FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation

Review 1

January 21, 1998

Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Watershed Technical Work Group

2501 S. W. First Avenue, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97201
Phone: 503-326-7031
Fax: 503-326-7033
Web Page: www.cbfwf.org

January 22, 1998

TO: Watershed Project Sponsors and CBFWA Fish and Wildlife Managers

FROM: Brian Allee

SUBJECT: FY 1998 Watershed Project Evaluation Report

The Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG) completed its evaluation of 135 FY 1998 watershed project proposals on January 16, 1998. The attached report, *FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation*, provides general recommendations as well as specific comments on each proposal. Please read the recommendations closely, as they will identify the next steps you need to take on your proposal.

The Anadromous Fish Caucus meets on January 27-29, 1998, the Wildlife Caucus meets on January 22, 1998, and the Resident Fish Caucus meets the week of January 26-30, 1998. At these meeting, the caucuses will evaluate the proposals using the Integrated Caucus Criteria and other management criteria developed by CBFWA. The caucus recommendations will be approved by CBFWA at the February 10, 1998 Members Meeting in Boise, Idaho. These recommendations will be presented to the Council on February 24-25, 1998 in Idaho.

The WTWG is to be commended for their efforts in reviewing and evaluating the projects within the short time frame allowed. I understand your need to have this information as soon as possible and appreciate your patience while the report was being prepared.

FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation

Executive Summary

On January 14-16, 1998, the nine-member Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) evaluated 135 new and ongoing Fiscal Year 1998 watershed proposals and made the following recommendations:

- 27% (35% ongoing, 21% new) need of the proposed projects were technically sound and feasible.
- 39% (39% ongoing, 38% new) of the proposed projects need to be revised - or "fixed".
- 34% (26% ongoing, 41% new) of the proposed projects were considered technically unsound.
- Modify several of the project evaluation criteria.
- Revise the review process for FY 99.
- Sponsor a workshop on how to write a proposal.
- Prioritize subbasins, watersheds, and projects.
- Improve site specific and subbasin-level monitoring and evaluation.
- Create a Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund
- Peer review model/focus watershed coordination.

1.0 Introduction

In 1997, the fish and wildlife managers of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) developed a process and criteria for selecting fiscal year 1998 watershed projects. Projects implemented under the Northwest Power Planning Council's (NPPC) Fish and Wildlife Program (Attachment 1) are funded by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). The fish and wildlife managers developed the following set of principles to guide watershed restoration projects and embedded them in Integrated Technical Criteria and Integrated CBFWA Caucus (management) Criteria:

1. Commit to a Watershed Approach
2. Emphasize Watershed Protection and Restoration
3. Commit to Broad Based Funding and Support

On November 21, 1997, the NPPC and BPA solicited proposals for watershed projects for the FY 1998 funding cycle. Proposals were due to BPA December 23, 1997. The project solicitation included the CBFWA process and criteria and the sponsors were notified that the proposals must fully address the criteria or risk being rejected for lack of sufficient information to allow proper evaluation. BPA received 135 project proposals and provided copies to the CBFWA on December 30, 1997. On December 31, 1997 the project proposals were express mailed to the Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) members.

The fish and wildlife managers developed the qualifications and scope of work, and selected the members of the non-representational Watershed Technical Work Group. A wide range of organizations were invited to submit nominations, including CBFWA members, NPPC, state agencies, federal agencies (EPA, USFS, BLM, NRCS, BPA, BOR, USGS), universities and colleges, Public Power Council, Direct Services Industry, watershed groups and councils, public utilities, and environmental organizations. The three CBFWA caucuses (anadromous fish, resident fish, wildlife) then selected nine WTWG members based on their experience in watershed management and expertise in pertinent scientific disciplines, including hydrology, geomorphology, fisheries biology, soil and water resources, ecology, wildlife and wetlands biology, and zoology.

The fish and wildlife managers directed the WTWG to use the Integrated Technical Criteria (Attachment 3) to evaluate the technical merit and feasibility of FY 1998 watershed project proposals, and provide

1. a list of project proposals which were technically sound and feasible and;
2. a list, including explanations and recommendations, of proposals that were unsound.

Each WTWG member reviewed the 135 proposals prior to the January 14-16 WTWG project evaluation meeting.

2.0 Watershed Project Evaluation Process

2.1 WTWG Operating Rules

The WTWG met in Portland on January 14-16, 1998 to evaluate the technical merits and feasibility of FY 1998 watershed projects. In developing the overall watershed project evaluation process, the WTWG was asked to define the operating rules. The group agreed to review and evaluate each of the 135 projects in the order they were presented, using the information contained in the proposal form. To provide the most complete picture of the technical merits, the WTWG considered all of the activities proposed for the life of the project (as opposed to confining the review to FY 98 activities). Even though the group had a very limited amount of time for the review, they discussed how well each project met each of the 10 Integrated Watershed Technical Criteria (Attachment 3) and arrived at a consensus-based decision. Although the criteria were geared to "yes" or "no" answers, the WTWG used "I" to identify areas where the proposals were incomplete and a yes/no answer could not be determined. In addition to looking at individual criteria, the WTWG gave each project one of three overall recommendations: *pass*, *fix*, or *fail*. The WTWG agreed that the *pass* threshold was unique to each project and they did not define the number of "yeses" required to pass. Projects which *passed* were considered technically sound and feasible. Projects which need to be *fixed* are still active and the sponsor has the opportunity to revise the project/proposal and resubmit it to the CBFWA Caucuses for review. Projects which *failed* were not considered to be technically sound and feasible. (Note that CBFWA will make final recommendations on FY 98 watershed projects by February 2, 1998. The Anadromous Fish Caucus will meet January 27-29, 1998, the Wildlife Caucus meets on January 22, 1998, and the Resident Fish Caucus will meet during the week of January 27-30, 1998.) Table 1 shows how well the projects met the criteria and lists the overall

project recommendation. Table 2 offers brief recommendations on most of the projects. Both of these tables will be useful for revising project proposals.

Watershed coordination projects presented a unique circumstance and did not match well with the Integrated Technical Criteria. With a few exceptions, the WTWG recommended that the nine project sponsors *fix* their proposals by providing additional information. In general, the revised coordination proposals should include a list of accomplishments, demonstrate how well the groups are coordinating, and provide letters of local support. Further, the coordinators should clearly describe their program direction, demonstrate the direct relationship to improved conditions for fish and wildlife, and show how their activities have been crucial to watershed restoration in the basin. Councils and coordinators should actively develop projects based on a watershed action plan and identified needs (as opposed to waiting for proposals to come to them). Proposals from watershed councils should clearly identify a suite of projects targeted for completion. Finally, coordinators should provide a detailed record of the dollars requested and the dollars spent.

Law Enforcement projects also did not fit neatly into the technical criteria and were reviewed in a slightly different light. The nine projects were evaluated together using the following four over-arching criteria as well as the 10 provided by CBFWA. In addition to demonstrating that law enforcement was an essential element of the watershed program, the proposal needed to clearly show that:

1. Illegal activities (harvest, diversions, screen, etc) were a major limiting factor.
2. Law enforcement activity was directly tied to a management action and program.
3. Past law enforcement activities have been effective.
4. The project addresses a specific measure in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program.

2.2 Project Proposal Form

While the FY 98 Project Proposal Form directed the project sponsor to provide a great deal of information (some of which appeared redundant), the WTWG suggested that more detail is needed in some areas. In the future, specific information about the costs of individual objectives/tasks, cost-sharing, in-kind contributions, the number of personnel (in FTEs) and an explanation of fringe benefits and indirect costs would be helpful. In addition, Section 3 *Relationships to other Bonneville Projects* should be expanded to include work related to the proposed project but not funded by BPA. A map describing the project area and a larger scale map of the region showing the location of all of BPA's projects would help the reviewer (and the sponsor) visualize where the project fits into the overall program. The form should also include a field identifying the Hydrologic Unit Code to the 6th level. In concert with site specific and regional maps, the form should request more information about regional plans and programs - perhaps under Section 7c *Rationale and significance to Regional Programs.*

During this review it was often difficult to "find" the "answers" to the criteria. A direct link between the proposal form and the evaluation criteria would speed up the review process and help the project sponsor prepare the proposal. To minimize references to documents which are not available to the reviewer, the sponsor should provide concise information which highlights the

salient points.

2.3 Proposal Form Workshop

During the review process it became evident that a number of project sponsors were unfamiliar with the new form. The WTWG recommends that CBFWA sponsor a workshop on how to prepare a proposal. This workshop could include specific instructions (and examples) on how to complete the form. In addition, this could be an opportunity where project sponsors learn, by example and networking, how to put together a cohesive package which:

1. Describes how critical problems were determined;
2. Clearly describes the proposed work (the objectives/tasks) and how it addresses those critical problems and limiting factors;
3. Outlines an effective monitoring and evaluation plan and a feedback loop for adaptive management;
4. Summarizes previous results and how they are used to make management decisions;
5. Demonstrates how the project fits into regional plans and programs and;
6. Details all of the costs through the life of the project.

2.4 Project Evaluation Criteria

In general, the Integrated Technical Criteria developed by the fish and wildlife managers worked well. Criteria 3 (long-term benefits), 4 (monitoring), and 5 (objectives), were well written and clear. The WTWG recommends the following:

1. Criterion 1 (strategies/techniques) should also include Criterion 2 (structural solutions) and could read: Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate, scientifically valid strategies or techniques, and sound principles? If a structural solution to an identified problem is proposed, does the proposal demonstrate that non-structural alternatives have been considered?

2. Number 6 (time frames) is really a subset of criterion 9 (appropriate resources). Number 9 could be reworded to read: Is the project likely to meet, or is it currently meeting its objectives and time frame milestones? Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate? ~~to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones~~.

3. Criterion 7 is awkward and should be a subset of Number 8 (target species). Criterion 8 could read: Will the target or indicator species/populations be significantly benefitted by the project? Would the techniques employed likely ~~have no significant inadvertent negative~~ avoid negative impact to non-target species/populations and species/population assemblages?

4. The supporting text for Criterion 10 should address the need to prioritize subbasins and watersheds within subbasins.

5. In proposals which were primarily focused on research, the link between project results and management applications was often unclear . A new criterion (number 11) could read:

Are the project results adequately and directly tied to local and regional management applications?

2.5 FY 99 Project Evaluation Process

Knowing that the Fiscal Year 1999 is right around the corner, The WTWG offered the following suggestions for the FY 99 project evaluation process. Because of the time constraints, the group reviewed FY 98 projects in numerical order. For FY 99, the WTWG recommends sorting the project summaries - and conducting the review - by subbasin and watershed. This will help the reviewer: 1. see the big picture; 2. evaluate the work proposed in each subbasin as an integrated unit; 3. identify and capitalize on interrelationships; and 4. look for efficiencies within and across projects. Watersheds, perhaps through their Councils/Coordinators, should be encouraged to submit a "package" which ties all of the projects together and explains the connections between them.

The final recommendation categories should be modified to include "pass", "fix" and two levels of "fail". Technically unsound projects would still receive a "fail" but proposals lacking enough information for an adequate review would receive an "incomplete".

3.0 FY 98 General Recommendations

3.1 Prioritize Subbasins and Watersheds

Throughout the review process one theme surfaced more often than any other - the need to prioritize subbasins and watersheds. The WTWG recommends that the regional fish and wildlife managers, in cooperation with the NPPC, identify the limiting factors at the watershed level and identify limiting watersheds and subbasins. A number of existing documents could aid in this process. The managers could start with the Forest Service's *Assessment of Ecosystem Components in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins* (and the west side NW Forest Plans) and juxtapose other information. This would allow the managers to pinpoint core populations and habitats (protect the best) and then move outward (fix the rest) using the potential for population response as the guide. Prioritizing subbasins and watersheds would help the region develop a hierarchial approach to allocating resources which identifies where to focus the greatest efforts and then solicits projects which alleviate the limiting factors in those areas. The WTWG recognizes the regional policy issues related to such an approach.

3.2 Clearly Describe Project Objectives

Clearly stated, logical objectives are critical to the success of any proposed project. They are also the starting point for any evlaution of the technical merits. However, the WTWG found that only about half of the proposals adequately defined the project objectives and described how the tasks will meet those objectives. In additon, a number of proposals needed more complete information about: 1. critical problems and how they were identified; 2. the proposed corrective acitons and how they were was chosen; and 3. the expected results of the proposed activities.

3.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are also an essential element of the watershed restoration process - yet,

more than half of project proposals need to provide a more detailed and structured program which provides direct feed back to local and regional management actions.For projects with research and monitoring/ evaluation as the *primary objective*, it is critical that the information be used for management decisions. At the minimum, project proponents need to include a clear description of: 1. the specific parameters that will be monitored; 2. the specific methods that will be used in obtaining, distributing, and managing that information; 3. how to determine if the project is achieving the expected results; and 4. the mechanism for modifying the project-specific, watershed, and regional plans. The WTWG encourages the fish and wildife managers to continue developing a system-wide monitoring and evaluation framework, and recommends that it include a process for using that information for management decisions at all levels.

3.4 Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund

In many situations, "protecting the best" means buying land and/or water rights. And, often the most cost- and biologically- effective opportunities do not coincide with BPA's annual budgeting process. The WTWG recommends that the region establish a Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund, using a portion of BPA's Fish and Wildlife budget, to support timely purchases of critical property and water rights. This fund could be approached in several ways including allocating money to specific subbasins -or- funding projects based solely on merit. Acquisitions made under this fund should represent significant biological opportunities and should be guided by criteria which identify critical needs and tie the proposed action to an overall watershed plan. This recommendation arose in part from discussions about proposals aimed at improving stream flows. The WTWG was concerned that activities such as consolidating diversions or lining ditches would not ultimately result in higher instream flows unless an instream water right is created. In streams that are fully or over appropriated, additional water would be used by the junior water right holder.

3.5 Peer Review Focus/Model Watersheds

The WTWG recommends a peer review of model and focus watersheds. While they recognize that coordination and planning are essential to any effective restoration effort, they were concerned about how well the majority of the coordination and watershed council proposals were able to demonstrate the fish and wildlife benefits attributable to "coordination" versus those benefits attributable to "on-the-ground" projects. The WTWG was also concerned about the amount of money invested in coordination and felt that funding for some focus and model watershed coordination was in excess of what was required to do the work. The proposed peer review could help define the roles and responsibilities of the coordinators and highlight which activities contribute the most toward meeting the watershed's objectives. It could also help the watershed identify highest priority activities and outline a logical, biologically-based sequence for addressing those actions in the most cost-effective manner.

