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# I. Introduction

For 25 years, the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) has supported a diverse range of research to pursue the biological objectives of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (program). Research is necessary to provide scientifically credible answers to questions addressing uncertainties pertinent to management. The term “research” is defined broadly to include parameter estimation, pattern recognition, observation, categorization, data collection to quantify important relationships and processes, tests of hypotheses, and improvements in statistical methods.

Research projects implemented under the program and others in the Columbia River Basin have advanced scientific understanding of fish and wildlife and their restoration. Despite this concerted effort, critical uncertainties remain and research lacks focus. Consequently, the Council requested development of a Columbia River Basin Research Plan (research plan) in the 2000 Program to guide the development of its research program and to foster collaboration with the research programs of the other resource management entities within the region. (For additional explanation of the context for the research plan, see Appendix A.). The 2009 Program recommended that the 2006 Research Plan be updated.

## Vision Statement

*The research plan will inform decision-making and management actions to conserve and recover fish and wildlife addressed in the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program by identifying and helping to resolve critical uncertainties.*

The research plan identifies 12 major research themes and critical uncertainties posed as questions. In so doing, the research plan provides guidance for addressing key uncertainties that affect anadromous fish, resident fish, wildlife, and the ecosystems that support them. The research plan will help the Council manage the program by informing decision-making, facilitating scientific review, focusing project selection, providing a basis for redirecting future research, and making the program more effective.

## Scope and Audience of the Columbia River Basin Research Plan

The geographic scope of the research plan is limited to the Columbia River Basin. The primary audience for the research plan is policy- and decision-makers responsible for natural resource management within the Columbia River Basin, such as the Council members and regional executives. The research plan also will provide guidance useful to researchers, project sponsors, and planners. The research plan provides a programmatic framework for research under the program and associates the research needed for recovery planning under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) with the broader responsibilities of the program.

In addition to improving implementation of the program, the research plan forges links to the research activity of the many parties that share responsibility for fish and wildlife management in the Columbia River Basin. For example, Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) and its funding of the Council program supports the work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, NOAA Fisheries, Environmental Protection Agency, and land management agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service, and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. The Columbia Basin tribes, in their role as co-managers, make significant contributions in the areas of harvest management, hatchery production, monitoring, and habitat restoration. The state fish and wildlife agencies also play key roles in implementation of the program.

# II. Objectives

The objectives of the research plan are to:

* Improve monitoring, evaluation, and the application of results
* Address critical uncertainties identified in subbasin plans
* Increase accountability for the annual expenditures of research funds
* Improve input from independent scientists, fish and wildlife agencies and tribes, and other interested parties in the region
* Improve coordination among mainstem research programs
* Improve access to the information generated by the research and restoration projects of the program

The research plan is intended to improve communication among scientists, cooperation among institutions, and better coordination of long-term biological monitoring. A key dialogue that the research plan can facilitate regards the role and use of biological and ecological research to inform decision-making on major conflicts in the basin that have profound socio-political implications, such as the persistent disagreements about the relationship of flow and survival of fish or the influence of hatchery fish on wild stocks. For example, fundamental issues of fish migration and of the interaction of hatchery and wild fish remain poorly understood, yet the consequences are substantial both for listed species and for the economy of the region.

Despite a large body of knowledge about the needs of fish and wildlife, instances remain in which the region lacks information to understand fully which mitigation or restoration actions will be most effective. The intent of the research plan is to facilitate prioritization and implementation of research that addresses those uncertainties as they affect anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife and the ecosystems that support them. Over time, research completed under the research plan will reduce critical uncertainties by increasing scientifically based knowledge. In sum, the research plan will help the Council manage the program by informing decision-making, facilitating scientific review, focusing project selection, providing a basis for redirecting future research, and most importantly, making restoration projects more effective.

## Scientific Principles

In 1998 the Council introduced a set of broad scientific principles and applied these principles to a description of the Columbia River as an ecosystem in the publication *Development of a Regional Framework* (NPCC 1998, Document 98-16). Subsequently, the Council continued to develop an explicit scientific foundation by articulating a set of eight scientific principles and discussing their implications for salmon restoration (see*,* [*2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2000/2000-19/Default.htm), NPCC Document 2000-19, page 15). These principles were derived from a number of reviews and recovery strategies for Columbia River fish, wildlife and their habitat including *Return to the River* (Williams 2005) that developed a conceptual foundation for restoration of fish, wildlife and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin. The scientific principles are grounded in established scientific literature to provide a stable foundation for the Council’s program (*see* *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program,* 2000, Section B2 (Basinwide Provisions). The Council intends that all actions taken to implement this program be consistent with these principles:

Principle 1. The abundance, productivity and diversity of organisms are integrally linked to the characteristics of their ecosystems.

Principle 2. Ecosystems are dynamic, resilient and develop over time

Principle 3. Biological systems operate on various spatial and time scales that can be organized hierarchically

Principle 4. Habitats develop, and are maintained, by physical and biological processes

Principle 5. Species play key roles in developing and maintaining ecological conditions

Principle 6. Biological diversity allows ecosystems to persist in the face of environmental variation

Principle 7. Ecological management is adaptive and experimental

Principle 8. Ecosystem function, habitat structure and biological performance are affected by human actions

Other science review groups (National Research Council 1996; CENR 2000) also have emphasized the need for an ecosystem perspective as a basis for designing a recovery program in the Pacific Northwest. Consequently, the scientific foundation developed by the Council represents an important step in the development of restoration and recovery programs grounded on ecological principles.

# III. Implementing the Research Plan

The research plan is intended to guide funding of research under the Council’s fish and wildlife program. The research plan also can help initiate a regional dialogue and guide research policy through partnerships by bringing focus to initial discussions of how best to address research topics that are shared by the Council and other entities. The advantage of engaging in these partnerships is that it allows for a coordination of approaches for addressing the range of research relevant to the Council’s program, specifically:

* Research appropriate for the Council to fund
* Research that is funded in part by the Council, is broader in scope than the fish and wildlife program, but ultimately is necessary to reduce the scientific uncertainties affecting the program
* Research that is inappropriate for the Council to fund but needs to be synthesized to update and inform the conceptual foundation and strategies used in the Council’s program

## Fish and Wildlife Program Project Review Process

The research plan identifies general research themes rather than specific issues in order to provide guidance that will be durable. These themes will be revisited to coincide with each program amendment process. Thus, the research plan will be updated every five years. The research plan will inform work undertaken by existing and new projects by:

* Identifying priority uncertainties for implementation
* Identifying within the research uncertainties database [insert weblink] projects that address these uncertainties
* Being responsive to advancements in science and technology
* Ensuring continuity in data collection

Thus, the critical uncertainties identified in the research plan can serve to inform and shape the research agenda for the region. For these reasons the research plan is structured as a framework guidance document for decision-makers and executives. The project review process will be used to address priority uncertainties set forth in the research plan, restoration priorities set forth in subbasin plans, and some of the monitoring priorities identified by the program and through Columbia River Basin regional processes involving federal and state fish and wildlife agencies and tribes. For additional explanation of implementation in the project review process and prioritization seeAppendix B.

## Interaction with Other Research Plans in the Pacific Northwest

The Council recognizes that the status quo for research within the region consists of multiple, separate research plans. These plans refer to the “need to coordinate” with other similar efforts, but rarely set forth explicit steps to implement such coordination. Consequently, the Council developed the research plan, in part, to enhance current coordination and facilitate future collaboration. This research plan recognizes other research plans as important components of a potentially integrated regional research program and provides a framework for establishing linkages between existing research programs and initiatives. Many of the critical uncertainties identified in other research plans in the region have been incorporated into this research plan. Thus, this research plan identifies research that can be funded directly through the program as well as recommendations for research that will require collaborative, multi-party funding commitments by the Council and other entities with similar research mandates.

The Council does not intend to subsume other research programs into the fish and wildlife program and then direct their funding. To the contrary, the Council intends to use program resources to catalyze research requiring long-term commitments such as research supporting the development of a regional approach to monitoring. To the extent possible, the research plan will facilitate the coordination of processes already in place. For example, other plans include the [2003 draft Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plan](http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/cbd/mathbio/isemp/docs/rme_plan_09-03.pdf) for the NOAA-Fisheries 2000 Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion, [2008 FCRPS Biological Opinion](http://www.salmonrecovery.gov/BiologicalOpinions/FCRPSBiOp/2008FCRPSBiOp.aspx), [Anadromous Fish Evaluation Program](http://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environment/AnadromousFishEvaluation.aspx), the [Research Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the Willamette Valley Projects](http://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environment/WillametteValleyBiologicalOpinion.aspx), [Washington State Salmon Recovery Plan](http://www.rco.wa.gov/salmon_recovery/index.shtml), and the [PNAMP](http://www.pnamp.org/project/3140) Aquatic Monitoring Strategy. These plans are not detailed in this research plan.

## Monitoring and Data Management in Support of Research

Implementation of the research plan will require administrative support in two key areas: monitoring and evaluation, and data management. Support for monitoring will come from PNAMP, a partnership that coordinates existing monitoring programs into a regional approach that can provide a basis for evaluation at the programmatic scale (*see* Appendix C). Support for data management will come from the data management projects supported through the program, such as StreamNet and PITAGIS, and regional collaborative process to facilitate data sharing, such as the PNAMP, Coordinated Assessments for Salmon and Steelhead, and the Resident Fish Implementation Strategies which are working with others to develop tools and guidance to support regional data sharing — a concept the Council supports.

The regional efforts occurring throughout the Columbia River Basin (e.g., PNAMP, StreamNet, Coordinated Assessments of Salmon and Steelhead) already benefit the region significantly. Regional partnerships offer the opportunity to increase the regional benefit by coordinating research, monitoring, evaluation, and data management and, as a result, potentially redirecting the Council’s program based on project results.

Specifically:

* Partnerships and coordination of research activities help improve the ability of the region to reduce scientific uncertainty
* Partnerships and coordination of monitoring activities help support the programmatic evaluation of the program
* The improvements in data management and sharing help inform evaluation and reporting at the programmatic scale

To succeed, the research program must institutionalize accountability at the programmatic scale and therefore must be closely coordinated with regional efforts. It will be essential to make the results of these research initiatives available to the region. This could be accomplished by the publication of a “Columbia River Basin Journal,” which could provide a vehicle for disseminating results of program actions and a forum for advancing regional knowledge (*see* Appendix D).

## Relationship to Subbasin Plans

In 2000 the Council initiated subbasin planning to help local entities develop fish and wildlife restoration plans. In 2004 and 2005, 57 subbasin plans that identified needs and opportunities for restoration became part of the fish and wildlife program. The Council amended the 2009 Program to adopt two additional subbasin plans, the Bitterroot subbasin plan in 2010 and the Blackfoot subbasin plan in 2011.The cooperative and inclusive participation of federal, state, tribal, and local stakeholders in subbasin planning created the opportunity for stakeholders to address collectively the critical uncertainties within a subbasin. A staff review found that a minority of the subbasin plans explicitly identified critical uncertainties. Those uncertainties will contribute to guiding review and solicitation of research projects.

Many subbasin plans, however, did not include research or monitoring strategies, and few addressed larger-scale conservation and restoration efforts at the provincial or basin scale, indicating the need for coordinated planning to ensure that research addresses uncertainties relevant to a majority of subbasins.

## Prioritization Guidance

The research plan addresses overarching research questions. However, from time to time rapidly emerging management uncertainties may arise that warrant updating the research plan with additional research priorities. Criteria are proposed to identify priority research in the project review process in Appendix A. The results of proposed research projects should have broad application to other provinces or to the basin as a whole, irrespective of where they are located. Consequently, research projects that address the critical uncertainties identified in the research plan and that potentially will help multiple subbasins will be given preference in the project review process.

