Appendix A. Project Review

Table of Contents

Project Review Methods 3
Technical Evaluations 5
    Watershed Technical Work Group 5
    Non-watershed Technical Work Group 35
    Fish Passage Advisory Committee 50
Management Evaluations 56
    Anadromous fish proposals 56
    Resident Fish Proposals 86
    Wildlife Proposals 105

List of Tables

Table 1. Watershed project results summary 6
Table 2. Watershed technical work group evaluation 7
Table 3. Watershed technical work group evaluation comments 16
Table 4. Non-watershed technical work group evaluation 36
Table 5. Fish Passage Advisory Committee evaluation 51
Table 6. Anadromous fish management evaluation 58
Table 7. Anadromous fish management SRT evaluation comments 70
Table 8. Resident fish management evaluation 91
Table 9. Resident fish management evaluation comments 95
Table 10. Wildlife management evaluation 113
Table 11. Wildlife management evaluation comments 115

Project Review Methods

The FY 2000 proposal evaluation process was curtailed as we received the project proposals in February and had to deliver the DAIWP by April 16. Given the contracted time frame for the second year in a row, we strongly recommend an earlier solicitation date for FY 2001 projects and CBFWA will work closely with NPPC and BPA in order to achieve this objective.

Between February and mid-April, 1999, the Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) reviewed and evaluated each proposed FY 2000 project submitted to the BPA Direct Fish and Wildlife Program. The projects were directed to one or more evaluation team according to the sponsor's designation of programmatic category and project type (anadromous fish, resident fish, wildlife, watershed, etc.). Three technical evaluation teams were assembled in order to review the technical qualifications of each proposed project. The Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) evaluated the technical merits of "watershed" projects. The Non-Watershed Technical Work Group (NWTWG) evaluated the technical merits of non-mainstem, non-watershed anadromous projects and the Fish Passage Advisory Committee (FPAC) evaluated the technical merits of the mainstem non-watershed anadromous projects. After these groups completed their technical review of the projects, within only 2-3 weeks of receiving the proposals, the CBFWA caucuses evaluated the management and fiscal aspects of all the proposed projects.

The projects were assigned to each evaluation team according to criteria listed on the project proposal. CBFWA staff reviewed each proposal and assigned the project to a technical and caucus review team. In some instances, the proposals were assigned to review teams other than the ones stated on the proposal forms, due to uncertainties in the project description. Due to the wide array of projects submitted for funding, some decisions had to be made as to where a project best fit in the process.

The Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG) was established by the CBFWA in 1997 to use integrated technical criteria for Fish and Wildlife Program proposal evaluations for the CBFWA FY99 and FY2000 DAIWPs. The criteria focus on the technical merit and feasibility of project proposals; for instance, whether the proposed project will achieve its expected results using the actions and strategies that are proposed. By performing analysis of the technical merit and feasibility of project proposals, the WTWG provides a useful and valuable service to the fish and wildlife managers.

The WTWG review is a process used internally by the fish and wildlife managers to provide information for their management review and budget development each fiscal year. The WTWG advises CBFWA through a report citing concerns and comments regarding each watershed project . Comments provided by the WTWG are of particular benefit to the management and fiscal review of watershed projects by the fish and wildlife managers. The comments raise questions that were then asked and answered during the fish and wildlife managers' review process.

Technical input is just one part of the process of selecting and recommending project proposals. During the management review by subbasin co-managers the WTWG recommendations must be

put into the context of subbasin goals, objectives and strategies. Using this guidance a project proposal is reviewed for its inherent, critical importance as a strategy for achieving the management goals for fish and wildlife populations. It is a distinct possibility that a project proposal might receive a negative technical recommendation from the WTWG and yet is of critical importance from a management point of view. This is based upon the fact that while the WTWG members have technical expertise generally but do not have the specific experience and knowledge of the subbasin co-managers especially relative to management needs. It is also not the purpose of the WTWG to engage in policy evaluation while reviewing the technical merits of each project.

After using the process for three years, some inadequacies are now evident and need to be addressed before the FY2001 review. There are too many projects to review in too short a timeframe, which in FY2000, did not allow for the entire WTWG to participate. Each WTWG member had approximately 30 projects to review this year and therefore the full component of expertise and representation throughout the geographic scope of the Columbia River Basin was missing for the FY2000 review. All WTWG members are not equally familiar with the purposes and goals of the Fish and Wildlife Program. In some cases the WTWG technical support for a specific project proposal left subbasin co-managers wondering if the WTWG understood the purpose of the fish and wildlife program generally or the anadromous program specifically. Also, the criteria are not equally applicable to the wide variety of project proposals and the criteria can be redundant or not of equal importance in the determination of technical merit. The number of “yes” or “no” answers do not always provide a reliable measure of whether the project is or is not technically sound. The review process and format can be improved to emphasize technical questions and concerns that the fish and wildlife managers can then address in their management and fiscal review and budget development.

