



# Spokane Tribal Natural Resources

P.O. Box 480 • Wellpinit, WA 99040 • (509) 626 - 4427 • fax 258 - 9600

February 12, 2016

Tony Grover  
Fish and Wildlife Division Director  
Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Fish and Wildlife Division  
851 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97204-1348

RE: Response to ISRP 2016-1

Dear Mr. Grover:

On behalf of the Spokane Tribe of Indians, please accept the attached response to the Scientific Review Panel's *Review of Proposed Habitat Suitability for Anadromous Salmonid Reintroduction in the Blocked Areas of the U.S. portion of the Upper Columbia Basin* (ISRP 2016-1).

The Spokane Tribe and our collaborators appreciate the ISRP's feedback and guidance they have provided. Comments and qualifications made have spurred constructive conversations among project proponents. Responses to the review are provided within the text of *ISRP 2016-1* and address the individual qualifications and comments made by the panel.

Please feel free to contact us with any further questions or comments you may have.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "BJ Kieffer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Billy Joe Kieffer, Director  
Spokane Tribe of Indians  
Department of Natural Resources  
PO Box 100  
Wellpinit, WA 99040



## Independent Scientific Review Panel

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

**Memorandum (ISRP 2016-1)**

**January 13, 2016**

**To:** Henry Lorenzen, Chair, Northwest Power and Conservation Council

**From:** Steve Schroder, ISRP Chair

**Subject:** Review of Proposed Habitat Suitability Assessment for Anadromous Salmonid Reintroduction in the Blocked Areas of the U.S. portion of the Upper Columbia Basin

### **Background**

In response to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's December 16, 2015 request, the ISRP reviewed the Spokane Tribe of Indians' proposal to assess the potential availability and suitability of habitat for anadromous salmon and steelhead survival in the U.S. portion of the Columbia River and its tributaries above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams, from river mile 545.1 to river mile 745. The Spokane Tribe of Indians developed this proposal and proposes to implement it in collaboration with its other regional co-managers: the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. The U.S. Geological Survey Columbia River Research Laboratory and NOAA Fisheries are also part of the collaborative group and would provide technical support.

This collaborative proposal was the only proposal submitted in response to the Council's request for proposals ([RFP](#)) to address part of Phase 1 of a multifaceted approach to investigate reintroduction of anadromous fish in the blocked waters of the upper Columbia River as called for in the [Anadromous Fish Mitigation in Blocked Areas Strategy](#) in the Council's 2014 Fish and Wildlife Program. Phase 1 of the investigation is to include:

- "Evaluate information from passage studies at other blockages and from previous assessments of passage at Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph dams.
- Investigate habitat availability, suitability and salmon survival potential in habitats above Grand Coulee. This might include selective releases of salmon and steelhead. Investigate the scientific feasibility and possible cost of upstream and downstream passage options for salmon and steelhead. Before funding new investigations, provide the Council with a report for consideration of subsequent work to advance the fish passage planning process.
- As part of Phase 1, the Council will engage in discussions with tribal, state, and federal agencies and others regarding the purpose, scope and progress of reintroduction

efforts above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams.”

This RFP targeted *one element* of Phase 1: the investigation into habitat potential. The species of interest are steelhead and Chinook and sockeye salmon. The habitat assessment, when linked with other elements of Phase 1, will inform reintroduction potential. The specific tasks in the RFP included:

- “Compile and synthesize what is known about both the area of interest and species of interest using existing studies, GIS information, reports, and local knowledge
- Identify areas where information is weak or lacking
- Identify and prioritize target reaches for potential field surveys using information from the compilation and synthesis in the first step
- As necessary, perform field studies in target reaches to evaluate existing habitat condition and suitability (may include water quality assessments, predation and competition and species risk assessments, etc.)
  - Outline proposed study design (e.g., see menu in [monitoringmethods.org](http://monitoringmethods.org))
  - Summarize information at the reach level by attribute (e.g., valley width, channel type, slope, terrace height and width, sinuosity, stream width and depth, gradient, substrate, eroding banks, water quality attributes, etc.)
- Summarize and analyze previously existing and newly collected data to determine: a) what species and life histories can be supported by the existing habitat; b) salmon survival potential; and c) species interaction, particularly with native and non-native fishes.
  - Analyze information to determine suitability for the species of interest, based upon water quality, habitat condition, and species assemblages.
- Evaluate findings and report to Bonneville and the Council.
- Finally, compile a report describing the condition, suitability, and potential of the habitat for salmon/steelhead survival potential for the target reaches in the area of interest.”

Before submitting the proposal for ISRP review, the Council staff confirmed that the proposal met the threshold requirements outlined in the RFP. The proposal is part of a more comprehensive sequence of objectives and activities listed in the proposal’s Appendix A. The ISRP’s review, however, focuses on the scientific soundness of the proposed methodologies to assess the habitat potential and address the tasks specified in the RFP (i.e., activities under Objective 2 in Appendix A).

## **Recommendation: Meets Scientific Review Criteria (Qualified)**

The key components for an effective assessment seem to be in place: cooperation and cost-sharing, workshops to compile expert opinion, remote sensing and GIS, modeling of intrinsic potential, analysis of migration barriers and EDT. With strong leadership, cooperation, and skilled analysts, this approach could provide a robust assessment to guide future decisions.

The ISRP concludes that the proposal meets scientific criteria with two Qualifications (listed below). These Qualifications and other specific ISRP comments can be addressed in the Council's proposal review and recommendation process and in BPA's contracting process. If implemented, the ISRP looks forward to reviewing a draft report when the assessment is completed.

### ***Qualifications***

1. Consideration of future suitability: Given the long-term nature of this reintroduction project, serious consideration must be given to expectations of future suitability, beyond current conditions, of habitat in blocked areas. The methodology should allow incorporation of information about expected patterns of land development and climate change. This proposal states "*where possible, we will incorporate physical data that have been shown to be important when considering the potential impacts of climate on salmonid IP [Intrinsic Potential]*" but gives no further details. The proposal should incorporate information that is currently available from climate change models, especially information relating to stream temperatures under various scenarios. For example, the [NorWeST](#) project provides high-resolution predictions of summer stream temperatures based on a comprehensive stream temperature database that was culled from more than 80 resource organizations. The [NorWeST](#) webpage hosts stream temperature data and geospatial map outputs from a regional temperature model for Northwest USA. The webpage also states "*a major goal of this project is to provide climate vulnerability and native trout refuge information to land managers and policymakers.*"

### ***Response:***

***Project proponents agree that evaluating future conditions will be a critical component in assessing the long-term suitability of habitat in the blocked area. To accomplish this, NorWeST +1°C, +2°C, and +3°C temperature increase scenarios will be included in iterations of IP modeling. These scenarios represent increases to a historical composite scenario of modeled August mean temperatures between the years 1993 and 2011. Where available and appropriate, modeled predictions of precipitation will also be incorporated to help inform expected changes in runoff and discharge. Current patterns of land use will be incorporated into the IP model. Future land use practices are an important consideration; however, anticipating future practices and identifying such data may be difficult to accomplish under the proposed scope of work and proposed funding level.***

2. Evaluation of Intrinsic Potential (IP): IP modeling will be used to assess the suitability of tributary habitats to support Chinook and steelhead within the blocked areas. However, the

proposal does not adequately justify the use of IP modeling or consider the limitations of using habitat surveys for resident species to evaluate habitat potential for Chinook and steelhead. A more detailed description of the proposed IP modeling approach (including its assumptions, limitations, and the specific metrics to be obtained from existing GIS data or from other sources) would likely ameliorate these concerns. The proponents provide a few references on IP modeling, but the proposal would have benefited from a more detailed discussion. For example, how well has the IP approach characterized habitat potential of Chinook and steelhead in the eastern side of the Cascade Range where habitat issues such as extreme water temperatures may be encountered? How well can the IP approach distinguish the suitability of habitat to support Chinook versus steelhead?

