FY 1999 Draft
Annual Implementation Work Plan

Volume III
Appendices

Submitted by

Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority

to the

Northwest Power Planning Council

May 13, 1998

Table of Contents

Appendix A. Watershed Technical Workgroup Report

FY 1999 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation

March 1998

Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Watershed Technical Work Group

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Executive Summary

On March 5-6, 1998, the Technical Work Group (WTWG) evaluated 138 new and ongoing Fiscal Year 1999 watershed proposals and made the following recommendations:

X 25% of the proposals (21 new projects and 13 ongoing projects) are technically sound and feasible and no further information is needed. In some cases, the WTWG requests additional information, but not as a requirement.

X 75% of the proposed projects (56 new and 48 ongoing) need to provide additional details or address technical deficiencies; the WTWG provides specific recommendations in Table 2 for response by project sponsors.

X 13% of the proposed projects (13 new and 5 ongoing) raise significant concerns regarding the validity of the techniques and the benefits to fish and wildlife; the WTWG notes that significant modifications to the proposal are needed.

X 56% of the proposals describe work that is considered new as of the date the proposal was submitted, of which 27% are technically sound and feasible, 73% need to provide additional information, and 17% need significant modification.

X 44% of the proposals describe ongoing work currently funded by the BPA, of which 21% are technically sound and feasible, 79% need to provide additional information, and 8% need significant modification.

X Conduct workshops on how to write a good proposal.

X Improve site specific and subbasin-level monitoring and evaluation.

X Create a Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund.

X Peer review the model/focus watershed coordination projects.

X Ensure that a full variety of interested parties are represented on watershed councils, and that the councils are not geographically separated by non-watershed boundaries.

Introduction

In 1997, the fish and wildlife managers of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) developed a process and criteria for recommending the fiscal year 1998 watershed projects implemented under the Northwest Power Planning Council's (NPPC) Fish and Wildlife Program and funded by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). This process was approved by the NPPC. It is again being used for fiscal year 1999 watershed project selections, and includes reviews of both the technical and management aspects of each project proposal. The fish and wildlife managers developed the following set of principles to guide watershed restoration projects and included them in the 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

To assist with the project selection process, the fish and wildlife managers used the non-representational Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) that was selected for the FY98 project review. Members were selected based on their experience in watershed management and expertise in pertinent scientific disciplines, including hydrology, geomorphology, fisheries biology, soil and water resources, ecology, and wildlife and wetlands biology. The fish and wildlife managers directed the WTWG to assist the project selection process by using the Integrated Technical

Criteria (Appendix) to evaluate the technical merit and feasibility of FY 1999 watershed project proposals, and provide:

1. a list of project proposals that have technical merit and are feasible;
2. a list of proposals that need more information before they can be deemed technically sound and feasible, including explanations and specific recommendations.

The technical review is but one aspect of the entire project selection process, which also includes management review of policy and technical issues. The technical review is used by the fish and wildlife managers to focus on technical deficiencies and to evaluate other issues that the technical reviewers raise for management consideration.

On November 21, 1997, the NPPC and BPA solicited proposals for watershed projects for the FY 1999 funding cycle. Proposals were due to BPA by January 23, 1998. The project solicitation included the CBFWA process and criteria; sponsors were notified that the proposals must fully address the criteria or risk being rejected for lack of sufficient information to allow proper evaluation. The 138 project proposals marked as Watershed in the Keywords section of the proposal (excluding enforcement projects) were sorted by subbasin and watershed in order to help the reviewers to:

0. see the big picture;
1. evaluate the work proposed in each subbasin as an integrated unit;
2. identify and capitalize on interrelationships; and
3. look for efficiencies within and across projects. The proposals were express-mailed to the WTWG members on February 13, 1998 for their technical evaluation.

Seven of the WTWG members reviewed the 138 proposals prior to the March 5-6 project review. Answers to the criteria and comments on individual projects were provided by three WTWG members via fax and were included in the review by four other WTWG members on March 5 and 6. This report is the product of the WTWG review.

Technical Evaluation Process

The WTWG met in Portland on March 5-6, 1998 to evaluate the technical merits and feasibility of FY 1999 watershed projects. The group agreed to evaluate each of the 138 projects using the information contained in the proposal form. 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 (Appendix) and arrived at a majority-based decision. Although the criteria were designed for yes/no answers, some criteria were marked "I" for incomplete to identify areas where reviewers needed more information. In addition to looking at individual criteria, the WTWG assigned each project a status of *pass* (no additional information required to determine that the project is technically sound and feasible) or *return* (return to the project sponsor because additional information is required in order to assess the technical merit and feasibility of the project proposal). Some of the proposals marked *return* were further identified as needing more information to address concerns about the validity of the proposed techniques and whether fish and wildlife will benefit from the proposed work.

The WTWG agreed that the *pass* threshold was unique to each project and they did not define the number of "yes" marks needed to pass. The WTWG identified criteria 1, 5, 8 and 9 as more critical, and the answers to these criteria heavily influence the designation of the overall project status.

Although additional information is not required for those projects identified as being technically sound and feasible (*pass*), the WTWG provide comments and in some cases request additional information. Projects that need to be *returned* are still active and the sponsor has the opportunity to provide additional information to the CBFWA. The CBFWA caucuses will then determine if technical concerns have been adequately addressed. Notification to project sponsors to provide additional information will be distributed March 18, 1998 with responses due to the CBFWA by 3 pm, March 25. The Anadromous Fish Caucus will meet April 7-8, 1998, the Resident Fish Caucus on March 30-April 1, and the Wildlife Caucus on March 19-20 and April 6-7. The CBFWA will make final recommendations to the NPPC and Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) on FY 99 watershed projects by April 22, 1998.

Table 1 shows how well the projects meet the criteria and lists the overall project status. Table 2 offers specific recommendations on most of the projects. The fish and wildlife managers added a column to Table 2 to whether each WTWG recommendation addresses a management issue or a technical concern. These tables will be useful

both to project sponsors to provide additional information, and to caucuses for management and technical considerations.

Only those projects where the project sponsor had marked Watershed with an X in the Keywords section were considered by the WTWG (except for two enforcement proposals which were marked as watershed, but were not reviewed by the WTWG). "New" projects are identified as those that had not been funded at the time the proposal was submitted (before January 24, 1998).

General Technical Review Recommendations

Project Proposal Form: The WTWG recommends that the proposal forms be modified so that the key technical elements of the projects more clearly stand out. The WTWG characterizes the following as critical areas needing clarification in each proposal in order to determine the technical merit and feasibility of the project:

1. What is the current resource condition, and the major, critical limiting factors (what is the problem)?
2. Specifically how were these determined to be the critical limiting factors?
3. What are the measurable objectives and do they address the critical limiting factors?
4. What are the strategic actions for achieving those objectives?
5. How were these actions decided upon (what other alternatives were considered)?
6. What are the expected results of those actions (how much of the problem will be fixed - how much of the measurable objective will be achieved)?
7. What specific parameters will be monitored to determine if the results are as expected?
8. What are the specific methodologies for obtaining, distributing and managing the monitoring information?
9. How will the monitoring information be evaluated in order to determine if the expected results are being achieved?
10. What is the adaptive management mechanism for using the monitoring results to modify the strategic actions as required?

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 the CBFWA, NPPC, and BPA sponsor workshops on how to prepare a good proposal. This workshop could include specific instructions (and examples) on how to complete the form. In addition, this would be an opportunity where project sponsors learn, by example and networking, how to put together a cohesive package that addresses each of the 10 critical areas stated above.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Monitoring and evaluation are an essential element of the watershed restoration process, yet most of the project proposals need to provide a more detailed and structured program which directly feeds back to local and regional management actions. The WTWG encourages the fish and wildlife managers to continue developing a system-wide monitoring and evaluation framework, and that it include a process for using that information for management decisions at all levels.

Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund: In many situations, the principle of "protecting the best" means buying land and/or water rights. Often the most cost-efficient 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 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 that identify critical needs and tie the proposed action to an overall watershed plan.

Peer Review Focus/Model Watersheds: The WTWG recommends a peer review, with CBFWA, NPPC and BPA participation, of model and focus watershed coordination and implementation projects. While it is recognized that coordination and planning are essential to any effective restoration effort, there is concern that most of the coordination and watershed council proposals do not demonstrate the fish and wildlife benefits attributable to "coordination" versus those benefits attributable to "on-the-ground" projects. The WTWG is also concerned about the amount of money invested in coordination and believes that funding for some focus and model watershed coordination exceeds what is 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 objectives for

each watershed. 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. The WTWG also recommends that the watershed coordinators meet together at regular intervals in order to benefit from each other's experiences with the intent of improved efficiency and communication between coordinators.

Watershed Councils: There should be a criterion to better determine whether watershed councils are fully represented by a variety of interests. When watershed councils are referenced, the specific information regarding who is on the council and the interests that are represented needs to be provided. Also, some watershed councils have boundaries such as state lines and/or upper/lower watershed designations; these boundaries may not be consistent with the watershed context.

Project Technical Review Recommendations

The WTWG evaluated the technical merits and feasibility of 138 proposals for ongoing and new FY 1999 watershed projects. As shown in Table 1 below, 34 projects passed and 104 projects need returned to the project sponsors for additional information. Of the 104 projects that need additional information, 18 have significant deficiencies requiring substantial modification in order to be identified as technically sound and feasible.

Table 1. Project review summary statistics

	New	**Ongoing**	**TOTAL**
Pass	21 (27% of new)	13 (21% of ongoing)	34 (25% of total)
Return (including *)	56 (73% of new)	48 (79% of ongoing)	104 (75% of total)
Return*	13 (17% of new)	5 (8% of ongoing)	18 (13% of total)
TOTAL	77 (56% of total)	61 (44% of total)	138

X 25% of the proposals (21 new projects and 13 ongoing projects) are technically sound and feasible and no further information is needed. In some cases, the WTWG requests additional information - but not as a requirement.

X 75% of the proposed projects (56 new and 48 ongoing) need to provide additional details or address technical deficiencies; specific recommendations are provided in Table 3 for response by project sponsors.

X 13% of the proposed projects (13 new and 5 ongoing) raise significant concerns regarding the validity of the techniques and the benefits to fish and wildlife; significant modifications to the proposal are needed.

X 56% of the proposals describe work that is considered new as of the date the proposal was submitted, of which 27% are technically sound and feasible, 73% need to provide additional information, and 17% need significant modification.

X 44% of the proposals describe ongoing work that the BPA is currently funding, of which 21% are technically sound and feasible, 79% need additional information, and 8% need significant modification.

Table 2. Technical Evaluation Summary

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Lower Columbia Subregion															
Chinook Subbasin															
9123	Restore Chinook Watershed	SR	A	334,750	N	N	I	I	I	I	Y	I	I	N	R
Cowlitz Subbasin															
9088	Implement Best Management Practices	CCD, WCD	A	98,211	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9127	Development of a Cowlitz Watershed Management Plan	SFF	A	58,000	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Willamette Subbasin															
9036	McKenzie Watershed Habitat Assessment and Project Prioritization	MFWC	A	147,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9037	Acquire Fish and Wildlife Habitat in the McKenzie Watershed	MFWC	A	241,500	Y	NA	N	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9038	Evaluate spring chinook life history-habitat relationships in the McKenzie	MFWC	A	182,250	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	R
9607000	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	MWC	A	105,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9206800	Implementation of Willamette Basin Mitigation Program--Wildlife	ODFW	W	500,000	I	I	I	Y	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9705908	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites-Oregon, Multnomah Channel	Metro	W	65,000	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Lower Columbia Mainstem Subbasin															
9058	Restore Chinook Passage into Woodard Creek & Enhance Habitat	CRGNSA	A	87,624	Y	N	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	I	Y	N	R
Sandy Subbasin															
9061	River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	USFS-CRGNSA	W	125,000	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9062	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	USFS-CRGNSA	W	21,500	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Lower Mid-Columbia Subregion															
White Salmon Subbasin															
9156	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	UCD	R	126,306	I	NA	I	I	Y	I	I	I	I	Y	R
Hood Subbasin															
9126	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWS	A	117,088	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Klickitat Subbasin															
9001	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In Eastern Klickitat County	EKCD	A	11,285	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	R
9002	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In L. Klickitat R. And Its Tributaries	CKCD	A	16,800	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	N	R
9506800	Klickitat Passage/Habitat Improvement M&E	YIN	A	573,979	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	R*
9705600	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YIN	A	295,683	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R*

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
9089	Classify riparian and wetland vegetation in the Columbia Basin of Wash.	WDNR,NHP	A	59,421	Y	NA	I	NA	I	Y	NA	I	Y	N	R
Fifteenmile Subbasin															
9087	Acquire 1860 Fifteenmile Cr irrigation water right and convert to instream	OWT	A	19,630	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	R
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project	ODFW	A	220,000	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	Y	N	Y	P
Deschutes Subbasin															
9003	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase II	JCSWCD	A	56,800	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	R
9004	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase I	JCSWCD	A	56,800	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	R
9005	Irrigation System Replacement Trout Cr. @ Willowdale II 1999 Funds	JCSWCD	A	28,750	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	R
9006	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Willowdale	JCSWCD	A	83,400	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	R
9007	Jefferson Co./Middle Deschutes Watershed Coordinator/Council Support 1999	JCSWCD	A	30,775	I	NA	N	NA	I	I	NA	I	Y	Y	R
9133	Bakeoven Riparian Assessment	WCSWCD	A	35,065	N	NA	N	I	N	N	Y	I	Y	Y	R
9138	Warm Springs Reservation 1999 Watershed Enhancement Project	CTWSRO	A	356,119	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9303000	Buck Hollow Watershed Enhancement	WCSWCD	A	99,961	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	R
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	ODFW	A	335,800	Y	NA	N	N	N	Y	Y	I	N	Y	R
9103	Upper Deschutes Basin Watershed Coordinator/Council Support		W	32,100	I	NA	I	I	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	R
John Day Subbasin															
9012	Mitigate Effects Of Runoff & Erosion On Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow	SSWCD	A	26,960	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9045	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams On Lower North Fork John Day	NFJDWC	A	66,500	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9139	Acquisition Of Pine Creek Ranch	CTWSRO	A	1,200,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9144	Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity Of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	ODFW	A	125,400	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9155	Establish the Methow Watershed Council	MVCC	A	58,076	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
8400800	North Fork John Day Habitat Improvement	USFS	A	30,000	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	R*
8402100	Protect And Enhance John Day River Fish Habitat	ODFW	A	380,000	Y	N	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	R
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	USFS	A	68,000	Y	NA	I	I	I	Y	Y	I	I	Y	R
9605300	North Fork John Day River Dredge Tailings Restoration	USFS/CTUIR	A	85,000	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project-FY'99 Proposal	ODFW	A	522,853	Y	NA	I	NA	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	P
9703400	Monitor fine sediment and overwinter sedimentation in John Day & Gr Ronde	CRITFC	A	30,066	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	R

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Rock Creek Subbasin															
9159	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	YIN Fisheries	A	266,106	Y	NA	I	NA	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	R
Umatilla Subbasin															
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	A	295,000	N	N	Y	I	N	N	Y	I	Y	Y	R
8710002	Protect & Enhance Coldwater Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Basin.	ODFW	A	320,560	I	NA	I	I	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	R
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration And Survival In The Lower Umatilla	ODFW	A	175,710	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	R
9506001	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish & Wildlife Habitat	CTUIR	W	210,000	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Walla Walla Subbasin															
9010	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	WDFW	A	183,792	I	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9601100	Screens and Traps on the Walla Walla and Touchet	CTUIR	A	1,400,000	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	R
9601200	Adult Fish Passage Improvement - Walla Walla River	CTUIR	A	400,000	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	I	N	Y	R
9604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	A	240,110	N	N	Y	I	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	R
Upper Mid-Columbia Subregion															
Yakima Subbasin															
9032	Teach adults to become holistic Master Watershed Stewards	GCEE	A	81,791	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	N	P
9065	Little Naches Streambank Restoration	USFS	A	24,240	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9067	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	YRWC	A	193,100	Y	NA	I	I	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9068	Improve Stream Habitat Through Reduction In Farm Runoff	BCD	A	1,925,000	I	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	R
9070	Improve Water Quality Through Sedimentation And Nutrient Reduction	SYCD	A	200,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	Y	R
9076	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	RSBOJC	A	50,000	N	NA	N	N	N	I	I	I	I	N	R*
9100	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin	YIN&WDFW	A	396,801	N	N	I	Y	N	N	Y	I	N	N	R
9101	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	YIN	A	225,075	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9102	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	YIN	A	289,990	Y	NA	Y	NA	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	R
9109	Acquisition Of Water And Floodplain Fisheries Habitat In The Yakima Basin	YIN	A	5,000,000	I	NA	I	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	R*
9114	Stabilizing Stream Channels In The Cabin Creek Watershed	USFS	A	86,000	Y	Y	I	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	R

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
9158	Little Naches River Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YIN Fisheries	A	90,470	Y	N	I	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9164	Analyze Ahtanum Creek Storage Project	AID	A	2,921,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R*
8506200	Evaluate The Effectiveness Of Fish Screens	PNNL	A	299,999	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9105700	Yakima Phase 2 Screen Fabrication	WDFWYSS	A	186,000	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	USBOR	A	1,500,000	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	R
9200900	Yakima Screens - Phase II - O & M	WDFWYSS	A	156,100	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	YIN	A	589,892	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9704900	Teanaway River Instream Flow Restoration	YIN	A	775,000	N	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	Y	R*
9705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	YIN	A	1,000,000	I	NA	I	N	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9705200	Enhancement Between Selah and Union Gaps	YIN	A	474,240	Y	NA	I	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
Wenatchee Subbasin															
9044	Replace Chumstick Creek Culvert	WDFW	A	171,380	Y	NA	Y	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9050	Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore riparian vegetation on Chumstick	USFWS	A	200,000	Y	I	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	R
9054	Reduce Erosion, Identify Access and Improve Aquatic Health in Bonneville Power Line Corridor	USFS	A	111,600	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	I	R
Entiat Subbasin															
9031	Implement Entiat Model Watershed Plan	CCCD	A	199,628	Y	Y	Y	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Methow Subbasin															
9024	Methow Tributaries Fish Passage	FS	A	5,700	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	P
9025	Prevent Mortality In Methow Endangered And Proposed Fish	FS	A	25,000	Y	N	Y	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	P
9026	Expand Respect The River	FS	A	34,000	I	NA	I	N	I	Y	Y	N	Y	N	R
9027	Prevent Pollution Of Methow River	FS	A	14,600	N	NA	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	R*
9028	Reduce Sediment In Frazer Creek, Beaver Creek, Methow River	FS	A	37,673	I	N	N	N	I	I	I	I	I	N	R*
9039	Increase Stream Flow In The Methow River And Provide Trail-Based Recreation	CCC	A	14,840	N	NA	N	N	I	I	N	N	I	N	R*
9097	Methow Basin Side Channel Habitat Construction	YIN	A	525,000	I	N	I	N	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	R
9604200	Restore And Enhance Anadromous Fisheries & Habitat In Salmon Creek	CCT	A	250,000	I	NA	N	N	I	I	I	I	I	N	R
Lower Snake Subregion															
Asotin Subbasin															

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
9401805	Enhance Habitat For Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bulltrout.	ACCD	A	193,000	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
Toucannon Subbasin															
9202602	Implement Eastern Washington Model Watershed Plans	WCC	A	159,466	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9401806	Enhance Habitat For Spring & Fall Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bulltrout.	CCD	A	1,300,000	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9401807	Enhance Habitat For Fall Chinook, Steelhead And Bulltrout	PCD	A	213,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	N	R
Clearwater Subbasin															
9059	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	CFWP-ISCC	A	196,654	I	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	R
9060	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	CFWP-ISCC	A	181,755	I	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	R
9118	Restore West Fork Little Bear Creek For Steelhead	PCEI	A	517,000	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	N	I	Y	R*
9120	Protecting and Restoring Big Canyon Creek Watershed	NPT	A	441,459	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9122	Rehabilitate Lapwai Creek	NPT	A	477,272	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R
9163	West Fork Squaw Creek Fish Passage Project	USFS	A	100,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, And Wildlife Habitat Within The Red River Watershed	ISWCD	A	589,960	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	R
9607702	Protecting And Restoring The Lolo Creek Watershed	NPT	A	361,062	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9607703	Protecting And Restoring The Squaw And Papoose Creek Watersheds	NPT	A	241,693	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9607704	Final Design for Fish Passage Improvements at Lower Eldorado Falls	NPT	A	17,802	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9607705	Restore Mccomas Meadows	NPT	A	123,553	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9607706	Restore Lolo Watershed	USFWS	A	87,635	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9607707	Restore Squaw and Papoose Watersheds	USFWS	A	106,925	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	ISCC	A	85,212	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	R
9706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	NPT	A	93,024	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	R
Grande Ronde Subbasin															
9085	Propagate Native Plant Species for Revegetation & Riparian Restoration Project	USFS	A	47,092	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	P
9119	Public-Private Cooperative Resource Mgmt in Lower Joseph Cr Watershed	WR	A	32,220	I	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	R
9128	Upper Grande Ronde Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	A	200,000	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
8402500	Protect And Enhance Fish Habitat In Grande Ronde Basin Streams	ODFW	A	280,264	I	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	R
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning Support	GRMWP	A	284,400	N	NA	I	N	N	N	Y	I	N	I	R
9402700	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Habitat Projects	GRMWP	A	950,000	I	N	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	Y	R

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
9043	Introducing Systems Science to Planning and Implementing Fish and Wildlife	DU	W	1,143,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	Y	R*
Grande Ronde Imnaha Subbasin															
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planning	NPT	A	55,313	I	NA	I	N	N	I	Y	I	I	Y	R
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan	NPT	A	50,000	N	I	N	N	N	N	I	I	I	Y	R
Salmon Subbasin															
9009	Restore Salmon River (Challis, ID) area to healthy condition	CCWG	A	100,000	I	Y	I	I	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9014	Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings on Yankee Fork Salmon River	SBT, IDFG, USFS	A	202,260	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9034	Reduce Sediment Delivery From Kline Mountain Road To The S.F. Salmon River.	USFS, BNF, Cascade RD	A	307,042	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	R*
9051	Stabilize Blowout Creek (South Fork of Meadow Creek)	USFS	A	335,147	I	N	I	I	I	Y	I	I	N	Y	R
9121	Assessment Salmon River Subbasin	NPT	A	27,083	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	N	R*
9202603	Idaho Model Watersheds Admin./Impl. Support	SCC	A	175,000	I	NA	Y	N	I	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	R
9401500	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement - O&M	IDFG	A	1,000,000	Y	NA	I	N	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	SWCD	A	400,000	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	I	Y	R
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	SBT	A	257,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation, Up. Salmon R., ID	CS&WCD	A	446,250	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
Systemwide															
9049	Feasibility Study For A State-Wide Water Quality Data Sharing Mechanism	Rachael Stein	A	66,375	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	N	R*
9099	Educate Landowners And Agencies On Salmon Stream Restoration Methods	OSU	A	838,111	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R*
9132	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Restoration Plan Now	CRITFC	A	121,385	Y	NA	Y	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
9142	Produce watershed analysis procedure for salmon habitat restoration	CRITFC	A	148,886	I	NA	I	NA	Y	I	Y	I	I	Y	R
Upper Snake Subregion															
9048	Transfer Attributes From 1:100,000 To 1:24,000-Scale Hydrography	IDWR	R	216,855	Y	NA	I	NA	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	N	R*
9053	Kirby (Atlanta) Dam Fish Ladder	BNF	R	300,000	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9800200	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	IDFG	R	250,000	I	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y	NA	I	N	Y	R

ID	Title	Sponsor	Focus	Cost	TWG Criteria										Status
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Owyhee Subbasin															
9701100	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian Areas on the Duck Valley Res	Sho-Pai Tribes	R	293,000	Y	NA	Y	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	R
Upper Columbia Subregion															
Pend Oreille Subbasin															
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	KNRD	R	70,809	N	NA	N	N	N	N	I	I	N	Y	R*
Upper Columbia Mainstem Subbasin															
9001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout Habitat/Passage Improvements of Tribs. to L. Roosev	CCT	R	168,000	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
9116	Rasor Ranch Acquisition/ Crab Creek Watershed Restoration Project	FWS	A	775,000	I	I	I	N	I	Y	I	I	Y	N	R
Flathead Subbasin															
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed		R	100,000	I	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	R
9401001	Mitigation for Excessive Drawdowns at Hungry Horse & Libby Reservoirs - Lib	MFWP CSKT	R	474,405	Y	NA	Y	I	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	R
9101903	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation - Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	MFWP	R	474,255	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	R
Kootenai Subbasin															
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	MFWPCSKT	R	99,547	Y	NA	Y	N	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	R
9124	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber	MFWP	R	2,000,000	I	NA	I	N	Y	Y	I	I	I	Y	R

Table 3. Project Recommendations

ID	Status	Title		Recommendations
Lower Columbia Subregion				
Chinook				
9123	Return	Restore Chinook Watershed	T	• Check accuracy of 500,000 PIT tags for $25,000.
			P	• Specify what hatchery improvements are needed and explain why and how upgrades to the hatchery will help accomplish the goal of using the hatchery fish for natural production supplementation. Explain if other alternatives were considered, such as phasing out the hatchery.
			T	• Clearly define the tangible objectives, including how the variety of tasks (e.g., develop watershed assessment, hatchery management plan for natural production supplementation, education) are tied together in coherent manner, including specific expected results and milestones, so that an assessment of their feasibility can be made.
			T	• Need a plan that specifies how the expected results will be monitored to determine if the objectives are being achieved.
			T	• Need more detail on the budget.
Cowlitz				
9088	Return	Implement Best Management Practices	T	• Need to more clearly define the objectives and explain how the funding will be used to achieve those objectives. The objectives in section 4 are not consistent with those in the narrative (section 7).
			T	• Explain how the budget is appropriate to fulfill the objectives; e.g., how many acres of land will be BMPs be applied to, miles of fence, need clarification on how much implementation will be done and how much it will cost versus the cost of coordination functions.
			T	• The specific measurable expected results are not detailed. Need to describe relationship and coordination with project 9127.
9127	Pass	Development of a Cowlitz Watershed Management Plan	T	• Need to describe the coordination with project 9088.
			T	• Provide a brief explanation about the Sustainable Fisheries Foundation.
			T	• Unclear if the target is a management plan for the entire Cowlitz or individual watersheds within the Cowlitz.
Willamette				
9036	Pass	McKenzie Watershed Habitat Assessment and Project Prioritization		• Good proposal.
9037	Return	Acquire Fish and Wildlife Habitat in the McKenzie Watershed	T	• Explain how the benefits from these 20 acres relate to the total benefits for the McKenzie River.
			T	• Additional information is needed regarding the existing condition of the gravel pit - how deep it is, whether it is active.

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
				T	• Explain if downstream sediment transfer, upstream headcuts, and hazardous waste potential have been evaluated with specific reference cited. Need to describe specific expected benefits: how will fish benefits be achieved by purchasing this land?
				T	• Concerns whether the per-acre cost ($250,000 for 20 acres) is appropriate to achieve the objectives.
				P	• Describe if other less-costly alternatives to achieving the objectives were considered.
				T	• Need more specific detail on how the results will be monitoring to determine if the results are as expected.
9038		Return	Evaluate Spring Chinook Life History-habitat Relationships in the McKenzie	T	• Explain how this project assists the other larger (ODFW) project that is referenced in the proposal?
				T	• Explain how this work relates to the development of the watershed assessment also being conducted by the MFWC, and which of the proposed work has been done or is being done by other projects.
				T	• Need a better description on how the information will be used (e.g., spawning and holding areas) to get fish benefits. Explain how fish and wildlife will benefit.
9607000	*	Pass	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination		• Good example of a coordinator proposal.
9206800		Return	Implementation of Willamette Basin Mitigation Program--Wildlife	T	• Need more detail on the existing resource condition and critical limiting factors, measurable objectives, and strategic actions and expected results for achieving those objectives, and the methods for monitoring to determine if expected results are being achieved and how the project will be adaptively managed based on the monitoring.
9705908		Pass	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites-Oregon, Multnomah Channel	T	• Need more detail on future monitoring and evaluation to measure the success of the restoration.
Lower Columbia Mainstem					
9058		Return	Restore Chinook Passage into Woodard Creek & Enhance Habitat	T	• Explain how these objectives relate to the entire watershed and address the stability of the upland conditions – what are the upland activities, other than the burn (~1930) that are causing problems and are being addressed. What are the activities in the uplands that are consistent with this work that will provide stable viable fish populations?
				T	• Need to provide the specific watershed context of this proposal – the referenced watershed assessments are too broad and general.
				T	• The measurable expected results need more clearly described.
Sandy					
9061		Return	River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	T	• Need to describe the specific measurable objectives, and provide more detail on how this work will achieve the expected restoration results.

ID		Status	Title	Recommendations		
9062		Pass	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	P	•	Note that this is wildlife mitigation below Bonneville Dam.
Lower Mid-Columbia Subregion						
White Salmon						
9156		Return	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	T T	• •	Need to describe the technical merit of the work in light of the possible removal of Condit Dam. Explain how all of the tasks will be accomplished with the stated budget.
Hood						
9126	*	Pass	Hood River Fish Habitat Project (FY98 project 8024)	P	•	Describe other alternatives that may have been considered for the fish ladder (e.g., infiltration pumps or removal of the diversion dam).
Klickitat						
9001	*	Return	Monitor Water Quality and Quantity in Eastern Klickitat County (FY98 project 8003)	T T T	• • •	Explain the relationship between the project and the critical needs of the basin. Explain the rationale for collecting the water quality parameters, (why is it important to monitor nitrates, temperature, etc.?) and how that information will benefit fish and wildlife. Explicitly state the link to the problem. Describe how this work is a component of a watershed assessment. Need to describe how this work is coordinated with project 9159 to prevent duplication, and to demonstrate that these activities are tied to a watershed assessment and other ongoing activities (projects 9002, 9705600).
				T	•	Explain how the information will be used - what decisions are made with the information.
9002	*	Return	Monitor Water Quality and Quantity in L. Klickitat R. and Its Tributaries (FY98 project 8002)	T T T T	• • • •	Explain the relationship between the project and the critical needs of the basin. Explicitly state the link to the problem – how fish and wildlife will benefit from this information. Describe how the information will be synthesized and used. Describe how this work is a component of a watershed assessment. Describe how this work does not duplicate other work in the basin (9705600).
9506800	*	Return*	Klickitat Passage/Habitat Improvement M&E	T T T T	• • • •	Need to clearly describe what work is going on in FY98, and what specifically is going to be done in FY99 (new activities). How does budget increase from FY98 relate to FY99 work and funding? Page 11 of the proposal (steps 1-5) seems to indicate the logical sequence of needs and actions and this needs to be more clearly threaded through the proposal (formatting problem). Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9705600		Return*	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	T	•	Clearly describe how the proposed action addresses the critical limiting factor, the assessment that identified those factors as being limiting, specifically what the measurable objectives are, and how the results will be monitored to determine if they are as expected.

ID		Status	Title			Recommendations
				T	•	Need site-specific information (miles of fencing, etc.)
				T	•	Clarify specifically what is being proposed and what the expected results are.
				T	•	Need to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem						
9089		Return	Classify Riparian and Wetland Vegetation in the Columbia Basin of Wash.	T	•	The proposal states that the existing information is limited and at a coarse scale – need to clearly explain why additional, finer scale information is needed. Need to clearly describe how this information will be used to benefit the watershed.
				P	•	Need to demonstrate how all the relevant entities (include tribes, conservation districts) are coordinated with.
				T	•	Need to explain if this project is related to the ICBEMP, and if the work duplicates other information.
Fifteenmile						
9087		Return	Acquire 1860 Fifteenmile Cr irrigation water right and convert to instream	P	•	Project is technically sound, but there are concerns on the cost. Need to clearly show the significance of the benefit – does 0.25 cfs benefit the watershed, and/or other programs that are being considered? How much relative benefit is added to the creek (0.25 cfs out of how much flow in the creek?).
				P	•	Explain if other alternatives, such as purchasing the land, would provide more benefits to the resource at a lower cost.
				T	•	Also, describe why the water would not be returned to the creek if native grasses are reestablished.
9304000	*	Pass	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project	T	•	Very concerned that the costs are excessive for operations and maintenance activities only.
Deschutes						
9003	*	Return	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase II (FY98 project 8037)	T	•	Include more detail. Although the intent of the projects is probably good, the proposals did not provide enough detail upon which to assess the technical merits.
				T	•	Describe the methods, linkages to specific problems, and how the objectives will be accomplished.
				T	•	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.
				T	•	Explain how the project will significantly benefit fish.
				P	•	Combine all three proposals (9003, 9004) into one project to show the coordinated effort.
9004		Return	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase I		•	See 9003
9005		Return	Irrigation System Replacement	T	•	Explain why the objectives are the same as 9006 except for reducing push-up dams. Describe

ID		Status	Title			Recommendations
			Trout Cr. @ Willowdale II 1999 Funds			more detail, how many push-up dams to be eliminated.
				T	•	Need to clearly describe the existing resource condition and critical limiting factors, measurable objectives, strategic actions and expected results, and the methods for monitoring to determine if the expected results are being achieved and how the project is adaptable based on the monitoring results.
				P	•	Request that ODFW and CTWSR assist the project sponsor with project coordination and especially with proposal development because the proposal is difficult to review as written. This applies also to 9003, 9004, and 9006.
9006	*	Return	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Willowdale (FY98 project 8038)		•	See 9005
9007		Return	Jefferson Co./Middle Deschutes Watershed Coordinator/Council Support 1999	P	•	Need to provide the make up of the watershed council to insure that many appropriate interests are represented.
				P	•	Need to explain why the scope of the coordination is limited to the middle Deschutes watershed – are there more than one council in the watershed?
				T	•	Specifically address how coordination results in on-the-ground benefits to target species.
				T	•	Need to clearly describe how the project will coordinate specific activities with specific expected results and benefits.
9133		Return	Bakeoven Riparian Assessment	T	•	Describe the scientific methods that will be used to conduct the assessment.
				T	•	Clearly explain how the monitoring protocol is tied to the project (is the monitoring done inside and outside the exclosures to determine effectiveness?).
				T	•	Need to clearly explain how the action will achieve the stated objectives (increase from 200 to 600 returning adults).
9138	*	Pass	Warm Springs Reservation 1999 Watershed Enhancement Project (FY project 8028)	T	•	Explain how objective 2 –turning over soil to a grade of 24" - is the most appropriate technique. Objectives 2 and 3 appear contradictory because objective 2 proposes using non-native grasses.
9303000	*	Return	Buck Hollow Watershed Enhancement	T	•	Clearly explain what has been accomplished and what remains to be done.
				T	•	Demonstrate how the quantifiable objectives will be met.
				T	•	Clearly explain the monitoring plan and demonstrate why it is appropriate. Include juveniles as well as adults.
				T	•	Address how 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).
				T	•	Clearly describe how previous work has met the objectives and benefited fish production.