Technical Evaluations

Watershed Technical Work Group

(Anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife watershed proposals)

Process

On October 9, 1998, BPA invited sponsors of new and ongoing projects addressing all aspects of the NPPC FWP to submit proposals by December 9, 1998. BPA received 434 responses including 176 "watershed proposals". Those proposals (94 ongoing projects, 75 new projects and 7 umbrella proposals) were distributed to the WTWG for evaluation in mid January 1999. The umbrella proposals provided important background information about subbasins but were not formally reviewed by the WTWG because there were no funding requests for these proposals.

From a procedural point of view, each WTWG member was assigned primary responsibility for reviewing 20 to30 proposals and was expected to "be familiar" with the remaining proposals. During the February 3-5, 1999 meeting in Portland, the WTWG collectively evaluated and came to a consensus recommendation on each of the 10 Integrated Technical Criterion for each proposed project. Although there was a "primary reviewer" for each proposal, the recommendations in this report represent the consensus view of the entire group, not the primary reviewer. WTWG members voluntarily left the room when the group discussed a project in which they had a vested interest. Table 1 summarizes the WTWG's detailed evaluation of the proposals relative to the criteria and includes the following responses: Y (yes), N (no), I (incomplete), and NA (not applicable). The column titled "Final" shows the WTWG final consensus recommendation about whether the project was technically sound and feasible. Table 2 includes a bulleted set of comments about each project. This technical review is but one step in the CBFWA project selection process and will be used by the caucuses to develop the FY2000 Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan.

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.)?

Results

The WTWG evaluated the technical merit and feasibility of 169 proposals for new and ongoing projects. As the table below shows, 75 projects (53 ongoing and 22 new) are considered technically sound. The remaining 94 projects (41 ongoing and 53 new) are not technically sound.

Table 1. Watershed project results summary

	Yes	No	Total
Ongoing	53 (56% of ongoing)	41 (44% of ongoing)	94 (56% of total)
New	22 (29% of new)	53 (71% of new)	75 (44% of total)
Total	75 (44% of total)	94 (56% of total)	169

Table 2. Watershed technical work group evaluation

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
20001	Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore instream and riparian habitat on	USFWS	Upper Mid-Columbia	Wenatchee	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
20002	Hydrologic Study of Stangland, Tyler and Clear Lake Area	Stangland-Tyler Aquifer Study	Upper Mid-Columbia	Crab	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	NA	N	Y	N	N
20003	Enhance Fish Habitat by Improving Water Quality	SYCD	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	I	I	I	I	Y	N
20004	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	White Salmon River Watershed Management Committee c/o Underwood Conservation District	Lower Mid-Columbia	Little White Salmon, Big White Salmon	I	N	N	I	I	I	Y	I	I	I	N
20005	West Fisher Watershed Restoration	USFS	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	I	N	N	I	I	Y	I	I	N	Y	N
20007	Acquire and Conserve Priority Bull Trout Habitat in Trestle Creek Watershed	River Network	Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I	Y
20008	Monitor and Protect Wigwam River Bull Trout for Koocanusa Reservoir	British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	N	NA	I	Y	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	N
20010	Improve Fish Habitat by Reducing Farm Sediment Runoff	Benton Conservation District	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	I	Y	N
20013	Restore Unobstructed Fish Passage to Duncan Creek	SLOA	Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y
20015	Characterize and Assess the John Day Watershed Using Landsat Tm Imagery	Northwest Habitat Institute	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	NA	N	NA	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	N	N
20017	Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	SBT, IDFG, USFS	Lower Snake	Salmon	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
20018	Tucannon River and Asotin Creek Riparian Enhancement	WDFW	Lower Snake	Tucannon, Asotin	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20027	Electronic Columbia Basin Watershed Newsletter	Intermountain Communications	Systemwide	Systemwide	NA	NA	N	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
20028	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber Company along Fisher	MFWP	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	I	NA	Y	N	I	I	Y	I	N	Y	N
20031	Community Ecology and Food Web Studies in the Columbia River Basin	USFS	Upper Mid-Columbia	Chelan, Crab or Entiat	Y	NA	N	N	N	Y	NA	NA	Y	N	N
20032	Protect Bear Valley Wild Salmon, Steelhead, Bull Trout Spawning Habitat	SBT & IDFG	Lower Snake	Salmon	Y	NA	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
20033	Rehabilitate instream and riparian habitat on the Similkameen and Okanogan	USFWS	Upper Mid-Columbia	Okanogan	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
20034	Impact of Flow Regulation on Riparian Cottonwood Ecosystems	BioQuest International Consulting Ltd.	Upper Columbia	Flathead, Kootenai	Y	Y	I	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
20035	Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi – Year FY2000- FY 2002	OWT	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day, Deschutes, Fifteenmile, Umatilla, Walla Walla	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	N	Y	Y	Y
20037	Improvement of Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage in Omak Creek	CCT	Upper Mid-Columbia	Okanogan	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
20038	Assess Habitat and Passage for Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph Dam	CCT	Upper Mid-Columbia	Upper Mid-Columbia Mainstem	N	NA	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	N	N
20040	Develop a Fish & Wildlife Management Plan for the Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	SPT - DVIR	Upper Snake	Owyhee	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
20042	Integrating Okanogan and Methow Watershed Data for Salmonid Restoration	Okanogan Conservation District	Upper Mid-Columbia	Upper Mid-Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	N	N	NA	N	N	Y	N
20049	Evaluate Sediment Transport in Spawning Habitat, Kootenai R., Idaho	USGS	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y
20050	Remove Excess Heat From Streams and Store It for Future Application	Parker's Inc (a close held general corp) dba BETTERFISH	Systemwide	Systemwide, Yamhill for actual research	N	N	N	N	N	N	I	I	I	N	N
20051	Decrease Sedimentation and Temp. in Streams, Educate Resource Managers	OSU EXT	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde, Imnaha, Deshutes, Fifteenmile, Hood,	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
20057	Strategies for Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon	OSU	Systemwide	Systemwide, Umatilla, Imnaha	Y	NA	N	N	N	I	Y	I	N	Y	N
20069	Innovation Proposal Fund: Construct fuzzy logic decision support system…	E&S Environmental Chemistry, Inc.	Systemwide	Systemwide	N	NA	N	Y	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	N
20070	Water Conservation and Stream Enhancement Project	Tumalo Irrigation District	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
20071	Restore Crab Lake and Adjacent Reaches of Crab Creek	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	Upper Mid-Columbia	Crab	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
20072	Restoring Perennial Instream Flows At Ahtanum Creek	Dames and Moore	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	Y	I	Y	I	NA	Y	NA	I	Y	N