**Response:**

***Intrinsic Potential has been applied along the west coast (e.g., Spence et al. 2005, Bidlack et al. 2014) and into eastern Washington, including in the Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow, and Okanogan (RTT 2014). The approach to IP modeling will be similar to that employed by the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, guided by Cooney & Holzer (2006) and Sheer et al. (2009) as well as by project partners. Habitat data used in the IP modeling will be GIS or remote sensing data available through the public domain. Data collected through resident fisheries surveys will not be included in the IP analysis. Likely metrics and data sources include but are not limited to those listed in Table 1.***

***Table 1. Metrics and data sources to be used to analyze intrinsic potential. Metrics and sources are subject to change upon recommendations from technical advisors.***

<b>Metrics</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>
Stream Gradient	USGS - National Elevation Dataset (10m DEM)
	USGS - National Hydrography Dataset (NHDPlusV2)
Bankfull & Wetted Widths	USGS - National Elevation Dataset (10m DEM)
	NOAA - NCEI (4km grid of mean annual precipitation)
Valley Confinement	USGS - National Elevation Dataset (10m DEM)
	USGS - National Hydrography Dataset (NHDPlusV2)
Water Temperature	USGS - National Elevation Dataset (10m DEM)
	USGS - National Hydrography Dataset (NHDPlusV2)
	NorWeST Stream Temperature Modeling
Sediment Delivery	USDA - National Resource Conservation Service (STATSGO2)
	USGS - National Elevation Dataset (10m DEM)
	USDA - National Agriculture Imagery Program (4-Band NAIP)
Distribution	WDFW - Fish Passage Barrier Program

***Biological data specific to upper Columbia Spring/Summer Chinook and steelhead have already been reviewed and compiled by the Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team (ICTRT) and the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB). These data were used to***

***develop regionally and species-specific habitat suitability curves to be applied to IP modeling. These curves reflect the different habitat preferences unique to Chinook and steelhead of the upper Columbia. These curves have been presented by Cooney and Holzer (2006) and Sheer et al. (2009) and will be used in the proposed analysis. Before being applied to the IP model, project partners will review the suitability curves to verify they are compatible for use within the blocked area.***

## **Comments**

The proposal is well organized and easy to read, but it only provides general descriptions of planned activities. This limits the potential for feedback that might be used to improve the project. The ISRP's specific comments are organized under the following five subheadings.

### **1. Synthesis of what is known about both the area of interest and species of interest using existing studies, GIS information, reports, and local knowledge, including identification of where information is weak or lacking**

The proposal describes an ambitious but nicely organized process for synthesizing anecdotal information and existing data that have not been compiled or scrutinized. The strengths of the proposal are the emphasis on including multiple stakeholders, partnerships among the Tribes and WDFW, and technical support from USGS and NOAA. Although not explicitly mentioned, it appears from Proposal Table 1, that the proponents also plan to work with the U.S. Forest Service. Such collaboration should prove quite useful as PIBO surveys, Level 2 Forest Service stream survey data, and watershed condition rating data are all available for the project area.

Another strength of the proposal is the planned series of three workshops to iteratively accumulate and reach consensus about potential barriers to species reintroduction, inputs for EDT modeling, and results from modeling. The planning and design of the workshops will be critical to success, given the workshops' central role, but details were not provided and could not be reviewed.

#### ***Response:***

***Planning and designing the workshops will be led by Spokane Tribe staff, with assistance from project partners. Meetings will be held in Spokane and be shared online with partners unable to be present. The first workshop will cover preliminary IP analysis, the status and sharing of existing habitat data, and to confirm the presence of natural barriers and identify any that may have been omitted. The second workshop will review the most recent iteration of IP, how the results compare with expert opinion, discuss current conditions of tributaries identified as having high IP, and known data gaps and uncertainties for these bodies of water. The third, and last, workshop will cover the final iteration of IP modeling, an evaluation of existing habitat data, and if available, present related works conducted by project partners.***

The proposal also states that a Habitat Database would be developed, but no details were provided about its structure or how it would be managed. These elements need to be addressed early in the project to avoid confusion and delays.