ID		Status	Title			Recommendations
						Consider including a trend analysis.
				T	•	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.
				P	•	Cost share aspects (30% BPA) of the proposal are good.
9404200	*	Return	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	T	•	Concern about excessive O&M costs – describe how the budget is appropriate for the proposed O&M work.
				T	•	Explain if illegal harvest is a critical limiting factor that justifies the law enforcement task.
				T	•	Part of the project should be committed to monitoring the maintenance and operations activities. Need to describe a monitoring program to determine if the original proposal objectives are still being met; and to evaluate the benefits and results from the O&M.
9103		Return	Upper Deschutes Basin Watershed Coordinator/Council Support	T	•	Need to provide more detail on the methods, measurable objectives, tasks, and expected results.
				T	•	Need to describe a monitoring and evaluation plan to determine if the expected results are achieved.
John Day						
9012		Pass	Mitigate Effects of Runoff & Erosion on Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow		•	Good demonstration of cost sharing, and landowner involvement.
9045	*	Pass	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams on Lower North Fork John Day (FY98 project 8031)	T	•	Concerned that the only M&E is water temperatures behind the push-up dams. Need to provide more detail on the monitoring and evaluation plans.
				P	•	Include an analysis of alternatives including transferring the water to an instream right.
9139	*	Pass	Acquisition of Pine Creek Ranch (FY98 project 8026)			
9144	*	Pass	Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity of John Day Basin Spring Chinook (FY98 project 8033)			
9155		Pass	Establish the Methow Watershed Council		•	Good example of watershed council proposal.
8400800	*	Return	North Fork John Day Habitat Improvement	T	•	Need to describe the existing resource condition and critical limiting factors, measurable objectives, strategic actions and expected results, and the monitoring methods for determining if the expected results are being achieved and the process for modifying the project based on the monitoring results.
				T	•	Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
					appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
8402100	*	Return*	Protect and Enhance John Day River Fish Habitat	T P T P	• Need to provide clear rationale for the cost in relation to O&M – the concern is that the cost is excessive for meeting the objectives of operations and maintenance only. • Classic example of high cost structural projects that require excessive money to maintain in the future. • Clearly identify the direct benefits to fish and wildlife, and whether those benefits are being achieved. • Part of the project should be committed to monitoring the maintenance and operations activities. Need to describe a monitoring program to determine if the original proposal objectives are still being met; and to evaluate the benefits and results from the O&M.
9303800	*	Return	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	P P T P	• Describe why a permanent fence (which is more cost effective in the long term) is not being used. Need description of the annual cost savings of annual re-wiring due to the posts now being in place. • Need to address whether a less structural approach, such as removing the grazing, would be more cost effective. • Need to describe the habitat response or other benefits from this fence. • Potential in-lieu issue (Is the need for the work caused by inadequate federal management?).
9605300	*	Pass	North Fork John Day River Dredge Tailings Restoration	T	• Provide a monitoring plan.
9306600	*	Pass	Oregon Fish Screening Project-FY'99 Proposal	T	• Hard to identify what exactly is the base cost - Need to clearly describe the base funding needs for maintenance versus the number and cost for fabrication of new and replacement screens.
9703400	*	Return	Monitor Fine Sediment and Overwinter Sedimentation in John Day & Gr Ronde	T	• The proposal was corrected for the final FY98 review, and those corrections are not in the FY99 proposal. If the additional information is provided as it was in 98, will have technical merit and feasibility.
Rock Creek					
9159		Return	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	T T T	• Explain why $250,000 is necessary to perform the watershed assessment. • Good that the assessment will follow the federal six-step guide and the Washington State WA manual. • Need to clearly describe what methodology will be used to perform the assessment and analysis, how the analyses will be used for management decisions, and what the expected outcome is.
Umatilla					
8710001	*	Return	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	T	• Same as original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
8710002	*	Return	Protect & Enhance Coldwater	T	• Concern that the costs are excessive to achieve the O&M objectives. Technically, it is important

ID		Status	Title			Recommendations
			Fish Habitat in the Umatilla River Basin.			to maintain the past investments, but within reasonable cost.
				T	•	Need to describe the management strategies, objectives, and tasks that may have changed since FY98.
				T	•	Address the fact that the objectives do not indicate doing new work, yet the narrative describes new fence (which is not shown in the materials budget).
				T	•	Also – need to expand the monitoring to address cover the adaptive management discussed in the proposal.
8902401	*	Return	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in the Lower Umatilla	T	•	Same as original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
9506001	*	Pass	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish & Wildlife Habitat	T	•	Need to provide more detail on the land acquisition (concern that the budget is excessive for the total acreage).
Walla Walla						
9010	*	Pass	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in Walla Walla Watershed in Washington (FY98 project 8016)	P	•	Need to address whether the coordination ends at the state line.
				T	•	Describe how this proposal relates to both the analysis and implementation activities in the headwater tributaries in Oregon?
9601100	*	Return	Screens and Traps on the Walla Walla and Touchet	T	•	Criterion 3: The proposal vaguely defined the long-term benefits that appear to be dependent on long-term funding. Describe how the benefits will be maintained in the future.
				T	•	Criterion 8: Explain the technical merit of trapping and hauling fish.
9601200	*	Return	Adult Fish Passage Improvement – Walla Walla River	T	•	Proposal still incomplete – resubmit in light of addressing those incomplete areas from FY98.
				T	•	Explain the location and quantity of area that will be accessed from improved migration, quality of that habitat, and the long term benefits in terms of number of fish produced in the future and what it means in terms of a system-wide framework.
				P	•	25% of the total is cost shared with COE – is this COE BPA reimbursable?
9604601		Return	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	T	•	Same as original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
Upper Mid-Columbia Subregion						
Yakima						
9032	*	Pass	Teach Adults to Become Holistic Master Watershed Stewards (FY98 project 8056)	P	•	Still appears that there is some room to improve coordination with the watershed groups and the other education project (9405900).
9065		Pass	Little Naches Streambank			

ID		Status	Title	Recommendations	
			Restoration		
9067		Return	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project	T	• Explain how conditions will be improved due to this effort (reduced sedimentation, or projects are developed as a result of this effort to do things like reduce sedimentation.)
			Planning/Implementation (FY98 project 8042??)	T	• Specify the measurable objectives and how they will be achieved.
9068	*	Return	Improve Stream Habitat Through Reduction in Farm Runoff (FY98 project 8041)	P	• Explain if equitable cost sharing with the NRCS has been pursued (the NRCS should provide this type of start-up funding when specific projects are proposed in accordance to strategic plans and with personnel and cost sharing strategies developed – then, once some structure and detailed proposals are developed, leverage BPA funds).
				T	• Need to define where, how much will be fixed, site specific aspects, and more detail on how $1.9 million will be spent. Also, should clearly describe the quantitative benefits that are expected (especially to fish and wildlife).
				T	• Specific goal is 2,915 acres per year - need a better description of which 2,915 acres each year will be picked in order to assure the biggest bang for the buck.
				T	• Need to describe the monitoring plan that will be used to evaluate if the expected results and fish and wildlife benefits are being achieved.
9070		Return	Improve Water Quality Through Sedimentation and Nutrient Reduction	T	• Need to describe the specific measurable objectives (e.g., acreage goals, and objectives for on-the-ground implementation) and how the work is related to a watershed context.
				T	• Explain why the cost is defined for all on-the-ground work, which doesn't match objectives. Provide more information about Sulfur Creek/Mud Lake – the existing resource conditions.
				T	• Describe how this work addresses a critical need in the Yakima basin.
				T	• Need to describe the work in the context of rest of the watershed.
				T	• Explain how money spent on this work will create/improve fish habitat and production?.
9076	*	Return*	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery (FY98 project 8053)	T	• Explain how pumping drain water into canals benefits fish and wildlife.
				T	• Need to describe the existing resource condition and identify the critical limiting factors, measurable objectives, strategic actions and expected results, and the monitoring methods for determining if the expected results are being achieved and the process for modifying the project based on the monitoring results. Explain the fish and wildlife benefits.
				P	• Need to identify other cost alternatives, e.g. whether including NRCS as a full partner, that were addressed.
				T	• Explain if the project's primary function is to benefit agriculture activities such as conducting a feasibility study to pump drain water into canals and/or constructing irrigation infrastructure versus primarily directed at benefits to fish and wildlife.
				T	• Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
					appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9100	*	Return	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin (FY98 project 8066)	T T	• Same as original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding. • Added a new objective for FY99, but not asking for additional money for that objective until FY2000 – is this objective already funded based on the 98 program?
9101		Pass	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed (FY98 project 8065)		
9102		Return	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	T T	• Clearly describe the methodology that will be used for the assessment (e.g., federal six-step guide and the Washington State Watershed Assessment manual versus a walk-through). • Explain how the cost for conducting the assessment ($290K) for a 171 square mile watershed is not excessive; and whether less costly alternatives to perform the assessment were considered.
9109	*	Return*	Acquisition of Water and Floodplain Fisheries Habitat in the Yakima Basin (FY98 project 8067)	 T P T	• Same proposal as FY98. • 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. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9114		Return	Stabilizing Stream Channels in the Cabin Creek Watershed	P T P T T	• Explain if cost sharing with Plum Creek was considered, because although there is checkerboard ownership, they share the same watershed. • Need to more clearly explain what the strategic action is – confusion regarding moving large wood into tributaries by helicopter, but then using an excavator to do what? • Note to managers to determine if the USFS should fund the work. • Need to demonstrate that the effects that cause the problem have been taken care of, or are fixable with these methods. • Approach is right to attack headwaters.
9158		Return	Little Naches River Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	T T T	• Explain if this is an ongoing project, not submitted in FY98 watershed process. • Explain what work has already been done? Explain how planning, and implementation will both occur in FY99. • Need to sequence the actions into steps by year – clearly describe exactly what will be done each year and how much money each action will require.
9164	*	Return*	Analyze Ahtanum Creek Storage Project (FY98 project	T T	• Need to clearly describe the project's fish and wildlife benefits. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
			8022)		appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefits.
8506200	*	Pass	Evaluate the Effectiveness of Fish Screens	P	• Suggest that this project is combined with projects 9105700, 9107500, and 9200900. Should be one proposal with multiple objectives.
9105700		Pass	Yakima Phase 2 Screen Fabrication	P	• Combine with 8506200, 9107500, and 9200900.
9107500		Return	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	P T	• Combine with 9506200, 9105700, and 9200900. • Incomplete proposal. Not acceptable to not complete the form when everyone else has to.
9200900		Pass	Yakima Screens - Phase II - O & M	T	• Combine with 8506200, 9105700, and 9107500.
9603501	*	Return	Satus Watershed Restoration	T T T	• Clearly describe how the objectives in FY99 differ from FY98. • Explain how the staffing level is not excessive to achieve the objectives. • Too similar to the original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
9704900	*	Return*	Teanaway River Instream Flow Restoration	P T T T	• Good idea. Needs to be accomplished under a proposed Land and Water Rights Acquisition Fund recommended under Project 8067 (9109 in FY99). • Clearly define the objectives, demonstrate what the project will accomplish, show how the 3 cfs will be achieved, and what the relative benefits of 3cfs in the Teanaway River is critical to fish and wildlife. • Same as original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding. Describe whether this is a request for new funding for FY99 or was FY98 the last year of funding? • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9705100		Return	Yakima Basin Side Channels	T T	• Explain what basis will be used to determine which specific sites will be chosen (similar to land and water easement proposals). Need to identify the specific properties. • Expand the project history information.
9705200		Return	Enhancement Between Selah and Union Gaps	T T	• Provide specifics about the easement – if the purpose is to purchase two parcels (40-acre and 192-acre). • If the benefits to fish and wildlife are clearly described, then the project is technically sound.
Wenatchee					
9044		Return	Replace Chumstick Creek Culvert	T T P	• Clearly describe the expected benefits (e.g., returns of fish.) • Proposal 9050 states that there are 23 more barriers – explain how removing this one culvert will open up a significant amount of habitat. • Consider combining this project with 9050.

ID	Status	Title	Recommendations
9050	Return	Remove 23 Migrational Barriers and Restore Riparian Vegetation on Chumstick	T • Need to explicitly state the existing resource condition, whether the culverts are a critical limiting factor, and how that determination was made. T • Need to describe the measurable benefits of culvert removal to fish and wildlife.
9054	Return	Reduce Erosion, Identify Access and Improve... at Bonn. Power Line Corridor	T • Need to provide more detail on the objectives and methods. P • Management flag – It appears that the Forest Service is proposing work that should be covered by the BPA (in-lieu question).
Entiat			
9031	Pass	Implement Entiat Model Watershed Plan	T • Explain if alternatives other than in-stream flows were considered. T • Describe what the rock is for.
Methow			
9024	Pass	Methow Tributaries Fish Passage	P • Management concern that the USFS should have included this work as part of the original assessment (in-lieu issue).
9025	Pass	Prevent Mortality in Methow Endangered and Proposed Fish	P • Management concern that this is an in-lieu problem because it's the USFS' responsibility to fund. P • Explain if non-screen alternatives were considered (e.g., an infiltration pump, or closing the diversion entirely).
9026	Return	Expand Respect the River	T • Need to provide more detail on the measurable objectives and expected results and monitoring and evaluation plans. T • Explain the printing vs. staff costs. P • Management concern that this may be an in-lieu issue. T • Explain if this project is coordinated with the Methow council (project 9155).
9027	Return*	Prevent Pollution of Methow River	T • Need to clearly describe the watershed benefits. T • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit. P • Management flag – may be an in-lieu issue.
9028	Return*	Reduce Sediment in Frazer Creek, Beaver Creek, Methow River	T • Explain if sediment has been determined to be the limiting factor, and what technique was used for this determination. T • Clearly explain the target species (brook trout?) and measurable objectives. T • Need more detail on the existing resource condition and critical limiting factors, measurable objectives, strategic actions and expected results, and the monitoring methods for determining if the expected results are being achieved and the process for modifying the project based on the monitoring results. T • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit. P • Management flag - should BPA pay for personnel costs?

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
9039		Return*	Increase Stream Flow in the Methow River and Provide Trail-Based Recreation	P T T	• Explain how building trails is appropriate for the NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program. • Describe the specific measurable benefits to the resource, the target species, and the watershed. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9097		Return	Methow Basin Side Channel Habitat Construction	T T P	• Need more detail on the existing resource condition and critical limiting factors, measurable objectives, strategic actions and expected results, and the monitoring methods for determining if the expected results are being achieved and the process for modifying the project based on the monitoring results. Need to relate rearing habitat to spawning habitat. • Need to provide detailed information regarding how specific locations and projects are identified. Need to describe how the cost estimate was derived without a specific design. • Identify why the indirect costs are higher than personnel costs.
9604200	*	Return	Restore and Enhance Anadromous Fisheries and Habitat in Salmon Creek	T T T T	• Provide a description of proposed riparian habitat improvements and specificity as to what projects will be implemented. • Clearly define the measurable objectives (e.g. what will be done with springs once they are identified). • Describe how the funding is not excessive to complete an MOU and report. • Describe how the FY98 funds do not accomplish the FY99 objectives.
Lower Snake Subregion					
Asotin					
9401805	*	Return	Enhance Habitat For Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead, and Bulltrout	T T	• Describe if the objectives, tasks, and funding have changed from FY98 – the schedule describes project completion by the end of FY98. • Resubmit the proposal based on approved funding in FY98, if funds for FY99 are justifiably needed.
Tucannon					
9202602	*	Return	Implement Eastern Washington Model Watershed Plans	T T	• Describe if the objectives, tasks, and funding have changed from FY98 – the schedule describes project completion by the end of FY98. Further explain what work is proposed. • Resubmit the proposal based on approved funding in FY98, if funds for FY99 are justifiably needed.
9401806	*	Return	Enhance Habitat For Spring & Fall Chinook, Summer Steelhead, and Bulltrout	T T	• Explain if the big cost increase from FY98 is from the added M&E objective. • Describe the specific projects at specific locations (especially the Meander project), and describe why these are the most critical projects to conduct.
9401807	*	Return	Enhance Habitat For Fall Chinook, Steelhead and Bulltrout	T T T	• Explain why the costs doubled although the proposal appears unchanged from FY98. • Identify the watershed plan upon which project implementation is based. • Identify the existing resource condition (what fish are currently in the habitat area).

ID	Status	Title	Recommendations	
			T	• Resubmit the proposal for FY99 work based on FY98 funding.
Clearwater				
9059	Return	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	P T T	• Need to explain if less-structural alternatives to the structures were addressed. • Need to define specific on-the-ground projects, and present them to the CBFWA for BPA and NPPC consideration for funding • Need to incorporate the effectiveness of BMPs – e.g., what BMPs will this work implement?
9060	Return	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	T T T	• Need to explain if more-passive alternatives to the structures exist. • Need to define specific on-the-ground projects, and then present them to the CBFWA for BPA and NPPC consideration for funding. • Need to incorporate the effectiveness of BMPs; what BMPs will this work initiate?
9118	Return*	Restore West Fork Little Bear Creek For Steelhead	T T T T T T	• Objective 4 is troubling because it appears that the proposed action should first be to construct the "functional floodplain." Explain how "re-constructing" a floodplain does not adversely affect fish and wildlife. • Need to more clearly describe specifically what work will be performed and why. • Explain how the budget is necessary for fixing the problem. • Need to clearly explain what the critical limiting factors in the watershed are. • Explain if the proposed action is an interim measure (Band-Aid approach), and if so, how this action is not contradictory to other present or future actions. Explain how the other factors in the watershed - specifically, those in the headwaters – contribute to causing the problem – and are being addressed in this proposal so that this action is presented in a watershed context. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9120	Return	Protecting and Restoring Big Canyon Creek Watershed	T T P	• Need to define specific on-the-ground projects, and present them to the CBFWA for BPA and NPPC consideration for funding • Need to clearly explain why this action is appropriate for an unstable watershed. • Explain how this project is coordinated with the surrounding projects associated with the designated Clearwater Focus Watershed.
9122	Return	Rehabilitate Lapwai Creek	T T P	• Need to define specific on-the-ground projects, and present them to the CBFWA for BPA and NPPC consideration for funding • Need to clearly explain why this action is appropriate for an unstable watershed. • Explain how this project is coordinated with the surrounding projects associated with the designated Clearwater Focus Watershed.
9163	Pass	West Fork Squaw Creek Fish Passage Project	P	• Need more detail on whether other alternatives (e.g., other types of culverts) were considered that may be cheaper than a bridge.

ID		Status	Title	Recommendations	
				P	• Management issue – evaluate if this USFS funding is the appropriate allocation.
9303501	*	Return	Enhance Fish, Riparian and Wildlife Habitat within the Red River Watershed	T T P P	• Basically, the same as the original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding. • Explain how $1.2M is necessary for one mile of restored creek • Explain whether the entire goal of 4.4 miles is critical to the watershed. Seems expensive considering results and scope. Living on site and "counting every willow" are expensive approaches. • Put this into context of why things are being measured so intensely; and how it relates to other watershed activities in the basin – and how the information is used for local and system-wide decision-making.
9607702	*	Pass	Protecting and Restoring the Lolo Creek Watershed	P T	• Management flag – concern about the "in-lieu" issue and the delegation of funding responsibility (is this an example of BPA funding replacing a USFS responsibility?). The Forest Service should fund some of this work because their activities caused many of the problems. • Need more detail on specifically which parameters will be monitored and evaluated to determine if the expected results are being achieved.
9607703	*	Return	Protecting and Restoring the Squaw and Papoose Creek Watersheds	P T T T	• Management flag – concern about the "in-lieu" issue and the delegation of funding responsibility. The Forest Service should fund some of this work because their activities caused many of the problems. • Explain how placing logs and backfill reduces surface erosion. • Explain how the action proposed by this technique will not cause another failure? • Explain how the costs are not excessive for road obliteration.
9607704	*	Return	Final Design For Fish Passage Improvements At Lower Eldorado Falls	T T	• Same as original FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, with a focus on new work for FY99. • Explain if the work was to be completed in FY98 and whether the FY99 proposal is for new work.
9607705	*	Pass	Restore McComas Meadows	P T T	• Management flag – concerned about the "in-lieu" issue and the delegation of funding responsibility. The Forest Service should be contributing more of the cost share. • Explain why a nursery needs constructed in order to revegetate the meadow. • Explain how this project is coordinated with other projects in the watershed.
9607706	*	Pass	Restore Lolo Watershed	T P P T	• Explain how this project matches with the FY98 project – is this misnumbered? • Management flag of whether this is and in-lieu issue for overhead and personnel costs. • Explain how this project is coordinated with 9607702. • Explain the "logistic restrictions" referenced in the proposal.
9607707		Return	Restore Squaw and Papoose Watersheds	P P	• Management flag of whether this is an in-lieu issue for overhead and personnel costs. • Explain how this project is coordinated with 9607703.

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
				T	• Explain the “logistic restrictions” referenced in the proposal.
9608600	*	Return	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	P T	• Resubmit single proposal with two co-coordinator positions listed (even understanding that there is a difficult coordination situation at hand) – combine project 9608600 with 9700600. • Basically, the same proposal as the FY98 proposal – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding, and progress towards consolidating the project with the other co-coordinator.
9706000	*	Return	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program		• See 9608600 above.
Grande Ronde					
9085		Pass	Propagate Native Plant Species for Revegetation & Riparian Restoration Project	T P	• The WTWG understands the merit of promoting greenhouses in these areas, for site-specific plant propagation and the related cost-effectiveness, and they understand the overall watershed benefits from native plants, but request that the sponsor identify information that indicates that fish and wildlife benefit more from native plants. • Management note – consider if there is an “in-lieu” issue associated with the personnel and indirect costs.
9119		Return	Public-Private Cooperative Resource Mgmt in Lower Joseph Cr Watershed	P T P T	• Explain how this position does not duplicate other southeast Washington coordination positions such as the Grande Ronde Model Watershed or Eastern Washington Model Watershed. • Clearly explain why the watershed assessment is needed, and explain the other analyses that have been done on this watershed. • Explain if NRCS cost-sharing has been pursued; along with using the existing model watershed program to implement this work. • Clearly describe the NPT work.
9128		Return	Upper Grande Ronde Habitat Enhancement (FY98 project 8069??)	T T	• Explain how this project is differentiated from FY98 work. • Resubmit the proposal with specific projects for 99 based on approved 98 funding.
8402500	*	Return	Protect and Enhance Fish Habitat in Grande Ronde Basin Streams	T T T T	• Specifically describe the streams in the subbasin where the projects are located. • Explain why the tasks and objectives from FY98 are the same - resubmit the proposal with 99 work based on approved 98 funding. • Explain why the budget is not excessive for O&M. • Explain why photo points and transects are needed every year.
9202601	*	Return	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning Support	T P T	• Explain why annual funding of data compilation and conducting assessments is critical year after year. • Explain why the personnel costs are not excessive for the BPA portion of the responsibility. • Explain how the project meets the “watershed coordinator project” criteria – especially with

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
					respect to the direct benefits to fish and wildlife.
9402700	*	Return	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Habitat Projects		• Good detail compared to 98 proposal.
				T	• Similar to FY98, with modified tasks – need to show how the budget is allocated across tasks.
				T	• Need to more provide more detail on the methods and actions that will be used to achieve the objectives. Need to describe the critical limiting factor and how the specific action to solve the problem was chosen.
9043	*	Return*	Introducing Systems Science to Planning and Implementing F&W Recovery (FY98 project 8025)	P	• 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.
				T	• Concerned about the logistics and workload generated by evaluating 12 watersheds simultaneously.
				T	• Proposed project appears to include too much planning,
				T	• Concerned that there are not enough benefits to fish.
				T	• Proposal adequately described the activities but did not identify where the work would be performed.
				P	• Encourage the sponsor to continue this idea but the current proposal is too open-ended; consider focusing on one or two watersheds to start with.
				T	• Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9403900	*	Return	Wallowa Basin Project Planning	P	• Explain how this effort is coordinated with, and does not duplicate the Grande Ronde Model Watershed.
				T	• Explain how this project directly benefits fish and wildlife.
				T	• Resubmit for FY99 work based on approved FY98 funding.
9702500	*	Return	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan	P	• Explain how this project differs from the Grande Ronde Model Watershed implementation project 9402700 and projects 9403900 and 9202601.
				T	• Clearly explain how the money will be spent. Organize the budget by Task. Explain what will be purchased with funds in the "Other" category.
				P	• The proposed project should be combined with project 9402700 (Grande Ronde Model Watershed).
				P	• 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?

ID		Status	Title	Recommendations	
				P	• The project proponents are encouraged to work through the watershed board.
				T	• Explain the specific M&E plans.
				T	• Resubmit for 99 work based on approved 98 funding.
Salmon					
9009		Return	Restore Salmon River (Challis, ID) Area to Healthy Condition	T	• Need to provide more specifics on the restoration techniques and monitoring plan.
					• Good concept, coordination, cost-share.
9014	*	Pass	Restore Habitat within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River (FY98 project 8021)		•
9034	*	Return*	Reduce Sediment Delivery From Kline Mountain Road to the S.F. Salmon River (FY98 project 8071)	T	• Benefits appear very small – explain how much sediment is there and where it comes from compared to the total South Fork Salmon River sedimentation load?
				P	• Management flag – is this an "in lieu" issue (is the USFS responsible for this funding)?
				T	• Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9051		Return	Stabilize Blowout Creek (South Fork of Meadow Creek)	T	• List the specific wetland restoration techniques.
				P	• Explain the cost-sharing.
9121	*	Return*	Assessment Salmon River Subbasin (FY98 project 8035)	T	• Clearly describe the objectives and expected results of the project. What are the outcomes from attending meetings? What are the fish and wildlife benefits?
				T	• Explain how this work does not duplicate ongoing work.
				T	• Explain how this methodology will provide a useful watershed assessment and strategic plan for conducting restoration activities.
				T	• Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9202603	*	Return	Idaho Model Watersheds Admin./Impl. Support	T	• Provide more specifics on the specific measurable objective and expected results, and how these are tied to the overall goal of this project.
				T	• Explain specifically what the staff will do?
				T	• Explain the subcontract budget in context with the rest of the proposal.
9401500	*	Return	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement - O&M	T	• Explain why this is not a new project.
				T	• Explain why this proposal describes a different project from FY98.
				P	• Explain if a new project number and title is needed (concern that new work is submitted on an existing project).
				T	• Need more detail on what specifically will be screened and how those areas are determined. If the sponsor already knows what needs to be screened, why are the “study” aspects needed?

ID		Status	Title	Recommendations	
9401700	*	Return	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	T T T T T	• 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. • Explain why $350,000 to fence 6 miles of stream is not excessive. • Confusion about the Baker Ranch – the Baker's appear to want an easement, but didn't request funding for this – please explain.
9405000	*	Return	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	T T	• Basically the same as the FY98 proposal – need to provide an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding. • Need to provide more detail on active on-the-ground implementation projects.
9600700	*	Return	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation, Up. Salmon R., ID	T P P	• Sponsor should monitor the before and after conditions. • Explain how the water savings are justifiable? • Explain how the work and funding is coordinated with 9401500 (Idaho Fish Screens)?
Systemwide					
9049		Return	Feasibility Study for a State-Wide Water Quality Data Sharing Mechanism	P	• Explain why this work is not redundant with many other projects (e.g., EPA, DEQ, StreamNet, FPC). True, currently there is a problem with data access, but existing agencies should fill the role.
9099	*	Return	Educate Landowners and Agencies on Salmon Stream Restoration Methods (FY98 project 8055)	T T P T	• Explain how the objectives are measurably directed toward fish and wildlife benefits. • Explain how the project provides the information and education functions for a specific program that is related to a watershed approach. • Explain why this work is characterized as a demonstration project when there are already many good examples of restoration available everywhere. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9132	*	Return	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Restoration Plan Now (FY98 project 8046)	T T	• Proposal is the same as in FY98 – need to provide the additional information that was provided in FY98, plus an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding. • Clearly identify the measurable objectives for FY99.
9142		Return	Produce Watershed Analysis Procedure for Salmon Habitat Restoration	P T T	• Explain how this project is not redundant with other established procedures (e.g., Forest Service (ICEBMP), WDFW, GWEB). • Explain how the costs are not excessive for the expected results. • More clearly describe how this process will address existing deficiencies in watershed analysis procedures.

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
Upper Snake Subregion					
Upper Snake					
9048		Return*	Transfer Attributes From 1:100,000 to 1:24,000-Scale Hydrography	P T T	• Management flag – evaluate if this project duplicates other efforts (e.g., Forest Service, State GIS); and whether this work should be funded by other sources (if it's not already). • Need to clearly describe the watershed benefits. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
9053		Pass	Kirby (Atlanta) Dam Fish Ladder	T	• Need better monitoring.
9800200		Return	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	P P	• Explain how this work does not duplicate work done by the Interior Columbia Basin project; or the Idaho Power Company's Snake R complex relicensing (i.e., the C.J. Strike monitoring effort will perform similar work). • Describe the how the work is coordinated with IDFG.
Owyhee					
9701100	*	Return	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian Areas on Duck Valley Reservation	T	• Basically the same as the FY98 proposal – need to provide an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
Upper Columbia Subregion					
Pend Oreille					
9700300	*	Return*	Box Canyon Watershed Project	T T	• Basically the same as the FY98 proposal – need to provide an explanation of work that was funded in FY98 plus new work in FY99 dependent on FY98 funding. • Proposal needs significant modification to clearly describe how the techniques are valid and appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the specific fish and wildlife benefit.
Upper Columbia Mainstem					
9001800		Pass	Evaluate Rainbow Trout Habitat/Passage Improvements of Tribs. to L. Roosevelt		
9116		Return	Rasor Ranch Acquisition/Crab Creek Watershed Restoration Project	T P T	• Explain the specific restoration activities and techniques. • Management flag – consider if this presents an in-lieu problem (using BPA funds to purchase land in a wildlife refuge). • Explain how this project is really a watershed project.
Flathead					
9608701	*	Return	Focus Watershed Coordination-	T	• Based on the proposal's text "model watershed plan will result from this program," explain if the

ID		Status	Title		Recommendations
			Flathead River Watershed		plan will be completed in 1998?
				T	• Need to provide an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
9401001		Return	Mitigation for Excessive Drawdowns at Hungry Horse & Libby Reservoirs - Lib	T	• Explain how all the tasks can be completed – and specifically how the budget provides for the accomplishment of all the tasks.
				T	• Concern that there is not enough resources dedicated to monitoring effort – explain how monitoring is adequately covered with the stated resources..
9101903	*	Return	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation – Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	T	• Need to provide an explanation of new work in FY99 resulting from FY98 funding.
Kootenai					
9608720	*	Return	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	T	• Need to describe what activities will be modified and what additional work will be performed based on receiving funding in FY98.
9124		Return	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber	T	• Explain how this expenditure is not excessive for a conservation easement.
				T	• Has potential value, but need more detail on the specific measurable objective and how this action addresses a critical limiting factor; and what parameters will be monitored to determine if the expected results are achieved.

Appendix - 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.)
2. If a structural solution to an identified problem is proposed, does the proposal demonstrate that non-structural alternatives have been considered?
3. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long-term?
4. Does the proposal include an appropriate implementation monitoring and evaluation plan?
5. Are the objectives clearly defined and achievable?
6. Is the project likely to meet, or is it currently meeting, its objectives and time frame milestones?
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?
9. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?
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.)?

Appendix B. Anadromous Fish

Appendix B.1. Nonwatershed Technical Workgroup Report

FY 1999 NONWATERSHED PROJECT PROPOSAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Executive Summary

The Nonwatershed Technical Work Group (NTWG) completed its technical review of 170 nonwatershed project proposals (59 new and 111 ongoing) for fiscal year 1999 on March 18, 1998. Of these 170 proposals, 63 (36%) need additional information to address identified deficiencies. Of the 63 deficient proposals, 29 (49% of all new proposals) are new and 34 (31% of all ongoing proposals) are ongoing. The NTWG provides specific recommendations, relative to each criteria, to the project sponsor.

Introduction

The Anadromous Fish Managers (AFM) of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) developed a process and criteria for selecting fiscal year 1999 nonwatershed projects for funding under the Northwest Power Planning Council=s (NPPC) Fish and Wildlife Program funded by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). In order to facilitate this activity the AFM established a process whereby a NTWG was formed to review these proposals for technical merit and feasibility. These same proposals are reviewed in a parallel process by the subregional review teams (SRT) for consistency with management criteria. The SRTs will consider the recommendations of the NTWG in their review and provide proposal sponsors with an opportunity to respond to the NTWG recommendations on their proposals.

When the regionally-circulated request for nominations for the NTWG was failed to produce results, six individuals with appropriate technical qualifications were selected, four from the CBFWA agencies, one from outside CBFWA, and one from CBFWA staff.

NTWG members were assigned about 30 project proposals each for which they had the primary review responsibility and were asked, in addition, to become sufficiently familiar with the remaining projects to participate in discussions covering all projects. NTWG members were provided with four criteria approved by the AFM and instructed to respond with a Ayes≅ if a criterion was met and an Aincomplete≅ if more information was needed to determine whether the criterion was met. Members were prevented from having the primary responsibility for reviewing proposals sponsored by their agency and were not allowed to participate in discussions of those proposals when considered by the group. All NTWG members received the proposals by March 5, conducted their review, and provided electronic copies of their recommendations for the proposals for which they had primary responsibility by March 16. The products of all reviewers were then combined into one master spreadsheet which was provided to all members March 17 so they could review each other=s recommendations. On March 18 consensus was reached on all recommendations Table 1.