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
20073	Evaluate Relationship Between Land Use,Water Quality, and Fish Health	USGS	Upper Mid-Columbia	Okanogan	Y	NA	N	NA	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	N
20074	Eagle Lakes Ranch Acquisition and Restoration	USFWS	Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	I	Y	N	Y	N	N
20077	Inventory & Assessment of Irrigation Diversion Alternatives to Push-up Dams	USBOR	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	NA	N	N	N	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	N
20081	STOI Wildlife Land Acquisition and Enhancements.	STOI	Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	N	Y	Y
20082	Rainwater Wildlife Area Operations & Maintenance	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem, Walla Walla	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20083	Evaluate, restore & enhance 14 miles of instream and riparian habitat on…	USFWS	Upper Mid-Columbia	Crab	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
20084	Protect and Restore the North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
20085	Analyze and Improve Fish Screens	NPT	Lower Snake	Lower Snake Mainstem, Salmon, Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20086	Rehabilitate Newsome Creek - S.F. Clearwater River	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
20087	Protect and Restore Mill Creek Watershed	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
20088	Assess Mckenzie Watershed Habitat and Prioritize Projects	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Council	Lower Columbia	Willamette	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
20089	Increase Instream Water Rights for Crabtree Creek	SSWC	Lower Columbia	Willamette	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20090	Logan Valley Wildlife Mitigation Project	BPT	Upper Snake	Malheur	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20091	Construct Warm Springs Wetland	SWID RC&D	Upper Snake	Boise	Y	NA	I	Y	I	I	Y	I	Y	I	N
20100	Characterize Historic Channel Morphology of the Columbia River: Mcnary Pool	PNNL	Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem, Walla Walla, Yakima,	Y	NA	I	I	I	I	NA	I	Y	Y	N
20101	Connectivity and Productivity of Mainstem Alluvial Reaches	PNNL	Systemwide	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	NA	I	I	Y	I	Y	I	N
20103	Indexing Salmon Carrying Capacity to Habitat, Population & Physical Fitness	OSU	Systemwide	Systemwide	N	NA	I	NA	N	I	NA	I	Y	I	N
20107	Reconnect the Westport Slough to the Clatskanie River	LCRWC	Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y
20108	Recruit, Train, Organize & Support River Stewards	Oregon Trout	Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem,Willamette,Sandy, Fifteen	I	NA	I	N	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	N

