, however, be available for Fiscal Year 2001.

The first step in the transition to a new funding process is to ascertain a baseline budget for the program for Fiscal Year 2000 and following years. The baseline budget is analogous to the concept of the fish and wildlife program's annual fixed costs. These are "required" costs that include such activities as operations and maintenance, monitoring and evaluation of ongoing programs, and capital construction activities that are likely to be maintained. While the baseline budget may grow in future years, it is not expected to decrease.

The baseline budget will always be less than the total annual amount Bonneville has available to allocate to the direct program (currently \$127 million). This is because in addition to the baseline costs, there are projects selected every year that are short-term in nature. They have a well-defined beginning and end, have no ongoing funding components, and, therefore, will not increase the baseline budget.

Although the transition period for province-based funding will not begin until Fiscal Year 2001, it is prudent to calculate the baseline budget for Fiscal Year 2000. The Fiscal Year 2000 direct program budget will be comprised of the baseline budget covering all nine provinces plus a currently undefined contingency fund for unforeseen needs. The total of the two will be \$127 million.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

In Fiscal Year 2001, the first three province reviews will be completed, and the funding transition will commence. The direct program budget will consist of an updated baseline covering all nine provinces and the new needs identified in the reviews of provinces 1 through 3, and a contingency fund for other unforeseen needs.

Similarly, the Fiscal Year 2002 budget will contain a new baseline budget covering all the provinces and the new needs identified in the reviews of provinces 4 through 6, and a contingency fund for the unforeseen needs.

In Fiscal Year 2003, the final year of transition, the budget will be made up of a new baseline budget for all nine provinces and the newly identified needs in provinces 7 through 9, and a contingency fund for any unforeseen needs.

As mentioned earlier, the total annual amount available for Bonneville's direct program is \$127 million through Fiscal Year 2002. This is based on the federal agencies' memorandum of agreement that established Bonneville's annual fish and wildlife commitment. The MOA may be renegotiated before Fiscal Year 2003. Therefore, it is possible that the amount available for that year may be either more or less than \$127 million.

3. No general project solicitation for Fiscal Year 2001; limited solicitation for selected provinces and innovative projects and identified needs

It makes little sense to begin a general project solicitation process this spring, which is the normal procedure. The Council and region will be engaged in a major amendment process, and the current program will be in a transition. In short, there will be no program to support project proposals. However, there may selected provinces that are advanced in their planning, or that do not have complex or controversial issues requiring resolution in a planning process, and specific work in other areas that could be solicited as follows:

- Specific RFPs for innovative projects at the start of the year up to a total cost;
- Possible specific RFPs for a very limited number of needs identified over the course of the year, including watershed assessment and subbasin planning;
- The Council may require projects identified as "fund for one year" by the ISRP to undergo additional review.
- Call for proposals in selected provinces.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

(b) Categories of Proposals and Generally Applicable Processes and Rules of Decision for Each Category

This Part, 1(b), sets forth the process used by the Council in making its project-specific recommendations to Bonneville for funding new and existing project proposals. This part also provides the Council recommendation for each category of projects, and references the projects table in Part 2 for identification of the individual projects in each category.

General Discussion - Proposed New Projects

The Council believes that it must be judicious in making funding commitments to *new* initiatives for Fiscal Year 2000 that are designed to implement the current program, given that the program is likely to receive a major overhaul within the next year as discussed in Part 1(a) above. This is especially so given that the ISRP has advised the Council this year (and in previous years) that substantial work must be done in many areas, and in several project categories, before associated projects will possess the scientific rigor to meet the standards of the Act. In addition, the Act requires the Council to make a determination that the projects it proposes for funding this year “employ cost effective measures to achieve program objectives.” The Council does not believe that anything in the Act prevents it from taking into consideration in its funding recommendations that the “program objectives” are in a state of flux with the imminent rulemaking.

The Council could decide not to begin new projects until the program is amended. On the other hand, given the status of the fish and wildlife, it seems undesirable to delay needed fish and wildlife initiatives, especially in cases where there is unanimity among the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes and the ISRP that the projects are scientifically sound, will benefit fish and wildlife, and have clear and measurable objectives. The risk that projects that enjoy this consensus will not be consistent with the objectives of the amended program or soon to be developed subbasin plans seem to be minimal. Therefore, the general approach that will be employed by the Council is to recommend funding new projects only when the ISRP and CBFWA reviews concur that funding should be provided in Fiscal Year 2000. The mechanics of the approach are discussed below.

General Discussion- Proposed Funding of Existing Projects

In regard to *existing* projects or programs in place and implementing the current program, it is likely that many of these will continue to be funded to implement the objectives of subbasin plans that will be developed and of the amended program. These existing projects represent significant prior investments and a manifestation of the strategies that the fish and wildlife managers are using to meet objectives in watersheds and subbasins. It is expected, however, that some of these existing projects may need to be modified or redirected in order to meet the scientific review criteria of the project selection process, as a result of being reconsidered in the context of developing or updating subbasin plans, and to increase the likelihood that they will continue to be consistent with a newly amended program. At least over the next few years, it can be expected that many existing projects will, by and large, continue as important strategies for at least some period of time under whatever program is adopted next year.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, the Council believes that it is reasonable to treat proposals to fund *existing* projects differently than proposals to fund *new* projects in Fiscal Year 2000. The Council believes that there is a balance that must be achieved that seeks to move solid fish and wildlife projects forward, while seeking to prevent the expenditure of Bonneville funds on projects that may ultimately not be consistent with the newly amended program. The decision-making framework detailed below seeks to achieve that balance, and is the primary basis for the Council's Fiscal Year 2000 decisions.

There is one final note to be made before delving into the framework for how the Council reached its final recommendations to Bonneville for projects proposed for funding. The Act makes the Council the final authority on which projects will be recommended to Bonneville for funding, not the ISRP. The Council understands that there are other factors outside of the province of the ISRP that go into the decision as to whether or not any particular project should be recommended for funding. These other factors include the Council's own consistency review, legal and policy considerations, economic implications and cost-effectiveness considerations. The Council has not and will not abandon its statutory duty to be the final decision-maker on which projects will be recommended for funding. The following process was designed to ensure that all considerations that go into a final funding recommendation are addressed. The Council understands the ISRP's recommendations and categories ("fund" "delay" etc.) to be advice limited to scientific considerations. The Council continued to address policy considerations along with the scientific. The Council did consider, but did not give special weight, to non-science based recommendations contained directly or inferentially in the ISRP report.

Treatment of Proposals by Category

1. New and Existing projects not recommended for funding by CBFWA or the ISRP

- The Council recommends that *new* projects that were rated as "do not fund" by the ISRP and were not recommended for funding by CBFWA ("tier 1") not be funded. (Concurrence not to fund).
- The Council recommends that *existing* projects that were rated "do not fund" by the ISRP and were not recommended by CBFWA (not "tier 1") not be funded. (Concurrence not to fund).
- The Council recommends that these projects not be funded at this time because of scientific, policy, and cost-effectiveness considerations. These projects did not meet the scientific review standards, and also raise policy and cost-effectiveness problems in that they seek to implement a program that will be amended within the term of the proposed project.

2. New and existing Fiscal Year 2000 projects recommended to be funded by *both* CBFWA and the ISRP in either its June 15 or October 29 reports, and no Council policy issues (concurrence to fund)

- The Council recommends that the projects rated as "fund" in either the June 15, 1999 or October 29, 1999 ISRP reviews and recommended for funding by CBFWA ("tier 1) be funded. These projects are identified in section I of the projects table found at Part 2. The Council recommends that these projects be funded at the CBFWA recommended

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

funding level (see table).

- As is suggested by the description of this category, some of the projects recommended for funding here were not rated as “fund” by the ISRP in its June 15, 1999 report. However, after additional information and analysis was provided to the ISRP, it issued a second report on October 29, 1999, in which it changed its funding recommendations in several cases. The Council finds it appropriate to rely upon the ISRP’s second report as the basis for recommending projects for funding that were not initially recommended in the June 15, 1999 ISRP report.
- The Council recommends that these existing and new projects be funded until ISRP review of the applicable subbasin or through Fiscal Year 2001. In contracting these projects, Bonneville and project sponsors are to address in writing any critical comments made by the ISRP and document responses. The request to document these critical comments is further defined as follows:
- The Council recommends to Bonneville that it require the proposal sponsors to address any specific items of concern noted by the ISRP as part of the contracting process, and to document their treatment. Bonneville should not fund the proposal until it has documented, in concert with the project sponsor, a written response to each of the ISRP concerns. The Council is not asking Bonneville to make an independent determination of the scientific merits of such responses. Rather, the scientific merit of the response will be an issue for both the ISRP and the Council when the proposal is next reviewed for funding.
- If the ISRP recommended that a certain portion of a proposal not be funded or implemented, and the sponsor and Bonneville determine that the remainder of the proposal cannot be implemented fully as a high-quality stand-alone project, no portion of the proposal should be funded.
- If CBFWA reduced the sponsor-requested budget such that the sponsor or Bonneville have concerns about the ability to implement the proposal, the Council will review the issue during the first quarterly review.
- Some projects that were rated as “fund” by the ISRP and ranked as tier 1 by CBFWA implicated “policy issues” that required consideration by the Council, and thus were not categorically recommended. These projects, and their attendant policy considerations, are identified at Part 1(c) below.

3. New and existing Fiscal Year 2000 projects recommended by CBFWA and rated by the ISRP as “Fund In Part” in its June 15, 1999 and October 29, 1999 Report.

- For the single new proposal (1 project, #20023), the Council recommends that the portion of the project recommended by the ISRP be funded at the level specified in Section I of the projects table in Part 2. The remaining portion of the project is not recommended for funding.
- For the existing projects that were initially rated by the ISRP as “fund in part,” the

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Council invited the sponsors to respond to the June 15, 1999 ISRP report. The Council had the ISRP consider the sponsor responses, and a coordinated CBFWA response (August 20, 1999 DAIWP), in what came to be referred to as the “fix-it loop review.” The decision rule adopted in advance of the second ISRP review was that if the proposal bettered its position to a “fund” rating by the ISRP, the Council would recommend funding the project. However, if the proposal maintained a “fund in part” rating, only that portion of the project favorably rated would be recommended.

- After the fix-it-loop review was completed, the ISRP’s October 29, 1999 report provided “fund in part” recommendations for eleven of these projects a second time. All other projects initially rated in this category improved their position to “fund,” and are included in Section I of the projects table in Part 2.
- In keeping with the announced general decision rule, the Council recommends that the eleven projects which retained a “fund in part” rating after the second ISRP review, as identified in Section I of the projects table in Part 2 be funded at the level indicated in the table. Where the project table does not recommend a specific funding level, the Council recommends that BPA use the project specific comments of the ISRP in its June 15, 1999 and October 29, 1999 reviews to set the appropriate Fiscal Year 2000 funding level for implementing those objectives or elements of the proposal that were approved by the ISRP.

4. New and existing Fiscal Year 2000 projects recommended by CBFWA and rated in the June 15, 1999 ISRP review as “Delay Funding”.

- For the projects rated in the June 15, 1999 report of the ISRP as “delay”, the Council invited the sponsors to respond to the report in the “fix-it-loop” review. The general rules of decision adopted in advance of the second review for proposals in this category were:
 - If rated as “fund” after the second ISRP review, fund;
 - If rated as “do not fund” after the second ISRP review and a *new* project, do not fund;
 - If *not* rated as “fund” after the second ISRP review and an *existing project*, provide the sponsors an opportunity to present to the Council policy-based reasons that the project should be funded as proposed and/or decide upon transition funding and development of a transition plan.
 - After the second ISRP review, all but four projects that were initially rated as “delay” improved their position to a rating of “fund.” However, in the case of the four projects that retained a “delay” rating, the ISRP clearly specified the remaining deficiency with the proposal in its report. The Council, after consultation with the ISRP, finds that these deficiencies are not fatal, and are of a nature that can be remedied by the proposal sponsor and Bonneville in the course of contracting. The Council recommends that these projects be funded, and they are included in the projects identified in Section II of the projects table in Part 2. Satisfactory treatment of the deficiencies noted by the ISRP will be a policy issue to be reviewed by the Council in the context of a request to fund the project in future years.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

- There were six projects in the June 15, 1999 ISRP report rated as “delay to establish priorities.” The ISRP advised that these proposals contained minor deficiencies that could be corrected during the Bonneville contracting process. The Council recommends these projects for funding, and requests that Bonneville and project proponents document how the deficiency was addressed. Satisfactory treatment of the ISRP concerns will be reviewed as a policy issue by the Council if the project is proposed in future years.
- There is a single project, 9303800 (riparian fencing on N. Fork John Day River), that was rated by the ISRP as “delay” and ranked as tier 2 by CBFWA that the Council is recommended funding for one year. The Council received additional information from the sponsor in regards to this project in January responding to criticisms noted by the ISRP (primarily related to monitoring). Like all other projects that had ISRP criticisms, the sponsor and Bonneville need to document the treatment of those issues in the contracting process. Finally, the Council urged the Forest Service to fund this project itself or with funds outside of the Bonneville program in future years.

5. New and existing Fiscal Year 2000 projects recommended by CBFWA and rated by the ISRP in its June 15, 1999 report as “Do Not Fund”

- If a *new* project, and rated in the June 15, 1999 ISRP report as “do not fund,” the Council recommends that the project not be funded in FY 2000.
- Sponsors of *existing* projects in this category were provided an opportunity to provide or revise their previously submitted responses to the June 15, 1999 ISRP report. This opportunity to provide responses was *in addition to* the statutory public comment period. The Council considered PATH (Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses), to be an ongoing project rated as do not fund by the ISRP. Responses up to 20 pages in length per project were permitted. Project sponsors were advised that if they believed the that responses they had already provided through the public comment period on the ISRP report and/or in the August 20, 1999 CBFWA Draft Work Plan were adequate, there was no need to submit additional material.
- The ISRP reviewed these existing projects, along with the sponsor and CBFWA responses to its initial report, a second time in the “fix-it-loop” review, and issued a Response Review Report on October 29, 1999. After the second review, ten projects initially rated as “do not fund” received a second rating of “do not fund.” One project originally rated as “delay” was rated as “do not fund” in the second review. Projects that were rated as fund in this second review are recommended for funding and included in Section I of the projects table in Part 2.
- The Council provided the sponsors of the eleven projects that received a second rating of “do not fund” an opportunity to state why they believed that policy based considerations warranted that the projects be funded notwithstanding the inability to secure a favorable rating in the two ISRP reviews. The Council framed the nature of the policy considerations that it thought may possibly support a decision not to adopt the ISRP ratings, and notified sponsors that it would consider comments, if applicable, on the following points:

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) The ISRP’s critical comments made in its original and second reviews of the project are not substantially related to any of the following issues: (1) evaluation of its scientific soundness, (2) its benefit (or lack thereof) to fish and wildlife, (3) its definition for outcomes and objectives or monitoring and evaluation provisions; or
 - b) The ISRP’s comments, though substantially related to one or more of items (1) through (3) above, are expressly critical of a strategy or objective that has been specifically approved in an adopted program measure (e.g. species substitution); or
 - c) Not funding the project in Fiscal Year 2000 would place the sponsor at immediate risk of not fulfilling obligations imposed by the Act, or otherwise required by law; or
 - d) Not funding the project in Fiscal Year 2000 would cause an immediate and direct loss of specifically identifiable fish and/or wildlife populations in calendar year 2000; or
 - e) Not funding the project in Fiscal Year 2000 would result in the loss of a unique funding efficiency opportunity (e.g. cost share, economy of scale) that will absolutely not be available in future years, or the loss of an opportunity to secure critical fish and/or wildlife benefits at a site-specific location that cannot be secured in future years (e.g. lost opportunity to purchase land on the open market for wildlife mitigation).
- In addition to the above procedures, the Council determined that unique review treatment was warranted for existing artificial production projects that have already received peer review at an advanced stage under the 3-step review process established in the Fiscal Year 1998 recommendations to Bonneville. This is so because in prior years, and principally in response to the Fiscal Year 1998 ISRP report, the Council has stated that it would rely upon the 3-step review process, and its own peer review requirements, as it considers proposals for artificial production projects until the Artificial Production Review process and report being worked on by the Council with the region is implemented. Therefore, the issues raised by the ISRP were addressed by the Council in a manner consistent with the 3-step review procedures in combination with the review processes detailed above. Three projects were determined to require this treatment. — the Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery, the Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone-Paiute Joint Culture Facility, and Lake Billy Shaw operation and maintenance.
 - Each of the projects that received or retained a “do not fund” rating in the “fix-it-loop” review is identified and discussed in Part 1 (c) below. The Council’s written explanation of its funding recommendation in light of the ISRP’s recommendations as required by the statute is provided in section 1(c).

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

6. New and existing Fiscal Year 2000 projects not recommended by CBFWA and rated by the ISRP as “Fund”

- There were 37 projects for which the ISRP disagreed with the relative priority assigned by CBFWA. In 13 instances, the ISRP indicated that it disagreed with the CBFWA prioritization because the ISRP found the proposals to be “innovative” and offering promising new concepts or addressing unexplored areas. The Council asked the ISRP to prioritize the projects in this category, along with the two conservation enforcement projects that did not receive a CBFWA funding allocation, and to take into special account four considerations: (1) an initial scoping effort tied to unimplemented elements of the program; (2) projects offering promising approaches to improve upon existing projects; (3) projects that have systemwide, or at least subbasin wide, significance, as distinguished from primarily site-specific significance, should receive higher consideration, and (4) projects that advance critical assessment or planning tasks in watersheds or subbasins in which the ISRP found these elements deficient should receive higher consideration.
- The ISRP presented its ranked list of projects to the Council on October 13, 1999. The ISRP’s rankings and report were posted on the Council’s web site. The Council does intend to encourage innovation and expansion of access to funding opportunities, and thus, will recommend approximately \$2 million as a planning target be dedicated to projects that the ISRP found to be “innovative” or offering promising insights to the program. The Council decided in February to direct this funding to new research projects that address unimplemented program elements and that have systemwide significance (criteria 1 and 3 above). The Council recommended funding these projects for one year in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 per project.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

(c) Specific issues raised by proposed projects or certain project types

In considering proposed projects, in addition to the recommendations of the ISRP, the Council takes into account scientific information being developed throughout the basin, legal and policy issues that arise from the Act and the adopted fish and wildlife program, and project management and administration issues (e.g. is the project being implemented according to the original terms of approval). Because of these additional considerations, there were instances where even though a project was recommended by both the ISRP and CBFWA, it was not automatically recommended for funding under the general rules of decision outlined in Part 1(b) above. Rather, the Council had to balance those recommendations along with additional considerations.

In addition, and beginning with item **(k)** below, the Council details how it considered each of the eleven projects that were rated “do not fund” by the ISRP at the conclusion of the “fix-it-loop” review in its October 29, 1999 report on their merits. The Council’s funding recommendation in light of such a recommendation by the ISRP is discussed for each of those projects in this part of the document.

(a) conservation enforcement - funding requested for two projects, (9202400, 9202409 - CRITFC, NPT), approx. \$814,000.

Issue: The ISRP recommended that funding be provided for two law enforcement projects. CBFWA did not reach a consensus funding recommendation on these projects. The Council was required to decide if it would: (1) continue to apply the standards developed and employed in the FY 1998 and 1999 processes regarding the funding of law enforcement projects, or, (2) defer to the ISRP’s recommendation to fund the projects without further inquiry.

Past Council Treatment: In its Fiscal Year 1998 recommendations the Council recommended that Bonneville funding of law enforcement projects be discontinued. This was in response to a request for funding from CBFWA for \$4 million for these projects. Law enforcement activities have been funded as part of the program since the early 1990’s. The Council made the recommendation to discontinue funding for such projects on the basis that the law enforcement portion of the program had expanded beyond its originally intended scope and duration, and because funding what were largely harvest-enforcement activities seemed to the Council to be an area peripheral to the Act’s focus on mitigating for the effects of the hydrosystem on fish and wildlife and their habitat. In addition, the Council was concerned that because law enforcement activities are of the nature traditionally funded by state and tribal governments, Bonneville funding of such activities may simply be replacing traditional state and tribal funding for such activities. This would present an “in lieu” issue under the Act. For all of these reasons, the Council decided that funding law enforcement activities should be a low priority in a constrained budget. Notwithstanding the general recommendation to discontinue funding of these projects, after further deliberation, review of comments, and public discussion, the Council advised that it would consider “proposals to fund specific law enforcement *tasks* that are tied to the core purposes of the Act, do not present an ‘in lieu’ issue under the Act, and are associated with activities funded under the Council’s program, such as protecting habitat investments.”

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

In its Fiscal Year 1999 recommendations, the Council reaffirmed the policy and approach for treatment of law enforcement projects that it established in the Fiscal Year 1998 process. In that year, four law enforcement projects were recommended (totaling about \$1.7 million). However, these projects were not part of a *consensus CBFWA recommendation* because the managers were unable to agree upon criteria to apply to law enforcement projects. In the end, the Council recommendation stated that if CBFWA were to ultimately present a funding recommendation for law enforcement activities, that it would review such a proposal, in consultation with the project sponsors and Bonneville, to determine if they are consistent with the standards established by the Council in the Fiscal Year 1998 process.

Council Recommendation: As last year, the Council is faced with project proposals for enforcement without a CBFWA consensus recommendation. The difference is that the ISRP recommended these projects favorably. At the September 1 work session meeting, CBFWA representatives stated that CBFWA had not taken a consensus position on the funding of two law enforcement proposals. The CBFWA work plan assigned the Nez Perce proposal a “tier 1” ranking, but it did not go on to recommend funds for the project as it did with all other tier 1 proposals in its proposed work plan. CBFWA did not assign the CRITFC proposal a tier rating. Thus, the cost of these projects was not included in the total CBFWA workplan budget.

These projects were rated as “fund” by the ISRP, but did not come with a funding recommendation from CBFWA. With this treatment, these two projects were very much like the 40 projects that were rated as “fund” by the ISRP, but did not receive a recommendation for funding from CBFWA (often because they were rated as “tier 2” or lower). Therefore, the Council decided to include the two conservation enforcement projects in that group of 40 projects treated more favorably by the ISRP than CBFWA, and asked the ISRP to rank that group of projects, considering specific criteria provided by the Council and using the process explained in Part 1(b) above. The ISRP provided its report and rankings for the 42 projects at the October 13th Council work session. The CRITFC proposal was ranked number 22 and the Nez Perce proposal ranked number 28.

The Council dedicated \$2 million to funding projects that were treated more favorably by the ISRP than CBFWA. The Council chose to focus these limited funds on new and innovative research oriented projects that were on the list of 42. The two conservation enforcement projects are implementation rather than research oriented, and were well down the ISRP’s overall list of 42 projects in any event.

The Council believes that these two projects were properly included in the category of projects rated as “fund” by the ISRP, but not receiving a funding recommendation from CBFWA. If the projects were not included on this list, they would have been dismissed for funding consideration under the general rule in all other project categories which required that projects receive a CBFWA funding recommendation to be eligible for a positive Council recommendation. Moreover, neither the sponsors nor CBFWA have taken a position that the Council should dedicate a larger sum to the projects treated more favorably by the ISRP than CBFWA this year, which may have increased the likelihood that these projects would be funded. Notwithstanding these facts, the Council is considering these two projects on their own merits, without regard for being included in this category.

The Council will continue to meet with the sponsors and CBFWA representatives, and

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

consider information provided by the sponsors in a package dated January 10, 1999, and assess remaining available funds, and make a final recommendation on these projects in the near future. The Council will provide Bonneville with its recommendation on this project under separate cover after discussions and Council consideration concludes.

(b) gas supersaturation monitoring and evaluation - (9602100, 20143(formerly 9300802), 20157 - USGS, CRITFC, IDFG), approx. \$202,000.

Issue: The ISRP recommended funding for two projects. A third, proposed by IDFG, was not submitted in time for ISRP review, which has also been the case in previous years. The issue for the Council was whether it would accept the recommendations of the ISRP on the two projects the ISRP recommended without further inquiry, or whether the Council would also require those proposals to be consistent with the gas research plan requested in Fiscal Year 1998 and provided by CBFWA later that year. In addition the Council decided that the project not reviewed by the ISRP should be subjected to independent review prior to making a funding recommendation.

Past Council Treatment: In reviewing projects totaling \$2.5 million in FY 98, the ISRP questioned the level of attention and expenditure that was being made on evaluating the effects of dissolved gas when “the physical causes and engineering solutions are known and the general biological detriment of high gas supersaturation were well proven.” In response, the Council recommended that funding for these projects be held in reserve pending the development of a coordinated research plan by the Dissolved Gas Team, associated funding recommendations, and review by the ISAB of the Corps’ gas program. Ultimately it was agreed that the research plan would be developed through CBFWA. (The plan was developed and released in December 1998).

In Fiscal Year 1999 the Council deferred a funding recommendation on two proposed gas projects, but recommended that Bonneville hold reserve funds sufficient for the two proposed projects. The deferral was made to permit time for CBFWA to review the ISAB report on the Corps’ gas program, and develop a research plan in consideration of that review and the Gas Team’s proposed research plan. Again, that plan was released in December 1998.

Council recommendation: 1) Project 9602100 has been substantially reduced from previous years. It is primarily external examination of juvenile migrants for external signs of gas bubble disease. The project is linked to the smolt-monitoring program. This type of juvenile monitoring is required by Oregon and Washington water quality agencies as a condition to granting permits to dam operators to spill water for fish passage that results in exceedances of water quality standards for dissolved gas. The CBFWA research plan states that “biological monitoring [of gas bubble disease] will continue as long as it is a necessary element of the dissolved gas waivers.” The Council recommends that this project be funded for one year, and reviewed in conjunction with the smolt monitoring program and other programmatic monitoring and evaluation programs.

2) Project 20143, though possessing a new project number, is the continuation of an ongoing gas project. It is primarily monitoring adult salmonids for signs of gas bubble disease. As of April 1999, neither the state of Washington nor Oregon requires adult monitoring as a condition of granting gas waivers for spill. Letters were received from both Oregon and Washington state water quality agencies, and neither stated that they would require this monitoring as a condition

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

of granting waivers for exceeding standards for gas. The Council did receive and consider letters from CBFWA and EPA supporting the project. The Council has considered comments and presentations provided by the sponsor over the preceding months. The Council staff recommendation has been to not fund this project, principally because the monitoring does not appear to be required for the waivers, and that recommendation remains in place.

The Council is not inclined to recommend that this project be funded because it is no longer required by the state water quality agencies to secure gas waivers, which is the primary link the CBFWA gas plan requires of biological monitoring. Moreover, the data gathered from biological monitoring in prior years (including the adult monitoring) indicates that there is a total dissolved gas (TDG) level of approximately 120% that can be viewed as a management trigger. While additional adult monitoring may continue to yield quality data, the sponsors did not indicate how additional data would possibly lead to a different management standard for TDG given the current spill program. The Council has asked the sponsor to provide any information that it may receive that the current spill program would be significantly altered in 2000 calling the continued adequacy of the 120% management trigger into question, and stated that it would revisit its decision in light of any such information. The Council has not received information from NMFS, the Corps, or the sponsor to date indicating substantial changes to the spill program.

The sponsor submitted information in a letter dated January 10, 1999 that identified three proposed studies that may occur in the 2000 migration year that may lead to differences in spill and gas conditions from those extant in recent years. There has been no official notification from NMFS or the Corps that the 2000 spill program per se will be significantly altered this year in a manner that substantially changes migration conditions. The Council understands that one of the studies (Bjornn) referenced in the January 10 letter includes the monitoring of a large number of adult salmonids for GBT. In addition, notwithstanding the fact that the three studies referenced by the sponsor that may occur in 2000, there is no indication that TDG levels will be permitted to exceed the levels approved in the waivers in recent years. The Council is concerned that additional funding for this type of adult monitoring, at this time, will not provide data with significant management relevance. Moreover, it appears that substantial monitoring of adult salmonids for gas bubble trauma (GBT) is already occurring in Corps funded research. Given the negligible incidence of GBT detected in adults in the several years of this and other monitoring efforts, the Council is reluctant to recommend additional direct program funding to this monitoring type of activity at this time. Nonetheless, the Council defers a final recommendation on this project at this time in order to determine if the water quality waiver permitting requirements discussed above will change from what is anticipated, and to allow the sponsor additional time to determine if the spill program for 2000 will be substantially modified.

3) Project 20157 also carries a new number, but the project has existed since 1995. The project was not reviewed by the ISRP due to its untimely submission. The project monitors biological symptoms of gas bubble disease as a condition for a waiver from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for spill at Dworshak dam. This project is scheduled to undergo a five-year evaluation by Idaho DEQ, IDFG, and NMFS, with a report expected in October of this year. The Council had the proposal submitted for ISRP review, and was awaiting the evaluation when the project sponsor withdrew the proposal for Fiscal Year 2000. The proposal should not be funded in Fiscal Year 2000.

(c) **predator control** - (9007700, 20095 - PSMFC, OSU/CRITFC), approx. \$3.14

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

million.

Issue 1: (avian predation) The Council requested a long-term management plan for Caspian tern predator control activities funded by Bonneville. A report on the management plan to the Council was provided on September 21. **Issue 2: (Northern Pikeminnow)** Regarding Pikeminnow, are the projects proposed consistent with that prior guidance to utilize those most cost-effective means of reducing these predators and not an expenditure on additional research oriented activities?

Past Council Treatment: (avian predation) On July 22, 1999 the Council sent a letter to the National Marine Fisheries Service, CBFWA, and the Corps requesting that they develop a management plan for Caspian tern predator control. That management plan was provided on September 21st, and a presentation was made to the Council. **Northern Pikeminnow:** In its Fiscal Year 1998 recommendations, the Council responded to an ISRP report criticizing the level of expenditures devoted to the Northern Pikeminnow control program by recommending funding for those portions of the proposed projects that utilized what experience had demonstrated as being the most cost-effective methods for reducing these predators, and recommending that funding be discontinued for those methods that had not been as demonstrably effective. In addition, the Council noted that the project had been so successfully monitored and evaluated that the questions related to predator behavior, and the benefit obtained by reducing their numbers had been answered, and that additional efforts to evaluate such issues were unnecessary.

Council Recommendation: (avian predation) The Council evaluated the avian predation project after considering the report and presentation by USFWS, NMFS and the Corps on the long-term management plan on September 21st. Following the ISRP presentation and discussion on this project, the Council became extremely concerned by what appeared to be a high level of disagreement and/or lack of focus on a plan to dramatically reduce the predation rates by Caspian terns. The Council sent a letter to NMFS asking that it assert a leadership role in quickly developing a plan to reduce predation rates on juvenile salmonids to less than five percent in the year 2000 out-migration.

On November 2nd, representatives of the Working Group made a second presentation to the Council and outlined an Fiscal Year 2000 work plan that was supported by a majority of the group, and was aimed at reducing predation on juvenile salmonids by 25 to 45 percent in the year 2000. On November 3rd the Council voted to recommend to Bonneville that the activities planned by the Caspian Tern Working Group in its Fiscal Year 2000 Tern Management Plan be funded. While approving the project for Fiscal Year 2000, the Council continues to seek development and implementation of a workplan that reduces predation below five percent beyond year 2000. The Council is also concerned that the NMFS and USFWS have not made a significant financial contribution to this effort, and will evaluate the contributions from these entities in future proposals seeking Bonneville funds for this type of work.