All project sponsors, whether or not there were any recommendations on their proposals from the NTWG, were supplied with the recommendations for their proposals and given the opportunity to respond to the NTWG recommendations at the appropriate SRT review meeting. The managers will consider information from both the NTWG and additional information the SRT review process in making their recommendations for funding for FY 1999 project proposals.

Nonwatershed Technical Work Group Technical Criteria

1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate, scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles?

2. Are the objectives clearly defined, measurable, and achievable?

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

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

Project Proposal Technical Recommendations

The Nonwatershed Technical Work Group completed its technical review of 170 nonwatershed project proposals (59 new and 111 ongoing) for fiscal year 1999 on March 18, 1998. Of these 170 proposals, 63 (36%) need additional information to address identified deficiencies. Of the 63 deficient proposals, 29 (49% of all new proposals) are new and 34 (31% of all ongoing proposals) are ongoing. The NTWG has provided specific recommendations, relative to each criteria, to the project sponsor.

Table 1. Nonwatershed Project Evaluations

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9008	WDFW	Eval. of Fall Chinook Production & Habitat Conditions in Lw.Tucannon River	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9011	USFWS	Characterize & Quantify Residual Steelhead in Clearwater River, Idaho	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9015	WCRD	Enhance and Protect Fisheries in the Wolf Creek Watershed	1	Yes	This project is inappropriately designated as a Flow/survival project type. It is primarily a watershed project and should so indicate. Difficult to evaluate because criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed projects.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9016	OSU / U of O	Research/Evaluate Restoration of NE Ore Streams and Develop Mgmt Guidelines	1	Yes	This project is inappropriately designated as a Flow/survival project type. It is primarily a watershed project and should so indicate. Difficult to evaluate because criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed projects.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9017	CCT	Improve Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage in Omak Creek	1	Yes	This project is inappropriately designated as a Flow/survival project type. It is primarily a watershed project and should so indicate. Difficult to evaluate because criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed projects.
			2	Incom-plete	Need more complete information on how benefits will be quantified. What is production potential of blocked area? How many steelhead will benefit initially? What is considered to be the likely long term outcome in terms of harvestable surplus?
			3	Incom-plete	It is not clear from the proposal that the instream structure work is justified. If the upstream activities that resulted in the habitat degradation are being corrected, the stream may correct itself and not require structural work.

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			4	Inc	
9018	CCT	Assess Habitat For Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph Dam	1	Inc	This project is inappropriately designated as a Flow/survival project type. It is primarily a watershed project and should so indicate. Difficult to evaluate because criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed projects.
			2	Inc	Lacks sufficient detail to judge whether criterium is met.
			3	Inc	Lacks sufficient detail to judge whether criterium is met.
			4	Inc	Lacks sufficient detail to judge whether criterium is met.
9019	OSU	Monitor Reproductive Physiology of Columbia River White Sturgeon	1	Yes	Resident fish project?
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9022	SPT	Reintroduction of salmon & steelhead - Mary's Cr. & Owyhee R.	1	Inc	It is not clear from the proposal exactly what techniques are being proposed to resore anadromous fish.
			2	Inc	There is insufficient information to determine the feasibility of this project. This project is listed inappropriately as a flow/survival study when it appears to be a supplementation study.
			3	Inc	The objectives are a mix of supplementation, watershed, and planning and there is insufficient information to judge the likelyhood of their being met.
			4	Inc	Insufficient information to judge.
9029	Clouston Energy Research & Pacific Agricultural Laboratory in collaboration with the Los Alamos Nat'l Lab, and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service	Monitoring Water Quality With Data Collection Platforms	1	Inc	There is insufficient information to determine the feasibilitiy of this project. It needs to be evaluated as a monitoring and evaluation part of other watershed projects.
			2	Inc	The objectives are too general. On page 6 Objective 5 says to monitor for the water quality goal. Tell what parameters are to be measured and specifiy the goals.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9030	AQT	Etiology of Headburns in Returning Adult Salmonids	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			4	Yes	
9035	NMFS	Evaluate Estuarine & Nearshore-ocean Migratory Behavior of Juvenile Salmon	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9047	ORNL	Use Unsteady Flow to Aid Mainstem Passage of Juvenile Salmonids	1	Yes	This is a hydraulic modeling study to measure the effect of pulsed flows. It is unclear what management decision would follow based on study results.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9057	IDFG	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	1	Yes	This is basic life history study.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9063	NMFS	Ocean Survival of Salmonids Relative to Migrational Timing, Fish Health…	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Expand proposal to explain exactly how survival is to be measured and related to growth rate.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9064	USFS	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	1	Yes	This project should have been reviewed with the watershed projects Difficult to evaluate since criteria are insufficient to evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9069	KCCD	Enhance Upper Yakima River Basin Fish Habitat	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. Difficult to evaluate as criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Inc	"Improve water quality" is not a specific or measurable objective.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9071	RSBOJC	Improve Yakima River Water Quality	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. Difficult to evaluate as criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9072	RSBOJC	Improve Return Flow Water Quality	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. Difficult to evaluate as criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9073	RSBOJC	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. Difficult to evaluate as criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9074	RSBOJC	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. Difficult to evaluate as criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9075	RSBOJC	Construct Wetlands	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. Difficult to evaluate as criteria are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9077	USGS	Evaluation of Interactions between American Shad and Salmon in Columbia R	1	Yes	Shad life history study.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9078	USGS	Water Temperature Effects on Fall Chinook Salmon in the Snake & Columbia R	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9080	USGS	Incidence and Effects of Gas Bubble Trauma on Salmonid & Resident Fish	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9082	USFWS, IFRO	Evaluate Feed Strategies to Reduce Residualism & Promote Smolting in Stlhd	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9083	NOAA	Develop Tools to Evaluate the Effects of Selective Fisheries on Chinook	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9086	PWI	Coordinate Assessment and Prioritization of Key Habitats in Methow Basin	1	Yes	This is a habitat restoration project that should have been reviewed as a watershed project. The criteria used are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9090	CRITFC	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts For Repeat Spawning	1	Inc	Given the wide range of kelt abundance est. among projects the study should explain how accurate the estimates of abundance are based on observations at only one project. Perhaps addition of other sites, where other factors come into play are necessary
			2	Inc	The proposal needs to state a criteria for the estimated number of kelts that would justify the continuation of the study.
			3	Inc	Possibly, but the study makes no contingency in terms of costs (dollars and time) if a morphological assessment cannot be adequately developed.
			4	Inc	The proposal only refers to two persons, one half time and the other 10% time. I trust this is sufficient personnel.

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9091	USFS	South Tower Fire Recovery Projects	1	Yes	This is primarily a watershed proposal and should have been reviewed as such. The criteria used are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals.
			2	Inc	The objectives are to rebuild and restore. The proposal includes no monitoring of events before/after to evaluate the effectiveness of the restoration efforts.
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Not able to discern from the proposal. Assume appropriate personnel are included in costs.
9092	CTUIR	Umatilla Tribal Fish and Wildlife Enforcement	1	Yes	Within the context of law enforcement
			2	Inc	The objectives are too general and not measureable.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9098	James J. Anderson Consulting	Technical Support For PATH - James J. Anderson	1	Inc	Participation in a scientific process should not merely be to "critique". The proposal should demonstrate a more positive relationship to the success of PATH. Appears to duplicate Project # 9700200
			2	Inc	Unable to determine from the proposal
			3	Inc	Unable to determine from the proposal
			4	Yes	
9104	USFWS, CRFP	Conduct baseline habitat and pop. dynamics studies on lampreys in Cedar Cr.	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9105	WDFW, ODFW	Determine if salmon are successfully spawning below Lower Columbia MS dams	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	The determination of a juvenile survival estimate should be more thought out and documented. It is unclear if continued Jones Beach sampling by NMFS is available, and whether this is sufficient for developing a juvenile survival estimate.
			4	Yes	
9108	WDFW	Evaluate strobe lights as a juvenile salmonid guidance behavioral tool	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Inc	While the objectives are clear the proposal needs to establish up-front measurable criteria against which success is measured. An absolute increase in FGE to a pre-determines level must be realized or the method will not be considered viable. Specific time lines should be established to achieve the FGE objective, or project does not continue.
			3	Yes	With the establishment of measurable criteria.
			4	Yes	
9112	The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	Numerical Evaluation of Flow Modification on Salmonid Migration	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Clearly define the objective of the study. Describe the anticipated changes in river flow with the vanes and tie this to the biological aspects of the fish migration. The impacts on other migrants and resident fish should also be considered.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9113	ORNL	Evaluate Effects of Hydraulic Turbulence on Survival of Migratory Fishes	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	The proposal accomplishes all the objectives within a one year time frame. This seems very aggressive but we believe it can be done. We are concerned about the applicability of derived criteria for turbulence given the variability in the system with environmental and structural variability.
			4	Yes	
9115	SMR	Develop TDG Abatement Plan of Action Using Wheels Pools and Falls Approach	1	Inc	It is impossible from the proposal to determine if the ideas are sound. Theoretically they may be, but in implementation the efficacy is unclear.
			2	Inc	We can't determine from the proposal what the actual product would be.
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	It is unclear that the proposer has sufficient engineering experience to develop the proposed design.
9117	NMFS	Facilitation Services for the Regional Forum	1	NA	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9125	Eastern Washington	Columbia River Basin Fish Key	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
	University Biology Department				
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9131	WDFW	Evaluate fall chinook & chum spawning, production & habitat use in Col R	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	No time line given for objectives 19-21. However, it seems possible to complete this analysis within the time frame allotted
			4	Inc	Need better explanation of how this proposal is linked to other proposals.
9135	USGS - CRRL	Assess Impacts of Hydro Operations on Mainstem Habitats for Fish	1	Inc	The likelihood of developing an assessment of pre-impoundment habitat is unclear from the proposal. Without this the proposal does not have clear objectives.
			2	Inc	Conditioned on ability to address comment on criteria #1.
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	The proposal is not clear relative to the costs of LIDAR and proposes to use side scan sonar but does not identify a purchase or cost.
9136	USGS	Influence of marine-derived nutrient influx on CRB salmonid production	1	Inc	It is difficult to review this proposal since its primary objective is to assemble a group to develop a research plan. Perhaps the out year objectives should be a separate proposal.
			2	Yes	For objective #1. The other objectives rely on the ability to measure nutrients before and after enrichment. There is no assessment included for improvements in salmon production.
			3	Yes	Dependent on the success of objective #1.
			4	Inc	Only addresses objective #1, but suggests several other objectives that would be accomplished. No out year costs are provided. However, if objective #1 represents 5% of the costs (as stated in proposal) the out year costs would be near three million.
9137	CTWSRO	John Day Watershed Restoration	1	Inc	Clearly a watershed proposal. The criteria used are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals. We can only assume that the proposed structural modifications are appropriate.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9141	OSU	Strategies For Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon	1	Yes	Within a watershed context.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9143	OSU	Evaluate Disease Interactions Between Wild and Hatchery Salmonids	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9145	ODFW	Evaluate the Status of Columbia River Sea-Run Cutthroat Trout	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9146	ODFW	Evaluate Effects of Habitat Work Conducted in Fifteenmile Creek	1	Inc	This is primarily a watershed proposal and should be reviewed as such. The criteria used are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals. The study proposes to monitor trends in survival and relate them to habitat improvements. These improvements, however, were initiated in 1986. There is no apparent way to establish a baseline against which improvement is measured. In addition, it is unclear how an upward trend in survival can be related to improvements in habitat in light of the myriad of factors affecting the life cycle.
			2	Inc	For reasons stated above.
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	
9147	ODFW	Prioritize Research and Restoration Needs for Pacific Lamprey	1	Inc	The study proposes to establish a technical work group to identify research needs and priorities. Establishing a group (in addition to one that already exists) may not be the appropriate method of developing a workplan. It has often failed before because of differing policy direction.
			2	Inc	
			3	Inc	
			4	Yes	
9148	Abernathy Salmon Culture Technology Center	Develop open formula diets to yield quality smolts	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9149	Abernathy Salmon Culture Technology Center, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.	Evaluate and Monitor Bacterial Cold Water Disease impacting salmonids	1	Inc	Assume the techniques are appropriate.
			2	Inc	The accomplishment of the objectives is dependent on the development of a quick assay for BCWD. At this point that is an unknown.
			3	Inc	It is not possible to determine this from the proposal. It does not contain sufficient detail to determine what needs to be accomplished for each objective.
			4	Yes	
9150	NPT	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	1	Inc	The basic premise of the proposal is that there may be differences in the nutritional status between sturgeon below the impoundments and those confined above. However, the proposal does not clearly establish the link between impoundment and the parameters they propose to study - deficiencies in iodine and selenium.
			2	Inc	The proposal uses information from domestic vertebrates and other species of fish, but does not adequately demonstrate with sufficient evidence the likelihood of demonstrating nutritional deficiencies.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9151	NPT	Assess Adult Steelhead Escapement in the Secesh River System	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9152	NPT	Feasibility of Sockeye Reintroduction to Wallowa and Warm Lakes	1	Inc	This proposal needs to be rewritten. Most of the proposal is focused on review of existing information and not enough detail is presented on what is proposed to judge whether it meets criteria.
			2	Inc	
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9153	CRITFC	Preserve Cryogenically the Gametes of selected Mid-Columbia Salmonid stocks	1	Inc	The need to preserve gametes of healthy populations does not seem like a sound principle. If this is a valid need then the proposal appears acceptable.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9154	UCD	Wind River Ecosystem Restoration	1	Yes	This is primaily a watershed proposal and should be reviewed as such. The criteria used are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposal.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9157	CRITFC	Effects of Ocean Conditions on the Growth and Survival of Salmonids	1	Inc	The strategy of using scale pattern analysis to assess ocean impacts appears sound. The oceanographic parameters are too limited. The proposal only suggests using temperature and barometric pressure. This should be expanded to using indices of primary and secondary productivity. There also should be an assessment of density dependent and density independent factors.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9160	KRD	Construct Sediment Settling Basin	1	Inc	This is primarily a watershed proposal and should be reviewed as such. The criteria used are insufficient to fully evaluate watershed proposals. Combine with 9161 and 9162, because these 3 proposals are so closely linked and overlap in their objectives; set strategies to focus on specific improvements to water quality and tell why these improvements are important to anadromous and resident fish;objectives are vague and not measurable(e.g. reduce turbidity from -- NTU to -- NTU) can't meet goals if don't set targets; not enough detail on resources needed.
			2	Inc	
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	
9161	KRD	Improve Return Flow Water Quality From Farms	1	Inc	Same as for proposal # 9060.
			2	Inc	
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9162	KRD	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	1	Inc	Same as for proposal # 9060.
			2	Inc	
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	
8201300	PSMFC	Coded-Wire Tag Recovery Program	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8331900	NMFS	New Fish-Tagging System	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8332300	IDFG	Monitor Smolts at the Head of Lower Granite Reservoir and Lower Granite Dam	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8335000	NPT	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8343500	CTUIR	Operate and Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8401400	NMFS	Smolt Monitoring at Federal Dams	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8612400	ODFW	Inspection Service For Little Fall Creek Passage	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8712700	PSMFC	Smolt Monitoring By Non-Federal Agencies	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			4	Inc	Minor - include staff qualifications
8712702	PSMFC	Comparative Survival Rate Study (Css) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Minor - include staff qualifications
8712703	NPT	Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8740100	USGS	Assess Smolt Condition for Travel Time Analysis: Physiology,Health Survival	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8802200	CTUIR	Trap and Haul in the Umatilla and Walla Walla Basins	1	Inc	Need more details in methods. On page 9, paragraph 6, the proposal mentions project guidelines but doesn't specify what they are. Also on the top of page 10 in paragraph 1, the proposal refers to project methods in an annual report but doesn't describe them. The methods in that report should be included (at least enough of them to be able to allow the reader/reviewer to determine if the project is using sound protocols).
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8805301	NPT	Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8805302	CTUIR	Plan, Site, Design & Construct NEOH Hatchery-Umatilla/Walla Walla Component	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8805303	CTWSRO	Hood River Production Program (HRPP)	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			4	Yes	
8805304	ODFW	Monitor Actions Implemented Under the Hood River Production Program.	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8805305	ODFW	NE Oregon Hatchery Master Plan and Facilities - ODFW	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Minor corrections needed. Not enough detail to determine if resources are enough or appropriate in order to accomplish project. No data on past costs are included. A very long list of personnel is included but no information of FTE amounts for each person is included. The proposal also needs to include qualifications statements for key personnel.
8810804	PSMFC	Streamnet:The Northwest Aquatic Information Network	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8811500	YIN - YFP	Yakima Hatchery Construction	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	Minor corrections needed. Need to include a timeline or some target dates for completion of objectives.
			4	Inc	Same as no.3 above, plus data on past project costs need to be included.
8812001	YIN - YKFP	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Management	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Recommendation - Resources to accomplish this project are to a large part found in Project no. 8812008 Fisheries Technicians. I strongly recommend combining these 2 projects (see comments below for 8812008).

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
8812005	YIN	Video Fish Monitoring Project	1	Inc	To help define the scientific validity of this technique add a reference to Hatch et al. (1994). The proposal also needs to draw on data and results from previous years' monitoring to use as justification for continuing and expanding. Especially refer to the successes and limitations in annual reports.
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	Since your annual reports are 4 years behind, you need to provide explanation as to how you will better meet objectives in a more timely manner.
			4	Inc	See no.3 above.
8812008	YIN	Fisheries Technician Field Activities	1	Inc	This proposal does not fit into the project definition in any way. The technicians are working on a variety of projects and it only makes sense to link each technician to whatever project(s) they are working on. This should not exist as a separate project and the best thing to do would be to combine with Project No. 8812001.
			2	Inc	See no. 1 above.
			3	Inc	See no. 1 above.
			4	Inc	See no. 1 above.
8816000	ODFW	Willamette Hatchery Oxygen Supplementation	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8902900	ODFW	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder - Hatchery	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8903500	ODFW	Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8906200	CBFWA	Prepare Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	inc	Form incomplete, need minor corrections/addition. On page 9, paragraph 4, the past history cost spreadsheet is missing. On page 7, objectives appear to be mixed up.

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
8906500	USFWS	Annual Fish Marking - Missing Hatchery Production Groups	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8906900	ODFW	Annual Coded Wire Tag Program - Missing Production OR Htc (ODFW)	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8907201	DOE/ORNL	Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8909600	NMFS	Monitor, Evaluate Genetic Characteristics of Supplemented Salmon & Steelhead	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Vague compared to other genetics proposals
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8909800	USFWS	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8909801	USFWS	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8909802	NPT	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	1	Yes	Why are 801-803 separate projects?
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8909803	SBT	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8910700	UW	Statistical Support For Salmonid Survival Studies	1	Inc	Not clear who is using the support provided.
			2	Yes	Rather vague

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
8910800	UW	Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support	1	Yes	I guess
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	A bit high in $?
9000500	ODFW	Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9000501	CTUIR	Umatilla and Walla Walla Basin Natural Production M&E Project	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9005200	USGS	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9005500	IDFG	Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9007700	PSMFC	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9007800	USGS	Evaluate Predator Control and Provide Technical Support For PATH	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9008000	PSMFC	Columbia Basin Pit-Tag Information System	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			4	Yes	
9009300	UI	Life History and Genetic Analysis of Oncorhynchus nerka	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9102800	NMFS	Monitoring Smolt Migration of Wild Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	Maybe
			4	Yes	Indefinite, or will it wrap up?
9102900	USGS	Life History and Survival of Fall Chinook Salmon in Columbia River Basin	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Some trouble so far
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	High $
9105100	UW	Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support	1	Inc	This proposal appears to be an almost complete overlap with project # 8910700.
			2	Inc	
			3	Inc	
			4	Inc	High $ - is this that important?
9105500	NMFS	Supplementation Fish Quality (Yakima)	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9107100	SBT	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	1	Yes	Gill nets for predation study?
			2	Yes	Maybe
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	?
9107200	IDFG	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9107300	IDFG	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation Program (INPMEP)	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9202200	NMFS	Physiological Assessment of Wild and Hatchery Juvenile Salmonids	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9202401	CRITFC	Enhanced Harvest & Habitat Law Enforcement for Anadromous Salmonids & Reside	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9202408	SBT	Protect Critical Salmonid Habitat and Habitat Restoration Investments.	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9202409	NPT	Enhance Law Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife and Watersheds of the Nez Perce	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9202604	ODFW	Spring Chinook Salmon Early Life History	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9203200	USFS	Life-Cycle Model Development and Application to System Planning	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9204000	NMFS	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research	1	yes	
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9204101	COE	Evaluate Adult Migration in Lwr Col. River and Tributaries	1	yes	
			2	yes	
			3	Inc	No end in sight. Needs wrap up funds for FY01 or explanation of future efforts.
			4	Inc	Need personnel resumes.
9300802	CRITFC	Symptoms of Gbt Induced in Salmon by TDGS of the Columbia and Snake Rivers	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9301900	CTWSRO	Hood River Production Program - Oak Springs, Powerdale, Parkdale O&M	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9302900	NMFS	Survival Estimates for Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Dams & Res.	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9303701	PER Ltd.	Technical Assitance With Life Cycle Modeling	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9305600	NMFS	Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Since the subcontractors are the largest budget item, need subcontractors resumes and their involvement.
9306000	ODFW, WDFW	Evaluate Columbia River Select Area Fisheries	1	Inc	Scientific justification of use of non-local stocks in particular how that relates to ESA and state wild fish policies.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Describe what are the additional planned expansions and when will they occur?

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9306200	Lemhi and Custer Soil and Water Conservation Districts	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Objectives are not well linked to fish or habitat resoration goals
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	No past costs given or key personnel identified.
9402600	CTUIR	Pacific Lamprey Research and Restoration	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	Approach needs more detail relative to habitat or "potential habitat" for lamprey. This is needed before measurements of quantity and quality can be done.
			4	Yes	
9403300	PSMFC	The Fish Passage Center	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Need resumes of key personnel and description of FPC office to justify personnel budget item.
9403400	NPT	Assessing Summer & Fall Chinook Salmon Restoration in Snake River Basin	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9405900	ESD 105	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	1	Inc	Seems inappropriate for this to be in the AF program
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9406900	PNNL	A Spawning Habitat Model to Aid Recovery Plans For Snake River Fall Chinook	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9500700	PGE	Hood River Production Program - PGE: O&M	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Need resume of key personnel for consistency.
9503300	USBR	O&M of Yakima Fish Protection, Mitigation & Enhancement Facilities	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9506300	YIN	Yakima/Klickitat Monitoring and Evaluation Program	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9506402	WDFW	Upper Yakima Species Interactions Studies	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9506404	WDFW	Policy/Technical Involvement & Planning for YKFP	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9506406	WDFW	Monitor Supplementation Response Variable For the YKFP	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9600500	CBFWF	Operate Independent Scientific Advisory Board	1	Yes	
			2	yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9600600	ESSA	Path-Facilitation, Technical Assistance, and Peer Review	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9600800	ODFW	Path-Participation by State and Tribal Agencies	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9600801	NMFS	Provide scientific input to the PATH process.	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9601700	BioAnalysts, Inc	Provide Technical Support in the Plan For Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9601900	BPA-EWI	Second-Tier Database For Ecosystem Focus	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9602100	USGS	Gas Bubble Disease Research & Monitoring of Juvenile Salmonids	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	Show what will have been already done in FY98 and what is proposed specifically for FY99. What can be modeled vs field tested? Add further discussion of effects of tags on behavior.
			4	Inc	Additional budget details would help. Staffing requirements, Travel 30k?
9603301	YIN	Supplement and Enhance the Two Existing Stocks of Yakima R. Fall Chinook.	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Reduce to approx. 10 pg. (submitted as 35 pg.), Relate Abstract and Description of Objectives (Sec. 7b.) to Sec. 4 (Objectives) and concentrate on describing this project specifically. Define methods for project tasks - i.e. What are critical stock identification techniques that will be employed (Objectives 1f, 2c, 4c), how will habitat inventory be done (Objective 2b), what new rearing and acclimation treatments will be tested and how (Objective 4b)?
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9603302	YIN	Evaluate the Feasibillity and Potential Risks of Restoring Yakima R. Coho	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Inc	Reduce to approx. 10 pg. (submitted as 35 pg.), Relate Abstract, Description of Objectives (Sec. 7b.) to this project specifically and to Sec. 4 Objectives. Please define methods for project tasks. Describe how tasks will be accomplished. Clarify the term "Develop" in Methods (Tasks 1d, 1e, 2c, 5a, 62). How will the competition and predation experiments be designed?
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9604000	YIN	Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia .	1	Yes	Is the competition/predation part of this study necessary and over such a long period of time (i.e. coho are native and co-evolved with other salmonids in these streams. Is not the same work in the Yakima adequate for understanding the interactions in the Methow and Wenatchee?)
			2	Inc	Use Abstract to refer to and describe this project. Summarize methods and excerpt from referenced document.
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Additional budget details would be useful. Staffing requirements, Travel 50k.
9604300	NPT	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement - O&M and M&E	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Clarify budget - Planning 120k, Interagency coord. 260k, Report 65k.
9606700	NMFS	Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9700100	IDFG	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	Clarify budget - Report 28k
9700200	UW	Path-UW Technical Support	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	Provide additional budget details - Capital equip. 16k?, O&M

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
					11.7k
9701000	BPA	PIT Tag System Transition	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9701300	YIN	Operation & Maintenance For Upper Yakima River Supplementation Facility	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Reduce proposal to approximately 10 pages (now 42p). Relate Abstract and Proposal Objectives (Section 7b) to Section 4 (Objectives and Tasks). Is Objective 3 not part of 1 (in Section 4)? Describe Project 9701300 specifically and not entire YKPP. Methods should reflect how this project's tasks will be accomplished.
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Additional budget details will help review . Include staffing requirements. Budget shows a subcontract for $84k? Also, 94k for fish identification. This work is not described. Will tag trailer be for FY99 releases? If not, how will fish be marked?
9701400	WDFW	Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on the Hanford Reach	1	Inc	Study should establish magnitude of problem first (how many fish influenced under what flow conditions). Please make stronger case to show why an artificial drawdown experiment is preferable over extended monitoring to evaluate problem. Also, it is not clear why extensive new temperature lab work is necessary. Major associated studies are not referenced (Coutant 1973, 1977; Brett 1952, 1971).
			2	Inc	Should detail how macroinvert. study design will adequately show the effect of dewatering and how barbecue baskets will represent natural substrate. Suspect it will overestimate problem from rapid drainage and drying.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9702400	OSU, CRITFC	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia R: Phase II M&E	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9702600	NMFS	Identify Marine Fish Predators of Salmon and Estimate Predation Rates	1	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9703000	NPT	Monitor Listed Stock Adult Chinook Salmon Escapement	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Methods for Tasks 3d and 3e - CRITFC's video editing system needs to be tested in this setting before being applied in production tape editing.
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Please add budget details. Report 50k?, Is the Hydrogenerator the item(s) in Capital equip.?
9703800	NPT	Listed Stock Chinook Salmon Gamete Preservation	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Please add budget details. Travel 22k?, Report 48k?, What is 15k subcontract?
9705300	YIN	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Clarify Objective 4. 70% of project is "Maintain and Monitor Leases." Nothing in Methods about this. Surface-groundwater interchange monitoring should be described. Why is only 20% of project for land purchase?
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Clarify cost of Objective 4 - 350k, Please add a note on why .5 FTE Admin. Support is needed and those services not provided through Indirect.
9705700	SBT	Salmon River Production Program	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Show in Methods how specified tasks will be accomplished.
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Clarify budget. Add staffing information. What is 60k subcontract? Travel 20k?
9706200	YIN	Development /Refinement of Natural Production Objectives & Strategies	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Describe methods specific to this project (not entire YKPP).
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
9800100	HES	Analytical Support-Path and ESA Biological Assessments	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9800702	NPT	Grande Ronde Supplementation - O&M/M&E - Nez Perce Tribe Lostine	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Match Objectives (Section 4) to later description of objectives in Section 7. Describe methods specific to this project (Lostine element) and not for entire Grand Ronde Program. Clarify methods. Use other sections of proposal for background and history and program framework, if necessary. Define "Develop" (Section 4, Objective 2). Does it mean plan or build in FY99? Are redd counts part of this or other project?
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Give some budget details - what does Capital and O&M represent?, Travel 27.6k?, Report 38k?
9800703	CTUIR	Conduct Satellite Facility O&M and Program M&E for Grande Ronde Spr Chinook	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	Further define "finish-up construction."
			4	Inc	Add budget details, especially for "Finish-up construction" 168k, Report 33k?
9801001	ODFW/NPT	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	Show budget details, including staffing . Report 25k?
9801002	IDFG	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon - M & E	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9801003	USFWS	Monitor and Evaluate the Spawning Distribution of Snake River Fall Chinook	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	

ID	Sponsor	Title	Crit	Met?	Comments
			4	Yes	
9801004	NPT	Monitor and Evaluate Yearling Snake R Fall Chinook Upstream of Lwr Granite	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Show budget details. Describe subcontract and capital costs. Report 108k?
9801005	NPT	Pittsburg Landing, Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Fall Chinook Acclimation Facility	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	Include tasks only for FY99 work. Some described in tasks for Objectives 1 and 2 appear to be FY98 activities. Past work can be described in Project History section.
			4	Inc	Add budget details, Report 72k, Travel 32k, Give more information about Subcontract for 270k.
9801006	NPT	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9808001	PSMFC	PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	Clarify whether there is any personnel cost in this project. Budget shows 0, Page 8 implies one or maybe five FTEs. Are they paid from another project?

Appendix B.2. Watershed Project Management Criteria and Evaluation Form

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

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

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?