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
20112	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Wenaha WMA Additions	ODFW	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
20113	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, South Fork Crooked River	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	Y	NA	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
20114	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	ODFW	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
20115	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Irrigon WMA Additions	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	Y	Y	Y
20116	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Horn Butte	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem	I	NA	I	Y	N	I	Y	I	I	Y	N
20117	Yakima River Subbasin Assessment	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	NA	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
20118	Klickitat River Subbasin Assessment	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Klickitat	Y	NA	NA	I	N	NA	Y	I	I	Y	N
20119	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Rock Creek, WA	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20125	Restore Riparian and Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Upper Sandy Basin	Mt. Hood NF	Lower Columbia	Sandy	I	I	N	N	I	I	I	I	N	Y	N
20126	Habitat Enhancement Within Transmission Corridors	USFS	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes, Sandy	N	I	N	Y	N	I	Y	I	I	I	N
20128	Riparian Restoration and Enhancement Planning for Multnomah Channel	Metro	Lower Columbia	Willamette	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
20130	Northeast Oregon Mitigation Trust Fund	NPT	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	N
20131	Enhance North Fork John Day River Subbasin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	NA	N	N	N	N	NA	N	Y	Y	N
20132	Yakima River Basin Water Temperature Monitoring and Modeling Project	Yakima Basin Joint Board	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
20133	Irrigation as a Management Tool for Stream Temperature	OSU	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	N	NA	N	N	I	I	Y	I	N	N	N
20134	Acquire Oxbow Ranch -- Middle Fork John Day River	CTWSRO	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	NA	N	Y	N	N	NA	Y	N	Y	N
20137	Acquisition of Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site	BPT	Upper Snake	Malheur	Y	NA	Y	I	I	I	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
20140	Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions	USFWS	Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem, Willamette	Y	NA	Y	I	I	I	Y	I	I	Y	N
20144	Create Stream Reference Condition Data Set for the Upper Flathead R Basin	Flathead National Forest	Upper Columbia	Flathead	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20150	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	RSBOJC	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	NA	N	N	N	I	Y	I	I	Y	N
20151	Landowner Communication Program	RSBOJC	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
20152	Improve Yakima River Water Quality by Incorporating Buffer Strips	RSBOJC	Lower Mid-	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
			Columbia												
20153	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	RSBOJC	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
20154	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	RSBOJC	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
20155	Inventory On-Farm Irrigation Practices	RSBOJC	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
20509	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Umbrella Project	CCT	Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	NOT REVIEWED										
20511	Deschutes River Umbrella Proposal	ODFW and CTWSRO	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	NOT REVIEWED										
20512	Grand Ronde River Basin Umbrella	ODFW	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	NOT REVIEWED										
20514	John Day River Umbrella	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	NOT REVIEWED										
20517	Libby Fisheries Mitigation	MFWP	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	NOT REVIEWED										
20547	Yakima Subbasin Habitat/Watershed Project Umbrella	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	NOT REVIEWED										
20554	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Umbrella	MFWP	Upper Columbia	Flathead	NOT REVIEWED										
8346700	Mitigation for the Construction and Operation of Libby Dam	MFWP	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	N	Y	I	N	Y	N
8402100	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the John Day Subbasin	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8402500	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in Grande Ronde Basin Streams	ODFW	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde, Catherine Cr	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
8506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	PNNL	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Umatilla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8710002	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Umatilla River Subbasin	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Umatilla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements of Tribs. to Lake Roosevelt	CCT	Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	i	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9004400	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities: Coeur D'alene Reservation	CDA Tribe	Upper Columbia	Coeur d'Alene	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
9004401	Lake Creek Land Acquisition and Enhancement	CDA Tribe	Upper Columbia	Coeur d'Alene	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9009200	Wanaket Wildlife Mitigation Project Operations & Maintenance	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
9101901	Flathead Lake Monitoring and Habitat Enhancement	CSKT	Upper Columbia	Flathead, Upper Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
9101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Watershed Restoration & Monitoring (MFWP Umbrell	MFWP	Upper Columbia	Flathead	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9105700	Yakima Phase 2 [Fish] Screen Fabrication	WDFW, YSS	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
9106000	Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project - Kalispel	KT	Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9106100	Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area	WDFW	Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	SBT	Lower Snake	Salmon	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	USBOR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y
9107800	Burlington Bottoms Wildlife Mitigation	ODFW	Lower Columbia	Willamette	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9200900	Yakima [Fish] Screens - Phase 2 - O&M	WDFW, YSS	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	N
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program	GRMWP	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	Y	N	I	N	Y	I	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
9202603	Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support	SCC	Lower Snake	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation and Maintenance Project	CCT	Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9205900	Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands Phase Two	TNC	Lower Columbia	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation	Albeni Falls Interagency Work Group	Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
9206200	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	I	N	Y	N
9206800	Implement Willamette Basin Mitigation Program	ODFW	Lower Columbia	Willamette, Lower Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed	ISWCD	Lower Snake	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	USFS	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	N
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request Multi-Year Funding)	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Fifteenmile	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	LSWCD, CSWCD	Lower Snake	Salmon	N	N	N	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
9306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project - Fy'00 Proposal	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y
9401002	Flathead River Native Species Project (MFWP Sub-proposal)	MFWP	Upper Columbia	Flathead	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9401500	Idaho Fish Screen Improvement - O&M	IDFG	Lower Snake	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	N	N	I	Y	I	Y	Y	N
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	LSWCD, CSWCD	Lower Snake	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9401805	Continued Implementation of Asotin Creek Watershed Projects	Asotin County Conservation	Lower Snake	Asotin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
		District													
9401806	Implement Tucannon River Watershed Plan to Restore Salmonid Habitat	Columbia Conservation District	Lower Snake	Tucannon	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
9401807	Continue With Implementation of Pataha Creek Model Watershed Projects	PCD	Lower Snake	Tucannon	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planner	NPT	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	Y	NA	Y	N	N	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	ODFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	N	NA	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M&E	SBT	Lower Snake	Salmon	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	KNRD	Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	N	N	N	Y	N	I	N	I	N	Y	N
9503300	O&M of Yakima Phase II Fish Facilities	USBOR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	N
9505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation	IDFG, SBT	Upper Snake	Upper Snake	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	N	Y	N
9506001	Protect & Enhance Wildlife Habitats in the Squaw Creek Watershed.	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Umatilla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9506700	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition	CCT	Upper Columbia	Upper Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon R	LS&WCD	Lower Snake	Salmon, Upper Snake River, Upper Salmon River	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
9601100	Walla Walla River Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Walla Walla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	N	N	Y	I	I	I	I	N	Y	N
9604200	Restore and Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat in Salmon Creek	CCT	Upper Mid-Columbia	Okanogan	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	NA	N	N	Y	N
9604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	Walla Walla	Y	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y
9605300	Upper Clear Creek Dredge Tailings Restoration	USFS/CTUIR	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	I	NA	I	I	N	N	I	I	I	I	N
9607000	Mckenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	McKenzie Watershed Council	Lower Columbia	Willamette	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	N	NA	I	Y	Y	Y
9607708	Protect and Restore the Lolo Creek Watershed	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
9607709	Protect and Restore the Squaw to Papoose Creeks Watersheds	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9607711	Restore Mccomas Meadow/ Meadow Creek Watershed	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
9608000	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation Project	NPT	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	N
9608300	Ctuir Grande Ronde Basin Watershed Restoration	CTUIR	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	N	I	N
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - Iscc	ISCC	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	Y	N	I	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	CSKT	Upper Columbia	Flathead	Y	I	N	N	N	Y	NA	I	Y	Y	N