3.6 Communication

Communication and cooperation are central to effective watershed restoration. In reviewing 135 proposals it appeared that many of the project sponsors worked independently, seemingly with little or no knowledge of other similar (if not redundant) proposals in the subbasin. The WTWG recommends that the region coordinate the efforts in a variety of ways, including: 1. conducting workshops on the project prioritization process and proposal preparation (see 2.3 Proposal Form

Workshop); 2. using a coordinated information system such as Streamnet to compile, accumulate, store, and distribute relevant watershed information and assessments; and 3. sponsoring annual project reviews.

3.7 In-lieu Issue

The WTWG was concerned about the possible delegation of funding responsibility and "in-lieu" issues surrounding 15 projects. Specifically, the WTWG questioned the expenditure of BPA dollars to conduct activities that may be the responsibility of other federal and state agencies (e.g. harvest enforcement, screening and diversion regulations, and correcting problems associated with Forest Service timber sales.) During the technical review, the WTWG flagged proposals which may fall into this category.

4.0 Project Recommendations

4.1 Summary of Recommendations

The WTWG evaluated the technical merits and feasibility of 135 proposals for ongoing and new FY 1998 watershed projects. As the table below shows, 37 projects passed, 52 need to be fixed, and 46 are not technically sound.

	Pass	**Fix**	**Fail**	**Total**
Ongoing	22 (35%)	24 (39%)	16 (26%)	62 (46%)
New	15 (21%)	28 (38%)	30 (41%)	73 (54%)
Total	37 (27%)	52 (39%)	46 (34%)	135

4.2 Table 1. Watershed Project Evaluation Summary

See attached

4.3 Table 2. Watershed Project Recommendations

See attached. Note that some projects have two sets of evaluations. The second set, in italics, is from the March review. See Part 2 of this workplan appendix for more detail.

5.0 Attachment 1.

Integrated Watershed Projects: The Process and Criteria for Selecting Watershed Projects for the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Table 1. Watershed project evaluation summary

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
8001	Inform Public			+			115,500	N	NA	N	N	N	N	NA	I	Y	N	**Fail**
8002	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In L. Klickitat R. And Its Tributaries	Klickitat	CKCD	X	+	+	16,800	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**
8003	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In Eastern Klickitat County	Klickitat	EKCD	X	+	+	11,285	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**
8004	Granite Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fix**
8005	Kalispel Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100											**Fix**
8006	Slate Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100			Combine into 1 project								**Fix**
8007	Indian Creek watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100			also 8012 - 8015								**Fix**
8008	Tacoma Creek watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100											**Fix**
8009	Davis Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100											**Fix**
8010	West Branch Of Priest River Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100											**Fix**
8011	Evaluate And Manage Fisheries Within The Pend Oreille River Watershed	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X		85,160	N	NA	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	I	N	**Fail**
8012	Ruby Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100											**Fix**
8013	Mill Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100			Combine into 1 project								**Fix**
8014	Middle Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100			See 8004 - 8010								**Fix**
8015	Sullivan Creek Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	51,100											**Fix**
8016	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	Walla Walla	WDFW	X			138,691	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8017	Umatilla Tribal Fish And Wildlife Enforcement	Umatilla; Grande Ronde; John Day; Walla Walla	CTUIR	X	+	+	234,776	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	**Fail** e
8018	Evaluate Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Restoration	Grande Ronde	USFS Wallowa/ Whitman NF	X			219,545	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8019	Identify Dispersal Corridors, for the Northern Spotted Owl	Wind, Little White Salmon, Big White Salmon, Klickitat, Hood	USFS Giford/Pinchot NF			X	143,500			Not a watershed project								
8020	Build Rock Vortex Weirs on Entiat River, Washington	Entiat		X	+		19,800	I	I	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Fix**
8021	Restore Habitat within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	Salmon	SBT/IDFG/USFS	X	+	+	109,380	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
8022	Analyze Ahtanum Creek Storage Project	Yakima	AID	X	+	+	802,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**
8023	Create fish passage and wild anadromous fish spawning and rearing habitat	John Day	Joann Vidondo - Landowner (ODFW/OWRD)	X	+		200,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**
8024	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	Hood	CTWSRO	X			97,198	I	I	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**
8025	Introducing Systems Science to Planning and Implementing Fish and Wildlife Recovery	Snake	DU	+	+	X	1,143,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	Y	**Fail**
8026	Acquisition Of Pine Creek Ranch	John Day	CTWSRO	X	+	+	350,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**
8027	John Day Watershed Restoration	John Day	CTWSRO	X	+		229,397	I	N	I	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Fix**
8028	Warm Springs Reservation 1998 Watershed Enhancement Project	Deschutes	CTWSRO	X	+		391,848	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8029	Restore Steelhead and Chinook habitat in Early Winters Creek	Methow	PWI	X	+		104,200	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8030	Trials of Smolt Herding by Periodic Feeding	Any dam site within the Columbia River system	W. P. Allen & Co.,Inc.	X			0	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**
8031	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams On Lower North Fork John Day	John Day	NFJDWC	X	+	+	50,000	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8032	Document Native Trout Populations	Wind, Big White Salmon...	WT		X		52,290	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	**Pass**
8033	Monitor natural escapement & productivity of John Day Basin spring chinook	John Day	ODFW	X			123,200	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8034	Evaluate Effects Of Habitat Work Conducted In Fifteenmile Creek (Fy 98).	Fifteenmile Creek	ODFW	X			258,933	N	NA	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	I	Y	**Fail**
8035	Assessment Salmon River Subbasin	Salmon	NPT	+	+	+	20,486	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fail**
8036	Implement Trout Creek watershed Restore/Enhance Phase I -1998 Funds	Deschutes	JCSWCD	X	+	+	56,400	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fail**
8037	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase II 1998 Funding	Deschutes	JCSWCD	X	+	+	56,800	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fail**
8038	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Willowdale 1998 Funding	Deschutes	JCSWCD	X	+	+	83,400	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fail**
8039	Restore in-stream habitat for salmonids on Goat Creek	Methow	USFWS	X			200,000	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
8040	Develop, Analyze, and Map Clearwater	Clearwater	IDFG		X		30,100		Information already exists									**Fail**

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status	
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	Basin Bull Trout Distribution, Strength, and Trends																		
8041	Reduce Stream Sedimentation In The Yakima River By Reducing Farm Runoff.	Yakima	BCD	X			800,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fix**	
8042	Educate/Support Yakima River Basin Groups	Yakima	YRWC	X	X	X	130,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**	
8043	Hydrologically Close 75 M. Of Roads In The Bear And Trout Creek Watersheds.	Deschutes	USFS, Ochoco NF	X		+	20,000	N	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	N	Y	**Fail**	b
8044	Plant Aspen And Other Riparian Vegetation Along 12 Miles Of Streams.	Deschutes	USFS, Ochoco NF	X		+	23,000	N	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fail**	b
8045	Rebuild 12 Miles Of Fence And Remove 10 Miles Of Old Unnecessary Fence.	Deschutes	USFS, Ochoco NF	X	+	+	56,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	**Fail**	b
8046	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Restoration Plan Now	Subbasins within the ceded lands and usual and accustomed fisheries of the Yakama, Warm Springs, Nez Perce, and Umatilla Tribes	CRITFC	X			113,121	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
8047	Improve Yakima River Water Quality	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	161,000											**Fix**	
8048	Improve Return Flow Water Quality	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	68,000											**Fix**	
8049	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	55,000			Combine into 1 project								**Fix**	
8050	Landowner Communication Program	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	9,000					8047 - 8053						**Fix**	
8051	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	262,000				also 8072-8074							**Fix**	
8052	Construct Wetlands	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	10,000											**Fix**	
8053	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	Yakima	RSBJC	X	+	+	35,000											**Fix**	
8054	Wind River Watershed Project	Wind River	UCD	X	+		822,366	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
8055	Educate Landowners And Agencies On Salmon Stream Restoration Methods		OSU-ES	X	+	+	997,743	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**	
8056	Teach adults to become holistic Master Watershed Stewards	1. Yakima; 2. Lower Columbia	WGCEE	+	+	+	79,409	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	N	**Pass**	
8057	Evaluate effects of grazing exclosures on habitat conditions	Potential Candidates: John Day, Deschutes, Grande Ronde, Salmon, Okanogan,	CRITFC	X			72,973	I	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status	
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
		Yakima																	
8058	Screening and Passage on Columbia River and Tributaries	Lower Columbia	WDFW	X			184,399	I	NA	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**Fix**	b,e
8059	Wild Steelhead Broodstock - Lower Columbia River, Cowlitz River	Lower Columbia River, Cowlitz River	WDFW	X			109,956	N	NA	N	N	I	I	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**	b, e
8060	Protective Screening Program on the Washington River Basins	Walla Walla, Touchet, Snake River, Columbia River, Asotin, and Grand Rhonde	WDFW	X	X		5,265	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fail**	b, e
8061	Protect Klickitat River Salmonids	Klickitat	WDFW	X			137,398	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**	b, e
8062	Sturgeon Broodstock Protection Project (SBPP)	Lower Columbia River & Upper Columbia	WDFW	X			100,436	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**	b, e
8063	Aircraft Monitoring of Tributary Systems	Walla Walla, Touchet, Snake River, Columbia River, Asotin, and Grand Rhonde	WDFW	X	X		12,509	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**	b, e
8064	Determine Salmonid Carrying Capacity In Watersheds By Flir Remote Imagery	John Day and Grande Ronde	OS-DWFFS	X	X		165,663	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**Fix**	
8065	Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed Analysis	Yakima	YIN	X	+	+	93,681	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	**Pass**	
8066	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin	Yakima	YIN	X	+	+	396,801	N	N	I	Y	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fix**	
8067	Acquisition Of Water And Floodplain Fisheries Habitat In The Yakima Basin	Yakima	YIN	X	+	+	5,000,000	I	NA	I	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fail**	
8068	Measure Mine Drainage Effects At Confluence Of Alder Creek And Methow River	Methow	UW	X	+		30,542	N	NA	N	N	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	N	**Fail**	
8069	Grande Ronde Subbasin Watershed Restoration	Grande Ronde	CTUIR	X			152,000	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
8070	Engineered Channels For Natural-Type Chinook Salmon Production	Wenatchee	ARI	X	+		266,018	Production project not technically sound										**Fail**	
8071	Reduce Sediment Delivery From Kline Mountain Road To The S.F. Salmon River.	Salmon	USFS, Boise NF	+			307,042	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**	b
8072	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	Yakima	KRD	X	+	+	341,500			Same as 8047-8053								**Fix**	see 8051
8073	Improve Return Flow Water Quality from Farms	Yakima	KRD	X	+	+	33,500		Combine into 1 project									**Fix**	see 8048

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status	
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
8074	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	Yakima	KRD	X	+	+	25,000											**Fix**	see 8049
8346700	Mitigation For The Construction And Operation Of Libby Dam (Fy98)	Kootenai, Upper Columbia	MDFWP		X		141,996	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
8400800	North Fork John Day Habitat Improvement	John Day	USFS, Umatilla NF	X	+		26,000	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**	
8402100	Protect And Enhance John Day River Fish Habitat	John Day	ODFW	X	+	+	368,600	I	NA	I	N	N	I	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fix**	
8402500	Protect And Enhance Fish Habitat In Grande Ronde Basin Streams	Grande Ronde	ODFW	X	+	+	265,034	I	NA	I	N	N	Y	Y	I	N	I	**Fix**	
8506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	Yakima	PNNL	X	+		300,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
8612400	Inspection Service For Little Fall Creek Passage	Willamette.	ODFW	X			15,074	I	I	I	I	I	I	N	I	I	N	**Fail**	
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	Umatilla	CTUIR	X			242,000	N	N	Y	I	N	N	Y	I	Y	N	**Fail**	
8710002	Protect & Enhance Coldwater Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Basin.	Umatilla	ODFW	X	+	+	592,540	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**	
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration And Survival In The Lower Umatilla	Umatilla	ODFW	X	+		259,842	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	g
9101903	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation - Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	Flathead, Upper Columbia	MDFWP		X		474,255	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	g
9202408	Protect Critical Salmonid Habitat and Habitat Restoration Investments	Salmon, Snake	SBT	X	+	+		N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fail**	e
9202409	Enhance Law Enforcement For Fish & Wildlife And Watersheds Of The Nez Perce	Snake River, Clearwater, Grand Ronde, lower Columbia River.	NPTEC	X			468,388	N	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	**Fail**	e
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning/Support	Grande Ronde	GRMW	X			295,000	N	NA	I	N	N	N	Y	I	N	I	**Fail**	c
9202602	Implement Eastern Washington Model Watershed Plans	Asotin Creek, Tucannon	WSCC	X	+	+	143,600	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	**Fix**	
9202603	Idaho Model Watersheds Admin./Impl. Support	Salmon	ISCC	X	+	+	152,000	I	NA	Y	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**	c
9303000	Buck Hollow Watershed Enhancement	Deschutes	WCSWCD	X	+	+	104,875	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	**Fail**	
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, And Wildlife Habitat Within The Red River Watershed	Clearwater	ICSWCD	X	+	+	449,931	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	g

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	John Day	USFS, Umatilla NF	X	+	+	68,000	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (For Funding In Fy 98)	Fifteenmile Creek	ODFW	X	+	+	307,982	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	Salmon	LCSWCD	X	+		37,000	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**
9306600	Oregon Fish Screens Project	John Day Basin	ODFW	X	+		426,000	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**
9401500	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement - O&M	Snake and Salmon	IDFG	X	+		200,000	Resubmit as a new project										**Fix**
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	Salmon	LCSWCD	X	+		350,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	Y	**Fix**
9401805	Enhance Habitat For Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bull Trout.	Asotin Creek	ACCD	X	+	+	193,000	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	**Fix**
9401806	Enhance Habitat For Spring & Fall Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bulltrout.	Tucannon	CCD	X	+	+	193,000	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	**Fix**
9401807	Enhance Habitat For Fall Chinook, Steelhead And Bulltrout	Tucannon	PCD	X	+	+	193,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	N	**Fail**
9402700	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning/Support	Grande Ronde	GRMW	X			863,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planning	Grande Ronde, Imnaha	NPT	X			50,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail** c
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	Deschutes	ODFW	X	+		250,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	Salmon	SBT	X			245,193	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
9405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	Yakima	ESD-105	X			112,703	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X		286,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	**Fail**
9506000	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish Habitat	Umatilla	CTUIR	X		X	667,000	I	NA	Y	N	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**
9506001	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Wildlife Habitat	Umatilla	CTUIR	X		X	667,000	I	NA	Y	N	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**
9506800	Klickitat Passage/Habitat Improvement Construction And O&M	Klickitat	YIN	X			238,000	Passage above a natural barrier										**Fail**
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidation & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon River, Idaho	Salmon	CCSWCD	X	+		766,071	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**
9601100	Screens and Traps on the Walla Walla and Touchet	Walla Walla	CTUIR	X			2,750,000	Resubmit on correct form										**Fix**
9601200	Adult Fish Passage Improvement - Walla	Walla Walla	CTUIR	X			250,000	Resubmit on correct form										**Fix**