# IV. Focal Research Themes and Critical Uncertainties

The research plan divides important scientific critical uncertainties into 12 focal research themes. The list of critical uncertainties is accepted in the region; the research plan does not include extensive background beyond that necessary to establish the significance of each topic of uncertainty. The critical uncertainties are described at a high level so that the research plan can provide long-range guidance while preserving flexibility of implementation in the near-term. As well, the critical uncertainties are presented this way in order to elicit the development of specific research hypotheses and project proposals without constraining innovative approaches. The critical uncertainties were synthesized from the fish and wildlife program, reports of the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) and the ISRP, regional fish and wildlife managers, subbasin plans, national science groups, biological opinions, and other research plans within the region (*see* Appendix E).

## (1) Hatcheries/Artificial Production

It is estimated that more than 83 million fish were released from hatcheries in the Columbia River Basin in 2004 (83 million juvenile salmon; FPC 2004) and more than 139.7 million hatchery fish were released in 2011 (139.7 million juvenile salmon, FPC 2012). There are many hatcheries in the basin, and they have diverse purposes including, for example, the culture and release of salmonids, white sturgeon, and largemouth bass. Hatchery uncertainties are therefore partitioned by purpose as defined in the Artificial Production Review (NPCC 1999, Council Document 99-15). These include uncertainties of supplementation and captive rearing for conservation and preservation and uncertainties of conventional production for harvest and reintroduction. The proportion of hatchery fish harvested in the various fisheries has not been determined.

Artificial production is authorized under many mandates in federal and state law, and the Council funds only a modest portion of total hatchery production. Artificial production programs may operate using an integrated[[1]](#footnote-1) versus segregated[[2]](#footnote-2) approach. The purposes of artificial include hatcheries focused on producing fish for conservation and restoration purposes (i.e.,. supplementation[[3]](#footnote-3), conservation[[4]](#footnote-4), restoration[[5]](#footnote-5), mitigation[[6]](#footnote-6)). We will refer to these hatcheries as *Supplementation Hatcheries.* These hatcheries focus on the conservation of depleted (often ESA-listed) populations using supplementation, captive rearing, and captive broodstocks; and reintroductions of species into subbasins where they have been extirpated. Other hatcheries focus on producing fish for the purpose of harvest (i.e. harvest-augmentation[[7]](#footnote-7), conventional) to mitigate for hydrosystem construction and operation by providing harvest for commercial, sport, and tribal fisheries. We will refer to these hatcheries as *Conventional Hatcheries.*

Using artificial production to provide a harvest opportunity carries with it a cost of increasing the risk of extinction or extirpation of naturally spawning independent populations. The Council's 1999 Artificial Production Review defined principles for using artificial production in the basin, beginning with determining the purpose of each hatchery program through the Artificial Production Review Evaluation (NPCC 2004, Document 2004-17). During 2000 to 2009, a congressional-established Hatchery Scientific Review group (HSRG) evaluated the hatcheries within the Columbia River Basin. The HSRG recommended principles to improve hatchery management within the Basin which are to be considered by the Council per the 2009 Program guidance. The [HSRG](http://www.hatcheryreform.us/hrp/reports/columbia/welcome_show.action)’s recommendations focused on how the Columbia Basin hatchery system can be managed consistent with conservation goals, while still providing sustainable economic benefits from salmon harvest (HSRG 2009). An urgent need remains for fundamental information on the interactions of hatchery-produced fish with wild fish populations ([Galbreath et al., 2008](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2008amend/uploadedfiles/95/Final%20Draft%20AHSWG%20report.pdf); Williams 2005; CENR 2000; NPPC 1999, Document 99-15; NPPC 1999, Document 99-4; NPCC 2000, [2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2000/2000-19/Default.htm); ISAB 2003, Document 2003-3).

 The essential issue for hatcheries now is to determine the balance between their effectiveness and their hazards. Specifically, how detrimental are the releases of hatchery fish

to wild fish owing to ecological interactions and interbreeding, and how detrimental are the supplementation programs to target and non-target natural populations from ecological interactions and interbreeding? The question of hatchery impacts on natural production extends from local and stock-specific interactions to interactions within large-scale mixed-stock fisheries over very large spatial and temporal scales. Moreover, there needs to be a better understanding of integrating the hatchery approach, which has expected limitations, with other approaches. The Council’s 2009 Program recommends that artificial production be used under the following conditions: 1) in an integrated manner to complement habitat improvements by supplementing native fish populations up to the sustainable carrying capacity of the habitat with fish that are as similar as possible, in genetics and behavior, to wild native fish; or 2) in a segregated manner to maintain the genetic integrity of the local populations in order to expand natural production while supporting harvest of artificially produced stocks; or 3) to replace lost salmon and steelhead in blocked areas. The 2009 Program incorporates the standards established by the Artificial Production Review (NPCC 1999, Council Document 99-15) as minimum standards for all artificial production projects. Included in these standards is that Artificial production must be implemented within an experimental, adaptive-management design that includes an aggressive program to evaluate the risks and benefits and addresses scientific uncertainties. (2009 Fish and Wildlife Program, page 18).

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

*Conventional Hatchery Production —*

1. What is the cost to natural populations from competition, predation (direct and indirect), and disease caused by interactions with hatchery-origin juveniles and from harvest in fisheries targeting hatchery-origin adults?

2. To what extent can interactions between production-hatchery fish and naturally produced wild fish be reduced — for example with the goal of achieving sustainable long-term productivity and resilience of the wild component of the population by spatial or temporal partitioning of natural and artificial production at the subbasin, province, basin, and regional scale?

*Supplementation Hatchery Production —*

3. What is the magnitude of any demographic benefit to the production of natural-origin juveniles and adults from the natural spawning of hatchery-origin supplementation adults?

4. What are the range, magnitude, and rates of change of natural spawning fitness of supplemented populations, and how are these related to management rules, including the proportion of hatchery fish permitted on the spawning grounds, the broodstock mining rate, and the proportion of natural origin adults in the hatchery broodstock?

5. Can the carrying capacity of freshwater habitat be accurately determined and, if so, how should this information be used to establish the goals and limitations of supplementation programs within subbasins?

*All Hatcheries —*

6. What is the relationship between basinwide hatchery production and the survival and growth of naturally produced fish in their habitat (e.g., freshwater, estuarine, and ocean habitats)?

7. What effect do hatchery fish have on other species in the habitats where they are released (e.g., Mainstem, tributaries, freshwater and estuarine)?

## (2) Hydrosystem

Construction and operation of the hydrosystem caused extensive changes in the Columbia River Basin including major alteration of the riverine environment. Evidence of this alteration includes slow-moving water in reservoirs, habitat degradation in the mainstems of rivers, power-peaking fluctuations in flow, elevated water temperatures, and barriers to fish migration. Therefore the fish and wildlife program emphasizes research of mainstem river operations, including spill, flow augmentation, and fish transportation. Fish-passage standards, objectives, designs, and evaluations must be related to increases in adult fish returning to spawning grounds (juvenile-to-adult survival rates), not just the incremental survival of juvenile fish or adult fish through the Columbia River Basin hydropower system.

Technologies that most closely approximate the natural physical and biological conditions of migration (within river systems and between rivers to the ocean) and that most likely would accommodate diverse species life histories, and multiple passage systems likely are needed to fully protect all species.

In some locations, such as the Willamette River subbasin, juvenile fish passage may be particularly challenging due to the difficulty in creating adequate attraction flows and safe passage routes over or around high head dams. A lack of successful examples of juvenile passage at high head dams elsewhere is notable. Experimental studies, fish passage model simulations, computational fluid dynamics (CFD) modeling[[8]](#footnote-8) and perhaps even physical modeling may be required to assist researchers in developing workable solutions to high head juvenile fish passage impediments.

River operations significantly different than the status quo need to be tested to provide information for resolving key uncertainties about the hydrosystem impacts on fish. There is considerable uncertainty about the effects of changes in river flows, spill, and water quality on the migratory behavior (within river systems and between rivers and the ocean) of juvenile and adult fish. Experimental studies of all aspects of mainstem flow manipulation, including load following, are needed to determine the effects on fish survival and behavior (ISAB Document, [2003-1](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2003-1.htm); [ISAB](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2004-2.htm) Document [2004-2](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2004-2.htm); ISAB Document, [2008-2](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/report.asp?d=350); Council’s [2009 Program](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2009/2009-09.pdf) ). For instance, determining the effects on movement and migration of stage waves and turbulent bursts or pulsing flows may provide information that supports opportunities for water management that could be 1) more effective in moving fish; and, 2) provide greater opportunity for power generation than current procedures. The secondary effects of flow differences on near-shore habitat conditions in reservoirs (temperature, flow, and food production) and effects of shoreline modifications along reservoirs (rip-rap, erosion, and permanent sloughs) also need to be evaluated.

Previous large-scale analytical assessments (Peters and Marmorek 2001; Karieva et al. 2000; Wilson 2003; Haeseker et al. 2012) evaluated management options for halting the decline of the Snake River stream-type Chinook populations. These results depended on whether the source of mortality in the estuary and early in the ocean residence of fish is related to earlier hydrosystem experience (delayed mortality) during downstream migration. Evidence suggests that salmon experience delayed mortality as the result of their passage through the hydrosystem (Budy et al. 2002; [Marmorek et al 2004](http://www.fpc.org/documents/CSS/CSSworkshop_reportfinal.pdf)).

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What is the relationship between levels of flow and survival of juvenile and adult fish through the Columbia Basin hydrosystem? Do changes in spill and other flow manipulations significantly affect water quality, fish movement, smolt travel rate, and survival? How do effects vary among species, life-history stages, and migration timings? What is the role of hydrodynamic features other than mid-channel velocity in fish movement and migration? What is the relationship between ratios of transport, inriver return rates, and measurements of juvenile survival (D values)?

2. What are the effects of multiple dam passages, transportation, and spill operations on adult fish movement, migration behavior, straying, and pre-spawn mortality, and juvenile-to-adult survival rates? E.g.,

3. What is the effect of hydrosystem flow stabilization, flow characteristics, and channel features on anadromous and resident fish species and stocks? What are the ecological effects of hydrosystem operations on (a) downstream mainstem, estuarine, and plume habitats and, (b) on different populations of fish and wildlife?

4. What are the optimal temperature and water quality regimes for fish survival in tributary and mainstem reaches affected by dams, and are there options for hydrosystem operations that would enable these optimal water quality characteristics to be achieved? What would be the effects of such changes in operations and environment on fish, shoreline and riparian habitat, and wildlife?

5. Is passage juvenile passage over or around high-head dams feasible and practical?

## (3) Tributary and Mainstem Habitat

Degradation, loss, and fragmentation of habitat have contributed substantially to the depletion of fish and wildlife populations in the Columbia River Basin. Fish and wildlife habitat has been severely degraded by dams and diversions, sedimentation from forestry and agriculture, and the introduction of nonnative species. Native fish and wildlife are sustained by complex and interconnected habitats, which are created, altered, and maintained by natural physical processes. Restoration efforts must focus on restoring habitats and habitat connectivity and on developing ecosystem conditions and functions that will support diverse species.