Council Recommendation: (Northern Pikeminnow) The Council reviewed comments submitted by the sponsor in response to the ISRP report (Appendix B, p. 144, CBFWA August 20, 1999), stating that the proposal focuses on what has been shown as the most cost-effective reduction strategies. The Council finds that these sponsor comments about funding allocations within the project satisfy past Council concerns for purposes of the Fiscal Year 2000 proposal.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, the Council recommends that Northern pikeminnow project # 9007700 be funded at the level proposed by CBFWA. Funding is recommended upon the following conditions:

- a) The Council recommends that carryover funds from Fiscal Year 1999 be made available for this ongoing project, and;
- b) Funding of this program in future years will be dependent on an analysis and report to the Council that addresses the following
 - the declining performance and justification of the entire program, specifically the dam angling and site-specific fisheries;
 - fiscal review of administrative and personnel costs for all components;
 - feasibility and cost/benefit analysis of alternative predator control strategies

(d) captive propagation - (Projects 9009300, 9107200, 9204000, 9305600, 9606700, 9801001, and 9801006 - various sponsors)

Issue: 1) Has NMFS developed a prioritization schedule for captive brood projects as previously requested by the Council, and; 2) if the answer is yes, does the Council find the interim standards for use of captive brood strategies adequately responsive to the Council’s concerns that these projects are costly, and the feasibility of the technology is unproven?

Past Council Treatment: In its Fiscal Year 1998 and Fiscal Year 1999 recommendations, the Council expressed several categorical concerns with the captive broodstock projects being proposed for funding: (1) the projects are expensive, (2) they appear to be proliferating, (3) the feasibility of the technology had not been adequately reviewed, and, (4) an underlying question related to the question of whether these projects are primarily “ESA projects” or projects that are consistent with and part of the program funded by Bonneville. In the end, the Council recommended that existing captive broodstock programs be funded, but it called upon NMFS to work with the other anadromous fish managers to develop a set of interim standards for the application of captive broodstock technology. The Council advised that its continued funding support for the NMFS systemwide project was contingent on a set of acceptable standards being developed. The Council also stated that it would not recommend funding for any new captive broodstock projects absent an emergency, without those standards. The Council also stated its intention to require captive broodstock projects to follow the interim 3-step review process for artificial production projects. The Council has also asked that NMFS prioritize captive broodstock projects and provide that schedule to the Council to assist in the review of the budget proposals.

In February of this year, NMFS submitted the interim standards report requested by the Council. The region is using these interim standards as temporary guidance in discussions about captive propagation. The standards were incorporated into the guidelines and performance standards developed in the preservation/conservation purpose of artificial production under the APR process, and are, therefore, consistent with the principles, policies, and purposes as described in the report and recommendations.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Council Recommendation: To date, the Council has not received a prioritization of likely target populations and intervention programs to form a basis for programmatic and budget planning. Therefore, funding levels for existing programs should be held at current levels pending that prioritization. If and when the prioritization is provided, a review of these captive brood programs for consistency with APR report policies and standards must be conducted before additional funds are allocated to these programs or new programs. The Council recommends that projects 9009300, 9107200, 9204000, 9305600, 9606700, 9801001 and 9801006 be funded with the following conditions:

- Funding should be held at levels required to fund these existing programs pending the prioritization that the Council has previously requested from NMFS, and expansion of existing programs should not be permitted. To date, the Council has not received a prioritization of likely target populations and intervention programs to form a basis for programmatic and budget planning.
- The Council should not consider any new funding for this technique until adequate review has been completed, and, if possible, subbasin plans are in place.
- A review of these captive brood programs for consistency with APR report policies and standards should be conducted before additional funds are allocated to these programs or new programs.
- The Council recommends that the Tuccannon project (#20020) be permitted to continue into the three-step artificial production review process. The low-cost and short duration attributes of this project and the status of the run being treated mitigate the Council's general concerns with captive propagation projects in this particular instance. NEPA and planning work may be funded with Fiscal Year 2000 funds, and the sponsor and BPA are to work with Council staff in identifying what needs, if any, there are for that work. Funding for implementation of the project will not be approved until three-step review is complete and applicable documents address the NMFS interim standards as well as the policies, purposes and performance standards in the APR report, and until NEPA requirements are satisfied.

(e) lamprey projects - (20019, 20065, 20121, 9402600) (IDFG, USGS, USFWS) approx. \$287,000.

Issue: CBFWA and the ISRP recommended funding for three new lamprey projects in Fiscal Year 2000. The Council was required to decide if it would: (1) recommend funding for the projects in concurrence with the ISRP, or (2) condition its recommendation on a finding that these new projects have been assessed and coordinated with the on-going lamprey umbrella project, demonstrating that there is a need for an expansion of the lamprey work in the basin.

Past Council Treatment: In its Fiscal Year 1999 recommendations the Council recommended that new lamprey research and evaluation projects recommended by CBFWA not be funded. The projects proposed that year did not appear to be connected or coordinated with the existing, on-going, coordinated lamprey umbrella project that was developed in response to a lamprey status review conducted in 1995 (project 9402600). That existing project, being implemented in

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

phases, is supposed to provide information regarding lamprey status, and possibly identify restoration plans. It made little sense to the Council to recommend the start-up of new lamprey projects not linked to the existing umbrella project. Moreover, the Council was concerned that the existing project seemed to be out of sequence, seeking funds for implementation (phase III) prior to the planning and Council approval of the planning to be completed in phase II. The Council's recommendation stated that if project sponsors sought to initiate new lamprey research projects in the future, the project sponsors and CBFWA should assess the on-going effort and proposed new projects in a coordinated way and recommend whether there is a need for a more detailed project review and possibly an expansion of the lamprey effort in Fiscal Year 2000. Moreover, and regarding the ongoing project and its implementation activities specifically, the Council recommended that no funds be expended until Council review and approval of the lamprey restoration plans to be produced during phase II of the project.

Council Recommendation: First, the ongoing project (9402600) was rated as “fund in part” by the ISRP initial review, but improved its rating to “fund” after the ISRP considered additional sponsor comments. Funding for Objective 2 of this proposal is recommended at this time.

The Council *conditionally* recommends funding for Objectives 1, 3, and 4 (and particularly 3, “pilot tests”) for this ongoing project. The condition that must be satisfied before funds should be provided by Bonneville for these objectives is Council receipt and approval of a lamprey restoration plan to be provided by the sponsor. The Council provided the sponsor a letter in late October 1999 explaining the Council's expectation with regard to receipt of a restoration plan, and setting out a preferred schedule for its submission to enable an expeditious review and final decision. The sponsor provided a draft of the restoration plan on November 29, 1999, which is under staff review.

Regarding the three *new* proposed lamprey projects, the ISRP considered them in its Response Review in the context of all the proposed lamprey work, ongoing and new, and in light of the “Status Report on Columbia Basin Pacific Lamprey Projects and Needs” provided in the August 20, 1999 Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Work Plan submitted by CBFWA. The ISRP found that these projects were adequately coordinated, and that there had been an adequate showing that it is reasonable to expand the lamprey work under the program at this time by initiating these three new projects. The Council recommends that the three new projects recommended for funding by both CBFWA and the ISRP identified above be funded in Fiscal Year 2000.

(f) CBFWA budget/coordination funding

Past Council Treatment: In Fiscal Year 1999 the Council recommended that CBFWA and Bonneville develop a proposal establishing the purpose and rules for allocating money to reimburse agencies and tribes for staff time spent on regional coordination. The recommendation stated such a proposal needed to be developed and reviewed by the Council before it would decide if it would recommend that Bonneville directly fund coordination activities. The crux of the Fiscal Year 1999 request for coordination funding was the managers' desire to have some staff time spent on regional coordination activities directly funded by Bonneville, rather than as a part of individual project administration costs. The Council and CBFWA ultimately reached agreement on coordination funding for Fiscal Year 1999.

Issue and staff recommendation: The Council and CBFWA staffs will continue to meet to

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

discuss and develop a mutually agreed upon plan of CBFWA activities and associated funding requirements for the coming fiscal year. The staff recommends that these items be funded at the current levels on an interim basis pending the collaborative resolution of the funding needs within the next two months. The final funding recommendation will come under separate cover.

(g) Lake Pend Oreille kokanee study

The Council dead-locked on a motion to recommend that the Corps of Engineers hold the lake level at the higher elevation for an additional year beyond the three years specified in the program measure related to this proposal. For this reason, the Council did not make a formal recommendation for a specific lake level for the 1999-2000 operations.

The Council did vote to approve funding project #9404700 for Fiscal Year 2000. The project sponsor verified that the study activities could continue and the work would be valuable whether the Corps of Engineers chose the higher or lower lake level in 1999-2000.

(h) wildlife mitigation: four projects (20112, 20114, 20115, 20116) (Oregon Wildlife Coalition)

Issue: The ISRP recommended that several new wildlife habitat acquisition and mitigation projects be funded for Fiscal Year 2000. Bonneville raised the issue in its comments submitted during the public comment period that funding these projects raises crediting issues, and would seek to postpone these projects (and others in the future) until crediting issues are resolved.

Council Recommendation: The Council recommends that Bonneville fund all wildlife projects recommended by CBFWA in Fiscal Year 1998, Fiscal Year 1999, and Fiscal Year 2000 that have been approved by the Council and recommended to Bonneville. This includes projects 20112, 20114, 20115, and 20116 referenced in Bonneville's August 13, 1999 comments. Pending resolution of the crediting issues, the managers and Bonneville should assign the HU's achieved by their projects on an interim basis to the hydroprojects where credits are believed to be available: NE Oregon (NPT), Logan Valley (BPT), Ladd Marsh (ODFW), Denny Jones (BPT), Wenaha (ODFW), and FY 99 and FY 00 Yakama Riparian acquisitions (YIN) to the Lower Snake; and Irrigon (ODFW), Pine Creek (CTWSRO), Horn Butte (ODFW), Trout Creek (ODFW), and S. Fork Crooked River (ODFW) to John Day, The Dalles, Bonneville, and the Willamette projects.

- The Council makes the above funding recommendations on the condition that it will facilitate a resolution of the crediting methodology, mitigation accounting, and equitable allocation of credits, and any other crediting issues that surface with the wildlife managers, Bonneville, and others. The Council is advised that the wildlife managers will be forwarding to it a recommendation on crediting methodology. The Council will use this recommendation as a vehicle to begin the discussions on all of the crediting issues discussed here.
- While not strictly an Fiscal Year 2000 issue, the Council considered and adopted an emergency motion related to the Pine Creek project (CTWSRO) in order to provide requested assurances to Bonneville that funding will be available in future years to pay the acquisition price of the property. The Council, by formal motion proposed by the

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Oregon Wildlife Coalition, voted to not approve any Oregon Wildlife Coalition projects in Fiscal Year 2001 unless and until the Pine Creek acquisition was completely funded.

(i) data management projects

These projects were recommended by the ISRP as “fund for one year” (Streamnet, smolt monitoring, Fish Passage Center, DART, etc.) and will be reviewed as part of a “systemwide” review following completion of the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program amendment process.

- The Council recommends that these projects that were recommended by CBFWA for funding and rated as “fund” by the ISRP be funded for one year. The Council cautions that sponsors should anticipate the need to review, possibly modify, and incorporate these activities funded by Bonneville into the monitoring and evaluation components of an amended program in future years.

(j) Hungry Horse Mitigation -- nonnative fish removal - (#910904, USFWS, \$428,950)

This is an ongoing project that was initiated in 1992 after the Council adopted the Hungry Horse Mitigation Plan. The project is intended to mitigate for Hungry Horse Dam hydro-related losses of salmonids from the Flathead River/Lake system. Hungry Horse Dam, constructed in 1952, blocked access from Flathead Lake to tributary reaches in the South Fork Flathead River, eliminating spawning and rearing habitat for bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout from Flathead Lake.

In Fiscal Year 2000 the sponsor seeks funding through this project to remove lake trout, a non-native predator of the native bull trout from Lake McDonald in Glacier National Park as off-site mitigation under the Power Act. The proponent explains that lake trout appeared in Lake McDonald in the 1950s, and that significant, viable lake trout populations in this type of system are considered incompatible with native bull trout. The proponent seeks funding to remove lake trout from Lake McDonald to assess the response of native bull trout. It is the new lake trout removal component of this project that raises a policy issue for the Council.

Several policy issues are presented. First, this is an existing project with significant history. The lake trout removal activities proposed for Lake McDonald for the first time this year are a new and different element of the project. The Council has consistently had a policy concern that projects seem to change or be redirected over time without a logical and natural progression, and without prior Council consideration of the new approach. A good example is the concern the Council has expressed in past years with traditional artificial production projects shifting into captive propagation projects without warning or prior Council approval.

In this case, the removal of lake trout from Lake McDonald does not seem to be a logical progression or next step for this existing project. This project was initially funded as in-place mitigation through the kokanee production and stocking program in Flathead Lake/River. This is the centerpiece of the project described in the Council’s program. The sponsors state that the kokanee program has failed, and that the focus shifted in Fiscal Year 1998 to rainbow trout and westslope trout production and stocking. The primary management objectives of both the kokanee and trout production activities apparently were to provide angler opportunities and to redirect angler effort from areas in the Flathead Lake/River system with depressed populations of westslope cutthroat trout and/or bull trout. It is difficult to understand the consistency between

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

the historic project activities and approach and the proposed lake trout removal. In fact, the proposal indicates that westslope cutthroat and bull trout populations in Lake McDonald are themselves depressed. Lake trout, on the other hand, are apparently abundant. Removing lake trout from Lake McDonald is fundamentally inconsistent with the project's historic approach of creating angler opportunity in areas without depressed native stock populations. The lake trout removal activities are of a fundamentally different nature than those that preceded it, and are more logically considered a new project.

The second policy issue presented by the lake trout component of the proposal is whether or not the activity is appropriately funded from the direct program as off-site mitigation for hydro-impacts to the Flathead Lake/River system. While many actions are funded by the direct program as off-site mitigation where in-place/in-kind mitigation is not possible, the Council and the program seek a rational or logical connection between such projects and hydro-related impacts. Such a connection appears to be missing in the lake trout removal activities of this project. The project proposal indicates that lake trout were introduced to Lake McDonald before Hungry Horse Dam was constructed in 1952. Expending funds to examine eradicating a species introduced before Hungry Horse dam was even built is far removed from the core of the Act's fish and wildlife mitigation objectives. This is not to say that such a project, or even this project, may never be funded by the direct program. Rather, the tenuous connection of the "problem" to the hydro-system tends to make such a project a low priority when considered relative to the many projects proposed for funding.

Third, during the October 12th Fish and Wildlife Committee meeting, the project sponsor acknowledged that lake trout removal to assist native species is not a management strategy that is endorsed by all relevant entities. The Council has concerns over moving forward with the funding for this project with the uncertainty that even if proven as a successful tool in aiding the recovery of depressed populations of native salmonids, there remained the strong possibility that the agencies with jurisdiction would not agree to implement the strategy in other areas. The Council is also concerned that the management agencies have not coordinated their own approaches to lake trout in Lake McDonald. It was noted that the sponsor here sought ratepayer funds to test the feasibility of effecting a large scale reduction in the lake trout population with nets, traps, etc., but the National Park Service maintained a catch *limit* on lake trout for recreational fishers at Lake McDonald.

Finally, as alluded to above, the Council is presented with total funding recommendations by CBFWA that exceed the budget available for Fiscal Year 2000. In addition, the ISRP is recommending that some projects not proposed by CBFWA receive funding. In short, Fiscal Year 2000 is an extremely tight budget year. In making its recommendations to Bonneville, the Council faces the difficult task of establishing at least general priorities on which projects to fund. Establishing these priorities is a policy matter for the Council. In this case, given the budget constraints and the points discussed above regarding the lack of a logical progression to the proposed activities, and the tenuous connection of the problem to a hydrosystem cause, the Council finds the lake trout removal component of this project to be a low priority for funding. The Council recommends funding the other objectives of this proposal in Fiscal Year 2000 at the level identified in the original proposal. The sponsor's request to increase the funding level to \$159,417 made in its letter to Council staff dated November 8, 1999 for those objectives is not accepted by the Council at this time. If the sponsor requires additional the funds as stated in its November 8, 1999 letter, it should route the request through CBFWA in the quarterly review

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

process.

(k) Projects that were rated “fund in part” or “do not fund” in the June 15, 1999 ISRP report and after the ISRP “fix-it-loop” review report of October 28, 1999.

(1) Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery, Project ID #8335000, FY00 CBFWA Rec. \$14,590,000; Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring And Evaluation, Project ID #8335003, FY00 CBFWA Rec. \$992,847

Discussion/Background: Project 8335000 seeks to implement construction of the Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery supplementation program to assist in the recovery and restoration of non-listed spring chinook and ESA-listed Snake River fall chinook in the Clearwater subbasin

Project 8335003 proposes to continue implementation of a comprehensive ecosystem approach to monitoring and evaluation (of up to 83 performance variables) of the proposed Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery to determine success of restoring salmon populations and avoiding adverse ecological impacts in the Clearwater subbasin.

ISRP Reviews: 1) **Facility construction (8335000)** Do not fund in the initial and response reviews. 2) **M&E (8335003)** Fund in part. Those aspects of the project to collect baseline data needed to evaluate the long-term goals of enhancement in the Clearwater Basin appear valuable; however, those aspects that are dependent on the hatchery should be removed.

Policy Issues Identified by Sponsor: The NPT specified that the following policy criteria applied to their project. Criteria "a" due to what they view as an ISRP misunderstanding of the previous reviews and proposals and the ISRP's questions regarding the use of hatcheries (i.e. supplementation) for any recovery efforts in the basin. Criteria "b" due to the numerous approved and adopted program measures relating to the NPTH. Criteria "c" due to the two decades of commitment to NPTH as it directly relates to obligations imposed by the Act regarding mitigation and enhancement of fisheries resources. Criteria "e" due to the possible failure to secure the lands needed for the project. (See Part 1(b)(5) for explanation of the criteria).

Discussion and Council Recommendations: The monitoring and evaluation project and the facility project are linked. The ISRP recommendation to eliminate the hatchery-related elements of the monitoring and evaluation project was clearly made because the ISRP recommended that the hatchery itself not be built. Therefore, the Council's approach will be to treat these projects as a pair, and seek to insure consistency in its final funding recommendations.

Council members and Council staff met numerous times throughout the summer and fall to review the NPTH hatchery proposal in light of the program language, prior Council action in previous steps of the project, and the Fiscal Year 2000 ISRP recommendations. On November 10th, Council staff, NPT staff, and BPA staff met regarding the NPTH proposal. At the conclusion of this meeting, Council staff requested that the sponsor submit by November 24th a proposal including: 1) a statement indicating that it had successfully developed a "low cost/small scale" facility (not to exceed \$16 million dollars) and include in that statement a list of the facilities proposed to be built and also proposed production numbers for each facility; 2) a presentation of the trade-offs associated with a reduction in the scale of the project and

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

elimination of specific elements of the experimental design along with the associated risks; 3) a presentation on establishing “biological triggers” for consideration of subsequent phases of the facility; and 4) a brief presentation of a proposed monitoring and evaluation plan, including a plan for collaboration with the ISRP on that plan.

On November 24, 1999, the NPT responded to the Council’s request for a revised project for the Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery. Documents submitted addressed all of the items requested by the Council at the November 10th meeting. The staff found, and reported to the Fish and Wildlife Committee, that the submittal captured the intent of the numerous meetings and correspondence that had occurred over the past year regarding this proposal. The NPT addressed in an adequate way the “low cost,” “small-scale” language of the program measure while maintaining production needs to achieve their goals and objectives. This has partially been accomplished by developing temporary and portable facilities. In addition the production numbers are complimentary to the requirements of their extensive monitoring and evaluation plan.

Fish and Wildlife Committee Review: The Committee reviewed the November 24 submission, and found it to be responsive to the elements the Council sought to have addressed. There was concern within the Committee that a statement in the narrative of the November 24 submission sought to bind the Council to future expansion of the facilities. The Committee did not believe future Councils can or should be so bound, but indicated that the Council’s final approval (to proceed with construction after Step 3) should include a statement that meeting the “triggers” or “milestones” are an indication of sufficient success that the recommendation is that expansion should proceed, as this is what this Council contemplated.

The Committee had considerable concern that the biological triggers, particularly the fall chinook trigger, proposed by the NPT did not “set the bar high enough” if these milestones were supposed to be indicators of not only success of the first phase of the project, but such robust success that the project should be expanded significantly. Discussions at the Committee meeting (that included representatives of the NPT) indicated that the Council and sponsor could further discuss appropriate triggers or milestones as the project moved to final design. The Committee stated that selecting the appropriate biological triggers or milestones for future expansion is primarily a policy issue for the Council to establish, but recognized that the ISRP may help with ensuring that the technical aspects of them are appropriate. The Committee recommendation was next considered by the full Council.

Council Recommendation: The Council found the proposal detailed in the November 24 submission to be significantly reduced in scale and intensity from the original proposal. This reduction directly addressed what appeared to the Council to be the ISRP’s primary criticism of the original proposal (“untested concept at too large a scale”). The Council also found significant the sponsor’s willingness to work with the ISRP on the design of the monitoring and evaluation program for the facility. The Council’s expectation is that this collaboration and ISRP review and approval will address many of the concerns noted by the ISRP on M&E design and implementation. Finally, the Council believes that the requirement of establishing biological triggers for possible future expansion speaks to the ISRP’s criticism that expansion of supplementation experiments in the basin should await a demonstration of the success of the technique.

The Council approves expenditures to proceed with the completion of final designs and

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

other associated tasks that are specific to the Step 3 submittal that is anticipated in March 2000. This submittal package will include the requested information as outlined in the Step 2 decision document (as outlined and supplemented in a letter addressed to Silas Whitman dated November 13, 1998). This submittal also needs to include a schedule for the estimated cost expenditures for future needs (ten years) for this project. Additionally, it is critical that this submittal follows the intent of the November 24, 1999 letter received by the Council from the Nez Perce Tribe. Additional items that need to occur prior to a final decision on construction includes the review and approval of the M&E plan by the ISRP (submittal date - January 2000). As part of the ISRP review the Council will also request their review and advice on the "biological triggers" proposed by the Nez Perce tribe in its November 24 submittal. There are two general issues for the ISRP regarding the triggers. First, are the proposed "biological triggers" appropriate indices in light of the M&E plan? Is the M&E plan designed to function in a manner that permits the tracking of the indices? Second, the ISRP will be asked to give its advice, if possible, on the question of whether or not the standard or "bar" set for each of the indices is generally recognized as being set at a level that would indicate robust success for the artificial propagation program. To assist the Council and the ISRP in their consideration of the proposed biological triggers, the Council requests that Nez Perce staff provide Council staff with an explanation of how the proposed triggers were selected. The Council will consider the ISRP's advice on these two general issues in its effort to reach agreement with the Nez Perce Tribe on the appropriate biological triggers.

- (2) **Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan**, NPT, Project ID #8805301, FY00 CBFWA Rec. \$1,217,017.

The purpose of this NEOH project is the development of comprehensive planning documents (i.e. master plans) for artificial production initiatives in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins for several anadromous species including Spring Chinook in the Imnaha/Grande Ronde, Coho Grande Ronde/Wallowa, Fall Chinook in the Imnaha/Grande Ronde, Steelhead in the Grande Ronde, and Sockeye in the Grande Ronde (Wallowa Lake). Current emphasis by NPT is the development of a master plan for the spring chinook in the Imnaha/Grande Ronde.

The NEOH project is a cooperative endeavor with ODFW, and differences in management philosophies have caused the Tribe and ODFW to be in dispute on fundamental aspects of fisheries production for Grande Ronde and Imnaha spring chinook since 1993.

This project is explicitly linked to several other projects and programs (e.g., two Lower Snake River Compensation Plan programs) in the basin as outlined below. Generally, the NPT is primarily responsible for operating supplementation facilities (adult collection and holding and juvenile acclimation and release) on the Lostine River, while the CTUIR is responsible for operating supplementation facilities on the upper Grande Ronde River and Catherine Creek. ODFW is responsible, in coordination with the Tribes, NMFS, and USFWS for production and activities occurring at the Lookingglass, Irrigon, and Bonneville hatcheries, and at the Manchester Marine Laboratory.

The Grande Ronde captive brood component of the Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Supplementation Program was implemented as an emergency measure in 1995 and the conventional component was implemented in 1997. To obtain a Section 10 permit to operate the program in 1998, NMFS required the co-managers to develop a management plan that integrated

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

captive and conventional broodstock production. Section 10 permit applications that included the broodstock management plan were developed cooperatively for the Imnaha and Grande Ronde and filed with NMFS who then authorized collection of spring chinook and propagation of this listed species. The NPT are using these agreements and management plans to guide the master planning process.

In 1998, the NPT focused on how they might more realistically phase in rebuilding goals with limited regional funding and broodstock. The original concept for the NEOH master plans called for "new" production that would be additional to the LSRCF production currently occurring at Lookingglass Hatchery. However, with the continuing decline of salmon runs and the subsequent overload this caused on Lookingglass (i.e. with the additional burdens placed on the facility), as a tool to forestall extinction of Northeast Oregon chinook, the NPT concentrated their planning efforts on alleviating stress at the facility and restructuring where existing production would occur.

ISRP Review: Fund in part. Fund the spring chinook Grande Ronde and Imnaha objectives, which involve some capital modifications to Lookingglass Hatchery. Do not fund the reintroduction efforts or efforts to use local endangered stocks to support harvest.

Policy Issues Identified by Sponsor: The NPT specified that the following criteria applied to their project. Criteria "a" due to the need for the master plan as required under the three-step review process and as stated by the ISRP in their review. Criteria "b" due to the numerous program measures and language in Section 7.4L of the NPPC Program. (See Part 1(b)(5) for an explanation of the policy criteria).

Discussion and Council Recommendations: There is a need to get clear direction from the managers on exactly what they want to accomplish through this planning effort so that the Council can understand and track the interrelationships between these associated projects and their progress. This is important clarification for the NEOH program and the resulting relationship through time to other projects.

Until completion and approval of a master plan and support documents as part of the step 1 review process, all activities associated with these projects (8805301 NPT and Objective 1 of 8805305 ODFW) should be funded only at a level for this specific task. In addition, the issues raised by the ISRP in the Fiscal Year 2000 Response Review and the Artificial Production Review Report (document 99-15) policies need to be addressed and made part of the step 1 review. The master plan constitutes the "new facilities" piece of the existing program. There is currently strong evidence that Lookingglass National Fish Hatchery is not capable of sustaining its current production without major capital improvements. The master plan should be able to describe the comprehensive plan for spring chinook in these two basins that include a range of alternatives- including new hatchery construction (8805301)- that would allow the program to be fully sustainable.

Adequate funds remain in the Fiscal Year 1999 contracts to complete the master plan. Fiscal Year 1999 contracts expire on January 1, 2000, and a no-cost time extension will authorize the NPT and ODFW to complete the project. This review will provide the direction needed to ensure that the master planning effort and capital expenditures are developed and defined in a productive manner. Until this review is completed, it is difficult to determine if the

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

suggested improvements to Lookingglass are an appropriate use of capital funds in the subbasin.

Fish and Wildlife Committee: The Committee considered this proposal together with the related ODFW component (# 8805305 below). The Committee recommended that: 1) the spring chinook planning component proceed into the 3-step process; 2) a no-cost extension of existing contract be given which will permit master plan completion using Fiscal Year 1999 funds (no new funds needed); 3) a master plan to be provided no later than April 15; 4) a placeholder be established should the sponsors successfully move to step-2 activities after master plan approval; 5) that future funding decisions, including release of Fiscal Year 2000 funds in placeholder, be made in context of normal step review process; 6) Council expects ODFW to retain person to participate in master planning as soon as possible; 7) no capital improvements to Lookingglass Hatchery until master plan is completed; 8) operations and maintenance portion of existing program should continue to receive sufficient funding in the interim.

Council Recommendation: The full Council considered the Committee recommendation outlined above, and endorsed it as its decision on this project. The placeholder for potential step 2 activities is not specific to this project, but rather, will be a general capital project placeholder.

- (3). **Northeast Oregon Hatcheries Planning And Implementation** - ODFW, Project ID #8805305, FY00 CBFWA Rec. \$226,000.

Description/Background: ODFW's primary objective is to provide timely and effective input to NPT and CTUIR on development of Master Plans for Imnaha, Grande Ronde and Walla Walla Basins.

ISRP Review: Fund in part. Fund the spring chinook Grande Ronde and Imnaha objectives, which involve some capital modifications to Lookingglass Hatchery. Do not fund the reintroduction efforts or efforts to use local endangered stocks to support harvest. See project 8805301.

Discussion and Council Recommendations: Of the \$226,000 CBFWA recommended funding level, approximately \$45,000 is directly allocated to master plan development (Objective 1). Lookingglass improvements should not be funded prior to master plan development and approval. Please see recommendations for item (2)(above). The operations and maintenance portion of existing program should continue to receive sufficient funding in the interim.

- (4). **Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies and Conservation Aquaculture**; KTOI; Project ID #8806400; FY 00 CBFWA Rec. \$1,150,202

Description/Background: Prevent extinction, preserve existing gene pool, and begin rebuilding healthy age classes of the endangered white sturgeon in the Kootenai River using conservation aquaculture techniques with wild broodstock.

Final ISRP Evaluation: Fund in part. Fund the research component. Do not fund capital expenditures until a comprehensive review of region-wide white sturgeon recovery efforts is complete. Do not fund kokanee portion of the proposal, Objective 4, because the scientific basis for linking kokanee to white sturgeon is not justified.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Sponsor’s Policy Response: Concurred with CBFWA and ISRP funding recommendations on delaying hatchery construction. The original \$2,750,202 funding request was reduced to \$1,150,202 by eliminating the capital construction portion of the budget.

Council Recommendation: Fund in part. Do not fund hatchery construction and kokanee study. Approve a project funding level of \$1,095,202. The sponsors concurred with CBFWA and the ISRP on delaying hatchery construction, and agree with the attendant budget reduction recommendations. The sponsor did not address the ISRP criticism of the proposed kokanee study portion of the project. The funding recommended above reflects the Council’s acceptance of the ISRP recommendation to delete the kokanee study. (the figure includes a reduction of \$55,000).

- (5). **Kootenai River Fisheries Recovery Investigations;** IDFG; Project ID #88065001; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$616,596

Description/Background: Determine status of Kootenai River white sturgeon (ESA), burbot (a genetically distinct stock), whitefish, and bull and rainbow trout stocks in the Kootenai River and effects of water fluctuations and ecosystem changes on these stocks.

ISRP Review: Fund in part. Do not fund hypotheses/objectives 3,4, and 11; 3 and 11 are not theoretically justified. The ISRP’s original recommendation to not fund hypothesis 2 is now changed to a fund because the response adequately addressed the ISRP concerns. Hypothesis 2 is for monitoring and evaluation of white sturgeon as related to environmental conditions. This monitoring is needed to implement the Recovery Plan and for adequate management by the Technical Management Team. It will also contribute to long-term records for scientific studies. The responses justify this work, especially at an exploratory level. Further coordination of all parties in the Kootenai system still seems desirable to the reviewers.

Council Recommendation: The Council concurs with the partial funding recommendation made in the ISRP’s October 28, 1999 report. Only the objectives endorsed by the ISRP are recommended for funding.

- (6). **Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone Paiute Joint Culture Facility,** Project ID #9500600, FY00 CBFWA Rec. \$282,621

Discussion/Background: The goal of the Shoshone Bannock and Shoshone Paiute Tribes’ Joint Culture Facility is to produce rainbow trout as well as the experimental holding and propagation of two native trout species (Yellowstone cutthroat, redband trout). Rainbow trout are to provide fish for the “put and take” fisheries in enclosed reservoirs (e.g. Lake Billy Shaw Reservoir) and the Fort Hall Bottoms. In addition to providing recreational and subsistence fishery opportunities, the “put and take” fisheries are intended to ease pressure on native fish stocks.

Measures for establishing Shoshone-Bannock Tribe and Shoshone-Paiute Tribe artificial production facilities have been in the Council’s program since 1987. Originally, these measures called for two separate facilities. In the early 1990s, feasibility studies demonstrated that the needs for these two facilities might be met at one site, the program was amended to reflect this finding, and planning has proceeded along that route. In April 1996, the Shoshone-Bannock

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Tribe and Shoshone-Paiute Tribe completed the Master Plan for the facility through a contract with Montgomery-Watson Consultants. In 1998, the environmental assessment (EA) for this facility was completed. The master plan and the EA are based on development of this facility at the Crystal Springs Site (otherwise known as Houghland Farm).