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status	
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	Walla River																		
9603401	Methow River Valley Irrigation Conservation Project	Methow	YIN	X			686,535	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**	
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	Yakima	YIN	X	+	+	799,000	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
9604200	Restore & Enhance Anadromous Fisheries & Habitat in Salmon Creek	Okanogan	CCT	X			105,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fix**	c
9605300	North Fork John Day River Dredge Tailings Restoration	John Day	USFS/CTUIR, Umatilla NF	X	+	+	85,000	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
9607000	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	Willamette	MWC	+	+	+	115,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	c, g
9607701	Meadow Creek Restoration - Idaho	Clearwater	USFS, Nez Perce NF	X	+		59,780	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
9607702	Protecting And Restoring The Lolo Creek Watershed	Clearwater	NPT/WMP	X	+	+	198,264	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b
9607703	Protecting And Restoring The Squaw And Papoose Creek	Clearwater	NPT/WMP	X	+	+	160,926	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b
9607704	Final Design For Fish Passage Improvements At Lower Eldorado Falls	Clearwater	NPT/WMP	X			14,827	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b
9607705	Restore Mccomas Meadows	Clearwater	NPT/WMP	X	+	+	85,854	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b
9607706	Rehabilitation Of Johnson Creek/Cox Ranch	Salmon	NPT/WMP	X	+	+	47,118	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b
9608500	Coordination Of Watershed Restoration Projects In Umatilla River Basin	Umatilla	UBWCF	X	+	+	69,955	Y	NA	Y	N	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**	c
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	Clearwater	ISCC	X			75,742	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**	c
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	Upper Columbia	CSKT		X		100,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fix**	c
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed (Fy98)	Kootenai	MDFWP		X	+	99,547	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	c, g
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	Pend Oreille	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	70,809	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	**Fail**	
9700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph And Grand Coulee Dams	Pend Oreille, Spokane, Upper Columbia Mainstem	Kalispel Tribe		X	+	405,007	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fail**	
9700600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	Clearwater	NPT	X			76,500	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**	c
9701100	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian	Upper Snake, Owyhee	SPT		X		293,072	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	**Pass**	

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	A	R	W	Cost	Criteria										Status	
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	Areas on Duck Valley Reservation																		
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan	Grande Ronde and Imnaha	NPT	X			50,000	N	I	N	N	N	N	I	I	I	Y	**Fail**	
9703100	Evaluate Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Restoration	Grande Ronde	USFS, Wallowa-Whitman NF	X			219,545				Same as 8018							**Pass**	see 8018
9703400	Monitor fine sediment and overwinter sedimentation in John Day & Gr. Ronde	Grande Ronde, John Day	CRITFC	X			26,293	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Fix**	
9703500	Evaluate responses of Snake Basin watersheds & salmonid habitats to storms	Clearwater, Salmon, Tucannon or Grande Ronde	CRITFC	X	+		38,861	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	
9704900	Teanaway River Instream Flow Restoration	Yakima	YIN	X	+		775,000	N	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	Y	**Fail**	

(Y)es, (N)o, (I)ncomplete, (N)ot (A)pplicable
(A)nadromous fish, (R)esident fish, (W)ildlife: x=main focus, +=secondary focus
c = coordination, b = in lieu, e = enforcement, g = well written

Table 2. Watershed project recommendations

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8001	Fail	Inform Public	• Clearly explain the objectives, methods, and expertise of the personnel. • Provide more detailed background information. • Integrate the concept with the existing Okanagan Focus Watershed Project.
8002	Fail	Monitor Water Quality and Quantity in L. Klickitat R. and its Tributaries	• Explain the relationship between project and the critical needs of the basin. Explicitly state the link to the problem. Why is it important to monitor nitrates, temperature, etc.? Why is this project important? • Describe how the information will be synthesized and used. • This work should be a clear component of a watershed assessment.
8003	Fail	Monitor Water Quality and Quantity in Eastern Klickitat County	
8004	Fix	Granite Creek Watershed Project	• Clearly identify the information to be collected. • Describe the general location, topography, climate, and base-line conditions. Include a map. • Describe land ownership patterns. Is this reservation land? • Describe the level of support by land-owners and other stakeholders. • Clearly state why the project is needed. • Demonstrate the "do-ability" of the project. The Washington process is very detailed (analytical step followed by a prescription process) and takes a great deal of effort and time. Is the proposed staffing level sufficient? • Show how the expertise of the project personnel matches the budget. • Combine these proposals into a cohesive package which prioritizes the watersheds. • Important detail was lost in boiler-plating the proposals.
8005	Fix	Kalispel Creek Watershed Project	
8006	Fix	Slate Creek Watershed Project	
8007	Fix	Indian Creek Watershed Project	
8008	Fix	Tacoma Creek Watershed Project	
8009	Fix	Davis Creek Watershed Project	
8010	Fix	West Branch Of Priest River Watershed Project	
8012	Fix	Ruby Creek Watershed Project	
8013	Fix	Mill Creek Watershed Project	
8014	Fix	Middle Creek Watershed Project	
8015	Fix	Sullivan Creek Watershed Project	
8011	Fail	Evaluate and Manage Fisheries within the Pend Oreille River Watershed	• Clearly state the objectives and methods. • Describe the potential conflict between largemouth bass and bull trout. • Clearly identify the target species. There is some question whether bull trout or bass are the target species. • Explain in detail how this project is integrated into a watershed approach. Is this really a watershed project? • Conduct this project in two phases. • Provide detailed information on the expertise of the personnel.
8016	Pass	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	• Good description of methods and protocols. • Good example of enough detail upon which to fully evaluate the proposal. • Concerned that not enough money is budgeted for the flow monitoring assessment because the proposal is not specific about this methodology.
8017	Fail	Umatilla Tribal Fish and Wildlife Enforcement	• Explain how the project relates to a major plan. • Clearly describe the problem or limiting factor. Proposal did not demonstrate that illegal

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
			harvest was the limiting factor.
8018	Pass	Evaluate Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Restoration	• How will the project results be integrated, synthesized, and disseminated into regional use? • Clearly state mechanism by which this good information is used for regional adaptive management.
8019	Fail	Identify Dispersal Corridors for the Northern Spotted Owl	• This is not a watershed project.
8020	Fix	Build Rock Vortex Weirs on Entiat River, Washington	• More clearly state the objectives (purpose of and need for action, and expected outcomes). • Describe the monitoring and evaluation in detail and link it directly to the stated objectives. • Clearly describe how the objectives relate to a stated problem. Include a critical factors analysis. • Specifically describe the analysis of non-structural alternatives.
	Pass		• *Supplemental information adequately addressed Criteria 1 and 2 and why the sponsor decided to do this kind of work.* • *Concerned about whether it is possible to achieve the expected benefits.* • *The monitoring program (Criteria 4) needs additional detail and an explanation about how to determine if the project has achieved its objectives.*
8021	Pass	Restore Habitat within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	• Is Objective 2 achievable? • Are there other potentially limiting factors in the area?
8022	Fail	Analyze Ahtanum Creek Storage Project	• Clearly describe the project's fish and wildlife benefits.
	Fail		• *Proposal incomplete. Fish benefits were not adequately described.*
8023	Fail	Create Fish Passage and Wild Anadromous Fish Spawning and Rearing Habitat	• Concerned about the legal issues surrounding water rights and the legality of the dam. • Clearly describe any analyses of options (such as dam removal). • Explain how much habitat would become available. • Provide more detailed budget information.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not adequately address the issues.*
8024	Fix	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	• Clearly describe how this project fixes the key problems. • Provide background information about habitat capability. How many miles of upstream habitat will be opened up?
	Pass		• *The monitoring program (Criteria 4) needs additional detail.*

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8025	Fail	Introducing Systems Science to Planning and Implementing Fish and Wildlife Recovery	• Integrate this idea with the many existing watershed groups. Describe how this project will assist the local people. Although regional watershed program management and coordination assistance may be needed, there are concerns that, as stated in this proposal, the project would dictate generic fixes across many different watersheds, creating a large potential for conflict with the solutions agreed-to locally. For example, bank stabilization is proposed with no indication of whether it is needed. • Concerned about the logistics and workload generated by evaluating 12 watersheds simultaneously.
	Fail		• *Proposed project appears to include too much planning,* • *Concerned that there are not enough benefits to fish.* • *Proposal adequately described the activities but did not identify where the work would be performed.* • *Encourage the sponsor to continue this idea but the current proposal is too open-ended; consider choosing one watershed to start with.*
8026	Fix	Acquisition of Pine Creek Ranch	• Good concept, the project would provide an important link to other efforts. • Clarify what specifically the money is buying. Is $350,000 adequate for acquisition? Is the $1 million in FY99 used to develop a plan to guide the management of this property after it is acquired? • Who are the partners?
	Pass		
8027	Fix	John Day Watershed Restoration	• Explain what alternatives to flash boards were considered (e.g., pumping, vortex weirs, infiltration galleries). There is some question about the proposed technology - could concrete and rock structures interfere with potentially important groundwater temperature benefits? • Explain the degree to which water can actually be added to the system. Although eliminating push-up berms improves fish passage, how will leaving additional water in the system benefit fish? This is a common water-right issue where the next person in line could remove the water this project adds to the system. • Explain how sediment reduction is being monitored.
	Pass		• *The concern expressed on bullet 2 above remains. The sponsor needs to actively create instream water rights.*
8028	Pass	Warm Springs Reservation 1998 Watershed Enhancement Project	• Is BPA funding for deep solar powered wells an “in-lieu” issue?
8029	Pass	Restore Steelhead and Chinook Habitat in Early Winters Creek	• Provide more detail about how the project relates to the rest of the watershed and to other strategies.
8030	Fail	Trials of Smolt Herding by Periodic	• Document the technical basis for the proposal.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
		Feeding	• Develop the rationale more fully. • Describe how monitoring and evaluation would be done in order to determine whether or not this idea works. • This is not a watershed project. Consider submitting it to the Corps funding process (through System Configuration Team (SCT) or AFEP/FFGRWG.
8031	Pass	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams on Lower North Fork John Day	• Provide more detail on the monitoring and evaluation plans. • Include an analysis of alternatives including transferring the water to an instream right.
8032	Pass	Document Native Trout Populations	• Describe how the information will be made available to the managers and watershed groups. • Describe how the project relates to the watershed assessments. • Provide more detail about the sampling program. This appears to be a lot of work for the stated resources. • Coordinate this project with Sandy Noble (USFWS, Leavenworth).
8033	Pass	Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	• Is there still a concern about the John Day Dam and Bonneville Dam PIT tag monitoring capabilities?
8034	Fail	Evaluate Effects of Habitat Work Conducted in Fifteenmile Creek (FY 98).	• Clearly relate the objectives to the methods. The methods do not address the objectives and make the project appear more like population monitoring to evaluate fish life history than baseline information. • Tie this assessment to pre- and post-treatment data. The lack of pre-treatment data upon which impacts from structures would be assessed renders the project not scientifically valid. Population changes can not be attributed to the habitat work without pre-treatment data.
	Pass		
8035	Fail	Assessment Salmon River Subbasin	• Clearly describe the objectives and expected results of the project. What are the outcomes from attending meetings? What are the fish and wildlife benefits? • Duplicates ongoing work.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information partially addressed bullet 1 above and did not address bullet 2.* • *Concern about the personnel budget. Only $14,000 was associated with three FTEs.*

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8036 8037 8038	Fail Fail Fail	Implement Trout Creek Watershed Restore/Enhance Phase I -1998 Funds Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase II 1998 Funding Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Willowdale 1998 Funding	• Include more detail. Although the intent of the projects is probably good, the proposals did not provide enough detail upon which to asses the technical merits. • Describe the methods, linkages to specific problems, and how the objectives will be accomplished. • Explain how the proposed action addresses the critical resource conditions of the subbasin. There is a concern that this work is not focused where the subbasin's critical fish populations can most benefit. • Explain how the project will significantly benefit fish. • Combine all three proposals into one project to show the coordinated effort.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not adequately address the concerns raised above. Proposal is vague and does not demonstrate fish benefits.*
8039	Pass	Restore In-stream Habitat for Salmonids on Goat Creek	• Provide detail on cost sharing with the USFWS.
8040	Fail	Develop, Analyze, and Map Clearwater Basin Bull Trout Distribution, Strength, and Trends	• The database already exists (e.g., An Assessment of Ecosystem Components in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins. Contact PNW Publications Distribution, Portland Habilitation Center, 5312 NE 148th Ave., Portland, OR 97230). • Provide more details about monitoring.
8041	Fix	Reduce Stream Sedimentation in the Yakima River by Reducing Farm Runoff	• Clearly define the objectives. The proposal targets sediment reduction, but does not discuss how the water saved will be used for in-stream uses. • Describe a specific methodology for determining water quality. • Describe which 1,180 acres (out of 175,000) will be converted and how these acres were chosen. What is the limiting factor? • Clearly state why this is a critical action and why converting less than 1% of the crop land will have significant benefits to the target species. • The concept and intent is good. • Describe cost-shares. NRCS should be a full partner.
	Fail		• *Project approach (on-farm work) is better than that described in the original proposal.* • *Supplemental information did not address the deficiencies in Criteria1 and 3. Proposal needs more site specific information and needs to be tied closely to a plan.* • *Sediment problem was not adequately supported by background data and does not justify $800,000.* • *Benefits to fish are unclear.* • *NRCS program is already in place to do this kind of work.*