**Response:**

***These details are currently being discussed with project partners. Several regional databases that are currently being used within the blocked area (e.g., Kalispel Tribe of Indians' Geospatially Enabled Database Management System, GEDMS; Colville Confederated Tribe's Resident Fisheries Database) are being considered for use as either a template or for direct integration.***

A few references were provided to support statements that surveys of stream habitat for resident fishes (e.g., native redband trout) have already been conducted within the proposed study area. However, as noted in Qualification 2, the proposal must address potential concerns about use of existing habitat survey data for resident species to predict habitat suitability for anadromous Chinook and steelhead.

**Response:**

***The body of existing data will be compiled and assessed to examine its completeness with respect to Level 2 Environmental Attributes for use in future EDT modeling. Physical habitat data collected through resident fish surveys will not be included in the IP analysis. This will ensure that all tributaries are assessed in a consistent manner.***

***Biological data derived from resident fish surveys will not be used in IP modeling. Instead, habitat suitability curves, which have previously been applied to the upper Columbia, will be used in the proposed IP modeling.***

It seems that many hundreds of stream kilometers might be available for recolonization. The proposal does not mention whether intrinsic habitat potential would be evaluated for every stream shown in the map (Appendix C). Perhaps that effort would be feasible if the project relied solely on GIS data. Stream discharge has been incorporated in previous studies of salmon intrinsic habitat potential (e.g., Burnett et al. 2007). It is not clear, however, if that will occur in this case as the proposal does not specify which metrics will be obtained from GIS data. For example, can GIS provide data on bank full width? Will flow be estimated for each tributary shown in the study area map? What stream flow metric is best used for steelhead versus Chinook? Water temperature will be a critical factor in the blocked areas, yet there is no mention of water temperature information or information on potential riparian habitat.

**Response:**

***The initial approach will be to consider all tributaries in the proposed IP modeling exercise. For this reason the approach will be solely reliant on existing GIS data and using those data to model specific metrics (e.g., wetted and bankfull width, valley width, mean annual flow & EROM velocity (NHDPlusV2), predicted temperatures, and others).***

Ideally a stratified random design for sampling should be used to achieve the level of accuracy needed for a reasonably comprehensive assessment of such a large area. Depending on the amount and the difficulty of compiling habitat information for blocked areas, perhaps it would be more cost-effective to identify migration barriers first and then to develop EDT models for habitat that exists below barriers, or above barriers that are easily breached.

**Response:**

***This is an excellent suggestion and a likely approach project proponents will take.***

**2. Identification and prioritization of target reaches for potential field surveys using information from the synthesis**

Intrinsic Potential (IP) modeling seems appropriate for developing a first approximation of priorities and has been used for this purpose in other broad scale assessments. For example, the report, *Habitat Intrinsic Potential Modeling of Selected Streams on the Outer Washington Coast for Anadromous Salmonid Fish* (Olympic Natural Resource Center, 2013), provides a good discussion on a broad scale prioritization assessment. However, as noted in Qualification 2, some additional discussion of the assumptions and limitations of IP modeling would be useful.

More detail on the consideration of potential interactions with non-native and/or invasive species would also be useful. This topic should be addressed at a general level now and in more detail in later phases of the project.