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	MFWP and CSKT	Upper Columbia	Kootenai	Y	NA	N	N	N	I	Y	I	I	Y	N
9609400	WDFW Habitat Unit Acquisition	WDFW	Systemwide	Systemwide	I	NA	I	Y	I	I	I	I	N	Y	N
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	KNRD	Upper Columbia	Pend Oreille	I	I	I	I	N	I	Y	I	I	I	N
9701100	Enhance and protect habitat and riparian areas on the DVIR	SPT - DVIR	Upper Snake	Owyhee	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y	Y
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan	NPT	Lower Snake	Grande Ronde	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	N
9703400	Monitor Fine Sediment and Sedimentation in John Day and Grande Ronde Rivers	CRITFC	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y
9705000	Little Naches River Riparian & In-channel Enhancement Project	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	I	I	Y	N
9705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	N	N	N	N	I	I	I	N	Y	N
9705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration and Assessment	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	N	N	N	N	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	N
9705600	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Klickitat	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	I	Y	Y	N
9705900	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon	ODFW, CTWS, CTUIR, BPT…	Systemwide	Systemwide	I	NA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Y	N
9706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9801700	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams on Lower North Fork John Day	NFJDWC	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y
9801800	John Day Watershed Restoration	CTWSRO	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y
9801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	UCD, USFS, USGS, WDFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Wind	I	N	I	I	I	I	Y	I	N	Y	N
9802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWSRO	Lower Mid-Columbia	Hood	I	N	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9802200	Pine Creek Ranch Acquisition	CTWSRO	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	N	Y	Y	Y
9802400	Monitor Watershed Conditions on the Warm Springs Reservation	CTWSRO	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	Y	NA	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9802800	Trout Creek Watershed Improvement Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	JCSWCD	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N	Y	N
9803100	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Assessment & Restoration Plan	CRITFC	Systemwide	Systemwide	Y	NA	I	I	Y	I	Y	I	N	Y	Y
9803300	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	N	N	Y	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	N
9803400	Reestablish Safe Access Into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin.	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	N	N	Y	Y	I	Y	I	N	Y	Y
9803500	Watershed Scale Response of Stream Habitat to Abandoned Mine Waste	UW	Upper Mid-Columbia	Methow	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Subbasin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Final
9900600	Restoration of Riparian Habitat in Bakeoven / Deep Creeks	WCSWCD	Lower Mid-Columbia	Deschutes	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9901000	Mitigate Effects of Runoff & Erosion on Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow	Sherman SWCD	Lower Mid-Columbia	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y
9901100	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	WDFW	Lower Mid-Columbia	Walla Walla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9901200	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	Ki-Yak	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	Y	NA	I	N	Y	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9901300	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	YIN	Lower Mid-Columbia	Yakima	I	NA	I	NA	Y	I	Y	I	N	Y	N
9901400	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	ISCC	Lower Snake	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	I	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9901500	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	ISCC	Lower Snake	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	I	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9901600	Protect & Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	Y	Y	I	I	I	I	Y	I	Y	Y	Y
9901700	Protect & Restore Lapwai Creek	NPT	Lower Snake	Clearwater	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9901900	Restore the Salmon River, in the Challis, ID area, to a Healthy Condition	Custer Co	Lower Snake	Salmon	I	NA	I	N	Y	I	Y	I	Y	I	N
9902500	Lower Columbia River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	USFS-CRGNSA	Lower Columbia	Sandy, Lower Columbia	I	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y
9902600	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	USFS-CRGNSA	Lower Columbia	Sandy	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Table 3. Watershed technical work group evaluation comments