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8042	Fail	Educate/Support Yakima River Basin Groups	• Clearly describe the proposed activities. The proposal is very general and lacks specifics. • Include a Strategic Plan which describes who will teach and how the instruction will be carried out. • Clearly demonstrate how this project relates to other regional programs. • Provide a detailed budget. There is a concern about the large amount of funding for vaguely described products. • Explain how this proposal relates to other education projects in the area (e.g. Project 9405900). There is a concern about the duplication of efforts.
	Pass		
8043	Fail	Hydrologically Close 75 M. of Roads in the Bear and Trout Creek Watersheds	• Describe how the proposed road obliteration ties directly to improvements to fish and wildlife habitat. • Describe the specific impact of the candidate roads and how the proposed obliteration fixes the problem. • There is not sufficient detail to adequately evaluate the proposal. • There is a concern about whether the work can be accomplished for the stated budget. • The roads were built to support timber sales and therefore proceeds from the sales should fund this action ("in-lieu" issue).
8044	Fail	Plant Aspen and other Riparian Vegetation Along 12 Miles of Streams	• This proposal lack details and is incomplete. • An " in-lieu" issue.
8045	Fail	Rebuild 12 Miles of Fence and Remove 10 Miles of Old Unnecessary Fence.	• Clearly state how the project will benefit fish and wildlife. • Clearly describe alternatives. • There is no guarantee that the fence will be maintained. • An "in lieu" issue.
8046	Pass	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Restoration Plan Now	• Why is this coordination role needed? What impediments have the tribes encountered? • Describe how the project will benefit watershed efforts. • Explain how to monitor and evaluate the project's effectiveness in getting watershed efforts implemented. • There is a concern about why the individual tribes do not have expertise themselves and therefore appear to need a centralized coordinator. • Explain why another watershed handbook is neecessary. This appears to duplicate a number of other efforts. • There is a concern about high indirect and fringe costs.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8047 8048 8049 8050 8051 8052 8053	Fix Fix Fix Fix Fix Fix Fix	Improve Yakima River Water Quality Improve Return Flow Water Quality Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program Landowner Communication Program Construct Sediment Settling Basins Construct Wetlands Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	• Combine these into one project and describe how they are integrated in a comprehensive approach. Conceptually, these are important projects. • Develop a clear quantified assessment of the problem first. Then develop a logical sequence of project implementation steps which address the problems identified in that assessment. • Identify the highest priority activities and describe how those priorities are determined. • Define how these actions specifically address critical limiting factors. Provide more detail about the current baseline information upon which identification of the limiting factors were based. • Provide measurable objectives. • Describe specific tasks relating to specific acreages and explain how these tasks were determined (e.g. How did you decide whether to change farming practices or make buffer strips?) • Provide more detail on the monitoring program and describe how it will be directed at the specific projects. • Include NRCS as a full partner. • The Fish and Wildlife Program should not fund agriculture activities such as constructing irrigation infrastructure.
	Fail		• *Deficiencies noted above were not adequately addresses.* • *Proposed projects should be tied a model watershed or focus group.*
8054	Pass	Wind River Watershed Project	• Describe non-structural alternatives. Although the proposal to evaluate the removal of Hemlock Dam is good, there is no indication that other non-structural alternatives were considered for the structural components of the project. • Explain how the objectives will be achieved. The objectives are clearly defined but can they be accomplished FY98? • Clearly explain the link between the budget, the objectives, and the timelines. Explain why $800,000 is needed for FY98 but only $11,000 is needed annually thereafter. • Describe in-kind contributions.
8055	Fail	Educate Landowners and Agencies on Salmon Stream Restoration Methods	• The objectives are not directed toward fish and wildlife benefits.
	Fail		• *The proposed project did not adequately address the criteria.* • *Project should provide the information and education function for a specific program .*
8056	Pass	Teach adults to Become Holistic Master Watershed Stewards	• Explain why the target audience is appropriate. • There were some concerns about the lack of reference to, the potential duplication with, and the need to integrate with other education projects in the Yakima Basin (Project 9405900). • Explain how this project will be coordinated with existing Watershed groups and efforts.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
			• The project area includes urban communities below Bonneville Dam.
8057	Pass	Evaluate Effects of Grazing Exclosure on Habitat Conditions	• Explain whether and how this work will be integrated and coordinated with other similar work.(e.g. Boone Kaufmann and Pat McDowell). • The objectives are well stated and important because of their potential applicability to other similar situations, but the proposal needs to explain how the techniques will allow the researcher to achieve the objectives. • Describe the location of the reference sites in relation to the treatment sites. • Explain why 10-year old exclosures were selected. Consider looking at a broader temporal scale for the treatments and response. Consider a wider variety of channel and stream types.
8058	Fix	Screening and Passage on Columbia River and Tributaries	• Good description of the problem and the rationale behind the project but it appears to duplicate monitoring projects. • Link Law Enforcement to specific projects. • Explain how this project relates to regional plans. • Describe the sampling frequency. • Explain how the project will be conducted in the future. • Explain how the project will be monitored and link it to management actions. Provide monitoring report including a record of all of the citations. • Align the personnel budget with the budget outlined in Section 9 of the proposal form. • Concerned about “in-lieu” issues.
8059	Fail	Wild Steelhead Broodstock - Lower Columbia River, Cowlitz River	• There is no evidence of any wild steelhead still present in the Cowlitz River. • Provide a compelling rationale and demonstrate the need for this project. Identify the limiting factor. • Provide an NPPC Program Number. • Demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed activities. • Tie the objectives back to the goal of achieving more wild steelhead. • Tie the project to a management plan. • Concerned about “in-lieu” issues.
8060	Fail	Protective Screening Program on the Washington River Basins	• Demonstrate that the project addresses an identified limiting factor. • Clearly explain the objectives. • Demonstrate the effectiveness of past Law Enforcement activities. • Demonstrate cost-sharing. • Tie the project to a management plan. • Provide an NPPC Program Number. • Concerned about “in-lieu” issues.
8061	Fail	Protect Klickitat River Salmonids	• Demonstrate that the project addresses an identified limiting factor.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8062 8063	Fail Fail	Sturgeon Broodstock Protection Project (SBPP) Aircraft Monitoring of Tributary Systems	• Demonstrate the effectiveness of past Law Enforcement activities. • Tie the project to a management plan. • Provide a NPPC Program Number. • Define biological "ride-alongs." • Concerned about "in-lieu" issues.
8064	Fix	Determine Salmonid Carrying Capacity in Watersheds by Flir Remote Imagery	• Question whether the hypothesis about differences between local habitat restoration efforts versus dams is scientifically appropriate. • Concerned that the results would be used in a negative way to continue rhetoric regarding dams versus habitat. • Concerned about whether the results will be detailed enough to provide useful management information. • Clearly explain how the findings will be translated into actions that will directly benefit fish and wildlife. • Explain how the information will be integrated into watershed management.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not adequately answer the questions and did not tie the imagery work back to the dams.* • *Proposed technique is valuable but the proposal and work products are poorly structured.* • *Concern about whether this research is appropriate for BPA funds.*
8065	Pass	Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed Analysis	• Develop the monitoring strategy as part of the analysis. • Provide more information on potential impacts to target species. • Provide information about the expertise of project personnel.
8066	Fix	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin	• Explain why these areas are most important. • Address the dewatering problem. Can the results be achieved? How has the amount of habitat, suitability of habitat (presence of water), and amount of funding required been considered in light of the dewatering? • Explain why no funds were requested for Objectives 5 - 8 (implementation actions). • Identify and clearly describe the highest priority actions for the Yakima Basin. • Provide more detail and specificity. Link the objectives, costs and schedules.
	Pass		

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8067	Fail	Acquisition of Water and Floodplain Fisheries Habitat in the Yakima Basin	• Provide specific details about how critically important lands will be chosen. Describe which areas and types of lands would be considered for acquisition. Provide an assessment of the availability of the critical properties. Provide a rationale for purchasing specific properties. • Explain the administrative infrastructure that will be used to implement the program, and the specific relationship with BOR. • The concept of a region-wide Land and Water Right Acquisition Fund - able to provide immediate funds when critical properties become available - needs to be explored but is beyond the scope of this review.
	Fail		• *It is important to provide funds for land acquisition.* • *Supplemental information did not offer new information , lacked specifics and did not identify the land they intend to purchase.*
8068	Fail	Measure Mine Drainage Effects at Confluence of Alder Creek and Methow River	• Much of this research has been done already. • Clearly describe the benefits to fish and wildlife.
8069	Pass	Grande Ronde Subbasin Watershed Restoration	• Well prepared proposal that is management oriented and highly integrated.
8070	Fail	Engineered Channels For Natural-Type Chinook Salmon Production	• This is not a watershed project. • Off stream channels have been tried unsuccessfully in a variety of different cases. • Show how this project fits into an overall management scheme. There may be some application to supplementation actions - (e.g., combined with stream-side incubation).
8071	Fail	Reduce Sediment Delivery From Kline Mountain Road to the S.F. Salmon River.	• Benefits appear very small. How much sediment is there and where does it come from compared to the total South Fork Salmon River sedimentation load? • An “in lieu” issue.
8072 8073 8074	Fix Fix Fix	Construct Sediment Settling Basins Improve Return Flow Water Quality from Farms Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	• Same recommendations as projects 8047- 8053 on page 8.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not address the questions and the background data was to generic.*
8346700	Pass	Mitigation for the Construction and Operation Of Libby Dam (Fy98)	• Provide budget detail. • Identify non-native fish (assumed these are yellow perch and pumpkinseeds).
8400800	Fix	North Fork John Day Habitat Improvement	• Provide a much more detailed proposal. • Difficult to determine if this is a watershed project.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
	Fail		• *Supplemental information was too generic and did not include enough detail.*
8402100	Fix	Protect And Enhance John Day River Fish Habitat	• Clearly describe the objectives. • Clearly describe the monitoring and evaluation program and how the results will be used at the subbasin level. • Clearly explain the distinction between structural work and maintenance work. Concern that 60% of the funding is going to maintenance. • Clearly explain how the costs relate to the objectives. • How does the ODFW M&E fit with management applications for the entire basin? • Identify implementation sites.
	Pass		
8402500	Fix	Protect And Enhance Fish Habitat in Grande Ronde Basin Streams	• Fully explain why all the objectives and tasks are critical to solving problems in the watershed. • Clearly demonstrate the need for coordination. Concerned about duplication and lack of coordination with the Grande Ronde Model Watershed. • O&M aspects are important and appear to be working. • Concerned about the amount of money required to maintain the fence. • Carefully examine the hard structures placed in the upper Grande Ronde, and explain where they fit with the principles of the Model Watershed Coordination group. • Explain how the monitoring will provide information for management decisions. • The O&M percent calculations appear to be inconsistent.
	Pass		
8506200	Pass	Passage Improvement Evaluation	• Consider submitting this as a new proposal. It appears that new technology is being suggested. • Concern that resources are more than adequate.
8612400	Fail	Inspection Service For Little Fall Creek Passage	• Provide a much more detailed proposal. Incomplete proposal made applying the criteria difficult (with the exception of criteria #7, to which the answer is no). • Question effectiveness and appropriateness of providing passage over natural barrier.
	Fail		• *Although the supplemental information attempted to respond to the concerns, it did not adequately address bullet two above. It is appropriate to construct or maintain passage over natural barriers? What are the potential negative impacts to resident fish above the barrier?* • *Demonstrate that fish actually use the ladder.* • *This is a policy issue. Should BPA fund passage over natural barriers?*

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
8710001	Fail	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	• Concern about using rock chuck dams in Wildhorse Creek. This technology works only in gullies and can be passage barriers to migrating fish. • Fully explain why another watershed analysis is needed. Is the 1988 work incomplete? Have conditions changed significantly since then? • Clearly define the monitoring program. Explain why macro invertebrates are sampled and why sedimentation is a problem. • Explain the reason for and the expected benefits from 12 miles of fence. • Concerned that the objective of restoring steelhead, chinook, and coho is not achievable. • Clearly explain how the project protects the important vestige populations and how it corrects the most important limiting factors in the Umatilla Basin. • Re-evaluate the proposed actions and consider submitting a new proposal. • Clearly state how this project fits into the priorities established for the subbasin.
	Pass		• *Sponsor made a great effort to address the issues noted above but concerns remain about rock chuck dams in Wild Horse Creek:*.
8710002	Fix	Protect & Enhance Coldwater Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Basin.	• Clearly explain what the flood damaged and why it is being fixed. • Some concern that the funding is overly adequate. • Specifically state whether the sponsor plans to widen the floodplain exclosure. • Clarify the O&M portion of the budget. The table states $30,875 (out of $592,540) yet the out year estimate is 60% O&M. • Clearly state the how this project fits into the priorities established for the subbasin.
	Pass		
8902401	Pass	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in the Lower Umatilla	• Is this a watershed project? • Explain past costs. • Describe the project results including whether and how they have been used in management decisions. • Well prepared proposal. • Clearly state the how this project fits into the priorities established for the subbasin.
9101903	Pass	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation - Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	• Clearly describe the primary objectives. • Clearly describe the expected incremental gains from year to year. • Is the funding adequate to achieve the objectives? • Well prepared proposal.
9202408	Fail	Protect Critical Salmonid Habitat and Habitat Restoration Investments	• Demonstrate that the project addresses an identified limiting factor. • Demonstrate the effectiveness of past Law Enforcement activities. • Tie the project to a management plan. • Describe project results. What has been accomplished with previous years' funding?