The Joint Culture Facility is a three-phase project. The phases are:

- Phase I - purchase of a site, construction of a hatchery facility, and propagation of hatchery rainbow trout for release in enclosed reservoirs.
- Phase II - experimentation to determine appropriate propagation methods for native Yellowstone cutthroat and redband trout in a hatchery setting and limited production;
- Phase III - full-scale production of native trout for planting into historically occupied waters.

At the May 19, 1998, meeting in Spokane, the Council recommended funding for the Joint Culture Facility's final design (i.e. approved Step 2). The final design cost is estimated at \$110,000. The Council's action included recommending the purchase of the Crystal Springs site at an estimated cost of \$760,000.

This Step 2 review is addressed Phase I as well as portions of Phase II that involves the experiments to determine appropriate propagation methods for native species. The portion of Phase II involving limited production activities and all of Phase III will require further development and a future step 2 and step 3 review before proceeding. After final design is completed for the facility, the Council will proceed with a Step 3 review to consider recommending funding construction and operation of the Joint Culture Facility.

As a condition to recommending funding, the Council called for development of a monitoring and evaluation plan. This monitoring and evaluation plan should be developed so that other elements of the project that might be approved at a future date can be incorporated into the plan. It is anticipated that questions about measurable objectives, project benefits, genetic interactions, and fish health will be addressed by this plan. The monitoring and evaluation plan will need to be submitted to the Council for consideration during the step 3 review.

Another condition to the recommendation was that additional information be developed relative to four technical areas for consideration during the Step 3 review. These include: 1) documentation of the current status of redband trout and other fish resources of concern; 2) evaluation and documentation of the potential, including cumulative, impacts on resident trout in the Fort Hall Bottoms; 3) an expanded evaluation of the possible incidence of, and magnitude of potential impacts of, whirling disease; and, 4) a literature review of the current knowledge regarding propagation and supplementation of native species.

Step 3 documents were scheduled to be submitted to Council earlier this year. To date no step documents have been received.

ISRP Review: Fund in part. Do not fund Objectives 5-8. This proposal received a recommendation for partial funding, with the hatchery component of the proposal not recommended for funding. The reasons for the negative recommendation for the hatchery

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

component (hatchery development and stocking program) were lack of adequate background data on status and trends of currently present native stocks and lack of adequate consideration of jeopardy to them from stocking with hatchery fish.

Sponsor Policy Response: No response was received.

Council Recommendations: Specific language approved by Council for the Joint Culture Facility on May 19, 1998 (step 2 approval) seems to address the concerns that the ISRP identified in their review (see 2 and 3 below). Therefore, it is critical that this language be addressed in the step 3 submittal documents. The step 3 submittal (i.e. final designs) will address only the Phase I as well as portions of Phase II that involves the experiments to determine appropriate propagation methods for native species as outlined in the Step 2 decision by the Council. The portion of Phase II involving limited production activities and all of Phase III will require further development and a future Step 2 and 3 review before proceeding. After final design is completed for the facility, the Council will proceed with a Step 3 review to consider a recommendation for funding construction and operation of the Joint Culture Facility.

1. Recommend that Bonneville fund final design of the Joint Culture Facility Project for Phase I and elements of Phase II that address experimental holding and propagation of native Yellowstone cutthroat and redband trout. This would include funding the purchase of the Crystal Springs Site.
2. The recommendation for funding final design is conditional on the development of a monitoring and evaluation plan for Phase I and elements of Phase II addressed above. This monitoring and evaluation plan should be developed so that elements of Phase II and Phase III that might be approved at a future date can be incorporated into the plan. It is anticipated that questions about measurable objectives, project benefits, genetic interactions, and fish health will be addressed by this plan. The monitoring and evaluation plan should be submitted to the Council for consideration during the Step 3 review.
3. The recommendation for funding final design is conditional on additional information being developed relative to four technical areas for consideration during the Step 3 review. These include: 1) documentation of the current status of redband trout and other fish resources of concern, 2) evaluation and documentation of the potential, including cumulative, impacts on resident trout in the Fort Hall Bottoms, 3) an expanded evaluation of the possible incidence of, and magnitude of potential impacts of, whirling disease, and 4) a literature review of the current knowledge regarding propagation and supplementation of native species. This information will address peer review concerns.

The Council received a letter from Bonneville on November 18, 1999 requesting clarification on the Step 2 decision that addresses the "experimental holding and propagation of native Yellowstone cutthroat and redband trout." In addition there seems to be confusion by the sponsors regarding the Step 2 decision and the production levels that were used for the master plan (April 1996). This change in the production levels seems to be what is also causing the confusion regarding the intent of the Step 2 decision. It is critical that the production levels and designs for the facilities address the decision made by the Council during the step 2 review.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Changes to the project’s intent will be addressed in supplemental master plans or additional step reviews.

Finally, recent information received by Council staff indicates that there may be differing objectives or management philosophies developing between the co-sponsors. In short, there is some indication that this facility may suit the needs of the Shoshone Bannock, but not the Shoshone Paiute. If this proves true, there was concern that the proposed design and capacity may not be appropriate as proposed. Therefore, the Council recommends that: 1) a placeholder for Fiscal Year 2000 be established in the amount of the proposal; 2) Council staff determine how the sponsors wish to proceed; 3) if it is determined that both sponsors wish to proceed as proposed, the conditions detailed above will apply to the Council recommendation.

- (7). **Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia**; YIN; Project ID # 9604000; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$100,000

Description/Background: Determine the feasibility of re-establishing a naturally spawning coho population within the mid-Columbia tributaries, while keeping adverse ecological impacts on other salmonid species of concern within acceptable limits.

Final ISRP Evaluation: Fund in part to continue monitoring in the Methow River Basin. The study of coho reintroduction feasibility should be continued in the Methow until a complete, comprehensive justification for switching the focus to the Wenatchee River Basin has been completed. Changing subbasins is too important a decision without the development of a detailed study plan and testable hypotheses.

Sponsor’s Policy Response: No written response submitted.

Council Recommendation: Fund in part. Withhold full funding for the project until: 1) a detailed written report on the Methow coho reintroduction project is submitted. This report will describe the background, methods, data collected, discussion and analysis of results, and problems encountered. Also included will be a policy and scientific rationale for the decision to switch the emphasis of the reintroduction project to the Wenatchee subbasin. 2) Complete the 3-step review process for the proposed coho reintroduction project in the Wenatchee subbasin. With the review, the project sponsors will submit a detailed study plan describing the proposed work. A combined step process may be appropriate to help expedite the process.

Provide interim funding to carry out the three-step review (i.e. staff analysis of monitoring results, short and long-term production plans, etc.). Also provide sufficient funding through April 30, 2000 to cover all fish rearing costs and associated project costs, including needed acclimation site development, to keep the coho reintroduction project on schedule for Fiscal Year 2000. Appropriate interim funding levels will be determined at a later time working with BPA and the project sponsors. Full funding for the balance of Fiscal Year 2000 (including the Fiscal Year 2000 proposed funding of \$100,000) will be contingent on three-step review process and final Council recommendation.

- (8) **Preserve the Gametes of Listed Salmonid Stocks**; NPT; Project ID # 9703800; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$185,122

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Description/Background: Establish a gene bank to preserve male gametes from listed steelhead and chinook salmon conservation units that are at low levels of abundance and at high risk of extirpation.

Final ISRP Evaluation: Fund in part. The original June 15th ISRP recommendation stands. Do not fund the portion to cryopreserve female genetic material as this part of the proposal is too uncertain and experimental. Work to preserve embryos should be proposed as a separate project by the principal investigator actually doing the work. The proposal should carefully outline past trials and summarize present knowledge. It should provide details of experimental methods. Such work has been going on for many years without success, so the funding agency should be prepared to either fund specific experiments with completion dates or be prepared to continue the funding indefinitely.

Project Sponsor's Policy Response: Sponsors believe that exploring the opportunity to preserve embryos is a management or policy judgement decision. Cryopreservation of gametes has been identified as an appropriate measure under the Council's fish and wildlife program and the sponsors have been applying cryogenic technology to preserve genetic diversity from adult male salmon gametes. Sponsors believe that they are making the needed logical progression by proposing research to preserve the genetic diversity of Pacific salmon.

Council Recommendation: As recommended by the ISRP, fund the project but do not fund the work on cryopreserving female genetic material. The female genetic work funding was intended to support graduate student work at the University of Idaho. The deletion of this funding would reduce the overall budget by \$22,000 and bring the total cost of this project down to \$163,122. The Council noted that there is limited work being conducted on the preservation of female gametes, and would entertain a proposal for this type of work in the future if structured as suggested by the ISRP.

(9). **Ocean Survival of Juvenile Salmonids in the Columbia River Plume**; NMFS; Project ID # 9801400; \$826,000 from ESA Placeholder

Discussion/Background: While there is no current obligation for the satisfaction of independent scientific review of projects funded under the ESA budget, the Fisheries Service submitted its proposal to the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) for their comments and peer evaluation.

ISRP Review: Fund in part. The ISRP June 15th report recommended partial funding of certain objectives only. In particular, they recommended against funding two of the proposed objectives (32 percent of the budget or \$264,000). In its October 29th report the ISRP continued with its strong reservation against one of the proposed objectives (21 percent of the budget or \$173,000). The ISRP recognized the value of studies in the plume area, but also indicated that it remains unconvinced about the adequacy of certain proposed methods and aspects described in the experimental design for this project.

1. **Expansion of activities:** While the review process for project 9801400 was underway, Bonneville initiated a procurement action to expand the statement of work for this project. The expansion of project 9801400 provides funding for the "*Canada-USA shelf salmon*

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

survival study”, submitted by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada. This action requires an additional **\$285,600 of ESA funds**. Talled together, the original request for 9801400 and its newest expansion add up to **\$1,111,600**. Furthermore, there is very little mutual acknowledgment between these two components of the project. The original proposal submitted by the Fisheries Service makes no reference to a future expansion. The additional proposal submitted by the Canadian agency makes a limited and confusing attempt to link up with the Fisheries Service’s project. The Canadian addition was not submitted for ISRP review and evaluation.

2. **Research planning:** On September 24, 1999, Will Stelle (Fisheries Service) sent a letter to Bob Austin (Bonneville) in support of the addition of the Canadian proposal to project 9801400. In his argument, Mr. Stelle links this proposal to the fulfillment of elements of the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative #13 in the Biological Opinion. The language in Alternative # 13 requires the development of “a [multi-agency] comprehensive monitoring, evaluation and research program.” The text further furnishes some examples of the kinds of studies that should be contained in such a comprehensive plan. Estuary and near-shore research studies are some of these examples.

In the past, the Council indicated its discomfort with the Fishery Service’s interpretation of the biological Opinion. A letter of May 5, 1998 from John Brogoitti (then Chairman of the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Committee) to Mr. Stelle clearly draws attention to the larger intent of the language, directed at developing a comprehensive plan instead of addressing individual efforts in a prescriptive manner.

Council staff analysis:

- **ISRP concerns remain unsatisfied.** The decision of the Fisheries Service to seek peer review input to enhance the scientific content of their proposed work is a move in the right direction. However, the peer review process should not be limited to an exchange of opinions. In order to be of value, all significant concerns expressed by reviewers should be addressed and satisfied by the proponents *before* proceeding with implementation of the proposed activities. A decision to move forward with implementation, despite pending concerns about the proposed structure of a study, defeats the purpose of independent scientific review.
- **Potential for expansion of original concerns.** Because of the alleged connection between the Fisheries Service’s original study and the latest addition proposed by the Canadian agency, the possibility exists that the later proposal may raise the same or similar concerns as those expressed by the ISRP on the Fisheries Service’s plan. The critical relevance of research in the plume, and the large funding investment considered currently and planned for future years, makes it imperative that all necessary adjustments to this combined study be addressed comprehensively before implementation.
- **No research plan.** To date, efforts to develop a collaborative research program to implement the Biological Opinion have not been successful. In its absence, the Fisheries Service opted for the implementation of isolated projects. This administrative behavior could potentially disrupt the regional prioritization process and commit millions of dollars to multi-year efforts. This may have serious implications for Bonneville’s direct fish and wildlife budget

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

in the future and for the necessary coordination to allow for planning and management of regional research efforts.

Council Recommendation The Council invites the Fisheries Service to agree to a full review by the ISRP of the studies proposed in the Columbia River plume. The review should result in the modification of proposed activities, the alignment of objectives in a coordinated manner, and the satisfaction of significant ISRP concerns. The Council makes this recommendation with some concern that the track record established for this project suggests that it may be burdening the ISRP with a review that is not treated as seriously by NMFS and Bonneville as is warranted. That is, the Council is not does not seek independent scientific review for this or any other project as a simple matter of process. Rather, the goal of the review is to improve the scientific integrity of the substance of the projects. The Council recommends that NMFS and Bonneville seek to address the ISRP's concerns for this project in a meaningful way as is required of all other projects in the review.

(10). Monitor Watershed Conditions on the Warm Springs Reservation; CTWSRO; Project ID # 9802400; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$35,402 (sponsor request \$160,975)

Discussion/Background: The project would monitor stream conditions for macroinvertebrate populations and sediment, evaluate fish passage at culverts and stream crossings, and inventory fish habitat in streams on the Warm Springs Reservation.

ISRP Review: The ISRP recommended funding in part on both reviews to perform Objectives 2 (culvert inventory and 4 (fish habitat surveys). On the second review, ISRP approved funding Objective 3 (Sediment sampling). ISRP believed that the proposal failed to adequately reference suitable sites for the macroinvertebrate study (Objective 1) and thus recommended deleting that study.

Sponsor Policy Response: Project sponsors have concurred with ISRP on the deletion of the macroinvertebrate study. Thus, there is no real policy issue. Sponsors did state that the CBFWA funding level would not allow them to perform all the objectives ISRP deemed worthy of funding. They had requested \$160,917 from CBFWA and received only \$35,420, enough to fund the culvert inventory. The total funds required to complete the three ISRP recommended objectives would be \$112,700.

Council Recommendation: The Council has approved projects at the CBFWA-recommended level, assuming that CBFWA has resolved budget disputes with the project sponsors. The Council recommends approving the project at the CBFWA recommended level of \$35,420. This level of funding will allow the culvert inventory (Objective 2) to continue. We could recommend that the project use the quarterly review process to seek funding the ISRP approved Objectives 3 and 4.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

(11). **Consumptive Sturgeon Fishery – Hells Canyon and Oxbow Reservoirs**; NPT; Project ID # 9903200; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$250,000

Discussion/Background: The project would provide fishing opportunities in Hells Canyon and Oxbow reservoirs to mitigate for the loss of white sturgeon in the Columbia and Snake River basins due to hydropower development. The project is in pre-Step 1 of the 3-step process. Project proponents were supposed to develop a detailed management plan in the first year of the project, in consultation with IDFG and ODFW. The plan has not been developed, due to a late start in project contracting, and likely will not be developed until March or April of 2000. Contracting for this project runs through March 2000, so there are funds available to complete the management plan.

There is also an ongoing evaluation of sturgeon fisheries and viability in both reservoirs by Idaho Power Company as part of the FERC Hells Canyon Complex relicensing process. CBFWA assigned the project to Tier 1.

ISRP Review: Do not fund (both reviews). On its second review, ISRP criticized the scientific justification and basis for the proposal. Specific concerns addressed the lack of a management plan and a sound data collection plan. They also questioned beginning a stocking program prior to scoping the possible side effects to other sturgeon and resident fish as a result of that stocking.

Policy Issues: The Nez Perce tribe provided policy justification to the Council in their letter of November 10, 1999. The Nez Perce tribe cited Council Criteria b of Director Lohn's memo of October 26, that ISRP comments are expressly critical of a strategy or objective that has been approved in an adopted program measure. The Nez Perce tribe cites Measures 10.4 and 10.4A.5 as providing justification for the project.

Measure 10.4 addresses sturgeon mitigation in the basin as a valid strategy. Measure 10.4A.5 authorizes funding for an evaluation of a consumptive sturgeon fishery in Oxbow and Hells Canyon reservoirs, in consultation with the Nez Perce Tribe, ODFW and IDFG. The Council must approve a plan prior to implementation.

Council Analysis and Recommendation: The Council adopted the recommendation included as Section 10.4A.5 in the 1995 program amendments. The Findings include an explanation of modifications the Council made to the recommendation. Specifically, the Council called for an evaluation of production and release of sturgeon, rather than immediate implementation. The evaluation should address three points:

“1) Is it possible to produce a successful sturgeon fishery, given what is known and not known about sturgeon production and the precise environment into which these fish will be [introduced]?”

2) Can the production and release of these fish occur without significantly reducing the productivity of wild sturgeon populations? [Given ISRP concerns, this evaluation should also address productivity of other resident fish.]

3) Whether this project addresses losses caused by the development and operation of the

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

hydropower system, and, if so, are other entities also responsible?”

On January 13, 1999 the Council sent a letter to the Nez Perce Tribe recommending Fiscal Year 1999 funding for the project and stipulating that future funding be conditioned upon “the development and peer review of a production master plan consistent with the Fish and Wildlife Program” and that “the Council specifically approve the master plan for the sturgeon fishery if warranted.”

The “production” component of this project is in a preliminary assessment and feasibility stage; therefore, it is currently at the master planning level or Step 1 in the Three-Step Process. The sponsors have been coordinating and consulting with ODFW and IDFG on a technical level and have also included Idaho Power in their consultations. They intend to submit the master plan and any NEPA documents in March or April 2000. Submission of these documents will initiate the Council review process. To date, no step documents have been received.

Until completion and approval of a master plan and support documents as part of the step 1 review process all activities associated with this project should be funded at a level for this specific task. This funding level will be maintained until Council receives and approves step 1 documents that clearly answers the questions as outlined in the Fish and Wildlife Program Findings (16-137 through 139). In addition the issues raised by the ISRP in the Fiscal Year 2000 Response Review and the Artificial Production Review Report (document 99-15) policies need to be addressed and made part of the step 1 review. This documentation will then provide the direction needed to ensure that the master planning effort is developed in a productive manner to meet the intent of Section 10.4A.5. The Council believes that funding this project at the reduced level for planning activities, and its requirement that the ISRP’s criticisms be addressed in the step 1 review is consistent with, and addresses the ISRP’s bases for, its recommendation.

Fund the project at a level that will assure completion of the master plan. Funding for three months of the project should provide the necessary funding to complete that task. Based upon the Fiscal Year 2000 budget, this funding level should be \$36,000 (using the figures for project personnel, benefits and overhead).

- (12). **Design And Construct NEOH Walla Walla Hatchery**, Project ID #20138, FY00
CBFWA Rec. \$250,000

Discussion/Background: A draft Walla Walla Master Plan was prepared in 1993 under the Northeast Oregon Hatchery – Walla Walla component project. The goal of the project is to reduce Walla Walla spring chinook production in the South Fork Walla Walla River from 600,000 initially proposed to 350,000. This production would be targeted at the more favorable and extensive spawning and rearing habitat in the South Fork Walla Walla River. Releases in the Touchet River will not be proposed initially but may be in the future pending findings from current WDFW habitat evaluation efforts. Also, a strong monitoring and evaluation component will be tied to the reduced initial spring chinook production in the Walla Walla to guide future adjustments. Additionally, a 100,000 Walla Walla stock (from Oregon) summer steelhead at Umatilla Hatchery as initially proposed in the earlier draft will be proposed. This production would fill the vacated Umatilla spring chinook space that is proposed for relocation. Steelhead smolts would be released in tributaries above Milton Freewater for supplementation of severely

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

depressed natural production. To date no progress has been made on this master plan. Emphasis has been placed on the Umatilla component. Therefore the dates mentioned above will not be met, and a new submittal date has not been received from CTUIR.

ISRP Review: Do not fund planning or development of new facilities in the Walla Walla until the province-level review is complete. See the programmatic recommendation for the Umatilla and Walla Walla Rivers under project 8903500.

Policy Issues: The CTUIR specified that the following criteria applied to their project. Criteria "a" due to ISRP's doubts that re-establishing natural production can be achieved due to harvest problems and low smolt-to-adult survivals at the Umatilla Hatchery. Criteria "b" due to ISRP's objection to this project is that they do not believe a hatchery supplementation program can restore natural production even though the Council's fish and wildlife program measure 7.4L.1 supports artificial production.

Council Recommendations: Until completion and approval of a master plan as part of the step 1 review process all activities associated with this project should be funded at a level for this specific task. This funding level will be determined in consultation with the sponsor and Bonneville and maintained until the Council receives and approves step 1 documents that clearly answers the technical questions required to be answered as part of the 3-step review process (i.e. step 1 - master plan). In addition the issues raised by the ISRP in the Fiscal Year 2000 Response Review and the Artificial Production Review Report (document 99-15) policies need to be addressed and made part of the step 1 review. This review will provide the direction needed to ensure that the master planning effort is developed in a productive manner to ensure the needs of the basins are met.

The Council did not accept that portion of the ISRP's recommendation that planning activities should not be funded until a province-level review is completed. The Council believes that the planning work that must be conducted as part of the step 1 planning for a potential facility will facilitate and encourage the collection of information and analysis that will be necessary to develop a subbasin plan that will be reviewed in the province-level review. For example, section 7.4B, which outlines required elements of a master plan, directs the sponsor to identify "factors limiting production," "alternatives for resolving the resource problem", and the "historical and current status of anadromous and resident fish in the subbasin," among other things. The type of information that is required in master planning will be very useful whether or not the facility is eventually constructed. The Council understands the ISRP's recommendation to not fund planning for this project at this time to be based in its belief that commitments to planning additional production facilities may tend to solidify the conclusion that they will be built without the benefit of a subbasin plan and review. The Council appreciates that concern, but states in the most certain terms here that a recommendation to fund planning activities at this early stage should not be interpreted or perceived to be a commitment to the eventual construction of the facility. Rather, the Council will retain its discretion to not recommend or approve construction at any point in the step review process if that is the result that scientific and policy considerations warrant. Finally, the Council does expect that a subbasin plan and review will be necessary prior to construction of a facility, should this project proceed past the step 1 planning stage.

The Council recommends that: 1) Council staff and sponsor fix a date certain for master

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

plan submission; 2) fund only planning activities at this time; 3) use the general capital projects placeholder to fund step 2 activities if step 1 is completed and approved; 3) all future funding, including release of placeholder funding, is contingent on step approvals.

- (13). **Dworshak Impacts/M&E and Biological Rule Curves**; NPT; Project ID # 8740700; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$ 199,485

Description/Background: Obtain and assess thermal, physical, chemical, primary production, zooplankton and benthic data for formulating biological/integrated rule curves for Dworshak Dam and Reservoir and for enhancing baseline data for monitoring and evaluation.

ISRP Reviews: Initial review -- delay funding. Response review -- do not fund.

Sponsor Policy Response: The project proponents identified Council program measures that the ISRP were critical of, indicating that the project was in line with the program measure, that project proponents were following program direction. Additional comments indicate that “not funding this project in Fiscal Year 2000 would result in the loss of a unique funding efficiency associated with a time sensitive inter-agency planning opportunity. The project sponsor’s scheduling of integrated rule curve development, and associated modeling, coincides with updating of the Corps of Engineers Dworshak Master Plan and Supplemental EIS, and Idaho Water Resources Board’s Dworshak Operating Plan.” The project sponsors state a desire by the coordinating entities to share information that would be mutually beneficial. Further, the project should proceed to develop a draft integrated rule curve by the end of Fiscal Year 2000.

Council Recommendation: A final report, including integrated rule curves, be prepared and delivered to the Council, in Fiscal Year 2000. In preparing the rule curves, the sponsor should coordinate with the IDWR and IDEQ to ensure that the IRC’s being developed in this project are consistent with those being developed by state agencies for Dworshak operations. To obtain these deliverables transition funding should be provided on a quarterly basis upon receipt of work product. The Council recommend funding Objective 2, “[d]evelop rule curve model” at project sponsor’s budget request of 46 percent of the budget for a total of \$93,000.

The Council’s recommendation to provide limited funding for this project to complete the work and receive the deliverable is consistent with the ISRP’s recommendation. The Council believes that that the limited funding it is recommending will provide an orderly conclusion to this project and produce the final report it has approved for funding in prior years.

- (14) **Plan, Site, Design And Construct NEOH Hatchery - Umatilla/Walla Walla Compo**; CTUIR; Project ID #8805302, FY00 CBFWA Rec. \$2,800,000

Discussion/Background: The master plan associated with this project is being developed as a supplement to the Umatilla Hatchery Master Plan and will include the additional spring chinook production and the facilities required to meet the spring chinook production objectives as outlined in the original master plan. The goal is to produce 589,000 spring chinook yearlings in the South Fork Walla Walla River as initially proposed in the Umatilla Hatchery Master Plan and the 1993 draft supplement. In addition, this master plan will address relocation of production of 100,000 spring chinook from Carson hatchery and 360,000 spring chinook from Umatilla

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Hatchery to the South Fork Walla Walla. This relocation will address the need for more favorable water conditions at the South Fork facility for chinook production and allow for more localized operations at Umatilla. The sponsor is currently developing the master plan for submittal to the Council as part of the step 1 review process.

ISRP Review: Do not fund planning or development of new facilities in the Walla Walla basin until the province level review is complete. See programmatic recommendation for the Umatilla and Walla Walla basins under project 8903500.

Sponsor Policy Response: The CTUIR specified that the following criteria applied to their project. Criteria "a" due to ISRP's doubts that re-establishing natural production can be achieved due to harvest problems and low smolt-to-adult survivals at the Umatilla Hatchery. Criteria "b" due to ISRP's objection to this project is that they do not believe a hatchery supplementation program can restore natural production even though the Council's program measure 7.4L.1 supports artificial production. Criteria "c" due to the extirpation of spring chinook, goals for adult returns, natural production, Indian and non-Indian harvest and broodstock collection cannot be met without employment of this project.

Council Recommendation: Until completion and approval of a master plan as part of the step 1 review process, all activities associated with this project should be funded at a level for this specific task. This funding level will be maintained until the Council receives and approves step 1 documents that clearly answers the technical questions as outlined in the letter sent to the CTUIR staff dated November 5, 1998. In addition, the issues raised by the ISRP in the Fiscal Year 2000 Response Review and the Artificial Production Review Report (document 99-15) policies need to be addressed and made part of the step 1 review. Adequate funds remain in the Fiscal Year 1999 contracts to complete the master plan. Fiscal Year 1999 contracts expire on April, 2000, and a no-cost time extension will authorize the CTUIR to complete the project. This review will provide the direction needed to ensure that the master planning effort is developed in a productive manner to ensure the needs of the basins are met.

The recommendation above includes the following particulars: 1) Council staff and sponsor establish a date certain for master plan submission; 2) the capital projects placeholder will be established and available should step 1 be successfully completed and approved, and step 2 work is required in Fiscal Year 2000; 3) all future funding decisions, including release of placeholder funds will be contingent on step approvals.

The Council does not accept that portion of the ISRP recommendation that planning activities should not be funded at this time. The reasons for its decision are the same as those discussed in regard to project (12) above, and those are adopted here by this reference. Similarly, approval for this limited planning should not be interpreted or understood to suggest that the Council believes that this facility, or any other facility in step review, will ultimately be constructed. Rather, approvals must be secured at each stage of the review process. The Council's willingness to recommend limited planning funding is largely a product of its belief that the information gathered in the master plan process will be useful and necessary in subbasin planning.

(15) **Idaho Water Rental: Resident Fish and Wildlife Impacts** - Phase III; IDFG; Project ID # 9106700; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$119,465.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion/Background: The sponsor advises that wrap-up activities can be accomplished with funds on hand. No funding for Fiscal Year 2000 is requested or required.

ISRP Review: Do not fund.

Council Recommendation: The Council recommends no funding for new Fiscal Year 2000 funds and anticipates receiving a final report on findings and/or conclusions developed during the course of this project. The Council recommends that Bonneville disburse funds on a quarterly basis and hold the final disbursement until the sponsor submits a final report.

(16) **Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project**; CCT; Project ID # 9501100; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$396,753

Discussion/Background: This project has two major elements, (1) stock assessment, and (2) an assessment of entrainment through Grand Coulee Dam. Specifically, this project is designed to determine the stock status, strength, genetics, and local fishery contribution by natural production kokanee. High entrainment rates are suspected through Grand Coulee Dam.

The stock assessment work seems especially important. The status of naturally producing kokanee, spawning escapement, genetic analysis of populations and natural production strength for weak unique wild stocks are crucial. Collection of this data is underway, but not yet complete.

Regarding the entrainment issue, the Colville Tribe has indicated that a report containing hydroacoustic data is due from their subcontractor at the end of December. The tribe requests 90 days after the data is provided in order to conduct an analysis of entrainment totals by powerhouse, turbine, diel and monthly periods. Identification of the hydropower operation responsible for the highest entrainment will also be included. In their report, the tribe will address ISRP questions regarding the significance of entrainment relative to the total population, as identified in the second review, to the extent possible. The hydroacoustic analysis report is to be submitted to the Council in March. A study design for the strobe light and fish behavior work should be submitted to the Council by June 15th, and subsequently reviewed by the ISAB or ISRP.

ISRP Review: Do not fund (both reviews). The ISRP states, “The proposal continues to be inadequate with respect to plans for meeting those objectives that have not been met or have only partly been met. However, the work is important and plans should be made for development of a scientifically sound study.

Sponsor Policy Response: The Colville Confederated Tribes responded to 4 of the overriding policy issue criteria: Criteria “b” and “c”: The project is an adopted program measure (measure 10.8B.7) and provides data and analysis that address elements identified in measure 10.8B.8. Entrainment of 300,000-800,000 fish annually undoubtedly impacts the fishery in Lake Roosevelt and puts at risk the effectiveness of mitigation measures for anadromous fish losses in the “blocked area” (resident fish substitution). Criteria “d”: Not funding the Chief Joseph Kokanee Project also represents a significant and immediate risk to the wild “unique” stock of kokanee identified in the San Poil and Nespelem drainages and jeopardizes existing fisheries opportunities in Lake Roosevelt. The existing project funds support two important project objectives, including monitoring adult spawner escapement and genetic evaluation of the free

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

ranging reservoir and tributary populations of kokanee. Criteria “e”: In addition to the potential loss of a wild kokanee stock and risk to the overall Lake Roosevelt fishery, a unique funding opportunity exists to address the entrainment issue at Grand Coulee. As a result of entrainment estimates at Grand Coulee and direction by the ISRP, the Tribe and the Bureau of Reclamation have collaborated in the development of a pilot strobe light study at Grand Coulee.

Council Recommendation: The Colville Confederated Tribe has been working with the Bureau of Reclamation, the USGS, WDFW, and the Spokane Tribe to secure cost sharing for the strobe light study. The cost share opportunity over a three-year period may contribute close to \$1million dollars to this effort. Because of the appropriations process, the Bureau and USGS contribution will not be available until 2002 and is earmarked for the strobe light application at Grand Coulee. It is imperative that the preliminary baseline data be in place to take full advantage of the cost share opportunity.

The Council recommends funding for the stock assessment work, which includes field investigation elements such as stock status, strength, genetics, and local fishery contribution by natural production kokanee. Fund the hydroacoustics analysis report, to include the ISRP questions, with the report due at the end of March. Fund CCT participation in the development of the strobe light/fish behavior study design due on June 15th. Fund training for CCT staff on the fish tracking system. Total recommended funding is \$317,057.

The Council recommends that the Corps, Bureau and Bonneville, in conjunction with a Council staff member, work to identify if a funding mechanism for a Bureau of Reclamation project can be found for available dollars in the capital construction budget category. For Fiscal Year 2000, capital expenses for a sonic tracking system and 20 sonic tags is expected to cost about \$104,000. For Fiscal Year 2000, fund the capital expense from the capital budget category, if possible. If a mechanism for funding cannot be found, the Council will consider funding from the direct program. The Council is willing to consider funding for this project because the ISRP and sponsor indicate that the time to do the work is now, the ISRP states that the work is important, and because of the cost-share opportunity. ISRP concerns will need to be addressed at all applicable decision-making stages.