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20001	Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore instream and riparian habitat on	No	• Proposal is confusing and contains a lot of literature review and duplication. The products and responsibilities are not clear. • What alternatives have been considered (e.g. pre-fabricated bridges versus removing and replacing culverts)? • What are the fish recovery outcomes? How much biological return will there be for BPA's investment?
20002	Hydrologic Study of Stangland, Tyler and Clear Lake Area	No	• Proposal does not demonstrate a clear linkage to BPA's mitigation obligations or regional fish and wildlife recovery goals and objectives. Does not lead to applied fish and wildlife management/ restoration activities. • Sections 3 and 4 are incomplete. The stated objectives are actually tasks and the proposal lacks time-referenced biological objectives and milestones. • Personnel roles not defined. Not all people listed as personnel are referenced in budget. • BPA does not seem appropriate. It appears that this project is Washington DEQ's responsibility.
20003	Enhance Fish Habitat by Improving Water Quality	No	• The proposal is based on good ideas but it is not well developed and does not provide enough detail about the project goals (i.e. loading reductions), how sediment and pollutants will be reduced, and how fish and wildlife will benefit. • Provide more information about the monitoring plan, the Information/technology transfer, and the rationale and significance to other programs. What methods will be used to evaluate success. • This appears to be an expensive way to improve farm runoff. • Describe the successes of and provide more detail about BMPs in other parts of the country. • Are these types of projects appropriate for BPA funding? • Describe how improving 300 acres of farmland has improved water quality and benefited fish and wildlife. • Estimate how much pollutant loads (nutrients, DDT, sediment, etc.) will be reduced. • What is the "Environmental and Wildlife Checklist" and why will it be used? • Explain how the budget was derived.
20004	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	No	• The proposal needs to be tighter, focusing specifically on restoration and assessment. • Unclear how all parts of proposal fit together. Is assessment completed, or are projects selected prior to assessment? • Weak link between watershed assessment, coordination/education, and restoration activities. • Unclear how coordination/meetings will result in on-the-ground improvements for salmon. • High levels of funding for federal employees.
20005	West Fisher Watershed Restoration	No	• Land acquisition activities are not clearly described. For what will the land be exchanged? • This project focuses on wildlife but Montana wildlife mitigation activities are funded through the Montana Wildlife Mitigation Trust Fund. • The Forest Service already has funding for road management. It is probably not BPA's responsibility to pay for Forest Service road obliteration.
20007	Acquire and Conserve Priority Bull Trout Habitat in Trestle Creek Watershed	Yes	• Project success depends on unsecured non-BPA funds.
20008	Monitor and Protect Wigwam River Bull Trout for Koocanusa Reservoir	No	• Unclear how data will be used to address the issues identified in abstract (assessing the relative importance of reservoir operations versus forest development).

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20010	Improve Fish Habitat by Reducing Farm Sediment Runoff	No	• Show the link between reducing sedimentation and improving fish habitat. Provide literature sources to support the statements. • Provide data on past BMPs within the basin and how they have improved water quality. Describe alternatives to BMPs. • Provide more detail on water quality monitoring. How often will samples be collected? Where? • Provide details supporting the suggestion that measured reductions have been documented in the basin. • Budget is confusing. Are all 4 FTEs supported by this project or only 1.5 FTEs? Why should BPA pay the salaries of the 2.5 FTEs that are currently being paid by the proponents?
20013	Restore Unobstructed Fish Passage to Duncan Creek	Yes	• What is the condition of the habitat above the diversion structure? Is it currently good enough to support fish?
20015	Characterize and Assess the John Day Watershed Using Landsat Tm Imagery	No	• How does this fit with Oregon'g GAP analysis, TNC's Heritage Program, and other watershed programs in the John Day? • How does the information gained in this project lead to management actions? • Proposal needs to demonstrate that this project fills critical data gap and does not duplicate existing information.
20017	Restore Habitat within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	No	• Section 3 is incomplete and Section 4 does not describe biological objectives or milestones. Are there any cost-share partners? • Monitoring plan is inadequate. • The Forest Service should contribute personnel and operation costs.
20018	Tucannon River and Asotin Creek Riparian Enhancement	Yes	• The project proposes using BPA funds for private landowners wishing to avoid restrictive conditions associated with alternative funding sources (page 8). • Monitoring plan needs more detail. • Not enough detail in the methods (width of setback, number of trees, stream distance protected). • This is a good example of non-structural restoration activities.
20027	Electronic Columbia Basin Watershed Newsletter	Yes	• Explain more clearly why this project is necessary. • BPA should actively promote this project. If it is recommended for FY2000 funding, both BPA and users should provide financial support.
20028	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber Company along Fisher	No	• Project success is dependent on $6 million in unsecured funding. The sponsor has no assurance that they can acquire the easements. • The proposal does not provide enough detail about the terms of the easements. There is considerable concern about activities allowed (i.e. timber management, subdivisions). • Is it appropriate for one BPA project to cost-share with another BPA funded project?
20031	Community Ecology and Food Web Studies in the Columbia River Basin	No	• Others have already done this research. • Most planned objectives are actually tasks. • The proposal lacks measurable biological objectives and may not provide a product for management application. Could be more useful to management if it is more focused (e.g. survival/mortality curves for life history stages egg-to-fry- 0+ - 1+).
20032	Protect Bear Valley Wild Salmon, Steelhead, Bull Trout Spawning Habitat	No	• Sections 3 and 4 are incomplete. The objectives should be quantified for time and distance of habitat/stream. Objective 2 is not valid for this project (will eliminating grazing result in 2000 *adult* chinook?). • The grazing permit should be retired (grazing permits are privileges, not rights). • Proposal should include a monitoring plan. • Land purchase and resale of base property to the original owner is questionable (Objective 1 tasks c and g). Where does the money received from resale show up in the budget?