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

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

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? List the specific plan referenced in the proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

14. Were the technical deficiencies identified by the WTWG adequately addressed?

15. Is the project urgent, or more urgent?

Watershed Project Management Evaluation Form

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Lower Columbia Subregion																	
Chinook Subbasin																	
9123	Restore Chinook Watershed	SR	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Cowlitz Subbasin																	
9088	Implement Best Management Practices	CCD, WCD	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
9127	Development of a Cowlitz Watershed Management Plan	SFF	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Willamette Subbasin																	
9036	McKenzie Watershed Habitat Assessment and Project Prioritization	MFWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	
9037	Acquire Fish and Wildlife Habitat in the McKenzie Watershed	MFWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	
9038	Evaluate spring chinook life history-habitat relationships in the McKenzie	MFWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	
9607000	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	MWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	
Lower Columbia Mainstem Subbasin																	
9058	Restore Chinook Passage into Woodard Creek & Enhance Habitat	CRGNSA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Lower Mid-Columbia Subregion																	
White Salmon Subbasin																	
9156	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	UCD															
Hood Subbasin																	
9126	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Klickitat Subbasin																	
9001	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In Eastern Klickitat County	EKCD	N	N	N			NA	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		?
9002	Monitor Water Quality And Quantity In L. Klickitat R. And Its Tributaries	CKCD	N	N	N			N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		?
9066	Protect Klickitat River and Wind River salmonids	WDFW	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y		?
9506800	Klickitat Passage/Habitat Improvement M&E	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		U
9705600	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		M

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9089	Classify riparian and wetland vegetation in the Columbia Basin of Wash.	WDNR,NHP															
Fifteenmile Subbasin																	
9087	Acquire 1860 Fifteenmile Cr irrigation water right and convert to instream	OWT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Deschutes Subbasin																	
9003	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase II	JCSWCD	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	I	I	I	I	N	Y	NA	I
9004	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Ashwood Phase I	JCSWCD	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	I	I	I	I	N	Y	NA	I
9005	Irrigation System Replacement Trout Cr. @ Willowdale II 1999 Funds	JCSWCD	I	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	I	I	I	N	Y	NA	I
9006	Restore/Enhance Trout Creek @ Willowdale	JCSWCD	I	Y	Y	I	I	I	Y	I	I	I	I	N	Y	NA	I
9007	Jefferson Co./Middle Deschutes Watershed Coordinator/Council Support 1999	JCSWCD	Y	I	I	I	N	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	NA	I
9133	Bakeoven Riparian Assessment	WCSWCD	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	NA	Y
9138	Warm Springs Reservation 1999 Watershed Enhancement Project	CTWSRO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9303000	Buck Hollow Watershed Enhancement	WCSWCD	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y	NA	Y
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9040	Central Oregon Watershed Enhancement	OSU Ext.	Y	N	I	Y	I	I	N	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
John Day Subbasin																	
9012	Mitigate Effects Of Runoff & Erosion On Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow	SSWCD	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9045	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams On Lower North Fork John Day	NFJDWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9139	Acquisition Of Pine Creek Ranch	CTWSRO	Y	I	Y	Y	N	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9144	Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity Of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	ODFW															
9155	Establish the Methow Watershed Council	MVCC															
8400800	North Fork John Day Habitat Improvement	USFS	N	I	Y	Y	N	N	I	I	Y	Y	Y	I	N	NA	Y
8402100	Protect And Enhance John Day River Fish Habitat	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	USFS	N	I	Y	Y	N	N	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	N	NA	Y
9605300	North Fork John Day River Dredge Tailings Restoration	USFS/CTUIR	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project-FY'99 Proposal	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9703400	Monitor fine sediment and overwinter sedimentation in John Day & Gr Ronde	CRITFC															
9137	John Day Watershed Restoration	CTWSRO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
9091	South Tower Fire Recovery Projects	USFS	N	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	I	Y
Rock Creek Subbasin																	
9159	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	YIN Fisheries															
Umatilla Subbasin																	
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8710002	Protect & Enhance Coldwater Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Basin.	ODFW	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration And Survival In The Lower Umatilla	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	N	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	N	N	I	Y
Walla Walla Subbasin																	
9010	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	WDFW	Y	I	I	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
9601100	Screens and Traps on the Walla Walla and Touchet	CTUIR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y+
9601200	Adult Fish Passage Improvement - Walla Walla River	CTUIR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y?
9604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	Y	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Upper Mid-Columbia Subregion																	
Yakima Subbasin																	
9032	Teach adults to become holistic Master Watershed Stewards	GCEE	Y			Y	Y	NA		Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		?
9065	Little Naches Streambank Restoration	USFS	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		U
9067	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	YRWC	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		U
9068	Improve Stream Habitat Through Reduction In Farm Runoff	BCD	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		U
9070	Improve Water Quality Through Sedimentation And Nutrient Reduction	SYCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	N?	Y	Y	Y		U
9076	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	RSBOJC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		U
9100	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin	YIN&WDFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		U
9101	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		U

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9102	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	YIN		Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			U
9109	Acquisition Of Water And Floodplain Fisheries Habitat In The Yakima Basin	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		U
9114	Stabilizing Stream Channels In The Cabin Creek Watershed	USFS	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		U
9158	Little Naches River Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YIN Fisheries	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		U
9164	Analyze Ahtanum Creek Storage Project	AID	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	NA	N	N	Y	N		?
8506200	Evaluate The Effectiveness Of Fish Screens	PNNL	O		Y			NA	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	U		
9105700	Yakima Phase 2 Screen Fabrication	WDFWYSS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		U
9107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	USBOR	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	N				Y	N	N		U
9200900	Yakima Screens - Phase II - O & M	WDFWYSS	Y	N		Y	N	N		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		U
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		U
9704900	Teanaway River Instream Flow Restoration	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y		NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		U
9705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y		NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		U
9705200	Enhancement Between Selah and Union Gaps	YIN		Y	Y	Y		NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		U
Wenatchee Subbasin																	
9044	Replace Chumstick Creek Culvert	WDFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y			N		U
9050	Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore riparian vegetation on Chumstick	USFWS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		U
9054	Reduce Erosion, Identify Access and Improve Aquatic Health in Bonneville Power Line Corridor	USFS															
Entiat Subbasin																	
9031	Implement Entiat Model Watershed Plan	CCCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y		
Methow Subbasin																	
9024	Methow Tributaries Fish Passage	FS	N	N	N		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		U
9025	Prevent Mortality In Methow Endangered And Proposed Fish	FS	N	Y	Y	Y	?Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	?N	N		U
9026	Expand Respect The River	FS	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	?	Y	N		U
9027	Prevent Pollution Of Methow River	FS	N	?	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y	N	N		N
9028	Reduce Sediment In Frazer Creek, Beaver Creek, Methow River	FS	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y			N	N		

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9039	Increase Stream Flow In The Methow River And Provide Trail-Based Recreation	CCC	N	Y	N	N	N	?	N	?	?	?	?	N	N		?
9097	Methow Basin Side Channel Habitat Construction	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		?
9604200	Restore And Enhance Anadromous Fisheries & Habitat In Salmon Creek	CCT															
Lower Snake Subregion																	
Asotin Subbasin																	
9401805	Enhance Habitat For Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bulltrout.	ACCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Tucannon Subbasin																	
9202602	Implement Eastern Washington Model Watershed Plans	WCC				Project integrated into 3 other SEWA projects											
9401806	Enhance Habitat For Spring & Fall Chinook, Summer Steelhead, And Bulltrout.	CCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9401807	Enhance Habitat For Fall Chinook, Steelhead And Bulltrout	PCD	Y	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Clearwater Subbasin																	
9059	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	CFWP-ISCC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9060	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	CFWP-ISCC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9118	Restore West Fork Little Bear Creek For Steelhead	PCEI	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	I	N	N	N	N
9120	Protecting and Restoring Big Canyon Creek Watershed	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9122	Rehabilitate Lapwai Creek	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9163	West Fork Squaw Creek Fish Passage Project	USFS															
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, And Wildlife Habitat Within The Red River Watershed	ISWCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9607702	Protecting And Restoring The Lolo Creek Watershed	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9607703	Protecting And Restoring The Squaw And Papoose Creek Watersheds	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9607704	Final Design for Fish Passage Improvements at Lower Eldorado Falls	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9607705	Restore Mccomas Meadows	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9607706	Restore Lolo Watershed	USFWS															
9607707	Restore Squaw and Papoose Watersheds	USFWS															
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	ISCC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grande Ronde Subbasin																	
9085	Propagate Native Plant Species for Revegetation & Riparian Restoration Project	USFS	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	N	NA	N
9119	Public-Private Cooperative Resource Mgmt in Lower Joseph Cr Watershed	WR	I	I	N	Y	I	NA	Y	NA	I	I	Y	N	Y	N	N?
9128	Upper Grande Ronde Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	Y	I	I	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8402500	Protect And Enhance Fish Habitat In Grande Ronde Basin Streams	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed - Project Planning Support	GRMWP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9402700	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Habitat Projects	GRMWP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Grande Ronde Imnaha Subbasin																	
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planning	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	I	I	Y	N	Y	I	Y
Salmon Subbasin																	
9009	Restore Salmon River (Challis, ID) area to healthy condition	CCWG	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
9014	Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings on Yankee Fork Salmon River	SBT, IDFG, USFS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9034	Reduce Sediment Delivery From Kline Mountain Road To The S.F. Salmon River.	USFS, BNF, Cascade RD	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
9051	Stabilize Blowout Creek (South Fork of Meadow Creek)	USFS	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
9121	Assessment Salmon River Subbasin	NPT	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
9202603	Idaho Model Watersheds Admin./Impl. Support	SCC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9401500	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement - O&M	IDFG															
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	SWCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	SBT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

ID	Title	Sponsor	Management Review														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation, Up. Salmon R., ID	CS&WCD															
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage	SWCD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Systemwide																	
9049	Feasibility Study For A State-Wide Water Quality Data Sharing Mechanism	Rachael Stein															
9099	Educate Landowners And Agencies On Salmon Stream Restoration Methods	OSU															
9132	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Restoration Plan Now	CRITFC															
9142	Produce watershed analysis procedure for salmon habitat restoration	CRITFC															
Upper Columbia Subregion																	
Upper Columbia Mainstem Subbasin																	
9116	Rasor Ranch Acquisition/ Crab Creek Watershed Restoration Project	FWS															

Appendix B.3. Non-Watershed Project Management Criteria and Evaluation Form

1. Does the proposal use key strategies and actions to achieve measurable objectives that address documented problems and limiting factors as identified in strategic plans (e.g., Multi-Year Plan, Subbasin Plans, *Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit* etc.)? Identify the specific management plan referenced in the proposal.

2. Does the proposal promote and maintain sustainable normative ecosystem processes, community diversity, and species richness?

3. Is there a cost share for the construction, implementation, operations and maintenance of the project?

4. Will the project complement management actions on private, public, and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes, and public?

5. Were other alternatives considered?

6. Will the project provide data critical for in-season, annual, and/or longer term management decisions? (to be used for Mainstem and Systemwide projects only).

7. Were the technical deficiencies identified by the NTWG adequately addressed?

8. Is the project urgent, or more urgent?

Non-Watershed Project Evaluation Form

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9008	Eval. of Fall Chinook Production & Habitat Conditions in Lw.Tucannon River	Tucannon River	WDFW	Y	NA	Y	I	N	Y	NA	Y
9011	Characterize & Quantify Residual Steelhead in Clearwater River, Idaho	Clearwater River	USFWS	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9015	Enhance and Protect Fisheries in the Wolf Creek Watershed	Methow River - Wolf and Patterson Lake Creeks	WCRD	Y	Y		Y		N		U
9016	Research/Evaluate Restoration of NE Ore Streams and Develop Mgmt Guidelines	Grande Ronde River, John Day River, Umatilla River	OSU / U of O	I	Y	N	I	N	I	NA	N
9017	Improve Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage in Omak Creek	OKANOGON	CCT								
9018	Assess Habitat For Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph Dam	not applicable	CCT	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		MU
9019	Monitor Reproductive Physiology of Columbia River White Sturgeon	Lower Columbia River	OSU	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9022	Reintroduction of salmon & steelhead - Mary's Cr. & Owyhee R.	Upper Snake River subbasin, Owyhee River subbasin	SPT	N	Y	N	N	N		N	N
9029	Monitoring Water Quality With Data Collection Platforms	Cathrine Creek/Grande Rhonde River. (coordinated monitoring).	Clouston Energy Research & Pacific Agricultural Laboratory in collaboration with the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the US Agricultural Departmen t's Natural	N	I	N	I	N	NA	N	N

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
			Resources Conservation Service.								
9030	Etiology of Headburns in Returning Adult Salmonids	Primarily Snake River subbasin	AQT	Y 1,2	N	Y	N	N	Y	NA	N
9035	Evaluate Estuarine & Nearshore-ocean Migratory Behavior of Juvenile Salmon	Columbia River estuary and nearshore ocean	NMFS	Y1,2	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N
9047	Use Unsteady Flow to Aid Mainstem Passage of Junenile Salmonids		ORNL	Y 1,2	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
9057	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	CLEARWATER RIVER DRAINAGE, IDAHO	IDFG	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y
9063	Ocean Survival of Salmonids Relative to Migrational Timing, Fish Health…	Nearshore Ocean	NMFS	Y 1,2,4	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
9064	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	Upper Middle Fork Salmon River, Lower Middle Fork Salmon River	USFS	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y
9069	Enhance Upper Yakima River Basin Fish Habitat	Upper Yakima River Basin (in Kittitas County) and associated subbasins.	KCCD	N	N	Y	N				
9071	Improve Yakima River Water Quality	Lower Yakima River	RSBOJC	N	Y	Y	N				
9072	Improve Return Flow Water Quality	Lower Yakima River	RSBOJC	N	Y	Y	N				
9073	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	Lower Yakima River	RSBOJC								
9074	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	Lower Yakima River	RSBOJC								
9075	Construct Wetlands	Lower Yakima River	RSBOJC								
9077	Evaluation of Interactions between American Shad and Salmon in Columbia R		USGS	Y 1,2,3,4,6	N	N	N	N	Y	NA	N
9078	Water Temperature Effects on Fall Chinook Salmon in the Snake & Columbia R	Snake River, Clearwater River,	USGS	Y 1,2,3	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y(U)

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Yakima River									
9080	Incidence and Effects of Gas Bubble Trauma on Salmonid & Resident Fish	Lower mid-Columbia River mainstem subbasin	USGS	Y 1,2,5	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N
9082	Evaluate Feed Strategies to Reduce Residualism & Promote Smolting in Stlhd	Clearwater River, Idaho	Idaho Fishery Resource Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with joint sponsors.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9083	Develop Tools to Evaluate the Effects of Selective Fisheries on Chinook		NOAA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9086	Coordinate Assessment and Prioritization of Key Habitats in Methow Basin		PWI	Y	Y		Y		Y		
9090	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts For Repeat Spawning	Snake River	CRITFC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	?	U
9092	Umatilla Tribal Fish and Wildlife Enforcement	Umatilla; Grande Ronde; John Day; Walla Walla	CTUIR	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	N	N
9098	Technical Support For PATH - James J. Anderson		James J. Anderson Consulting	N	N	N	N	N	N	?	N
9104	Conduct baseline habitat and pop. dynamics studies on lampreys in Cedar Cr.	Cedar Creek (of the Lewis River) subbasin.	USFWS, CRFP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9105	Determine if salmon are successfully spawning below Lower Columbia MS dams	Lower Columbia Mainstem	WDFW, ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9108	Evaluate strobe lights as a juvenile salmonid guidance behavioral tool	Cowlitz Basin above Cowlitz Falls Dam located at RM 88.5	WDFW	Y 1,2,3,4	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
9112	Numerical Evaluation of Flow Modification on Salmonid Migration		The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	Y 1,2	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
9113	Evaluate Effects of Hydraulic Turbulence on Survival of Migratory Fishes	Laboratory study	ORNL	Y 1,2,3,4	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		not associated with a particular subbasin									
9115	Develop TDG Abatement Plan of Action Using Wheels Pools and Falls Approach	Snake, Willamette and Rogue	SMR	Y 1,2	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
9117	Facilitation Services for the Regional Forum	Issues and decisions pertain primarily to the Mainstem Columbia and Snake Rivers	NMFS	Y 1, 2,4	N	N	N	Y	N	NA	Y(MU)
9125	Columbia River Basin Fish Key	Existing data will be collected for all sub-basins	Eastern Washington University Biology Department	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9131	Evaluate fall chinook & chum spawning, production & habitat use in Col R	Mainstem Columbia	WDFW	Y 2,3,7,8	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y(U)
9135	Assess Impacts of Hydro Operations on Mainstem Habitats For Fish	Lower Columbia River Mainstem, Lower Snake River Mainstem	USGS - CRRL	Y 2	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
9136	Influence of marine-derived nutrient influx on CRB salmonid production	Research to be conducted throughout the Columbia River basin.	USGS	Y 2,3,4,7	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
9141	Strategies For Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon	Blue Mountains, Umatilla	OSU	I	Y	N	I	N	N	NA	N
9143	Evaluate Disease Interactions Between Wild and Hatchery Salmonids		OSU	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9145	Evaluate the Status of Columbia River Sea-Run Cutthroat Trout	Subbasins include Eagle, Herman, Hood, Rock, Wind, White Salmon, and Klickitat above Bonneville Dam,	ODFW	I	I	N	I	I			Y

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		and selected subbasins downstream from Bonneville Dam.									
9146	Evaluate Effects of Habitat Work Conducted in Fifteenmile Creek	Fifteenmile Creek	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	I		Y	Y
9147	Prioritize Research and Restoration Needs For Pacific Lamprey	This is a planning project that deals with populations basin-wide.	ODFW	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	?	N
9148	Develop open formula diets to yield quality smolts		Abernathy Salmon Culture Technology Center	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9149	Evaluate and Monitor Bacterial Cold Water Disease impacting salmonids	Lower Columbia	Abernathy Salmon Culture Technology Center, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9150	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	Grande Ronde River (Lostine River)	NPT								
9151	Assess Adult Steelhead Escapement in the Secesh River System	Salmon River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9152	Feasibility of Sockeye Reintroduction to Wallowa and Warm Lakes	Warm Lake, ID - Salmon River Basin, Wallowa Lake OR - Grande Ronde River Basin	NPT	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	N
9153	Preserve Cryogenically the Gametes of selected Mid-Columbia Salmonid stocks	Upper Columbia, The Deschutes and possibly others	CRITFC	Y	N	N	N	N	N	?	N
9154	Wind River Ecosystem Restoration	Wind River subbasin	UCD								
9157	Effects of Ocean Conditions on the Growth and Survival of Salmonids	None	CRITFC	Y 2,3	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
9160	Construct Sediment Settling Basin	Kittitas	KRD	N	Y	Y	N	N			N

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9161	Improve Return Flow Water Quality From Farms	Kittitas	KRD	N	Y	Y	N	N			N
9162	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	Kittitas	KRD	N	Y	Y	N	N			N
8201300	Coded-Wire Tag Recovery Program	N/A: Basin-wide program	PSMFC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
8331900	New Fish-Tagging System	Snake and Columbia River Basins	NMFS								
8332300	Monitor Smolts at the Head of Lower Granite Reservoir and Lower Granite Dam	Salmon River, Snake River	IDFG	Y 1,2,4	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y(MU)
8335000	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery	Clearwater	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y
8343500	Operate and Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities	Umatilla, Walla Walla	CTUIR	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NA	NA	Y+
8401400	Smolt Monitoring at Federal Dams	Columbia Basin	NMFS	Y 1,2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y(MU)
8612400	Inspection Service For Little Fall Creek Passage	Little Fall Creek - tributary to Middle Fork Willamette	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8712700	Smolt Monitoring By Non-Federal Agencies	Columbia River Mainstem/Snake River Mainstem	PSMFC	Y 1,2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y(MU)
8712702	Comparative Survival Rate Study (Css) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook	Mainstem Snake and Columbia Rivers	PSMFC	Y 1,2	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y(MU)
8712703	Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project	Imnaha River, Snake River	NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
8740100	Assess Smolt Condition for Travel Time Analysis: Physiology,Health Survival	Snake River, Columbia River and tributaries	USGS	Y 2,4	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N
8802200	Trap and Haul in the Umatill and Walla Walla Basins	Umatilla, Walla Walla	CTUIR	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y+
8805301	Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan	Imnaha River, Grande Ronde River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
8805302	Plan, Site, Design & Construct NEOH Hatchery-Umatilla/Walla Walla Component	Walla Walla, Umatilla	CTUIR	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
8805303	Hood River Production Program (HRPP)	Hood River	CTWSRO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
8805304	Monitor Actions Implemented Under the Hood River Production Program.	Hood River	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8805305	NE Oregon Hatchery Master Plan and Facilities - ODFW	Walla Walla, Grande Ronde, and Imnaha.	ODFW	Y	Y	N/Y	Y	N/Y	Y	N	Y/Y+
8810804	Streamnet:The Northwest Aquatic Information Network	StreamNet is involved in data development throughout the Columbia Basin. StreamNet data reports are available at the subbasin level for all portions of the Columbia Basin.	PSMFC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
8811500	Yakima Hatchery Construction	Yakima River Subbasin	YIN - YFP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y
8812001	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Management	Yakima River, Klickitat River	YIN - YKFP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
8812005	Video Fish Monitoring Project	Yakima	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
8812008	Fisheries Technician Field Activities	Yakima, Klickitat	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
8816000	Willamette Hatchery Oxygen Supplementation	Willamette River Subbasin	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8902900	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder - Hatchery	Dechutes River / Hood River	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
8903500	Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance	Umatilla River subbasin.	ODFW	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NA	NA	Y+
8906200	Prepare Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan	entire Columbia River Basin	CBFWA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
8906500	Annual Fish Marking - Missing Hatchery Production Groups	Columbia River and tributaries; Snake River and tributaries	USFWS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
8906900	Annual Coded Wire Tag Program - Missing Production Or Htc (Odfw)	Work is performed at ODFW hatcheries in the Lower Columbia River and Willamette River	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Basin. Fish tagged under this project are released in the Columbia River and tributaries below Bonneville Dam, Willamette Basin, and Umatilla and Yakima Rivers.									
8907201	Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support	no subbasin	DOE/ORNL	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
8909600	Monitor, Evaluate Genetic Characteristics of Supplemented Salmon & Steelhea	Steelhead: Tucannon, Grande Ronde, Imnaha, Clearwater. Sp/SumChinook: Grande Ronde, Imnaha, SF/MF/Upper Salmon	NMFS	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
8909800	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	Clearwater River, Salmon River	USFWS	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
8909801	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	Clearwater River, Salmon River	USFWS	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
8909802	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	Clearwater River, Salmon River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
8909803	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	Clearwater River, Salmon River	SBT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
8910700	Statistical Support For Salmonid Survival Studies		UW	Y 1,2,4	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
8910800	Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support		UW	Y 1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
9000500	Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	Umatilla River subbasin	ODFW	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
9000501	Umatilla and Walla Walla Basin Natural Production M&E Project	Umatilla, Walla Walla	CTUIR	Y	Y	N	Y	I	Y	NA	Y
9005200	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation	N/A. Results apply to or affect all subbasins	USGS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9005500	Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	Clearwater River, Salmon River	IDFG	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9007700	Northern Squawfish Management Program	Lower Columbia & Snake River Mainstem	PSMFC	Y 1,2,4	N	N	Y	Y	N	NA	N
9007800	Evaluate Predator Control and Provide Technical Support For PATH		USGS	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9008000	Columbia Basin Pit-Tag Information System	Mainstem Snake and Columbia Rivers	PSMFC	Y 1,2,4,9	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y(MU)
9009300	Life History and Genetic Analysis of Oncorhynchus nerka	Columbia and Snake Subbasins	UI	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9102800	Monitoring Smolt Migration of Wild Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook	Salmon River Drainage of Idaho	NMFS	Y	N	N	N	N		Y	Y
9102900	Life History and Survival of Fall Chinook Salmon in Columbia River Basin	Snake River, Columbia River	USGS	Y 1,2,3,4	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y(MU)
9105100	Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support		UW	Y 1,2,4	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
9105500	Supplementation Fish Quality (Yakima)	Yakima, Snake River	NMFS	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y
9107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	Salmon River	SBT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9107200	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	Upper Salmon River - Redfish Lake, Alturas Lake, Pettit Lake	IDFG	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9107300	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation Program (INPMEP)	Salmon River subbasin, Clearwater River subbasin,	IDFG	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9202200	Physiological Assessment of Wild and Hatchery Juvenile Salmonids	Mainstem, Yakima	NMFS	Y 2,4	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N
9202401	Enhanced Harvest & Habitat Law Enforcement for Anadromous Salmonids & Resid	Mainstem Columbia River and environs	CRITFC	Y 1,2,3,4,11	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N
9202408	Protect Critical Salmonid Habitat and Habitat Restoration Investments.	Salmon, Lower Snake, Upper Snake	SBT	ENFORCEMENT							
9202409	Enhance Law Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife and Watersheds of the Nez Perce	Snake River, Clearwater, Grand Ronde, lower Columbia River.	NPT	ENFORCEMENT							

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9202604	Spring Chinook Salmon Early Life History	Grande Ronde and Imnaha River subbasins	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y
9203200	Life-Cycle Model Development and Application to System Planning		USFS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9204000	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research	Salmon River, Stanley Basin	NMFS	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9204101	Evaluate Adult Migration in Lwr Col. River and Tributaries	Lower Columbia and Snake River, and tributaries	COE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9300802	Symptoms of Gbt Induced in Salmon by TDGS of the Columbia and Snake Rivers	Lower and Mid-Columbia Mainstem and Snake River Mainstem	CRITFC	Y 1,2,3	N	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y(MU)*
9301900	Hood River Production Program - Oak Springs, Powerdale, Parkdale O&M	Hood River	CTWSRO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
9302900	Survival Estimates for Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Dams & Res.		NMFS	Y 1,2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y(MU)
9303701	Technical Assitance With Life Cycle Modeling		PER Ltd.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9305600	Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology		NMFS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9306000	Evaluate Columbia River Select Area Fisheries	Lower Columbia basin and side channels, including: Deep River, Steamboat Slough (Skamokawa Cr.), Cathlamet Channel, Youngs Bay, Tongue Point Basin, Blind Slough (Gnat Cr.), Clifton Channel, and Wallace Slough (Clatskanie R.).	ODFW, WDFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9403300	The Fish Passage Center	Columbia River Mainstem and Snake River	PSMFC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Mainstem									
9403400	Assessing Summer & Fall Chinook Salmon Restoration in Snake River Basin	Clearwater, Grande Ronde, Salmon, Imnaha	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	Yakima	ESD 105	Y	N		Y		N		N
9406900	A Spawning Habitat Model to Aid Recovery Plans For Snake River Fall Chinook	Middle Columbia River mainstem (Bonnevile to Priest Rapids), Snake River mainstem (mouth to Hells Canyon Dam)	PNNL	Y 1,2,4,7,12	N	N	Y	N	Y	NA	N
9500700	Hood River Production Program - PGE: O&M	Deschutes and Hood River Subbasins.	PGE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
9503300	O&M of Yakima Fish Protection, Mitigation & Enhancement Facilities	Yakima River	USBR	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y
9506300	Yakima/Klickitat Monitoring and Evaluation Program	Yakima	YIN	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y
9506402	Upper Yakima Species Interactions Studies	Yakima River	WDFW	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y
9506404	Policy/Technical Involvement & Planning For YKFP	Yakima River	WDFW	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y
9506406	Monitor Supplementation Response Variable For the YKFP	Yakima River	WDFW	Y	Y		Y		Y		YU
9600500	Operate Independent Scientific Advisory Board	n/a	CBFWF	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9600600	Path-Facilitation, Technical Assistance, and Peer Review		ESSA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9600800	Path-Participation by State and Tribal Agencies	Columbia River Basinwide	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	MU
9600801	Provide scientific input to the PATH process.	N/A	NMFS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9601700	Provide Technical Support in the Plan For Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses	Topic matter spans the entire Snake-Columbia Basin		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9601900	Second-Tier Database For Ecosystem Focus	Columbia, Snake, Clearwater, Salmon	BPA-EWI	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9602100	Gas Bubble Disease Research & Monitoring of Juvenile Salmonids	Snake, Mainstem	USGS	Y 1,2,4	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
9603301	Supplement and Enhance the Two Existing Stocks of Yakima R. Fall Chinook.	Yakima	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		YMU
9603302	Evaluate the Feasibillity and Potential Risks of Restoring Yakima R. Coho	Yakima	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		YMU
9604000	Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia .	Methow, Wenatchee	YIN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		YMU
9604300	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement - O&M and M&E	Salmon River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9606700	Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project	Upper Salmon River Basin (ID), Grande Ronde River Basin (OR)	NMFS	Y	Y	?	Y	Y		Y	Y
9700100	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	Salmon River (Lemhi River, East Fork Salmon River, and West Fork Yankee Fork Salmon River)	IDFG	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9700200	Path-UW Technical Support		UW	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9701000	PIT Tag System Transition	Columbia/Snake River Basin-Wide	BPA	Y 1,2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y(U)
9701300	Operation & Maintenance For Upper Yakima River Supplementation Facility	Yakima	YIN	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		YMU
9701400	Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on the Hanford Reach	Hanford Reach of the Columbia River	WDFW	Y 1,2	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y(U)
9702400	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia R: Phase II M&E	Work will be conducted on the lower Columbia River from the estuary to the head of McNary Pool.	OSU, CRITFC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9702600	Identify Marine Fish Predators of Salmon and Estimate Predation Rates	Nearshore Ocean	NMFS	Y 1,4	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N
9703000	Monitor Listed Stock Adult Chinook Salmon Escapement	Salmon River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9703800	Listed Stock Chinook Salmon Gamete Preservation	Middle Fork Salmon River, Upper Salmon River, Lemhi River, Pahsimeroi River, South Fork Salmon River, mainstem Salmon River tributaries, Grande Ronde River, Imnaha River, and Snake River tributaries	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration	Yakima River,	YIN								

ID	Title	Subbasin	Sponsor	Non-Watershed Management Criteria							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Toppenish Creek, Simcoe Creek									
9705700	Salmon River Production Program	Lower Snake River; Salmon River	SBT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9706200	Development /Refinement of Natural Production Objectives & Strategies	Yakima	YIN	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		YMU
9800100	Analytical Support-Path and ESA Biological Assessments	N/A	HES	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U
9800702	Grande Ronde Supplementation - O&M/M&E - Nez Perce Tribe Lostine	Grande Ronde River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9800703	Conduct Satellite Facility O&M and Program M&E for Grande Ronde Spr Chinook	Grande Ronde River	CTUIR	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9801001	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	Grande Ronde River	ODFW/NPT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y+
9801002	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon - M & E	Salmon River (Lemhi R., East Fork Salmon River, and West Fork Yankee Fork Salmon River)	IDFG	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9801003	Monitor and Evaluate the Spawning Distribution of Snake River Fall Chinook	Snake River, Clearwater River, Imnaha River, Salmon River, Grande Ronde River	USFWS	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9801004	Monitor and Evaluate Yearling Snake R Fall Chinook Upstream of Lwr Granite	Snake River, Clearwater River	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9801005	Pittsburg Landing, Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Fall Chinook Acclim. Fac.	Snake River (between Asotin, WA and Hells Canyon Dam), Lower Clearwater River.	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y
9801006	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	Grande Ronde River (Lostine River)	NPT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	NA	Y
9808001	PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution		PSMFC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	?	MU

Appendix C. Resident Fish

Appendix C.1. Policies

(Established January 16-17, 1997 - updated May 1, 1998)

0. Bring the projects in the Pending List up to full funding.
1. Begin new projects using the priorities established in the FY 99 Work Plan.
2. Consider requests for funds that exceed the amount budgeted for FY 99.
3. Budget Requests and Scope of Work changes: Budget requests up to 10% over the FY 99 amount will be reviewed and approved by the RFM. Budget requests for more than 10% over the FY 99 amount will be reviewed and approved by the RFM and the Council. (Outlined in a July 16, 1996 letter to John Etchart.)

Emergency Fund

The Resident Fish Managers established an Emergency Fund using unallocated funds. Although they have not established the relative size of the fund, the managers agreed to look for other sources of money. "Emergencies" are defined as requests for funds outside the priority list and the MOA Contingency Fund.

Criteria

0. Are alternative funds available?
1. Would deferring the action cause a threat to federally listed Threatened or Endangered species?
2. Would deferring the action cause the program to stop or substantially reduce project accomplishment and/or biological objectives?
3. Could the work be deferred until next year?
4. Could the Scope of Work be modified to accommodate the proposed action? Can the funds be obtained within the existing contract?
5. Is this a one-time expense with no out-year costs? Will the proposed action result in a "bow wave"?
6. Is the proposed action the result of a catastrophic event?
7. The RFM reserves the right to consider if the "loss" is a result of deferred maintenance and/or negligence.

Process

0. Requests for emergency funding should be sent to the Resident Fish Managers Chair.
1. The request should address *all* of the criteria listed above and must include a justification and an itemized budget.
2. The request will be sent via Consent Mail to the Resident Fish Managers, who will have ten working days to respond.
3. If there is no consent, there will be a conference call to try to resolve the issue.

4. If the issue cannot be resolved during the conference call, then it will be presented to the Members Steering Group with a minority and majority report.
5. If the RFM agrees with the request for emergency funding, it will be presented to the MSG and the Council for final approval.

Appendix C.2. Project Evaluation Criteria

Step 1. Screening Criteria

A proposed project must meet all of these criteria to be considered further.

1.A. Project addresses specific Council Program measures. (Yes / No)

1.B. Project developed to meet particular program measures must be consistent with management objectives of the agencies or tribes which have jurisdiction. (Yes / No)

1.C. Project addresses one of the priorities listed on page 10-3 of the Sept. 13, 1995 NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program). (Yes / No)

X Accord highest priority to rebuilding to sustainable levels weak, but recoverable, native populations

X Accord second highest priority to resident fish substitution measures in areas that previously had salmon and steelhead, but where anadromous fish are now irrevocably blocked by federally operated hydropower development.

X Accord high priority to measures that meet the following criteria (not in rank order):

- Provide benefits for wildlife and/or anadromous fish.
- Develop biological or integrated rule curves that will protect resident fish in storage reservoirs.
- Protect the health of existing resident fish populations.
- Other native stocks that may be at risk due to the construction and operation of the FCRPS.
- Demonstrate that they do not adversely affect native resident or anadromous fish.
- Address biological objectives that have been adopted by the Council.
- Give preference to measures that address losses at hydropower facilities for which an assessment of losses and gains is approved and completed by the Council.
- Substitution measures in areas that previously had salmon and steelhead, but where such fish are now permanently blocked by federally licensed or regulated hydropower facilities.

Step 2. Technical Criteria

2. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate, scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles? (Yes / No)

3. Are the objectives clearly defined and measurable and are tasks aligned to the objectives? (Yes / No)

4. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones? (Yes / No)

5. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation of the results (in the context of the objectives - including performance measures/methods) at the project level? (Yes / No) (Proposal Form Section 4,7a,b,c,d,e)

Ongoing Projects: A specific monitoring plan is in place, the results have been evaluated and the evaluation guides the project direction.

New Projects: The proposal includes a specific detailed monitoring and evaluation plan which links project objectives to expected results.

6. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations? (Yes / No) (Proposal Form Section 7a,b,c,d)

Project provides direct benefits to target species/indicators populations.

7. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long-term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin? (Yes / No) (Proposal Form Section 7a,b,c,d)

Proposal clearly describes the long-term Apicture≅. Supporting documentation clearly demonstrates that activities within the basin complement each other.

8. Demonstrates that all "reasonable" precautions have been taken, based on best available science, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of native resident and anadromous fish. (Yes / No) (Proposal Form Section 7a)

9. Is the short and long-term budget (including planning, construction, operations and maintenance, and monitoring and evaluation) appropriate and cost-effective to achieve the objectives, tasks and time frame milestones? (Yes / No) (Proposal Form Section 5)

The budget (short and long-term) is carefully prepared and related directly to the specific objectives, tasks and schedules. The staff, materials and equipment are appropriate.

10. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used? (Yes / No) **(ISRP C IV-3)** (Proposal Form Section 10)

Specific transfer plans included in the proposal.

Step 3. Programmatic Criteria

The Resident Fish Caucus could use these programmatic criteria to evaluate projects.

11. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife-related strategies, needs and actions as identified by the resources managers (e.g. CBFWA DAIWP MYIP Section 6, Loss Assessments, Mitigation Plans, Watershed Assessments, Subbasin Plans, and the Council=s Program)? (Yes / No) (Proposal Form Section 1,7c)

The proposal addresses (including adequate technical information and references) strategic needs, critical assumptions, measurable objectives, and stated performance standards.

12. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection? (Yes / No) **(BCH C-8)** (Proposal Form Section 7a,b,c,d)

Population and habitat is in serious time frame jeopardy such that failure to act immediately will result in a significant loss.

13. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes?
(Yes / No) **(WS C 4-9)** (Proposal Form Section 7a,b,c,d)

14. Does the project promote or maintain desirable community diversity? (Yes / No) **(WS C 4-4)**
(Proposal Form Section 7a,b,c,d)

The proposed project contributes significantly and directly to species diversity and richness.

15. Provides for an important fishery that does not target or adversely affect a weak but recoverable native stock (e.g., consumption, subsistence, cultural, recreation). (Proposal Form Section 4, 7a,b,c,d)

- Target fish population provides important fishery (e.g., consumption, subsistence, cultural, recreation).

- Some of the targeted fish populations provide important fishery.
- Target fish population does not provide important fishery.

16. Does the proposal put the project into the context of other work funded in the FWP? Does it include collaborative efforts with similar projects, even if not part of an overall joint plan? If this proposal is intended as an integrated component of a set of projects, is the rationale for that set and any time sequencing explained and documented? (Yes / No) **(ISRP C III)** (Proposal Form Section 8)

Strong collaborative effort with logical allocation of effort and linkages described or a full rationale of why linkages are not appropriate.

17. Is there cost-share for the construction/implementation, and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project? (Yes / No) **(WS C 4-5)** Not requested in project summary form.