The Council encourages the sponsor to address the ISRP concerns, whatever budget category provides funds. Should the Council need to ultimately recommend direct program funds, it will require that the sponsor adequately address the ISRP’s criticisms of the project. The Council is relying upon the ISRP’s statement regarding the importance of the proposed work in its decision to keep a recommendation for direct program funding open as a possibility.

- (17). **Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program**, Project ID #9501300, FY00
CBFWA Rec. \$750,000

Discussion/Background: On January 29, 1998, Council staff met with Nez Perce Tribal and Bonneville staff to discuss the status of the Nez Perce Trout Ponds (9501300) with regard to the 3-step review. It is our understanding that in Fiscal Year 1998, the project calls for an “emergency repair” of two existing rainbow trout ponds, with site inventory, design and construction of up to 12 additional fish ponds for rainbow trout, as well as continued operations and maintenance of facilities.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

This project calls for the “emergency repair of two existing trout ponds and site inventory, design and construction of up to 12 additional fish ponds,” as well as continued operations and maintenance of facilities. As we understand it, the simplicity of this project makes it unnecessary to prepare preliminary designs. For that reason, National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) compliance and final design will be accomplished on approximately the same schedule. Therefore, the requirements of step 1, 2, and 3 reviews will be combined into a single step 3 review for the Nez Perce Trout Ponds and will include both a scientific and fiscal review. All applicable master-planning requirements will be addressed as part of the required NEPA compliance. Final design and cost estimates will also be provided to the Council at the same time as the NEPA documents are submitted.

ISRP Review: Do not fund. The original proposal and response do not convince the reviewers that this is a scientifically sound proposal. The basic idea is supportable both in the Fish and Wildlife Program (the objective to use “substitute fisheries”) and scientifically, but the proposal is not adequate as it stands. A simpler, lower-cost, more practical project could be developed.

Sponsor Policy Response: The NPT specified that the following criteria applied to their project. Criteria "a" since the ISRP's comments are critical of the strategies and objectives and evaluation of the scientific soundness of the project. Criteria "b" due to the program measures and language in Section 10.8D.1 of the Council Program.

Council Recommendation: The Fiscal Year 2000 proposal has a new title “Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program” and appears to have a new focus on “resident species” (i.e. trout, bass and sturgeon). This project was originally in a combined step review process. Additionally, the Fiscal Year 2000 proposal addresses “trout, bass and sturgeon” that are not covered under the program measures and language in Section 10.8D.1 of the Council Program.

On March 26, 1999 Council and BPA staffs met with NPT staff to discuss the status of the project. The two existing ponds (i.e. Mud Springs and Talmaks) have had the required emergency repairs completed. To date, site inventory has included the identification of 15 new sites, of which only two sites seem suitable at this time for development. The two new sites that will be explored further include the Deer Creek (proposed at 115 surface acres) and Tunnel Pond sites. At this time the NPT will emphasis the Deer Creek site, but depending on the outcome of budgetary, land ownership and NEPA issues, the NPT may want to explore other opportunities for the implementation of this program. As discussed at the meeting, the Council is still anticipating the submittal of Three-Step Review Process documents, as outlined in the memo sent to the NPT and Bonneville on February 20, 1998. Additionally, at the meeting tribal staff mentioned the interest to approach this program under a multi-species approach. To date the site development at Tunnel Ponds is nearing completion.

A letter was sent to James Muaney (NPT) on April 16, 1999 stating that upon “reviewing the program language and discussing with Council staff, Council reaction is that the program measure is specific to trout and does not support expansion or revision to the production of other species.

This project has gone beyond the original intent as outlined in the program measure. Therefore the Council accepts the ISRP's recommendation not to fund this project. Transition activities

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

should solely focus on the operation and maintenance of the three existing ponds. The existing Fiscal Year 1999 contract expires on May 31, 2000, and currently there is approximately \$474,081 remaining. Through no-cost extensions, these monies seem to be adequate for the above maintenance activities. Therefore the Fiscal Year 2000 request within the CBFWA budget could be reallocated.

(18). Genetic Inventory of Westslope Cutthroat Trout in the N.F. Clearwater River Basin;
NPT; CBFWA FY 00 Rec. \$180,000

Description/Background: Document the extent of hybridization among native westslope cutthroat trout and introduced rainbow trout and evaluate the effects of Dworshak resident fish mitigation on wild trout in the North Fork Clearwater basin.

ISRP Review: Do not fund (both reviews). This project has been receiving funds since 1995. The proponents have found evidence of introgression, a finding that was a virtual certainty given the presence of both species in the basin. There is little reason to continue to seek evidence of introgression. If managers do not want introgression to occur, they should halt the stocking programs immediately and hope that the cutthroat trout can re-establish themselves in the basin.

Project Sponsor's Policy Response: The ISRP's comments did not recognize that the primary purpose of the project was to create a genetic inventory to help determine the status of westslope cutthroat trout. The project is more comprehensive than how it has been characterized the ISRP. The need for monitoring and evaluation is recognized by the NPPC. The ISRP recommendation is not consistent with an approved program measure calling for genetic inventory work and stocking recommendations in the North Fork Clearwater drainage. Not funding the project would eliminate possible cooperative funding efficiencies with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Council Recommendation: Do not fund. Provide transition funding of \$65,000 to phase out the project. Bridge funding will give the project sponsors six months to analyze and summarize data and provide final project reports. The project sponsor will write two papers for publication in scientific journals, submit a final BPA report and present findings at professional fisheries meetings. Funding will also enable some samples taken from the 1999 field season to be re-analyzed and data evaluated. Funds will be disbursed based on completion of tasks described in the project statement of work and work schedule.

(19). Salmon River Production Program, Project ID #9705700, FY00 CBFWA Rec.
\$931,376

Discussion/Background: The overall goal of the project is to use low cost, effective, closer-to-natural production measures to reintroduce and recover anadromous fish runs in vacant and under-seeded habitats of the Snake and Salmon rivers. Based upon the latest scientific principles and theory for rapid recovery of endangered native fish species, proposed methods involve reforming and redirecting existing hatchery practices in conjunction with the addition of small, relatively inexpensive facilities to hold broodstocks and enable volitional releases of naturally acclimated fish. Emphasis to date has focused on the use of streamside hatch boxes and various acclimated juvenile releases in conjunction with other captive broodstock initiatives in the

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Salmon River basin. Bonneville initiated funding for this project in fiscal year 1998. During the staff discussion on July 8, 1998 and in letter form to Shoshone-Bannock Tribe on August 12, 1998, it was determined that the “production” component of this project is in an experimental stage, therefore, it is currently at the master planning stage or step 1 in the three-step process. The sponsors intend to submit together the master plan and NEPA compliance documents in May 1999. Submission of these documents will initiate the Council review process. To date, no step documents have been received.

ISRP Review: Do not fund. The response did not adequately address the ISRP concerns. The master plan development and implementation are confusingly intertwined. Completion of the master plan should precede implementation. However, here it appears implementation precedes planning. There is not a sufficient monitoring and evaluation plan to test the efficacy of the project.

Sponsor Policy Response: The SBT specified that the following criteria applied to their project. Criteria "a" due to the question of whether a master plan should precede any implementation, and extent of adaptive management. The SBT feels that their development of an "operational" master plan, implementation of adaptive management, NEPA compliance, and equivalent master plans secure this program. (See Part 1(b)(5) for description of policy criteria).

Staff Recommendation: Until completion and approval of a master plan and NEPA compliance documents as part of the three step review all activities associated with this project should be funded at a level for these specific tasks. Other activities for this project will not occur until completion of the step and environmental documents. This funding level will be maintained until the Council receives and approves the step documents that answers the technical questions as outlined in the above referenced letter. In addition, the issues raised by the ISRP in the Fiscal Year 2000 Response Review and the policies described in the Artificial Production Review Report (document 99-15) need to be addressed and made part of the step 1 review. Adequate funds (\$230,180) remain in the Fiscal Year 1999 contracts to complete the master plan. Fiscal Year 1999 contracts expire on June 30, 2000, and a no-cost time extension, if needed, will authorize the SBT to complete the project. Under this current contract (Fiscal Year 1999) the SBT have a deliverable of a master plan and more than adequate funding to complete this task. Fiscal Year 2000 funds should not be expended on the master plan. Fiscal Year 2000 funds may be considered by the Council upon completion and approval of the master plan.

The Council is concurring with the ISRP recommendation. The Council is approving the use of carry-forward funds, but only for the limited purpose of completing a master plan. The Council understands the ISRP’s primary criticism with the proposal to be the lack of separation from planning and implementation, and with this recommendation calling for planning only, believes that its recommendation is consistent with and addresses the ISRP’s recommendation.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

(20) Restore the Salmon River in the Challis, Idaho area to a healthy condition; Custer County Watershed Group; Project ID # 9901900; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$50,000

Discussion/Background: Restore the river corridor to a healthy condition by reestablishing riparian vegetation and allowing the floodplain to become functional. Social and political factors are being addressed through a county-based watershed group.

ISRP Review: Do not fund. The ISRP stated the need for a technically defensible master plan (or its equivalent) in place that defines critical elements of project planning, experimental design, and monitoring and evaluation.

Policy Response: Model watershed projects in the Lemhi, Pahsimeroi and East Fork Salmon Rivers are similar in nature to the work intended on the mainstem Salmon River. Because the Model Watershed Advisory Committee restricts itself to these three sub-basins, it was not feasible to coordinate this project through that program.

Council Recommendation: Project sponsors are in the process of developing a master plan. This is a cooperative effort including federal, state, and local governments, private industry and landowners. There are significant cost sharing efforts included. Project proponents have been working with the Corps who have agreed to assist with the funding for the watershed assessment plan on this twelve-mile reach. Total funding for the project, as estimated by the Corps, is \$1.4 million with sixty-five percent of the funding provided by the Corps. Funding from the Corps for the feasibility study totals \$209,000. The funding for the feasibility study, as well as the implementation dollars, is dependent on receipt of BPA funds for the year 2000. These funds were to be used in addition to landowner cost share to carry out restoration as determined by the plan currently in the development stage.

As this project is in the process of developing a Master Plan, with Corps matching funds that are dependent on BPA funds, the recommendation is to provide funding (\$50,000) for this effort with the understanding that a Master Plan will be finalized and delivered. The Council believes that the ability to secure significant matching funds from outside sources and the unique collaborative effort underway presents policy issues to balance against the concerns presented by the ISRP sufficiently to recommend limited funding for this project this year. The Council does, however, strongly encourage the sponsors to deal substantively with the criticisms of the ISRP in its planning work, and will review the adequacy of the response in any future funding proposals for this project.

(21). Evaluate Rebuilding the White Sturgeon Population in the Lower Snake Basin; NPT; Project ID # 9700900; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$409,494

Discussion/Background: This project was rated as “fund” by the ISRP in its second review, but was held for further consideration of policy issues by the Council. The project would evaluate the need for and identify measures to protect and restore white sturgeon between Hells Canyon and Lower Granite dams to obtain sustainable, harvestable levels.

ISRP Review: ISRP recommended Fund in Part in the first review and Fund in the second review, but reiterated their concerns expressed in the first review. Those concerns included the

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

lack of data provided by the study, the lack of collaboration with other ongoing sturgeon projects (particularly the collaborative effort taking place under project 8605000), the lack of active cooperation with Idaho Power Company in its sturgeon study, vague study objectives, the lack of demonstrable progress in the previous year, and the lack of any published materials after three years of study. ISRP suggested the Council set a termination date for the project and require a multi-year proposal be submitted.

Policy Issues: Council Member Bloch requested further information on the project, specifically on the coordination and collaboration with the other sturgeon projects and the Idaho Power relicensing efforts, prior to sending the project to the Council for any funding approval. No policy justification was required of this project.

CBFWA held a meeting with the Nez Perce Tribe, ODFW, Council on November 19, 1999 to resolve technical and policy issues with the project. The meeting resulted in a coordination agreement among the managers present (NPT, ODFW, WDFW), which will be transmitted in a letter from CBFWA Executive Director Brian Allee to the Council. The agreement names the principles to the agreement, and establishes coordination procedures, goals and schedules for both technical coordination and information sharing.

Council Recommendation: Fund in full. After meeting with management entities at the CBFWA offices on November 19, 1999, the managers appear to be in agreement that information sharing needs to take place in a multi-party exchange. The goal of the parties involved is to enhance research coordination and sturgeon management, and promote understanding of sturgeon activities.

CBFWA Executive Director Dr. Brian Allee sent a letter to Director Lohn on November 24, 1999 detailing the November 19 agreements and recommendations from the management entities. The letter stated:

“Consensus agreement at this meeting was achieved on the following points:

1. General agreement to coordinate on technical and information sharing on white sturgeon projects by all parties including, Nez Perce Tribe (NPT), Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Council staff, BPA staff. It was recognized that Idaho Power staff is presently coordinating and is willing to be involved but was not present at this meeting.
2. Specific agreement by the meeting attendees to coordinate on the project statement of work, tasks and progress reports.
3. Achieve improved management of white sturgeon in the Columbia Basin by better coordination of management plans.
4. Joint commitment to cross project participation opportunities for staff during the field season to promote better understanding of field conditions and to provide mutual support.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition, it was agreed to rotationally host a white sturgeon workshop to promote and enhance coordination and information transfer on an annual basis among BPA, ODFW, IDFG, WDFW, NWPPC staff, Idaho Power staff, NPT and others. The format discussed for the annual workshop would include presentations on recent project results and new technology developments coupled with subsequent breakout sessions with project sponsors to apply this information to specific tasks within the project statement of work. The site for the annual workshop will be chosen by the hosting agency or tribe. The initial workshop is scheduled for February 2000 and will be hosted by the NPT.

In approving the project for funding, the Council recommends that Bonneville include the points of agreement detailed in Dr. Allee's November 24 letter in BPA's contractual arrangements with all management entities involved in sturgeon projects in the Columbia and Snake mainstems.

(22). Pacific Lamprey Research and Restoration; CTUIR; Project ID # 9402600; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$381,190

This project was rated as "fund" by the ISRP in its second review. However, the Council has stated that it will continue to require submission and approval of a lamprey restoration plan in advance of recommending that funds be spent on implementation activities. Bob Lohn sent the project sponsors a letter in late October outlining the process to be used to submit a plan for approval. The sponsors did provide the draft restoration plan, which was approved insofar as the Fiscal Year 2000 project is concerned.

Council Recommendation: The activities presented in the Fiscal Year 2000 proposal that do not involve implementation are recommended for funding. The Council will ask the ISRP to review the restoration plan, but funding this project in Fiscal Year 2000 is in no way contingent upon that review occurring or its outcome.

(23). Evaluate Sediment Transport in Spawning Habitat, Kootenai River, Idaho; USGS; Project # 20049; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$96,550

Discussion/Background: Enhance understanding of pre- and post-Libby Dam substrate habitat conditions in the Kootenai River, Idaho. This information may be key to understanding limiting factors for the endangered Kootenai River sturgeon. Information gained from this study will be utilized to guide future actions, such as habitat rehabilitation, or changes in hydro operations. The study area will include sturgeon spawning area. Council member Karier asked that additional information be gathered on this project, particularly since the ISRP did seem to encourage that it be resubmitted in the near future.

ISRP Review: Do not fund. The proposal was for a new project, and was not reviewed in the "fix-it-loop" review. Initially, the ISRP recommended that this project not be funded, but it encouraged submission in Fiscal Year 2001 (perhaps as part of another proposal), addressing the ISRP's concerns. The ISRP was primarily supportive, writing in their review of this project, "The proposal adequately addresses the FWP and FWS white sturgeon recovery plan, relates the work to other Kootenai River studies, ...Schedule and costs seem reasonable... Background, rationale, and project relationships are brief but acceptable... Objectives are good, and resumes are fine."

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Sponsor Policy Response: Because the project proponents were not included in the category of projects reviewed a second time by the ISRP, they were not included in the list of proponents from whom the Council requested a policy response. The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho did circulate to Council members a justification for this project on October 29th, 1999. Subsequent to the October 29th memorandum, the Kootenai Tribe has maintained phone contact regarding this project. The ISRP was primarily concerned with a lack of connection of this project to an umbrella proposal. Therefore, the tribe stated that the ISRP did not oppose their project on the grounds that it was not scientifically sound, or of questionable benefit to fish, and thus met policy criteria ‘a’. It should be noted that this project is well coordinated through the Kootenai River Sturgeon Recovery Team. Criteria ‘b’ is also met in Measure 10.8B.22 of the Council’s program, which directs the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho to perform an ecosystem evaluation, to include the identification of hydropower effects and solutions to ecosystem problems, such as hydropower effects.

Council Recommendation: This project is low cost and of a short duration. The ISRP indicated that the work was valuable, and suggested that it be proposed again next year. The ISRP criticisms seemed to center around concern about the relationship of this project to an umbrella proposal, and can easily be resolved by incorporating this project as a subcontract to project 8806400 ‘Kootenai River Sturgeon Studies and Conservation Aquaculture,’ which is the research component for much of the sturgeon work. The sponsor has indicated that this can be done. The Council recommends funding this project at the level recommended by CBFWA for Fiscal Year 2000 at \$96,550 and for Fiscal Year 2001 at \$18,000 for creation of the report.

(24) North Fork John Day Riparian Fencing; USFS; Project ID # 9303800; CBFWA 00 Rec. 0\$(Tier 2); Sponsor request \$68,000

Discussion/Background: This is a proposal to erect and maintain temporary fencing to protect 60 miles of riparian area on the North Fork John Day River. This project was in the category of existing projects not recommended by CBFWA, and so, under the general rules of decision adopted by the Council, would not be funded. However, a final decision on this project was delayed for additional Council review and consideration.

The Forest Service proposed protecting 60 miles of riparian vegetation by resetting 76 miles of seasonal electric fence and converting some (though the quantity is not specified) fencing to permanent barbed wire.

The project received no funding recommendation from CBFWA (Tier 2) and received a delay funding recommendation from the ISRP. ISRP found the proposal technically inadequate. They questioned how particular stream reaches were accorded priority and also questioned the sponsor’s claims of effectiveness of the project without providing any supporting scientific evidence.

Policy Issues: Council Member Brogoitti requested the Council delay a funding recommendation at the October work session pending further investigation of the project.

The Forest Service provided a policy justification based upon Program measures 7.6B.4 and 7.6C.5. Measure 7.6B.4 instructs that priority should be accorded to actions that maximize

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

the desired result per dollar spent and prioritizing actions that succeed at minimal cost. Measure 7.6C.5 requires federal management agencies to manage riparian areas to re-establish natural ecological functions.

USFS also argues that not funding the project will cause them to choose between requesting take permits from the NMFS or refusing to allow 21 grazing permits on the Umatilla National Forest.

Council Recommendation: Though the project offers some protection to riparian areas at a modest cost, the proposal provides little detail on its success in providing habitat recovery in key anadromous fish production areas, nor any detail on its 98 percent success at exclusion. The Council, through the Fish and Wildlife Committee, received additional information from the project sponsor to determine if the questions and issues raised by the ISRP that prompted its recommendation to delay funding may be addressed. The Council found that these questions were or could be addressed in contracting, and recommends that this project be funded for one year. The Council urged the Service to find funding outside of the Bonneville fund in future years for this project.

(25) Hanford Reach Steelhead Stock Investigation; WDFW; Project ID # 20023; CBFWA 00 Rec. \$91,546

Brief Description of the Project: In 1998 a large number of concentrated spawning redds were observed in the Hanford Reach. These redds were observed during a time when only steelhead typically spawn. This project intends to identify this unique spawning population.

ISRP Review: Fund in part. This project was not evaluated in the final ISRP review of projects as it did not fit into the category submitted for review. The initial ISRP review recommended funding for objectives 1-3, related to continuing observation of steelhead spawning (20 percent of overall request). Do not fund other activities until their feasibility is demonstrated.

Sponsor Policy Response: Sponsor responded to the original ISRP review, and agreed that funding to perform only the objectives that pertain to the documentation of steelhead spawning go forward.

Council Recommendation: Fund the project objectives that pertain to the aerial surveys and ground-truthing of redds. The sponsor indicates that this work will cost \$10,500. In the event steelhead redds are identified in the Hanford Reach, the sponsor requests the opportunity to approach the Council with the findings and solicit additional funds to perform the objectives associated with stock delineation.

26. PATH (not identified by Bonneville as non-discretionary); ESSA (9600600); ODFW (9600800); NMFS (9600801).

Discussion/Background: The PATH projects and process are designed to test hypotheses underlying key salmon recovery management decisions, develop decision analysis to evaluate alternative management strategies, and assist in designing research, monitoring and adaptive management experiments.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

ISRP Reviews: Do not fund in the initial review. Fund for transition in the October 29, 1999 report. In both reports the ISRP recommended a different and revised process geared principally toward data collection and design issues for the basin, identifying data needs that are directly linked to management responses, and to coordinating data needs in the basin in an efficient and timely manner.

Council Recommendation: The Council recommendation consists of four major parts. Collectively, the four-part recommendation concurs with and incorporates the ISRP recommendations.

Recommendation Part 1: The three projects identified above should receive transition funding in a combined amount of \$330,000 in Fiscal Year 2000, and also have remaining Fiscal Year 1999 funds available to complete the following tasks, with a planning target date that these tasks be completed by March 2000:

1. Complete experimental management options and associated monitoring and evaluation. (2/00)
2. Update spawner recruit information for the Snake River, mid-and lower Columbia River spring/summer Chinook stocks (12/99).
3. Assist with stock status for Quantitative Analytical Reports (QAR) for upper Columbia and lower Columbia stocks.
4. Assist in development of analysis for QAR.
5. SRP review of fall Chinook and experimental management reports.
6. ESSA and PATH work with NMFS to complete development of CRI metrics for PATH outputs to facilitate comparison.
7. ESSA and PATH work with Council to completed development of EDT metrics for PATH outputs to facilitate comparison.
8. ESSA to provide to Council data files (full outputs) from all model runs reported in PATH spring/summer Chinook (12/8) and fall Chinook (11/99) reports.
9. ESSA to provide to Council copies of Bayesian Simulation Model.
10. Anderson to provide to Council a copy of the CriSP model, including input files used for PATH spring/summer and fall chinook reports.
11. Publish PATH methods/results in peer-reviewed journal.
12. Assess key differences between PATH and CRI.
13. Assess feasibility of actions to improve survivals at different life stages.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Part 2: Beyond the completion of these specific activities, the Council recommends that its staff work with state, tribal and federal parties who have participated in PATH to develop a new data collection and analysis system that has the following five attributes:

The new data system would have to meet certain specific needs of the Council and the region. For example, a new data system would:

1. Allow the Council to evaluate the effectiveness of each individual project funded by BPA.
2. Allow the Council to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Council's program;
3. Provide baseline populations from which the Council can establish meaningful quantitative goals;
4. Allow the region to evaluate progress on recovery measures for all endangered species;
5. Include all species relevant to the Council's program: anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife.

Recommendation Part 3: The Council expects that any data system proposal will include provisions for oversight and management to ensure accountability and orderly administration.

Recommendation Part 4: The Council may ask that the ISRP or ISAB review the data management system, and take comments of those bodies into account in making its funding recommendation.

Part 3, item 27, below, provides additional discussion regarding the Council's treatment of the ISRP's recommendations about the funding of PATH-related projects.

27. Projects recommended by ISRP, but rated tier 2 or tier 3 by CBFWA/Innovative projects.

There are two groups of projects that the Council considered for funding. First, the ISRP recommended projects for funding that were rated as either tier 2 or tier 3 by CBFWA (the "elevated projects"). Two law enforcement projects were added to this "elevated" list because they did not receive a funding recommendation from CBFWA, but were rated as "fund" by the ISRP. The second group of projects are those that the ISRP identified in its report as "innovative" and offering promising new techniques or approaches (the "innovative projects"). All of the projects that the ISRP found to be "innovative" (and also meeting the scientific review standards) were included in first list of "elevated" projects by the ISRP. The Council itself did not combine the project lists.

In past reports, the ISRP has expressed concern that new and innovative project proposals were not receiving sufficient attention in the funding process. Two years ago, the Council

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

created a targeted request for proposals process for certain areas of interest that had not otherwise received funding recommendations, and a relatively small amount of funding was provided for qualifying projects. The Fiscal Year 2000 solicitation for proposals indicated that an “innovative proposal fund” would be established to support new initiatives of this type. However, no criteria were specified for “innovative” proposals and most new projects were not proposed as “innovative.”

The Council requested that the ISRP prioritize the list of “elevated” projects (42 total). The Council also asked the ISRP to consider four specific criteria in its rankings. They were asked to determine if the project: 1) dealt with an unimplemented program area; 2) improves existing projects; 3) has systemwide significance; and 4) advances critical watershed assessment work. The ISRP ranked the projects from 1 to 42 based on their assessment of the overall worth of each project and indicated which of the criteria were met by each.

The Council reviewed the ranked list of 42 projects, and determined that it would not recommend funding for all of them. The Council established \$2 million as a planning target for funding projects on this list. In order to bring discipline to the selection process, the Council decided what *type* of projects it wanted to recommend the limiting funding for. The Council determined that it wished to focus on research-oriented projects that the ISRP found to be innovative, and also met two or more of the four criteria identified above (as determined by the ISRP). At the February 1, 2000 work session meeting in Portland, the Council recommended possible funding for eleven projects from the list of 42 elevated projects. Those projects are: 20045, 20057, 20034, 20102, 20106, 9803500, 20064, 20006, 20067, 20076, and 20054.

Review of the ISRP rankings shows that only these projects were identified by the ISRP as fulfilling an unimplemented program area and having systemwide significance. These 11 projects were mainly in the upper half of the overall ranking; the lowest-ranked project on the list ranks 24 out of 42. All 11 projects are research-oriented and, by definition, fulfill part of our current fish and wildlife program and have importance for the system as a whole. The Council found that this seems a reasonable subset of projects to be funded as “innovative.”

The Council has previously indicated its desire to cover all of the initial costs for “innovative” projects at the time they are selected, allowing a new competition for funding of innovative projects to be held each year without creating a burden on future years’ budgets. Unfortunately, the proposed budgets for these eleven projects, over the next four years, would exceed \$8 million. (The budgets for the first four projects alone would exceed \$4 million.)

Rather than fully fund a few projects, the Council’s proposal is to provide initial funding for preliminary research, prototyping, and proof of concept for all 11 projects. Specifically, the proposal is to offer each project \$200,000 (or the amount initially requested by the sponsor if that amount is less than \$200,000), for a total of \$2,119,000. After completion of the initial work and a final report on that work, project sponsors would be free to seek additional funding as a part of the regular project selection process.

While \$200,000 is much less than the sum requested for most of these projects, it is still a substantial amount by the standards of most research grants and should lead to meaningful results. This approach also allows us to gain further information on the value of research before making a large, long-term investment.

PART 1: – RECOMMENDATIONS

Project sponsors designated to receive this funding are being asked to prepare a revised plan of work reflecting the reduced funding. The revised plan would be reviewed by Council staff and the chairman of the ISRP to assure that the revised plan still represents valuable research that is consistent with the proposal originally reviewed by the ISRP.

In summary, the staff proposal is as follows:

- Fund only the 11 projects identified by the ISRP meeting as both fulfilling an unimplemented area of the Council program and having systemwide significance.
- Offer each of these 11 projects \$200,000 (or the amount requested if less than \$200,000).
- Review by ISRP chair and Council staff of a revised plan for each project to assure that proposed work is valuable research consistent with the original proposal.
- Require final report to be submitted before project can apply for additional funding.
- Projects funded within this project category may not reapply in subsequent years for funding under the “innovative” category, which the Council expects to explicitly develop for future project solicitations but may apply for additional funding within the regular project selection process

After the Council and ISRP representatives review the revised plans for the eleven projects noted above, and confirm that valuable innovative research can be conducted and reported under the funding and other conditions discussed above, the Council will advise Bonneville under separate cover of its final recommendations for these projects. The Council anticipates that it can provide final recommendations for these projects to Bonneville in late March. Bonneville should refer to that separate letter on this issue for the final Council recommendations on these projects.

Note: Unless the context indicates otherwise, “fund” means that the Council would recommend to the Bonneville Power Administration that a project be funded. The Council’s fish and wildlife program is established by statute for implementation by Bonneville, and the Council itself does not directly fund fish and wildlife mitigation. However, in recent years, Bonneville has followed the Council recommendations closely.

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
|------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|

PART 2 Fiscal Year 2000 Projects Table

I. FY 2000 Proposals Recommended for Funding by the Council

I.A. Proposals recommended for funding by the Council, CBFWA, and the ISRP in its June 15 Report.