The 2009 Fish and Wildlife Program places importance on improved natural habitat for fish spawning and rearing throughout their life cycle, including tributary, estuary, and marine stages. The critical ecosystem features for the full life cycle of fish species and salmonid stocks must be defined (CENR, 2000), and the dynamic relationships between habitat and fish and wildlife productivity must be better understood to conserve and restore fish and wildlife populations. A comprehensive life-cycle approach that addresses both natural variability in environmental conditions and human impacts on physical, chemical, and biological processes affecting fish and wildlife populations must be defined (ISAB, 2003-2). It is also necessary to have an understanding of food-webs in these systems to be able to assess interactions between mitigation efforts and the response in aquatic species (ISAB, 2011-11). A comprehensive landscape approach is also needed when mitigating and assessing effectiveness of habitat conservation and restoration as species and populations depend on the highly heterogeneous characteristics of land, water, and people ([ISAB, 2011-4](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/report.asp?d=640)).

Several critical knowledge gaps must be addressed. The [Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project](http://www.icbemp.gov/) was largely limited to federally managed lands. Recently the Council recommended that Bonneville funds a pilot project to assess the status and trend of aquatic tributary habitat for salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River Basin ([i.e., Columbia Habitat and Monitoring Program – Pilot](http://www.cbfish.org/Project.mvc/Display/2011-006-00)) and continues to support a comprehensive approach to monitoring of aquatic habitat in the lower Columbia River estuary (e.g. [the Lower Columbia River Estuary Ecosystem Monitoring; consult www.cbfish.org for more information on these and other Council recommended and Bonneville funded aquatic habitat monitoring projects)](http://the Lower Columbia River Estuary Ecosystem Monitoring; consult www.cbfish.org for more information on these and other Council recommended and Bonneville funded aquatic habitat monitoring projects)). Hopefully, this information will assist in developing a sound, basinwide restoration strategy. The rate of habitat loss should be quantified, and locations of habitat loss and restoration should be inventoried and evaluated to assess how well the current and projected habitat template supports the life history needs of fish and wildlife. The effectiveness of present best management practices and restoration techniques must be resolved by scientific evaluation at both site-specific and watershed scales. Finally, little is known about the food-webs in the Columbia Basin, especially in the tributaries (e.g., how have they been altered by land and water use, by the introduction of toxics and of non-native plants and animals, by harvesting, and by climate change). Scientific understanding of the role of nutrients in the growth of juvenile fish in freshwater and estuarine conditions is also incomplete, but fewer adult salmon returning to spawn in many streams has resulted in decreased import and transport of nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. To what extent do tributary habitat restoration actions affect the survival, productivity, distribution, and abundance of native fish and wildlife populations?

2. Are the current procedures being used to identify limiting habitat factors accurate?

3. What are the impacts of hydrosystem operations on mainstem habitats, including the freshwater tidal realm from Bonneville Dam to the salt wedge? How might hydrosystem operations be altered to recover mainstem habitats?

4. What pattern and amount of habitat protection and restoration is needed to ensure long-term viability of fish and wildlife populations in the face of natural environmental variation as well as likely human impacts on habitat in the future?

## (4) The Estuary

The Columbia River estuary constitutes the physical and biological interface for fish as they move between their freshwater and ocean life stages. Juvenile anadromous fish rear and undergo adaptation to marine conditions in the estuary, and rearing locations, seasonal timing, residence timing, and migration pathways differ between fish species and salmonid stocks. Wetlands and tidal channels are important rearing habitats for some fish. The Columbia River estuary also provides important rearing habitat for other marine animals and year-round habitat for estuarine species.

The estuary has been impacted by habitat development and management locally and upriver. Changes in biological processes range from alteration in the food-web to the exclusion of fish from large portions of the tidal marshes. Changes in seasonal flows following the development of the hydrosystem have resulted in changes to estuarine circulation, sedimentation, and biological processes. Although all of the anadromous fish must migrate through this unique environment, the effects of restoration projects in the estuary have not been fully evaluated and many basic biological functions of the estuary in the life cycle of fish remain poorly understood. Monitoring of the fish and estuary habitat, and evaluation of large-scale manipulations of estuarine habitats can be combined to better understand the role of the estuarine environment and its degradation or restoration in the success or failure of fish species and more specifically salmonid populations (ISRP, 2003-13).

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What is the significance to fish survival, production, and life-history diversities of habitat degradation or restoration in the estuary as compared with impacts to other habitats in the basin? How does this partitioning of effects vary among species and life-history types?

2. What are the highest priority estuarine habitat types and ecological functions for protection and restoration (e.g., what are most important habitats in the estuary for restoring and maintaining life-history diversities of fish, and how effective were past projects in restoring nursery/feeding areas)?

3. What specific factors affect survival and migration of species and life-history types of fish through the estuary, and how is the timing of ocean entry related to subsequent survival?

## (5) The Ocean

Recent research has established that global- and regional-scale processes in the ocean and atmosphere can influence the production of anadromous species such as salmon, lamprey, and cutthroat trout, as well as the structure and dynamics of marine ecosystems. Natural variation in these processes must be understood to correctly interpret the response of fish to management actions in the Columbia Basin (e.g., ISRP, 2012-3; Jacobson et al., 2012).

The marine survival of juvenile fish, and their growth rates and age and size structures, are linked to local and regional processes in the North Pacific Ocean. Salmon abundances in the California Current region (off Washington, Oregon, and California) and in the Gulf of Alaska (Alaska Current) may respond in opposite ways to shifts in climatic regime. For example, during periods of a strong low pressure in atmospheric circulation over the North Pacific Ocean in winter (Aleutian Low), zooplankton production and early marine survival of juvenile salmonids generally increase in the Alaska Current and decrease in the California Current. Climatic phase shifts characteristic of the strong Aleutian Low regime occurred from about 1925 to 1946 and after 1976/77; both periods were marked by precipitous declines in the coho salmon fishery off Oregon. Opposing cycles of salmon abundance between the Alaska Current and the California Current regions underscore the importance of stock-specific regulation of ocean fisheries. In 1999, a phase shift in the Victoria climate pattern and sea surface temperature seems to have influenced productivity of the California Current more than the Alaska Current. As a result of favorable marine conditions in both the California and Alaska currents, the total production of salmon in the eastern North Pacific and Gulf of Alaska reached an all-time high in the early 2000s. The relationship between ocean conditions and other anadromous species, such as white sturgeon and Pacific lamprey, is less well known.

While the marine production of salmon can be tied to major oceanic and atmospheric circulation, salmon life cycles are shorter than the inter-decadal periods of large-scale climatic change, and short-term climate change phenomena such as the El Nino-Southern Oscillation also can have a strong influence on freshwater and marine survival of salmonids. Thus, the ability to predict adult salmon returns in the face of both short-term and long-term climate change is critical to harvest management and recovery of depressed stocks of Columbia River salmonids. While the abundance of salmonids is known to track large- and small-scale shifts in climate, the specific mechanisms of biological response are poorly understood. Decadal and interannual cycles of ocean productivity have the potential to mask changes in the survival of salmon during freshwater phases of their life cycle, confounding interpretation of the performance of restoration efforts and increasing losses of some stocks. There is also increasing evidence that ocean fisheries on groundfish (Pacific whiting, walleye pollock, halibut, etc.) and coastal pelagic species (squid, sardines, anchovies, etc.) may affect salmonids through food-web interactions. Stocks with different life history traits and ocean migration patterns may be favored under different combinations of climate and more local conditions, and such differences may afford stability to salmon species in the face of environmental variability. Conservative standards for harvest, hatchery practices, and freshwater habitat protection may be necessary even during periods of high ocean productivity to maintain the genetic diversity needed to withstand subsequent troughs in productivity.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. Can stock-specific data on ocean abundance, distribution, density-dependent growth and survival, and migration of salmonids, both hatchery and wild, be used to evaluate and adjust marine fishery interceptions[[9]](#footnote-9), harvest, and hatchery production in order to optimize harvests and ecological benefits within the Columbia River Basin?

2. Can monitoring of ocean conditions and abundance of salmon and steelhead during their first weeks or months at sea improve our ability to predict interannual fluctuations in the production of Columbia Basin Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) or populations to enable appropriate changes to harvest levels? How are Pacific lampreys, green sturgeon, and white sturgeon affected by ocean conditions?

3. How can interannual and interdecadal changes in ocean conditions be incorporated into management decisions relating to hydrosystem operations, the numbers and timing of hatchery releases, and harvest levels to enhance survival rates, diversity, and viability of fish populations?

4. What are the effects of commercial and sport fishing on ocean food-webs?

## (6) Harvest

Harvest management for many fish populations in the Columbia River Basin has substantially changed due to state and federal listings. Recently, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation have begun experimenting with alternative gear to decrease the impact on fish species listed under the Endangered Species Act (see individual project proposals at www.cbfish.org). Harvest for listed populations is managed under biological opinions that attempt to ensure fisheries do not pose jeopardy to listed fish species. Most current harvest management targets fish from hatcheries; productivity to support harvest has been largely divorced from production in natural habitat.

The ISAB Harvest Management Review (ISAB, 2005-4) addressed the question: what constitutes a sound scientific basis for the management of Pacific salmonids in the Columbia River Basin? The report also noted critical uncertainties as to the effect of harvest on the conservation of naturally produced salmonids, including the fundamental need to better monitor and understand mixed-stock fisheries. Three fundamental components of harvest management were identified as causes of concern: a paucity of quantitative data for analyses by population units; limited identification and assessment of the catches of hatchery and wild stocks to identify trends in their status and provide a biological basis for production goals; and limited evidence of accounting for uncertainty in management plans. Similarly, concerns about the gap in knowledge in the biology of harvested species and in their management approach were recently highlighted by the ISRP for Columbia River white sturgeon, Pacific lamprey [(ISRP, 2012-44a)](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2010-44a.pdf)

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What are the effects of fishery interceptions and harvest in mixed-stock areas, such as the ocean and mainstem Columbia, on the abundance, productivity, and viability of ESUs or populations, and how can fishery interceptions and harvests of ESUs or populations, both hatchery and wild, best be managed to minimize the effects of harvest on the abundance, productivity, and viability of those ESUs and populations?

2. What new harvest and escapement strategies can be employed to improve harvest opportunities and ecological benefits within the Columbia Basin while minimizing negative effects on ESUs or populations of concern? Can genetic techniques be used to quantify impacts on wild or ESA-listed stocks in ocean fisheries?

3. How can the multiple ecological benefits that salmon provide to the watersheds where they spawn (e.g., provision of a food resource for wildlife and a nutrient source for streams and riparian areas) be incorporated effectively into procedures for establishing escapement goals?

## (7) Population Structure and Diversity

Fish and wildlife populations are characterized by life history, ecological, behavioral, phenotypic, and genetic diversity, which buffer populations against short- and long-term environmental variation. For anadromous salmonids, stock diversity has been reduced by the extinction of many local populations, as well as a reduction in population size of most remaining populations. Moreover, losses of genetic diversity within populations may have decreased fitness and therefore decreased the probability of long-term persistence for many stocks. A better understanding is needed of the dominant processes influencing the distribution, interconnection, and dynamics of populations through time and space. This likely applies to Pacific lamprey, white sturgeon, bull trout, and other resident fish species.

Additionally, populations are a fundamental unit of viability analysis, and effectively evaluating the status of a species may depend on correctly understanding its population structure. Identification of strong, weak, and at-risk native populations is a critical step in determining what actions can be taken to preserve and protect populations of salmoinds (*see* ISAB, 2001-7). This need to understand better the population structure likely applies to pacific lamprey, white sturgeon, bull trout, and other resident fish species, populations, and sub-populations. Several species (e.g., resident and anadromous rainbow, ocean and reservoir type fall Chinook) have co-occurring life-history types that are poorly understood and pose critical problems for management.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What approaches to population recovery and habitat restoration are most effective in regaining meta-population structure and diversity that will increase viability of fish and wildlife in the Columbia River Basin?

2. How do artificial production and supplementation impact the maintenance or restoration of an ecologically functional metapopulation structure?