18. Is continued funding required to achieve project objectives? (Yes / No)

Appendix C.3. Project Evaluation Matrix

Subregion	Subbasin	ID	Title	Sponsor	Screen	Tech Criteria	Progm	Status
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9101901	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Plan Flathead Lake	CSKT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9101903	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation - Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	MFWP	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9101904	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Hatchery-Based Impl. of Native Fish Recovery	USFWS	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9401002	Mitigation for Excessive Drawdowns: Hungry Horse Component	MFWP, CSKT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9502500	Flathead River Instream Flow Project	MFWP	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	CSKT, MFWP	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Flathead, Kootenai	8346500	Libby and Hungry Horse Modeling Technical Analysis	MFWP	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	9401001	Mitigation for Excessive Drawdowns at Hungry Horse & Libby Reservoirs - Lib	MFWP, CSKT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	8346700	Mitigation For the Construction and Operation of Libby Dam	MFWP	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	8806400	Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies and Conservation Aquaculture	KTOI	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	8806500	Kootenai River Fisheries Investigations	IDFG	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	9404900	Improve the Kootenai River Ecosytem	KTOI	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	MFWP, CSKT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Coeur d'Alene	9004400	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities :Coeur d'Alene Reservation	CDA Tribe	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	KNRD	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	KNRD	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille, Spokane, Upper Columbia Mainstem	9700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams	KNRD	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	8503800	Colville Hatchery	CCT	Y	Y	Y	1

1-Meets all criteria; 2-Meets some (but not all) criteria; 3-Does not meet screening criteria and/or received "no"s in all 3 categories.

Subregion	Subbasin	ID	Title	Sponsor	Screen	Tech Criteria	Progm	Status
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout Habitat/Passage Improvements of Tribs. to L. Roosev	CCT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9104600	Spokane Tribal (Galbraith Springs) Hatchery O&M	STOI	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery O&M	WDFW	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9404300	Monitor, Evaluate, and Research the Lake Roosevelt Fishery	STOI	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9500900	Volunteers Rear 500,000 Net Pen Rbt Above Grand Coulee Dam	LRDA	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	CCT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Malheur	9107	North Fork Malheur River Bull Trout and Redband Trout Life History Study	BPT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Malheur	9701900	Stinkingwater Salmonid Project	BPT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Owyhee	9701100	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian Areas on the Duck Valley Res	SPT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Upper Snake	9201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	SBT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Upper Snake	9500600	Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone-Paiute Joint Culture Facility	SBT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Upper Snake	9700900	Evaluate Rebuilding the White Sturgeon Population in the Upper Snake River	NPT	Y	Y	Y	1
Lower Snake	Clearwater	8740700	Dworshak Impacts/M&E & Biological-Integrated Rule Curves	NPT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Snake	Snake	9093	Consumptive Sturgeon Fishery-Hells Canyon and Oxbow Reservoirs	NPT	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Mid-Columbia	Crab	9502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	WDFW	Y	Y	Y	1
Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes, John Day, Grande Ronde, Umatilla...	9405400	Bull Trout Genetics, Habitat Needs, L.H. Etc. in Central and N.E. Oregon	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	1
Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia	8605000	White Sturgeon Mitigation and Restoration in the Columbia and Snake Rivers	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	1

1-Meets all criteria; 2-Meets some (but not all) criteria; 3-Does not meet screening criteria and/or received "no"s in all 3 categories.

Subregion	Subbasin	ID	Title	Sponsor	Screen	Tech Criteria	Progm	Status
Lower Mid-Columbia	Wind, Little White Salmon, Klickitat	9033	Document Native Trout Populations	WT	Y	Y	Y	1
Lower Mid-Columbia	Wind, Little White Salmon, Klickitat	9095	Bull Trout Population Assessment in the Columbia River Gorge, WA	WDFW	Y	Y	Y	1
Lower Columbia	Willamette	9405300	Bull Trout Assessment - Willamette/Mckenzie	ODFW	Y	Y	Y	1
Systemwide	Systemwide	9084	Assessing Genetic Variation Among Columbia Basin White Sturgeon Populations	UI	Y	Y	Y	1
Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	9404700	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	IDFG	Y	N	Y	2
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9502700	Assess Limiting Factors of the Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Population	STOI	Y	N	Y	2
Upper Snake	Boise, Payette, Upper Snake	9106700	Idaho Water Rental: Resident Fish and Wildlife Impacts. Phase III	IDFG	Y	N	Y	2
Upper Snake	Boise, Payette, Weiser, Owyhee, Mid Snake-Powder	9800200	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	IDFG	Y	Y	N	2
Upper Snake	Owyhee	9501500	Billy Shaw Wetlands catch and release fishery O&M	SPT	Y	N	N	2
Upper Snake	Upper Snake	9020	Genetic Analysis of Native Fish on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation	SPT	Y	N	Y	2
Upper Snake	Upper Snake, Owyhee	8815600	Stocking fish in lakes and streams on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation	SPT	Y	N	N	2
Lower Snake	Clearwater	8709900	Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigation	IDFG	Y	N	Y	2
Lower Snake	Clearwater	9501300	Nez Perce Trout Ponds	NPT	Y	N	N	2
Lower Snake	Clearwater	9501600	Genetic Inventory of Westslope Cutthroat Trout, North Fork Clearwater Basin	NPT	Y	Y	N	2
Lower Snake	Snake River Drainage, Idaho	9056	Evaluate Status of White Sturgeon in the Hells Canyon Reach Snake River, ID	IDFG	Y	Y	N	2
Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia	9603201	Begin Implementation of Year 1 of the K Pool Master Plan Program	YIN	Y	N	N	2
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	9124	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber	MFWP	N	N	N	3
Upper Snake	Mid Snake	9052	Demonstrate that a Translucent Pipeline Feels Normal to Fish	Fish Passage, Inc.	N	N	N	3

1-Meets all criteria; 2-Meets some (but not all) criteria; 3-Does not meet screening criteria and/or received "no"s in all 3 categories.

Subregion	Subbasin	ID	Title	Sponsor	Screen	Tech Criteria	Progm	Status
Upper Snake	Mid Snake	9053	Kirby (Atlanta) Dam Fish Ladder	USFS, BNF	N	N	N	3
Lower Snake	Clearwater	9055	Evaluate Movement Patterns of Bull Trout in Dworshak Reservoir.	IDFG	N	N	N	3
Lower Snake	Snake, Salmon, Clearwater, Coeur d'Alene, Selway,	9048	Transfer Attributes From 1:100,000 to 1:24,000-Scale Hydrography	IDWR	N	N	N	3
Upper Mid-Columbia	Methow	9046	Identify Resident Fish and Macroinvertebrate Taxa & Function in Anad Habita	Methow Biodiversity Project	N	N	N	3
Upper Mid-Columbia	Yakima	9110	Assess Resident Fish Within Toppenish Creek and Satus Creek	YIN	N	N	Y	3
Lower Columbia	Little White Salmon	9156	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	UCD	N	Y	N	3
Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem	9079	Inventory Resident Fish Populations in Bonneville, Dalles, John Day Res.	USGS	N	N	N	3
Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem	9081	Impact of Exotic Fishes and Macrophytes on Juvenile Salmonids	USGS	N	N	N	3
Upper Columbia	Kootenai/ Flathead	9041	Enhance/Protect Imperiled Native Fish Species Through Improved Education...	MFWP	N	Y	N	3
Systemwide	Systemwide	9134	Effects of catch & release angling and exhaustive stress on white sturgeon	USGS - CRRL	N	N	N	3
Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	9103	Upper Deschutes Basin Watersehd Coordinator/Council Support 1999	DCWC	N	N	N	3
Upper Columbia	Flathead	9111	Evaluate Effects of Food Web Changes on Native Fish Restoration Strategies		N	N	N	3
Upper Columbia	Kootenai	9401200	Kootenai River Fisheries Investigation M&E Supplemental Budget	IDFG, KTOI	Shift $50,000 to #8806500, other $50,000 in #8806400			4
Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	9094	Produce Kokanee Salmon in Net Pens For Release Into Lake Roosevelt	STOI		Withdrawn by sponsor		4
Upper Snake	Upper Snake	9202406	Public Fisheries Education/Enhanced Protection of Resident/ESA Species	MFWP		Enforcement		4

1-Meets all criteria; 2-Meets some (but not all) criteria; 3-Does not meet screening criteria and/or received "no"s in all 3 categories.

Appendix C.4. Project Evaluation Summary

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
9033	1	Document Native Trout Populations	***Presentation:*** The sponsor did not give a presentation. ***Questions/Comments:*** Where will the FY 99 work be conducted? In the Pend Oreille watershed? This work is a small piece of many other ongoing projects including the Joint Stock Assessment (9700400, 9095, and 9156) Where in region are they planning to survey? This is another genetics study with $5,000 in lab costs. This seems low. The proponent will do it. Does this meet the screening requirements? It addresses a general measure of program (watershed projects). Didn=t we fund this last month for FY 98? Yes. Is Dr. Trotter integrated with WDFW basin work? WDFW has had discussions but have not started work yet. How will this work benefit fish in long run? By documenting fish presence/absence. ***Screening Criteria*****:** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes ***General Comment:*** Projects 9033, 9095, and 9156 appear to overlap and need better coordination.
9084	1	Assess Genetic Variation among Columbia Basin White Sturgeon Populations	***Presentation:*** The goal is to provide information to develop and implement future management actions for sturgeon. Sturgeon life history used to allow gene flow. Hydro development has restricted the gene flow and the reproductive genes have been compromised. What do we conserve? Where do we conserve? What is population? Is the Columbia Basin one gene pool? The objective of the study is to compare inter- and intra population variation by looking at mitochondrial sequencing and nuclear genetic variation. This is the first comprehensive study. We have received over 60 samples from a variety of locations. ***Questions/Answers:***

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Task 1b in project 8605000 seems to address this for $40,000, your budget is $100,000. Response: The $40,000 in 8605000 is for lab work. If this project (9084) is funded 8605000 won=t use the $40,000. The scope of this project is bigger geographically and scientifically. All four sturgeon projects have a genetic component. It seems like we are paying for this twice. Response: All of the sponsors recognized the need and do not intend to duplicate each other. This is a comprehensive project. How much money goes into genetics? BPA could open their own lab cheaper. Is the technology to the point that if we do this study will it resolve the question or will we need more work? *Answer:* Yes. The life histories for salmon are opposite from sturgeon. Sturgeon are more simple than salmon. Getting baseline information before the opportunity is lost will lead to a more controlled approach to sturgeon. This information can identify issues related to transferring and stocking. Is there cost sharing? *Answer:* National Science Foundation money (since 1987) runs out this summer and probably won't be renewed. In Objective 2, are 10 individuals considered random samples? *Answer:* They would be. We want minimum 60 samples from each location. And a 95% statistical confidence for 5% of the individuals. This is the last key piece of information needed to move toward restoration and supplementation. ***Screening Criteria***: Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes. This project duplicates ongoing work. Redirect funds from the 4 sturgeon proposals (8605000, 9502700, 9056, 9700900) to this project. Project 8605000 agreed to reduce its genetic component if this project gets funded. ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes
9093	1	Consumptive Sturgeon Fishery-Hells Canyon and Oxbow Reservoirs	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to provide a consumptive sturgeon fishery above the free flowing section of the Snake River by augmenting fish in areas where there is no natural reproduction. Sturgeon in Hells Canyon and Oxbow pools are isolated from other populations. Catch-and-release fisheries are not consistent with the Nez Perce Tribe's goals. This project is consistent with the MYIP and has been on the books since 1994-95 but has not been high enough on the priority list. ***Questions/Answers:*** Does the project result in a future need for new or upgraded facility? *Answer:* In the beginning we want to use an existing facility for early rearing. It could be cost-effective to purchase fish from the College of Idaho. Another

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			alternative is to use trawl-and -haul from other areas as part of a put-grow-take operation. This would be one of the few opportunities to harvest sturgeon. The objective is 250 sturgeon per pool for $250,000. It looks like $50,000 per fish. Response: The costs include follow-up investigations and monitoring and evaluation. If 90cm is the minimum catch-size and they grow at 6 cm /year, what is release size of the fish? *Answer:* It depends on where we obtain the fish, we are interested in multiple year-classes. We did an equilibrium release model to determine what to stock annually. Are there currently sturgeon in the reservoir? *Answer:* Not to my knowledge - unless they are remnants left from before the area was blocked. Would habitat rehabilitation be more cost-effective than stocking hatchery fish? *Answer:* The spawning habitat is just not there. Can you use the existing stock for brood stock? Probably, if we can catch them. Who owns and operates the reservoirs? *Answer:* Idaho Power (IPC). What is the risk of introducing diseases (viruses) which could spread to downstream self-reproducing stocks? *Answer:* Viruses have been isolated from wild juveniles. Pathogens are in the system already and were not created in the hatcheries. If the NPT and IDFG have different goals (e.g. catch-and-release versus consumptive harvest), how do you work that out? *Answer:* We have not had negative feedback. We will be happy to work with the other co-managers (i.e. IDFG and ODFW). Can IPC pick up funding? *Answer:* I don=t know, we haven't asked and it is not on the books. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes ***General Comments:*** The project proponent needs to coordinate with ODFW and WDFW. Pursue cost share with IPC/ FERC.
9095	1	Bull Trout Population	***Presentation:*** This project addresses Council measure 10.5A.6 and considers how stocks relate to each other. In addition to conducting a low- level presence/absence assessment, it will look at limiting factors and develop recovery

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Assessment in the Columbia River Gorge	methods. We don't know much about bull trout in this area. Adult bull trout have been observed below Condit Dam and in the headwaters of the Klickitat. ***Questions/Answers:*** Are you using the information from the Forest Service research in Lewis drainage? *Answer:* Yes. What is WDFW doing internally to prioritize bull trout work? *Answer:* We have completed stock assessments and the status of 75% of the stock is unknown. We are developing spawning abundance studies and taking genetic samples. We are moving up the Columbia River now and are pursuing activities to fund project across the state. What about the genetics work? *Answer:* There is nothing in this budget to cover it. We are hoping to do it in-house. This information is needed. How can it best be accomplished? *Answer:* We are working with ODFW and YIN. How will the genetics work change management practices? *Answer:* As we identify isolated populations we can see where connectivity can be restored. The broader scope is the relationship with dolly varden and where they occur together. This will help us deal with the Endangered Species Act. Re-introductions are also important. Is Condit Dam a fish barrier? *Answer:* Yes. Do anadromous fish have access to the Klickitat? Yes. How do you coordinate with project 9033? *Answer:* That group is focusing on the Yakima basin and we need to coordinate with them. According to the proposal, the population above Condit is distinct. Would this area be a priority? How would removing the dam change the project focus? *Answer:* There are too many unknowns to act yet. Explain the hydro impact to bull trout in the Klickitat. Response: 1992 work shows historic and current distribution. Bull trout used to be in the mainstem Columbia River but the dams have fragmented the populations. What about the life history patterns? Are the mainstem pools their "ocean"? *Answer:* We don=t know. That is part of what we want to find out. ***Screening Criteria*:** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Programmatic Criteria: Yes ***General Comment:*** This project needs to coordinate with 9033, 9156, and 9095 to reduce costs.
9107	1	North Fork Malheur River Bull Trout and Redband Trout Life History Study	***Presentation:*** We propose working on North Fork of the Malheur River because there is pure strain of bull trout. This is a separate project which complements our Stinkingwater Project. Bull trout are likely to be listed in June so we need data on which to base a Recovery Plan. Brook trout are a problem – they are the same size as bull trout and there is no easy way to tell them apart. This study will let us compare the genetics of the North and Middle Fork systems. Both rivers are dammed so the species do not intermix. There are redband trout in both systems so we should do the studies simultaneously. We plan to radio–tag 30 fish and send the samples to Montana State University for analysis. The costs of this project are shared with several agencies including (USFWS, BLM,) The Burns Paiute Tribe contributes 24% of the project. The goal is to get baseline data on the status of the population and then develop and implement a recovery plan. ***Questions/Answers:*** Does this project address both redband and bull trout? What objectives deal with redband trout? *Answer:* This project looks at bull trout first and then will look at redband trout. The Stinkingwater project focuses more on redbands. We are doing genetic samples of both species. What is the impact if these studies were not conducted simultaneously? *Answer:* There would be a delay and we wouldn't have the information necessary for the recovery plan (which needs the data). The Forest Service would have to do it. Explain the costs. *Answer:* The $34,000 cost is divided into 3 years. The costs drop in the future because we save money by combining the projects. The cost share agreement was put in the first year budget. Is the money expended up front or over time? *Answer:* Over time ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes. Sponsor indicated possible budget adjustments. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes. This project needs better coordination with project 9701900
8346500	1	Libby and Hungry Horse Modeling Technical Analysis	***Presentation:*** This is listed as a separate project to make a point, but the objectives and $20,000 budget could be included in the Libby or Hungry Horse mitigation projects (8346700 and 9101903). Under this project, the sponsor has created modular Windows versions of the models (for dam operators or anyone else) and in the future will develop optimization models which link to the Libby IFIM model (9502500). The models are used in the decision making process and help resolve conflicts when they arise. The project is based on kokanee and cutthroat trout and has also developed a tiered flow approach for white sturgeon. Although cutthroat trout can not be linked to bull trout we can

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			look at lower trophic levels and infer relationships. It is difficult to do population modeling for bull trout and other species in large reservoirs. Some FY 98 carryover is expected. ***Questions/Answers**:* How are models open-ended enough to link to other models? *Answer:* The models are not physically linked but will be linked via the optimization model for the river and reservoir models. ***Screening Criteria**:* Yes ***Technical Criteria**:* Yes. The objectives of this project will be moved into Projects 8346700 and 9101903 in FY99 ***Programmatic Criteria**: Yes*
8346700	1	Mitigation for the Construction and Operation of Libby Dam	***Presentation:*** This project is the primary Kootenai mitigation project and is in transition from finishing the IFIM (9502500) to implementing mitigation. The public review process is complete and the plan now goes to the Council. This project will replace the excessive drawdown project (9401001) if the IRCs are implemented. Construction of Libby Dam caused the initial impacts but the operations continue to cause impacts. Until the IRCs are implemented, damage from excessive drawdowns will be covered under project 9401001. ***Questions/Answers***: Is this a watershed project? *Answer:* Yes, it is driven by the watershed coordinator but that project does not provide money for on-the-ground projects in other areas. The Libby Mitigation Plan equals the Libby Watershed Plan. Would it be more cost effective to have one group do all of the sturgeon work? *Answer:* Not really because they share equipment. Work on the ESA sturgeon is non-discretionary. Most of the work is done in Idaho, however Montana does some population estimates. ***Screening Criteria**:* Yes ***Technical Criteria**:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria**:* Yes
8503800	1	Colville Hatchery	***Presentation:*** This project provides resident fish substitution for anadromous fish losses caused by Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams. The objective of the hatchery is to produce rainbow trout (4 stocks), brook trout, and Lahontan trout to sustain a tribal subsistence and recreational fishery. BPA has a 25-year obligation to fund 100% of the hatchery operation and maintenance. Livestock, timber and power production depleted the native species and had a dramatic impact on the tribes. The reservation now has 2 native stocks remaining; 1) an adfluvial rainbow trout stock in the San Poil River; and 2) a kokanee stock that is a derivative of sockeye. The hatchery doesn=t stock hatchery fish on top of native fish.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Questions/Answers: Do brook trout get into Lake Roosevelt? *Answer:* Brook trout are not native to the area and have been on the reservation since 1913. They could get into Lake Roosevelt but the habitat isn=t suitable and there are no known bull trout in the reservoir. Are westslope cutthroat trout native? *Answer:* Yes. We are stocking Lahotan cutthroat trout in one highly alkaline lake. The catch-per-unit-effort goals seem high. Are you achieving them? *Answer:* No – except for a few months. They may need to be re-evaluated. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
8740700	1	Dworshak Impacts M&E & Biological-Integrated Rule Curves	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to maintain a productive healthy reservoir while serving the flood control, power production and flow augmentation needs. We are following Montana's lead on the rule curves and hope the Dworshak IRCs are implemented upon Council approval. The Tribes objectives are consistent with Idaho's objectives for Dworshak. ***Questions/Answers:*** When will the rule curves be done? *Answer:* We hope to submit them to the Council in 2000. Do they include power? *Answer:* We started with biological curves and will work toward integrated rule curves. Will you consider the biological opinion? *Answer:* We do look at it. The steelhead report just came out. We don't expect the Recovery Plan to hit the street before the IRCs are released. What is the best-use practice at Dworshak? *Answer:* We have populations of native endangered chinook spawning below Dworshak. We have to consider the needs of the whole system -- resident fish and spawning, rearing, and passage for anadromous fish. What is the budget ($175,000 to $250,000) increase for? *Answer:* The increase will cover modeling work and sub-contractors. We are coordinating with Brian Marotz to share data from the templates. The budget increase in 2001 is to finalize the modeling, but we may not need it.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Densities in the drawdown zones look similar to Hungry Horse. Can money be saved there? Does the model include a thermodynamics unit to look at downstream temperature and temperature modifications? *Answer:* Yes. An instream flow study of the Clearwater River below Dworshak showed different scenarios. Temperature is an important factor. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: *Yes*
8806400	1	Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies and Conservation Aquaculture	***Presentation:*** This project started in 1991 when the co-managers recognized that there was a water quality problem and that there had been no natural recruitment. Could sturgeon reproduce? Sturgeon were listed as Endangered in 1994 and recovery efforts are guided by the White Sturgeon Recovery Team (BC ministry of Environment, MT, ID, KTOI, FWS, etc). The hatchery=s short term goal is to prevent extinction and it is implementing the Kincaid Breeding Plan included in the Recovery Plan. The project has 3 objectives: 1) conservation aquaculture -release hatchery reared juvenile sturgeon back into the Kootenai River; 2) provide a facility for research, including timing of the development of embryos and contaminates in eggs; and 3) kokanee enhancement efforts - including reintroducing kokanee into the system. The hatchery has 2 phases: 1) the current hatchery upgrades and a test well for the counter current exchange system; and 2) an alternate rearing site. The FY 99 budget includes the funds necessary to begin the Council's 3-step process for the alternative rearing site. ***Questions/Answers:*** The sturgeon broodstocks are very valuable, and kokanee are known to harbor diseases. Why are you raising kokanee next to sturgeon? *Answer:* Kokanee do spread disease. We began raising kokanee this year because of the loss of the entire sturgeon 1997 year class. In the future we will not raise kokanee in the sturgeon hatchery but will instead use streamside incubators. The kokanee work could be done under the ecosystem project. Concern: The capital costs in 1999 and the future will come from the Resident Fish budget. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes. The kokanee work is inappropriate. Sponsor agreed to move the kokanee work (Objective 4) to the Ecosystem Project (9404900). ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes
8806500	1	Kootenai River Fisheries	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to restore fisheries (especially white sturgeon, trout, burbot, and whitefish) to self-sustaining population levels. Libby Dam reversed the hydrograph, raised the winter water temperatures, and created

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Investigations	a nutrient sink in Lake Koocanusa. The tropic structure of the Kootenai River community changed after the construction of Libby Dam. Double peaks caused by flow augmentation add an unnatural variable which IDFG would like to avoid. IDFG monitors sturgeon test flows and ESA-listed white sturgeon spawning and collects eggs and juveniles. Burbot are weak swimmers that a species of special concern in the Kootenai system, and are on the verge of demographic extinction. Winter flows for hydropower and flood control (4 to 5 times higher than historic levels) have altered burbot spawning habits. Rainbow trout are the most popular sport fish and catches are lower than historic levels. Spawning occurs in the tributaries and IDFG was unable to find spawning in the mainstem. Rainbow trout are not stocked in the Kootenai River in Idaho. All of the pieces of the Kootenai River package fit together -- the white sturgeon hatchery (8806400), the ecosystem improvement study (9404900) and the fishery investigations (8806500). This project and its companions work closely with Canada to study and manage transboundry stocks. ***Screening Criteria**:* Yes ***Technical Criteria**:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria**:* Yes
9001800	1	Evaluate Rainbow Trout Habitat/Passage Improvements of Tributaris to Lake Roosevelt	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to provide a subsistence and recreational fishery through natural production of native rainbow trout in the San Poil River. The initial phases of the project focused on habitat improvements (instream structures, large woody debris, fencing and channel restoration) in 5 tributaries. The habitat work has been completed and the project has 2 more years of monitoring (population sampling and adult returns). ***Questions/Answers***: Is this an adequate length of time to monitor the effectiveness of the project? *Answer:* No. Can other hatchery rainbow trout stocked in Lake Roosevelt go up the San Poil River? What prevents the hatchery fish from straying? *Answer:* Yes, hatchery rainbows can go up the San Poil, but we have never caught one in our weirs. We identify hatchery fish by fin condition and FLOY tags. ***Screening Criteria**:* Yes ***Technical Criteria**:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria**:* Yes General Comment: There is some concern about how hatchery rainbow trout will impact wild rainbow trout.
9004400	1	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities -	***Presentation:*** This project began in 1992 with a baseline study. In 1995 the Council approved the recommendations from the baseline study and in 1996 implementation got underway. The project has 5 parts: 1) restoration in 4 watersheds; 2) education and outreach; 3) monitoring and evaluation; 4) supplementation; and 5) interim harvest

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Coeur d=Alene Reservation	opportunities. Funds for construction of the hatchery are included in the 99 budget so that the tribe won=t have to come back for more money when the NEPA/Master Plan/ 3-Step processes are complete. BPA may have to go to Congress to get approval. The Tribe is also doing work on Benewah, Alder and Evans creeks. ***Questions/Answers:*** Concern: The capital expenditure for the hatchery should come out of the capital budget. What percent is the hatchery cost versus the trout pond construction? *Answer:* It will take $50,000 - $100,000 to build and maintain each pond. The trout for the ponds have been donated by another hatchery. How much supplementation is needed? *Answer:* That will be covered in the master plan. What does the personnel budget cover? *Answer:* The $274,000 covers project supervisors, technicians and biologists. Is there money in this proposal for the Lake Creek Project. *Answer:* No. Lake Creek is a priority watershed and the purchase will be completed by the end of this year. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9101901	1	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Plan- Flathead Lake	***Presentation:*** This project began in 1992 and is the lake monitoring component of the Hungry Horse Mitigation Plan. It monitors community structure, biological responses and bioenergetics (*mysis* shrimp - lake trout - whitefish) in Flathead Lake (but not the tributaries). Indirect costs are 13.2%. This is a collaborative effort and activities (e.g. Dayton Creek) are coordinated with the ongoing watershed project (9608701). ***Questions/Answers****:* ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9101903	1	Hungry Horse Dam Mitigation - Watershed	***Presentation:*** This project began in 1992 as a result of a 1991 NPPC amendment adopting the Hungry Horse Mitigation Plan. The Hungry Horse system supports the last intact native species assemblage and the strongest meta-population of bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout. The project is currently operating on FY 97 dollars and will begin using FY 98

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Restoration and Monitoring	funds ($380,000) in July 1998. The Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG) asked what new work would be conducted in FY99 as a result of the work completed in FY 98. Answer: The sponsor has many on-the-ground activities going forward at the same time but each is on a different schedule, some projects lag (in permitting etc.) while other progress quickly. Having many projects in the que ensures that some are completed each year. This project meets the screening criteria in that it is based on an approved loss assessment and Mitigation Plan and focuses on native species. In terms of information transfer, a Libby and Hungry Horse web site will be the central repository for information . There will also be the Annual Reports, peer-reviewed Project Reports (based on monitoring data), model results, and presentations at professional meetings. The data should also be fed into StreamNet. In addition, this information will be used in the System Operation Request process. Cost-sharing includes contributions from the BOR, USFWS, MDFWP, MSU and U of M. ***Questions/Answers:*** ***Screening Criteria**:* Yes ***Technical Criteria**:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria**:* Yes
9101904	1	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Hatchery Based Implementation of Native Fish Recovery	***Presentation:*** The project is somewhat open-ended for FY99 as it transitions from producing kokanee for Flathead Lake to a native species orientation. The project now produces fish for off-site recreational uses (does not stock fish in Flathead Lake) and includes native species restoration in the drainage. A large part of the project will be operating Sekokini Springs, a private trout farm currently being purchased by MDFWP. Sekokini Springs used to produce rainbow trout which leaked into Flathead Lake. Ojbective 1: Stop rainbow trout production, raise native cutthrroat trout instead and reconnect ponds to recreate native habitat. Objective 2: Conduct research aimed at providing better information about raising bull trout in hatcheries. The hatchery currently has 200 4-year olds and produced about 100,000 eggs. These fish came from 3 adult females and cannot be used for stocking. It looks like bull trout might be susceptible to dioxin. Objective 3: Produce rainbow trout for stocking on the Salish-Kootenai Reservation (70,000 fish in 3 reservoirs). Objective 4: Complete the kokanee test - no more fish will be stocked but the evaluation needs to be completed next fall when the fish return. The FY 99 project budget should be reduced by $95,000 to $389,400. The Sekokini Springs project produces cutthroat trout, half of which are used for stocking to augment angling opportunities and half of which go into the ponds. One goal is to build a pure Flathead westslope cutthroat stock which will then be used to stock upper tributaries and headwater lakes. There are no native rainbow trout in the Flathead system and rainbow trout are still stocked in irrigation reservoirs to create fishing opportunities. There is no overlap between these two stocking programs. The project also includes some bass work. ***Questions/Answers:***

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Will you plant the bull trout? *Answer:* No. They are strictly for research to help with bull trout production in the future. The object is to learn as much as possible now while there is still time. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9104600	1	Spokane Tribal (Galbraith Springs) Hatchery O&M	***Presentation:*** The Spokane Tribal hatchery is part of a collaborative effort to restore and enhance Lake Roosevelt. The hatchery arose from a 1987 Council amendment and was built in 1991 by BPA. Grand Coulee Dam completely blocked anadromous fish passage and caused an 80% loss of habitat suitable for salmonids. A feasibility report concluded that fish populations in Lake Roosevelt were not large enough to sustain anything other than a seasonal fishery and recommended large- scale hatcheries to supply rainbow trout and kokanee to the lake and tributaries. The hatchery production goals (13.5 million kokanee fry and 500,000 rainbow trout) were developed before the hatchery was on line and were based on assumptions that weren't accurate. The lake has warmer water and a lower volume than originally planned. The hatchery oversight team has lowered the 1999 production goals to 500,000 kokanee yearlings (255,000 of which go to Sherman Creek), 960,000 kokanee fingerlings, and 530,000 rainbow trout. Production is now double what it was designed for. There is some cost sharing involved with trapping in the tributaries. ***Questions/Answers:*** Are the fish transferred to the net pens? *Answer:* The kokanee produced here go to an existing net pen program which we are using to indicate the success with kokanee. We had a surplus of kokanee and decided to rear them in net pens. These fish do not go into the kokanee net pen project 9094. Explain the $83,000 in utility costs? *Answer:* We put in a new well and run two 50 hp pumps. Comment: There are three facilities putting fish in Lake Roosevelt. It seems like a lot of fish. *Answer:* We coordinate activities. Are you going to blacktop roads? *Answer:* This year the road will be improved. What is the output into Lake Roosevelt? *Answer:* The hatchery is monitored and evaluated by the Lake Roosevelt Monitoring Program (9404300). ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Programmatic Criteria*:* Yes
9104700	1	Sherman Creek Hatchery O&M	***Presentation:*** This is a resident fish substitution program. The hatchery was built in 1992 by BPA, is 100% devoted to mitigation and works cooperatively with the Spokane Hatchery (9104600) and the Colville Hatchery (8503800). The goal is to enhance recreational and subsistence fisheries in Lake Roosevelt. The collective management (through the Lake Roosevelt Hatchery Coordination Team) is unique and annual production goals are agreed to by the participants (STOI, CCT, WDFW). Lake Roosevelt is a very big lake. The hatchery residence needs an upgrade. ***Questions/Answers:*** On the new residence, can we pay for this with money left over rather than earmarking it? Can you roll over FY 98 money if there is some left over? *Answer:* We may need more buildings added to site, the mobile home is not working well. Timing may also be a problem (i.e. using the engineering staff without knowing if money is available). We would like to build this in 1999. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria*****:** Yes: Suggest that sponsor omit costs of $150,000 for the purchase of the house for now -pending the availability of funds. This should be discussed during the budgeting process. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes. Purchase the residence with FY 98 unexpended dollars, reduce the FY 99 project request accordingly.
9401001	1	Mitigation for Excessive Drawdowns at Hungry Horse & Libby Reservoirs - Libby Component	***Presentation:*** This is the other half of the excessive drawdown project (see 9401002) and has a sunset date. The mitigation biologist is streamlining the project and reducing the number of people required. It is very efficient because the same person works on Libby Mitigation, the Kootenai Focus Watershed and this project. The FY 99 budget can be reduced by $100,000 to $374,405. Loss statements are complete and have been submitted but the Libby Mitigation Plan has not been adopted yet. The goal is to develop pilot projects to look at the cost-effectiveness of different strategies. Our mitigation biologist finds the sites, handles the permitting etc., gets the landowners on board, and sets up the contracts, site plans and habitat work. Projects are currently being conducted on Grave, Sinclair and Therriault creeks. There are also some flood control issues. ***Questions/Answers:*** Will the implementation projects be monitored? *Answer:* Yes. The Libby Mitigation project will cover monitoring because this project sunsets. Are the cutthroat trout objectives appropriate given that recovery efforts over the last 20 years have failed and that kokanee have been established? *Answer:* Cutthroat trout are still a native species and are still in the headwaters. There was hybridization in the tributaries. The objectives are habitat based and will benefit fluvial and adfluvial fish even if