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20033	Rehabilitate instream and riparian habitat on the Similkameen and Okanogan	No	• Mostly a literature review and does not synthesize information into project detail. It appears to repeat proposal 20001. • This proposal seems to be the antithesis of Rosgen principles (i.e. make the system work naturally rather than forcing it structurally). • Poor cost-benefit for fisheries production. High cost per mile of stream ($298,000), shoreline ($716,000), and/or island ($448,000).
20034	Impact of Flow Regulation on Riparian Cottonwood Ecosystems	Yes	• Cottonwood stands are affected by many factors other than dam-regulated flows. • This project proposes applied research tied to future management actions. • What will the outyear funds cover? The objectives will be met by end of FY2000, but outyear costs extend for 4 years. • Even if the sponsor quantifies the relationship between flow regimes and cottonwood development, will there be the opportunity to modify flow regime (river operators or regulators)? Will other factors limit the recovery of gallery forests (i.e., levies, agriculture, city development, grazing)?
20035	Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi-Year FY2000 – FY 2002	Yes	• Good proposal. • One drawback is current lack of landowner support. • Good example of cost-sharing.
20037	Improvement of Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage in Omak Creek	No	• The proposal emphasizes structures and indirect means of addressing what appear to be impacts caused by ongoing management programs. Perhaps it should address improving the management program as well. • High cost for the benefit returned. What is the long-term biological benefit or return on investment?
20038	Assess Habitat and Passage for Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph Dam	No	• Proposal is too general. Purpose, need and product are unclear. Information on the relationship to other projects, measurable objectives, milestones, cost-sharing, subcontracting, information/technology transfer is incomplete.
20040	Develop a Fish & Wildlife Management Plan for the Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20042	Integrating Okanogan and Methow Watershed Data for Salmonid Restoration	No	• Proposal does not include measurable time-referenced biological objectives and milestones. • Stated objectives are actually tasks. • Project success is speculative, based on assumptions, and is dependent on receiving data from other agencies. • It is unclear who is doing which tasks. The FTEs do not add up. • Partnership is minimal (3% of project). • Only 13% of the costs are shown. 87% are hidden (subcontractors). • Why should BPA pay for Conservation District dues?
20049	Evaluate Sediment Transport in Spawning Habitat, Kootenai R., Idaho	Yes	• What are the management implications from this study? • Is it appropriate for BPA to fund USGS work?
20050	Remove Excess Heat From Streams and Store It for Future Application	No	• Scientific techniques are questionable. • This does not appear to be a long-term solution. It proposes an engineering solution rather than addressing the underlying causes of the problem. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20051	Decrease Sedimentation and Temp. in Streams, Educate Resource Managers	No	• Project management and project expenses appear redundant. • BMPs are already well known. • The proposal does not appear to include enough real on-the-ground work and does not seem to be cost-effective. • Properly Functioning Conditions parameter is subjective. • The Extension Service should already be doing this work, without any additional cost to ratepayers. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20057	Strategies for Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon	No	• Good proposal that provides important information on where aquatic productivity is high within seral-stage riparian areas. However, there is no discussion of alternative hypotheses that may explain aquatic productivity. • Clarify the link to real time management activities. • Budget appears excessive.
20069	Innovation Proposal Fund: Construct fuzzy logic decision support system…	No	• It is not appropriate to rely solely on the output of this model to make management decisions. • The BPA/ NPPC mitigation program is not the appropriate source of funding. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
20070	Water Conservation and Stream Enhancement Project	No	• Proposal does not provide enough information to evaluate the water-right savings. • Proposal does not appear to be cost-effective. • The final disposition of the saved water is unclear. Will it become an in-stream water right? • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20071	Restore Crab Lake and Adjacent Reaches of Crab Creek	No	• Proposal does not demonstrate a clear linkage to BPA's mitigation obligations, does not identify direct fish and wildlife benefits. • Is this a private hunt club? • Section 10 (information transfer) promotes Ducks Unlimited and indicates that this project is a DU responsibility. BPA funding does not seem appropriate.
20072	Restoring Perennial Instream Flows At Ahtanum Creek	No	• Considerable concern about whether it is really possible to get 1/3 of total flows from Ahtanum Creek. Upstream storage is a questionable method of improving instream flows. • Demonstrate that an in-stream water right will be created. • Demonstrate that the increased flows will benefit fish and wildlife and not be used by irrigators. • "Scoping" is not an appropriate use of BPA funds and should be done before the proposals are submitted. • Not enough detail in Task C. 1. How will temperature and flow be measured. Define sufficient spatial resolution. Consider temporal resolution.