3. What is the relationship between genetic diversity and ecological and evolutionary performance, and to what extent does the loss of stock diversity reduce the fitness, and hence survival rate and resilience, of remaining populations?

4. What are the differential effects of flow augmentation, transportation, and summer spill on “ocean type vs. reservoir type” fall Chinook? Are there effects on the movement and migration of sturgeon and Pacific lamprey?

## (8) Effects of Climate Change on Fish and Wildlife

 Variation in climate and ocean conditions are now recognized as major contributors to fluctuations and trends in fish and wildlife abundance. Global climate change may interact with shorter-term climate patterns to accentuate these effects on fish and wildlife. In the Pacific Northwest, reduced ocean survival of salmon and stressful freshwater conditions, due to low precipitation, low stream flow, and high stream temperatures, tend to be concurrent. Whether there are similar relationships for other anadromous fish species is not well known. The changes in regional snowpack and stream flows in the Columbia Basin that are projected by many climate models could have a profound impact on the success of restoration efforts and the status of anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife populations ([ISAB, 2007-2](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/report.asp?d=354)). Nevertheless, climate change is rarely incorporated into natural resource planning. Additionally, the cumulative effects of human development of the Basin may become apparent only when climatic conditions trigger a dramatic response.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. Can integrated ecological monitoring be used to determine how climate change simultaneously affects fish and wildlife and the freshwater, estuarine, ocean, and terrestrial habitats and ecosystems that sustain them?

2. Can indices of climate change be used to better understand and predict interannual and interdecadal changes in production, abundance, diversity, and distribution of Columbia Basin fish and wildlife?

3. What long-term changes are predicted in the Columbia River Basin and the northeast Pacific Ocean, how will they affect the fish and wildlife in the region, and what actions can ameliorate increased water temperatures, decreased summer river flows, and other ecosystem changes?

## (9) Toxics

Toxic contaminants need to be evaluated by the fish and wildlife program, as toxics could negate much of the good work being accomplished in the basin (ISAB, 2011-1). Toxics have been recognized as a problem since bald eagles and osprey, which eat fish from the river that contain various contaminants, were almost eliminated from the Columbia Basin by the mid-1970s. Reproduction continues to be adversely affected by DDE in a portion of the Columbia River osprey population. Many of the legacy contaminants (e.g., DDE, PCBs) have been declining for years, but new emerging contaminants are taking their place as contaminants of concern. Flame-retardants polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) are one group of special concern in the Columbia River. Based upon data from the upper Columbia River, PBDE concentrations in fish are doubling every 1.6 years, and PBDEs have been found in bald eagle eggs from the lower Columbia River and in all 15-osprey eggs sampled from Puget Sound in 2003. Many other emerging contaminants, including modern pesticides and pharmaceuticals, need to be investigated. An adequate toxics monitoring and research program needs to be developed as a coordinated effort of various agencies and groups, including the Council. Guidance for this work could come from the interagency [Columbia River Basin Toxics Reduction Action Plan](http://www.epa.gov/columbiariver/toxics.html) (US EPA 2010).

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What is the distribution and concentration of toxics, including emerging contaminants, in the Columbia River Basin, and what are/have been their trends over time?

2. How do toxic substances, alone and in combination, affect fish and wildlife distribution and abundance, survival, and productivity?

## (10) Invasive Species

Invasive species[[10]](#footnote-10) comprise one of the most significant alterations of native ecosystems and are rapidly becoming a dominant component of ecosystems within the Columbia River Basin (Office of Technology Assessment, 1993). For instance, a 2004 survey found 81 nonnative aquatic species below Bonneville Dam[[11]](#footnote-11) and (Sytsma et al. 2004), and a 2006 survey found at least 50 nonnative aquatic species in the middle Columbia and lower Snake rivers (Draheim et al 2007). The impacts of non-native fish stocked for recreation and subsistence are widely recognized, however, many other non-native plants and animals also could have a large impact on aquatic habitat and productivity (e.g., Eurasian milfoil, New Zealand mud snail, zebra mussel, Japanese knotweed, Himalayan blackberry, giant reed, and riparian-associated animals such as livestock). Non-native species affect native fish and wildlife both directly , such as by predation or competition, or indirectly, by altering food-webs, water chemistry, physical habitat attributes (e.g., [ISAB, 2011-1](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/2011-1/isab2011-1.pdf); [ISRP, 2012-6](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2012-6.pdf)). Some of the most challenging long-term management problems involve nonnative, invasive species, such as the widespread rainbow and brook trout, which were introduced to provide angling opportunities. Intentional introductions of taxa have proven just as likely to cause harm as unintentional introductions (Office of Technology Assessment, 1993).

Additionally, there is conflict between the value of fish passage restoration for native species and the chance that such passage may allow non-native species, such as New Zealand mudsnails, crayfish, other nonnative fish (e.g., Atlantic salmon), and new diseases, to spread. Thus, there is a need for better assessments of the biological and economic consequences of invasions, including research to identify patterns and consequences of invasions on species and ecosystems. Initial baseline information and monitoring are necessary to detect trends in abundance of non-native and invasive species, and targeted research on invasive species is required to better understand the structural and functional changes in ecosystems, habitats, and food-webs that they cause.

There have been relatively few examples of success in eradicating well-established invasive species at an ecosystem level. Prevention of introduction and detection of new introductions are therefore essential. A proactive approach to anticipating invasions and identifying areas at-risk could potentially save many millions of dollars in future efforts to control species once they become established and threaten native flora and fauna. Research is needed to identify pathways of introduction and related preventive actions that can reduce the risks of introduction and spread of non-native species.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What is the current distribution and abundance of invasive and deliberately introduced nonnative species (e.g., the baseline condition), and how is this distribution related to existing habitat conditions (e.g., flow and temperature regimes, human development, restoration actions)? How will climate change alter their distribution?

2. To what extent do (or will) invasive and nonnative species significantly affect the potential recovery of native fish and wildlife species in the Columbia River Basin?

3. What are the primary pathways of introduction of invasive and nonnative species, and what methods could limit new introductions or mitigate the effects of currently established invasives?

## (11) Human Development

Like climate change, the impact of human population growth in the Columbia Basin is widely recognized (ISAB, 2007-3; ISAB, 2011-4), but is rarely incorporated into fish and wildlife planning. The human population of the Columbia Basin is increasing rapidly, a trend that is expected to continue. This increase is largely concentrated in and around urban areas, but affects non-urban areas as well, through recreation, housing, and changing land uses. At the same time, the economy of the region is shifting, with the potential for both positive and negative impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitats. The Council’s program and the NOAA Fisheries restoration plans do not include consideration of human population trends. The fish and wildlife program mitigates human impacts, related to the development and operation of the hydrosystem, on fish, wildlife, and their habitats, and it is important to consider demographic and economic trends and their potential impacts on efforts to restore and recover fish and wildlife resources.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. What changes in human population density, distribution, and economic activity are expected over the next 20 years? 50 years?

2. How might the projected changes under different development scenarios affect land use patterns, protection and restoration efforts, habitats, and fish and wildlife populations?

## (12) Monitoring and Evaluation

Adaptive management, using scientifically well-informed management actions and information drawn from their implementation, is recognized as essential to effective implementation of the fish and wildlife program. Adaptive management requires monitoring and evaluation, including status and trend monitoring of fish, wildlife, habitats, and ecosystems, and action effectiveness research, to provide information with which to evaluate project outcomes relative to project objectives and programmatic standards. Monitoring contributes needed information to address whether biological and programmatic performance objectives established within the fish and wildlife program (e.g., subbasin plans and mainstem amendments; FCRPS BiOp; and ESA Recovery Plans) are being met; how current management should be changed to better meet those objectives; what factors are limiting ability to achieve performance standards or objectives; and what mitigation actions are most effective at addressing the limiting factors. For example, supplementation has significant critical uncertainties that require extensive and coordinated monitoring to resolve (ISRP and ISAB, 2005-15; [Galbreath et al., 2008](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2008amend/uploadedfiles/95/Final%20Draft%20AHSWG%20report.pdf)). These uncertainties may be addressed by coordination of hatchery projects across the Columbia River Basin so that, in aggregate, they constitute a basinwide adaptive management experiment that includes reference streams that have not been planted with hatchery fish. Thus, some priority research topics require a monitoring program for answers.

This research plan identifies four critical monitoring and evaluation needs, listed below, in addition to the need to support additional monitoring priorities and programs as a collaborative partner.

Critical Uncertainties: [note: once a compilation of recent uncertainties is completed, we will assess if new questions are needed for the below section – input from the region and ISAB will inform whether others need to be added and whether any can be considered addressed and thus removed]

1. Can a common probabilistic (statistical) site selection procedure for population and habitat status and trend monitoring be developed cooperatively?

2. Can a scientifically credible trend monitoring procedure based on remote sensing, photography, and data layers in a GIS format be developed?

3. Can empirical (e.g., regression) models for prediction of current abundance or presence-absence of focal species concurrent with the collection of data on status and trends of wildlife and fish populations and habitat be developed?

4. Make best professional judgment, based on available data, as to whether any new research in the spirit of the Intensive Watershed Monitoring approach should be instigated immediately. Most new intensive research should arise as a result of the interaction of existing inventory data with new data arising in population and habitat status and trend monitoring.

The last three uncertainties were identified as key steps for building a foundation to address critical monitoring needs of the fish and wildlife program, as well as to support the coordinated monitoring and evaluation needs of other regional research and management programs, *see* ISRP Retrospective Report 1997-2005 (ISRP, [2005-14](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2005-14.htm)).

There are a number of existing efforts in the region to coordinate and collaborate around monitoring and evaluation, but until recently there has been a lack of an organizing principle or central forum to facilitate these efforts. In 2005, the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) was chartered to provide such a forum. As members of PNAMP, the Council, Bonneville, and the fish and wildlife managers are working to implement the fish and wildlife program within the context of a regional network of monitoring effort so that the shared monitoring needs and objectives of the program can be achieved. Other regional efforts that have targeted specific monitoring and evaluation needs include the development of the draft [Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Strategy](http://www.cbfwa.org/AMS/), the d[raft Resident Fish Implementation Monitoring Strateg](http://www.cbfwa.org/RFMS/)ies, the draft [Wildlife Implementation Monitoring Strategy](http://www.cbfwa.org/WMIS/), [the Coordinated Assessment for Salmon and Steelhead](http://www.pnamp.org/project/3129) (documents are accessible from http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/merr/Default.asp).

# V. Appendixes

## Appendix A. Context for the Research Plan

**Objectives of the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program**

This appendix provides additional explanation of the rationale for the research plan. In 1980, Congress passed the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act[[12]](#footnote-12) that authorized the states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington to create the Northwest Power and Conservation Council. The Act directs the Council to develop a program to:

*“…protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife, including related spawning grounds and habitat, on the Columbia River and its tributaries … affected by the development, operation and management of [hydroelectric projects] while assuring the Pacific Northwest an adequate, efficient, economical and reliable power supply.”*

The Council’s Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program is one of the largest regional efforts in the nation to recover, rebuild, and mitigate impacts of hydropower dams on fish and wildlife. As a planning, policy-making, and reviewing body, the Council develops and monitors the program, which is funded by the Bonneville Power Administration and implemented by tribal, state, and federal fish and wildlife managers and others. The Council adopted the first fish and wildlife program in November 1982. The 2000 program, marked a significant departure from past versions, which consisted primarily of a collection of measures directing specific activities. The 2000 Program establishes a basinwide vision for fish and wildlife along with four overarching biological objectives:

* A Columbia River ecosystem that sustains an abundant, productive, and diverse community of fish and wildlife
* Mitigation across the basin for the adverse effects to fish and wildlife caused by the

development and operation of the hydrosystem

* Sufficient populations of fish and wildlife providing abundant opportunities for tribal trust and treaty right harvest and for non-tribal harvest
* Recovery of the fish and wildlife affected by the development and operation of the

hydrosystem that are listed under the Endangered Species Act

The 2009 program maintained the scientific foundation of the 2000 program including the basinwide vision and overarching biological objectives.