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			cutthroat trout don=t recover. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** *Yes.* Same overall comments as Project 9401002.
9401002	1	Mitigation for Excessive Drawdowns: Hungry Horse Component	***Presentation:*** The maximum drawdown at Hungry Horse is 88 feet, however drafts of 107, 173, and 188 feet occurred recently. Under the Council's Program, BPA must provide mitigation for excessive drawdown. For the last four years, this project has been funded by BPA from Power Supply. In FY 99, BPA moved it into the Direct Program. The IRC=s have not yet been implemented, but they will supercede the drawdown limits. Among other things, the project monitors predator / prey interactions and the use of selective withdrawl to control water temperatures. Monitoring shows that spawning redds have increased by 16%. ***Questions/ Answers****:* What are the benefits of radio-tagging versus mass-marking? *Answer:* The bull trout and cutthroat trout don=t have to be handled. To follow the radio-tagged fish, there are two ground stations on the river which cross-check the aerial flights. Using radio-tags saves time and provides more information about life history. There is some concern about BPA=s shift in funding responsibility and the Council should be made aware of it. The AOperations≅ budget under the MOA is not being expended to the full extent. How much of the deep drawdown is for flood control versus power production? *Answer:* We run the reservoir models, taking inflow into account and then Acharge≅ only for drawdown below the flood control draft point. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes
9404300	1	Monitor, Evaluate, and Research the Lake Roosevelt Fishery	***Presentation:*** The Lake Roosevelt monitoring Program (goal: pre-assessment prior to hatchery construction) started in 1988 and merged with the Lake Roosevelt Data Collection Program (goal: collect data for the Corps System Operation Review) in 1994. Lake Roosevelt provides water, pass-through of flow augmentation from Montana, power, and irrigation. There are lots of “reservoir interests (users)”. Resident fish interests usually take a back seat. There is not much data on the reservoir and this project attempts to monitor the ecology of the lake. The project includes hydroacoustics, walleye population estimates, kokanee returns, hatchery release evaluations, net pen studies, water quality studies, phytoplankton studies, and bioenergetics models. Lake Roosevelt acts more like a big river than a lake

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			and there is a large range in water retention times. Water is an appropriate species to manage in this lake. ***Questions/Answers:*** What is the $780,000 in sub-contractors for? *Answer:* WDFW - $350,000 for a creel survey, hydoacoustics, and empirical sampling methods (trawling, netting); Al Scholz -$100,000 for estimates of walleye populations and kokanee returns; Dr. Black - $100,000 for *in situ* (corral study) of zooplankton; Colville Tribe - $350,000-$500,000 for a net pen study, bathymetric maps, habitat survey and benthic studies; Spokane Tribe -$100,000 for water quality studies; ESU - $12,000 for phytoplankton and peripphyton studies; and WSU - $33,000 for primary productivity studies. We are still negotiating with the BOR about who should do the bathymetric work. We are having a problem getting the work done but money is not the issue. The bathymetric map overlays the habitat map. Is there any cost-sharing? *Answer:* No, unless it comes from the BOR Is this project totally up-and-running? *Answer:* Yes. In FY 97 the co-managers decided on 17 month contract instead of a 12month contract. Budget increases in 1998 are for equipment purchase. In FY99 the higher funding level will cover sampling intensity. The budget will then tail off. We don=t know yet how much we will have to do. We are currently doing land-based creel surveys and it takes a lot of time to drive around the reservoir. This year we would like to see if boat-based creel surveys will provide better information. One limitation might be a loss of information. The biological components for model and the SOR process narrow what you can actually control. Can you streamline the model and just use information since 1988? *Answer:* There are further complications – a fertilizer plant that previously dumped nutrients into the system is no longer there. The study has to continue. There is no agreement in the region on what Lake Roosevelt is for. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes **Constructive Criticism:** The project could be completed for less money. Consider a stratified creel survey that doesn=t have to be done once a year.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
9404900	1	Improve the Kootenai River Ecosystem	***Presentation:*** This project arose from a 1995 Council amendment calling for a 5-year study. At that time, there were holes in the data on the Kootenai River system downstream from Montana. The first year of the study looked at invertebrates and developed a biological baseline. More work is still needed on game and non-game assessments. In addition to monitoring water quality on monthly basis, there is some habitat assessment on the west side tributaries and IDFG conducts the contaminant analyses. This project includes the mainstem Kootenai River as well as the tributaries and is linked to the Kootenai River Network. Other activities include conducting a workshop, compiling data for management use, and developing a model. ***Questions/Answers:*** One third of the budget is for indirect costs? *Answer:* KTOI indirect rates are 56% of the personnel costs only. Indirects are not applied to implementation actions (on-the-ground work). The Attorney General sets indirect rates for tribes for government contracts. You are in the fourth year of a five-year project, why does the budget run through 2003? *Answer:* The outyear budgets beyond the end of the 5-year study covers implementation of the recommendations developed during the study. Are other projects collecting similar information? Is there duplication? *Answer:* There is no overlap, the contaminant studies are coordinated with IDFG. This project also coordinates and cost-shares with IDFG on other work in the basin including population estimates/ radio implants. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes ***General comment:*** Mainstem work duplicates ongoing sampling.
9405400	1	Bull Trout Genetics, Habitat Needs, Life History etc in Central and NE Oregon	***Presentation:*** The goal of this cooperative project between ODFW, the Warm Springs Tribe and the Forest Service is to protect and restore bull trout. Over harvest may be a factor. The plan is to complete the project in 2001. So far, we have sampled 46 populations for nuclear DNA analysis; looked at historic and current distribution and status; conducted a distribution and habitat survey of bull trout-brook trout hybrids; collected bull trout spawning data in three watersheds to establish guidelines for determining abundance; radio-tagged bull trout to determine movement; determined the relationship between fish size and injuries caused by electrofishing; looked a macro invertebrates in two streams in different subbasins; looked at foraging behaviors; and collected temperature data on two streams. ***Questions/Answers:***

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			How many bull trout will you tag? What percent of the population? *Answer:* 15-20 of adults in 3 streams. A total of 50 over several years. There is a concern about tagging potentially spawning fish? *Response:* There is low mortality associated with tagging. It doesn=t seem to adversely affect spawning. We are seeing a lot of movement. We are tagging fewer adults in Mill Creek because of the smaller population Have you completed the first two objectives? *Answer:* We have completed the genetics work but we may revisit the 1997 Spruell and Allendorf work. Objective 2 is ongoing. The radio-tag work will continue but the historic and current distribution studies are complete. The migratory work will continue into 2000. For objective 5 (sympatry work, invertebrate survey), how does the continuing work build on the title in bibliography? *Answer:* This is ongoing work and we have a graduate student working on the reporting. This project has a sunset date of 2001. How will the scope and/or budget change if bull trout are listed? *Answer:* A listing shouldn=t affect our ability to do the work. A steering committee keeps up with listing decisions and feedback from the Fish and Wildlife Service suggests a listing shouldn=t be a problem. If additional work is needed, we would write a new proposal. How has the funding been distributed from 94 to the present? *Answer:* This is a cooperative project and the distribution changes with the level of funding. In the early years it was mostly Oregon, now Tribal money is used on their lands. The USFS work is sub-contracted. Is this an anadromous fish project? *Answer:* No, bull trout are resident fish. There are still some trout in the Hood River basin. In shared watersheds bull trout are nuisance predators of salmon and steelhead. *Response:* Our approach is ecological. Bull trout spawn and rear above salmon and steelhead runs, are an upper-level predator, and indicate the health of the system. Mill Creek is tributary to the Walla Walla. What do you do to coordinate activities with WDFW? *Answer:* We work closely with WDFW and the USFS since the upper portion of Mill Creek is on USFS land. ***Screening Criteria*:** Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Programmatic Criteria: Yes. There is a lack of technical coordination with CTUIR. ***General Comment:*** More passive methods should be used to gain information without disturbing populations. Comprehensive projects like this should be encouraged in program.
9500100	1	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	***Presentation:*** This is a 4-part project which includes habitat restoration (for bull trout, cutthroat trout and bass) and bass supplementation. The tribe has conducted baseline assessments looking at habitat quality and quantity in 7 tributaries. A micro assessment was conducted on each reach and stream. Recommendations have been developed from the baseline studies and the streams in the poorest condition were selected for enhancement. The recommendations have been submitted to the land owners and managers. Suggested enhancement measures include cattle management, fencing and planting. Each enhancement activity will be monitored and evaluated for 3 years. The most effective enhancement actions will then be applied to other tributaries. At this time, there is not a substantial bull trout population. If a bull trout stream is found, it will be enhanced. There is little winter cover for large mouth bass in the Pend Oreille River and survival rates are declining. This project provides artificial cover in sloughs. A low cost bass hatchery was completed in October 1997, and production should begin in 1998. ***Questions/Answers****:* Is there any cost share? *Answer:* Yes, many groups contribute. Explain how bass supplementation does not conflict with bull trout in the tributaries? *Answer:* Warm water fish don=t conflict with others. Box Canyon pool has a uniform temperature and does not stratify. The habitat is unusable by salmonids (there are very few brook trout). Are there long-term agreements with the landowners? *Answer:* There are no formalized agreements but the landowners are working through the Box Canyon Watershed project and have a seat at the table. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes
9500600	1	Shoshone -Bannock/ Shoshone - Paiute Joint Culture Facility	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to produce native Yellowstone cutthroat trout, redband trout and rainbow trout. The first two phases have been completed and the project has been issued a FONSI through the NEPA process. The project is currently in Step 2 of the Council's 3-step process. The Tribe has signed an option to purchase the property on May 3, 1998. Construction should be completed in 1998. The 1999 budget covers start-up, maintenance, personnel, etc. ***Questions/Answers:*** Have you secured the construction money? *Answer:* Yes, $1.7 million was allocated in 1995 and has been carried

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			forward. Where will the fish be stocked? *Answer:* For now, the project will supply fish for the reservations but after the project passes the second NEPA review, we would like to supply fish to other areas. What does the $61,000 star-up money cover? *Answer:* It will be used to purchase of hatchery equipment, nets, buckets, etc. It may be high. You are planning to replace native broodstock with wild gametes at 20-30% per year. Is this more than you need? *Answer:* We came up with that number from the literature. We want to maintain the integrity of these fish. Do you need to develop a broodstock management plan as well? In the first phase we will raise rainbow trout and do an inventory of the reservation. Would you stock hatchery fish on top of wild native stock? No, our main plan is to stock rainbow trout on the reservation, we will only re-introduce fish where there are no pure Yellowstone cutthroat trout. ***Screening Criteria*:** Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes . What is the link between the two tribes? Criteria 11 isn=t adequately addressed. ***General Comment:*** Exercise caution with pure wild stocks. Will costs for 9501500 and 8815600 decrease?
9500900	1	Volunteers Rear 500,000 Net Pen Rbt Above Grand Coulee Dam	***Presentation:*** This project is truly a grassroots volunteer effort that has grown in size. We have 51 volunteers (average age 70) who work with CCT, ST and WDFW. The volunteers build and maintain 43 rainbow trout net pens spread over a 96-mile area. We also have 6 kokanee net pens at Kettle Falls. BPA provides funding for coordination. The goal is to produce 500,000 rainbow trout in pens to increase the target harvest to 190,000 fish. Last year's 82 foot drawdown caused a problem for the fish: we were constantly moving and re-anchoring ***Questions/Answers:*** What is the catch rate? *Answer:* In 1997 it was 100,000 –200,000 out of a 500,000 release. We met the objective of 180,000 fish harvested. Can net pen rainbows be increasing fishing pressure on wild (San Poil) stocks by drawing fishermen to lake? *Answer:* The native population is limited to the San Poil River and is protected by fishing regulations. The net pen trout do not go up the San Poil River. Can you mobilize the volunteers to build net pens for kokanee? *Answer:* We could use the volunteers if the kokanee

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			were localized in larger pens. But there are regulations about how many fish the pens can hold. The 9 existing net pens are very spread out now. The nutrients from the net pens would add to system. ***Screening Criteria***: Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes
9501100	1	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	***Presentation:*** This is a substitution project for the blocked area. Kokanee are unique, indigenous derivative of the sockeye present prior to Grand Coulee Dam. The goal is to enhance a self-sustaining kokanee stock for tribal fishing and recreational use. Hatchery kokanee have been stocked in Lake Roosevelt since the 1940s. Natural kokanee production has been documented in 8 different tributaries. Adult returns to those tributaries have decreased and in some places completely stopped. The San Poil kokanee run is unique from other known kokanee stocks. The objective of this project is to determine the current population status, genetic analysis, and limiting factors (including entrainment) in order to develop enhancement measures. It appears that there is lots of good quality habitat and entrainment is the problem. ***Questions/Answers:*** What type of enhancement measures might be recommended? *Answer:* We want to identify what the limiting factors are, where they are, and how to deal with the entrainment issue. This is a lot of money for biosonics. Do you need monitor every penstock for 4 years? *Answer:* We are not monitoring every pen stock. We have 11 transducers (mounted on the roof of the turbine intakes) spread over 3 power houses. We must monitor every year because of the high variations in flow. We can't show a trend unless we know. We would like Bonneville, the Corps and the BOR to acknowledge that entrainment is a problem and then try to fix it. They want proof. The number of fish that go through the project is huge. What about the rate of entrainment, can it be correlated to anything? *Answer:* It is difficult to correlate it to draft level or flow. High entrainment rates seem to come within weeks of net pen releases. We have a distinct natural stock and we are stocking millions of hatchery fish on top of them. It is hard to believe that there is no straying or impact. *Response:* Harvest regulations and weirs minimize the impact. Very few hatchery fish show up at the wiers. Are you experimenting with light and sound? *Answer:* Not yet. It is difficult to determining species composition now. This is a deep, wide area and our gill net sampling areas are limited. We do not have good data now.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Screening Criteria: Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes. Look at paring down sub-contractors costs. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes
9502500	1	Flathead River Instream Flow Project	***Presentation:*** This is a three-year project that has ranked high enough for funding twice but has been deferred. The budget will cover all the necessary sampling to complete the physical parts of the IFIM. The Libby Technical Analysis (project 8346500) will do the modeling. This project is similar to what was completed on the Kootenai River; will look at ramping rates for flow fluctuation; increase the resolution of the thermal model of the river; and evaluate how fish are using the river. This is the last piece needed to model the Flathead River from the headwaters to the confluence with the Clark Fork. Four modeling projects link management activities. ***Questions/ Answers:*** ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9502800	1	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	***Presentation:*** This is a resident fish substitution project that addresses Council measure 10.8B19. In June of 1997 it was partially funded for FY 98. 1999 will be the second year of the study. If the project is fully funded for FY 98 (there is a request pending) then we can reduce the 99 budget slightly. The objective is to restore fisheries in Moses Lake to provide recreational opportunities. The study will occur in phases: 1) define the limiting factors; 2) identify implementation measures; and 3) implement restoration measures. ***Questions/Answers:*** What is the tie to the hydrosystem. *Answer:* This is off-site mitigation and substitution for the loss of anadromous fish above Chief Joseph Dam. Are the goals realistic? *Answer:* In the 1970's this was the premier fishery in the basin. For shoreline spawning fish, are low lake levels in the spring a problem? *Answer:* This is probably not a limiting factor. Does the lake fluctuate much? Not more that a few feet. Is WDFW sharing any of the cost? *Answer:* Yes. Sport groups also contribute. What species of trout will you manage for? *Answer:* We will try to balance warm water fish and trout and will identify

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			the species that is best suited - probably rainbow. ***Screening Criteria*:** Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes ***General Comment:*** Because it is "off-site" and deals with non-native species, this project should be a lower priority than "on-site" substitution projects. Pending the outcome of the Council's current deliberation on FY 98 funding, there could be an opportunity to reduce the FY 99 budget.
9608701	1	Focus Watershed Coordination - Flathead River Watershed	***Presentation:*** The objective of this coordination project is to promote grass roots participation in watershed restoration efforts. Currently the project focuses on two areas; 1) Dayton Creek which is an historic bull trout and cutthroat trout stream, and 2) Valley Creek which has a mixed species assemblage including bull, cutthroat, rainbow and brown trout. The WTWG asked two questions: 1) When will the watershed plan be completed? *Answer:* this is an ongoing project that will produce an umbrella document; 2) How does the proposed work in FY 99 build on FY 98? *Answer:* Habitat restoration is ongoing. This is a large basin and it will take more than one year to restore it. On-the ground activities are cost-shared and this project includes $20,000 for seed money. There are many cooperators. ***Questions/ Answers****:* Concern: the goals appear unrealistic, the coordinator has no authority. *Answer:* A lot of groups are involved and this is only one component of the overall Flathead system. There are three functional areas in the Flathead system: 1) the upper Flathead River; 2) Flathead Lake; and 3) the Lower Flathead River. The Flathead Basin Commission coordinates work in the upper Flathead (area 1), this projects coordinates with the Flathead Lake work (area 2) and conducts the work in the lower river (area 3) because it is on the Salish-Kootnenai Reservation. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9608720	1	Focus Watershed Coordination - Kootenai River Watershed	***Presentation:*** This is the sister project to the Flathead Focus Watershed project. It coordinates implementation of Excessive Drawdown (9401001) and Libby Mitigation (8346700). The Libby Mitigation Plan equals the Libby Watershed Plan. The FY 99 budget will be used for coordination, public scoping/outreach and travel. The funding for on-the-ground work and monitoring comes from other projects. The local county comissioners provide some for stream rehabilitaiton. ***Questions/Answers****:* There is a concern about sprouting coordinators. Does this project coordinate with the Kootenai River Ecosystem

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			project (9404900)? *Answer:* No, the Kootenais do not want to be the primary coordinators. Why is $20,000 in the budget for purchasing conservation easements? *Answer:* This is being negotiated at this time. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9700300	1	Box Canyon Watershed Project	***Presentation:*** This is a pilot project to facilitate work in other tributaries and coordinate assessments and implementation throughout the Pend Oreille subbasin. It is complimentary to the Kalispel Resident Fish Project (9500100) in that it focuses on upland areas while 9500100 focuses on riparian areas. Sedimentation could be a limiting factor. The project promotes grass roots communication and networking between landowners, private parties, the Forest Service, and WDFW. Through this communication, costs-sharing is part of the project development. ***Questions/Answers****:* What on-the-ground work will be conducted? *Answer:* We are currently doing the leg-work and contacting and coordinating with the land owners. What are the target species? *Answer:* Bull trout and cutthroat trout. The project focuses on the upland where problems start instead of on the streams where problems show up. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9700400	1	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams	***Presentation:*** This project addresses the need for a centralized database and formalizes the coordination between the Spokane Tribe, the Colville Tribe, the Kalispel Tribe and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project has several phases: Phase 1 (slated for completion in 1998) will set up central office space, acquire central computers, establish links to satellite offices and Streamnet, coordinate data collection system, and formalize the coordination between the co managers. Phase 2 (1999 - 2001) will develop analysis tools, input and assess data, identify data gaps, and recommend management efforts for the blocked area. StreamNet will link templates and data for spatial representation. Phase 3 will begin in 2002 and will implement, monitor and evaluate recommendations. ***Questions/Answers:*** Why doesn=t the proposal include resumes? *Answer:* Some people are not hired yet. The Kalispel Tribe position is that

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			the personnel we hire fall under the guidance of the Tribe. Is this a data management project? *Answer:* Not entirely. When the data gaps have been identified, the project will move to implementation. The data will be displayed spatially. How will data compiled by this project modify management actions in the Pend Oreille system? *Answer:* The management agencies will use this information. It will also be available to the FERC re-licensing proceedings. The Forest Service has land in this area that the other management entities do not have access to. This project brings information together for all of the co-managers to share. FERC license holders are contributing to the project. What would happen if the BPA funding ran out? Will the database be maintained? *Answer:* Maintaining the database can be done by the Kalispel Tribe. The tribe has a strong commitment to do this. Funding for implementing the management recommendations would have to be addressed at that point. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes. Data management tasks not aligned with objectives in FY 2000 and beyond. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes
9700900	1	Evaluate Rebuilding the White sturgeon Populations in the Upper Snake River	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to rebuild white sturgeon population in the Snake River between Lower Granite and Hells Canyon dams to support sustainable subsistence harvest by the Nez Perce Tribe. Although some previous work has been done, little is known about the current population structure. From a sample of 300 fish, it appears that the majority of the population are juveniles and there are few fish over 6 feet long. A Biological Risk Assessment was conducted in 1995 and identified resource objectives and potential mitigative actions. Lack of basic information prevented an analysis of the risks and effectiveness of potential actions. ***Questions/Answers:*** How much consultation have you had with IDFG? *Answer:* This project was part of the lower river sturgeon project (8605000) and is now part of the Nez Perce Tribe Management Agreement. IPC (through a MOA) is also doing work in this area and sharing information and costs. There is no duplication. Is there any cost share? *Answer:* This project shares equipment and staff with other NPT projects. Also, costs are shared through the agreement with IPC. These fish are hard to catch and occur in hard to reach areas. How does this project relate to sturgeon projects in Hells Canyon and Oxbow reservoirs? *Answer:* The habitat in Hells Canyon and Oxbow is poor and there is no natural spawning. That population needs supplementation. Below Hells

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Canyon, the habitat is OK and there is natural recruitment. Supplementation is not needed. The objective of a 5 kg/ha/ year harvest is not consistent with IDFG's objectives. *Answer:* The population has good recruitment. We would like to see fish over 6 feet. ***Screening Criteria*: Yes** ***Technical Criteria***: **Yes** ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes ***General Comment:*** The parties need to cooperate better, coordinate efforts with project 9056.
9701900	1	Stinkingwater Salmonid Project	***Presentation:*** The Tribe is currently using state-approved protocols and methods (FLIR Flights, water temperature monitoring, snorkeling, etc.) to conduct habitat and presence/absence surveys on the Middle Fork of the Malheur River. The goal is to identify the overall habitat conditions and quantify the population structure of bull trout and redband trout. In addition to the habitat work, the Tribe will do some genetic analysis of redband trout (for which there are no current genetics analyses). Cost-sharing comes from the USFS ($32,000/year), BOR ($47,000/year), BLM, and others. The funding is tight so it is important to have both projects (9701900 and 9107). In order to develop management strategies , it is important that both projects - the North Fork bull trout study (9701) and the Stinkingwater - be implemented at the same time. ***Questions/Answers:*** Are the bull trout in the North Fork migratory? *Answer:* We don't know. This is what we want to find out. We have no information. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes ***General Comment:*** Do you need 3 biologists and 3 technicians for this project?
8605000	1	White Sturgeon Mitigation and Restoration in the Columbia and Snake Rivers	***Presentation:*** This cooperative project (ODFW, WDFW, USGS BRD, CRITFC) began in 1986 and addresses Council Measure 10.4a. When the project began, there was no information on white sturgeon. Initial findings indicated that the lower three reservoirs had fewer sturgeon than below Bonneville Dam. The hydrosystem severely impacted sturgeon in a number of ways. There is poor recruitment because the reservoirs offer poor rearing conditions and don't provide spawning flows. The sturgeon are trapped between the dams and don't use the fish ladders. The original $2.9 million budget was based on a planning document that was 4-5 years old and the new FY 99 budget should be $2 million. In the future, the budget will be in the $2 million range. This proposal is based on a 5-year Statement of Work reviewed and

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			approved by the Council in 1997. The 1999 budget includes $40,000 to analyze genetics samples and we are coordinating and subcontracting with Mat Powell's group. In addtion, 1999 work will focus on 4 objectives including non-hydro mitigation activities such as transferring 8,000 fish from the lower river to the pools. ***Questions/Answers:*** What is the current range of the project? *Answer:* Bonneville to Lake Roosevelt. What was the FY 98 budget? *Answer:* $2.028 million. The outyear budgets are about $2 million and may decrease slightly. Who are the subcontractors? *Answer:* 1) WDFW - $450,000 to assess recruitment in 3-4 reservoirs and do creel surveys and management activities; 2) USGS BRD - $500,000 to monitor young-of- the-year and look at more efficient technology; FWS - $100,000 to profile the Hanford Reach; and CRITFC - $350,000 to work on hatchery technology and less invasive surgery for broodstock. Explain "non-hydro mitigation". *Answer:* It is supplementation and harvest monitoring. Sturgeon are transplanted from below Bonneville Dam to The Dalles and John Day reservoirs. How realistic is Objective 2 (hanges to the hydro system)? *Answer:* We are continuing to document the effects of flow on white sturgeon. High flows are good for sturgeon. Is overhead taken out twice when you subcontract? *Answer:* No. What about dissolved gas? *Answer:* Some studies show that recruitment occurs when gas levels are high. Objective 1 is 40% of the budget. What percent of the 40% is used on the ground? *Answer:* About ½ . Are funds from this project going to Lake Roosevelt? *Answer:* Yes in 1998 but no in 1999. The $2 million does not include work in Washington. Council Measure 10.4A.5 calls for consultation with tribe. What activity is going on? Has the project looked in the Hells Canyon area? *Answer:* There is no on-the-ground activity but we do have ongoing communication.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			The Council wanted this to be broken up into parts. How will all this be coordinated? It appears that to be a duplicated effort. Why aren't the parts separated so we can look at the parts? *Answer:* We are not aware that the Council said to split this up. We do a lot of coordination, including workshops for all parties to work together on methodologies. The overlap may be in geography and time. This is a broad area. Objective 2 defines the relationship between river discharge between McNary and Priest Rapids and spawning. Isn't this free-flowing ? *Answer:* Yes, this is the best area to look because it is a more natural system. Have you looked at the pools downstream already? Is there consistent pattern - more flow equals better spawning? You should be able to show a trend without looking at every pool. *Answer:* Yes, there appears to be a trend, but the 1997 data show that there may be an upper limit to the benefits. The morphologies below dam are very different. The trend is there but we don=t have enough data for "proof." Are the management agencies contributing money to harvest objective? *Answer:* Yes. Will steelhead flows help sturgeon in the Hanford Reach? *Answer:* No. When will the project be finished? *Answer:* Objective 1 is ongoing. The mitigative action will never be done. ***Screening Criteria*:** Yes ***Technical Criteria***: Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes General Comment: The project should move into the mitigation management arena instead of the research arena. Coordinate with Lake Roosevelt sturgeon (9502700) and the K-Pool sturgeon project (9603201) to avoid duplication. The proposal should be written to highlight component parts to make future reviews easier.
9405300	1	Bull Trout Assessment – Willamette/ McKenzie	***Presentation:*** This low-budget recovery-type study in the Upper Willamette Basin has shown very good success. Adult bull trout are moving into spawning areas and we have found juveniles rearing in Olallie Creek. Now we are looking at the middle fork of the Willamette where bull trout are probably extinct. There have been 1-2 sightings in the past 3 years by anglers. We will do snorkeling to see if there is a population in the middle fork. Studies suggest that there is no major difference between the main McKenzie and the tributaries. ODFW, in cooperation with the USFS, proposes to collect fry and them into the middle fork Willamette. ***Questions/Answers:*** Is the area above Lookout Point and Waterville beyond the range of anadromous stocks? *Answer:* There is a small

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			residual population and we hope they will move down. Who owns the facilities (dams) in the upper Willamette? *Answer:* The Corps and Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB). Bull trout have declined for several reasons but there is no mention of hydropower. *Response:* That was an oversight. Hydropower has a major effect on migratory corridors. The proposal is to transfer excess fish from Anderson Creek. How did you determine that they were excess? *Answer:* Anderson Creek is a small adult spawning area. We find about 12,000 migratory fry in early spring. These could be early nomads or excess fry. The theory is that fry go right into the main McKenzie, but the main McKenzie is not good habitat for early rearing therefore the fry won't survive. To cover both bases, just in case the theory is wrong, we take only about 10-25% of the migratory fry. We do find 1+ and 2+ year old fish in the area. Is there any cost share? *Answer:* Yes, with the USFS. ***Screening Criteria*:** Yes ***Technical Criteria**:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes
9701100	1	Enhance and Protect Habitat and Riparian Areas on the Duck Valley Res	***Presentation:*** The project started in FY 1997 and 1999 will be the third year. In 1997 we protected 5 streams. During the 1998 contract period (which began April 4, 1998), we are concentrating on 3 to 4 streams that we believe support redband trout. We plan to conduct habitat surveys, estimate populations, analyze genetics, fence natural springs, plant trees, and provide water troughs for cattle. The habitat is in pretty good shape and needs more protection than enhancement. We hope to make some intermittent streams perennial. ***Questions/Answers:*** Have the ranchers changed their livestock management to protect the investment in habitat work? *Answer:* We are meeting with the Cattleman=s Association and NRCS but our work with them is mostly on education (e.g. salt block placement). We are also working cooperatively on a grazing ordinance to control a disease outbreak on Tribal land. Also, the landowners work with NRCS and have to maintain the improvements after they are installed. The WTWG asked, based on the work accomplished in 1998, what would be done in 1999. *Answer:* Stream protection. The Project History section of the proposal (page 8) looks similar to baseline data collection listed in Sect 4 – Objectives

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			(page 3). Explain. *Answer:* The habitat work was begun in 5 streams. We have 250 miles of streams on the reservation. In 1999 and beyond, we will finish the habitat work in the other streams and continue to monitor previous work. Do you have a formal plan of attack? *Answer:* Yes. One of the objectives is to repair windmills. What is the hydraulic continuity? *Answer:* We probably won't repair the windmills. This task could be deleted. It was originally planned in conjunction with fences for cattle, however our Natural Resources Program may do the repairs. They will most likely be doing the repairs on west side of reservation where the streams are intermittent. The Sho-Pai Tribes are working with IPC but have not reached resolution on who (e.g. IPC?, BOR? BPA?) is responsible for mitigation, and how much. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes ***General Comment:*** Project needs better coordination with related projects. Insufficient details for proposals in related projects.
9201000	1	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	***Presentation:*** The goal of this project is to provide good habitat to support a self-sustaining native cutthroat trout population. It began in 1992, focuses on low cost / low tech stream restoration, and includes riparian fencing, instream structures and willow plantings. The Tribe has been successful in increasing the density of spawning and rearing trout. The budget includes $60,000 for genetics work on Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Fish from the Joint Culture Facility (9500600) will be used for supplementation. ***Questions/Answers:*** Biologs are really expensive. Upstream barbs are all that is needed to direct the current away from the bar. *Response:* We have put in woody debris to trap silt and provide cover for fish. We haven't seen fry in areas where we haven't enhanced the habitat. The $60,000 for processing genetic samples seems high. *Response*: This would be the maximum amount. The price includes field work. We may sample 15-20 fish per stream but we don't have to do every stream. We are trying to pick up different populations. Do you see genetic introgression? *Answer:* There may be pure Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the mountains and in some

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			streams. In the major streams, such as Spring Creek, there are virtually no cutthroat trout without hybridization. The hybridization rate is anywhere from 10-90%. Does Objective 4 (deter and reduce non-game fish) include native and non-native fish? Does it lead to a diverse community and a healthy stream ecosystem that fish will self- stock? *Answer:* We are still considering the options, we could use Yellowstone cutthroat trout. We haven't removed rainbow trout yet. The restoration work began in 1992. What will ensure longevity of restoration actions? *Answer:* Most of the work has been fencing to protect against grazing. We can't do much about flooding. Are you attempting to change livestock practices? Yes. We are trying rotational grazing schemes, etc. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes
9020	2	Genetic Analysis of Native Fish on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation	***Presentation:*** This project addresses a Council Measure that has never been implemented. BLM data show that there are some genetically pure redband trout in the Owyhee River downstream from the reservation. No genetics work has been done on fish on the reservation. Bull trout used to be present in that drainage and this project will confirm their presence or absence. The Govenor's bull trout recovery plan stopped at Hell=s Canyon. ***Questions/Answers:*** In order to assess the genetics, is it necessary to kill and freeze the fish? *Answer:* We will use incidental only (no killing). In light of the mine upstream, the subcontractor would also like to test for the presence of metals. Do you have a more systematic sampling plan? Explain your strategy for starting in the headwaters. *Answer:* We will start on streams not connected to the river. We know there are pure redband trout downstream. Nevada Fish and Wildlife found pure strains higher up also. What species are you testing? How many samples? *Answer:* Native redband trout. The number of samples depends on the population estimates - we may use 20 -30 fish. The $40,000 budget is a flexible estimate. There isn=t a link between the genetics work and invertebrate samples. Who will be doing the work? *Answer:* Guy, Vinnie, Reggie and one more person. If you need less money, when can you revise your budget? *Answer:* I don=t know. This is a multi-year project.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Does this project transition into something else or will the sampling last for 5 years. *Answer:* The genetics sampling will continue for as long as it takes to do of the all streams on the reservation. After that we will implement recovery projects. The data will be used for recovery planning and will be shared with other basin users. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** No. Methods are not adequate and the budget is not appropriate to achieve the project objectives. ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes. ***General Comment:*** The budget for the genetic analysis appears to be high.
9501500	2	Billy Shaw Wetlands catch and release fishery O&M	***Presentation:*** Reservoir construction should begin this begin this spring. FY 99 money is for operation and maintenance plus habitat work (fences, fish screens, monitoring water quality before fish come in, public education, catch-and-release). Fish for the reservoir are expected to come from the Joint Culture Facility (9500600) but if that doesn=t work, then there is money in the FY 99 budget for fish from another source. At this point we are not sure which species will be stocked in the reservoir. The project also includes some tributary habitat work to generate natural production to support a self-sustaining system. We may not spend all of the $250,000 this year. ***Questions/Answers:*** There was a large amount of carry forward from previous years, what will it cover? *Answer:* Those funds cover the construction of the reservoir and have nothing to do with fish production. Will the fish screens stay in place? *Answer:* Yes, they will not be washed out during run-off. What percent of the budget is for the park? *Answer:* This funding will not be used to develop a campground. It will be used to maintain the reservoir, keep debris out of the reservoir (maintain water quality), clean up the access sites, and clean up after campers. Are these activities consistent with the Council=s Program? *Answer:* Yes, this addresses the measure. Is the project committed to stocking redband trout? *Answer:* Our focus is on weak but recoverable stocks rather than on production. How many tributaries enter Billy Shaw Reservoir? *Answer:* Two perennial streams and 2-3 intermittent streams. Are the site evaluations done? *Answer:* Yes.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Screening Criteria: Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** No. Tasks are not clearly aligned with program. Trash removal (1/3 of costs) is not a BPA responsibility. ***Programatic Criteria:*** No. Project does not satisfy criteria 12, 13, and 14. ***General Comment:*** Project needs closer coordination and consolidation of objectives and tasks with 9701100, 9020, and 8815600.
9800200	2	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	***Presentation:*** This multi-phase project (similar to the Joint Stock Status Assessment 9700400) started in 1998 and the staff has not been hired yet. The goal is to assess the status of native salmonids (e.g., bull trout, redband trout, Yellowstone cutthroat trout), identify limiting factors, fill in the data gaps, and ultimately implement projects based on the assessment. Since there is limited data, the assessment will start in the Payette system first. The project will be cost-shared with several other entities such as the Forest Service, timber companies, ranchers, BOR and IDFG. There may also be some ESA contributions. Idaho has $30,000 - $50,000 for bull trout this year. During the FY 99 review, the WTWG asked how this work does not duplicate the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Project and IPC=s work. This project doesn=t duplicate the Interior Columbia Basin project because it collects more detailed data. It also doesn=t duplicate IPC=s work (e.g. C.J. Strike monitoring) because this project looks at the tribuatries while IPC=s work focuses on the mainstem. At this point, no FY 98 money has been spent. The budgets presented are estimates. If they are low, then IDFG will absorb the overruns, if they are high, there may be some carry forward. ***Questions/Answers****:* What technique will you use for the genetics work? *Answer:* We don=t want to lock into anything at this point. We will use the best technique to assess stocks (not necessarily mitochondrial DNA) and subcontract the work. Have the stock assessments been done in the Owyhee by BLM? *Answer:* Yes, some work has been done; however, there is a need to coordinate and we have to pull the information together first. ***Screening Criteria*** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes. This does not appear to be a BPA responsibility, cost should be borne by IPC and BOR. ***Programmatic Criteria***: No. Project needs better coordination and does not meet criteria 13, 14, 15, 16. This is expensive for a stock assessment and cost shares should be established
9106700	2	Idaho Water Rental: Resident Fish and Wildlife Impacts.	***Presentation:*** The purpose of this project (Phase III) is to monitor and evaluate the impacts of Upper Snake flow augmentation (above Brownlee reservoir) on resident fish. Phase I of the project started in 1991 with an agreement with BPA to assimilate the pertinent information. Phase II (also completed) was a mini IFIM study. This project is closely