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---------------|--|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 20001 | Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore instream and riparian habitat ... | USFWS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$160,000 | \$160,000 | \$305,000 |
| 20008 | Monitor And Protect Wigwam River Bull Trout For Kooconusa Reservoir | BC Ministry of Env., Lands and Parks | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 |
| 20032 | Protect Bear Valley Wild Salmon, Steelhead, Bull Trout Spawning Habitat | SBT & IDFG | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$310,000 | \$310,000 | \$310,000 |
| 20035 | Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi-Year Fy 2000-2002) | | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$130,000 | \$130,000 | \$130,000 |
| 20037 | Improvement Of Anadromous Fish Habitat And Passage In Omak Creek | CCT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$349,661 | \$349,661 | \$349,661 |
| 20059 | Infrastructure To Complete FDA Registration Of Erythromycin | U of I-FWR | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$71,022 | \$71,022 | \$71,022 |
| 20088 | Assess Mckenzie Watershed Habitat And Prioritize Projects | McKenzie River Focus Watershed Council | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$183,000 | \$183,000 | \$183,000 |
| 20090 | Logan Valley Wildlife Mitigation Project | BPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | | | \$2,002,301 |
| 20118 | Klickitat River Sub-Basin Assessment | YIN | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$141,035 | \$141,035 | \$235,059 |
| 20119 | Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project | YIN | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$156,206 | \$156,206 | \$240,317 |
| 20120 | Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum Salmon Populations | USFWS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$189,853 | \$189,853 | \$189,853 |
| 20124 | Evaluate An Experimental Re-Introduction Of Sockeye Salmon Into Skaha Lake | CCT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$171,171 | \$171,171 | \$219,450 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20128 | Riparian Restoration And Enhancement Planning For Multnomah Channel | Metro | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$65,000 |
| 20134 | Acquire Oxbow Ranch -- Middle Fork John Day River | CTWSRO | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,300,000 | \$1,300,000 | \$2,628,064 |
| 20140 | Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions | FWS | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$1,250,000 |
| 20141 | Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts | CRITFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$72,752 | \$72,752 | \$80,252 |
| 20146 | Lake Roosevelt Kokanee Net Pens | WDFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$185,825 | \$185,825 | \$185,825 |
| 8201300 | Coded-Wire Tag Recovery | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,923,498 | \$1,923,498 | \$1,923,498 |
| 8332300 | Smolt Monitoring At The Head Of Lwr. Granite Reservoir & Lwr. Granite Dam | IDFG | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$396,700 | \$396,700 | \$396,700 |
| 8401400 | Smolt Monitoring Program Marking | USFWS | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$121,038 | \$121,038 | \$121,038 |
| 8402100 | Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In The John Day Subbasin | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$426,046 | \$426,046 | \$426,046 |
| 8402500 | Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In Grande Ronde Basin Streams | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$273,000 | \$273,000 | \$366,782 |
| 8506200 | Passage Improvement Evaluation | PNNL | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 8605000 | White Sturgeon Mitigation And Restoration In The Columbia And Snake Rivers | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,919,161 | \$1,919,161 | \$1,919,161 |
| 8709900 | Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigation | IDFG | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$285,000 | \$285,000 | \$285,000 |
| 8710002 | Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Subbasin | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$353,000 | \$353,000 | \$465,158 |
| 8712700 | Smolt Monitoring by Federal and Non-Federal Agencies | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,870,449 | \$1,870,449 | \$1,870,449 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 8712702 | Comparative Survival Rate Study (CSS) Of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$936,201 | \$936,201 | \$936,201 |
| 8712703 | Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project | NPT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$188,722 | \$188,722 | \$188,722 |
| 8805303 | Hood River Production Program - M&E | CTWSRO | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$499,888 | \$499,888 | \$499,888 |
| 8805304 | Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$424,000 | \$424,000 | \$424,000 |
| 8810804 | Streamnet: The Northwest Aquatic Information System | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,936,453 | \$1,936,453 | \$1,936,453 |
| 8815600 | Implement Fishery Stocking Program Consistent With Native Fish Conservation | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$119,903 | \$119,903 | \$129,903 |
| 8816000 | Willamette Hatchery Oxygen Supplementation | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$33,310 | \$33,310 | \$33,310 |
| 8902401 | Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration And Survival In The Lower Umatilla | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$250,785 | \$250,785 | \$300,499 |
| 8902900 | Hood River Production Program-Pelton Ladder-Hatchery | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$115,029 | \$115,029 | \$115,029 |
| 8906500 | Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (USFWS) | USFWS | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$110,586 | \$110,586 | \$110,586 |
| 8906600 | Annual Stock Assessment- Coded Wire Tag Program (WDFW) | WDFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$373,852 | \$373,852 | \$373,852 |
| 8906900 | Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (ODFW) | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$215,800 | \$215,800 | \$215,800 |
| 8907201 | Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support | DOE/ORNL | na | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$99,918 | \$49,959 | \$99,918 |
| 8909600 | Monitor and evaluate genetic characteristics of supplemented salmon and steelhead | NMFS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$175,000 | \$175,000 | \$249,300 |
| 8909800 | Idaho Supplementation Studies | IDFG | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$974,229 | \$974,229 | \$974,229 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 8909801 | Evaluate Salmon Supplementation in Idaho Rivers (ISS) | USFWS-IFRO | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$129,965 | \$129,965 | \$129,965 |
| 8909802 | Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies In Idaho Rivers | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$377,455 | \$377,455 | \$377,455 |
| 8909803 | Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies In Idaho Rivers | SBT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$228,438 | \$228,438 | \$228,438 |
| 9004401 | Lake Creek Land Acquisition And Enhancement | CDA Tribe | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$140,423 | \$140,423 | \$140,423 |
| 9004402 | Coeur D' Alene Tribe Trout Production Facility | CDA Tribe | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,553,244 |
| 9005200 | Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation | BRD | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$460,000 | \$460,000 | \$495,232 |
| 9008000 | Columbia River Basin Pit Tag Information System | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,364,976 | \$1,364,976 | \$1,364,976 |
| 9009200 | Wanaket Wildlife Mitigation Project Operations & Maintenance | CTUIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 |
| 9101903 | Hungry Horse Mitigation - Watershed Restoration & Monitoring (MFWP) Umbrella ... | MFWP | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$498,026 | \$498,026 | \$498,026 |
| 9102800 | Monitoring Smolt Migrations of Wild Snake River Sp/Sum Chinook | NMFS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$325,200 | \$325,200 | \$385,200 |
| 9104600 | Spokane Tribal (Galbraith Springs) Hatchery Operation & Maintenance | STOI | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$521,934 | \$521,934 | \$521,934 |
| 9104700 | Sherman Creek Hatchery O&M | WDFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$201,397 | \$201,397 | \$201,397 |
| 9105500 | N A T U R E S [Formerly Supplemental Fish Quality] Yakima | NMFS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |
| 9105700 | Yakima Phase 2 [Fish] Screen Fabrication | WDFW, YSS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$293,113 | \$293,113 | \$293,113 |
| 9106000 | Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project - Kalispel | KT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$153,917 | \$153,917 | \$153,917 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9107500 | Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction | USBOR | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| 9107800 | Burlington Bottoms Wildlife Mitigation Project | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$116,822 | \$116,822 | \$116,822 |
| 9200900 | Yakima [Fish] Screens - Phase 2 - O&M | WDFW, YSS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$133,591 | \$133,591 | \$133,591 |
| 9201000 | Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation | SBT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$132,821 | \$132,821 | \$132,821 |
| 9202200 | Physiological Assessment of wild and hatchery juvenile salmonids | NMFS | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$349,589 | \$349,589 | \$358,064 |
| 9202601 | Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program | GRMWP | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$930,000 | \$930,000 | \$930,000 |
| 9202603 | Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support | SCC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$185,400 | \$185,400 | \$185,400 |
| 9202604 | Life History Of Spring Chinook Salmon And Summer Steelhead | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$700,000 | \$700,000 | \$797,616 |
| 9204101 | Lower Columbia River Adult Study | COE | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 |
| 9205900 | Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands Phase Two | TNC | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$2,376,020 |
| 9206100 | Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation | | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$2,195,237 | \$2,195,237 | \$4,417,686 |
| 9206200 | Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration | YIN | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,550,000 | \$1,550,000 | \$1,750,000 |
| 9206800 | Implement Willamette Basin Mitigation Program | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$230,000 | \$230,000 | \$230,000 |
| 9301900 | Powerdale, Parkdale, and Oak Springs O&M | ODFW and CTWSRO | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$486,805 | \$486,805 | \$486,805 |
| 9302900 | Survival Estimates for the Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Dams ... | NMFS/NWF SC | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,198,950 | \$1,198,950 | \$1,198,950 |
| 9304000 | Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request Multi-Year Funding) | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$246,856 | \$246,856 | \$246,856 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9304001 | Fifteenmile Creek Wild Steelhead Smolt Production | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$27,180 | \$27,180 | \$27,180 |
| 9306000 | Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project | ODFW, WDFW, CEDC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,400,000 | \$1,400,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| 9306200 | Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement | LSWCD, CSWCD | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 9401002 | Flathead River Native Species Project (MFWP Sub-proposal) | MFWP | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$267,049 | \$267,049 | \$267,049 |
| 9401500 | Idaho Fish Screen Improvement - O&M | IDFG | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| 9401700 | Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects | LSWCD, CSWCD | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 |
| 9401805 | Continued Implementation Of Asotin Creek Watershed Projects | Asotin County Conservation District | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$235,000 | \$235,000 | \$239,000 |
| 9401806 | Implement Tucannon River Watershed Plan To Restore Salmonid Habitat | Columbia Conservation District | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$253,000 | \$253,000 | \$330,000 |
| 9401807 | Continue With Implementation Of Pataha Creek Model Watershed Projects | Pomeroy Conservation District | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$120,000 | \$120,000 | \$212,995 |
| 9403300 | The Fish Passage Center (FPC) | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,079,363 | \$1,079,363 | \$1,079,363 |
| 9403400 | Assessing Summer And Fall Chinook Restoration In The Snake River Basin | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$316,822 | \$316,822 | \$316,822 |
| 9403900 | Wallowa Basin Project Planner | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$55,313 | \$55,313 | \$58,035 |
| 9404200 | Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project Multi Year Funding Proposal | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$358,847 | \$358,847 | \$380,697 |
| 9404300 | Monitor, Evaluate, And Research The Lake Roosevelt Fishery | STOI | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 9405000 | Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M&E | SBT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$245,000 | \$245,000 | \$245,000 |
| 9405300 | Bull Trout Assessment - Willamette/Mckenzie | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$59,240 | \$59,240 | \$59,240 |
| 9405400 | Bull Trout Genetics, Habitat Needs, L.H., Etc. In Central And N.E. Oregon | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$380,000 | \$380,000 | \$424,608 |
| 9405900 | Yakima Basin Environmental Education | ESD 105 | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$125,186 | \$125,186 | \$125,186 |
| 9406900 | A Spawning Habitat Model To Aid Recovery Plans For Snake River Fall Chinook | PNNL | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$149,907 | \$149,907 | \$333,127 |
| 9500700 | Hood River Production Program - PGE O&M | Portland General Electric | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$50,010 | \$50,010 | \$50,010 |
| 9500900 | Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project | LRDA | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 9502500 | Flathead River Instream Flow Project (MFWP Umbrella Sub-proposal) | MFWP | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 9503300 | O&M Of Yakima Phase II Fish Facilities | USBOR | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$99,520 | \$99,520 | \$99,520 |
| 9505700 | Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation | IDFG, SBT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,153,964 | \$1,153,964 | \$4,334,510 |
| 9506001 | Protect & Enhance Wildlife Habitats In The Squaw Creek Watershed | CTUIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$200,589 | \$200,589 | \$200,589 |
| 9600500 | Independent Scientific Advisory Board | CBFWF | na | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$683,580 | \$341,790 | \$683,580 |
| 9601100 | Walla Walla River Juvenile And Adult Passage Improvements | CTUIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$2,840,000 | \$2,840,000 | \$2,840,000 |
| 9603501 | Satus Watershed Restoration | YIN | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$472,252 | \$472,252 | \$502,396 |
| 9604200 | Restore And Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat In Salmon Creek | CCT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$577,983 | \$577,983 | \$2,427,983 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9604601 | Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement | CTUIR | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$240,000 | \$240,000 | \$275,000 |
| 9607000 | Mckenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination | McKenzie Watershed Council | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$105,000 | \$105,000 | \$105,000 |
| 9608000 | Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation Project | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$235,325 | \$235,325 | \$235,325 |
| 9608300 | CTUIR Grande Ronde Basin Watershed Restoration | CTUIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$125,000 | \$125,000 | \$250,000 |
| 9608701 | Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed | CSKT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$103,000 | \$103,000 | \$103,000 |
| 9608720 | Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed | MFWP and CSKT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$99,919 | \$99,919 | \$99,919 |
| 9609400 | WDFW Habitat Unit Acquisition | WDFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$1,912,335 | \$1,912,335 | \$1,912,335 |
| 9700400 | Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph And Grand Coulee Dams | KNRD | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$421,000 | \$421,000 | \$421,000 |
| 9701000 | PIT Tag System Transition | COE; PSMFC; NMFS-CZES | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$853,313 | \$853,313 | \$853,313 |
| 9701100 | Enhance and protect habitat and riparian areas on the DVIR | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$294,722 | \$294,722 | \$294,722 |
| 9701400 | Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on The Hanford Reach | WDFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$217,000 | \$217,000 | \$217,000 |
| 9701900 | Evaluate The Life History Of Native Salmonids In The Malheur Basin | BPT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$201,184 | \$201,184 | \$201,184 |
| 9701901 | North Fork Malheur River Bull Trout And Redband Life History Study | BPT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$113,826 | \$113,826 | \$113,826 |
| 9702500 | Implement The Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$50,000 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9703000 | Monitor Listed Stock Adult Chinook Salmon Escapement | NPT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$156,122 | \$156,122 | \$163,122 |
| 9703400 | Monitor Fine Sediment And Sedimentation In John Day And Grande Ronde Rivers | CRITFC | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$32,145 | \$32,145 | \$32,145 |
| 9705300 | Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration And Assessment | YIN | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$163,544 | \$163,544 | \$231,978 |
| 9705600 | Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project | YIN | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$269,666 | \$269,666 | \$300,000 |
| 9705900 | Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon | ODFW, CTWS, CTUIR, BPT... | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$3,900,000 | \$3,900,000 | \$5,000,000 |
| 9800200 | Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment | IDFG | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$225,208 | \$225,208 | \$225,208 |
| 9800401 | Electronic Fish And Wildlife Newsletter | Inter- mountain Comm- unications | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$150,450 | \$150,450 | \$150,450 |
| 9800702 | Grande Ronde Supplementation - O&M/M&E - Nez Perce Tribe Lostine | NPT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$384,800 | \$384,800 | \$430,929 |
| 9801004 | M&E Of Yearling Snake R. Fall Chinook Released Upstream Of Lower Granite | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$272,798 | \$272,798 | \$272,798 |
| 9801005 | Pittsburg Landing, Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Acclimation Facilities | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$654,400 | \$654,400 | \$686,000 |
| 9802100 | Hood River Fish Habitat Project | CTWSRO | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$227,934 | \$227,934 | \$227,934 |
| 9803100 | Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Assessment & Restoration Plan | CRITFC | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$267,471 | \$267,471 | \$355,325 |
| 9808001 | PIT Tag Purchase And Distribution | PSMFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$0 | | \$0 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|---|---|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 9900600 | Restoration Of Riparian Habitat In Bakeoven / Deep Creeks | WCSWCD | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$80,000 | \$80,000 | \$80,000 |
| 9901000 | Mitigate Effects Of Runoff & Erosion On Salmonid Habitat In Pine Hollow | Sherman SWCD | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$33,937 | \$33,937 | \$33,937 |
| 9901300 | Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment | YIN | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$240,191 | \$240,191 | \$240,191 |
| 9901800 | Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho | USFWS-IFRO | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$84,365 | \$84,365 | \$84,365 |
| 9902000 | Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon | RMRS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$103,850 |
| 9902200 | Assessing Genetic Variation Among Columbia Basin White Sturgeon Populations | U of I | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$146,938 | \$146,938 | \$146,938 |
| 9902500 | Lower Columbia River Wetlands Restoration And Evaluation Program | USFS-CRGNSA | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$125,000 | \$125,000 | \$125,000 |
| 9902600 | Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation | USFS-CRGNSA | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$24,000 | \$24,000 | \$24,000 |
| Subtotal - Council "funds" from September 9 Decision | | | | | | \$61,063,407 | \$60,671,658 | \$78,552,961 |
| I.B. Proposals recommended for funding by the Council, CBFWA, and the ISRP after the "fix-it-loop" review. | | | | | | | | |
| 20084 | Protect And Restore The North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$154,782 | \$154,782 | \$204,782 |
| 20086 | Rehabilitate Newsome Creek - S.F. Clearwater River | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$301,689 | \$301,689 | \$364,725 |
| 20087 | Protect And Restore Mill Creek Watershed | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$63,036 | \$63,036 | \$63,036 |
| 20127 | Walla Walla River Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Project | CTUIR | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$134,000 | \$134,000 | \$156,931 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20131 | Enhance North Fork John Day River Subbasin Anadromous Fish Habitat | CTUIR | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$205,544 | \$205,544 | \$205,544 |
| 20139 | Walla Walla River Fish Passage Operations | CTUIR | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$73,000 | \$73,000 | \$83,400 |
| 8331900 | New Fish tagging System | NMFS | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$1,388,800 | \$1,388,800 | \$1,388,800 |
| 8343500 | Operate And Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities | CTUIR | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$775,000 | \$775,000 | \$822,161 |
| 8343600 | Umatilla Passage Facilities O & M | Westland Irrigation District | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$502,000 | \$502,000 | \$703,106 |
| 8346700 | Mitigation For The Construction And Operation Of Libby Dam | MFWP | Fund in Part | Fund existing scope | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |
| 8503800 | Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery | CCT | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$360,973 | \$360,973 | \$360,973 |
| 8710001 | Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat | CTUIR | Fund in Part | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$260,000 | \$260,000 | \$305,000 |
| 8740100 | Assessment Of Smolt Condition: Biological And Environmental Interactions | USGS-BRD, CRRL | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$199,046 | \$199,046 | \$199,046 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 8802200 | Umatilla River Fish Passage Operations | CTUIR | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$360,000 | \$360,000 | \$379,000 |
| 8811525 | Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design And Construction | YIN | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$1,565,000 | \$1,565,000 | \$1,565,000 |
| 8812025 | YKFP Management, Data And Habitat | YIN | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$750,000 | \$750,000 | \$750,000 |
| 8902700 | Power Repay Umatilla Basin Project | BPA | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$800,000 | \$550,000 | \$650,000 |
| 8903500 | Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance | ODFW | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$850,000 | \$850,000 | \$895,346 |
| 9000500 | Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring And Evaluation | ODFW | Fund in Part | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$650,000 | \$650,000 | \$721,588 |
| 9000501 | Umatilla River Basin Natural Production Monitoring And Evaluation | CTUIR | Fund in Part | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$480,000 | \$480,000 | \$609,191 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9001800 | Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tribs. To Lake Roosevelt | CCT | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$189,636 | \$189,636 | \$189,636 |
| 9004400 | Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities: Coeur D'alene Reservation | CDA Tribe | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$685,254 | \$685,254 | \$685,254 |
| 9005500 | Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers | IDFG | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$407,744 | \$407,744 | \$560,744 |
| 9007800 | Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-Scale Patterns | USGS | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$117,880 | \$117,880 | \$117,880 |
| 9101901 | Flathead Lake Monitoring And Habitat Enhancement | CSKT | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$95,000 | \$95,000 | \$95,000 |
| 9102900 | Life History And Survival Of Fall Chinook Salmon In Columbia River Basin | USGS | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$743,558 | \$743,558 | \$799,525 |
| 9106100 | Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area | WDFW | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$247,500 | \$247,500 | \$247,500 |
| 9107100 | SNAKE RIVER SOCKEYE SALMON HABITAT AND LIMNOLOGICAL RESEARCH | SBT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$427,000 | \$427,000 | \$438,461 |
| 9107300 | Idaho Natural Production Monitoring And Evaluation | IDFG | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$767,512 | \$767,512 | \$767,512 |
| 9303501 | Enhance Fish, Riparian, And Wildlife Habitat Within The Red River Watershed | ISWCD | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$450,000 | \$450,000 | \$550,000 |
| 9401001 | Mitigation For Excessive Drawdowns At Libby Reservoir | MFWP and CSKT | Do Not Fund | Fund existing scope | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$377,971 | \$377,971 | \$377,971 |
| 9404900 | Improve The Kootenai River Ecosystem | KTOI | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$270,000 | \$270,000 | \$300,000 |
| 9500100 | Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish | KNRD | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$297,000 | \$297,000 | \$297,000 |
| 9502800 | Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery | WDFW | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$234,890 | \$234,890 | \$234,890 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9506325 | Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring And Evaluation | YIN | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$4,309,934 | \$4,309,934 | \$4,639,934 |
| 9506425 | YKFP - WDFW Policy And Technical Involvement In The YKFP | WDFW | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$275,000 | \$275,000 | \$275,000 |
| 9506700 | Colville Tribes Performance Contract For Continuing Acquisition | CCT | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| 9600700 | Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon R. | LS&WCD | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$293,113 | \$293,113 | \$753,816 |
| 9604300 | Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Project | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$2,800,000 | \$2,800,000 | \$2,800,000 |
| 9605300 | Upper Clear Creek Dredge Tailings Restoration | USFS/CTUIR | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$85,000 | \$85,000 | \$85,000 |
| 9607708 | Protect And Restore The Lolo Creek Watershed | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$203,750 | \$203,750 | \$203,750 |
| 9607709 | Protect And Restore The Squaw To Papoose Creeks Watersheds | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$303,607 | \$303,607 | \$353,607 |
| 9607711 | Restore Mccomas Meadow/ Meadow Creek Watershed | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$166,622 | \$166,622 | \$166,622 |
| 9608600 | Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - ISCC | ISCC | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$89,450 | \$89,450 | \$89,450 |
| 9701325 | Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations And Maintenance | YIN | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$2,260,160 | \$2,260,160 | \$2,260,160 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9702600 | Ecology Of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence On Salmonid Ocean Survival | NMFS, NWFSC | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund); ESA funding | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 |
| 9705100 | Yakima Basin Side Channels | YIN | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$601,673 | \$601,673 | \$801,673 |
| 9706000 | Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$98,737 | \$98,737 | \$98,737 |
| 9800800 | Regional Forum Facilitation Services | | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$183,500 |
| 9801003 | Spawning distribution of Snake River fall chinook salmon | USFWS | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$177,666 | \$177,666 | \$182,666 |
| 9801600 | Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity Of John Day Basin Spring Chinook | ODFW | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$159,800 | \$159,800 | \$179,800 |
| 9801700 | Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams On Lower North Fork John Day | NFJDWC | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$90,250 | \$90,250 | \$90,250 |
| 9801800 | John Day Watershed Restoration | CTWSRO | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$424,575 | \$424,575 | \$459,918 |
| 9801900 | Wind River Watershed Restoration | UCD, USFS, USGS, WDFW | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$553,717 | \$553,717 | \$1,146,412 |
| 9802800 | Trout Creek Watershed Improvement Project Multi Year Funding Proposal | JCSWCD | Do Not Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$231,126 | \$231,126 | \$483,795 |
| 9803400 | Reestablish Safe Access Into Tributaries Of The Yakima Subbasin. | YIN | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$771,918 | \$771,918 | \$771,918 |
| 9900300 | Evaluate Spawning Of Salmon Below The Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams | WDFW, ODFW, USFWS, PNNL | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$355,838 | \$355,838 | \$385,788 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|---|--|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 9901100 | Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington | WDFW | Delay Funding | Fund existing activities | 11-03-99 (Fund, address ISRP comments in BPA contract) | \$169,723 | \$169,723 | \$184,723 |
| 9901200 | Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation | Ki-Yak | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$70,496 | \$70,496 | \$70,496 |
| 9901400 | Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat In The Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed | ISCC | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$196,855 | \$196,855 | \$217,855 |
| 9901500 | Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat In The Nichols Canyon Subwatershed | ISCC | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$186,237 | \$186,237 | \$211,237 |
| 9901600 | Protect & Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$61,276 | \$61,276 | \$61,276 |
| 9901700 | Protect & Restore Lapwai Creek | NPT | Delay Funding | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$61,276 | \$61,276 | \$61,276 |
| Subtotal funds - post ISRP "fix-it-loop" | | | | | | \$31,156,614 | \$30,906,614 | \$35,507,661 |
| I.C. Proposals recommended for funding by the Council after resolution of policy issues. The issues and Council recommendations are discussed in the text under Section I.C. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>I.C.1 PATH projects recommended for transition funding</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 9600600 | Facilitation, Technical Assistance And Peer Review Of Path | ESSA | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (Fund thru 3/2000) | Portion of \$330,000 for transition | \$450,000 | \$450,000 |
| 9600800 | STUFA Participation In A Plan For Analyzing And Testing Hypotheses (Path) | ODFW | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (Fund thru 3/2000) | Portion of \$330,000 for transition | \$745,131 | \$745,131 |
| 9600801 | Technical Support For Path | NMFS | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (Fund thru 3/2000) | Portion of \$330,000 for transition | \$75,000 | \$75,000 |
| PATH Transition total | | | | | | \$330,000 | \$1,270,131 | \$1,270,131 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
|------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|

I.C.2. PATH related projects identified for BPA Non-discretionary Technical Support Project Placeholder

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---|---|-----------|-----------|
| 9601700 | Provide Technical Support For Path | BioAnalysts, Inc. | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (Funding subject to independent review): BPA Non-discretionary (Technical Support Project Placeholder) | \$109,000 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | \$27,221 | \$109,000 |
| 9800100 | Analytical Support-Path And ESA Biological Assessments | Hinrichsen Environmental Services | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (See above 9601700) | \$125,000 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | \$119,900 | \$125,000 |
| 9303701 | Stochastic Life Cycle Model Technical Assistance | PER Ltd. | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (See above 9601700) | \$180,000 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | \$70,000 | \$180,000 |
| 9700200 | Path - UW Technical Support | UW | Do Not Fund | Fund for Transition | 12-07-99 (See above 9601700) | \$301,081 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | \$182,389 | \$301,081 |
| 8910800 | Monitor And Evaluate Modeling Support | UW | Do Not Fund | | 12-07-99 (See above 9601700) | \$411,300 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | | \$411,300 |
| 9800600 | Path Technical Support - James J. Anderson | Anderson Consulting | Do Not Fund | | 12-07-99 (See above 9601700) | \$50,000 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | | \$50,000 |

BPA Non-discretionary technical project placeholder **\$1,176,381** **\$399,510** **\$1,176,381**

I.C.3. Council Recommendation to Fund Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|--|--|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 8906200 | Fish And Wildlife Program Implementation | CBFWA | na | | 02-23-00 (Fund) | \$2,000,000 | \$2,042,041 | \$2,180,531 |
| Council's CBFWA Recommendation Equals \$2mil. in SOY Budget Placeholder | | | | | | \$2,000,000 | \$2,042,041 | \$2,180,531 |
| <i>I.C.4. Other proposals - see text under section I.C.</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 20019 | Evaluate Status Of Pacific Lamprey In Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho | IDFG | Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$73,000 | \$73,000 | \$119,039 |
| 20020 | Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program | WDFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 10-13-99 (Fund with conditions) | \$134,049 | \$134,049 | \$283,538 |
| 20023 | Hanford Reach Steelhead Stock Investigation | WDFW | Fund in Part | no response review | 12-07-99 (Fund in part per ISRP rec.) | \$10,500 | \$91,546 | \$98,820 |
| 20049 | Evaluate Sediment Transport In Spawning Habitat, Kootenai R., Idaho | USGS | Do Not Fund | no response review | 12-07-99 (Fund in coord. With 8806400) | \$96,550 | \$96,550 | \$96,550 |
| 20065 | Identification of larval Pacific lampreys (Lampetra tridentata), river lamp | USGS-BRD, CRRL | Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$78,700 | \$78,700 | \$78,700 |
| 20112 | Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Wenaha Wma Additions | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$42,302 | \$42,302 | \$142,302 |
| 20114 | Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$144,637 | \$144,637 | \$360,637 |
| 20115 | Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Irrigon Wma Additions | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$25,394 | \$25,394 | \$25,394 |
| 20116 | Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Horn Butte | ODFW | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$42,302 | \$42,302 | \$442,302 |
| 20121 | Evaluate Habitat Use And Population Dynamics Of Lampreys In Cedar Creek | USFWS | Fund | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$134,790 | \$134,790 | \$138,790 |
| 20135 | Consumptive Sturgeon Fishery-Hells Canyon And Oxbow Reservoirs | NPT | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund master plan and 3- step) | \$36,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20138 | Design And Construct Neoh Walla Walla Hatchery | CTUIR | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund master plan and 3-step, remainder in capital project placeholder) | \$100,000 | \$250,000 | \$1,380,000 |
| 8335000 | Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery | NPT | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund final design of revised plan, construction Funding after ISRP m&e review, Council approval of biological triggers) | Coucil recommendation of \$8,000,000 total (\$1,761,068 from '00 funds for planning design and construction. Balance of funds will come from carry-forward) | \$14,590,000 | \$20,188,949 |
| 8335003 | Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring And Evaluation | NPT | Do Not Fund | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund in sequence with 8335003) | \$992,847 | \$992,847 | \$992,847 |
| 8740700 | Dworshak Impacts/M&E And Biological/Integrated Rule Curves | NPT | Delay Funding | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund obj. 2 only, rule curve model) | \$93,000 | \$199,485 | \$199,485 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 8805301 | Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan | NPT | Do Not Fund | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund completion of master plan and 3-step 4/15/2000 using \$162K in '99 carryover, remainder of '99 and '00 budget in capital project placeholder) | \$0 | \$1,217,017 | \$1,217,017 |
| 8805302 | Plan, Site, Design And Construct NEOH Hatchery - Umatilla/Walla Walla ... | CTUIR | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund master plan and 3-step using \$93K in '99 carryover, remainder of '00 budget in capital project placeholder) | \$0 | \$2,800,000 | \$6,400,000 |
| 8805305 | Northeast Oregon Hatcheries Planning And Implementation - ODFW | ODFW | Do Not Fund | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund completion of master plan and 3-step 4/15/2000, remainder as placeholder) | \$169,500 (for project # 199800704) | \$226,000 | \$660,422 |
| 8806400 | Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies And Conservation Aquaculture | KTOI | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund in part per ISRP rec.) | \$1,095,202 | \$1,150,202 | \$2,750,202 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 8806500 | Kootenai River Fisheries Recovery Investigations | IDFG | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund in part per ISRP rec.) | \$561,103 | \$616,596 | \$616,596 |
| 9007700 | Northern Pikeminnow Management Program | PSMFC | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$2,506,000 | \$2,506,000 | \$3,306,000 |
| 9009300 | Genetic Analysis Of Oncorhynchus Nerka (Modified To Include Chinook Salmon) | U of I | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$139,434 | \$139,434 | \$144,859 |
| 9101904 | Hungry Horse Mitigation - Nonnative Fish Removal / Hatchery Production | USFWS | Fund in Part | Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund obj. 1,2,3 only) | \$159,417 | \$428,950 | \$428,950 |
| 9107200 | Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program | IDFG | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$680,096 | \$680,096 | \$680,096 |
| 9204000 | Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing And Research | NMFS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$475,000 | \$475,000 | \$500,000 |
| 9305600 | Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology | NMFS | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$1,236,923 | \$1,236,923 | \$1,310,300 |
| 9402600 | Pacific Lamprey Research And Restoration | CTUIR | Fund in Part | Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund plan review, remainder as placeholder) | \$381,190 | \$381,190 | \$381,190 |
| 9404700 | Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project | IDFG | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$379,000 | \$379,000 | \$379,000 |
| 9500600 | Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone Paiute Joint Culture Facility | SBT | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (hold Funds in placeholder) | \$282,621 | \$282,621 | \$282,621 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9501100 | Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project | CCT | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund kokanee stock assessment and hydroacoustics analysis report) | \$317,057 | \$396,753 | \$596,753 |
| 9501300 | Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program | NPT | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund O&M with FY carryover of \$474,081) | \$0 | \$750,000 | \$850,000 |
| 9501600 | Genetic Inventory Of Westslope Cutthroat Trout In The N F Clearwater Basin | NPT | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund project close-out and final report) | \$65,000 | \$180,000 | \$200,000 |
| 9602100 | Gas bubble disease research and monitoring of juvenile salmonids | USGS-BRD, CRRL | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Fund) | \$43,711 | \$43,711 | \$43,711 |
| 9604000 | Evaluate The Feasibility And Risks Of Coho Reintroduction In Mid-Columbia | YIN | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund in part: Methow and 3-step) | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$1,418,000 |
| 9606700 | Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project | NMFS | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$450,000 | \$450,000 | \$500,000 |
| 9700100 | Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon | IDFG | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$546,385 | \$546,385 | \$546,385 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9700900 | Evaluate Rebuilding The White Sturgeon Population In The Lower Snake Basin | NPT | Fund in Part | Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund consistent with coordination Agreement) | \$409,494 | \$409,494 | \$419,494 |
| 9702400 | Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River | OSU/CRITFC | Fund in Part | Fund | 11-03-99 (Fund) | \$642,600 | \$642,600 | \$642,600 |
| 9703800 | Preserve Listed Salmonid Stocks Gametes | NPT | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund in part per ISRP rec.) | \$163,122 | \$185,122 | \$185,122 |
| 9705700 | Salmon River Production Program | SBT | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund master plan and 3-step, NEPA from FY99 Funds \$230,180) | \$0 | \$931,376 | \$931,376 |
| 9801001 | Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program | ODFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$616,097 | \$616,097 | \$646,097 |
| 9801006 | Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Funding level determination for BPA) | \$131,031 | \$131,031 | \$146,031 |
| 9801400 | Ocean Survival Of Juvenile Salmonids In The Columbia River Plume | NMFS-NWFSC | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Recommend full ISRP review) | \$0 | \$0 | \$826,000 |
| 9802400 | Monitor Watershed Conditions On The Warm Springs Reservation | CTWSRO | Fund in Part | Fund in Part | 12-07-99 (Fund in part, obj. 2,3,4 per ISRP rec.) | \$35,402 | \$35,402 | \$160,917 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|---|---|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9901900 | Restore the Salmon River, in the Challis, ID area, to a healthy condition | Custer Co. | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (Fund contingent upon completion of master plan) | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal "funds" - Council policy issues (Not including PATH or CBFWA) | | | | | | \$15,400,524 | \$35,132,602 | \$52,017,092 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|-------|---------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
|------------|-------|---------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|

I.C.5. Proposals the Council Recommends for Funding but not included in NPPC Start of the Year Budget