**Mandate for the Research Plan**

Critical uncertainties have persisted for years because the relevant research questions are difficult to answer due to: environmental variability; the complexity of the Columbia River Basin environment; and the inherent difficulty in agreeing on specific problem definitions. In addition, over the course of the development of the program, the Council adopted specific measures for research without a research plan to provide clear prioritization of the remaining critical uncertainties. Without a research plan it was difficult to focus on those uncertainties, and so in the 2000 Program the Council called for development of a Columbia River Basin Research Plan. The plan will guide the development of a research program and foster collaboration with the research programs of other resource management entities within the region. Specifically, the Basinwide Provisions (D.9) state that:

*“The Council will establish a basinwide research plan, similar to the subbasin plans, which identifies key uncertainties for this program and its biological objectives and the steps needed to resolve them. The plan will identify major research topics, including ocean research, and establish priorities for research funding.”*

The 2009 program reiterates the commitment of the 2000 program to identify and prioritize uncertainties (Basinwide Provisions section D.9). The 2009 program further provides guidance mirroring the 2006 Research Plan ([document 2006-03](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2006/2006-3.htm)) about collaboration and coordination, and calls for the 2006 Research Plan to be updated:

*“The Council, in collaboration with the parties listed above, will identify research priorities to resolve critical ecosystem or biological uncertainties. Research will focus on those areas where, in a reasonable amount of time, results could be generated or tools developed to better inform management decisions and to more efficiently deploy Program mitigation resources.*

***Research plan:*** *The Council, with assistance from the parties listed above, will update its research plan, which identifies major research topics and establishes priorities for research funding.*

***Coordination:*** *The research plan will be updated in a transparent manner to ensure all interested parties in the region have an opportunity for input.”*

## Appendix B. Implementing the Research Plan through the Project Review Process and Prioritization

This appendix explains the methods by which research project proposals are solicited; and reviewed by the Independent Scientific Review Panel, and evaluated against decision criteria for identifying priorities.

**Requests for Proposals**

 To implement the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program, the Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) and the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) regularly review projects to benefit fish and wildlife populations affected by the Federal Columbia River Power System. Past review processes have taken many forms including program-wide solicitations, rolling provincial reviews, and targeted solicitations.

Based on the experience with these past review processes, the Council and Bonneville, with input from fish and wildlife managers and Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) staff, have developed a review structure to most effectively review projects for Program implementation beginning in Fiscal Year 2010 and beyond. This review structure includes a category review (i.e., strategy and topic) for existing projects that are similar in nature and intent, followed by a geographic review (by subbasin and province), that may result in targeted solicitations. For each of the reviews (categorical and geographic) there are five review steps that occur prior to final funding decisions. The process includes *planning, sponsor reports, ISRP review* (and site visits*), staff recommendations, Council recommendations*, and finally *Bonneville funding decision* (for details on each of these steps consult: http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2010/wildlifereview2.pdf).

**Review of Project Proposals by the ISRP**

The Northwest Power Act requires all project proposals to undergo an independent scientific review of specific project proposals by the ISRP to ascertain their scientific and technical merits. The 1996 amendment to the Northwest Power Act requires the ISRP to determine whether projects proposed for funding:

* Are based on sound science principles
* Benefit fish and wildlife
* Have clearly defined objectives and outcomes
* Have provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results
* Are consistent with the program

The ISRP review process includes the following steps:

1. evaluation of proposals and supporting documents such as management plans, past reports, and monitoring and evaluation data;
2. a tour of a subset of past and proposed project sites;
3. project presentations (preceding or following the site visit depending on logistics) with an opportunity for questions from the ISRP;
4. a preliminary ISRP review with a response loop and public comment period to provide an opportunity for project sponsors and the public to address ISRP concerns and/or incorporate ISRP suggestions;
5. a final ISRP report with recommendations on each project and programmatic comments on scientific issues that apply across the wildlife category
6. an ISRP presentation to the Council summarizing the ISRP’s findings

The ISRP’s review criteria shown below further define and link these criteria to the proposal form. This linkage allows the reviewers to read the proposal and determine to what extent the criteria are met in each section. The ISRP criteria apply to all kinds of projects from operation and maintenance of a hatchery to habitat acquisition to gamete preservation research. Some individual projects include several unique strategies.

The ISRP’s preliminary and final reports provide written recommendations and comments reflecting the consensus of the ISRP on each proposal that is amenable to scientific review.

For each proposal, the ISRP provides a recommendation to the Council based on the above assessment. The ISRP, as of April 2012, uses the following terms for final recommendations:

* Meets Scientific Review Criteria
* Meets Scientific Review Criteria (Qualified)
* Meets Scientific Review Criteria - In Part
* Meets Scientific Review Criteria - In Part (Qualified)
* Does Not Meet Scientific Review Criteria
* Not Applicable

For preliminary reviews the ISRP also uses:

* Response Requested

The full definitions for the above ISRP recommendation categories are:

**1. Meets Scientific Review Criteria** is assigned to a proposal that substantially meets each of the ISRP criteria. Each proposal does not have to contain tasks that independently meet each of the criteria but can be an integral part of a program that provides the necessary elements. For example, a habitat restoration project may use data from a separate monitoring and evaluation project to measure results as long as such proposals clearly demonstrate this integration. Unless otherwise indicated, a “Meets Scientific Criteria” recommendation is not an indication of the ISRP’s view on the priority of the proposal, nor an endorsement to fund the proposal, but rather reflects its scientific merit and compatibility with Program goals.

**2.****Meets Scientific Review Criteria - In Part** is assigned to a proposal that includes some work that substantially meets each of the ISRP criteria and some work that does not. The ISRP specifies which elements do not meet the review criteria. In general, the proposal element that does not meet criteria is adequately described, but that element is not sound, is redundant, or would not benefit fish and wildlife. Required changes to a proposal will be determined by the Council and BPA in consultation with the project sponsors in the final project selection process.

|  |
| --- |
| **(Qualified)** is assigned to recommendations in the two categories above for which additional clarifications and adjustments to methods and objectives by the sponsor are needed to fully justify the entire proposal. The ISRP also uses “Qualified” in two other situations: * for proposals that are technically sound but appear to offer marginal or very uncertain benefits to fish and wildlife and
* when further ISRP review of a project’s final implementation plan or analysis of results is needed before the project moves to full implementation. An example is a proposal for both background assessment work and concurrent on-the-ground implementation that cannot be justified before results of the assessment are known. Another example is a proof of concept research project for which methods need to be tested at a pilot scale before full implementation. Please note, in past reviews, some ISRP recommendations to sequence assessment or test phases and full implementation were designated as “In Part” rather than “Qualified.”

The ISRP expects that needed changes to a proposal will be determined by the Council and BPA in consultation with the project sponsor in the final project selection process. Regardless of the Council’s or BPA’s recommendations, the ISRP expects that, if a proposal is funded, subsequent proposals for continued funding will address the ISRP’s comments. |

 **3. Does Not Meet Scientific Review Criteria** is assigned to a proposal that is significantly deficient in one or more of the ISRP review criteria. One example is a proposal for an ongoing project that might offer benefits to fish and wildlife, but does not include provisions for monitoring and evaluation or reporting of past results. Another example is a research proposal that is technically sound but does not offer benefits to fish and wildlife because it substantially duplicates past efforts or is not sufficiently linked to management actions. In most cases, proposals that receive this recommendation lack detailed methods or adequate provisions for monitoring and evaluation, and some propose actions that have the potential for significant deleterious effects to non-target fish or wildlife. The ISRP notes that proposals in this category may address needed actions or are an integral part of a planned watershed effort, but the proposed methods or approaches are not scientifically sound. In some cases, a targeted request for proposals may be warranted to address the needed action.

**4. Not Applicable** is assigned to proposals with objectives that are not amenable to scientific review.

**5. Response Requested** is assigned to a proposal in a preliminary review that requires a response on specific issues before the ISRP can make its final recommendation. This does not mean that the proposal has failed the review. In general, the ISRP requests responses on a majority of proposals, and a majority of proposals provide sufficient information in the response loop to meet the ISRP’s scientific review criteria.

Thus, current decision criteria for ranking projects as meet scientific review criteria” or not are based primarily on technical merit and do not include specific reference to research priorities. Consequently, this research plan should enable the ISRP to better compare and evaluate projects for relevance to critical uncertainties.

In addition to the ISRP’s scientific review, proposals are evaluated within a policy context to determine their potential contribution to management decision-making. The regional fish and wildlife managers provide recommendations to the Council on these matters, and it is essential that they continue their key role in determining which projects are most likely to benefit fish and wildlife, including research projects that may provide the basis for eventual management actions. In summary, the Council’s recommendations for Bonneville funding rest on a mix of priorities, legal considerations, technical adequacy, management urgency, regional opportunities, and available funding.

**Identifying Projects that Address Research Priorities**

The following criteria are proposed to identify priority research in the project review process.

*Critical Uncertainties* - Projects that address critical uncertainties identified in this research plan will be considered priority projects. The results of such work must have broad application. For example, they must provide a basis for extrapolation across ecologically similar subbasins, provinces, or habitat action types.

*Time Required, Statistical Power* - If the activity is likely to produce useful results within the five- to 10-year timeframe for the biological opinion, it will be ranked higher than one that requires more time to yield information relevant to management decisions. Activities that yield statistically reliable results given the design of the experiment (duration, type, and intensity of monitoring) will be ranked higher than those that do not. If survival rates are being monitored, the change should be large enough to be important in reducing extinction risks or increasing the likelihood of recovery.

*ESU Significance* - Monitoring directed at ESA-listed ESUs will be ranked higher than activities directed at other stocks. For those directed elsewhere, there should be another justification for conducting the activity (for example, determining smolt-to-adult returns for Middle Columbia Chinook in order to compare the Snake and Upper Columbia stocks). Populations with higher extinction risk or greater necessary increases in survival rates generally will receive higher priorities for both management and research actions.

*Cost Feasibility* - In prioritizing competing research activities intended to produce roughly the same information, cost of the different activities will be one criterion in selecting projects for funding. Feasibility also will be important. For example, a project may be powerful and well designed but also impractical due to logistical constraints — for example, take permits cannot be issued quickly or customized equipment may take too long to build.

*Relationship to Other Research* - To what extent does the proposed activity depend on other projects, and to what degree does it build on ongoing, related work? Some projects may conflict with other research. For example, a “control” stock for habitat enhancement cannot simultaneously be a “treatment” stock for nutrient supplementation. These conflicts require resolution before research activities are undertaken.

*Innovation* - Innovation is a critical element of any large management or research program and should be encouraged. The Innovative Project category was suggested by the ISRP in past annual program reviews and was designed to improve knowledge, encourage creative thinking, and provide an opportunity for project sponsors to test new methods and technologies. Innovative projects were funded in Fiscal Years 1998, 2000, 2001, and 2002. Although innovative project solicitations were not pursued since 2002, Council members have expressed continued support for an innovative-project category. Although the innovative category has not been used in recent project review cycles, the project review cycle still provides an immediate opportunity to fund innovative projects. Given the intractability of some research challenges it is important to keep the spark of innovation alive.