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Phase III	tied to the Snake River Salmonid Assessment Project (980200) and will build on their work. IDFG has been working with the water managers to increase the benefits to resident fish from flow augmentation. ***Questions/Answers:*** Are you doing IFIM on large systems? *Answer:* It is difficult to do. Some areas have been done, (e.g. the USFWS did some work below C.J. Strike Reservoir and IPC has also done some IFIM work for sturgeon). We will use other existing information as is becomes non-proprietary. Is there any effort to cost-share with NMFS since this project address NMFS-caused impacts? *Answer:* No, but we can pursue it. We are also pursuing BOR money. Is there any indication that your results and recommendations will actually be implemented? *Answer:* IDFG is optimistic because we already have support to modify flows from the Payette and Boise rivers. Also, the parties are Aat the table." There are 3 Federal dams on the Boise River. The river goes up and down in response to irrigation and flood control needs. Flows are nothing like the natural hydrograph. When you have finished collecting the data, will there be monitoring and evaluation? *Answer:* Yes, in conjunction with power production and the BOR. This project really monitors and evaluates flow augmentation. The big issue is the NMFS 1999 decision. We anticipate more water demands from the Upper Snake. ***Screening Criteria*** Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* No. This should be under ESA costs. ***Programmatic Criteria***: Yes
8815600	2	Stocking fish in lakes and streams on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation	***Presentation:*** This resident fish substitution project has been stocking rainbow trout in 2 reservoirs on the reservation for 8 - 10 years. The reservoirs are screened and there is some natural fish production. In addition to native species surveys, the project includes creel surveys to determine how many fish are harvested, how many over winter, etc. The reservation already has non-native fish that have come into the system from Nevada. There is low fishing pressure on the Owyhee River because habitat and ultimately fishing success is poor. However, tribal members prefer to fish on the river (as opposed to the reservoir) and stocking fish in the river could relieve fishing pressure on the reservoirs. ***Questions/Answers:*** Why stock fish in the river under these conditions? *Answer:* We haven=t yet. What is the species assemblage in the tributaries? Are redband trout there? *Answer:* We don=t know. The rainbow trout

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			stocked in the reservoirs cannot escape into the tributaries. Is funding a seasonal employee an appropriate objective (Obj. 2)? *Answer:* Yes. What will happen when Billy Shaw Reservoir is completed? *Answer:* That depends on the status of the Joint Culture Facility (9500600) Do you conduct any education activities on when and where to fish? *Answer:* Yes. Ice fishing picked up this year. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes. ***Technical Criteria****:* No. Objectives, tasks and monitoring are poorly developed and unclear. There is not enough information to determine if stocking will have an impact on weak native stocks. Stocking the Owyhee River is not justified. ***Programmatic Criteria****:* No. Project doesn=t meet criteria 12, 13,14, or 16. ***General Comment****:* Objective 2 should be a task not an objective.
9056	2	Evaluate Status of White Sturgeon in Hells Canyon Reach Snake River, Idaho	***Presentation:*** IDFG has management responsibility for the Snake River to the Washington border. The construction of Lower Granite Dam isolated sturgeon in this reach. Currently the sturgeon fishery is limited to catch and release. The goal of this study is to estimate the current population and measure changes since the population was last assessed in the 1970s and 1980s. ***Questions/Answers*:** How is this project related to and how does it build on other sturgeon projects in the area? *Answer:* This section of the river is managed by Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the Nez Perce Tribe. Idaho feels left out of the loop in some areas and this proposal addresses our needs separate from the whole Columbia River. Sturgeon project 8605000 does not cover this area. Were you involved in the biological risk assessment? *Answer:* The risk assessment identified needs and put together a plan but the plan was not developed by the agencies involved in the risk assessment. How were the 1970-1980 studies used for management recommendations? *Answer:* The earlier efforts were baseline studies which looked at age classes. Our intent is to evaluate the changing age structure through time. This will lead to refinements in the harvest regulations. The catch and release fishery was implemented based on the previous studies. We now want to look at the sport fishery to see if we can allow harvest

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Screening Criteria: Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. The co-managers need to coordinate projects (e.g. 9700900) prior to implementation to avoid duplication. ***General Comment:*** Coordination should not increase costs for these projects
8709900	2	Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigations	***Presentation:*** Dworshak Dam on the North fork Clearwater River completely blocks upstream passage and is used for power production. Annual drawdowns can be as much 155 feet. Dworshak Reservoir can support a self-sustaining kokanee population of about 30 - 50 adults per hectare. Kokanee use the tributaries for spawning. Winter kokanee tend to school and high entrainment losses during high flow periods are the problem. This project is based on past research on entrainment. IDFG tested sound as a possible Aanti-entrainment≅ device but it didn=t work. Strobe light tested in a wild environment were effective up to 30 meters away, but that is not enough distance at Dworshak. Strobe tests in clear water show kokanee stayed away up to 140 meters. It is necessary to test the lights in turbid water during spring flows. The next phase is to install strobe lights on dam. Monitoring (4 times per year) will include looking at kokanee behavior patterns at the turbine intakes; conducting spawner counts; conducting hydrocoustic estimates over the length of reservoir; and trawling to evaluate the physical characteristics of the fish. ***Questions/Answers****:* Is there an overall mitigation plan for the upper Dworshak area? *Answer:* The Dworshak Mitigation Plan (an agreement with the Corps) says to stock 100,000 of something annually, but we have never really stocked this much. Solving the entrainment losses are a high priority. NPT and University staff collaborate. There is an earnest effort to use past knowledge to preserve this fishery. Is there a way of testing the lights on one rather than all of the turbines? Could you coordinate with the Corps to test one turbine first? *Answer:* No. The 3 turbines are side by side and run at different times. Will the turbid water test be completed before the FY 99 budget cycle? *Answer:* Entrainment occurs in March, before the spring runoff and is a problem throughout the runoff season. What happens if the strobe test doesn=t work ? *Answer:* The project disappears. In order to be considered a success, the strobes need to work in muddy water and deter 50% of the fish most of the time. Shouldn=t NMFS pay for this because the summer drafts are used for temperature control for fall chinook? *Answer:* Summer drafts are better for kokanee but not for public recreation.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Have you done any public scoping? *Answer:* No, but it shouldn=t be a problem. The locals want the entrainment problem solved. The most serious kokanee losses are related to winter flood control releases. Will the Corps fund the O&M on the lights? How much will it be? *Answer:* The estimated O&M is much cheaper than other alternatives but the Corps hasn't agreed to fund O&M yet. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria****:* No. An overall Council-approved Mitigation Implementation Plan is needed for the Dworshak Reservoir. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** Yes ***General Comment:*** Can NMFS/anadromous fish dollars pay part of this project since it is mitigation for the impacts of salmon recovery actions? Can the full light array be delayed until the turbid water test is completed?
9404700	2	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	***Presentation:*** Lake Pend Oreille is the largest body of water in Idaho and the deepest lake in the county. Cabinet Gorge Dam (Washington Water Power) was built on the inflow and Albeni Falls (Corps) was built on the outflow. Kokanee and bull trout declined after the dams were constructed. The historic kokanee harvest was about 1 million; now it ranges between 100,000 and 200,000 per year. Kokanee are also the main food source for the lake. The Cabinet Gorge kokanee hatchery has operated for 10 years but has not recovered the population. Although it may have stopped the decline, it doesn=t provide long-term benefits and is not part of this project. Cabinet Gorge Dam does not have fish passage and kokanee stack up below the dam during the spawning season. ***Questions/ Answers:*** The third Objective deals with increasing warm water fish populations in the Pend Oreille River. What effect does this have on bull trout? *Answer:* Bull trout do not frequent the Pend Oreille River. Objective 5 (milfoil control) is 10% of the budget. This is the biggest stumbling block to the project. Why is milfoil control a ratepayer responsibility? *Answer:* Milfoil monitoring had to be in place in order for the Corps of Engineers to go ahead with the lake level test. IDFG does not want milfoil to invade the lake and is currently documenting and evaluating it. Was there a change in the existing species assemblage? *Answer:* There may have been other species introduced into the lake. Bull trout declined in the 1950's and may not be harvested from Lake Pend Oreille.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			What are the outyear projections for this project? *Answer:* This is a 5-year project – 3 years of high winter lake levels followed by 2 years of low winter lake levels. This may not be long enough to really determine if the lake level test significantly improved kokanee spawning and populations. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** No. The ratepayers are not responsible for milfoil control. Not convinced that spawning habitat is the limiting factor. The project includes studying food web dynamics and *mysis* shrimp as well as winter higher lake levels ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes
9501300	2	Nez Perce Trout Ponds	***Presentation:*** This is a resident fish substitution project to compensate for the loss of anadromous fish caused by Dworshak Dam. The goal of the project is to develop trout ponds to substantively increase harvest. The tribe currently has 2 ponds and would like to construct 2 more (and is waiting for the geotechnical reports). A number of activities will occur this year including; deepening existing ponds; working with Corps on the design of the dams for the new ponds; writing legal descriptions; repairing a damaged spillway; constructing two silt retention ponds to catch drain; conducting creel censuses; conducting a feasibility study; monitoring the channel; surveying boundaries; and working with the watershed group. **Questions/Answers:** Currently there are 2 small trout ponds. What do the 7 people do? *Answer:* The land is owned by tribal members. There are 4 full time people and 3 part-time people in administration. Two or three people survey, write legal descriptions, collect data from 3 transects on each site, and monitor the channel. Are the ponds open to the public? *Answer:* The two new ones will be, the two existing ponds are heavily used by tribal members. What are the subcontractors used for? *Answer:* The budget includes $360,000 for pond construction. How are the existing ponds used? *Answer:* The existing ponds (totaling 11.2 acres) are used quite a bit. They are stocked with rainbow trout and used for ice fishing, camping and swimming. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical: Criteria****:* No. The project does not meet criteria 4 (the resources proposed are excessive to achieve objectives). ***Programatic:*** *No*. Project does not meet criteria 12, 13, 14, and 17.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
9501600	2	Genetic Inventory of Westslope Cutthroat Trout, North Fork Clearwater Basin	***Presentation:*** Previous studies showed that hybridization with exotic trout was the greatest threat to the conservation of native westslope cutthroat trout. Rainbow trout are not a primary fishery in the basin. Funding for this project began in 1995. During the first year we conducted background studies, set up the genetics studies and collected the reference samples. This study asks 4 basic questions: 1) Is there any genetic introgression? 2) Are there any morphological characteristics useful for field identification (how can you tell a rainbow trout from a cutthroat trout)? 3) What is the correlation between habitat and the distribution of the species? 4) What are the catch rates (creel surveys)? The project also includes bull trout work (including a genetics-based look at bull trout/brook trout hybrids). If the kokanee population flourishes, the Tribe may introduce a predator (bull trout?). ***Questions/Answers:*** Explain the long-term budget. Is it to inventory genetically pure fish? To stop stocking rainbow? To develop a pure westslope cutthroat trout brood stock? Answer: The increase in funding is related to broodstock development. Is brood stock development a Council Measure? Answer: We are planning ahead. We have enough information to know that we have a significant introgression problem. Broodstock development is a natural outgrowth of a genetic inventory, but it will still have to be approved by the Council. The initial project was to last 2-3 years at $100,000. The project seems to have drifted. What is the clear link to a Council Measure? Answer: The original measure arose from a report that identified the need to evaluate introgression potentially resulting form rainbow trout stocking in Dworshak Reservoir. The Tribe is now showing that introgression is a problem. The Corps has sole mitigation responsibility and currently raises rainbow trout but it could shift to cutthroat trout. Comment: Since cutthroat trout are the most Aat-risk≅ native trout, can=t we just tell the Corps to stop producing rainbow trout and develop cutthroat trout broodstock instead? Comment: The idea of cutthroat trout broodstock needs more work, some of the co-managers are not comfortable with it. Would this stocking be for population maintenance or for a consumptive fishery? Answer: It depends on the goal -- recovery versus harvest. There could be some consumptive use. Do you have genetically pure fish? Answer: Yes, we used non-coded DNA sequences. Comment: Non-coded DNA sequences can change too fast to be useful. Is this a Corps responsibility through the Reimbursible fund? Answer: We haven't looked into this. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Technical Criteria*:* Yes. The genetic inventory is excessive. ***Programmatic Criteria*****:** No. The project doesn=t address enough of the criteria. ***General Comment:*** The out year objectives are not based on work to date. If rainbow trout are a problem, stop stocking them.
9502700	2	Assess Limiting Factors of the Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Population	***Presentation:*** This project is intended to work in cooperation with the lower river sturgeon project 8605000. The goal is to index populations and identify habitat availability in Lake Roosevelt and Rufus Woods Lake. Lake Roosevelt sturgeon are a transboundry population of about 600 individuals and there has been little recruitment during the last 20-30 years. The sponsors are not sure that data collected under project 8605000 will answer the questions for Lake Roosevelt sturgeon. This 3-year project has not been funded in the past and a cooperative (with WDFW) sampling program could start this year. ***Questions/Answers****:* Has the previous work provided enough management information? *Answer:* There has not been much sturgeon work done on the reservoir. The co managers need information from other projects (including 8605000). Habitat mapping conducted under another project will fold into this project. The population above lake Roosevelt needs to be monitored but this is outside the scope of the other sturgeon projects. ***Screening Criteria****:* Yes ***Technical Criteria:*** No. Tasks and objectives are not clearly defined. ***Programmatic Criteria****:* Yes. Can the white sturgeon monitoring be part of the Lake Roosevelt Monitoring Project (9404300)? ***General comment***: The relation to project 8605000 seems unclear.
9603201	2	Begin Implementation of Year 1 of the K Pool Master Plan Program	***Presentation:*** This is a sturgeon supplementation project which evaluates options for using Hanford K-pools and addresses an approved Council measure. The Master plan is to be reviewed by Yakama Leadership next week and Council approval is expected later this year. The project has 3 parts: 1) spawning of gravid females; 2) juvenile rearing; and 3) captive brood stock development from wild sturgeon. To complete the project we will use the existing K Pools, a trout hatchery and the Abernathy Technology Center. Ultimately the YIN would like to build a new sturgeon hatchery if they can do it cost effectively. They are looking at 46 potential sites. This project compliments 8605000 and we already use their data. That project has done an done impact assessment on developing this program. The YIN is raising sturgeon in net pens at the Hanford K pool and in 1995 gave 150 fish to the NPT for their Asotin project. The project will use research and protocols to support restoration activities. The Hanford pools are water treatment pools and need a pumping system. The Yakima Trout Hatchery is not being used and needs emergency funds for repairs. This why the YIN wants to build a new facility. There are no radio nuclei in the fish going to sea. The $214,000 in subcontracts is for the design of needed modifications.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Questions/Answers: Are you coordinating with WDFW and the other co-managers? Are they in agreement with this project? *Answer:* John Devore from WDFW was on the team to develop the program. We are in conformance with WDFW's Wild Salmonid Policy. There is some concern about the broodstock and the magnitude of releases. Where would the brood stock would come from? If funded, how soon and where would your release fish? *Answer:* It would take a few years. The first year of implementation would involve getting the facility ready and getting a few gravid females to test things out. Is this new artificial production? Does it have to go through the 3-step process? How does this project relate to the K basin anadromous fish fall chinook production? *Answer:* This project won=t interfere with that. Why is resident fish paying for the lamprey component? *Answer:* I don't know. It is mostly a pilot scale test - a small part of budget. It would be OK if the funding came from other sources. YIN has funded this on its own since 1985. Is there any funding in the anadromous fish side for sturgeon now? *Answer:* No. Is the Master Plan complete? *Answer:* It was written by consultants for YIN and is in the approval process now. How does this relate to CRITFC subcontract in project 8605000? *Answer:* It dovetails. The work for 8605000 provides research and recommendations. ***Screening Criteria:*** Yes. The project does not meet Criteria 1B. This sponsor has not coordinated with ODFW. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. The impacts of stocking hatchery sturgeon on top of wild sturgeon were not addressed. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. There is not demonstrated consensus among managers. Lack of coordination with states. ***General Comment****:* Pacific lamprey should be removed from the proposal as discussed with the sponsor. No statement regarding how to address Council=s 3-step process. ODFW and WDFW would like full coordination but don't want to stop the project.
9041	3	Enhance/Protect Imperiled Native Fish Species through Improved	***Presentation:*** Previous studies showed that 50% of the people had difficulty correctly identifying fish. As a result, the public may be inadvertently taking fish the regulations are designed to protect. This project funds one person to go to schools to teach fishing ethics and species identification. There is also an ongoing cooperative effort under which MDFWP has distributed pamphlets and installed display boxes (showing lake, bull, rainbow, and cutthroat trout models) to help the public identify fish.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Education	***Questions/Answers:*** What Council Program measure does this project address? *Answer:* The link is weak, the project doesn't address a specific measure. How does harvest compliance relate to hydropower losses and Bonneville's responsibilties? *Answer:* Harvest compliance is based on knowledge. The fish are in weak condition because of the hydro impacts. We don=t have any outreach currently and we have a catch-and-release policy. All of us have to foster public awareness and assistance within what we are doing. Could this be done under your watershed projects? *Answer:* We could put it there. Comment: Similar states are not requesting funding for this in the same way. Isn't this a state responsibility? Did you see any significant decline in illegal bull trout harvest resulting from your ongoing outreach programs? *Answer:* The enforcement project used to fund sting operations of poaching. There were about 29.7 illegal harvests (extrapolated from busts) in the tributaries per week. Did the inadvertent mistakes decline with education? *Answer:* I don=t know. Probably not. ***Screening Criteria****:* No. Project does not address a specific Council measure. ***Technical Criteria:*** Yes. There is no evidence this activity actually reduced incidental catch of bull trout. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. There is no clear hydro connection considering other activities in area. ***General Comment:*** This does not appear to be a ratepayer obligation. Funding should come from a different source.
9046	3	Identify Resident Fish and Macroinvertebrate Taxa & Function in Anadromous Fish Habitat	***Presentation:*** The Methow Biodiversity Project is a private organization that is interested in biological issues. We have conducted a 3-year amphibian study and we know what we have. The objective of this study is to conduct an inventory and determine the relative abundance of resident fish and macroinvertebrates in the area. We don't really know what species are here because no one has ever done a study of non-game species. We think that 11 of a possible 18 species exist in the area. As land development increases, so does the use of water resources. We have no baseline data and we have no way to assess the impacts. There are two hatcheries which release coho fry. ***Questions/Answers:*** Haven't there been 20 years of spawning ground surveys for anadromous fish? *Answer:* The Fish and Wildlife Service

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			collected a lot of data on abundance but non-game resident species haven=t received management attention. Which Council Program measure is applicable? *Answer:* We didn't have access to the Program and were told that the correct measure would be filled in. ***Screening Criteria:*** No. Proposal doesn=t address a specific Council Measure dealing with resident fish. ***Technical Criteria***: No. What are target species? Does not meet criteria 6 and 7. Proposal lacks use of historical data and summary of past information. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. Proposal doesn=t meet criterion 12. ***General Comment:*** This project more appropriately addresses anadromous fish and could be part of a watershed project.
9048	3	Transfer Attributes from 1:100,000 to 1:24,000 Scale Hydrography	***Presentation:*** The project sponsor did not give a presentation. ***Questions/Comments:*** How is this project linked to the Council=s Program ? It does not appear to address a measure. Why is IDWR the sponsor when 2/3 of the project budget is contracted to IDFG? Is this information on GIS? How will transfering the attributes benefit resident fish? ***Screening Criteria:*** No. The proposal doesn=t address a specific Council Measure. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. What are the direct benefits to fish? ***Programmatic Criteria***: No. The proposal didn=t meet criterion 11. General Comment: This appears to be a worthy project but the BPA Direct program/ Resident Fish Budget is the wrong funding source. This type of work should be done on a system/region basis.
9052	3	Demonstrate that a Translucent Pipeline Feels Normal to Fish	***Presentation:*** The sponsor did not give a presentation. ***Questions/Comments:*** Why is this a resident fish project? It appears to be more appropriate for anadromous fish. Project does not address a Council Measure.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			$8 million is a lot to test “what feels normal.” Normal hasn=t been characterized. Is this a company? Could they Asell≅ it if it worked? Even if successful, what is application to resident fish? ***Screening Criteria:*** No. Project does not meet the screening criteria. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. Project fails to meet nearly all of the technical criteria. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No.
9053	3	Kirby (Atlanta) Dam Fish Ladder	***Presentation:*** The objective of this project is to restore passage at Kirby Dam (a hydropower dam owned by the Forest Service) for bull trout spawning and rearing in the Upper Middle Fork of the Boise River. This area has the best habitat in the basin and can produce excellent results. The Forest Service provided recommendations for bull trout passage. A preliminary design of fish ladder has been conducted. Kirby dam failed in failed in 1991 and passage was not provided over the new structure because of time constraints. Recent studies show the importance of migratory component of the bull trout population. Atlanta Power is a partner, along with BOR, USFS, and IDFG. The bull trout conservation plan for Idaho includes a plan for each key watershed which highlights the risks and threats. ***Questions/ Answers:*** Have any other passage structures been considered? *Answer:* The preferred method is vertical slot fish passage. Joe Teeter looked at blasting for jump pools with limited ladders. The engineering was too difficult because of existing roadways etc. The best design is the one proposed. Does this address specific Council Measures? *Answer:* I am not familiar with the Program. This is a new project that addresses weak bull trout populations that will go extinct above dam. It meets the criteria for a blocked area. The original dam was built in 1906. What dams on the system were constructed prior to that date? *Answer:* None. The loss of fish would be due to Kirby Dam. The diversion dams were built after 1906. What about the FERC license? *Answer:* Atlanta Power Company to serves 60 residents year round and will be required to get a FERC license. Are brook trout present above or below dam? *Answer:* We only found brook trout in high lakes that have outlets, we are not finding them in other areas in big numbers.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Is there any cost-share? *Answer:* The Forest Service funds the NEPA work, IDFG is doing the design engineering. Atlanta Power will be getting a FERC license and could maintain the ladder. What is the tie to the Federal Hydropower system? *Answer:* This dam blocked passage. The original dam had fish passaage that didn't work. Fish had access to the spillway until 1915 but the upper country was blocked after that. ***Screening Criteria:*** No. The proposed projects doesn=t meet a specific Council Measure. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. The proposal didn=t demonstrate that adequate measures have been taken to prevent exotic species from using the ladder. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. The proposal doesn=t meet criteria 11, 15, 16, ***General Comment***: This looks like a worthwhile project. The Forest Service should apply for *Bring Back Natives* money. This is not a BPA responsibility.
9055	3	Evaluate Movement Patterns of Bull Trout in Dworshak Reservoir	***Presentation:*** Dworshak Dam blocks bull trout movement through the North Fork of the Clearwater River. (The South Fork is blocked by Hartford Dam.) If bull trout move out of this basin they are unable to ascend back into the system – and there is no opportunity for others to move into drainage. The spatial separation increases the risk of extinction of the species. Gas bubble trauma may also effect bull trout below Dworshak Dam. The goal of this study is to determine if bull trout go through the reservoir and past the dam and develop and to implement strategies to minimize entrainment. ***Questions/Answers:*** Is this project related to the genetic work on the westslope cutthroat trout (9501600)? *Answer:* These are companion studies. We need to look at the tributaries of Dworshak Reservoir. We can dovetail the stream and reservoir information. Is monitoring of radio tracking every 2 weeks often enough? *Answer:* This is the minimum. Initially we will monitor more frequently. If the bull trout move to upper drainage we may not look as frequently. The goal is to monitor fish moving past the dam. Which Council Measure does this address? *Answer:* I don't know the details of the Program but this project addresses entrainment through Dworshak which is mentioned in two measures. Bull trout entrainment is probably similar to kokanee entrainment. This project would fulfill measure 10.3C.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Is bull trout entrainment established at Dworshak? *Answer:* No, but last year we had very high flows and saw bull trout below the dam. They did not suffer trauma. Do we know much about bull trout biology? Radios are fun and are usually put on 14 -inch fish. Probably the movement is not from adult fish. We need more basic information on bull trout before we use radio tags. This study seems to be focusing on a small segment without knowing the big picture. *Answer:* Data from the South Fork suggests that the biggest movement is from adult fish. If we tag smaller fish, they may not survive and therefore won't provide the best data. This is one more piece to the puzzle. How will you determine the significance of entrainment? *Answer:* A companion study with the Forest Service on the South Fork looks at a mix of fish in the whole Clearwater system. Does the Governor's Bull Trout Plan have any money? *Answer:* No. The State Conservation plan doesn=t have funding available at this point. ***Screening Criteria:*** No. The project doesn=t meet specific program measures. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. There are some concerns regarding radio telemetry methodologies. Research won=t benefit the species. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. The project doesn't meet criteria 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16. ***General Comment:*** Why aren=t the tasks part of the Dworshak Impacts/ M&E and Biological-Integrated Rule Curves (874700)?
9079	3	Inventory Resident Fish Populations in Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day Reservoirs	***Presentation:*** ISRP said the region needs information on status and trends of resident fish in the mainstem reservoirs. We would like to develop an inventory and look at the relationships between species. The study has the following objectives: 1) Develop standardized sampling methods, design, strict guidelines. (Through the first year). 2) Use the methods to assess status of resident fish in 3 reservoirs (second and third years). The fourth year will be the final write up phase. This project meets Council measures 10.1a and 10.1a.2 and lays the groundwork for assessing resident fish throughout the area. ***Questions/Answers:*** What do Oregon and Washington managers think of this project? Are these species generally ignored in the multi-million dollar projects? *Answer:* There is a lot of work going on in the area but it is not focused on resident fish. What historical pre-impoundment data are available to give a "baseline" to the "baseline"? *Answer:* There is not a lot of information. There was one paper done on the Hanford Reach.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			What are the target species? *Answer:* All species. We will test the efficiency of a variety of sampling gear to find out what gear combination will sample the greatest number of species. Do you plan to summarize all of the information that has already been collected for these reservoirs first? *Answer:* Yes. Is the sampling adequate? The protocol calls for sampling in February and March. *Answer:* We need to conduct the sampling when there are minimal effects on outmigrating salmonids. We are trying to be sensitive to migratory passages for adults and juvenile salmonids. The sampling is hindered by listed species. How will this basic research translate into implementation? What is outcome of this information, given all programs already going? *Answer:* We will communicate the results (in terms of how resident fish populations are changing and what would be the effects of changes in river management) and coordinate with the other agencies and groups that need it. Do you anticipate that the information will be related to exotic fish or native fish? *Answer:* Both (depending on sampling methods). We have smallmouth bass, walleye, carp etc. We will also troll for other fish to get a better data set for whole community. ***Screening Criteria:*** No. The project doesn=t meet Council Measure and doesn=t meet criteria 1.B or 1.C. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. The project does not meet criteria 5,6,7, and 10. This appears to be basic research with no link to implementation and no direct benefits to resident fish. It is unclear how a loss assessment will be determined based on new sampling methods. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. The project doesn=t meet criteria 11, 12, 15, and 16. ***General Comment:*** There has been a lot of work in these pools. They could compile an inventory from that work.
9081	3	Impact of Exotic Fishes and Macrophytes on Juvenile Salmonids	***Presentation:*** This study compliments project 9079 and adds a finer level of detail. It will aid in effective management of exotic fish predation on juvenile salmonids. Monitoring exotic species will help return the Columbia River to a more normal system. This study will provide information on fish community structure in the main channel and backwater areas of John Day pool. It also addresses supporting and rebuilding native species. This project is related to the anadromous fish section of the Council Program. We are investigating juvenile salmon as well as exotic fish and the proposal could have gone into either (resident or anadromous fish) section. ***Questions/Answers:*** Would the information be used to manage for or against resident fish? *Answer:* That is a management decision.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			It seems as if your focus is on predation ? *Answer:* Yes, because it is an easy way to monitor interaction and collect community structure information. Are the non-native exotic species the result of midnight fish managers or the result of past management agency activities? *Answer:* Non-native species invaded the backwaters of the artificial impoundments and are now dominant. We want to understand the dynamics before manipulating other factors. How is this predator index different from previous work in John Day pool? *Answer:* The other work was done on the main channel. This study is a finer scale. What is surface area of sloughs and backwater areas (Patterson Slough, Plymouth Slough) compared to reservoir? *Answer:* There is a large backwater area. Who is looking at the functional relationship of shads? *Answer:* We have found shad (larvae). They are a major player and the BPA shad project has ended. We have a FY 99 proposal to look at shad. ***Screening Criteria:*** No. This project belongs in the anadromous fish group. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. Project doesn=t benefit target species. These waters are low priority for native resident salmonids. Predator indexing has already been done in John Day reservoir. ***Programatic Criteria:*** No. This is an anadromous fish project. There is a lot of work done in this area. They could compile The data from that work.
9103	3	Upper Deschutes Basin Watershed Coordinator/Council Support	***Presentation:*** The sponsor did not give a presentation. ***Questions/Answers:*** How were the WTWG concerns addressed in the revised proposal? How does this project relate to the objectives and specific resident measures in the Council's Program? ***Screening Criteria:*** No. The proposal doesn=t meet a specific council measure. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. This is more of a wildlife proposal than anything else. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. The proposal doesn=t meet criteria 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18 ***General Comment:*** This work should be coordinated with other projects in Upper Deschutes Basin.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
9110	3	Assess Resident Fish within Toppenish Creek and Satus Creek	***Presentation:*** A 1980 study surveyed resident fish in two tributaries of the Yakima River. Steelhead return to the Satus basin where there is an ongoing watershed project. ***Questions/Answers****:* Will you look at non-salmonids? *Answer:* Yes, we will look at all species including bull trout. Historically there were no bull trout here. Can you give a brief summary of the anadromous fish work in these two creeks? *Answer:* 80% of the steelhead in the Yakima River go into the Satus watershed. The Toppenish drainage has a lot of irrigation, unscreened diversions and a wildlife refuge. Who operates the hydro project? *Answer:* It is a BOR irrigation project. There is some frustration that anadromous fish projects have ignored resident fish. Why should we fund resident fish work here as opposed to other drainages? *Answer:* Satus Creek is a major steelhead stream. ***Screening Criteria:*** No. The project does not address a specific resident fish measure. ***Technical Criteria****:* No. The objectives and tasks are not clearly developed. There is nothing in the methods section. ***Programmatic Criteira:*** Yes. The work may be valuable, but it should be assimilated into other work in the area from a watershed perspective. This is primarily an anadromous fish area. ***General Comment****:* The project does not appear to coordinate with other ongoing or past work.
9111	3	Evaluate Effects of Food Web Changes on Native Fish Restoration Strategies	***Presentation:*** The project sponsor did not give a presentation. ***Questions/Concerns:*** Does project address a specific measure in the Council=s Program? What is linkage between this and developing a fisheries? The Flathead Lake system is in a constant state of flux and the sponsor proposes to collect data for 2 years and then create a model. How will the model have predictive power in future if the 2 years of data are based on a constantly fluctuating system? Project appears to lack top-down information on water quality and the food web. Research like this has been done before in other systems.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Screening Criteria*:* No ***Technical Criteria:*** No. This appears to be a Flathead Lake research project with limited links to hydropower impacts. Some tasks seem inappropriate and have excessive budgets. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. Project does not meet criteria 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17.
9124	3	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber	***Presentation:*** The bottom line is that Plum Creek is selling all of its property that touches water. It is difficult to determine how much this project will cost but it will not need $2 million for 3 years. The FY 99 budget should be reduced to $250,000. It might be possible to use unallocated money identified in the BPA Quarterly review. The Montana Wildlife Mitigation Trust Fund will contribute $6-$8 million for 50-foot riparian easements which will cover a lot of stream frontage in the Thompson and Fischer River drainages. Target species are bull trout, interior redband trout and cutthroat trout in the headwaters. ***Questions/Answers:*** What is an Aeasement≅? *Answer:* Plum Creek is a private landowner, the Aeasement" restricts the use of the land in perpetuity, even if the property is sold. The easement will specify what can and cannot be done with the land. If the area gets developed, we won=t be able to protect the habitat in the future. These easements will protect the core areas for native species. Plum Creek is currently on a voluntary best management timber practices but these are not always the best. The land is too expensive to buy outright. The dollars requested are for the fish protion of the cost share, wildlife has money for their part. Does the easement include water rights? *Answer:* In Montana, the law is first in time, first in right. Some streams are over appropriated. What is the tie between Libby mitigation and the Fisher River basin? Are the perceived benefits in excess of the Libby Loss Assessment? Do other projects fully mitigate for Libby? *Answer:* Yes. How does the Thompson River work fit in? *Answer:* The Thompson River is a tributary to the Clark Fork downstream from Hungry Horse Dam. This is offsite mitigation for the loss of low gradient habitat. ***Screening Criteria****:* No. The project is not tied to a specific Council Measure. ***Technical Criteria*****:** No. There is not enough specific information to determine the benefit to fish. The proposal lacks a definition of a conservation easement and is not tied to specific loss statement.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Programmatic Criteria*:* No. This is not a priority under the Hungry Horse Mitigation Plan.
9134	3	Effects of Catch and Release Angling and Exhaustive Stress on White Sturgeon	***Presentation:*** Why should BPA fund this research? Because the sturgeon populations are in poor shape due to hydropower development and the current management action (catch-and-release) is designed to protect the populations. Sturgeon support the largest sport fishery in the basin. Catch-and-release is a tool to help protect the populations but we don't know enough about its effects. It is hard to tell if we are actually conserving the population. A report from the Hells Canyon reach discussed stress on sturgeon. The information collected during this study would feed into a bioenergetics model and (Objectives 1 and 2 – swimming performance, metabolic rate) and also provide information needed to consider sturgeon passage at the dams. In Canada and Idaho, angling for Kootenai sturgeon has been banned due to concern about its effects on populations. We don=t know the effect of catch-and-release fishing but we are managing the fish as if we do know. ***Questions/Answers:*** If this is a high priority, why isn't it part of project 8605000? *Answer:* This project will benefit a variety of people. We were asked to separate the tasks and this study is not within the scope of 8605000. Some sturgeon have already been tagged in Hells Canyon. Does that information indicate a problem? Wouldn=t there be evidence if fish were detrimentally affected? *Answer:* Fishing usually occurs in deep water and the carcasses may not be observed, particularly if death is delayed. Washington does annual carcass surveys and appears to find low numbers; but how many is too many? We also want to look at the effects of catch-and-release on reproduction but it is difficult to do. The indirect costs seem high. How much of the budget is going to indirects? *Answer:* 38% is not that high, it covers personnel and equipment. We are told to charge that rate. ***Screen Criteria:*** No. Catch-and release fishing is a management call. This project doesn=t meet a specific Council Measure. ***Technical Criteria:*** No. Given habitat the constraints on white sturgeon it is doubtful that catch-and-release stress is the weak link in sturgeon reproduction. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** No. The proposal failed to meet all of the criteria except 15. ***General Comment:*** There is not mitigative relief from catch-and-release stress. It is the responsibility of managers to initiate and fund this.
9156	3	White Salmon River Watershed	***Presentation:*** The construction of Condit Dam in 1913 totally blocked fish passage. In the 1980s, water quality declined (possibly due to timber harvest, construction, cattle grazing). Local groups began assessing water quality

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
		Enhancement Project	issues and put together a broad-scope watershed management plan. In 1994 the group began implementing restoration projects including education and monitoring. Enhancement work is needed in the basin. This project has 5 objectives: 1. Coordinate activities between stakeholders (Forest Service, private landowners, etc). 2. Identify and document water quality and fish habitat. (Some work has been done and it needs to be continued throughout the entire watershed. The information needs to be compiled in a central place for joint management use.) 3. Implement restoration projects based on past work and our analysis. 4. Expand public education and outreach. (the Conservation District is also using education grants). 5. Monitor and evaluate water quality. ***Questions/Answers:*** Do any entities contribute money? *Answer:* Other entities provide in-kind contributions but not always money. There has been some cost share on the management plans. We have worked with dairies in the Trout Lake area. Do you coordinate with the WDFW Region 5 office in Vancouver? *Answer:* We have communicated to them what we were doing. We would like to cooperate but haven't done any joint work yet. How does thinning trees in riparian zones benefit resident fish? *Answer:* The trees are overstocked - which suppresses growth. Thinning increases the growth rate, larger conifers provide better shade (temperature control) and better large woody debris recruitment. Alders are abundant on the bank in the Trout Lake Creek area. How will the restoration work be maintained in the future? What happens when the ownership/management changes? *Answer:* Cost shares with the land owners ensure that the landowner will maintain the improvements for 10 years. Riparian improvements have more stringent standards. Current laws also ensure that timber companies won=t harvest. We also "educate" the landowners. Is there an overlap with other projects? *Answer:* Above Condit dam, we would have to coordinate those funds. The WTWG asked for additional information on this project. Describe measures, objectives, and technical merits. *Answer:* Condit Dam work will benefit resident and anadromous fish - not just resident fish. Within the budget, there are in-kind contributions as noted from the Forest Service and private timber companies. We didn=t highlight those the first time through the process. If Condit Dam is removed, would the focus be on anadromous fish? *Answer:* Watershed restoration will still benefit both. The screening will be for resident fish too.