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|------------------|
| 9202400 | Protect Anadromous Salmonids In The Mainstem Corridor | CRITFC | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 22 | 02-16-00 (Fund) | 388427 (not start of the year budget) | | \$388,427 |
| 9202409 | Enhance Conservation Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife, Watersheds Of The Nez Perce | NPT | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 28 | 02-16-00 (Fund) | 425236 (not start of the year budget) | | \$425,236 |
| 9303800 | North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing | USFS | Delay Funding | no response review | 02-02-00 (Fund) | 68000 (Not in start of the year budget) | | \$68,000 |
| Total FY2000 Proposals Recommended for Funding not in NPPC SOY Budget | | | | | | \$881,663 | \$0 | \$881,663 |

II. Proposals the Council Recommended for Funding Pending Sponsor Compliance with ISRP Comments through BPA's Contracting Process

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 20074 | Eagle Lakes Ranch Acquisition And Restoration | USFWS | Delay Funding | | 12-07-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$287,134 | \$287,134 | \$853,500 |
| 20082 | Rainwater Wildlife Area Operations & Maintenance | CTUIR | Delay Funding | | 12-07-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$274,966 | \$274,966 | \$274,966 |
| 20137 | Acquisition Of Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site. | BPT | Delay funding | | 12-07-99 (Fund pending compliance) | | | \$2,030,079 |
| 9306600 | Oregon Fish Screening Project - Fy'00 Proposal | ODFW | Delay Funding | | 12-07-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$641,621 | \$641,621 | \$641,621 |
| 9802200 | Pine Creek Ranch Acquisition | CTWSRO | Delay Funding | | 12-07-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$94,600 | \$94,600 | \$98,336 |
| 9803300 | Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed | YIN | Delay Funding | | 12-07-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$194,583 | \$194,583 | \$207,003 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|---|--|------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 9204800 | Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation And Maintenance Project | CCT | Do Not Fund | Delay Funding | 11-03-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$350,000 | \$350,000 | \$383,225 |
| 9501500 | Lake Billy Shaw Operations and Maintenance and Evaluation (O&M, M&E) | SPT - DVIR | Do Not Fund | Delay Funding | 11-03-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$221,550 | \$221,550 | \$221,550 |
| 9800300 | O&M Funding Of Wildlife Habitat On STOI Reservation For Grand Coulee Dam | STOI | Delay Funding | Delay Funding | 11-03-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$97,187 | \$97,187 | \$97,187 |
| 9800703 | Facility O&M And Program M&E For Grande Ronde Spring Chinook Salmon | CTUIR | Delay Funding | Delay Funding | 11-03-99 (Fund pending compliance) | \$489,000 | \$489,000 | \$597,516 |
| Subtotal "funds" - pending compliance with ISRP comments | | | | | | \$2,650,641 | \$2,650,641 | \$5,404,983 |
| TOTAL FUNDS NPPC Start of the Year Budget | | | | | | \$110,601,186 | \$131,031,156 | \$174,114,139 |

III. Proposals the Council Recommended as Eligible for One-time Grants as Innovative Research Projects from ISRP Rank of 42 (see text part III)

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|
| 20006 | Yakima Basin Benthic Index Of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI) | Washington Trout | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 19 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$189,822 | | \$48,072 |
| 20034 | Impact Of Flow Regulation On Riparian Cottonwood Ecosystems | BioQuest | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 3 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$199,973 | | \$148,034 |
| 20045 | Analyzing Genetic And Behavioral Changes During Salmonid Domestication | WSU | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 1 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$199,996 | | \$209,720 |
| 20054 | Evaluate Effects Of Hydraulic Turbulence On The Survival Of Migratory Fish | ORNL | Fund in Part | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 24 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$200,000 | | \$341,000 |
| 20057 | Strategies For Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon | OSU | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 2 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$199,976 | | \$429,463 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request | |
|---|---|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 20064 | Upstream migration of Pacific lampreys in the John Day R: behavior, timing | USGS-BRD, CRRL | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 14 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$199,644 | | \$298,700 | |
| 20067 | Effects Of Supersaturated Water On Reproductive Success Of Adult Salmonids | USGS | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 22 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$149,972 | | \$839,893 | |
| 20076 | Diet, Distribution & Life History of Neomysis Mercedis in John Day Pool | UMT | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 24 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$176,158) | \$176,158 | | \$176,158 | |
| 20102 | Research/Evaluate Restoration Of Ne Ore Streams And Develop Mgmt Guidelines | OSU/UO | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 3 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$200,000 | | \$309,936 | |
| 20106 | Heritability of Disease Resistance and Immune Function in Chinook Salmon | USFWS | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 6 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$200,000) | \$200,000 | | \$398,596 | |
| 9803500 | Watershed Scale Response Of Stream Habitat To Abandoned Mine Waste | UW | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 13 | 02-02-00 (Eligible for \$165,222) | \$165,222 | | \$53,820 | |
| Total for 11 Research Projects (NPPC SOY Budget Placeholder of \$2mil) | | | | | | \$2,141,380 (total eligible) | \$2,080,763 (total requested / eligible) | \$0 | \$3,253,392 |
| IV. BPA Non-discretionary Technical Support Projects with No Formal Council Recommendation | | | | | | | | | |
| 8910700 | Statistical Support For Salmonid Survival Studies | UW | Do Not Fund | | 12-07-99 (Funding subject to independent review);BPA Non-discretionary Technical Support Project (\$184,930) | \$184,930 (placed in BPA technical support project placeholder) | | \$184,930 | |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|---|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 9105100 | Monitoring And Evaluation Statistical Support | UW | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 19 | 02-02-00 (BPA Non- discretionary Technical Support Project) | \$340,357 (BPA Non-discretionary Technical Support Project) | | \$340,357 |
| 9601900 | Second Tier Database Support For Ecosystem Focus | BPA | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 29 | 02-02-00 (BPA Non- discretionary Technical Support Project) | \$195,000 (BPA Non-discretionary Technical Support Project) | | \$180,000 |
| BPA Non-discretionary technical support projects | | | | | | \$720,287 | \$0 | \$705,287 |
| V. Proposals the Council did not Recommend for Funding | | | | | | | | |
| 20002 | Hydrologic Study Of Stangland, Tyler And Clear Lake Area | Stangland-Tyler Aquifer Study | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$171,211 |
| 20003 | Enhance Fish Habitat By Improving Water Quality | SYCD | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$200,000 |
| 20004 | White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project | White Salmon River Watershed Mgmt. Com. | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$205,527 |
| 20005 | West Fisher Watershed Restoration | USFS | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$288,112 |
| 20007 | Acquire And Conserve Priority Bull Trout Habitat In Trestle Creek Watershed | | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 9 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$276,370 |
| 20009 | Fertilization Of Kootenay Lake And Arrow Reservoir | B.C. Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$175,000 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 20010 | Improve Fish Habitat By Reducing Farm Sediment Runoff | Benton Conservation District | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$1,500,000 |
| 20011 | Evaluate Whole System Effects On Migration And Survival Of Juvenile Salmon | Oregon Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$400,698 |
| 20012 | Develop New Technology For Telemetry And Remote Sensing Of Fish Quality | OCFWRU | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 24 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$323,690 |
| 20013 | Restore Unobstructed Fish Passage To Duncan Creek | SLOA | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 17 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$190,000 |
| 20014 | Evaluate Songbird Use Of Riparian Areas During Fall Migration | U of I | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 29 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$32,760 |
| 20015 | Characterize And Assess The John Day Watershed Using Landsat Tm Imagery | Northwest Habitat Institute | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$215,380 |
| 20016 | Snake River Steelhead Hooking Mortality Study | WDFW | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$117,240 |
| 20017 | Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings On The Yankee Fork Salmon River | SBT, IDFG, USFS | Do Not Fund | | 11-03-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | \$65,000 | \$207,260 |
| 20018 | Tucannon River and Asotin Creek Riparian Enhancement | WDFW | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$134,051 |
| 20021 | Estimate natural steelhead production in two tributaries of the Walla Walla | WDFW | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$332,850 |
| 20022 | NE Oregon Hatchery Planning & Coordination - WDFW | WDFW | Do Not Fund | | 11-03-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$12,942 |
| 20024 | Evaluate Fall Chinook Natural Production and Spawning Habitat Conditions in ... | WDFW | Delay Funding | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$120,687 |
| 20025 | Deschutes River Stray Summer Steelhead Assessment | ODFW | Do Not Fund | | 11-03-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | \$65,337 | \$65,337 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20026 | Evaluate Status Of Coastal Cutthroat Trout Above Bonneville Dam | ODFW | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$255,053 |
| 20027 | Electronic Columbia Basin Watershed Newsletter | Intermountain Communi-cations | Delay Funding | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$56,600 |
| 20028 | Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber Company along Fisher | MFWP | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 14 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$500,000 |
| 20029 | Electronic Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Research Report | Intermountain Communi-cations | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 34 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$56,600 |
| 20030 | Impact Of Nutrients On Salmon Production In The Columbia River Basin | U of BC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$185,640 |
| 20031 | Community Ecology And Food Web Studies In The Columbia River Basin | USFS | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$65,500 |
| 20033 | Rehabilitate instream and riparian habitat on the Similkameen and Okanogan | USFWS | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 32 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$484,902 |
| 20036 | Evaluate bull trout movements in the Tucannon and Lower Snake rivers | USFWS-IFRO | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$111,164 |
| 20038 | Assess Habitat And Passage For Anadromous Fish Upriver Of Chief Joseph Dam | CCT | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$274,284 |
| 20039 | Comparative Population Study: Naneum, Coleman, Cooke Creeks | Washington Trout | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$52,218 |
| 20040 | Develop A Fish & Wildlife Management Plan For The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R. | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Owyhee | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$22,411 |
| 20041 | Develop A Fish & Wildlife Conservation Law Enforcement Plan, D.V.I.R. | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Owyhee | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$40,872 |
| 20042 | Integrating Okanogan And Methow Watershed Data For Salmonid Restoration | Okanogan Conservation District | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 7 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$269,285 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 20043 | Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection: Genetic Retrieval From Single Sperm | U of I | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$223,765 |
| 20044 | Endocrine Control Of Ovarian Development In Salmonids | U of I | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$222,150 |
| 20046 | Induction of Precocious Sexual Maturity and Enhanced Egg Production in Fish | U of I | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$196,812 |
| 20047 | Enhancement of salmonid gamete quality by manipulation of intracellular ATP | U of I | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$182,915 |
| 20048 | Viral Vaccines And Effects On Reproductive Status | WSU | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$204,887 |
| 20050 | Remove Excess Heat From Streams And Store It For Future Application | Parker's Inc | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$29,160 |
| 20051 | Decrease Sedimentation And Temp. In Streams, Educate Resource Managers | OSU EXT | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$882,877 |
| 20052 | Strategies To Limit Disease Effects On Estuarine Survival | OSU, NMFS | Fund in Part | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 34 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$334,178 |
| 20053 | Anadromous Salmonid Transit System | Morrison- Knudsen Corp | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$698,523 |
| 20055 | Evaluate A Mark-Resight Survey For Estimating Numbers Of Redds | RMRS | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$43,050 |
| 20056 | Elucidate Traffic Patterns Of Ihn Virus In The Columbia River Basin | USGS-WFRC | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 14 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$75,207 |
| 20058 | Leavenworth Hatchery Complex | BOR | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$630,000 |
| 20060 | Juvenile Anadromous Fish Prototype- Scale Evaluation Facility | Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, Inc. | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$127,700 |
| 20061 | Influence Of Marine-Derived Nutrients On Juvenile Salmonid Production | USGS-BRD | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$309,859 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|--|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 20062 | Adaptive Management Of White Sturgeons | USGS-BRD, CRRL | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 11 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$184,674 |
| 20063 | Evaluate Effects Of Catch And Release Angling On White Sturgeon | USGS, IDFG | Fund in Part | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 32 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$271,486 |
| 20066 | Inventory Resident Fish Populations in the Bonneville, The Dalles, and John | USGS-BRD | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$267,340 |
| 20068 | Numerical Study Of Flow-Field Structure On Salmonid Migration | UMICH | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$94,640 |
| 20069 | Innovation Proposal Fund: Construct fuzzy logic decision support system ... | E&S Env. Chemistry, Inc. | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$100,000 |
| 20070 | Water Conservation And Stream Enhancement Project | | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$18,382,000 |
| 20071 | Restore Crab Lake And Adjacent Reaches Of Crab Creek. | Ducks Unlimited, Inc. | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 34 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$365,000 |
| 20072 | Restoring Perennial Instream Flows At Ahtanum Creek | Dames and Moore | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$184,900 |
| 20073 | Evaluate Relationship Between Land Use, Water Quality, And Fish Health | USGS | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$261,100 |
| 20075 | Engineered Anadromous Salmonid Habitat | U of I | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$60,502 |
| 20077 | Inventory and Assessment of Irrigation Diversion Alternatives to Push-up DA | USBOR | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$187,500 |
| 20079 | Assessing Adult Steelhead Escapement & Genetics In The South Fork Salmon | NPT | Do Not Fund | | 11-03-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | \$175,000 | \$278,481 |
| 20080 | Evaluate a Modified Feeding Strategy to Reduce Residualism and Promote ... | IFRO-USFWS | Do Not Fund | | 11-03-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | \$146,800 | \$168,050 |
| 20081 | STOI Wildlife Land Acquisition And Enhancements | STOI | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$2,032,750 |
| 20083 | Evaluate, restore and enhance 14 miles of instream and riparian habitat on ... | USFWS | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 7 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$102,706 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20085 | Analyze And Improve Fish Screens | NPT | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$129,141 |
| 20089 | Increase Instream Water Rights For Crabtree Creek | South Santiam Watershed Council | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$1,402,816 |
| 20091 | Construct Warm Springs Wetland | SWID RC&D | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$47,200 |
| 20092 | Inventory Wildlife Species & Populations Of The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Owyhee | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$185,985 |
| 20093 | Evaluate The Feasibility For Anadromous Fish Reintroduction In The Owyhee | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Owyhee | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$56,851 |
| 20094 | Assess Resident Fish Stocks Of The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R. | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Owyhee | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$220,799 |
| 20095 | Evaluate Interactions Of American Shad With Salmon In The Columbia River | USGS-BRD | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$152,314 |
| 20096 | Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation and Maintenance | WDFW | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$333,105 |
| 20097 | Phalon Lake Wild Rainbow Trap Improvements and O&M | WDFW | Delay Funding | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$25,000 |
| 20098 | Develop And Evaluate Selective Commercial Fishing Gear: Tangle Nets | WDFW | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$184,673 |
| 20099 | System For Salmon Migrating Through Dams | Krick Salmon Survival Systems | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$145,000 |
| 20100 | Characterize Historic Channel Morphology Of The Columbia River: McNary Pool | PNNL | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$119,751 |
| 20101 | Connectivity And Productivity Of Mainstem Alluvial Reaches | PNNL | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$166,905 |
| 20103 | Indexing Salmon Carrying Capacity to Habitat, Population, & Physical Fitness | OSU | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 3 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$363,392 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 20104 | Sources Of Myxobacterial Pathogens In Propagated Salmonids | USFWS-SCTC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$90,100 |
| 20105 | Develop New Feeds For Fish Used In Recovery And Restoration Efforts | USFWS-SCTC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$99,761 |
| 20107 | Reconnect The Westport Slough To The Clatskanie River | LCRWC | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 17 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$29,850 |
| 20108 | Recruit, Train, Organize & Support River Stewards | Oregon Trout | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$75,750 |
| 20109 | Cedar Creek Natural Production and Watershed Monitoring Project | WDFW | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 9 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$225,899 |
| 20110 | Develop Wheels, Pools and Falls Approach for Fish Passage at Dams. | Sun Mountain Reflections | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$198,570 |
| 20111 | Preserve Cryogenically the Gametes of Selected Mid-Columbia Salmonid Stocks | CRITFC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$89,573 |
| 20113 | Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, South Fork Crooked River | ODFW | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 19 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$13,877 |
| 20117 | Yakima River Subbasin Assessment | YIN | Delay Funding | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$235,059 |
| 20122 | Test guidance flows and strobe lights at a SBC to increase smolt FCE & FGE | WDFW | Fund in Part | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 11 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$295,300 |
| 20123 | Restoration Of Sockeye Salmon Into Palmer Lake | Salmonsoft | Delay Funding | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$101,460 |
| 20125 | Restore Riparian And Anadromous Fish Habitat In The Upper Sandy Basin | Mt. Hood NF | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$97,750 |
| 20126 | Habitat Enhancement Within Transmission Corridors | USFS | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$308,500 |
| 20129 | Dworshak Mitigation Cultural Resource Survey Project | NPT | Na | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$45,000 |
| 20130 | Northeast Oregon Mitigation Trust Fund | NPT | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$4,500,000 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20132 | Yakima River Basin Water Temperature Monitoring And Modeling Project | Yakima Basin Joint Board | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$84,700 |
| 20133 | Irrigation as a Management Tool for Stream Temperature | OSU | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$81,444 |
| 20136 | Burns Paiute Mitigation Coordinator | BPT | Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$50,494 |
| 20142 | Snake River Temperature Control Project, Phase III | CRITFC, UI, OGI | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$564,491 |
| 20143 | Monitor Symptoms Of Gas Bubble Trauma In Adult Salmonids | CRITFC | Fund for 1 YR | | 02-23-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | \$112,755 | \$112,755 |
| 20144 | Create Stream Reference Condition Data Set For The Upper Flathead R Basin | | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$26,000 |
| 20145 | Evaluate Little Walla Walla Screening Facility | ODFW | Fund in Part | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$242,677 |
| 20147 | Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R. - NPT | NPT | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$188,100 |
| 20148 | Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R - Idfg | IDFG, NPT | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$154,920 |
| 20149 | Develop Research Priorities For Fall Chinook In The Columbia River Basin | PNNL | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$70,080 |
| 20150 | Evaluate Return Flow Recovery | RSBOJC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$35,000 |
| 20151 | Landowner Communication Program | RSBOJC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$11,500 |
| 20152 | Improve Yakima River Water Quality By Incorporating Buffer Strips | RSBOJC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$161,000 |
| 20153 | Construct Sediment Settling Basins | RSBOJC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$264,500 |
| 20154 | Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program | RSBOJC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$161,000 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 20155 | Inventory On-Farm Irrigation Practices | RSBOJC | Do Not Fund | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$9,600 |
| 20156 | Identification Of Redband And Rainbow Trout In The N F Clearwater Basin | NPT | Fund | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 29 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$110,925 |
| 20157 | Gas Bubble Trauma Monitoring in the Clearwater River | IDFG | Not Reviewed | Fund | sponsor withdrew project | \$0 | \$59,000 | \$45,117 |
| 20536 | Develop Management Plan & Assess Fish & Wildlife - Owyhee Basin, D.V.I. R. | SPT - DVIR | Fund for 1 YR | | 09-22-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$133,820 |
| 9106700 | Idaho Water Rental: Resident Fish And Wildlife Impacts - Phase III | IDFG | Do Not Fund | Do Not Fund | 12-07-99 (complete wrap-up with funds on hand) | \$0 | \$119,465 | \$119,465 |
| 9502700 | Collect Data On White Sturgeon Above Grand Coulee Dam | STOI | Fund for 1 YR | ISRP Rank of 42 - Rank 27 | 02-02-00 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$342,086 |
| 9603201 | Begin Implementation Of Year 1 Of The K Pool Master Plan Program | YIN | Fund | | 10-13-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$428,073 |
| 9700300 | Box Canyon Watershed Project | KNRD | Fund for 1 YR | | sponsor withdrew project | \$0 | | \$70,256 |
| 9705000 | Little Naches River Riparian & In-channel Enhancement Project | YIN | Fund for 1 YR | | 10-13-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$96,142 |
| 9802600 | Document Native Trout Populations | Washington Trout | Fund for 1 YR | | 10-13-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$60,701 |
| 9902400 | Bull Trout Population Assessment in the Columbia River Gorge, WA | WDFW | Do Not Fund | | 10-13-99 (Do Not Fund) | \$0 | | \$200,000 |
| Total Not Recommended for Funding | | | | | | \$0 | \$753,357 | \$48,210,083 |

PART 2: – PROJECTS TABLE

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | ISRP June 15 REC | ISRP response rev. rec. | Council Decision | FY00 NPPC Budget Rec. | FY00 CBFWA Rec. | FY00 Sponsor Request |
|------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
|------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|

| VI. Summary of Totals for FY2000 Project Proposals | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| Subtotal - Council "funds" from September 9 Decision | | | \$61,063,407 | \$60,671,658 | \$78,552,961 |
| Subtotal "funds" - post ISRP "fix-it-loop" | | | \$31,156,614 | \$30,906,614 | \$35,507,661 |
| Subtotal "funds" - Council policy issues | | | \$15,400,524 | \$35,132,602 | \$52,017,092 |
| PATH Transition total | | | \$330,000 | \$1,270,131 | \$1,270,131 |
| Subtotal "funds" - pending compliance with ISRP comments | | | \$2,650,641 | \$2,650,641 | \$5,404,983 |
| TOTAL COUNCIL FUNDS (SOY) | | | \$110,601,186 | \$130,631,646 | \$172,752,828 |
| BPA Non-discretionary technical support projects (No Council Recommendation) | | | \$720,287 | \$0 | \$705,287 |
| TOTAL PROJECTS IN START OF THE YEAR BUDGET | | | \$111,321,473 | \$130,631,646 | \$173,458,115 |
| Council's CBFWA Recommendation Equals \$2mil in SOY Budget Placeholder | | | \$2,000,000 | \$2,042,041 | \$2,180,531 |
| Total for 11 Research Projects (NPPC SOY Budget Placeholder of \$2mil) | | | \$2,080,763 (total requested / eligible) | \$0 | \$3,253,392 |
| BPA Non-discretionary technical project placeholder | | | \$1,176,381 | \$399,510 | \$1,176,381 |
| Total FY2000 Proposals Recommended for Funding not in NPPC SOY Budget | | | \$881,663 | \$0 | \$881,663 |
| TOTAL FY2000 PROPOSALS FUNDED OR ELIGIBLE FOR PLACEHOLDER FUNDS | | | \$117,460,280 | \$133,073,197 | \$180,950,082 |

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

PART 3 Council Response to ISRP Programmatic Recommendations

Explanation of reasons for accepting or rejecting the programmatic recommendations made by the ISRP in its Fiscal Year 2000 report.

Volume I of the June 15, 1999 Report of the ISRP (99-2) included a number of programmatic recommendations from the ISRP to the Council. Those recommendations are set forth in italics below, and the Council response follows immediately after each recommendation.

1. *The ISRP recommends that Council not delay funding decisions pending receipt of the retrospective report, but rather that funding decisions be made on the basis of this present report. (Vol. I, p. 6)*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation that project funding recommendations for Fiscal Year 2000 should not await the retrospective report. Funding recommendations for Fiscal Year 2000 proposals will be made after full consideration of the June 15, 1999 and October 29, 1999 ISRP reports.

2. *The ISRP recommends that the project proposal format and instructions be modified to help proposers better understand the distinction between objectives, tasks, and methods, and that the format include a checklist of items needed for a complete proposal and a signature line for the appropriate administrator after an internal technical review. (Vol I., p.17).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. Proposal format is an issue that seems to be visited in some manner each year. The Council, in coordination with the ISRP, CBFWA, and Bonneville, will be considering improvements in proposal format and instructions for Fiscal Year 2001 as part of the general overhaul of the project review process described in Part 1 above. The specific suggestions noted by the ISRP above will be considered as part of the overall evaluation of the proposal format. With or without modifications to the form, the Council encourages the ISRP to provide comment and suggestions within the context of its review of proposals regarding the appropriate distinctions among objectives, tasks and methods, as it has in the past.

3. *The ISRP recommends that projects not be funded when the proposals fail to adequately include (1) monitoring of results to measure success, and (2) evaluation to rate the success or lack thereof against the stated objectives (both of which could be in the project itself or specifically identified in other projects that may be devoted to monitoring and evaluation). (Vol. I., p. 18).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council believes that the recommendation is best implemented in the context of its consideration of discreet projects, which the ISRP has reviewed and commented upon in its annual reports. Therefore, the Council calls upon the ISRP to continue to identify those projects that fail to adequately include monitoring of results, and/or methods or provision for evaluation against stated objectives as it conducts its review of projects proposed for Fiscal Year 2001 and future years. Further, it is the

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

Council's understanding that projects proposed for funding in Fiscal Year 2000 that fail to provide this information were identified by the ISRP in its project-by-project review, and adequately addressed these issues as a condition to receiving a "fund" rating from the ISRP.

4. *The ISRP recommends that NPPC and CBFWA staff together identify all sets of linked projects in the basin that could benefit from an umbrella proposal. These would likely include projects grouped by subbasin (e.g., Grande Ronde, John Day, etc.), by topic (e.g., smolt monitoring, captive brood), or by a combination of topic and geography (e.g., all watershed and habitat restoration projects within a single subbasin).* (Vol. I, p. 19)

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council, in coordination with CBFWA, proposes to transition the project selection and review process to a model that targets discreet "provinces" and subbasins within each province, beginning in Fiscal Year 2001. This model would provide for geographic groupings of proposed projects by subbasin. To accomplish this, the Council and CBFWA are working to develop agreement on common criteria for subbasin plans that would be the document through which proposals in any particular subbasin would be developed and justified. Once the criteria for subbasin plans have been established, the actual development of the plans will be the means to identify and organize proposals that share this subbasin linkage. At a general level, it is contemplated that subbasin plans will have three major elements: (1) assessments; (2) a description of past and existing activities and a description of the accomplishments and/or failures of those activities; and (3) a 10-15 year plan that sets out goals and objectives for the subbasin. Sponsors would then make proposals to implement the subbasin plans in a three-year implementation plan, and the ISRP would review proposed projects within the context of the subbasin and implementation plans.

However, the Council believes that it may take some time to produce subbasin plans that meet all of the criteria that will likely be established for Program purposes. Moreover, subbasin plans will need to demonstrate their consistency with basin and province level goals and objectives that are unlikely to be conclusively established until the program amendment process is completed next year. This means that not all subbasin plans of the quality ultimately required will be ready by the time that the ISRP begins its review of Fiscal Year 2001 proposals for one or more province. Therefore, until subbasin plans are developed to meet the criteria to be agreed to by the Council and CBFWA for the province(s) to be reviewed by the ISRP, the Council will call upon CBFWA to use existing information as the basis for a subbasin assessment, and utilize the umbrella proposal concept, or a similar concept, to organize and link proposed projects in each subbasin. The Council may also elect to use a topical umbrella in some circumstances in addition to, or in lieu of a geography-based umbrella or subbasin plan.

5. *The ISRP recommends that a specific umbrella proposal format be developed for use in FY 2001 and beyond. Umbrella proposal content should provide the information needed to conduct peer review, facilitate regional coordination, and assess progress of the closely linked projects toward fish and wildlife program goals.* (Vol. I, p. 19).

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation, and is proposing that the "umbrella" be organized on a subbasin basis until subbasin plans meeting program criteria are adopted. Please see the response immediately above, and the response to recommendation 1.0 above. However, the new review model and process that the Council has been developing with the advice and assistance of the ISRP and CBFWA does not contemplate that *all* material needed

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

or useful for the ISRP in its review would be in a proposal form alone. Rather, there are background historical, planning, and review documents that would be provided by sponsors to the ISRP. In addition, the opportunity for site-visits is contemplated under the new review format. The Council will continue to work with the ISRP, CBFWA, and Bonneville to strike the right balance between reliance on a comprehensive proposal forms and the provision of other relevant documentation for proposed projects.

6. *The ISRP recommends that experimental methods be implemented or tested first as pilot-scale projects designed to ascertain and evaluate feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and potential harm. (Vol. I., p. 20).*

Response: The Council concurs with that part of the recommendation that states that projects that employ experimental methods should be designed in a way that feasibility, cost-effectiveness, potential harm (and potential benefit) may be evaluated. This leaves open, however, the question of whether or not “pilot” or “small” scale is the appropriate scale to conduct such evaluations in all instances. The Council agrees that in many instances the appropriate scale may be pilot or small. However, the Council does not find at this time that pilot or small scale is necessary or appropriate in every instance as a blanket rule. The Council’s decision to not accept this portion of the recommendation, establishing a general rule regarding scale, is not so much a rejection of the ISRP’s rationale, but is more of a product of believing that the proposed “pilot scale” standard creates a rule without definition if adopted in the abstract.

The first definitional uncertainty is understanding what does “pilot” or “small” scale mean? The measuring standard could be one of size (e.g. square feet), cost, number of items, duration, or any number of other factors. Moreover, the question of what is “pilot” tends to be a relative and qualitative assessment that cannot be reasonably determined in the abstract. In some instances specific program language addresses project scale or methods, and will be an important element in fixing the appropriate scale. Therefore, the Council believes that the appropriate scope or scale of projects using experimental methods should be considered on a case-by-case basis in the context of the development and review of discreet proposals.

The second definitional issue is related to the broad range of “experimental methods.” The Council believes that methods that may be properly considered “experimental” likely cover a range roughly described as “highly experimental,” “untested,” or “unaddressed in the peer reviewed scientific literature” at one end, to “slightly experimental,” “tested but not proven” or “with strong support in the scientific literature” at the other end. Exactly where the proposed method in question falls out within this range would be a relevant consideration in fixing the scale of any given project. Again, this requires assessment in the context of evaluating a specific project.

7. *The ISRP recommends that a plan for regular site reviews of related projects be developed and implemented in FY2000. (Vol. I., p. 20).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation for site visits. However, the restructured review process being discussed with the ISRP and CBFWA contemplates that not all of the provinces, and therefore not all Fiscal Year 2000 projects, will be able to be reviewed in 2000. Rather, over the next three years, all projects funded for Fiscal Year 2000

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

(and all others proposed over the next three years) will be completed or subject to resubmission and ISRP review, and that review will include site visits.

8. *The ISRP recommends that Council consider mechanisms for initiation of a Columbia River Basin Journal and consider soliciting proposals for innovative mechanisms for offering technical support to projects for development of publications. (Vol. I., p. 21).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council will consult with CBFWA, the ISRP, and others with expertise in this subject matter on this recommendation.

9. *The ISRP recommends that the Fish and Wildlife program move toward multi-year approval of most projects, with proposal and site reviews, and effectiveness evaluations made at intervals of 3 to 5 years. (Vol. I., p. 22).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council, in consultation with CBFWA and the ISRP, is in the process of restructuring the project proposal, review, and selection process to a model that reviews each of the provinces in the Basin once every three years. Projects reviewed by the ISRP and approved by the Council will be recommended for funding for three years -- until the review cycles back to that province. Site reviews will be a part of those province-level reviews. Projects proposed will need to demonstrate how they implement a subbasin plan, or in the interim, some other organizing document along the lines of a subbasin level umbrella that includes an evaluation of past effectiveness of activities sought to be continued and methods by which the effectiveness of new activities will be evaluated.

10. *The ISRP recommends that projects claiming to use adaptive management approaches be required to support the approach with specific examples of its past or planned use. (Vol. I., p. 22).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council encourages the ISRP to continue to evaluate and comment upon the appropriateness of claims of “adaptive management” as it reviews proposals each year.

11. *The ISRP recommends that the Council solicit innovative proposals in the area of watershed assessment, with particular goals being improved methods for watershed inventory and improved methods for evaluating outcomes of management practices at the watershed or basin level. (Vol. I., p. 23).*

Response: The Council does not accept the recommendation at this time to the extent that it is recommending that the Council seek such projects in the annual project solicitation, review, and selection process that would be funded by Bonneville. However, to the extent that the recommendation is a more general recommendation for the Council to seek out innovative tools or methods for conducting watershed assessments, or tools or methods of conducting watershed inventories or evaluating management practices, by whatever means or source possible, the Council concurs.