**Response:**

***Project proponents agree, interactions with non-native species will be an important consideration when evaluating reintroduction. Such a topic warrants greater scrutiny than can be afforded under the current solicitation and proposed funding level. However, project partners are currently working on developing a risk assessment for the blocked area that will address these interactions in depth.***

**3. As necessary, description of field studies in target reaches to evaluate existing habitat condition and suitability (may include water quality assessments, predation and competition and species risk assessments, etc.)**

- **Outline of proposed study design (e.g., see menu in [monitoringmethods.org](http://monitoringmethods.org))**
- **Summary of information at the reach level by attribute (e.g., valley width, channel type, slope, terrace height and width, sinuosity, stream width and depth, gradient, substrate, eroding banks, water quality attributes, etc.)**

Field studies were not described in the proposal, so the ISRP could not evaluate their scientific merits or judge whether funding will be adequate. However, the general approach seems adequate and much of the field work probably can be done after an analysis of existing information. The proposal indicates that the types of data collected by field surveys in 2017

would be determined during a workshop in 2016. Given the limited budget for FY2017, what portion of the study area could feasibly be surveyed? What types of data collection are currently anticipated given knowledge from previous habitat studies for resident fishes? Would field work in 2017 be limited to verification of potential migration barriers?

**Response:**

***Field work and associated data collection required for IP modeling will be minimal. It is anticipated that field work will be limited to a barrier survey to evaluate natural barriers to fish passage. However, the effort for this barrier survey may be minimal given the abundance of existing data provided by WDFW's Fish Passage Barrier dataset and work previously performed by project partners.***

***Once compiled into a database, existing data will be reviewed to evaluate which Level 2 Environmental Attributes need to be collected so the data may be used as EDT model inputs.***

It is also not clear to what extent migration barriers due to anthropogenic effects, identified in the WDFW data base, will be validated and whether there will be any additional assessments. Although beyond the scope of this RFP, field sampling to determine level 2 EDT parameters for future modeling will be a key element for long term success. Restoration of connectivity likely will be a relatively expensive one to address.

**Response:**

***The intent of the proposed project is to evaluate the historic distribution of anadromous salmonids within the blocked area, which would have been limited by natural barriers. Anthropogenic barriers, those within the WDFW database and from other sources, will need to be validated. However, this will likely occur under a separate project that will assess the current conditions and distribution potential of reintroduced anadromous salmonids.***

**4. Summary and analysis of previously existing and newly collected data to determine: a) what species and life histories can be supported by the existing habitat; b) salmon survival potential; and c) species interaction, particularly with native and non-native fishes.**

- **Analysis of information to determine suitability for the species of interest, based upon water quality, habitat condition, and species assemblages.**

The proposal refers to habitat surveys already conducted for resident species, but it would benefit from more description of the data collected during these surveys and how those data may or may not apply to Chinook and steelhead. For example, can current and future water temperature be identified as suitable for Chinook and steelhead? Have quantitative estimates of spawning and rearing habitats and their relative quality been identified for resident trout or kokanee?

**Response:**

***Many projects have been implemented and completed within the proposed study area under the auspices of fisheries and water quality management groups, local universities, and others. However, the exact nature and geographic extent of data collected through these works is currently unknown. Assembling regional experts and their existing data will likely prove beneficial in informing one another as to the work that has occurred within the area.***

Potential obstacles to this assessment's progress are the challenges of compiling standardized information and gaining consensus from numerous parties. The EDT method has been extensively applied, and so it is likely to gain acceptance among the parties given its history of use and peer review in the Basin. Technical support available from USGS and NOAA should be beneficial. Another feature of EDT is that its inputs are explicitly documented, which will facilitate the process of determining gaps for future surveys. Gap identification might be a key outcome of this phase of the study.

**5. Report to Bonneville and Council describing the condition, suitability, and potential of the habitat for salmon/steelhead survival potential for the target reaches in the area of interest**

The nature of the final report to the Council is not described in any detail, but the proposal provides a solid foundation and appropriate time schedule for report preparation. The project and final report could be improved if the Council could be more specific about the questions that need to be addressed, and the level of detail required, to help guide Council's decisions about implementing future phases of the project. The questions and direction currently provided in the Anadromous Fish Mitigation in Blocked Areas Strategy are quite general; they do not establish any specific criteria or thresholds that will help to *"provide the Council with a report for consideration of subsequent work to advance the fish passage planning process."* Thus, we encourage the proponents to work with Council staff to determine what additional detail would allow formatting and focus for a report that best meets Council needs and facilitates effective decision making.