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
			• Concerned about "in-lieu" issues.
9202409	Fail	Enhance Law Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife and Watersheds of the Nez Perce	• Demonstrate that the project addresses an identified limiting factor. • Provide more detail in the proposal. • Demonstrate the effectiveness of past Law Enforcement activities. • Clearly describe how this project will significantly benefit the target species. • Concerned about "in-lieu" issues.
9202601	Fail	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning/Support	• Project appears to duplicate other work. Assessments, GIS, EDT, etc. have already been done. • Clearly state what has been accomplished and what still needs to be done. • Clearly state how the project results relate to the objectives and how the results have been used to modify management actions. • Clearly state how the objectives translate into fish and wildlife benefits. Which benefits are attributable to the overall coordination and which are attributable to individual implementation projects? • Concerned about the large amount of funds required for this project.
	Pass		• *Is weed control an identifiable benefit to fish and wildlife* .
9202602	Fix	Implement Eastern Washington Model Watershed Plans	• Clearly describe the critical limiting factors. Specify the number and type of structures proposed and provide a direct link to alleviating the limiting factors. • Clearly describe how all entities in the basin will be coordinated. • Provide more specific information about the proposed actions and the watershed plans. • Concerned about the merits of specific sampling techniques and methodologies (e.g. steelhead anglers). • Need both pre- and post- project spawning data to evaluate the project benefits.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information and proposal are still incomplete.* • *Concern about the project accomplishments specifically regarding diking and its effects on the fish.*
9202603	Fix	Idaho Model Watersheds Admin./Impl. Support	• Provide list of completed projects (e.g. annual report). • Clearly describe the monitoring plan and how it will be used to measure projects' effectiveness. • Cost sharing aspects of coordinator position are good. • Provide a clear delineation of the coordinator's role versus the project implementor's role.
	Pass		

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9303000	Fail	Buck Hollow Watershed Enhancement	• Clearly explain what has been accomplished and what remains to be done. • Demonstrate how the quantifiable objectives will be used. • Clearly explain the monitoring plan and demonstrate why it is appropriate. Include juveniles as well as adults. • Concerned about whether the objectives are realistic (e.g., reductions to temperatures, increases in over-hanging vegetation, ability to add water to the system). • The methods proposed to achieve the objectives do not appear to be adequate (e.g., vegetation will not result in the expected channel width:depth ratio). • Clearly describe how previous work has met the objectives and benefited fish production. Consider including a trend analysis. • Demonstrate why this project is important in the context of the entire Deschutes River system. Anchor points (important vestige refuges) for endangered species may be in different areas of the subbasin and should be used as starting points for implementation.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not address the concerns noted above, did not include revised goals and objectives, and did not describe how the objectives would be achieved.* • *Not enough bang for the "Buck".* • *Cost share aspects (30% BPA) of the proposal are good.*
9303501	Pass	Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat within the Red River Watershed	• Well written proposal. Good sequencing in completing the objectives. Methods well described. • Some concern about the cost-effectiveness of the benefits to fish and wildlife.
9303800	Fix	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	• Proposal is incomplete. • Have monitoring results shown benefits? • Are the costs adequate?
	Pass		• *$1000/mile for fence repair seems high for maintaining a removable electric fence.* • *Referred to monitoring data in other documents but did not demonstrate that this is an effective technique.* • *Supplemental information did not address whether the benefits have been achieved.*
9304000	Pass	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (For Funding in FY 98)	• Improve the monitoring plan. As proposed, it is insufficient to document project effectiveness. • Concerned about whether the project is accomplishing its objectives. Recommend a full-scale review by NPPC, CBFWA, and BPA. • Concerned that some fencing is too close to the stream.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9306200	Fix	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	• Explain how theses projects meet the limiting factors in the watersheds. • Clearly describe the expected benefits to fish and wildlife, how the projects will be monitored and how benefits will be measured. • Explain how the instream flows will actually be increased without obtaining instream water rights. • Explain out-year costs. Are they related to EF-9 and L-8a?
	Pass		• *No explanation of what outyear costs are used for?*
9306600	Fix	Oregon Fish Screens Project	• Clearly describe what the project will accomplish. Differentiate between fish screens and habitat rehabilitation. • Provide a more detailed proposal. Concerned about the accuracy of some information (e.g. Trout Creek restoration work).
	Pass		• *More budget detail would be useful. How much money is needed for existing or new screen shops?*
9401500	Fix	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement - O&M	• Clearly state the objectives. Differentiate between the Idaho Fish Screens project and other habitat work. • Resubmit this proposal as a new project. It appears that the objectives are new.
	Pass		• *This is a new project and should be numbered as such..*
9401700	Fix	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	• Clearly describe the methods and materials. Why is the rock needed? • Clearly describe how the methods will accomplish the objectives. • Provide enough detail to allow an evaluation of whether the funding requested is adequate to meet the objectives.
	Pass		• *$350,000 to fence 3 to 4 miles of stream seems extremely expensive.*
9401805	Fix	Enhance Habitat for Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead, and Bull Trout.	• Clearly explain how this structural work addresses the problems identified in the basin. Describe any non-structural alternatives that may have been considered. • Provide enough detail to evaluate whether the proposed work is scientifically valid and whether it is occurring in the highest priority areas. • Demonstrate that the structures will withstand a flood. • Add more detail and clarity to the objectives.
	Pass		
9401806	Fix	Enhance Habitat for Spring & Fall Chinook, Summer Steelhead, and Bulltrout.	• See comments on Project 9401805 and Project 9202602.
	Pass		

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9401807	Fail	Enhance Habitat for Fall Chinook, Steelhead and Bulltrout	• Has a watershed plan been reviewed and adopted? • Explain the inconsistency between the target species (including chinook) and the statement that chinook have "never" been documented in the creek. • Explain the direct links to and consistency with the NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program. • Identify the limiting factors and explain how this project alleviates those factors. • Explain how the instream structures constructed in the recent past have been tied to the major problem of sedimentation in the Columbia River basin?
	Fail		• *Project sponsor attempted to address the concerns noted above but the supplemental information was not convincing, especially on Criterion 10. The response to Criterion 3 was incomplete - the proposal did not demonstrate enough benefit over the long term.* • *Not enough "bang for the buck".* • *Concern about whether the proposed benefits can be achieved in Pataha Creek..*
9402700	Fail	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning/Support	• Provide more detailed information about the objectives, methodologies, accomplishments, and project accountability. • Explain how the objectives will be accomplished. What methods will be used to accomplish the objectives (i.e. improved fish passage, habitat diversity, etc.)? • Explain how the proposed actions address the major limiting factors in the subbasin.
	Pass		• *Supplemental information addressed the concerns noted above. This is an ongoing project that fits within watershed analysis for the focus area, benefits and objectives are laid out. 50 % is cost-shared.* • *Some concern that the projects described are similar to other projects that were proposed individually but failed.* • *Should BPA pay for weed control?* • *What are the benefits to fish?*
9403900	Fail	Wallowa Basin Project Planning	• Explain how this effort is coordinated with, and does not duplicate the Grande Ronde Model Watershed. • Explain how this project benefits fish and wildlife.
	Pass		

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9404200	Fail	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	• Explain the O&M budget in detail. Although maintaining the fences is important, there are concerns that the funding requested for O&M of 70 miles of fence is excessive. • Revise Section 4 to include the objective of providing unobstructed passage of adult salmon (stated in section 7.b). • Identify the critical limiting factors in the subbasin and explain how the objectives address those factors. • Demonstrate the cost- and biological- benefits of this project. Is the return on the investment worth it considering the location of the project? Explain what proportion of the subbasin's fish population directly benefit from this project. Strategically this is a large expenditure for a small portion of the population.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not correct the deficiencies and did not describe the need for monitoring.* • *Budget seems high for 132 miles of fence.*
9405000	Pass	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	• Synthesize project accomplishments and effectiveness to date.
9405900	Pass	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	• Well written proposal.
9500100	Fail	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	• Demonstrate that there is not a conflict between bull trout/ cutthroat and improvements for yellow perch and largemouth bass. How secure is the temperature segregation - especially in the winter? • Explain if and how the bass hatchery will enhance bull trout and cutthroat in the basin. Is this a watershed project? Perhaps this should be separated into two projects - production and tributary habitat. • Align the objectives in Section 4 with those in Section 7. • Clearly describe the methods used to achieve the objectives (e.g. the bull trout density objectives). • Provide enough detail and specific information to allow an adequate evaluation of the proposal.
9506000 9506001	Fix Fix	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish Habitat Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Wildlife Habitat	• Provide enough detail and specific information to allow an adequate evaluation of the proposal and whether or not the objectives are achievable. • Clearly describe the objectives. • Identify the major problems and limiting factors in the Umatilla subbasin. Demonstrate how the proposed work addresses these. • Provide more detail about the monitoring and evaluation plans. • Demonstrate that the private landowners will cooperate. • Explain why land acquisitions are needed.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
	Pass		• Concern about what appears to be double-funding. Understand that the Wildlife Caucus prefers separating the projects to clearly identify the portion funded by wildlife. • Should BPA fund weed control (although wildlife habitat projects often need weed control to preserve native plants)?
9506800	Fail	Klickitat Passage/Habitat Improvement Construction and O&M	• Providing fish passage above a natural barrier is not a scientifically sound technique.
	Pass		• *Proposal demonstrated that fish historically reached the area above the barrier, but would benefit from more information on fish passage.* • *Concern about the monitoring plan, Where is the intent to show present versus future conditions.* • *The potential effects on other non-target species were not addressed.*
9600700	Pass	Irrigation Diversion Consolidation & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon River, Idaho	• Project addresses problems identified during an initial survey. • Quantify the potential benefits of this project in light of the number of other diversions.
	Pass		• *Sponsor should monitor the before and after conditions.*
9601100 9601200	Fix Fix	Screens and Traps on the Walla Walla and Touchet Adult Fish Passage Improvement - Walla Walla River	• Resubmit the project using the correct form. It was difficult to apply the criteria. • Support this type of work in the Walla Walla subbasin. Providing passage through the lower river makes the large amount of good habitat in the headwaters accessible.
	Fail		*9601100:* • *Criterion: 3:The proposal vaguely defined the long-term benefits which appear to be dependent on long-term funding. How will the benefits it be maintained in the future? Criterion 8: There is some question about the validity of trapping and hauling particularly in the mainstem Columbia.* *9601200:* • *Criterion: 1: The analysis of the problem is better than in the original proposal but t is still incomplete. Criterion 6: Milestones and project history were not described. Criterion 7: The potential negative impacts to non-target species are not well addressed. Proposal was incomplete.*
9603401	Fix	Methow River Valley Irrigation Conservation Project	• Explain the project in much more detail. It was difficult to evaluate. • Identify the critical limiting factors in the Methow subbasin and explain how this project addresses them.
	Fail		• *Supplemental information did not provide enough detail.* • *A preferred alternative under NEPA was not identified. Instead the sponsor referred to the environmental assessment.*

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9603501	Pass	Satus Watershed Restoration	• Clearly describe the monitoring and evaluation plan.
9604601	Pass	Riparian/Fish Habitat Analysis & Enhancement - Walla Walla River	• Proposal was inadvertently left out of the original evaluation process and was reviewed on February 6 for the first time. • Criterion 1: The objectives seem backwards chronologically. Objective 2 is only 5% of funding, is this a future activity? • It appears that the project was funded in 1997 but the accomplishments are not described. • Identified 2 projects to implement in 1998 but need to explore and describe the next steps. • Criterion 4: The techniques were not well described. • Criterion 6,:The letters of intent from landowners shows attention to the milestones. • Criterion 9: $70,000 salary for less than 1 FTE total seems to be a high.
9604200	Fix	Restore & Enhance Anadromous Fisheries & Habitat in Salmon Creek	• Clearly explain what is to be accomplished and how the budget will be spent. It seems that 60% of the budget is devoted to carrying out the work plan of the steering committee, yet it appears that the steering committee has not been formed yet. • It is difficult to evaluate the technical feasibility of this type of project. • Clearly explain how project benefits will be measured.
	Pass		
9605300	Pass	North Fork John Day River Dredge Tailings Restoration	• Provide a monitoring plan.
9607000	Pass	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	• Good example of a coordinator proposal.
9607701	Pass	Meadow Creek Restoration - Idaho	
9607702	Pass	Protecting and Restoring the Lolo Creek Watershed	• Concerned about the “in-lieu” issue and the delegation of funding responsibility. Some of this work should be funded by the Forest Service because their activities caused many of the problems.
9607703	Pass	Protecting and Restoring the Squaw and Papoose Creek	
9607704	Pass	Final Design for Fish Passage Improvements at Lower Eldorado Falls	• Concerned about the “in-lieu” issue and the delegation of funding responsibility. The Forest Service built the road that is causing the problems. • Provide detailed information about the amount and quality of the habitat this project makes available.
9607705	Pass	Restore Mccomas Meadows	• Concerned about the “in-lieu” issue and the delegation of funding responsibility. The Forest Service should be contributing more of the cost share.
9607706	Pass	Rehabilitation Of Johnson Creek/Cox Ranch	• Concerned about the “in-lieu” issue and the delegation of funding responsibility.

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9608500	Fix	Coordination of Watershed Restoration Projects in Umatilla River Basin	• Difficult to apply the criteria to the proposal.
	Pass		
9608600	Fix	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	• Difficult to apply the criteria to the proposal. • Combine with Project 9700600 (NPT Coordinator). Projects appear redundant.
	Fail		• *Redundant effort (Soil Conservation Commission, Nez Perce Tribe, Clearwater Basin Advisory Group).* • *Combine with 9700600 as recommended.*
9608701	Fix	Focus Watershed Coordination - Flathead River Watershed	• Provide enough detailed information to adequately evaluate the proposal.
9608720	Pass	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed (FY98)	• Good example of a coordinator proposal. • Well anchored to regional programs. • Concerned about the amount of work proposed. Can all of the tasks can be completed? • Clearly define the monitoring plan.
9700300	Fail	Box Canyon Watershed Project	• Provide clearly defined and specific information about the objectives and methods. Link the methods to the objectives. • In the discussion about the setting, link fish habitat condition to upland land management activities. • Prioritize projects in the watershed and identify which ones are ready to go. • Include a project history. Demonstrate what the project has already accomplished.
9700400	Fail	Resident Fish Joint Stock Status Assessment Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams.	• Clearly explain the project objectives. • Clearly explain the relationship between developing the database and the upstream and downstream migratory traps in Task 5h and 5i. • Explain how the proposed database differs from and/or is related to the information available in the Washington River Information System database (WARIS). • Describe in detail how the database is going to be used and what the managers will ultimately do with the data.
9700600	Fix	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program.	• Difficult to apply the criteria to the proposal. • Combine with Project 9608600 (ISCC Coordinator). Projects appear redundant.
	Pass		
9701100	Pass	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian Areas on the Duck Valley Reservation	• Provide a monitoring and evaluation plan. • Identify the critical limiting factors and explain how protecting spawning areas and springs addresses those factors. • Quantify the objectives. Include the number of miles of fencing and the number of springs

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
			and windmills needing protection. • Explain how this project relates to management plans. • Has an assessment been conducted? If not, consider submitting a proposal.
9702500	Fail	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan	• Explain how this project differs from the Grande Ronde Model Watershed implementation project 9402700 and projects 9403900 and 9202601. • Clearly explain how the money will be spent. Organize the budget by Task. Explain what will be purchased with funds in the "Other" category.
	Fail		• *The proposed project should be combined with project 9402700 (Grande Ronde Model Watershed).* • *Supplemental information discussed why these are separate projects, but the general system trend is to unify watersheds. This raises a broader question - how do large watersheds coordinate?* • *The project proponents are encouraged to work through the watershed board.*
9703100	Pass	Evaluate Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Restoration	• Project summary not provided. Assumed to be the same as Project 8018.
9703400	Fix	Monitor Fine Sediment and Overwinter Sedimentation in John Day & Grande Ronde	• Has this work been done elsewhere in the basin? Are the results available? • Clearly state what the project will accomplish. • Provide a clear tie between the project objectives and management actions. How do the results relate to other implementation projects? • Provide a clear link between project activities and the cause of the problem. This project appears to look only at the channel. • Describe (in Section 10. Information/ Technology Transfer) how the project relates to past restoration work and how the information will be used in the future. • Revise the proposal to highlight the relationship between surface fines and fine sediment intrusion. Tie surface fines measurements to total fines bed composition. • Demonstrate that the goals can be accomplished. Without "pre" information it will be difficult to determine if the habitat has been improved.
	Pass		• *Sponsor did an excellent job of answering the question and citing relevant literature. A "gold star" proposal.*
9703500	Pass	Evaluate Responses of Snake Basin Watersheds & Salmonid Habitats to Storms	

Proj ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9704900	Fail	Teanaway River Instream Flow Restoration	• Good idea. Needs to be accomplished under a proposed Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund recommended under Project 8067. • Clearly define the objectives, demonstrate what the project will accomplish, and show how the 3 cfs will be achieved. • The proposal does not identify funding for purchasing water rights. • Clearly explain in detail how the money will be spent.
	Fail		• *The proposal is incomplete and possibly premature.* • *The supplemental information did not discuss instream water rights.* • *Consider proposing this project under a different funding.*

Integrated Watershed Projects:
The Process and Criteria for Selecting Watershed Projects for the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program

1.0 Introduction

This document describes a process for evaluating watershed proposals for fiscal year 1998 Fish and Wildlife Program implementation. It has been developed by the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) based on recommendations by the Watershed Integration Subcommittee.