*Level of Scientific Support –* If an uncertainty is associated with a low level of scientific support, as described in the Council document [2000-12](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/return/2000-12.htm) with number 1 being the highest level of certainty (see Chapter 2), then it may merit being prioritized over others:

1. Thoroughly established, generally accepted, good peer-reviewed empirical evidence in its favor.
2. Strong weight of evidence in support but not fully conclusive.
3. Theoretical support with some evidence from experiments or observations.
4. Speculative, little empirical support.
5. Misleading or demonstrably wrong, based on good evidence to the contrary.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix C. Monitoring and Evaluation

An important objective of the research plan is to encourage development of an effective and economical approach to long-term monitoring that provides a basis for future programmatic-scale evaluations. Some components of a regional monitoring program, such as counts of returning anadromous adult fish at dams, harvest estimates, hatchery production, already have been developed in the Columbia Basin. Yet the program needs to facilitate the development of additional components that are important, including long-term PIT-tagging of important populations of anadromous and resident fish, coordinated estimates of spawners or escapement into tributaries by standardized sampling and estimation methods, and standardized habitat and water quality sampling and estimation methods.

In order to effectively implement subbasin, recovery, and conservation plans, it is necessary to follow a logical process and paradigm of *Assess, Design, Implement, Monitor, Evaluate and Adaptively Adjust* plans and their implementation processes (Figure 1.).

The axiom that “all plans fail at implementation” can be avoided by following the steps toward adaptive management set forth in Figure 1.

* *Assessing* limiting factors and critical uncertainties
* *Designing* projects, programs and monitoring to maximize both on-the-ground effectiveness and learning
* Coordinated and documented *implementation* of projects
* Consistent *monitoring* through standardized methods, protocols, and training
* Timely and thorough *evaluation* of effectiveness
* Overall guidance to the region to *adjust* plans and programs at the province and subbasin levels

Figure 1. A framework for adaptive management (Nyberg, 1999).

**Assess**

**Adjust**

**Evaluate**

**Design**

**Implement**

**Monitor**

Monitoring and evaluation are at the heart of adaptive management because they provide the information, data, and analysis that decision-makers and resource managers need to track the progress, or lack of progress, of plans and populations. The success of current plans and programs depends on the consistent application of well-designed research, monitoring, and evaluation at multiple scales. These scales range across tributaries with major projects, populations, major population groups, subbasins, ESUs or Distinct Population Segments, and the entire Columbia Basin. To be useful to decision-makers, a regional approach to monitoring must identify the information required for different types of decisions at each scale, such as management of harvests, the hydrosystem, and hatcheries; and decisions on the protection and restoration of habitat).

Evaluating the occurrence and magnitude of trends over time requires a commitment to long-term monitoring (multiple years), and consistent data collection through networks of sites that represent the target population(s) of interest. Substantial research has been conducted on trend detection — discussion of form of trend, best tools to detect trend — (*see* Esterby 1993). Yet there has been little discussion in the ecological literature of what constitutes a ‘‘policy-relevant’’ trend and how well we can measure or detect it (Urquhart, Paulsen and Larsen 1998).

**Monitoring Activity**

Monitoring under the program primarily has been conducted to evaluate work across all subject areas, but at the project scale. This approach has generated information from monitoring individual or opportunistic protection and restoration efforts and the effects of isolated or tactical actions and activities. To advance, the limited resources available for monitoring must be focused on a more programmatic approach that is designed to identify the need for and detect the sum total effect of actions at the population, subbasin, and/or province scale. This can support future analyses of more strategic actions and plans and allow decisions to be made at a higher scale that is population- and ecosystem-based. Finally, performance metrics and high-level indicators can support a programmatic approach to evaluation that can be reported to Congress, the Council and to state, federal, and tribal resource managers (*see* Figure 2.)

While work at the project scale has intrinsic value and should be continued in many cases, it cannot substitute for the lack of a monitoring program of sufficient scope to provide a basis upon which the program as a whole can be evaluated and re-directed. Monitoring is required at a number of different scales to assess the performance of the program relative to biological and programmatic objectives, to identify where and why there are performance problems, and to identify the most effective actions needed to correct problems so that program objectives can be achieved. This type of monitoring and evaluation across multiple geographic and temporal scales requires standardized approaches and programmatic, long-term commitments and interconnections for effectively combining information and answering program management questions. The absence of a regionally coordinated approach to monitoring and evaluation in the Columbia River Basin has constrained restoration and planning efforts for decades.

For this reason, it is important that a more hierarchical approach be utilized with increased emphasis on achieving useful outcomes from monitoring. Specifically, methods need to be developed and implemented so that monitoring results can be “rolled up” to provide scientifically defensible evaluations of whether the ecological condition of a subbasin, an ESU, or the Columbia River Basin as a whole is improving or declining over time.

This capability would be very useful to policy and decision-makers as they deliberate on future actions that affect the long-term, ecological health of the basin.



Figure 2. In the monitoring information pyramid, examples of types of information are on the left and related users or generators of that information are represented on the right.

Moving monitoring from the project scale to larger spatial scales has both benefits and challenges. One benefit of focusing on the population scale is that it has direct relevance to fish managers, who want to know whether actions upstream of the monitoring location actually improved a fish population’s production in addition to improving habitat conditions in the restored reaches. For example, did actions lead to an increase in fish productivity? The population scale is also of great interest to agencies like NOAA Fisheries, which is charged with evaluating the status of listed populations.

There are also some significant challenges at larger spatial scales. Reliably attributing observed changes in fish survival or production to particular sets of management actions requires careful monitoring design. Otherwise one might erroneously infer that observed changes were due to management actions when in fact they were the result of natural variation in freshwater climate or ocean conditions. Ideally, one would monitor both ‘treated’ areas (those with habitat restoration actions) and nearby ‘reference’ areas (those without restoration actions) for several generations of fish populations both before and after implementation of actions while simultaneously measuring other explanatory variables. One significant challenge in shifting monitoring to larger spatial scales — populations, subbasins, and provinces — is that at larger scales it becomes increasingly difficult to establish the strong contrasts required to evaluate effectiveness. That is, it is increasingly difficult to compare and contrast specific areas and times with and without certain classes of restoration actions. For example, adjacent subbasins could have a variety of implemented restoration actions. Comparing fish production among these subbasins over time would not lead to any clear inferences about which actions (if any) were responsible for the observed differences in trends. Therefore, it still would be necessary to conduct effectiveness evaluations at finer spatial scales (project to population) for a carefully selected subset of restoration actions and locations in order to generate information of value to the program.

**Province-scale Objectives and the Need for High-Level Indicators**

It will be important for the province-scale objectives required by the program to encompass a set of core objectives common to the four states while respecting additional reporting needs of each state. The process of developing, negotiating, and gaining regional acceptance of province-level objectives will be highly analogous to the ongoing efforts of Washington and Oregon. These efforts have been driven either by statutory requirements or by pressure from Congress and legislatures for accountability. Once established, province-scale objectives will provide focus for efforts to develop a regional approach to monitoring that can support evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the program. Figure 2. above shows the relationship between types of information and how each supports decision-making. For example, the status of high-level indicators compels the activities at the bottom of the pyramid — on-the-ground methods, protocols, and logistical implementation requirements. High-level indicators also can help direct decisions and recommendations about the analytical processes and statistical designs in the middle of the pyramid.

In order to implement adaptive management, resource management agencies need high-level indicators that are easy to understand in terms of every-day definitions and experiences and yet flow explicitly from on-the-ground monitoring programs providing information on progress toward biological objectives. During 2009, the Council adopted three high-level indicators (1) Abundance of Fish and Wildlife, 2) Hydrosystem Survival and Passage, and 3) Council Actions), deferred adoption of a fourth indicator (Ecosystem Health) until it was more clearly defined, and approved fish and wildlife management questions as a working list (<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/hli/2009_10.htm#background>). A subcommittee of PNAMP is working to develop a pool of high-level indicators that can be used as the basis for developing province-scale objectives that the agencies and tribes of the Pacific Northwest can endorse and implement. Through the coordinated use of high-level indicators, a uniform message about watershed health can be developed with all participating agencies using the same terms and coming to similar conclusions.

**Components of a Regional Framework For Research, Monitoring and Evaluation**

Through this research plan, the program will contribute to the design and implementation of a coordinated and integrated regional approach to monitoring. Existing regional should be networked based on a monitoring framework comprising:

* Common management questions and information needs supporting the management questions
* Common research, monitoring, and evaluation categories, monitoring designs and protocols that allow the communication and networking of regional programs
* Common understanding of responsibilities and cost sharing of the monitoring needs

The management questions and project category components of this framework are well developed through ongoing regional coordination efforts. Many of the objectives and management questions of the fish and wildlife program overlap with those of other regional entities and local, state, federal, and tribal governments. The costs of the monitoring and research needed to adequately address these common management questions are more than one program can adequately support or fund. Only through the combined efforts of multiple entities can a sufficient level of information be developed to guide these regionally shared resource management decisions through coordinated, standardized, and programmatic approaches to monitoring.

The components of the research plan that provide support for the development of a regional monitoring framework are its long-term vision and its organization around biological concepts and management questions. Several other large-scale planning documents support this approach by identifying similar objectives and priorities. Source documents that have contributed to the conceptual foundation of the regional approach include:

* Monitoring Section of ISRP’s Retrospective Report (NPCC 2005)
* Research Plan for the Columbia River Basin (NPCC 2006)
* Strategy for Coordinating Monitoring of Aquatic Environments in the Pacific Northwest (PNAMP 2005)
* Considerations for Monitoring in Subbasin Plans 2004 (PNAMP 2004)
* Conservation of Columbia Basin Fish; Final Basinwide Salmon Recovery Strategy (Federal Caucus 2000)
* Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (RME) Plan for the NOAA Fisheries 2000 Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) Biological Opinion (Action Agencies and NOAA 2003)
* ISAB and ISRP Review of the Action Agencies and NOAA Fisheries’ Draft Research, Monitoring & Evaluation Plan for the NOAA-Fisheries 2000 Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion (RME Plan) (ISAB and ISRP, 2004-1)
* Updated Proposed Action for the FCRPS Biological Opinion Remand (Action Agencies 2004)
* Proposed Design and Evaluation of Preliminary Design Templates (CSMEP 2004)
* Data Quality Objectives for Decisions Relating to Status and Trend of Fish Populations, as well as Action Effectiveness of Habitat, Hatchery, Harvest and Hydrosystem Actions (CSMEP 2005)
* Scope of Work for Implementation of the Northwest Environmental Data Network Project (Northwest Environmental Data Network 2005).

Lower Columbia River Estuary Program

BOR Habitat Monitoring Program

EPA National and State Level Monitoring Programs

## Appendix D. Integrating Research Results into Council Policy and Decision-making

Research results must be reviewed and evaluated in order to direct new research and inform ongoing work to protect and restore fish and wildlife. The effectiveness of new actions and the results of research into those actions must be evaluated objectively before the results are widely applied in order to avoid misinterpretation. For example, for a time logjams were considered impediments to salmon passage and were removed from streams. This is what research appeared to support. But further objective evaluation revealed that logjams have value in moderating stream flows, reducing sediment transport, and creating pools where smolts rest and rear. So rather than remove logjams, fisheries scientists began placing logs and logjams in streams.

The review of research results must be conducted across projects and subject areas to determine the contribution of particular results to overall improvements in management. Some tools and metrics for evaluating research contributions across the “H” topic areas — hydropower, harvest, hatcheries, and habitat — and across all life stages of a species were developed and used during subbasin planning. Others currently are being developed under the auspices of PNAMP and through various ESA-related processes. Additional tools and metrics may need to be developed.