**Response:**

***This is an excellent suggestion and the Spokane Tribe will reach out to Council staff to assist in further developing this component of the decision making process.***

The ISRP encourages the investigators to provide a comprehensive review of the potential for the habitat to support Chinook and steelhead in its report to Bonneville and the Council. This comprehensive approach is suggested in the chart in Appendix E, which suggests that this project will integrate the intrinsic modeling effort with an ongoing data review funded by other sources and workshops.

The proposal does not describe the administrative structure of the collaborative group. For example, will the Spokane Tribe be responsible for data analyses and reporting? As noted above, it would be useful to include a brief description of the basic structure and

responsibilities for development of the Habitat Database. Additionally, how will cost sharing be verified? These issues should be addressed before funding is allocated.

**Response:**

***The Spokane Tribe will be responsible for data analyses and reporting; however, STI will seek support from project partners during all phases of the project. The tracking and verification of cost sharing will need to be further coordinated with Bonneville and project partners during contract development.***

Finally, the ISRP is reasonably confident that the proponents will be able to predict which species and life histories can be supported by existing habitat based on direct examination of that habitat. We are less confident about such predictions based on modeling of intrinsic habitat potential. It seems doubtful that IP habitat modeling can capture the effects of riparian condition, late summer flows and temperatures, and land uses or the influences of environmental conditions (e.g., climate regimes) outside the active stream channel.

**Response:**

***Project proponents agree that direct examination of habitats will be crucial. However, the current funding limits contained in the RFP will constrain the ability to perform some of this work. However, proponents believe that the proposed IP analysis is a productive first step in assessing the suitability of habitats within the blocked area.***

**General Comments (including issues beyond the scope of this proposal)**

The reintroduction feasibility effort could benefit from developing life cycle models for the species proposed for reintroduction (see ISAB [2014-4](#) and [2013-5](#)). Life cycle models typically incorporate estimates of survival and annual variability in survival for each life stage, including downstream passage through the main stem dams, residence in the ocean, and passage of adults through the dams and back to natal rearing areas. Harvest rates can be incorporated based on recent fisheries data. The models should be based on existing empirical data when possible, but it is reasonable to include assumptions where data are not available. The key purpose of the life cycle modeling effort would be to (1) identify critical data gaps and (2) determine the conditions that would be necessary to establish viable self-sustaining populations. If initial modeling suggests that a population is unlikely to be viable, is it possible to further investigate which life stages would be best targeted to improve survival through restoration or management actions?

Large-scale reintroductions can be viewed as big experiments. The investigations described in this proposal, together with life cycle modeling are useful for making decisions, but the predicted outcome will still be highly uncertain. It is essential to embrace this unknown with a plan that incorporates comprehensive monitoring and adaptive management.

***The guidance provided by the ISRP is appreciated by proponents of this project and the reintroduction feasibility effort. Many works will need to be completed during this undertaking and life cycle modeling is anticipated to an important component.***