2.0 Collaborators

Project Sponsors

Anyone interested in implementing a watershed project under the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program may submit a proposal. Project sponsors may include: individuals, watershed groups and councils, environmental organizations, schools, public utility districts, state and federal natural resource agencies, CBFWA Member agencies and tribes, or other interested parties.

Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Caucuses

The state and federal fish and wildlife agencies and Indian tribes, which constitute the membership of the CBFWA, set objectives, strategies, and critical paths for management of fish and wildlife in the Columbia River Basin. CBWFA is divided into three functional caucuses: resident fish, anadromous fish, and wildlife. The caucuses individually and collectively develop criteria to evaluate project proposals, establish the watershed technical work group, and provide final project recommendations to the Council.

Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG)

The WTWG evaluates the technical merit and feasibility of project proposals and may include people with expertise in geology, hydrology, biology, ecology, engineering, archeology, geography, wildlife or fisheries.

Northwest Power Planning Council (Council)

The Council, established under the 1980 Northwest Power Act, develops and monitors the implementation of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. The Council reviews the evaluation criteria, and makes final recommendations to BPA for project funding.

Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP)

The ISRP provides independent scientific review of projects proposed for BPA funding under the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. The ISRP considers the project's rationale, experimental or management design, sampling methods and analysis, monitoring and evaluation, qualifications of participants, and relevance to

specific measures of the Fish and Wildlife Program. For FY 1998 watershed projects, the ISRP reviewed earlier versions of the criteria shown in Appendices 1-4 (ISRP Report 97-2, available from the Council).

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

As directed in the 1980 Power Act, BPA funds the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program and negotiates and oversees final contract agreements with project proponents based upon the Council's recommendations.

3.0 Watershed Principles

The Fish and Wildlife Managers developed a suite of principles (Attachment 1) to guide watershed restoration projects funded under the Council's Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

These principles are:

- Commit to a Watershed Approach
- Emphasize Watershed Protection and Restoration
- Commit to Broad Based Funding and Support

These concepts are embedded in the Integrated Technical Criteria (Attachment 3) and the Integrated Caucus Criteria (Attachment 4).

4.0 Project Evaluation and Selection Process

In general , projects will be evaluated against two standards. The first standard will be technical and will be established using the Integrated Technical Criteria (Attachment 3). A non-representational Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) will apply the technical criteria and complete the technical evaluation of proposals. The second standard will be management-related and will be established partly using the Integrated CBFWA Caucus Criteria (Attachment 4). The Fish and Wildlife Managers will apply the Caucus Criteria and will select proposals based on their relevance to critical strategies necessary to meet objectives in the subregions/subbasins throughout the Columbia and Snake River basins. Projects will be assessed based on how well each addresses priority management objectives described in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, the Multi-Year Implementation Plan (MYIP), the Subbasin Plans, the Wildlife Plan, etc.

It is not always possible to foresee *rare* opportunities to make significant contributions to watershed and ecosystem protection/restoration. If the following *unique circumstances* exist, then proposed projects may be considered on their individual merit. In other words, timing alone will not disqualify a once-in-a life-time project opportunity.

1. The project must be consistent with the principles outlined in Attachment 1, the Screening Criteria in Step 4b, and the criteria enumerated in Attachments 3 and 4.

2 Existing environmental/land-use regulations will not provide adequate protection for the habitat and species identified.

3. The proposed project was identified outside the usual annual work plan process and schedule.

4. The proposed project must go forward in the fiscal year for which funding has been requested or else it is highly unlikely that it will ever be implemented.

Possible examples of this type of rare and unique project opportunity might be as follows:

1. A landowner is facing foreclosure on property that contains prime spawning habitat for an important fish population. The property is proposed for development, and because of the topography of the area, this development could contribute to severe habitat degradation.

2. There is a small window of opportunity for agreement among many landowners to consolidate irrigation diversions in order to improve smolt survival and migration timing.

The following steps are provided to explain the process for evaluating watershed proposals for FY 1998 implementation:

Step 1. Develop Integrated Technical Criteria and Integrated Caucus Criteria

Who: CBFWA

Purpose: Develop criteria for the Watershed Technical Work Group and Caucus-level evaluations of the watershed proposals. The Council and/or the ISRP will be asked to review the criteria. These criteria will ensure that the projects recommended for funding are technically feasible, biologically sound and meet the objectives of the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program.

Product:
1. Integrated Technical Criteria to be used by the Watershed Technical Work Group (Attachment 3)
2. Integrated CBFWA Caucus Criteria. (Attachment 4) These criteria provide guidance and direction to the caucuses as they prepare project recommendations.

Step 2. Establish Watershed Technical Work Group

Who: CBFWA

Purpose: Establishe a watershed technical workgroup that includes technical expertise from several scientific disciplines and may include Members of CBFWA. This workgroup will sort the projects by type and use the *Integrated Technical Criteria* (Attachment 3) to evaluate the technical merit and feasibility of ongoing and new watershed projects. Members of the technical workgroup will be appointed by CBFWA from nominees submitted by CBFWA, the Council, BPA, and others in the region.

Product: An unbiased Watershed Technical Work Group

Step 3. Solicit Proposals

Who: BPA and the Council

Purpose: Solicitation of new project proposals and updated information on on-going watershed projects for consideration for funding in FY 1998.

Product: A group of proposals from a wide range of interested parties and/or watershed groups which address the needs of fish, wildlife, and watersheds in the Columbia Basin.

Step 4. Sort Proposals and Apply Initial Integrated Screening Criteria
Step 4a. Sort Proposals by Caucus

Who: CBFWA Staff

Purpose: To streamline the process and facilitate the initial screening, the proposals will be "assigned" to the most relevant Caucus. Integrated proposals addressing multiple species will be reviewed in the appropriate caucuses.

Product: A group of proposals to which each Caucus will apply the screening criteria

Step 4b. Apply Screening criteria

Who: CBFWA staff and/or Caucuses

Purpose: To ensure that the watershed proposals meet the initial requirements of the program, the CBFWA staff and/or Caucuses will apply the following two integrated screening criteria. Those proposals which meet these criteria will continue on to Step 5. Those which do not will not be considered further.

Product: A group of proposals which are consistent with the program and comply with the applicable laws.

Screening Criterion 1. Does the project address a specific measure in and/or is the project consistent with, the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program?

Proponents should be able to explain how the project meets specific program measures in the Council program. The project should describe whether it addresses special fish and wildlife losses in areas where hydroelectric projects blocked and eliminated runs of anadromous fish (e.g. resident fish substitution projects) or impacted resident fish and wildlife. It should also identify if and how it addresses program mitigation priorities.

Also, proponents should be able to demonstrate how/why this project is not "in-lieu" - i.e. that other federal, state, tribal or local statutes do not require this work to be done and, therefore, funded by some source other than BPA.

Screening Criterion 2. **Does the project comply with local, state, tribal and federal laws?** Laws that may require compliance include: Federal laws such as NEPA, ESA, NHPA, Clean Water Act, NFMA, etc.; tribal laws such as treaties, trust agreements, tribal statutes, etc.; state laws such as water quality statutes, fill/removal/hydraulic permits, SEPA, Forest Acts, water rights, etc.; local laws such as zoning and other land-use ordinances, taxes, etc.

The proposal should identify permits necessary to implement this project and state whether they have been obtained. If not, the proposal should state when they will be acquired.

Step 5. Evaluate Technical Merits of the Proposals
Step 5a. **Sort Proposals by Watershed Project Type**

Who: WTWG

Purpose: Proposals are sorted in categories to facilitate evaluation (See Attachment 2).

Product: A list of proposals by project type.

Step 5b. Apply the Technical Criteria

Who: WTWG

Purpose: The WTWG will use the criteria in Attachment 3 to judge the technical merit and feasibility of individual project proposals. The proposals must fully address the criteria or risk being rejected for lack of sufficient information to allow proper evaluation.

Product: A list that identifies technically sound and feasible proposals. Technical deficiencies will be explained and proposals which do not pass will be returned to the sponsors for correction.

Step 6. Select Projects

Who: CBFWA Anadromous Fish, Resident Fish, and Wildlife Caucuses

Purpose: The Fish and Wildlife managers will use the integrated criteria listed in Attachment 4 and criteria unique to each caucus to develop a suite of technically sound and feasible watershed projects. Each caucus may choose to use the criteria in Attachment 4 differently (e.g. incorporate Attachment 4 into existing criteria) to reflect its project selection process and its management priorities The Caucuses will look at the extent to which the proposed projects meet the priority objectives, critical strategies, and actions described in regional plans including the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, MYIP, Subbasin Plans, Habitat Conservation Plans, Habitat Management Plans, the Wildlife Plan, etc. Strategies will be deemed critical based upon a number of factors including urgency for action, status of watersheds, and populations and/or communities in question, etc.

Product: A list of proposed watershed projects which CBFWA recommends that the Council approve for funding.

Step 7. Council Recommends Funding for Watershed Proposals

Who: Council

Purpose: Recommend, to BPA, a suite of watershed projects for funding under the Council's Program.

Product: List of recommended watershed projects.

Step 8. BPA Approves Funds for Watershed Projects

Who: BPA

Purpose: Develop Statements of Work and fiscal contracts for funding watershed projects in FY 1998.

Product: Implement the Council's recommendations by completing contracts for funding FY 1998 watershed projects.

Attachment 1.
Watershed Principles

A. Commit to a Watershed Approach

A watershed approach promotes holistic ecosystem and community-based activities for watershed protection and restoration, and is essential for successful watershed activities. This approach is based on a suite of activities: on-the-ground projects; watershed assessments, monitoring and evaluation, administrative support and coordination; and education. All subbasins will be encouraged to take a "watershed" approach to protection and restoration. This concept is embodied in Technical Criteria 7 and 8 as well as Integrated Caucus Criteria 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9.

B. Emphasize Watershed Protection and Restoration

1. Protect the Best

Protection of high quality watersheds and habitats that support multiple species/stocks is a cost effective use of limited fish and wildlife program funds. Watersheds that most closely resemble natural, fully functional ecosystems, often support large, continuous blocks of high quality habitat and multiple species. Maintenance and connectivity of quality habitats in watersheds is critical to preserving these ecosystems on watershed, subbasin, and subregional scales. In these watersheds, connectivity between tributaries and within the watershed and through the mainstem river corridor is good, These watersheds typically express all life cycle stages and strategies individually or in combination within a subbasin.

These subbasins also provide a system of habitats large enough and well-dispersed enough to be resilient in the face of large-scale, catastrophic disturbance. They provide the best opportunity for long-term persistence of native assemblages and may well be the most important sources for assisting in re-establishment of other areas. These subbasins are often associated with wilderness or other administratively-restricted lands where the presence of activities that might conflict with conservation is often minimal. Maintaining habitat characteristics through management strategies or acquisition may be the best tools for protection of these subbasins. This concept is emphasized in Integrated Technical Criteria 2, 3 and 10 as well as Integrated Caucus Criteria 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, and 11.

2. Fix the Rest.

Subbasins having the greatest potential for restoration are those that support important aquatic and terrestrial resources, often containing watersheds classified as strongholds for one or more species. Due to habitat disruption or loss, subbasins and/or watersheds may have become fragmented, and contain many areas where species have been lost or are at risk. The level of fragmentation within and between watersheds and the ability to reconnect habitats is a critical factor for evaluating restoration potential. In these areas (including through the mainstem corridor), some connectivity still exists, or could be easily restored, such that maintenance, rehabilitation or dispersal of life-history patterns among watersheds most likely can be achieved. Reestablishing the necessary mosaic of habitats will often require protection of existing high-quality sites as well as the rehabilitation of whole watersheds that still support

remnant populations. These watersheds may show the greatest potential for restoration, but this should not preclude restoration efforts in other areas where extensive habitat degradation/alteration has occurred. This concept is emphasized in Technical Criteria 3 and Integrated Caucus Criteria 2, 3, 4, 9 and 10.

3. Identify Watersheds with a Low Potential for Recovery or Response

Watersheds that are heavily fragmented by extensive habitat loss or disruption need to be evaluated for restoration potential. Evaluations should examine several factors including the opportunity for restoring connectivity among watersheds and through the mainstem; the full expression of life histories; and other large-scale characteristics of fully functioning and resilient ecosystems. In keeping with Aldo Leopold's admonition to "keep all the parts", isolated small populations that may be crucial for long-term species survival should also be considered. If it is determined that large investments in these watersheds would have very small, if any, benefits in the foreseeable future to fish and wildlife, they would be considered low priority.

C. Commit to Broad-Based Funding and Support

Watershed projects should have multiple sources of funding and a long-term funding plan. Fish and Wildlife Program funds should be used to leverage or provide start-up funds for watershed activities. Project sponsors should be able to show a funding strategy to integrate various funding sources within the watershed. In addition, project sponsors should also be able to show a broad-base of support from interested parties—private landowners; tribal, local, state, and federal governments; and other affected interests. This principle is embedded in Integrated Caucus Criteria 1, 5 and 11.