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

The Council is currently in the process of gathering information from various state, federal, and tribal entities and universities that are conducting watershed assessments outside of the fish and wildlife program. The Council is aware of the fact that the states, Oregon and Washington for example, have developed procedures for conducting watershed assessments. Federal agencies have done this as well, and are revising the methods that they are employing. In addition, there are currently projects funded through the program that are aimed at developing watershed and subbasin assessment models. The Council believes that it is most prudent to explore and understand the varied watershed assessment methods and tools being developed throughout the region before it solicits initiatives for additional projects of this nature as part of the program. Moreover, the Fiscal Year 2000 project selection process is complete. The limited Fiscal Year 2001 proposal solicitation will not start for at least several months. The Council does not want to delay its objective of finding a watershed assessment model that it can apply in subbasin planning and project selection until projects potentially selected in the Fiscal Year 2001 proposal solicitation are completed.

12. *The ISRP recommends that no land acquisition be funded without a clear description of the land to be acquired and without demonstration of its priority for the fish and wildlife program. (Vol. I., p. 24).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. Lands proposed for acquisition should be clearly described. In addition, lands sought for acquisition should be justified through a detailed explanation of its contribution toward achieving fish and wildlife and habitat objectives of the applicable subbasin and province goals and objectives. The Council understands this recommendation to also require sponsors of land acquisitions to articulate how the lands, once acquired, will be held and managed in furtherance of Fish and Wildlife Program goals and objectives (as articulated in subbasin plans and province level objectives) as opposed to other permitted or contemplated activities.

13. *ISRP recommends that the Council solicit innovative proposals for development, testing, and evaluation of cost-effective passive methods for control of non-native species. (Vol. I., p. 25).*

Response: The Council declines to accept the recommendation that it solicit specific types of proposals for control of non-native species at this time. For the time being, the Council will continue the project solicitation and selection model currently used, where both it and the ISRP receive and review the proposals that are recommended by CBFWA. The Council believes efforts to control non-native species should be articulated in the context of a subbasin plan (and in light of complete assessments). Therefore, these types of proposals, and all others for that matter, should be made and reviewed in the context of activities seeking to implement a subbasin plan rather than in the abstract. The Council does encourage the ISRP to identify and comment upon innovative proposals for development, testing, and evaluation of cost-effective passive methods of control of non-native species in the context of its review of proposed projects in its annual reports. The Council will take those comments into account in making its funding recommendations in Fiscal Year 2001 and future years.

Regarding the recommendation that the Council solicit proposals as a general matter, the Council finds that completion of watershed assessments and development of subbasin plans is a

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

high priority. Should the Council find that assessment and planning work is not being proposed or completed through the work plans submitted by CBFWA, it may, in fact, solicit proposals to expeditiously advance that type of work under the program.

14. *The ISRP recommends that all supplementation projects in the basin undergo a coordinated programmatic level review by an independent scientific review panel. The panel should address uncertainties as well as differences among supplementation projects with respect to monitoring and evaluation protocols, project-specific as well as program goals, and the effectiveness of supplementation as a rebuilding tool. [Resident fish hatcheries as well as anadromous fish hatcheries should be included in the overall basin-wide review of hatchery effectiveness. Many of the same questions arise for resident fish propagation and supplementation of wild stocks. Funding recommendations in hatchery-related proposals for resident fish are premised on acceptance of the high value of artificial propagation. This premise needs evaluation from the perspective of the fish species or stock being propagated as well as from the perspective of the wild, native stocks (and ecosystem) with which the hatchery-produced fish will mingle]. (Bracketed material not set off as a recommendation by the ISRP, but understood by the Council to be part of the recommendation). (Vol. I., p. 26).*

Response: The Council declines to accept the recommendation to initiate an independent scientific review focused on the artificial production technique of supplementation at this time. Several science panels, including the ISRP, have commented upon and/or discussed the general uncertainties and risks associated with supplementation and other artificial production techniques in recent years. In addition, the Council has recently completed its Artificial Production Review Report (APR) where supplementation, and other artificial production techniques were reviewed. The foundation of the APR was a review of the state of artificial production science by an independent science body, the Science Review Team. The APR report developed specific policies that are intended to guide the questions of if, where, when, and for what purposes should artificial production be used. The Council intends that the APR and its policies be used in province level and subbasin-level planning. If and when artificial production projects are proposed for funding in the future, sponsors will need to demonstrate consistency with the APR and a comprehensive subbasin plan as part of the demonstration that it is based upon the best available science. Further, if it is determined that supplementation (or any of the other artificial production techniques) will be implemented, the APR establishes performance standards and indicators designed to ensure that the contemplated risks and benefits are measured in a way that will permit managers and the Council to make adjustments, including the possible cessation of the program, if necessary. The performance standards and indicators developed through the APR are intended to establish uniform monitoring and evaluation protocols for artificial production activities. The Council believes that another general programmatic review of supplementation and other artificial production techniques conducted in the abstract would largely duplicate recent independent reviews and comment, and not generate the type of hatchery reforms that are being suggested by some independent science groups as effectively as implementing the APR in the context of specific subbasins and provinces.

15. *The ISRP recommends that the ongoing basin-wide review of hatchery effectiveness be continued, and the results of such a review be used to form the basis for future hatchery funding decisions. (Vol. I., p. 26).*

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. See response to 12.0 above. As stated above, to demonstrate that they are based on best available science, artificial production proposals will need to demonstrate consistency with the APR as a condition of the Council's recommendation for funding in the future.

16. *The ISRP recommends that the Council terminate funds for captive brood projects that do not provide convincing evidence that the problems causing depletion have been identified and that reasonable plans and effort are being applied to their resolution. (Vol. I., p. 27).*

Response: The Council declines to accept the recommendation creating a blanket rule for the termination of funding for captive brood projects on the terms suggested. The Council believes that decisions to terminate funding (or more accurately, to not recommend continued funding or funding of new projects) must be done on a case-by-case basis. However, in recommending funding for captive brood projects in Fiscal Year 2000, the Council did provide the following conditions, which were informed by the ISRP's recommendation:

- (a) Funding should be held at levels required to fund these existing programs pending the prioritization that the Council has previously requested from NMFS, and expansion of existing programs should not be permitted. To date, the Council has not received a prioritization of likely target populations and intervention programs to form a basis for programmatic and budget planning.
- (b) The Council should not consider any new funding for this technique until adequate review has been completed, and, if possible, sub-basin plans are in place.
- (c) A review of these captive brood programs for consistency with APR report policies and standards should be conducted before additional funds are allocated to these programs or new programs.

In considering whether or not to recommend funding a captive brood project, the Council must take into account first and foremost the state of the resource. The Council does not wish to adopt a blanket rule that penalizes the resource, particularly one that is in peril, for the lack of effective assessment and planning work by the management entity. The rule proposed by the ISRP is clearly intended as an action-forcing mechanism to spur the managers' assessment of limiting factors and their resolution. The recommendation that the sponsors of these projects plan and apply effort to remedy limiting factors as a condition of funding, however, fails to recognize that the sponsor may not have jurisdiction or control over the limiting factors. When deciding whether or not to recommend funding for a captive brood project, the Council will need to determine if the entity proposing or conducting the captive project has any jurisdiction or control over the factors causing the decline as identified in a subbasin assessment. It would clearly be an inequitable result, and a penalty to the resource, if, for example land, water, hydro-facility, or harvest management outside of the jurisdiction and control of the captive brood project sponsor was found to be the cause(s) of decline, and the sponsor's inability to control reforms in those areas led to termination of the project and the loss of the animals. Again, only on a case-by-case basis can these elements be determined.

As stated in response to many of the recommendations above, the Council agrees that

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

assessments must be done for all subbasins as soon as possible to justify *all* projects sought to be funded under the program. The Council may choose to condition its funding recommendations for captive brood projects, and other projects, on the completion of assessments in the future.

17. *The ISRP recommends that all captive brood projects in the basin undergo a coordinated programmatic level review by an independent scientific review panel. The panel should address uncertainties and differences among captive brood projects with respect to monitoring and evaluation protocols, project-specific as well as program goals, and the effectiveness of captive brood technology as a rebuilding tool. (Vol. I., p. 28).*

Response: The Council declines to accept the recommendation for a review of the captive brood projects at this time. The reasons are as stated in response to 12.0 above.

18. *The ISRP recommends that resident fish mitigation actions focus on native resident fish stocks, rather than substituting non-native stocks, wherever practicable. Priority, as indicated by the FWP, should be given to projects that use or explore use of native stocks. (Vol I., p. 28).*

The Council views this recommendation as an endorsement of current program requirements. The Council will continue to rely upon adopted program language and policies when considering resident fish mitigation projects.

19. *The ISRP recommends that umbrella proposals be developed in FY2001 for all white sturgeon projects and all Pacific lamprey projects in the basin. Umbrella proposal content should provide the information needed to conduct peer review, facilitate regional coordination, and allow assessment of these closely-linked projects' progress toward fish and wildlife program goals. (Vol. I., p. 29).*

Response: As stated in response to several of the above recommendations, the Council intends to change the way in which project solicitation, review, and selection is conducted in Fiscal Year 2001. Rather than a general basinwide solicitation, the Council expects to solicit proposals in Fiscal Year 2001 for several provinces. Further, the Council believes that in most instances projects are best linked on a subbasin geographic basis rather than a topical basis as this recommendation suggests. Finally, ISRP review will be of those limited provinces, and in the context of subbasin plans, or some other subbasin-based coordinating mechanism pending completion of those plans. The Council also intends to expand the basis for the ISRP review beyond the traditional proposal forms to include background documents and site visits. Because the recommendation does not square well with these anticipated changes to the project review and selection process, the Council declines to accept the recommendation that white sturgeon and Pacific lamprey proposals be required to develop umbrella proposals, and that the proposal form itself be the sole or primary document relied upon by the ISRP for its review.

However, while it will not require an umbrella proposal per se, the Council interprets its program provisions that relate to sturgeon and lamprey to require regional coordination of these types of projects. Therefore, in order to demonstrate consistency with the program, sponsors of these projects will need to demonstrate to the ISRP and Council that there is regional coordination by some means. For example, sponsors of Pacific lamprey projects proposed for Fiscal Year 2000 conducted a workshop and developed an appendix to the CBFWA draft work plan that demonstrated the regional coordination of those projects. This type of report and

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

documentation, at a minimum, will be necessary for these projects in Fiscal Year 2001 and beyond.

20. *The ISRP recommends expanded use of targeted requests for proposals to resolve uncertainties and information gaps in the current fish and wildlife program and the projects that constitute it. Funding duration and amount should be appropriate for the task solicited. The ISRP, ISAB, and Council staff should consult together to identify fruitful areas for targeted RFPs for the FY2001 annual cycle. (Vol. I., p. 29).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation that RFPs may be used in select instances in the future. However, the Council is on the eve of a major program amendment process, and using RFPs or similar device to address gaps or uncertainties in the existing program may not be the appropriate objective. The Council encourages the ISRP to consult with Council staff about the possibility of using RFPs in limited instances in Fiscal Year 2001, with the caveat that it does not anticipate using this approach expansively until the program is amended.

21. The ISRP recommends that the Council urge CBFWA to include in its Annual Implementation Work Plan a report of past accomplishments at the watershed and subregional/subbasin levels or topical level (e.g., smolt monitoring, captive brood stock, etc.). The accomplishments should be reported in terms of FWP goals, rather than as listings of completed tasks. (Vol. I., p. 30).

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. One of the general elements of the subbasin plans that the Council and CBFWA are discussing includes a description of past and current activities and accomplishments in each subbasin. The Council expects that the accomplishments will be reported in terms of subbasin goals, that relate to both province and basinwide goals.

22. *The ISRP identified sixteen “innovative” proposals in the course of its project level review. Of those sixteen, the ISRP recommended that thirteen of them be funded in FY 2000. Of those thirteen, CBFWA recommended that two of the projects be funded in FY 2000. The ISRP has recommended that the eleven others not recommended by CBFWA be recommended for funding by the Council. (Vol. I., p. 31).*

Response: The Council declines the recommendation that each of the 11 “innovative” proposals identified by the ISRP, which were not recommended by CBFWA, be recommended for funding. The Council does not accept the recommendation for reasons of priority and available budget. In addition, the Council and CBFWA did not develop criteria or standards for innovative projects in the project solicitation process, and believes that a larger portion of the available budget should not be dedicated to “innovative” proposals unless and until such criteria are established to provide notice and equal opportunity for prospective sponsors of this type of work. After recommending funding for that significant block of projects, limited funds remain. There are not sufficient funds available to fund all of the innovative projects identified by the ISRP given other project priorities of the Council.

However, the Council does wish to encourage innovative proposals, and it did recommend full funding for two of the innovative proposals (20124 and 20141). The Council asked the ISRP to

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

rank projects that it recommended for funding that CBFWA did not. Within this ranked list (42 projects) as a subset are the “innovative” proposals that were recommended by the ISRP but not CBFWA. This ranking assisted the Council to balance its goal of recruiting innovative proposals along with its other project priorities. Using the previously identified \$2 million planning target, the Council will seek to provide at least partial funding for 11 of the projects in the October 8, 1999 prioritized list provided by the ISRP. The Council anticipates that this will increase the number of “innovative” proposals that are funded in Fiscal Year 2000.

23. *In its FY 2000 review of projects, the ISRP identified 37 projects that it recommended for funding that were ranked by CBFWA as Tier 2 or 3 with no funding recommended. The ISRP recommends funding for these 37 projects. (Vol. I, p. 37).*

Response: The Council declines to accept the recommendation in its entirety. As explained in Part 1 above, for Fiscal Year 2000 the Council’s priority was to recommend funding for projects that received a consensus funding recommendation from both CBFWA and the ISRP. This general rule provides strong assurance that projects are scientifically sound and also consistent with the program. After funding that significant block of projects, there was limited funding available. The Council asked the ISRP to prioritize these projects, including the innovative projects, in ranked order to assist it in deciding where limited funds would be recommended. The Council has proposed to provide at least partial funding for several of the 37 projects recommended by the ISRP but rated Tier 2 or Tier 3 by CBFWA.

24. Smolt Monitoring

The following discussion refers to 20 proposals that belong in the broad smolt monitoring category. In Table 9, they include those labeled Smolt Monitoring, Dissolved Gas, PIT Tag and Telemetry Technology, and Coded Wire Tag. They relate to monitoring of smolt survival, condition, travel time and passage through the mainstem, acquisition and deployment of tags, conduct of specific experiments tracking tagged fish, routine collection and distribution of tag recovery data, longer term data management, data analysis, and communication of data summaries. As a group, this set of proposals suffered from lack of coordination and integration. We have organized our comments into three sections in the discussion that follows: 1) the need for an effective overall design for monitoring, which needs to go arm-in-arm with 2) the need for development and use of effective analytical methods, and 3) the need for effective data management.

1) Smolt Monitoring Design

The ISRP repeats its recommendation of the FY1999 review that [Smolt Monitoring, Dissolved Gas, PIT Tag and Telemetry Technology, and Coded Wire Tag] projects should be combined and subjected to a comprehensive programmatic review that gives special consideration to the complex interactions between the projects. At a minimum, these projects should be incorporated under a larger umbrella proposal that integrates the various components into a comprehensive program. (Vol. I, p. 54).

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council appreciates the detailed comments of the ISRP on this issue, and is convinced that such a review is needed. The Council will work with the ISRP to determine when such a review is best started, taking into account the other tasks and reviews that the ISRP will be doing in the coming year. The Council

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

would also seek to time this review such that it may be most useful in designing research, monitoring, and evaluation goals and objectives of an amended program.

25. *The ISRP recommends an independent review of the data management efforts that are supported by the direct funded program before funding is continued beyond FY2000. (Vol. I, p. 54).*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation that an independent review is needed in the immediate future. The Council declines to state as a matter certain at this time, however, that it will not recommend funding for such projects beyond Fiscal Year 2000 if the review cannot be completed prior to those decisions. Again, the Council will consult with the ISRP about the timing of the review, and whether or not the ISRP or some other entity is most appropriate for this review.

26. *The ISRP recommends that monitoring of the remaining wild spawning populations be targeted as a priority project for FY2001 and a request for proposals be issued.*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation to the extent that it calls for making monitoring of wild spawning populations a priority; it declines to adopt that part of the recommendation that RFPs be the device to implement it at this time. As discussed in several of the responses above, the Council is planning to transition the project review model from the general project solicitation currently used to one that targets specific provinces in Fiscal Year 2001. Moreover, project sponsors will be called upon to organize and justify their proposed projects through a subbasin plan, or, where not completed, a subbasin umbrella. While the details of the subbasin umbrella are not finalized, and discussions are occurring now on the fundamental elements that must be in a subbasin plan, the Council believes that either device will need to demonstrate how wild spawning populations are or will be monitored in the subbasin. The Council will work with the ISRP and CBFWA in finalizing the elements of a subbasin plan or umbrella, and seek to ensure that the monitoring proposed above is addressed in both. The Council believes that it is desirable to attempt to address the need for making monitoring of wild populations a priority through these collaborative discussions for subbasin planning before going to an RFP device.

Taking a slightly different approach to the recommendation, the Council does understand the review standards of the Act to provide a platform for the ISRP to raise the visibility of this issue. That is, as it reviews each project, the ISRP is directed under the Act to make a finding if it “benefits fish and wildlife.” It could be argued that the ISRP would have difficulty making an affirmative finding on this point where projects or collections of projects fail to describe how the proposed activities will be monitored for impact or affect on wild spawning populations in the area. The Council encourages the ISRP to rely upon the statutory review criteria as it conducts project-specific reviews in the coming years to advise the Council if and when projects fail to provide adequate monitoring of wild populations in such a way that the ISRP is able to make an affirmative finding of “benefit.”

27. *The ISRP concludes that PATH should be congratulated for a job well done and recommends that it be honorably retired. PATH in its present form should be phased out. A simpler process could be created to meet the continuing need for evaluation of the limited data now available to address management questions relative to the hydro biological opinion. Future*

PART 3: – COUNCIL RESPONSE

cooperative modeling ventures will be needed, based on new data or new visions of modeling needs, and at that time a successor to PATH might usefully be organized for the new mission. This more ambitious and comprehensive scientific consensus process could be developed somewhat along the lines of PATH. Primary tasks of this new process would be to address data collection design issues for the basin, identify data needs that are critical to the actual management questions, and ensure that data needs are met in a coordinated and efficient manner.

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. The Council understands the above recommendation to be consistent with, or superceded by the ISRP's recommendation in its October 28, 1999 *Response Review*, where it recommends that the PATH projects be funded for a transition to the type of process described above. The Council will seek to fund a transition to a process that provides for a regional analytical process that promotes development of effective and scientifically credible tools to organize and focus information on specific natural resource problems. The Council will seek a process that promotes transparency and understanding of analysis performed to support regional decision-making and the supporting tools and information. Moreover, the process must include clear, streamlined and efficient project management and accountability. This includes the need for a focused project management group that includes the Council and NMFS. Subcontractors to the process should be held to clear accountability for time and products.

28. *The ISRP continues to recommend that the Council place more emphasis on protection and enhancement of habitat of naturally reproducing salmon populations in the mainstem of the Columbia River.*

Response: The Council concurs with the recommendation. In its plans for a revised fish and wildlife program, the Council hopes to increase significantly the attention given to mainstem habitat. The Council envisions adopting habitat objectives for the portion of the mainstem that falls within the different ecological provinces. Recognition and opportunities to protect and enhance naturally spawning habitats in the mainstem will be advanced through the planning efforts that will be required for program and project selection purposes.

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

PART 4 Statement Regarding the Council’s Consideration of the Impact of Ocean Conditions on Fish and Wildlife Populations

The Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) continued to incorporate new concepts and the latest understanding on the effects of ocean conditions on Columbia River salmonids during the formulation of funding recommendations for Fiscal Year 2000. This expanded scope of the Council’s functions emerged directly from the 1996 amendment of the Northwest Power Act. According to the language in the congressional amendment, the Council was instructed to “...consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations...” in making its recommendation to the Bonneville Power Administration regarding funding hydropower mitigation projects. Efforts to-date have helped shape a growing body of concepts concerning ocean variability and its effects on salmonid populations. The Council’s awareness and understanding of these additional complexities have resulted in a permanent recognition of this portion of the salmon ecosystem as an integral part of the Council’s fish and wildlife agenda.

The following items illustrate the Council’s most recent interests and activities in pursuing an adequate understanding of the role of ocean conditions on salmonid populations:

1. Activities funded by the Bonneville Power Administration.
2. Council’s convention of an Ocean Symposium.
3. ISAB review of estuary work.
4. Council efforts: Multi-species Framework Project, Artificial Production Review, and Fish and Wildlife Program amendment process.
5. Relevant efforts by other agencies.

1. Activities funded by the Bonneville Power Administration

Table 1 lists the collection of proposals for estuary, nearshore and ocean studies submitted for funding by the Bonneville Power Administration in Fiscal Year 2000. This collection of proposals consists of four new submittals (20011, 20052, 20107, 20120) and six renewals (9007700, 9306000, 9702400, 9702600, 9801400, 9900300). A full description of each one of these submittals can be accessed at the Bonneville web site www.efw.bpa.gov/Environment/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2000/2000cd/readme.htm

The total funding requested for these projects in Fiscal Year 2000 adds up to \$7,814,967. Funding for these projects is made available by the Bonneville Power Administration through the direct fish and wildlife budget or through a budget reserve for activities related to the satisfaction of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). There are two important caveats that apply to these budget figures. First, while a significant portion of this budget request will be applied *directly* to estuarine or ocean studies, it is important to understand that some of this funding supports activities elsewhere in the system. The northern pikeminnow management program is a good example of this, since it includes the removal of these predators that consume salmon smolts in the estuary as well as in other reservoirs along the Columbia River mainstem. Thus, the budget figures presented in Table 1 do not reflect solely investments in the estuary and nearshore areas.

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

The second caveat refers to *indirect* investments to cope with ocean variability. Ironically, this portion of the funding is very significant, yet hard to calculate. The large family of projects throughout the basin that are implemented to maintain or enhance a rich salmonid life history diversity are a good illustration of this point. The Council believes that maintaining a diversity of life history types and species is an effective strategy for salmonids to withstand environmental variation of any kind, whether observed in marine or freshwater locations. An expensive network of artificial production facilities and related research and monitoring are a good example of these regional efforts. The Council, along with other entities in the region, have developed guidelines for artificial production in the region designed to maintain biological diversity of artificially supported populations. Because of the subtle and complex connection between such projects and the variability of the ocean, those costs are not included in table 1.

In terms of regional endorsement and scientific review, the proposals listed in table 1 received mixed comments and degrees of support by the fish and wildlife managers of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) and the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP), during their review of submittals for Fiscal Year 2000. The sequence and outcome of these reviews can be found at www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2000/index.html

During 1998, the Council recommended the funding of a new study to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the biological requirements of different salmonid life histories under current or potential in-river mitigation strategies, and impacts of ocean conditions, whether manifested in the estuary or coastal ocean. The Council's Annual Implementation Work Plan for Fiscal Year 1998 identified near-ocean and estuary research as a new research initiative, at a suggested cost of \$150,000 from Bonneville's direct fish and wildlife budget. The study, "*Impacts of hydroelectric development and operation on the Columbia River estuary and nearshore plume*" (project 9800404), was originally conceived as a target for an open solicitation process. Almost simultaneously, however, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) announced the initiation of a long-term study in the estuary and plume of the Columbia River (9801400, listed in table 1). Because of the close relationship between the Council's proposed study (9800404) and the effort by NMFS, a decision was made to merge both needs under the common umbrella provided by project 9801400. The original analysis and report envisioned under 9800404 still maintained an identity of its own and is expected to be completed by March 2000.

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

Table 1. Proposals for estuary, nearshore and ocean studies submitted for funding by the Bonneville Power Administration in Fiscal Year 2000.

| ID | Title | Sponsor | Sponsor FY00 Request | CBFW A Tier 4/16/99 | CBFWA Recomm. 4/16/99 | ISRP Final Recom m. | COUNC IL FY00 Recomm. |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| 20011 | Evaluate Whole System Effects On Migration And Survival Of Juvenile Salmon | Oregon Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit | \$400,698 | 2 | \$0 | Do not fund | \$0 |
| 20052 | Strategies To Limit Disease Effects On Estuarine Survival | Oregon State University, NMFS | \$334,178 | 2 | \$0 | Rank 34/42 | Under review |
| 20107 | Reconnect The Westport Slough To The Clatskanie River | Lower Columbia River Watershed Council | \$29,850 | 3 | \$0 | Rank 17/42 | Under review |
| 20120 | Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum Salmon Populations | USFWS | \$189,853 | 1 | \$189,853 | Fund | \$189,853 |
| 9007700 | Northern Pikeminnow Management Program | Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission | \$3,306,000 | 1 | \$2,506,000 | Fund | \$2,506,000 |
| 9306000 | Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project | ODFW, WDFW, Clatsop County Economic Development Council | \$1,500,000 | 1 | \$1,400,000 | Fund for 1 year | \$1,400,000 |
| 9702400 | Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River | Oregon State University/Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission | \$642,600 | 1 | \$642,600 | Fund in Part | \$642,600 |
| 9702600 | Ecology Of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence On Salmonid Ocean Survival | NMFS | \$200,000 | 1 | \$0 (ESA funds) | Fund | \$0 |
| 9801400 | Ocean Survival Of Juvenile Salmonids In The Columbia River Plume | NMFS | \$826,000 | 1 | \$0 (ESA funds) | Fund in Part | \$0 |
| 9900300 | Evaluate Spawning Of Salmon Below The Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams | WDFW, ODFW, USFWS, Pacific Northwest National Lab. | \$385,788 | 1 | \$355,838 | Fund | \$355,838 |
| | Direct Fish and Wildlife Funds | | \$6,788,967 | | \$5,094,291 | | \$5,094,291 |
| | ESA | | \$1,026,000 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | TOTAL | | \$7,814,967 | | \$5,094,291 | | \$5,094,291 |

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

2. Council's convention of an Ocean Symposium

In an effort to make sensible and educated progress toward our broader view of salmon management, the Council sponsored a *Symposium on Ocean Conditions and the Management of Columbia River Salmon*, on July 1, 1999. This event was convened to underscore and discuss contemporary regional perceptions about the interaction between salmon and a variable ocean environment.

The symposium continued the pattern of responsiveness initiated by the Council since the release of an issue paper entitled “*Consideration of ocean conditions in the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*” (Issue Paper 97-6, posted on www.nwppc.org/ocpaper4). The issue paper was prepared and adopted as policy by the Council in June 1997, in response to the amendment of the Northwest Power Act. Briefly, this Issue Paper stated two general principles to guide the Council in the consideration of ocean impacts. The first concept consisted of a recognition that the estuary and near-shore plume are important ecological environments for salmon, and that natural events, river management actions and local actions critically impact them. The second concept was one that promotes salmon life-history diversity. This survival strategy is the natural mechanism that evolved in salmon in response to changing environmental conditions. Since the release of the Council's issue paper, these principles have received scientific peer review and have been added to the available scientific literature.²

The day-long symposium of July 1 gathered a select group of experts who included leading authorities in the fields of climatology, oceanography and fishery sciences, to expand many of the arguments, emphasize fundamental principles and provide a more detailed account of current thinking regarding the variability of the marine environment. In particular, the notion of *environmental variability* and *life history diversity* captured most of the day's discussion. The end result, was a unanimous recognition that the focus of salmon management should incorporate these two concepts. This general conclusion is consistent with the considerations adopted by the Council in its 1997 issue paper.

Over 100 representatives of federal, state, and tribal entities, members of the public, and private interests attended the event. The list of presenters at the symposium included: Daniel Bottom (Oregon State University), Richard Beamish (Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans), Ed Casillas (National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Fisheries Science Center), Robert Francis (University of Washington), John “Jack” Helle (National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Science Center), and George Taylor (Oregon State University). In addition, some of the top resource administrators in the region proposed some provocative questions on how to incorporate current scientific understanding about the variability of conditions in the marine environment into salmon management. The collective concerns, contributions, and perceptions of all of those who attended the symposium are recorded in: *Ocean Conditions and the Management of Columbia River Salmon: Proceedings of a Symposium* (Council Document No. 99-11, released on August 16, 1999, and posted on www.nwppc.org/ocean.htm).

² Bisbal, G.A. and W.E. McConaha. 1998. Consideration of ocean conditions in the management of salmon. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 55(9):2178-2186.

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

3. Council efforts: Multi-species Framework Project, Artificial Production Review, and Fish and Wildlife Program amendment process

The Columbia River Multi-Species Framework Project (*Northwest Power Planning Council, An integrated framework for fish and wildlife management in the Columbia River Basin*, Document No. 97-2 (1997), www.nwframework.org/) was an effort concluded in December 1999 to address the problems of scale and purpose for fish and wildlife planning in the Columbia River Basin. The Framework connects a vision, which describes what the region is trying to accomplish in regard to fish and wildlife, the biological objectives, which describe the ecological conditions we need, and the strategies, which describe a set of actions applied to the system. These three elements of the Framework are linked through a scientific foundation. The scientific foundation provides a set of scientific principles (currently eight) that describe our view of how species, including humans, relate to their environment. These statements are global in nature and are well grounded in the scientific literature.

One of these scientific principles states that “biological diversity accommodates environmental variation.” These variations in both the ocean and freshwater conditions are now accepted as integral components of the salmon ecosystem. The natural strategy utilized by salmon to negotiate this variability is through a diverse pool of life history traits, such as migration and spawning time, size of individuals, growth patterns, maturation rates, etc. This diversity allows for the survival of different populations as the environment shifts over time. As some populations suffer under a particular set of environmental conditions, others fare better. This principle received early recognition and endorsement by the Council and became one of the main pronouncements contained in its 1997 issue paper.

More recently, the Council completed a report that focuses on the use of hatcheries to rebuild fish populations in the Columbia River Basin (*Artificial Production Review*, Council Document No. 99-15, November 15, 1999, www.nwppc.org/99-15.htm). The report acknowledges that decisions to apply artificial intervention need to be made in a scientifically sound manner by addressing specific biological problems. These considerations are captured in a set of production policies that provide guidance for production efforts in the basin. One of these policies maintains that “a diversity of life history types and species needs to be maintained in order to sustain a system of populations in the face of environmental variation.” This statement follows recent scientific reviews that suggest that effective restoration of fish populations to the Columbia River may depend far more on protecting and restoring biological diversity and habitat than simply increasing abundance. A central management consideration in all artificial production should be to minimize adverse effects on biological diversity and, to the extent possible, to use the artificial production tool to help reverse declines in biological diversity.

Both the Multi-Species Framework and the Artificial Production Review are cooperative efforts of state, federal and tribal natural resource managers organized by the Council to provide the basis for development of a revised version of the Council’s program. In the revised fish and wildlife program, the Council intends to develop and implement the framework concept at three geographic levels -- the *basin* as a whole, including the estuary; subdivisions of the basin called “*ecological provinces*”; and *subbasins* that are components of each province. These nested geographic scales are linked to a long-term, large-scale vision for the basin. The “multi-species”

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

aspect reflects our emphasis on breaking down the usual demarcations between terrestrial and aquatic management and between management of anadromous versus resident fish. In the context of this effort, the Columbia River ecosystem is defined as the watershed of the Columbia River and marine areas frequented by anadromous salmon, lamprey and sturgeon. Currently, a total of 10 ecological provinces will be considered. Five of these areas correspond to “marine” areas: 1) Transitional, 2) Dilute (which includes the Columbia River plume), 3) Ridge, 4) Coastal Upwelling, and 5) Coastal Downwelling. A sixth area, the Lower Columbia River province, includes the river’s estuary.

The Council opened its fish and wildlife program for revisions and public comment, in the first quarter of 2000. Once the program is reorganized according to a framework of goals, ecological objectives, and strategies that provide a logical structure for regional planning, conditions will improve significantly for making year-to-year implementation, operational, and funding decisions. This improvement should also enhance the Council’s ability to evaluate the success of all actions taken under the program, including those that concern the estuary, nearshore, and ocean.

