

## Coles, Kendra

---

**From:** O'Toole, Patty  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 3:44 PM  
**To:** Coles, Kendra  
**Subject:** FW: comments on wildlife project costs

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

PISCES wildlife o&m comment for the file.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Scott Kline [mailto:skline@pn.usbr.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 3:05 PM  
**To:** O'Toole, Patty  
**Cc:** Scott Kline  
**Subject:** comments on wildlife project costs

Patty,  
I'm sure you'll get a lot of comments about this, but I wanted to stress the need to develop some sort of metric to quantify or at least qualify the biological value of the project land. When one looks at the cost per acre columns of the spreadsheet, eyebrows would obviously raise at some of the high costs for some projects. But, if there is a high cost per acre on a project with just a few hundred acres, the overall cost of managing those acres might be small if there is a high biological benefit to managing those acres. Perhaps those few hundred acres are prime habitat required for a species' livelihood.

It seems like the existing "focal species" data collected in PISCES could be used to qualify the biological value of the land. Obviously, if an ESA-listed species is one of the focal species for the project, then each acre might be more valuable than if the focal species was resident fish.

Perhaps PISCES could also collect data on the numbers of each of the focal species impacted to help quantify the value of each acre. As a PISCES user, I understand how difficult this data would be to collect, but perhaps the data could be collected in order of magnitudes instead of numbers, such as "tens", "thousands", or "hundreds of thousands" of individuals impacted.

Sincerely,

Scott Kline  
Biologist  
Yakima Field Office  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
509-575-5848 x277 or  
509-930-6695 (cell)