Attachment 2.
Watershed Project Types

Five types of projects may be considered for evaluation: on-the-ground projects, assessment projects, monitoring and evaluation, administrative support, and education.

A. On-the-Ground Projects
On-the-ground projects include projects which employ strategies that target particular sites within the watershed for protection and/or restoration. Examples include fencing, removing passage barriers, revegetation, etc. Law enforcement can be considered a component of an on-the-ground project if: 1) efforts are specifically focused on land use management, habitat use, irrigation withdrawal, in-stream water use, etc. and 2) activities support the Monitoring and Evaluation component at the project level.

B. Watershed Assessments
Where assessments do not exist or are not adequate, assessment projects become a high priority for that subbasin, as the information they provide is critical to the identification of problems in the watershed and the implementation of on-the-ground projects to address these problems.

C. Watershed-Level Monitoring and Evaluation Projects
Watershed-level monitoring and evaluation projects are warranted to assess success. This does not include project-based monitoring and evaluation, as each on-the-ground project is expected to include its own monitoring and evaluation component (as described in Attachment 3 Criterion 4). Watershed-level monitoring and evaluation projects serve to keep watershed assessments current and collect information on the overall effects of on-the-ground activities on watershed health and fish and wildlife populations. See Attachment 4 Criterion 3 for a description of this type of project.

D. Administrative Support and Coordination Projects
Administrative support and coordination projects may be needed. Coordination and support through watershed councils or other mechanisms help provide access to federal, state, tribal and private land, as well as opportunities to leverage resources from non-Bonneville sources through cooperative partnerships. In addition, administrative support and coordination help provide accountability for project management, budget management and reporting. For these types of projects, projects with a demonstrated local cost-share should be given a high priority.

E. Education Projects
Education projects, which support the other types of projects, are critical to developing and sustaining watershed-based understanding and progress. Education projects should be linked in some way to on-the-ground activities to be considered for funding.

Attachment 3.
Watershed Technical Work Group
Integrated Technical Criteria

1. **Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate, scientifically valid strategies or techniques, and sound principles? (This could be either a proven or promising technique.)**

   Proponents must describe how/why the proposed project (including habitat law enforcement) is the best approach for reducing or eliminating the identified problem(s). Strategies and techniques used should be previously documented as viable in recent, peer-reviewed watershed restoration literature. If an unproved strategy or technique is being proposed, proponent must be able to demonstrate how it will resolve the identified problem. Restoration efforts should utilize, if available, native plant and animal species, materials, etc.

- For *watershed coordinator* projects, the proposal should clearly describe how the watershed problem or present situation warrants the need for a coordinator. The proposal must define the role of the coordinator and demonstrate a clear tie between the duties and responsibilities of the watershed coordinator and the objectives of the watershed assessment, plan, program or council (if a council exists). The proposal should demonstrate a high degree of local support for the coordinator position and for the assurance of fiscal responsibility and authority for management of the watershed.

- For *watershed assessment* projects, the proposal should specifically describe reliable and widely accepted methodologies for developing watershed assessments that are applicable to the problem and that incorporate wide public, agency, tribal and private landowner involvement. The project sponsor must demonstrate the technical ability to apply the methodology to achieve objectives.

- For *watershed monitoring projects*, the proposal needs to include: 1) a demonstrated plan for incorporating the information collected into watershed or basin-wide databases (e.g. Streamnet), 2) a description of how this information will be synthesized and used to evaluate the success of watershed activities, and 3) a description of how this information contributes to management adjustments.

- *Watershed education proposals* must clearly describe the methodologies to meet the expected outcomes in terms of accepted educational strategies (e.g., Tribal, State and Federal Education Department requirements, essential learning skills, hands-on learning, etc.). Additionally, the proposal project must describe reliable and widely accepted methodologies for evaluating if the educational objectives are achieved, and the project sponsor demonstrate the technical expertise to reach the target audience.

2. **If a structural solution to an identified problem is proposed, does the proposal demonstrate that non-structural alternatives have been considered?**

Has the project proponent reviewed all the possible remedies prior to committing to construction? Have natural processes been considered, especially as they contribute to other natural restoration processes? An example would be doing seeding in headwaters and letting them naturally disperse versus plantings at specific sites. Another would be riprap versus allowing stream to re-incorporate the flood plain.

3. **Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long-term?**

   Any treatment must be based on an understanding of how the watershed functioned prior to significant disturbances (historically) and how it functions currently. The proposal should describe the likelihood that the benefits can be managed over the long-term (e.g. are site enhancements likely to be maintained.)

4. **Does the proposal include an appropriate implementation monitoring and evaluation plan?**

   An adequate implementation monitoring and evaluation plan will describe the outcomes associated with each objective and how those outcomes will be measured over time.

   For *coordination projects*, the proposal should include a clearly developed performance evaluation plan for the coordinator position that outlines specific criteria related to the work plan.

5. **Are the objectives clearly defined and achievable?**

   The proposal must have measurable objectives, such as habitat units and/or species response to actions planned.

   - A *watershed assessment* proposal should clearly describe the proposed assessment and why it is needed as well as the status of other past or on-going watershed assessment efforts as they relate to this proposed project. It should describe the watershed assessment objectives in terms of what is being assessed and why, how it is being measured and the schedule, and how and what watershed information will be used to clearly define the watershed conditions and problems. (See Caucus Criterion 4.)
   - *Watershed monitoring* projects should demonstrate an explicit link to a specific need for baseline data identified in a watershed assessment, clearly describe the monitoring objectives in terms of what is being measured and why, how it is being measured and the schedule, and how the monitoring information will be evaluated in order to determine success. Additionally the monitoring proposal objectives must be clearly defined in terms of watershed and/or basin-wide performance measures.
   - *Watershed education* proposals should describe the need for and desired outcomes of the education project (e.g. raising public awareness, modifying behavior, enabling

promulgation of the information to educate others, etc.). Project objectives must be clearly defined in terms of educational outcomes that address the watershed condition.

6. Is the project likely to meet, or is it currently meeting, its objectives and time frame milestones?

If the project seeks biological outcomes, the proposal must explain how and why those outcomes are biologically possible.

For a *coordination project*, the proposal should demonstrate that the work is appropriately tracked and supervised by the watershed council and/or local fish and wildlife managers.

7. Would the techniques employed likely have no significant inadvertent negative impact to non-target species/populations and species/population assemblages?

8. Will the target or indicator species/population be significantly benefited by the project?

For a *watershed assessment* project, the proposal should clearly define how the watershed assessment information is synthesized and used to evaluate watershed problems; and to develop specific recommendations (i.e., action plan) that will achieve the protection and restoration goals in the watershed.

9. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?

The proposal must identify and separate costs for pre-planning, implementation (acquisition, enhancement, O&M, data collection and analysis, etc.) and monitoring and evaluation. The proposal must also explain how the approach is the most cost reasonable for meeting the objective(s), including protection of and/or passive restoration of the watershed.

- For *coordination projects*, the project should have a well defined budget plan that describes how administrative support funds will be used by the coordinator to address the identified needs of the watershed.
- *Education projects* should have a well defined budget that describes how these funds will be used to address the needs of the educational project.

10. Does the project address watershed or habitat strategies related to fish and wildlife goals and objectives (MYIP, Subbasin Plans, Wildlife Plan, Mitigation Plans, etc)?

The proposal should describe how the project helps or improves habitats that are limited or limiting for the focus or key species.

Attachment 4.
Integrated CBFWA Caucus Criteria

1. **Does the proposed project have demonstrable support from the affected agencies, tribes, local watershed groups and public and/or private landowners?**

   Support by the landowner should be demonstrated and may include written approval showing an understanding of project location, duration and scope. Additionally, the proposal should demonstrate a high level of involvement and cooperation among various agencies, local businesses, organizations, volunteers and youth groups. [This would not necessarily apply to all projects, especially where land or water rights are to be acquired.]

   The proposal should explain if and how it addresses concerns of others, including such things as additions to public land ownership, impacts on local communities or the local economic base and consistency with local comprehensive plans.

   A watershed group is local, community and governmental, has a technical team reflecting group participation, and has an open public process. Letters of support are encouraged to demonstrate support of agencies, watershed groups and others.

2. **Is the proposed project based on a watershed assessment, plan or program with clearly defined objectives?**

   A watershed assessment, plan or program requires an understanding of the ecological relationships among watershed processes, functions, and biota so that all human activity is placed in its broader context and evaluated not only for site specific effects but also for effects on the overall biological integrity of the watershed. An adequate watershed assessment, plan or program should accomplish the following:

- Identify and assess the status of key physical elements of the watershed and how they function (e.g., soil holding capacity). Identify and assess the status of key biological elements of the watershed and how they interact (e.g., nutrient recycling).

- Identify the target species and the status of those species in the watershed.

- Identify critical aquatic and terrestrial habitat refuges (strongholds) within the watershed as well as areas most sensitive to management that either should be included within riparian or watershed reserves or protected through other specific management directions.

- Identify the key watershed areas that most directly affect riparian function and, therefore, should be protected (e.g.; wetlands, side channels, and flood plains).

- Identify areas within the watershed that may be more easily restored to provide more refuges and/or connect productive habitat types.

- Identify risks or threats to ecological function of the watershed, particularly threats to connectivity, between the stream and flood plains or riparian zones, that should receive immediate attention to avoid the need for more difficult and costly remediation later.

- Identify the degree to which land management measures are needed to maintain or improve aquatic biodiversity (including, but not limited to, fish and wildlife) at self-sustaining levels within the watershed.

- Provide information necessary to support specific recommendations that will achieve protection and restoration goals in the watershed and thereby ensure long-term ecological sustainability.

  Doing a watershed assessment of this detail could require funding and staffing. But it should start with gathering and organizing information that already exists, working to place the information in a watershed context, and analyzing it to develop a comprehensive understanding of the actions needed to protect or restore the biological integrity of the watershed. Thus, proponents should be aware of and use assessments and/or other data that already exist to partially, if not fully, meet this requirement.

3. **Does an adequate strategic plan (e.g., MYIP, Subbasin Plans, Wildlife Plan) exist that addresses "documented" problems/limiting factors identified in the watershed assessment, plan or program?**

   A strategic plan identifies strategies and activities necessary to protect or restore key watershed functions as identified by the watershed assessments.

4. **Does the project promote/maintain community diversity and species richness?**

   The proposal should describe whether it provides riparian or other habitat or takes other actions that benefit fish and wildlife other than that which it targets. The proposal should also describe the extent to which it protects endangered, threatened and sensitive listed species and/or high quality native or other habitat.

5. **Is there a cost-share for the construction/implementation of the project?**

   The project should demonstrate cost sharing from a wide variety of agencies, organizations and/or individuals with a high ratio of matching funds and/or a significant level of in-kind contributions.

   For *coordination projects*, the project should clearly demonstrate that the position is or will be supported by funds other than BPA.

6. **Is this proposal sustainable without operation and maintenance activities? If operation and maintenance is required, is there a non-Bonneville commitment to fund operation and maintenance?**

7. **Does the proposal address key strategies and actions as identified in strategic plans (e.g., MYIP, Subbasin Plans, Wildlife Plan) that are linked to a watershed assessment?**

   Describe why/how this project was chosen to protect or restore the proper functioning condition of the watershed (i.e.; connect the project to the problem). Proponent must explain: 1) How the project assists in reversing long-term downward trends in watershed quality and restores ecological function. 2) The possibilities of unintended side effects from the restoration treatments. 3) How the project ensures that it is addressing causes and not just symptoms. 4) How this project relates to other projects in addressing key strategies and actions identified in the strategic plan.

8. **Is the project consistent with existing watershed-level monitoring and evaluation programs?**

   A watershed assessment will include a biological monitoring and evaluation plan for the watershed. It should include a set of assessment questions and objectives, including baseline monitoring and/or reference sites. The restoration program and the monitoring plan must be designed prior to project implementation. Key questions and objectives must be identified and the monitoring plan must be completed before any work is done on-the-ground.

   Indicators should be used in the monitoring strategy to determine changes in biological and physical states. These must be designed to reflect watershed-scale processes. Monitoring should be able to assess influences of human and natural disturbances, and land and water interactions. Biological assessment of specific parameters (i.e., water quality, pool-to-riffle ratios, habitat units, etc.) and changes in upslope conditions should be combined for a watershed-level monitoring and evaluation plan. The monitoring and evaluation plan needs to directly relate back to the goals and objectives of the watershed.

   The plan should explain the time line for monitoring and demonstrate that financial commitments are in place for monitoring. Monitoring of restoration projects at the watershed scale is a long-term process and must be able to reflect long-term trends and natural variability.

   Specific monitoring proposals should describe how the information gained is integrated with on-going, similar or complementary monitoring and evaluation projects in the watershed and/or basin.

9. **Does the project promote/maintain sustainable normative and/or ecosystem processes?**

10. **Does the project promote connectivity of habitats in the watershed?**

    The proposal should describe the extent to which the habitat types it protects or enhances are unique, i.e. explain how widely or narrowly distributed are its elements or types. The proposal

should also describe how it contributes to the maintenance or establishment of important ecological corridors and cite where those corridors exist and why they are deemed important.

11. Will the project complement management actions on private, public, and tribal land?

The project should describe how it is consistent with and/or complements the activities of the region's federal and state fish and wildlife agencies and tribes. The proposal should also describe if and how it encourages or incorporates partnerships with other persons or entities that may reduce costs, increase benefits and/or eliminate duplicative activities.

Also, the project should relate to other completed or planned projects that address problems identified as high priorities in the watershed assessment.

For watershed assessment projects, the proposal should describe how the information gained is integrated with on-going, similar or complementary watershed assessment efforts in the watershed and/or the basin.

12. Does the proposal demonstrate that the success of the project will not be compromised by other activities in the subbasin?

Instream habitat conditions and biota are largely determined by the processes occurring in the drainage basin, the riparian zone, and floodplain areas. They cannot be manipulated independent of this context (e.g.; Will continued logging or culvert failure in the upper basin offset the gains made by the restoration project?).

13. Does the project demonstrate an active and effective promotion of public awareness to a large number and diversity of people?

FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation

Review 2

February 8, 1998

Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Watershed Technical Work Group

2501 S. W. First Avenue, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97201
Phone: 503-326-7031
Fax: 503-326-7033
Web Page: www.cbfwf.org

Executive Summary

On February 6, the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) met via conference call to review supplemental information provided by the sponsors of 63 anadromous fish proposals that received a "fix" or a "fail" during the initial WTWG review (see the January 21, 1998 FY 98 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation). The WTWG:

- Passed 30 proposals (7 new and 23 ongoing)
- Failed 33 proposals (21 new and 12 ongoing).