## References

- Bidlack, A.L., Benda, L.E., Miewald, T., Reeves, G.H. and G. McMahan. 2014. Identifying suitable habitat for Chinook salmon across a large, glaciated watershed. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*. 143(3):689-699.
- Burnett, K.M., G.H. Reeves, D.J. Miller, S. Clarke, K. Vance-Borland, and K. Christiansen. 2007. Distribution of salmon-habitat potential relative to landscape characteristics and implications for conservation. *Ecological Applications* 17:66-80.
- Cooney T., and Holzer, D.M., 2006, Appendix C: Interior Columbia Basin Stream Type Chinook salmon and Steelhead Populations: Habitat Intrinsic Potential Analysis. Preliminary draft of the viability criteria for the Interior Columbia domain.
- Olympic Natural Resource Center. 2013. Habitat Intrinsic Potential Modeling of Selected Streams on the Outer Washington Coast for Anadromous Salmonid Fish.
- RTT (Regional Technical Team). 2014. A biological strategy to protect and restore salmonid habitat in the Upper Columbia Region. A Draft Report to the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board. From The Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team. 44 pages plus appendices.
- Sheer, M.B., D.S. Busch, E. Gilbert, J.M. Bayer, S. Lanigan, J.L. Schei, K.M. Burnett and D. Miller. 2009. Development and management of fish intrinsic potential data and methodologies: State of the IP 2008 summary report: Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership Series 2009-004.
- Spence, B.C., Harris, S.L., Jones, W.E., Goslin, M. and A. Agrawal. 2005. Historical occurrence of coho salmon in streams of the Central California Coast coho salmon evolutionarily significant unit. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Technical Memorandum: NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-383.



COEUR D'ALENE TRIBE  
850 "A" STREET  
P.O. BOX 408  
PLUMMER, IDAHO 83851  
(208) 686-1800 FAX (208) 686-1182

REFERENCE:

February 10, 2016

Henry Lorenzen, Chairman  
Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
851 SW Sixth Ave., Suite 1020  
Portland, OR 97204-1347

Dear Chairman Lorenzen:

I am writing on behalf of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe to express our continued support for the Spokane Tribe's proposal for the Identification of Suitable Habitats for Blocked Area Reintroduction. We are pleased to see the proposal was found to meet scientific criteria (qualified) by the Independent Scientific Review Panel. Our staff has reviewed and appreciates the feedback provided by the ISRP. Along with our project partners, we have provided responses to the ISRP's qualifications and comments to better inform the Council, managers, and the public as to the work put forth.

The proposed project is an important first step in the Council's emerging priority towards investigating blocked area mitigation options through reintroduction, passage, and habitat improvement. The Coeur d'Alene Tribe looks forward to continued collaboration with our partners. We strongly urge the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to recommend funding this proposal under the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Sincerely,

  
Alfred M. Nomee  
Natural Resources Director



State of Washington

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Eastern Region • Region 1 • 2315 North Discovery Place, Spokane Valley, WA 99216-1566  
Telephone: (509) 892-1001 • Fax: (509) 921-2440

February 12, 2016

Mr. Henry Lorenzen, Chairman  
Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
851 SW Sixth Ave., Suite 1020  
Portland, OR 97204-1347

Dear Chairman Lorenzen:

On behalf of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Director Jim Unsworth, I am pleased to provide this letter which expresses our continued support for the Spokane Tribe of Indian's (STOI) study proposal for the *Identification of Suitable Habitats for Blocked Area Reintroduction*. As you are likely aware, this proposal was reviewed by both the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) and by Council staff, and was found to meet prescribed scientific criteria. I believe that these favorable reviews are clear acknowledgement that the work identified in this proposal represents an important first step in understanding the viability of reintroducing salmon above Grand Coulee dam.

As the project partners continue their collaborative efforts to organize, collect, and advance the science associated with the return of anadromous species above Grand Coulee, there are concurrent efforts underway by WDFW and the Upper Columbia United Tribes to reach out to communities and local leaders in the Upper Columbia to build support for this effort. The WDFW looks forward to this continued strong partnership which seeks to advance a comprehensive understanding of the viability of reintroduction and we urge the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to recommend funding this proposal under the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Sincerely,

Steve Pozzanghera, Regional Director  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Region 1

cc: Northwest Power and Conservation Council:

Tom Karier and Phil Rockefeller

Lynn Palensky

Office of the Governor:

JT Austin

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife:

Bill Tweit, Ron Warren, Jim Brown, Guy Norman, Amy Windrope, Dan Rawding, Chris Donley

Upper Columbia United Tribes:

DR Michel

Spokane Tribe of Indians:

BJ Keiffer