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			Is the focus recovery of salmon and steelhead stocks? *Answer:* Even if fish passage is provided at Condit Dam, anadromous fish still can=t get past the falls. ***Screening Criteria****:* No. The project does not meet a specific Council Program measure. ***Technical Criteria****:* Yes. This project should coordinate with 9033, 9156 and 9095. ***Programatic Criteria****:* No. The project addresses mostly non - federal hydro impacts. BPA ratepayers are not responsible. ***General Comment****:* There is an anadromous fish component to this project.
9094	4	Produce Kokanee Salmon in Net Pens for Release Into Lake Roosevelt	***Presentation:*** Kokanee released as yearlings survive better than those released as fry. And, raising fish to a larger size requires more space. This is intended as a one-time low cost project. Volunteers will do the ground work. Funds were allocated in FY 98 but the project has not moved forward because of lack of coordination. It was submitted for FY 99 just to keep it on the books. The Council considers these net pens an expamsion of the Scope of Work of the Spokane Tribal Hatchery, therefore this project will have to go through the 3-step process. **Withdrawn by the sponsor.**
9202406	4	Public Fisheries Education/Enhanced Protection of Resident/ESA Species	**Withdrawn. The Council phased out enforcement projects in FY 98.**
9401200	4	Kootenai River Fisheries Investigation M&E Supplemental Budget	***Presentation:*** This project started out as a supplemental budget to support the monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the white sturgeon aquaculture (8806400) and the Kootenai River Fisheries investigations (8806500). This project could be withdrawn and the funds could be added to those two projects. The KTOI has already included $50,000 in project 8806400. The remaining $50,000 should be added to IDGF=s 8806500. ***Questions/Answers****:* The money that the RFM allocated to the new field station last year was to be deducted from the FY 99 budget. Was it? *Answer:* It didn=t work out that way. How much money is really needed for sturgeon? *Answer:* The KTOI worked on this last year and will provide updated numbers. The FY 99 funding level will be zero because $50,000 from this project was already included in project 8806400 and the

ID	Criteria Status	Title	Comments
			remaining $50,000 has been added to project 8806500.

Appendix D. Wildlife

0. Background

The Northwest Power Act of 1980 recognizes that the development and operation of the hydroelectric dams of the Columbia River and its tributaries has impacted fish and wildlife resources. The Act calls upon the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC or Council) to develop a program to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife, including related spawning grounds and habitat, on the Columbia River and its tributaries (NPA 1980, Section 4(h)(1)(A), page 12; NPPC 1995, Section 2, page 2-1). The Council's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program was created as a result of the Act. The goal of the Council's Wildlife Program is to fully mitigate for the wildlife losses that have resulted from the construction and operation of the federal and non-federal hydroelectric facilities (NPPC 1995, Section 11.1, page 11-2) while assuring an adequate, efficient, economical, and reliable power supply (NPPC 1995, Section 2.1, page 2-1).

Each state, associated tribe, and agency completed a wildlife construction loss assessment for each hydroelectric facility. The impacts (positive and negative) of the hydroprojects on wildlife resources were quantified using Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP). Upon completion of the Wildlife Loss Assessments, mitigation plans were developed for some hydroelectric projects. The mitigation plans were to be approved by the NPPC, at which time the BPA or the appropriate project operator was to fund implementation of the plans.

An audit of these Loss Assessments prepared in 1993 (Beak 1993) identified several differences in impact assessment approaches between the states. An amendment to the Council's Wildlife Program called for a written plan (i.e., Wildlife Plan) to determine how to reduce the likelihood of differences in methodology as the Loss Assessments were standardized and completed. The Wildlife Plan outlined procedures to standardize the original Loss Assessments, assess impacts caused by the operation of hydroelectric dams, and integrate credit gained through existing wildlife mitigation consistently between hydroprojects. Additionally, the Wildlife Plan called for developing and implementing mitigation plans that will fully mitigate for wildlife losses, and monitoring and evaluating mitigation activities to ensure mitigation success. The Wildlife Plan incorporated quality assurance procedures that address the technical quality of products and the consistency between region-wide efforts.

0. Wildlife Project Rankings and FY 99 Budget Proposal

The following scoresheet in Table 1 contains the results of applying the Wildlife Mitigation Evaluation Criteria (as described in 11.2D.1 of the NPPC FWP, also attached) to the 42 wildlife projects proposed in FY 1999. All projects receiving a final score were considered appropriate and qualified for funding, and are moving forward in FY 1999. Several projects included multiple, discrete acquisitions. Those components were individually ranked, as reflected on the scoresheet. Projects that did not pass the threshold criteria are not listed on the scoresheet, but are addressed below. The managers recommend allocation of $15,300,660 for wildlife projects, as detailed in Volume I, Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Wildlife Mitigation Criteria Score Sheet

ID	Title	Sponsor	A	B	C	D	E	F	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
9013	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Continuing Acquisition	CCT	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	0	0	1	0	1	2.5	1.5	2.4	1	2	0	1.5	2	16.9
9061	River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	USFS	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	1	0.5	1	0	2	2	0	3	3	1	1	1.5	2	19
9062	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	USFS	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	3	3	2	0	1.5	2	19.5
9106	OWC, Acquisition of Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site	BPT	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0.5	1	1	2	2.1	3	2	1	0	3	21.6
9116	Rasor Ranch Acquisition/Crab Creek Watershed Restoration	USFWS/CNWS	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	0	3	3	1.5	0	2	3	21
9206100	Albeni Falls Everett's Island	IDFG	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	0	1	2	17
9206100	Albeni Falls Gamlin Lake	IDFG	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	2	0	2.5	3	4	1	1	2	19
9206200	Yakama Nation – Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	YIN	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0.5	1.5	2	1	3	3	2.5	1	2	2	24.5
9505700	S. Idaho - S. Fork of Snake	IDFG	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	3	2.5	1	2	2	22.5
9505700	S. Idaho – Camas Prairie	IDFG	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	2	1.5	2.4	3	3	1	1.5	2	20.4
9505700	S. Idaho – Boise Foothills	IDFG	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	0.5	0	1	1	2	2	0.5	2	1	2	1	3	2	19
9505700	S. Idaho – Portneuf	SBT	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	0	2	1	0.5	2	1.5	1	2.6	3	2	0	1	2	19.6
9705904	OWC, Horn Butte	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	0	1	0.5	1	2	0	3	3	3	1	2	2	21.5
9705905	OWC, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0	2	1.5	0	3	3	2	0.5	1	2	21
9705906	OWC, McKenzie River Islands	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0.5	0	2	0	1.2	3	2	1	0.5	1	17.2
9705907	OWC, E. E. Wilson WMA Additions	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0.5	1	2	0	1.8	3	2	1	2	2	21.3
9705908	OWC, Multnomah Channel	Metro	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	1	1	0	2	1.5	0	3	3	2	0	2	2	20.5
9705909	OWC, Mitchell Point	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	1	1	0	2	2.5	0	3	2	4	0	1	1	20.5
9705910	OWC, Trout Creek Canyon	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0.5	0	1.5	0	2.1	3	1.5	0	2	2	18.6
9705911	OWC, Irrigon WMA Additions	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.5	0	2.1	3	1.5	0	2	2	17.1
9705912	OWC, Wenaha WMA Additions	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	0.5	2	1	0	1	1.5	0	1.6	3	1.5	0	2.5	3	19.6
9705913	OWC, South Fork Crooked River	ODFW	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	1.7	3	1.5	1	0	2	18.2
9705915	OWC, Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge Wildlife Mitigation Project	CTUIR	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	1	1	1	0	2	2.5	0	3	3	2	1	2	1	21.5
9705916	OWC, Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions	USFWS	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1	1	2	1	1	1	1.5	0	2.9	3	2	1	2	2	21.4

1=Meets the Screening, Technical and Programmatic criteria. 2=Meets some (but not all) of the criteria. 3=Does not meet screening criteria or received "no's" in all 3 categories

Previously Approved, Nondiscretionary, and Ongoing Projects

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY99
9004401	Lake Creek Land Acquisition and Enhancement	CDA	186,083
9009200	Wanaket Wildlife Mitigation Project	CTUIR	150,000
9106000	Kalispel Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project	KT	115,557
9106100	WDFW Projects	WDFW	233,300
9107800	Burlington Bottoms Wildlife Mitigation Project	ODFW	58,000
9204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range	CCT	250,000
9205900	Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands Phase II	TNC	50,000
9506001	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish & Wildlife Habitat	CTUIR	200,000
9506700	Colville Confederated Tribes Performance Contract (Credits For Habitat)	CCT	100,000
9608000	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation Project	NPT	227,735
9800300	O & M Funding of Wildlife Habitat on STOI Reservation for Grand Coulee Dam	STOI	96,939

Projects considered by BPA to be nondiscretionary, ongoing O&M projects, and other projects previously reviewed by the caucus were not re-ranked, and are again recommended for funding by Bonneville. Project lands have been purchased or leased and funding is for long-term enhancement and operation and maintenance. Working with BPA and the NPPC, the caucus has developed standards for reasonable O&M and enhancement activities, and is scheduled to review these ongoing projects for consistency with these standards in May 1998.

Program consistency: Measure 11.3D.5 directs Bonneville to fund ongoing wildlife mitigation projects and incorporate them into agreements. These projects are directed at mitigating for losses identified in NPPC Table 11-4 and thus are consistent with measure 11.3A.1. Additionally Measure 11.3C.1 directs Bonneville to provide adequate operation and maintenance funding to sustain the mitigation for which it receives credit.

Coordinated Implementation

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY99
9206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation Project	IDFG	700,000
9206200	Yakama Nation – Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	YIN	1,600,000
9206800	Implementation of Willamette Basin Mitigation Program--Wildlife	ODFW	400,000
9505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation	IDFG	3,111,446
9609400	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife Habitat Units Acquisition	WDFW	3,130,100
9705900	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon	OWC	4,000,000
9106	OWC - Acquisition of Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site	BPT	
9130	OWC - Burns Paiute Mitigation Coordinator	BPT	
9140	OWC - Acquisition of Pine Creek Ranch	CTWSRO	
9705904	OWC - Oregon, Horn Butte	ODFW	
9705905	OWC - Oregon, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	ODFW	
9705906	OWC - Oregon, McKenzie River Islands	ODFW	
9705907	OWC - Oregon, E. E. Wilson WMA Additions	ODFW	
9705908	OWC - Oregon, Multnomah Channel	Metro	
9705909	OWC - Oregon, Mitchell Point	ODFW	
9705910	OWC - Oregon, Trout Creek Canyon	ODFW	
9705911	OWC - Oregon, Irrigon WMA Additions	ODFW	
9705912	OWC - Oregon, Wenaha WMA Additions	ODFW	
9705913	OWC - Oregon, South Fork Crooked River	ODFW	

9705915	OWC - Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge Wildlife Mitigation Project	CTUIR	
9705916	OWC - Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions	USFWS	

This category includes planning and coordination efforts that have been funded in the past or are called for directly in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. Several projects are combined under these coordinated efforts. For example, a number of projects in southern Idaho by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Shoshone Bannock Tribes were combined under the single heading of "Southern Idaho Mitigation Project." The Oregon Wildlife Coalition (OWC) projects are approved for implementation under "umbrella project" 9705900, pending the resolution of hydroproject crediting issues. The Yakama Indian Nation is continuing acquisitions under its coordinated wetland restoration project begun under the Washington Interim Agreement. Acquisitions in the Albeni Falls project area are coordinated under the multi-agency Albeni Falls working group. Similar efforts have, and are continuing to be funded in the State of Washington under the Washington Interim Wildlife Agreement. New acquisitions developed as part of these programs have been and will continue to be submitted to the Wildlife Caucus annually and ranked prior to funding.

As stated above, Measure 11.D.8 calls for coordinated planning and implementation for projects in southern Idaho. Additionally, Measure 11.3D.7 calls on Bonneville to fund advance design studies for mitigation at Black Canyon Reservoir. Measure 11.3D.8 specifically addresses the Idaho projects and call on Bonneville to fund advance design activities and initiate implementation planning for projects associated with the Palisades project in consultation with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and the State of Idaho. Consolidation of the Camas Prairie and the South Fork Snake River Project is consistent with this measure. The inclusion of mitigation for the Minidoka project is not addressed specifically in the Program, however it appears to make sense to include it as part of the coordinated effort in southern Idaho and is not inconsistent with the intent of the Program Measure 11.3E which anticipates long term state wide or subregional funding agreements for wildlife mitigation. Although there is not a specific measure addressing consolidation of efforts in Oregon, the proposed project does consolidate several existing planning efforts and pre-project planning requirements such as NEPA. This also appears to be consistent with the development of the long-term agreements anticipated under Measure 11.3E.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The development of a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) program as outlined in the Wildlife Plan began in FY98 and will continue in FY99. The Wildlife Caucus believes that funding of these efforts is necessary to ensure successful implementation of wildlife mitigation projects. The M&E plan is supported with funds carried forward from FY97 and FY98 (project 9706400).

Measure 11.4 calls for a monitoring program to determine projected benefits to wildlife that result from the Program. The mechanism for developing such a process has been described in the Wildlife Plan as addressed in Measure 11.3B.1.

New Project Proposals

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY99
9013	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Continuing Acquisition	CCT	150,000
9061	River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	USFS	125,000
9062	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	USFS	21,500
9116	Rasor Ranch Acquisition/Crab Creek Watershed Restoration Project	USFWS	395,000

This group consists of projects that were submitted through the general BPA solicitation for FY99 projects. The Wildlife Caucus evaluated and ranked these projects at its March and April, 1998 meetings.

Tier 2 Projects

In order to allow all qualified projects to move forward in FY99, several wildlife project budget requests were reduced. The caucus will reallocate any unspent funds identified in the BPA Quarterly Review process to projects with budget reductions. (See Volume I, Table 3 for magnitude of reduction and impacted tasks.)

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Request
9096	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation O&M Trust Fund	NPT	3,392,822

Project 9096, Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation O&M Trust Fund, was submitted as an alternative funding arrangement for O&M project 9608000. Fiscal restraints prohibit its implementation in FY99. The members of the CBFWA Wildlife Caucus fully support the establishment and use of trust funds to fund the operation and maintenance of existing wildlife mitigation projects as well as the implementation of new wildlife mitigation activities. Trust funds are the caucus's preferred method to ensure the continued funding of wildlife mitigation activities throughout the Columbia River Basin. The Wildlife Caucus is developing a coordinated, program-wide proposal for realizing the substantial cost savings achieved through trust funds. Project 9096 is recommended for funding only if a substantial amount of additional funds becomes available for the wildlife program.

Tier 3 Projects

Several projects failed to meet the Wildlife Caucus screening criteria, as detailed below.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Request
9021	Mitigate Wildlife Losses on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation	SPT	253,200

Project 9021, Mitigate Wildlife Losses on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, did not meet threshold criteria E, "Is the proposed project consistent with, or does it complement the activities of the region's state and federal wildlife agencies and Indian tribe(s)?" The wildlife inventory tasks proposed are not consistent with the loss assessment approach pursued in the wildlife program. The hydropower-related wildlife losses of the Shoshone Paiute Tribe appear to be primarily operational and secondary impacts. At this time, the caucus has not developed a coordinated approach to assessing and addressing those impacts, (although these efforts are beginning in FY98 and continuing in FY99), and anticipates working with the Tribes to address these impacts.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Request
9023	Enforcement of ESA Laws on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation	SPT	92,500

Project 9023, Enforcement of ESA Laws on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation appears to be inconsistent with threshold criteria D, "Does this project impose on Bonneville the funding responsibilities of others, as prohibited by the Northwest Power Act?"

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Request
9042	Critical Ecosystem Reclamation, Recovery and Recharge Project	SBT	266,560

Project 9042, Critical Ecosystem Reclamation, Recovery and Recharge Project, is not consistent with threshold criteria A, "Is the project based on and supported by the best available scientific knowledge?" and threshold criteria E, "Is the proposed project consistent with, or does it complement the activities of the region's state and federal wildlife agencies and Indian tribe(s)?" Many of the proposed actions are not supported under the wildlife program. The project sponsor is encouraged to coordinate with the Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation Project, revise the proposal, and resubmit for funding in FY00.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Request
9043	Introducing Systems Science to Planning and Implementing F&W Recovery	DU	1,143,000

Ducks Unlimited's FY99 project proposal, "Introducing System Science to Planning & Implementing Fish & Wildlife Recovery in the Watershed", addresses a new approach to watershed restoration that has not been previously considered by the Northwest Power Planning Council. Although submitted as a Wildlife Project for FY99, the Wildlife Caucus believes this proposed approach aimed at restoring watershed functions includes non-wildlife components (in addition to wildlife components). Therefore, the Wildlife Caucus recommends all three CBFWA caucuses review this project if it is resubmitted in the future.

The Wildlife Caucus has several specific concerns with DU's project proposal. Funding of this project would affect on-going watershed projects as well as other projects proposed for implementation throughout the Columbia River Basin. There are numerous watershed projects already being conducted throughout the Basin. Any new approach to watershed restoration, such as DU's proposal, should be carefully coordinated with established watershed councils and incorporated into on-going watershed activities and plans to avoid duplication of efforts. Implementation of a new approach without coordination with existing processes and activities would not be a wise use of limited funds. Also, implementation of this project with its proposed budget as proposed would affect the availability of funds for implementing other projects proposed by the various Tribes and Agencies throughout the Basin.

The Wildlife Caucus also has concerns about the technical merit of the DU project proposal. It appears that the success of this proposed approach relies wholly on a total of two or three public meetings. It is assumed that only two or three meeting will be needed for watershed participants to agree on the activities necessary for restoration of a particular watershed. The Wildlife Caucus questions this assumption. As proposed, the mechanism to gain total agreement is the STELLA program. STELLA projects the actions of the suggested restoration activities over time. The Wildlife Caucus has had no experience on the use of this program, and is unwilling to deviate from the existing watershed process, as flawed as it may be, to implement a new process based on a program that no one is familiar with. Experience has shown that even the best and clearest projections of how our actions will affect our future usually do not result in across-the-board agreements among publics with differing goals and perspectives.

In summary, the Wildlife Caucus recommends that DU's project proposal in its present form not be funded in FY99. If DU wishes to resubmit this project proposal and apply for BPA funding in FY00, the Caucus suggests that the project proposal be submitted to all three CBFWA caucuses for review. The Caucus also recommends that the project be incorporated into the on-going activities of an established watershed council. A watershed test case would allow the Tribes and Agencies to review the applicability of the approach to the overall process. The decision to expand this approach to other areas could then be made based on these results.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Request
9206801	Implementation of Willamette Basin Mitigation Program--Watershed	ODFW	500,000

The project sponsor withdrew this project from consideration. It is an exact duplication of recommended project 9206800, Implementation of Willamette Basin Mitigation Program-Wildlife.

WILDLIFE WORKING GROUP
Definitions and Weighting Factors Assigned to
Wildlife Mitigation Criteria
Developed by the
Northwest Power Planning Council

PROGRAM CONSISTENCY - THRESHOLD QUESTIONS:

A. Is the project based on and supported by the best available scientific knowledge? (Response must be supported by answers to questions 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.)

B. Is the project biologically possible? (Response must be supported by answers to questions 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.)

C. Are there any state, federal or local laws, ordinances, executive orders which would prevent this project from coming to fruition?

D. Does this project impose on Bonneville the funding responsibilities of others, as prohibited by the Northwest Power Act?

E. Is the proposed project consistent with, or does it complement the activities of the region's state and federal wildlife agencies and Indian tribe(s)? (Identify agency/tribe affected.)

F. Does the project have measurable objectives, such as Habitat Units and/or species response to actions planned?

RANKING CRITERIA:

1. **Be the least costly way to achieve the biological objective.** Project presentation must identify and separate costs for preplanning, acquisition, enhancement, operation and maintenance for a five year period. Project presentation should also discuss enhancement (development) plans, site potential, and the anticipated minimum number of Habitat Units by target species that would result from implementation of this project.

   Points: 0 = Less cost effective
   1 = Comparable costs
   2 = More cost effective

2. **Encourage the formation of partnerships with other persons or entities, which would reduce project costs, increase benefits, and/or eliminate duplicative activities.**
   Beyond general community support, the extent to which evidence presented shows this project demonstrates efficiencies and/or reduces costs through documented use of matching funds, volunteers, donations, signed cooperative agreements or signed memoranda of understanding, (includes tribal lands if dedicated in perpetuity for wildlife mitigation and if credit is given to BPA for enhancements).

   Points: 0 = No evidence presented.
   .5 = Letter of interest is documented.
   1 = Letter of commitment is documented.

3. **Provide riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife (for resident and anadromous fish.)**

   Points: 0 = No benefits to fish.
   1 = Incidental benefits to fish.
   2 = Substantive benefits to fish.

4. **Address concerns over additions to public land ownership and impacts on local communities, such as reduction or loss of local government tax base, special district tax base, or the local economic base; or consistency with local government or tribal governments' comprehensive plans.**

Points: 0 = Does not demonstrate tangible effort to address concerns.
1 = Does demonstrate tangible effort to address concerns.

5. **Immediacy of Threat.** The extent to which evidence (documented) shows that acquisition of this site is necessary to protect the site from an identified threat. Documentation is defined as (but not limited to): a letter, a picture, or a news article, which clearly shows the property is on the market for sale, rezoning or regulations are pending, property is being subdivided, or timber/mineral rights are for sale.

Points: 0 =No evidence presented or minimal threat; target feature(s) appear to be in no immediate danger of loss in quality, (e.g. could be partially protected by zoning, regulation or voluntary measures)
1 =Actions are under consideration which could result in the target feature(s) losing quality. (Must be documented.)

6. **Use publicly owned land for mitigation, or management agreements on private or tribal land, in preference to acquisition of private land, while providing permanent protection or enhancement of wildlife habitat.**

Points: 0 = Does not utilize easements or publicly owned land.
1 = Utilizes a mixture of fee title acquisition and easements or public lands.
2 = Project can be completed using management agreements, easements and/or public lands.

7. **Mitigate losses in-place; in-kind, where practical.** Out-of-kind mitigation is not acceptable for impacts to habitat for: endangered, threatened, sensitive or candidate species. When out-of-kind mitigation is being proposed, the sponsor must identify the proposed species or habitat type substitution. Project must also identify the target species and which hydroelectric facility(ies) will be credited with mitigation. Air miles (from anywhere on the pool) are used to calculate distances.

Points: 0 = Off-site (more than 100 miles) and out-of-kind.
1.0 = Off-site (more than 100 miles) and in-kind.
1.5 = Off-site (50-100 miles) and in-kind.
2.0 = On-site (within 50 miles) and in-kind.
2.5 = On-site (must be adjacent to impact area) and in-kind.

8. **Address special wildlife losses in area that formerly had salmon and steelhead runs that were eliminated by hydroelectric projects (for example, societal and tribal wildlife losses).** Criteria contains two factors and therefore receives points for both rating factors:

A. *Dam causing impact: (identify dam)*

Points: 0 = No blockage of existing anadromous fish.
.5 = Blocks anadromous fish, but tribe in the area still has access to anadromous fishery.
1.0 = Blocks anadromous fish. Tribe in region does not have access to anadromous fishery.

AND

B. *Mitigation project proposed:*

Points: 0 = Does not mitigate for tribal losses.

1 = Addresses tribal losses.

9. **Address achieving the Council's mitigation priorities (See Attachment B).** The purpose of this question is to determine how closely the proposed project matches the NPPC's mitigation priorities. To score the project, use the following example: The proposed project has: (Determined by Attachment A)

	45% High priority habitat	= 4.5
	25% Medium priority habitat	= 2.5
	30% Low priority habitat	= 3.0
Points:	High = .3 points	
	Med = .2 points	
	Low = .1 point	
Scoring:	High priority habitat	= 4.5 X .3 Points = 1.35
	Medium priority habitat	= 2.5 x .2 Points = .50
	Low priority habitat	= 3.0 x .1 Point = .30
	Total Score	= 2.15

10. **Protect endangered, threatened, and sensitive species.** The extent to which evidence presented supports significant occurrence of threatened, endangered status, and/or sensitive, fish and wildlife species. Sponsor must demonstrate the relationship of the proposed project to key life history attribute of the species; e.g., breeding, wintering, feeding, resting and migration.

The site exhibits significant occurrences of:

Points:
- 0 = No species listed in state or federal policy, or listed species is an occasional visitor.
- 1 = One species listed threatened or sensitive in state or federal policy.
- 2 = One species listed endangered in state or federal policy.
- 3 = More than one species listed threatened, endangered or sensitive.

11. **Protect high quality, native or other habitat.** (Habitat Quality)The extent to which evidence presented establishes that the area is among the best representatives of this type for the target species. The intent of this question is to determine the quality of habitat of a site compared to other sites of the same type. Consider quality and extent of cover, key structural elements, species composition, water, food sources, human disturbance, etc.

Points:
- 0 = Marginal quality. High number of vegetative intrusions and/or degradation present compared to others of same type. This site exhibits low quality and will require restoration. OR Land to be managed to support vegetation or habitat not existing there naturally (i.e. planting of ornamental vegetation, creation of artificial impoundments, water control structures).
- 1 = Moderate quality. Vegetative intrusions and/or degradation are present. Will require some restoration (i.e. the majority of the property was intensively used). Property is degraded but has moderate potential for rehabilitation.
- 2 = Average quality. Property is degraded but has high potential for rehabilitation.
- 3 = Good quality. No significant vegetative intrusions found. Site is among the best regional representatives of this type (i.e., existing habitat is near optimum stage and exhibits signs of past disturbance). May require some restoration.
- 4 = Excellent quality. No significant vegetative intrusions found. Site is among the best state representatives of this type.

12. **Uniqueness of Habitat Types.** The extent to which evidence presented shows this project is unique. This can be based the rarity of the site's key elements or on the project size (i.e. the whole drainage or an "ecosystem") or distribution and status of its key elements. For scoring purposes, protected is defined as

public/tribal land owned and managed exclusively for, and accessible to, wildlife OR land which through zoning, regulation or voluntary measures is not in danger of a loss in habitat quality and is accessible to wildlife.

Points: 0 = Ordinary. The elements or types are widely distributed across the region and several examples are protected.
1 = Unusual. Poor distribution and few examples are protected.

13. **Connectivity.** The extent to which evidence presented establishes that acquisition or management of this site will benefit or be benefited by other protected lands. Protected is defined as public or tribal land managed exclusively for, and accessible to, wildlife OR land which through zoning, regulation, or voluntary measures is not in danger of a loss in habitat quality and is accessible to wildlife.

Points: 0 = No or marginal connectivity. Generally, the area does not relate to existing protected area/protected watershed.
1 = Moderate connectivity. The site will modestly enhance an existing protected area/protected watershed.
2 = Good connectivity. The site provides an important ecological corridor to at least one other protected area/watershed.
3 = Excellent connectivity. The site is an important ecological corridor to an especially important protected area/protected watershed (consider total size if multiple sites are involved).

14. **Long-term management potential.** (Protect or enhance natural ecosystems and species diversity over the long term.) The extent to which evidence presented shows the overall site (core and key buffer tract(s)) can be managed over the long term and still protect the target species. Consider site size, location, and buffers (to withstand surrounding human activities and invader species). A buffer increases protection of adjacent core site values by screening it from outside impacts and improving manageability. Target features surrounded by numerous protected and undeveloped acres tend to resist most threatening forces than features surrounded by developed acres.

Points: 1 = Marginal protection. On a long term basis, core and/or buffer areas are probably too small/poorly located to withstand existing or future incompatible activities on neighboring lands (e.g., timber harvesting, high density developments etc.).
2 = Average protection. Buffers/size/location are probably large enough to withstand existing or future incompatible activities on neighboring lands.

3 = Excellent protection. Buffers/size/location will definitely foil significant incompatible outside influences.

WILDLIFE MITIGATION PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA

RELATIONSHIP TO NPPC PROGRAM PRINCIPLES

		NPPC Program Reference	
THRESHOLD QUESTIONS			
A.	Best scientific knowledge	Power Act	
B.	Biologically possible	Power Act	
C.	Laws preventing project implementation	11.2D.l	#11
D.	Impose funding respons. of others to BPA	11.2D.1	#9
E.	Consistent with state, fed, tribal	11.2D.l	#7
F.	Measurable objectives	11.2D.1	#2
SOCIAL/ECONOMIC:			
1.	Least cost	11. 2D. 1	#1
2.	Partnerships	11.2D.1	#8
4.	Public land/impacts to local economy	11.2D.1	#11
6.	Use of public land vs acquisition	11.2D.1	#12
8.	Wildlife losses in blocked areas	11. 2D. 1	#10
	Wildlife losses in blocked areas	1l.2D.l	#10
BIOLOGICAL MERIT:			
3.	Provides riparian benefits for fish	11.2D.1	#4
7.	In-place, In-kind	11.2D.1	#5
9.	NPPC mitigation priorities	11.2E.1	
10.	Protect T,E, and S	11.2D.1	#3
11.	Protect high quality habitat (Includes potential to restore hi-qual)	11.2D.1	#3
12.	Uniqueness of habitat types	11.2D.1	#3
13.	Connectivity	11.2D.1	#7
LOGISTICS:			
5.	Immediacy of threat	Power Act	
14.	Long term management potential	11.2D.1	#6

References

Beak Consultants, Inc. February 1993. Audit of Wildlife Loss Assessments for Federal Dams on the Columbia River and its Tributaries.

BPA, March 1997. Wildlife Mitigation Program Final Environmental Impact Statement.

CBFWA, June 1997. Draft Multi-Year Implementation Plan.

CBFWA Wildlife Caucus, May 1998. Enhancement, Restoration, Operations and Maintenance of Columbia Basin Wildlife Mitigation Projects.

NPPC, September 1995. Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Wildlife Working Group, December 1994. Draft Wildlife Plan, Version 5.