In thinking about FY 1999, the WTWG reiterated initial recommendations to:

- Sort and evaluate the proposals by subbasin.
- Categorize the proposals by type (on-the-ground, monitoring, assessment, coordination, education).
- Refine the criteria to fewer than 10.
- Provide a model proposal as an example for the project sponsors.
- Establish a Land and Water Rights Trust Fund. The CBFWA caucuses should address this issue as soon as possible.

Introduction

The January 21, 1998 FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation report provides background information and describes the process for and results of the January 14-16 Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) review. This report presents the results of the February 6, 1998 WTWG review of 63 proposed anadromous fish projects and compiles the recommendations from both reviews.

FY 1998 Watershed Project Evaluation Process Review 2

In keeping with the process outlined in Step 5b of Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC) approved *"Integrated Watershed Projects: The Process and Criteria for Selecting Watershed Projects for the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program,"* which states that "technical deficiencies will be explained and proposals which do not pass will be returned to the sponsors for correction", the Anadromous Fish Caucus asked the sponsors of anadromous fish proposals that did not pass the January 14-16 WTWG review to respond to the recommendations by January 30, 1998. Sponsors of 63 of the 80 eligible proposals provided supplemental information. In addition, sponsors of several proposals which "passed" the initial review also submitted responses.

The WTWG met via conference call on February 6, 1998. With several exceptions as noted below, the WTWG evaluated how well the supplemental information provided by the project sponsors responded to the initial WTWG recommendations and assigned each project a pass or a fail. The "fix" category created in the initial review was not used. The WTWG did not provide "yes, no, or incomplete" responses to the 10 Integrated Watershed Technical Criteria. During the initial review, two proposals were submitted on the incorrect form and one was inadvertently left out. During the second review, the WTWG discussed how well these three proposals met the individual criteria. These proposals are marked with an "n" or a "w" in Table 1.

The recommendations from the February 6 review are presented in Table 2 and are shown below the January 14-16 recommendations separated by a dashed line. For anadromous fish proposals, the overall status (pass/fail) is a combination of both reviews so that proposals which passed the first and/or passed the second review got an overall pass. Moreover, proposals which received a fix or fail in round 1 and a fail in round 2 received an overall fail. Proposals assigned a fix or fail the first time and which did not submit additional information, received an overall fail.

Although the Resident Fish Caucus considered giving the sponsors of projects that did not pass the January 14-16 review the opportunity to submit additional information to the WTWG, the Caucus ultimately decided to forego the second WTWG review. The Resident Fish Caucus did request additional information on 4 projects (2 "passes", 1 "fail" and 1 "fix") to be evaluated at the caucus level.

Project Recommendations

During the February 6, 1998 review (Review 2), the WTWG evaluated the supplemental information provided for 63 anadromous fish proposals which received a fix or fail during the January 14-16, 1998 review. As shown in this table below, 30 of the 63 anadromous fish proposals passed and another 33 failed Review 2 (see page 3).

Watershed Technical Work Group Review 2. Anadromous Fish Proposals. February 6, 1998			
	Pass	**Fail**	**Total**
Ongoing	23	12	**35**
New	7	21	**28**
Total	**30**	**33**	**63**

Combining reviews 1 and 2, of the 113 anadromous fish proposals, 62 passed and 51 failed.

Watershed Technical Work Group Combined (Review 1 and 2) Recommendation. Anadromous Fish Proposals			
	Pass	**Fail**	**Total**
Ongoing	42	15	57
New	20	36	56
Total	**62**	**51**	**113**

The final outcome of both WTWG reviews shows that 67 proposed projects passed, 58 failed and 12 need to be fixed.

Watershed Technical Work Group Combined Recommendation. All (137) Proposals.				
	Pass	**Fix**	**Fail**	**Total**
Ongoing	46	1	18	**65**
New	21	11	40	**72**
Total	**67**	**12**	**58**	**137**

Table 1. FY 1998 Watershed Project Evaluation Summary *(Attached)*

Table 2. FY 98 Watershed Project Recommendations

See italicized notes in Part 1, Table 2 of this workplan appendix.

Table 3. FY 1998 watershed projects after February 6 review

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
8001	Inform Public	N	NA	N	N	N	N	NA	I	Y	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
8002	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In L. Klickitat R. And Its Tributaries	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
8003	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In Eastern Klickitat County	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
8004	Granite Creek Watershed Project	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fix**			**Fix**
8005	Kalispel Creek Watershed Project											**Fix**			**Fix**
8006	Slate Creek Watershed Project			Combine into 1 project								**Fix**			**Fix**
8007	Indian Creek Watershed Project			also 8012 - 8015								**Fix**			**Fix**
8008	Tacoma Creek Watershed Project											**Fix**			**Fix**
8009	Davis Creek Watershed Project											**Fix**			**Fix**
8010	West Branch of Priest River Watershed Project											**Fix**			**Fix**
8011	Evaluate and Manage Fisheries Within the Pend Oreille River Watershed	N	NA	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	I	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
8012	Ruby Creek Watershed Project											**Fix**			**Fix**
8013	Mill Creek Watershed Project			Combine into 1 project								**Fix**			**Fix**
8014	Middle Creek Watershed Project			See 8004 - 8010								**Fix**			**Fix**
8015	Sullivan Creek Watershed Project											**Fix**			**Fix**
8016	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
8017	Umatilla Tribal Fish And Wildlife Enforcement	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**	e		**Fail**
8018	Evaluate Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Restoration	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8019	Identify Dispersal Corridors, for the Northern Spotted Owl			Not a watershed project								**Fail**			**Fail**
8020	Build Rock Vortex Weirs on Entiat River, Washington	I	I	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8021	Restore Habitat within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8022	Analyze Ahtanum Creek Storage Project	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8023	Create fish passage and wild anadromous fish spawning and rearing habitat	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8024	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	I	I	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8025	Introducing Systems Science to Planning and Implementing Fish and Wildlife Recovery	N	NA	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8026	Acquisition Of Pine Creek Ranch	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8027	John Day Watershed Restoration	I	N	I	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8028	Warm Springs Reservation 1998 Watershed Enhancement Project	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8029	Restore Steelhead and Chinook habitat in Early Winters Creek	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8030	Trials of Smolt Herding by Periodic Feeding	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
8031	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams On Lower North Fork John Day	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
8032	Document Native Trout Populations	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	**Pass**			**Pass**
8033	Monitor natural escapement & productivity of John Day Basin spring chinook	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8034	Evaluate Effects Of Habitat Work Conducted In Fifteenmile Creek (Fy 98)	N	NA	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	I	Y	**Fail**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8035	Assesment Salmon River Subbasin	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8036	Implement Trout Creekwatershed Restor/Enhance Phase I -1998 Funds	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8037	Restor/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase II 1998 Funding	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8038	Restor/Enhance Trout Creek @ Willowdale 1998 Funding	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8039	Restore in-stream habitat for salmonids on Goat Creek	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8040	Develop, Analyze and Map Clearwater Basin Bull Trout Distribution, Strength, and Trends		Information already exists									**Fail**			**Fail**
8041	Reduce Stream Sedimentation In The Yakima River By Reducing Farm Runoff.	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8042	Educate/Support Yakima River Basin Groups	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8043	Hydrologically Close 75 M. Of Roads In The Bear And Trout Creek Watersheds.	N	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	N	Y	**Fail**	b		**Fail**
8044	Plant Aspen And Other Riparian Vegetation Along 12 Miles Of Streams.	N	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fail**	b		**Fail**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
8045	Rebuild 12 Miles Of Fence And Remove 10 Miles Of Old Unnecessary Fence.	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	**Fail**	b		**Fail**
8046	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Restoration Plan Now	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8047	Improve Yakima River Water Quality											**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8048	Improve Return Flow Water Quality											**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8049	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program			Combine into 1 project								**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8050	Landowner Communication Program					8047 - 8053						**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8051	Construct Sediment Settling Basins				also 8072-8074							**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8052	Construct Wetlands											**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8053	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery											**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8054	Wind River Watershed Project	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8055	Educate Landowners And Agencies On Salmon Stream Restoration Methods	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8056	Teach adults to become holistic Master Watershed Stewards	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	N	**Pass**			**Pass**
8057	Evaluate effects of grazing exclosures on habitat conditions	I	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8058	Screening and Passage on Columbia River and Tributaries	I	NA	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**Fix**	b,e		**Fail**
8059	Wild Steelhead Broodstock - Lower Columbia River, Cowlitz River	N	NA	N	N	I	I	Y	I	I	N	**Fail**	b, e		**Fail**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
8060	Protective Screening Program on the Washington River Basins	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fail**	b, e		**Fail**
8061	Protect Klickitat River Salmonids	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**	b, e		**Fail**
8062	Sturgeon Broodstock Protection Project (SBPP)	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**	b, e		**Fail**
8063	Aircraft Monitoring of Tributary Systems	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**	b, e		**Fail**
8064	Determine Salmonid Carrying Capacity in Watersheds by Flir Remote Imagery	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8065	Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed Analysis	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8066	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin	N	N	I	Y	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8067	Acquisition Of Water And Floodplain Fisheries Habitat In The Yakima Basin	I	NA	I	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8068	Measure Mine Drainage Effects At Confluence Of Alder Creek And Methow River	N	NA	N	N	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
8069	Grande Ronde Subbasin Watershed Restoration	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8070	Engineered Channels For Natural-Type Chinook Salmon Production	Production project not technically sound										**Fail**			**Fail**
8071	Reduce Sediment Delivery From Kline Mountain Road To The S.F. Salmon River.	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**	b		**Fail**
8072	Construct Sediment Settling Basins			Same as 8047-8053								**Fix**	see 8051		
8073	Improve Return Flow Water Quality from Farms		Combine into 1 project									**Fix**	see 8048		
8074	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program											**Fix**	see 8049		

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
8346700	Mitigation for the Construction and Operation of Libby Dam (FY98)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8400800	North Fork John Day Habitat Improvement	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8402100	Protect And Enhance John Day River Fish Habitat	I	NA	I	N	N	I	Y	Y	N	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8402500	Protect And Enhance Fish Habitat In Grande Ronde Basin Streams	I	NA	I	N	N	Y	Y	I	N	I	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
8612400	Inspection Service For Little Fall Creek Passage	I	I	I	I	I	I	N	I	I	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	N	N	Y	I	N	N	Y	I	Y	N	**Fail**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8710002	Protect & Enhance Coldwater Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Basin.	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration And Survival In The Lower Umatilla	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	g		**Pass**
9101903	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation - Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	g		**Pass**
9202408	Protect Critical Salmonid Habitat and Habitat Restoration Investments	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	**Fail**	e		**Fail**
9202409	Enhance Law Enforcement For Fish & Wildlife And Watersheds Of The Nez Perce	N	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	**Fail**	e		**Fail**
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning/Support	N	NA	I	N	N	N	Y	I	N	I	**Fail**	a	**Pass**	**Pass**
9202602	Implement Eastern Washington Model Watershed Plans	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
9202603	Idaho Model Watersheds Admin./Impl. Support	I	NA	Y	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**	c	**Pass**	**Pass**
9303000	Buck Hollow Watershed Enhancement	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, And Wildlife Habitat Within The Red River Watershed	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	g		**Pass**
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (For Funding In Fy 98)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9306600	Oregon Fish Screens Project	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9401500	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement - O&M	Resubmit as a new project										**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9401805	Enhance Habitat For Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bull Trout.	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9401806	Enhance Habitat For Spring & Fall Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bulltrout.	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9401807	Enhance Habitat For Fall Chinook, Steelhead And Bulltrout	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
9402700	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning/Support	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planning	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**Fail**	c	**Pass**	**Pass**
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	**Fail**			**Fail**
9506000	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish Habitat	I	NA	Y	N	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
9506001	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Wildlife Habitat	I	NA	Y	N	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9506800	Klickitat Passage/Habitat Improvement Construction And O&M	Passage above a natural barrier										**Fail**		**Pass**	**Pass**
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidation & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon River, Idaho	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9601100	Screens and Traps on the Walla Walla and Touchet	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	**Fix**	o	**Fail**	**Fail**
9601200	Adult Fish Passage Improvement - Walla Walla River	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	**Fix**	o	**Fail**	**Fail**
9603401	Methow River Valley Irrigation Conservation Project	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**		**Fail**	**Fail**
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9604200	Restore & Enhance Anadromous Fisheries & Habitat in Salmon Creek	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fix**	c	**Pass**	**Pass**
9604601	Riparian/Fish Habitat Analysis & Enhancement - Walla Walla River	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	n	**Pass**	**Pass**
9605300	North Fork John Day River Dredge Tailings Restoration	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9607000	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	c, g		**Pass**
9607701	Meadow Creek Restoration - Idaho	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9607702	Protecting And Restoring The Lolo Creek Watershed	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b		**Pass**
9607703	Protecting And Restoring The Squaw And Papoose Creek	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b		**Pass**
9607704	Final Design For Fish Passage Improvements At Lower Eldorado Falls	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b		**Pass**
9607705	Restore Mccomas Meadows	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b		**Pass**
9607706	Rehabilitation Of Johnson Creek/Cox Ranch	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	b		**Pass**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
9608500	Coordination Of Watershed Restoration Projects In Umatilla River Basin	Y	NA	Y	N	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	**Fix**	c	**Pass**	**Pass**
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**	c	**Fail**	**Fail**
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	**Fix**	c		**Fix**
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed (FY98)	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**	c, g		**Pass**
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	**Fail**			**Fail**
9700400	Resident Fish Stock Status above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	I	Y	**Fail**			**Fail**
9700600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	**Fix**	c	**Pass**	**Pass**
9701100	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian Areas on Duck Valley Reservation	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	**Pass**			**Pass**
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan	N	I	N	N	N	N	I	I	I	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**
9703100	Evaluate Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Restoration				Same as 8018							**Pass**	see 8018		
9703400	Monitor fine sediment and overwinter sedimentation in John Day & Gr. Ronde	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Fix**		**Pass**	**Pass**

ID	Title	Criteria										Jan 16		Feb 6	Final
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Status	Note	Status	WTWG
9703500	Evaluate responses of Snake Basin watersheds & salmonid habitats to storms	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	**Pass**			**Pass**
9704900	Teanaway River Instream Flow Restoration	N	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	Y	**Fail**		**Fail**	**Fail**

h:\work\awp98\Appendix.doc