4. ISAB review of estuary work

In October, 1999, the Council requested that the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) undertake a review of the impacts of estuarine conditions and management on the Council’s mission to “...*protect, mitigate and enhance*...” fish and wildlife in the Columbia River as affected by development and operation of the hydroelectric system. The ISAB is a panel of 10 independent, nationally-recognized scientists that advises both the Council and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

The review should examine the impact of past, on-going and planned development and management of the estuary on the effectiveness of actions taken upstream, especially those encompassed by the Council’s fish and wildlife program. This effort should also provide input regarding the impact of current and expected actions in the estuary such as dredging and channel maintenance, and suggest ideas that might be included in the Council’s program. The ISAB is expected to provide its proposal for the review at the Council’s meeting in January 2000.

5. Relevant efforts by other agencies

The interest to consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations is not exclusive to the Council’s agenda. Several multidisciplinary efforts and programs, whether regional, national, or international, continue to devote significant efforts on research, monitoring and evaluation to understand the forces driving variability in the northeastern Pacific Ocean and how these affect ecosystem productivity. The 1997 Council’s issue paper described some of these contemporary initiatives. The Council continues to learn about the progress and accomplishments of these efforts and explores possibilities for cooperation and interaction. Staff continues to monitor these and other activities and keep the Council informed of significant developments. What follows is a sample --not intended to be an exhaustive list-- of current relevant efforts:

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| TITLE | The U.S. Global Ocean Ecosystems Dynamics (U.S. GLOBEC) |
| WEB SITE | www.usglobec.org |
| SPONSOR | U.S. National Science Foundation Division of Ocean Sciences, and the Coastal Ocean Program Office(COP) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) |
| CONTACT | Michael Fogarty (<i>Chair</i>), University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, P.O. Box 38 / One Williams Street Solomons, MD 20688, phone: (410) 326-7290, Fax: (410) 326-7318, e-mail: fogarty@cbl.cees.edu |

Brief description: U.S GLOBEC is a research program organized by oceanographers and fisheries scientists to address the question of how global climate change may affect the abundance and production of animals in the sea. The program currently has major research efforts underway in several regions, including the Northeast Pacific (with components in the California Current and in the Coastal Gulf of Alaska).

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| TITLE | North Pacific Marine Science Organization – PICES |
| WEB SITE | http://pices.ios.bc.ca/ |
| SPONSOR | Canada, People's Republic of China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, and the United States of America |
| CONTACT | PICES Secretariat, Institute of Ocean Sciences, P.O. Box 6000, Sidney, B.C., Canada V8L 4B2, phone: (250) 363-6366, Fax: (250) 363-6827, e-mail: pices@ios.bc.ca |

Brief description: PICES is an intergovernmental scientific organization that was established and held its first meetings in 1992. The purposes of the Organization are to 1) promote and coordinate marine research in the northern North Pacific and adjacent seas especially northward of 30 degrees North; 2) advance scientific knowledge about the ocean environment, global weather and climate change, living resources and their ecosystems, and the impacts of human activities; and 3) promote the collection and rapid exchange of scientific information on these issues. The PICES approach is multidisciplinary, with standing committees concerned with biological oceanography, fishery science, physical oceanography and climate, and marine environmental quality.

In 1993, PICES and GLOBEC agreed to organize an international science program on Climate Change and Carrying Capacity (CCCC) in the temperate and subarctic regions of the North Pacific Ocean (<http://pices.ios.bc.ca/cccc/ccccf.htm>). The CCCC Program addresses how climate change affects ecosystem structure and the productivity of key biological species at all trophic levels in the open ocean and coastal North Pacific ecosystems. There is a strong emphasis on the coupling between atmospheric and oceanic processes, their impacts on the production of major living marine resources, and how they respond to climate change on time scales of seasons to centuries. Implementation of the CCCC program was approved in 1995.

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| TITLE | North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission - NPAFC |
| WEB SITE | www.npafc.org |
| SPONSOR | Canada, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the United States |
| CONTACT | North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission, Suite 502, 889 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., V6C 3B2, phone: (604) 775-5550, Fax: (604) 775-5577, e-mail: secretariat@npafc.org |

Brief description: NPAFC was established under the Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean, signed on February 11, 1992 and entered into force on February 16, 1993. Its objective is to promote the conservation of anadromous stocks in waters of the North Pacific Ocean and its adjacent seas, north of 33 degrees north latitude beyond 200-miles zones of the coastal member countries. Conservation measures under the Convention include the (i) Prohibition of directed fishing for anadromous fish in the Convention Area, (ii) Minimization to the maximum extent of the incidental taking of anadromous fish, and (iii) Prohibition of the retention on board a fishing vessel of anadromous fish taken as an incidental catch during fishing for non-anadromous fish. The Convention authorizes fishing for anadromous fish in the Convention Area for scientific research purposes under national and joint research programs approved by the Commission. The parties also cooperate in collecting, reporting and exchanging biostatistical information, fisheries data, including catch and fishing effort statistics, biological samples and other relevant data pertinent to the purposes of the Convention. Each party is vested with enforcement authority to board, inspect and detain fishing vessels of the other parties found operating in violation of the Convention. The parties cooperate in exchange of information on any violation of the provisions of the Convention and on enforcement action.

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| TITLE | National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Fisheries Science Center |
| WEB SITE | www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/nwfsc-homepage.html |
| SPONSOR | U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) |
| CONTACT | Usha Varanasi, Science and Research Director, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112, phone: (206) 860-3200, Fax: (206) 860-3217, e-mail: usha.varanasi@noaa.gov |

Brief description: The Northwest Fisheries Science Center is the Pacific Northwest regional research center of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and is responsible for providing scientific and technical support for the management, conservation, and development of the Pacific Northwest region's anadromous and marine fishery resources. The Center conducts research programs to develop the scientific base required for reports on status of stocks and of fisheries, environmental assessment and environmental impact statements for management plans and international negotiations; and pursues research to answer specific management needs in habitat conservation, endangered and protected species, aquaculture, and full utilization of harvested fish. Its multidisciplinary research--involving fisheries science, marine biology and ecology, genetics, biochemistry, molecular biology, oceanography, and aquaculture--is conducted in cooperation with other agencies (federal, state, local, and tribal), universities throughout the world, Pacific Rim and European countries.

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| TITLE | PMEL - Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory |
| WEB SITE | www.pmel.noaa.gov/ |
| SPONSOR | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration |
| CONTACT | Eddie Bernard (<i>Director</i>), Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, NOAA R/PMEL, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115, phone: (206) 526-6800, Fax: (206) 526-4576, e-mail: Eddie.Bernard@noaa.gov |

Brief description: PMEL carries out interdisciplinary scientific investigations in oceanography, marine meteorology, and related subjects. Current PMEL programs focus on coastal and open ocean observations in support of prediction of the ocean environment on time scales from days to decades. Studies are conducted to improve our understanding of the complex physical and geochemical processes operating in the world oceans, to define the forcing functions and the processes driving ocean circulation and the global climate system, and to improve environmental forecasting capabilities and other supporting services for marine commerce and fisheries. The laboratory participates in the Joint Institute for Study of the Atmosphere and Ocean (JISAO), a collaborative effort with scientists from the University of Washington, launched to study the global climate system and its sensitivity to human activities. The laboratory also conducts complementary research programs with the Cooperative Institute for Marine Resources Studies (CIMRS), a joint institute between Oregon State University and the National Marine Fisheries Service, on living and non-living components of the marine and estuarine environments of the eastern Pacific Ocean from northern California to the Bering Sea.

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| TITLE | The Lower Columbia River Estuary Program – LCREP |
| WEB SITE | www.lcrep.org/ |
| SPONSOR | Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and States of Oregon and Washington |
| CONTACT | Debrah Richard Marriott (Director), Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204, phone: (503) 229-5421, fax: (503) 229-5214, or e-mail: marriott.debrah@deq.state.or.us |

Brief description: The 1990-1996 Lower Columbia River Bi-State Program identified the Columbia River estuary's major problems, including water quality, toxic contaminants in sediment and fish tissue, habitat loss and modification and declines in fish and wildlife. In 1995, the Lower Columbia River was entered into the National Estuary Program (NEP). The NEP was created in 1987 through amendments to the federal Clean Water Act to “*protect estuaries of national significance that are threatened by degradation caused by human activity*”. In 1999 an implementation committee with representation from business and industry, recreational and environmental interests, commercial fishing, agriculture, forestry, the public, and local, tribal, state and federal governments, signed a plan to restore the vitality of the Lower Columbia ecosystem. This committee approved a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan which includes actions over about 4,300 square miles, including coastal waters to the three-mile limit off the river's mouth and extending 146 miles upstream to the Bonneville Dam. The actions are separated into three categories. Twelve actions suggest changes to land use that ensure habitat protection as well as actions to restore damaged habitat. Fifteen actions propose public education and better coordination between government agencies. Finally, 15 more actions are to reduce pollutants (toxic, elevated temperature and bacteria).

PART 4: – OCEAN CONDITIONS

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| TITLE | The Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce - CREST |
| WEB SITE | www.oregonvos.net/~crest/ |
| SPONSOR | Council of Governments that includes the local counties, cities, and port districts surrounding the Columbia River Estuary in Oregon and Washington |
| CONTACT | Kathy Taylor, Executive Director, 750 Commercial Street, Room 205, Astoria, OR 97103, phone (503) 325-0435, fax: (503) 325-0459, or e-mail: crest@OregonVOS.net |

Brief description: CREST is a Council of Governments which includes the local counties, cities, and port districts surrounding the Columbia River Estuary in both Oregon and Washington. CREST was initially formed in 1974 and current members include Clatsop, Wahkiakum, and Pacific Counties; the cities of Astoria, Warrenton, Ilwaco, and Seaside; the Port districts of Astoria, Ilwaco, and Wahkiakum (No.2); and Clatsop Soil and Water Conservation District. CREST is not a regulatory agency; instead it provides a forum for members to identify and discuss issues of regional importance; to monitor and comment on governmental activities related to the development and management of the natural, economic, and human resources of the Columbia River estuary. It also provides coastal and estuarine technical services for members; coordinates activities between local, state, and federal agencies; and provides information, maps, and educational materials to citizens of the region. CREST now assists local jurisdictions with permitting issues, zoning ordinance, comprehensive plan and shoreline master plan amendments, estuarine impact analysis, wetlands issues, dredging issues, and water quality issues. CREST is cooperating with the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program (LCREP) to coordinate volunteer monitoring efforts and to implement a voluntary wetland protection and enhancement program within the Columbia River estuary.

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| TITLE | The Columbia River Channel Improvement Study |
| WEB SITE | http://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/pm/projects/crnci/ |
| SPONSOR | Portland District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and seven lower Columbia River ports |
| CONTACT | Laura Hicks, project manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, CENPP-PM, P.O. Box 2946, Portland, OR 97208, phone: (503) 808-4705, fax: (503) 326-6106, or e-mail: Laura.L.Hicks@usace.army.mil . |

Brief description: On August 1999, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released its draft Integrated Feasibility Report for Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement: Columbia and Lower Willamette River Federal Navigation Channel. This document recommends deepening 105 miles of the Columbia River channel, between Portland and Astoria from its 40-foot depth to a depth of 43 feet to accommodate larger, deep-draft ships. The cost of the project is \$196 million. Congressional authorization for these funds was granted in the spring of 1999. A federal appropriation is necessary after the final Chief of Engineers' report is forwarded to Congress in 2000. Actual deepening of the channel is expected to begin in November 2001. The Corps is currently waiting for two biological opinions: One for the effects the 43-foot channel deepening project would have on fish and wildlife, and the other for the Corps' channel maintenance program, an ongoing dredging program that maintains the current 40-foot-deep channel.

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

PART 5 “Cost-effective Measures” Determination

Under the 1996 amendment to the Northwest Power Act, the Council must, in making its fish and wildlife project funding recommendations to Bonneville, “determine whether the projects employ cost effective measures to achieve program objectives.” The scientific review by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (Scientific Panel, also known as the ISRP) and the Council’s cost-effectiveness review together should greatly increase the likelihood that projects funded will be biologically promising and economically sound.

As noted in previous years, the legislation did not specify any particular approach to cost-effectiveness analysis. It does not require, for example, the use of a single measure of biological effectiveness as a basis for comparison among projects, nor the use of strictly quantitative analysis. Because of this, the Council has taken several steps over the past three years to understand the state of the art in natural resource economics and cost-effectiveness analysis to make the determination required by the Power Act.

First, the Council established an Independent Economic Analysis Board (Economic Board, also known as the IEAB) to provide advice on and improve economic analysis of fish and wildlife recovery measures. The Economic Board members have substantial experience in areas of natural resource economics; irrigation and agricultural economics; water use and policy; river transportation economics; fishery economics; local-area economic impact assessment; non-market valuation of natural resources; electricity system configuration and economics; and U. S. Army Corps of Engineers hydroelectric project evaluation. The Economic Board has helped the Council determine how to analyze the proposed projects and make funding recommendations that are consistent with the statute’s call for cost-effectiveness review.

Second, the Council produced, with the Economic Board’s help, a discussion of “Methods of Economic Analysis for Salmon Recovery Programs” (July 30, 1997, Council Document No. 97-12), for the purposes of initiating the cost-effectiveness review in Fiscal Year 1998. The Economic Board reviewed the paper and supported the analysis and conclusions. The methods analysis concluded that several problems make it difficult for the Council to undertake a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison among fish and wildlife projects using a single, quantified, measure of benefits to determine which projects produce the greatest benefit per dollar. The problems include the lack of agreement on measures of biological effectiveness; the fact that the complex life-cycle of anadromous and resident fish makes it difficult to isolate the biological effects of particular activities or to compare different biological effects of different kinds of projects; and the fact that in the prioritization process, different project sponsors provide different kinds of cost and economic information, which makes cost comparisons difficult.

Based on the methods analysis and the Economic Board’s advice, the Council concluded in the past two years that it could not undertake a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison of the projects, primarily due to the inability to quantify the expected benefits of particular projects. The Council reached the same conclusion for Fiscal Year 2000. Whether this will be possible in future years is still not known. A quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison would require a far greater understanding of the biological effectiveness of actions than we have now. It would also require a better defined set of biological goals and objectives for the Council’s Program to be able to make a quantified analysis of

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

whether projects are cost effective in meeting “program objectives.” The Council, the ISRP and the Economic Board have all urged the development of a more coherent analytical framework for the Fish and Wildlife Program. A clearer, more comprehensive Program framework could provide a sounder basis for establishing measures of effectiveness, perhaps allowing in the future for a multi-variable quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison of projects as described in the Council’s methods paper. Beginning at the end of Fiscal Year 1998, and continuing into Fiscal Year 2000, the Council, in cooperation with the other governments in the basin, has initiated such a framework development process -- the Multi-Species Framework project. The Council then intends to revise the fish and wildlife program in 2000 into a framework of goals and objectives built upon an explicit scientific foundation.

Council proposal to clarify program objectives

Based in large part on the information gathered in the Multi-Species Framework project, the Council is convinced now more than ever that a better defined set of program objectives is desirable and achievable. The Council opened its program amendment process February 2000, and will be seeking to adopt a program with much more clearly identifiable objectives. More specifically, the Council has been exploring with the region a proposal for structuring the next program principally as a three-tiered framework. That framework will include goals and objectives established for the basin as a whole, goals and objectives for 10 provinces within the basin, and goals and objectives for each subbasin. The goals and objectives for each subbasin would need to be consistent with the goals and objectives for the province in which it is located, and each province must have goals and objectives that are consistent with the basin wide goals and objectives. While the Council cannot be certain that the region will ultimately call for this type of program format, this construct has been discussed in the Multi-Species Framework project and other arenas, and the Council believes that there is broad concept level support in the region for such a model.

The Council does not intend to suggest here that the purpose of pursuing a more definitive framework and biological objectives for the program will ensure that a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison can or will be completed for the annual project selection process after the program is amended. The challenges in quantifying expected benefits of proposed projects will remain even if the program objectives are clarified as desired. However, the Council does believe that more definitive program objectives, and the requirement for goals and objectives at all three geographic scales contemplated for the program to be “consistent,” will permit a much more transparent and rigorous qualitative review of the cost-effectiveness of projects proposed each year. This will be achieved by requiring that individual projects specify how their proposed activities seek to implement the applicable subbasin goals and objectives. With all projects in any subbasin specifying how they expect to meet the goals and objectives in a subbasin, the ISRP and Council will be able to better assess their alternatives presented by the proposed projects, including the costs.

Cost-effectiveness through project review, selection and management procedures -- continuing to refine and build upon strategies identified in the methods analysis.

As highlighted in the past two years, there is more to cost effectiveness than a quantitative comparison of the costs of alternative ways to achieve a single biological objective. Cost-effectiveness review may suggest procedures for project review, selection and management that emphasize efficiency and accountability, making it more likely that projects funded will be effective and efficient, even if these changes cannot be reliably quantified. The methods analysis completed two years ago recommended four strategies to help improve the cost-effectiveness of projects proposed for funding: emphasizing the role of independent scientific review in increasing the cost

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

effectiveness of the Council's program; improving the level and nature of cost information provided; evaluating the results of specific projects; and improving contract selection and management procedures. As in previous years, a description of what the Council has done and is doing to implement these strategies is the bulk of this year's statement. The Council does believe that it has made significant progress on several of the cost-effectiveness strategies in the Fiscal Year 2000 project selection and review process.

Role of independent science review in the cost-effectiveness review. The purpose of the ISRP is to provide an independent scientific assessment of the biological effectiveness of the proposed projects. The independent science review process has proven useful in raising questions about the effectiveness of certain types of projects, project management and funding priorities.

Like last year, the ISRP reviewed each project that was proposed for Fiscal Year 2000 funding, and provided project-specific comments for every proposal. The ISRP used a different rating system than in the past two years, seeking to be very specific as to whether or not it found each project to meet the statutory review criteria. If the ISRP found the project wholly satisfactory, it rated it as "fund." If the project was found to out of sequence with what the ISRP believed was a necessary planning step, it was rated "delay," and the ISRP stated what planning step should proceed implementation of the project. If a part of the project was found to meet the Act's standards, but another part found deficient, it was rated "fund in part." Finally, if a project was found not to meet the review standards, the ISRP rated it as "do not fund." This change in the rating categories brought much more transparency and definition to the proposals than in previous reviews.

Two examples of how the ISRP's modified rating system for Fiscal Year 2000 projects improved the ability to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the projects stand out. First, as in previous years, the ISRP paid close attention to the statutory review criterion that projects must have "clearly defined objectives and outcomes with provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results. In many cases, proposals were not rated as "fund" because the ISRP found that they did not satisfy this requirement. The ISRP was very explicit in many of its recommendations that this was the area where a project was found deficient. The ISRP's criticism with regard to reporting and evaluation of results is consistent with the Power Act amendment's charge to the ISRP to focus attention on improving monitoring and evaluation (that is, the ISRP's funding recommendations are to include a determination that projects have "clearly defined objectives and outcomes with provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results"). This is a further step toward improving our long-term understanding of the effectiveness of projects that implement the Council's program.

Second, the ISRP's use of the "delay" rating advanced the ability of the Council to consider the cost-effectiveness of the proposed projects. As explained above, the ISRP used the "delay" rating primarily in those instances where a project appeared to be out of phase with what the ISRP believed to be a necessary planning or design requirement. For example, the ISRP found that several projects proposed significant new activities or a major expansion of activities in a subbasin, but that a subbasin plan or assessment had not been done to determine if the proposed project was the most appropriate strategy for addressing the fish and wildlife needs for the area. The implications for the cost-effectiveness evaluation of such projects are obvious -- without an assessment or plan for the subbasin establishing the goals and objectives for the subbasin, and identifying the factors limiting fish and wildlife productivity, it is unclear if the proposed project advanced the appropriate objectives, or was geared toward addressing the limiting factors. Moreover, without the requisite planning and assessment, the ISRP questioned whether or not the proposed strategies, as opposed to other alternatives available, most effectively advanced the objectives or mitigated limiting factors.

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

The ability to evaluate the potential trade-offs is an important element in seeking cost-effectiveness.

In another example, the ISRP used the “delay” rating where it found that a project dealing with a certain species or type of project did not appear to be coordinated with other projects dealing with similar subject matter. The ISRP noted that the information or benefits sought through projects dealing with similar subjects or experiments would be enhanced through the information exchange and synergies that may be accomplished with better coordination. Again, the Council understood the ISRP’s recommendations for coordination to be directly related to the increased “value” that projects would provide if properly coordinated over that which they would provide if they were not.

The ISRP rated 100 proposals for existing projects recommended by CBFWA (not new for FY 2000) in its June report as “do not fund,” “delay” or “fund in part.” Rather than recommend to Bonneville that it and project sponsors seek to remedy the deficiencies of these projects in the contracting process as it did last year, the Council provided project sponsors an opportunity to address the ISRP comments in additional written submissions. Sponsors were asked to directly respond to the specific criticisms noted by the ISRP. The ISRP then reviewed these proposals a second time, taking into consideration the additional information and/or improvements that were made by the sponsors in their second submission. On October 28, 1999 the ISRP issued a second report, and found that the deficiencies initially noted in its June 15, 1999 report had been adequately remedied for 75 of the 100 proposals. These were rated as “fund.” Thus, referring back to the items discussed above, this new process enabled the great majority of sponsors to provide sufficient information for the ISRP to ultimately find that monitoring and evaluation requirements or planning requirements were in place for the proposed projects.

The combination of further definition in the rating of proposals used by the ISRP, and the second level of comment from sponsors and review by the ISRP substantially increased the Council’s ability to conclude that the projects that it recommended for funding this year are cost-effective.

Improved cost information/increased fiscal review of capital investments and operation and maintenance obligations. A second strategy recommended by the methods analysis has been to bring better cost information into the decisionmaking process. Council staff has worked with Bonneville, the managers and the project sponsors to develop and provide better cost information about projects and about the program allocations in general. This is exemplified by, for example, the improved cost information in the project submissions, in the cost and budget allocation information displayed in CBFWA’s draft implementation workplan and subsequent comments, and in the ISRP’s report.

More important than the simple display of cost information, however, continues to be increased scrutiny of the components of those costs and their long-term financial implications for the Council’s program. Consistent with the Council’s recommendations in Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999, the past year has seen increased fiscal scrutiny by the Council, Bonneville and others during the final design phase of production projects to ensure more attention to capital investment needs and operation and maintenance cost expectations; better descriptions of project-specific operation and maintenance costs overall; compliance with the Council’s direction that the operation and maintenance costs set forth in project descriptions be treated by Bonneville, the managers and the project sponsors as estimates, with the actual budget allocation for operation and maintenance expenses to be determined during contracting; better efforts to develop and stick to a more realistic schedule for the capital investments; and increased consideration of the procedures of “value

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

engineering” to find more cost-effective ways of completing major capital improvements.

One of the methods to bring increased fiscal scrutiny in the interest of ensuring cost-effectiveness that has been developed by the Council since the amendment to the Act that stood out in this year’s project selection process was the use of the interim “3-step review process” that was developed in 1998 for new production projects. These projects tend to be some of the most capital intensive in the program, and also usually require several years to move from concept to operation. In order to bring budget discipline to these larger projects, and reduce the possibility that large investments are irretrievably committed at those early concept phases, the 3-step process segments these proposals into three discreet phases. This segmentation facilitates a more transparent and discreet allocation among conceptual planning, preliminary design, final design and construction, and operational phases of these projects. Each step of the process requires Council approval and scientific review. Further, under this process, the Council approves funding only for the phase or step that the project is in, rather than for all phases as had sometimes been done in the past.

Because of the number of production proposals made this year, the Council relied upon the 3-step review to elucidate more detailed cost information and fiscal review for a significant portion of the proposed Fiscal Year 2000 budget and workplan. In several instances the Council recommended that projects be funded for only the step or phase that was likely to occur over the next year, rather than the combined planning and construction funding recommendations made by project sponsors.

Project review. A third strategy recommended by the Council’s methods analysis is to evaluate the record of existing projects. To reiterate from last year, projects that have been ongoing for some time should have yielded measurable effects or have contributed concrete knowledge about fish and wildlife problems. A sampling of projects could be evaluated to determine what benefits they have yielded for the money expended. This exercise should introduce accountability into the process as well as provide a better understanding of how to specify measurable objectives in future project information sheets. On-going project reviews are essential for an adaptive management approach to program design and implementation.

In the months leading up to the Council’s Fiscal Year 2000 funding recommendations, the Council, as in past years, scrutinized a set of projects for concerns about effectiveness, questions about cost, or both. These included the predator control program, and the captive propagation projects, lamprey projects, gas supersaturation projects, and the Hungry Horse mitigation project. The Council then made use of the results of these reviews in making its funding recommendations this year, as shown throughout the discussion in Part 1(c) above.

Similar effort occurred during Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999-- the Council initiated reviews of several projects or program areas, reviews that resulted in (or may yet result in) better defined and more efficient projects and contributed to the Fiscal Year 2000 funding recommendations. The Council sought to ensure this year that the conditions or guidance that it had outlined in the past two fiscal years had been followed before it would recommend funding, even where the ISRP had rated a project as “fund.”

General project decision rules used by the Council in Fiscal Year 2000

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Another element related to procedures used in project review to advance cost-effectiveness was uniquely applicable to Fiscal Year 2000. That is, the Council initiated a program amendment process in January 2000, and anticipates adopting major revisions to the program in the fall of the year 2000. At the same time, the Council must make recommendations for funding Fiscal Year 2000 projects that will be implemented throughout the year 2000 and, in many cases, beyond. If the proposed amendment schedule that is proposed is met, the projects that the Council recommends this year will outlive the current program. In such a case, if the program adopted next year has objectives and goals that differ from those in the current program (and the Council believes that there is a regional consensus that this is not only a possibility, but a *goal* in the pending amendment) there is a risk that the projects approved this year will not be designed to meet the objectives of the program that will be in place for a significant portion of the projects' duration. Clearly, if a project does not even address the objectives of the program, it certainly cannot be a "cost-effective measure to achieve program objectives."

In an attempt to limit the number of instances where this happens, the Council required a high level of agreement between the ISRP, and the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes as a requisite of a positive funding recommendation. This was especially emphasized in the case of proposed new projects. That is, except in the case of the "innovative" projects recommended by the Council, unless the ISRP and CBFWA both recommended funding for a new project, it would not be funded.

Again, as discussed in Part 1(c) above, the Council sought to employ general rules of decision for Fiscal Year 2000 that harmonized the two statutory obligations that it is simultaneously fulfilling over the coming months. The discussion contained in Part 1(a), "A Program In Transition," and Part 1(b) in the "General Discussion" sections provides additional explanation of the how the Council's project selection decision rules were adopted to reconcile what could be incompatible obligations presented uniquely this year. Those sections are incorporated into this Part 4, "Cost-Effectiveness Determination," section by this reference.

Improvements in contract selection and management/contract management review and audits. A fourth strategy developed out of recommendations in the economic analysis paper has been to improve the procedures for selecting and managing contracts and reviewing contract management. In regard to project selection, the Council continued an initiative started in Fiscal Year 1999 to attempt to fund innovative proposals as a means to bring promising new concepts or methods into the program, and/or to make the process more accessible to entities that are not members of CBFWA . This year the Council asked the ISRP to prioritize a group of 42 proposals that the ISRP found to be either innovative, or deserving higher priority than had been assigned by CBFWA in its proposed workplan.

Using \$2 million as a planning target, the Council recommended that as many as the top 11 projects on the ISRP-prioritized list be provided funding in the nature of "grant funding" to prove the value of the concepts being proposed. The ISRP was asked to give the highest priority to projects that: 1) represented an initial scoping effort tied to unimplemented elements of the program; 2) offered a promising approach to improve upon existing projects; 3) provided systemwide, or at least subbasin wide significance, as distinguished from primarily site-specific significance; and 4) advanced critical assessment or planning tasks in watersheds or subbasins in which the ISRP found these elements deficient. The Council believes that the continuation of this process, and the search for projects that meet these criteria is an important contribution toward satisfying its obligation to recommend cost-effective projects for funding.

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Reviews of contract management procedures and audits of specific contracts are another tool for increasing the overall efficiency of the Program. As discussed in last year's cost-effectiveness determination document, the Council retained an independent accounting firm, Moss-Adams LLP, to review a representative set of Bonneville fish and wildlife contracts in Fiscal Year 1998. The purpose of this review was not to evaluate these projects as much as to evaluate Bonneville's contract management process, to see if the appropriate controls and procedures were in place. The Council asked the auditor to investigate whether the contracting process contained the procedures necessary to manage a project's cost and effectiveness, such as whether projects are held to schedule and cost estimates, whether projects are allowed to change in scope, activities, or budget without policy review, and whether there are clear review responsibilities for contract managers, especially to determine if project sponsors report results consistent with the stated objectives for the project.

Moss-Adams completed the report in December 1997, "*Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Management Review of Contracting Processes.*" Moss-Adams recommended that Bonneville make several changes in its contract selection and management procedures, such as to make more use of a competitive solicitation process to request proposals for implementing priority projects; modify its agency purchasing instructions to strengthen procurement and contract administration; develop a transition mechanism for funding maintenance and operation costs; establish minimum information requirements for contractor statements and progress reporting; and evaluate certain opportunities to reorganize contract administration personnel to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of contracting activities.

Consistent with these recommendations, and particularly that related to information requirements and contract reporting, the Council has recommended fiscal accountability provisions for contract management in Fiscal Year 2000. The Council put special emphasis on this element in Fiscal Year 2000 because since the initiation of the regional project selection process, it has had to respond to a number of unanticipated increases in project costs. These are instances where planned construction and implementation costs are exceeded, sometimes, dramatically, by actual costs once full planning and design is completed. The Council's staff, the Authority and Bonneville have attempted to address these issues in recent years through discussions of improvements in project management practices, budgeting procedures and a sequenced review process in the case of artificial production projects. To bring more specificity to project planning and budgeting, the Council recommended the following project management practices apply to all projects recommended for funding this year and in future years:

1) For projects involving construction or specific implementation measures of more than \$250,000, Bonneville should develop separate statements of work for each major phase of the project, including, but not limited, to the following;

- feasibility review
- planning and design (including NEPA)
- construction
- operations and maintenance
- monitoring and evaluation.

Budgets for each phase should be based on the specific scope of the tasks identified in the project proposals and remain collectively consistent with the overall budget recommended for the entire

PART 5: – COST-EFFECTIVENESS

project. Budgets for each phase should be maintained as separate project line items so that transfers of budgets between the project elements would only be permitted after review and recommendation by the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority and the Council. The Council staff intends to discuss with the Council a mechanism to provide a more expeditious review of these transfers in certain specified instances and will work with Bonneville staff in developing such a proposal.

2) As part of the contract, the statement of work for each phase should include the following:

- Specific timelines and schedules for deliverables; i.e. length of time to produce a master plan or a final project design.
- Contractor billings that are specific to tasks or objectives outlined in the statement of work for each specific phase and reflect the actual cost of the project elements.

The purpose of this guidance is to build into the contracting process procedures that will provide more immediate signals when actual project costs are beginning to diverge from the budgets anticipated in the project selection process. The Council hopes that such mechanisms improve the Council's and Bonneville's ability to maintain project implementation consistently with the agreed-upon scope and schedule and to more efficiently identify significant revisions to the projects that would otherwise result in unanticipated cost increases.

What all of these activities add up to is that the Council's fish and wildlife program, as implemented and funded through the set of projects, is being more closely scrutinized than before in terms of effectiveness, accountability, cost, and efficiency, although much still needs to be done. One result should be a program that is more cost-effective, satisfying the direction of Congress in the 1996 Power Act amendment. The Council makes this conclusion while recognizing that improvements in cost-effectiveness have not and cannot be quantified. As discussed in the first portion of this document, what is especially lacking is a satisfactory way of understanding and measuring the biological effectiveness of particular projects or of the program as a whole, as well as a comprehensive and consistent framework of goals and objectives for the Program that could be based on a better understanding of biological effectiveness. The Council believes that it has made significant progress in this area in Fiscal Year 2000 in advancing efforts to develop a multi-species scientific framework for the Council's program and fish and wildlife restoration in the basin as a whole.