Annual workshops sponsored by the Council, federal and state agencies, and tribes could provide a forum for evaluating and disseminating the results of research. The results of individual research projects can provide a basis for larger-scale reviews of the effectiveness of the research program and discussion of additional complementary approaches, including:

* Broader-scale analysis that applies information from several projects to address a particular question
* Synthesis reports of work completed in a particular area, such as the Giorgi report, “Mainstem Passage Strategies in the Columbia River System: Transportation, Spill, and Flow Augmentation” (Council Document [2002-3](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2002/2002-3.htm))
* Expanded project review presentations
* Workshops and science and policy exchanges structured around single topics driven by specific questions, such as transportation effects, and projects synthesized to address that topic
* Workshops, science and policy exchanges, and symposia on emerging topics, such as toxics and invasive species

These forums could help assess future research priorities through oral presentations, reporting of results of relevant studies, and the development of scenarios for applying research results in support of management actions. These forums could promote the exchange of scientific results and provide the Council with information to better inform future funding decisions.

**Dissemination of Research Results**

The Council should collaborate with federal and state agencies, and tribes to develop a strategy for the transfer of research results to other researchers and interested parties. The public nature of Bonneville funding implies that research results are the property of the general public. Bonneville should post all final research reports on its [PISCES database](https://efw.bpa.gov/contractors/using_pisces/get_pisces/download/) and [Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Program Projects & Portfolio database](http://www.cbfish.org/) to facilitate access. Research reports and data should be made available to scientific collaborators, administrators, and the public for additional analyses. The final reports, and any other products derived from them, should be made available through the e [StreamNet Library](http://www.streamnetlibrary.org/) ([project # 2008-505-00](http://www.cbfish.org/Project.mvc/Display/2008-505-00)) either by linking to the reports on the Bonneville databases or by submitting an electronic copy to the library. This library includes materials relating to the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest and maintains a regional depository of all research projects funded under the fish and wildlife program. The StreamNet Library provides regional services that include reference, referral, data base searching, inter-library lending, and document delivery.

The ISRP has recommended that all project proposals reference past achievements and that annual and final project progress reports be issued on time and made available to the region. Further, the ISRP has supported publication of evaluations of work conducted under the fish and wildlife program in a “Columbia River Basin Journal,” as a way to disseminate results and provide a forum for advancing regional knowledge on program actions (see document 2000-6). Such a journal could:

* Provide short turn-around on the presentation of program results to a regional audience that includes managers
* Provide a common information base to support decision-making by the middle-management groups
* Help focus discussion on future directions

## Appendix E. Critical Uncertainties

**Critical Uncertainties Defined**

Critical uncertainties arise from the most important policy issues facing the region. In 1993 the Scientific Review Group (SRG) defined critical uncertainties:

“…*as questions concerning the validity of key assumptions implied or stated in the Fish and Wildlife Program. Critical uncertainties identify important gaps in our knowledge about the resources and functional relationships that determine fish and wildlife productivity. Resolution of uncertainties will greatly improve chances of attaining recovery goals in the Fish and Wildlife Program*.”

The research plan divides complex scientifically important issues into critical uncertainties. The research plan provides a rationale for why the critical uncertainties are important, but does not include extensive background beyond that necessary to establish significance of the issue. Full syntheses of current knowledge on each research topic are not provided because doing so would require a much longer research plan. The critical uncertainties are described at a high level to preserve flexibility of implementation and to prevent the research plan from quickly becoming dated. The critical uncertainties were compiled from the fish and wildlife program, the Council’s 2006 Research Plan, the draft research and monitoring implementation strategies (e.g., Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Strategy, ASMS) and synthesis (e.g., ocean synthesis report) documents produced by managers, the Counicl’s Science-Policy Exchange materials, various reports of the ISAB and the ISRP including those produced by their predecessors the Independent Scientific Group and Scientific Review Group, input from regional fish and wildlife managers, subbasin plans, recommendations from national science groups, biological opinions, and other research plans within the region. Chapter IV introduces long-standing and contemporary focal research themes and critical uncertainties important to the program and to the region.

By articulating and organizing these uncertainties the research plan helps the region agree upon research priorities, address knowledge gaps, and avoid duplication of effort. The research plan describes the critical uncertainties in terms that are intended to elicit the development of specific research hypothesis and project proposals. Therefore each research theme profiles the topic and why it is important. This approach highlights the central issues while preserving the challenge for investigators to develop more innovative or integrative approaches.

The ISAB and ISRP recommend against an overly detailed rendition of research needs, pointing out that this inadvertently might diminish innovative responses; preclude flexibility to incorporate new information and techniques; and result in early obsolescence of the research plan. Further, the ISAB and ISRP cautioned that too many research recommendations could precipitate difficulty in reaching consensus on priorities. Consequently inventories of all the potential research topics identified during the public review of the research plan do not appear in the plan. All uncertainties, however, are to be compiled in the supporting research uncertainty database initiated in 2012 (insert link to database). Taken together the critical uncertainties set forth in Chapter IV and the supporting database will provide a framework for guiding more detailed discussions of the allocation of research funding.

**Sources of Critical Uncertainties**

Independent Science Groups

The Council has relied on committees of scientists for their expert advice on fish and wildlife issues ever since the Council was formed. In the early 1990s, the Council asked its Scientific Review Group to identify critical scientific uncertainties for the purpose of focusing implementation of the fish and wildlife program. In January 1993 the SRG issued its report, entitled *Critical Uncertainties in the Fish and Wildlife Program* (SRG 1993-2).

The SRG concluded that a major shortcoming of the fish and wildlife program was that it lacked an explicit conceptual foundation “that couples life histories and production with appropriate ecosystem components.” The SRG identified six “ecological uncertainties that encompass the fish and wildlife program as a whole, as opposed to a long list of uncertainties associated with each of the program elements.” The six uncertainties were programmatic in scale, and are included here in their original form, but phrased as questions:

* What are the key assumptions in the fish and wildlife program, and are they scientifically valid?
* Can salmonid populations in the Columbia River be increased and sustained over the long-term, given the multitude of biological, physical, and cultural constraints?
* Can the diversity of anadromous salmonid stocks be sustained over the long-term?
* What are the relative contributions of habitat loss, harvest, predation, and mainstem passage to reduced riverine survival and production of anadromous salmonids and other fish targeted in the program?
* To what extent are hatchery production and supplementation programs detrimental to wild salmonid productivity and stock diversity?
* To what extent are assumptions in the wildlife part of the fish and wildlife program ecologically sound?

Subsequently, the Council revised the fish and wildlife program and included actions to address the uncertainties, including creation of the Independent Scientific Group to provide an ongoing evaluation of the program on its scientific merits. Importantly, the Council made clear that uncertainties should be used to guide the prioritization and funding of research efforts conducted under the program. The Council created the ISRP for the purpose of reviewing projects proposed for funding under the program, and in this role the ISRP provides guidance on prioritizing research. The Council and NOAA Fisheries also jointly created the ISAB to provide advice to both agencies, and now also to the Columbia River Indian Tribes. Further background on the science review groups can be found at [www.nwcouncil.org/fw/science.htm](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/science.htm). Uncertainties extracted from ISAB and ISRP reports during the 2012-2013 update of the Research Plan are identified in the Council’s working draft of research uncertainties database available: [insert weblink].

Fish and Wildlife Program

 The Fish and Wildlife Program captures uncertainties related to the program that have been identified and incorporated during each amendment process. The uncertainties extracted from the Fish and Wildlife Program during the 2012-2013 update of the Research Plan are identified in the Council’s working draft of research uncertainties database available: [insert weblink].

Fish and Wildlife Managers

Many valuable recommendations were received from the fish and wildlife managers and other resource management entities and incorporated in the research plan. The fish and wildlife managers are uniquely qualified to help identify research priorities and determine when and where to implement projects. This is an important part of coordinating large-scale planning. The types of comments received ranged from very general points regarding the organization of the document to very specific comments on a particular research topic [ update to reflect 2012-2013 comments]. Uncertainties extracted from managers’ input during the 2012-2013 update of the Research Plan are identified in the Council’s working draft of research uncertainties database available: [insert weblink].

National Scientific Reviews

The Committee on Protection and Management of Pacific Northwest Anadromous Salmon was formed in 1992 under the auspices of the National Research Council’s Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology. The Committee was charged with assessing the state of the stocks, analyzing the causes of decline, and analyzing options for management, taking into consideration socioeconomic costs and benefits. The NRC Committee’s efforts culminated in the 1996 publication of *Upstream: Salmon and Society in the Pacific Northwest*. Although this initiative did not focus on research needs per se*,* it addressed gaps in knowledge, information needs, and scientific uncertainty. Key points from these topics as well as insights on institutional arrangements have been included in the 2006 research plan and remain in the current version.

In November 2000, the National Science and Technology Council Committee on Environment and Natural Resources released *From the Edge: Science to Support Restoration of Pacific Salmon* (CENR 2000). The report was prepared to support President Clinton’s Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Initiative, initiated in 1999 to help reverse the decline of Pacific salmon. It is important to note that key authors of this report included members of the ISAB. A major element of the initiative was to accelerate the use of federal science and technology to assist in the conservation of Pacific salmon. The CENR was requested to develop an assessment that identified knowledge gaps and research priorities based on the considerable amount of scientific information already in existence. The report discusses the science needs for remediation, reviews the findings of several management-oriented science summaries for the Columbia River Basin, discusses the role of science in a restoration program, and underscores the importance of monitoring the status of salmon stocks and the magnitude of risk factors. The report also identified six broad categories of relevant and important research that have been underemphasized in the past, including:

* Definition of critical ecosystem features for the full life cycle of salmonid species and stocks
* Quantitative definition and assessment of risks (natural and human caused) during upstream, downstream, and estuary/ocean life stages
* Clarification of fundamentals of biological diversity in salmon species, races, and stocks
* Development of remedial technologies that work with nature rather than replacing it
* Clarification of the regional variation in the physical, biological, social, cultural, and economic environments of salmon
* Development of quantitative indicators and analytical methods to assess the status of salmon, characterize risk factors, and evaluate outcomes of remediation efforts to improve environmental conditions or reduce risks

**2004 Public Review of the Columbia River Basin Research Plan**

The Council accepted public comments on the draft 2006 Columbia River Basin Research Plan from October 1 to November 30, 2004. A total of 28 comments were received from the tribes (three), state agencies (eight), federal agencies (eight), local government (one), academic institutions (two), consulting firms (four), and private individuals (two). A list of all the entities that provided comments follows.

Alaska Resource and Economic Development, Inc. (consulting firm, Wrangell, Alaska)

Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Oregon State University, Institute for Natural Resources

Economic Development Council, Clatsop County

ESSA Technologies Limited (consulting firm Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada)

Federal Caucus

Lathim, Mr. Del (citizen, Pasco Washington)

Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership

Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks

Natural Solutions (consulting firm, Helena MT.)

Northwest Fisheries Science Center, NOAA

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Taylor, Mr. Bernie (citizen, Newberg, Oregon)

Tinsley, Mr. Thomas (citizen, Springfield, Oregon)

University of Notre Dame, Department of Biological Sciences

US Bureau of Reclamation

US Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration

US Fish and Wildlife Service

US Forest Service

US Environmental Protection Agency

US Geological Survey

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Washington Department of Ecology

Wyoming Game and Fish Department

**2013 Public Review of the Columbia River Basin Research Plan**

The Council accepted public comments on the draft Columbia River Basin Research Plan from November 8 2012 to February 8 2013. A total of x comments were received from the tribes (x), state agencies (x federal agencies (x), local government (x), academic institutions (x consulting firms (x), and private individuals (x). A list of all the entities that provided comments follows.

[ insert the list of entities that provided comments ]

# VI. References

[Annual Implementation Work Plan, Fiscal Year 2000](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2000/2000-6.htm). Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. Vol. I., p. 21

Budy, P., G.P. Thiede, N. Bouwes, C.E. Petrosky, and H. Schaller. 2002. Evidence linking delayed mortality of Snake River salmon to their earlier hydrosystem experience. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 22:35-51.

Committee on the Environment and Natural Resources (CENR), 2000. From the Edge: Science to Support Restoration of Pacific Salmon. National Science and Technology Council.

Draheim, R., M. Sytsma, R. Miller, and J. Cordell. 2007. Middle Columbia River Aquatic Nonindigenous Species Survey. Center for Lakes and Reservoirs, Portland State University, OR, and the University of Washington, WA. <http://www.clr.pdx.edu/docs/MCRANS_Final_Rprt.pdf>

Esterby, S.R. 1993. Trend analysis methods for environmental data. Environmetrics 4:459-481.

FPC, 2004. [2004 Annual Report of the Fish Passage Center](http://www.fpc.org/documents/annual_FPC_report/FPC2004_Annual_Report.pdf), p. 100. Table 41. Fish Passage Center, Portland, OR.

FPC, 2012. 2011 [Annual Report of the Fish Passage Center](http://www.fpc.org/documents/annual_FPC_report/FPC%202011%20ANNUAL%20REPORT--FINAL.pdf), p. 158. Fish Passage Center, Portland, OR.

Haeseker, S.L., J. A. McCann, J. Tuomikoski, and B. Chockley. 2012. Assessing Freshwater and Marine Environmental Influences on Life-Stage Specific Rates of Snake River Spring-Summer Chinook Salmon and Steelhead. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 141:121-138.

HSRG (Hatchery Scientific Review Group). 2009. Columbia River Hatchery Reform System-Wide Report. Pacific Northwest Hatchery Reform Project. <http://www.hatcheryreform.us/hrp/reports/columbia/welcome_show.action>

ISAB, 2001-7. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Review of Salmon Recovery Strategies for the Columbia River Basin](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2001-7.pdf). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2003-1. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Review of flow augmentation: update and clarification](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2003-1.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2003-2. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Review of Strategies for Recovering Tributary Habitat](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2003-2.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2003-3. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Review of Salmon and Steelhead Supplementation](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2003-3.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2004-2. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [ISAB Findings from the Reservoir Operations/Flow Survival Symposium](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2004-2.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2005-4. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Report on Harvest Management of Columbia River Salmon and Steelhead](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2005-4.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB 2007-2. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Climate Change Impacts on Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/report.asp?d=354). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB 2007-3. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Human Population Impacts on Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2007-3.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2011-4. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Using a Comprehensive Landscape Approach for More Effective Conservation and Restoration](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/report.asp?d=640). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISAB, 2011-11. Independent Scientific Advisory Board, [Columbia River Food-webs: developing a Broader Sciencitifc Foundation for Fish and Wildlife Restoration](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/2011-1/ExecutiveSummary.pdf). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP and ISAB, 2004-1. [Review of Draft Action Agency and NOAA Fisheries RME Plan](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2004-1.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP and ISAB, 2005-15. [Monitoring and Evaluation of Supplementation Reports](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2005-15.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP, 2000-3. [Review of Databases Funded through the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2000-3.pdf). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP, 2003-13. Independent Scientific Review Panel, [Review of the Action Agencies' Draft Estuary Plan](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2003-13.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP, 2005-14. [Retrospective Report 1997-2005](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2005-14.htm). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP, 2012-3. [ISRP Review of the Ocean Synthesis Report: The Marine Ecology of Juvenile Columbia River Basin Salmonids: A Synthesis of Research 1998-2011](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/report.asp?d=664). Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

ISRP, 2012-6. [ISRP Final Review of Proposals for the Resident Fish, Data Management, and Regional Coordination Category](%5C%5C%5C%5Cnas1%5C%5Cfish%5C%5CNL%5C%5CWw%5C%5CNWcouncil%5C%5Cresearchplan%5C%5CISRP%20Final%20Review%20of%20Proposals%20for%20the%20Resident%20Fish%2C%20Data%20Management%2C%20and%20Regional%20Coordination%20Category%20) <http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2012-6.pdf>. Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

Jacobson, K., B. Peterson, M. Trudel, J. Ferguson, C. Moran, D. Welsch, A. Baptista, B. Beckman, R. Brodeur, E. Casillas, R. Emmett, J. Miller, D. Teel, T. Wainwright, L. Weitkamp, J. Zamon, and K. Fresh. 2012. [The Marine Ecology of Juvenile Columbia River Basin Salmonids: A Synthesis of Research 1998-2011](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2010/rmeap/MarineEcology2012.pdf). Report of the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Kintama Research Services, Ltd. and Oregon State University to Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

Lee, K.N. and D.L. Klemka, with M.E. Marts. 1980. Electric Power and the Future of the Pacific Northwest. University of Washington Press, Seattle, WA.

Litchatowich, J. No-date. Salmon Hatcheries: apst, Present and Future. Prepared for Oregon Business Council. Alder Fork Consulting. <http://www.orbusinesscouncil.org/docs/hatcheries.pdf>

Marmorek, D.R., M. Porter, I.J. Parnell, and C. Peters. [2004 Comparative Survival Study Workshop February 11-13, 2004](http://www.fpc.org/documents/CSS/CSSworkshop_reportfinal.pdf). Fish Passage Center. Portland OR.

National Research Council, 1996. Upstream: Salmon and Society in the Pacific Northwest. National Academy Press.

NPCC, Council Document 99-4. [Review of Artificial Production of Anadromous and Resident Fish](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/1999/99-4.htm). Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 99-15. [Artificial Production Report](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/1999/99-15.htm). Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 98-16. [Development of Regional Framework](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/1998/98-16.htm).

NPCC, 2000-19. [2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2000/2000-19/Default.htm), A MultiSpecies Approach for Decision Making. Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 2000-09. [Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, 2009 Amendments.](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2009/2009-09.pdf) Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 2002-3. [Mainstem Passage Strategies in the Columbia River System: Transportation, Spill, and Flow Augmentation, aka "Giorgi Report"](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2002/2002-3.htm). Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 2004-17. [Artificial Production Review Evaluation](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2004/2004-17.htm). Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 2006-3. [Columbia River Basin Research Plan](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2006/2006-3.htm). Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

NPCC, Council Document 2009-09. [Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, 2009 Amendments.](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2009/2009-09.pdf) Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland OR.

Nyberg, B.1999. Implementing Adaptive Management of British Columbia’s Forests – Where Have We Gone Wrong and Right? *In:* McDonald, G.B., J. Fraser and P. Gray (eds.). Adaptive Management Forum: Linking Management and Science to Achieve Ecological Sustainability. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada, pp. 17-20.

Office of Technology Assessment (U.S. Congress). 1993. Harmful non-indigenous species in the United States. OTA-F-565 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office) – also available online at: [www.wws.princeton.edu/~ota/disk1/1993/9325 n.html](http://www.wws.princeton.edu/~ota/disk1/1993/9325%20n.html)

Peters, C.N. and D.R. Marmorek. 2001. Application of decision analysis to evaluate recovery actions for threatened Snake River spring and summer Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 58:2431-2446.

Pinkerton, E.W. 1992. Translating Legal Rights into Management Practice: Overcoming Barriers to the Exercise of Co-Management. Human Organization 51:330-41.

PNAMP, 2005. [PNAMP Strategy for Coordinating Monitoring of Aquatic Environments](http://www.reo.gov/PNAMP/Products/index.htm) (Northern California, Oregon, Idaho, Washington).

RASP (Regional Assessment of Supplementation Project). 1992. Supplementation in the

Columbia Basin: summary report series. Final Report DOE/BP-01830-14, Bonneville

Power Administration, Portland, OR.

Roni, P., editor. 2005. Monitoring stream and watershed restoration. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland. 350 pp.

Scientific Applications International Corporation, 2003. Recommendations for a Comprehensive and Cooperative Columbia River Information Management System. Report to the NWPC, April 30, 2003.

Scientific Review Group, 1993-2. Critical Uncertainties in the Fish and Wildlife Program Northwest Power Planning Council. Portland, Oregon.

Sytsma, M.D., J.R. Cordell, J.W. Chapman, R.C. Draheim. 2004. Lower Columbia River Aquatic Nonindigenous Species Survey 2001-2004 Final Technical Report. Prepared for the United States Coast Guard and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. <http://www.clr.pdx.edu/docs/LCRANSFinalReport.pdf>

Urquhart, Paulsen and Larsen, 1998. Monitoring for Policy-Relevant Regional Trends Over Time. Biological Applications, 8(2), pp. 246-257

US EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, region 10 & The Columbia River Toxics reduction Working group). 2010. [Columbia River Basin Toxics Reduction Action Plan.](http://www.epa.gov/columbiariver/pdf/columbia_river_toxics_action_plan_sept2010.pdf) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, WA.

Williams, R.N. Editor. 2005. Return to the River. Elsevier Academic Press, 699 pp.

Wilson, P.H. 2002. Using population projection matrices to evaluate recovery strategies for Snake River spring and summer Chinook salmon. Conservation Biology 17:782-794.

1. Integrated hatchery program is a hatchery program with the intent for the natural environment to drive the adaptation and fitness of a composite population of fish that spawns both in a hatchery and in the wild. (HSRG 2009, http://hatcheryreform.us/hrp\_downloads/reports/columbia\_river/system-wide/4\_appendix\_g\_glossary.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Segregated hatchery program is a atchery program with the intent for the hatchery population to represent a distinct population that is reproductively isolated from naturally-spawning populations. (HSRG 2009, http://hatcheryreform.us/hrp\_downloads/reports/columbia\_river/system-wide/4\_appendix\_g\_glossary.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Supplementation is the use of artificialpropagation in the attempt to maintain or increase natural production while maintaining the long-term fitness of the target population, and keeping the ecological and genetic impacts onnon-target populations within specified biological limits” (RASP 1992). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The goal of conservation hatcheries is to prevent extinction of threatened or endangered stocks (Litchatowich, no-date). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Restoration hatcheries attempt to reestablish salmon or steelhead populations in habitat from

which they were previously extirpated (Litchatowich, no-date) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Mitigation hatcheries attempt to replace natural production lost because of habitat degradation (Litchatowich, no-date). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The goal of augmentation hatcheries is to increase sport and/or commercial harvest Opportunities (Litchatowich, no-date). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. **Computational fluid dynamics**, usually abbreviated as **CFD**, is a branch of [fluid mechanics](http://www.ask.com/wiki/Fluid_mechanics?qsrc=3044" \o "Fluid mechanics) that uses [numerical methods](http://www.ask.com/wiki/Numerical_methods?qsrc=3044" \o "Numerical methods) and [algorithms](http://www.ask.com/wiki/Algorithms?qsrc=3044" \o "Algorithms) to solve and analyze problems involving fluid flows. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Interceptions are catches of juvenile, immature, or maturing fish by non-target fisheries. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For the purpose of this plan, invasive and native species are defined as, as follows: “invasive species” means an alien species whose introduction does or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health, and “native species” means a species that historically occurred or currently occurs in an ecosystem, without being the result of an introduction. (Section 1 of Presidential Executive Order 13112 Invasive Species). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. http://www.clr.pdx.edu/docs/LCRANSFinalReport.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-501, 94 Stat. 2697 (December 5, 1980), codified with amendments in U.S Code Annotated 16, section 839 (2000)). Relevant to this research plan, Section 839b(h)(6)(B) directs the Council to include in the fish and wildlife program measures the Council determines are based on, and supported by, the best available scientific knowledge. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)