20073	Evaluate Relationship Between Land Use, Water Quality, and Fish Health	No	• Is $50,000 for report preparation appropriate? • Proposal appears to initiate a never-ending cycle of research. When and how will this information lead to direct management decisions relative to the fish and wildlife program? • Poor cost-benefit ratio. • No cost-sharing.
20074	Eagle Lakes Ranch Acquisition and Restoration	No	• Provide information on the number of HU that will be gained. Most of the benefit is to wintering waterfowl, but they were not identified as a loss caused by the construction of the hydro system. Minimal production benefit for mallards. • Considerable concern about the appropriateness of this project. Most of the benefit appears to be economic. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20077	Inventory & Assessment of Irrigation Diversion Alternatives to Push-up Dams	No	• Proposal does not include a watershed assessment or reference to a watershed assessment. • Proposal does not appear to be coordinated with ODFW's existing program. • What are the biological benefits? • Will the project result in a management action? Who will have the authority to enforce any recommended changes? • Who will fund the installation of alternative structures?
20081	STOI Wildlife Land Acquisition and Enhancements.	Yes	• Extremely vague proposal that does not demonstrate why the project is necessary and does not describe an overarching plan. • Lacks detailed descriptions of which parcels will be acquired. • Who is doing the work? There are no personnel listed in budget.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20082	Rainwater Wildlife Area Operations & Maintenance	Yes	• Project does not appear to mitigate for lost habitat. Conifer forests were not impacted by dam construction. Some concern about how HEP is used. • High personnel and related expenses. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20083	Evaluate, restore & enhance 14 miles of instream and riparian habitat on…	No	• Proposals 20071 and 20083 appear to be duplicate efforts. 20083 is considerably more expensive ($121,000/ mile) and has less definition of biological outcomes. What is the return on investment for restoration or mitigation? • The stated objectives are actually tasks and there are not any time-referenced biological objectives.
20084	Protect and Restore the North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds	No	• Considerable concern about the cost-effectiveness and long-term biological benefit of this project. The Forest Service is not staying out of abused watersheds to allow recovery and is planning timber sales in this particular area. • Road obliteration is the Forest Service's responsibility.
20085	Analyze and Improve Fish Screens	Yes	• Inadequate fish screens have high mortality rates. • Cooperative project with IDFG.
20086	Rehabilitate Newsome Creek - S.F. Clearwater River	No	• Considerable concern about the cost-effectiveness and long-term biological benefit of this project. The Forest Service is not staying out of abused watersheds to allow recovery. This watershed is low relief with many easily accessible stream-side roads. Only 10 miles of road will be obliterated for high cost. • Road obliteration is the Forest Service's responsibility.
20087	Protect and Restore Mill Creek Watershed	No	• The problem has persisted over the past 25 years and there are other possible solutions (e.g. eliminate grazing). The Forest Service should fund the fence.
20088	Assess Mckenzie Watershed Habitat and Prioritize Projects	Yes	• Well written proposal. • Proposal does demonstrate the need for a comprehensive watershed assessment but to create the assessment from existing data should not cost $155,000. • $14,000 to manage the subcontractor should be covered on the previous proposal 9607000.
20089	Increase Instream Water Rights for Crabtree Creek	Yes	• Project costs are high (as are most water conservation projects), but this is a relatively good value for the amount of water that will be acquired. • This proposal creates an in-stream water right. • What is the condition of the habitat? Proposal does not demonstrate that the habitat problems in Crabtree Creek will be addressed. Is this stretch of Crabtree Creek currently being used for salmonid rearing? • Is the water right fully protected from the point of diversion at river mile 30 to the mouth of Crabtree Creek? Have there been discussions with the State to ensure that they will protect it?
20090	Logan Valley Wildlife Mitigation Project	Yes	• The objectives appear to be tasks. Without measurable biological objectives, how does the project benefit the target species? • Who gets title to the property? Who pays the taxes? Who does the maintenance, etc,? • The "short project description" and target species are not consistent. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20091	Construct Warm Springs Wetland	No	• This project should be based on an assessment, should demonstrate how it addresses the most limiting factor for redband trout, and should show why it is a high priority for funding in this area. • Clearly show how this project relates to the Fish and Wildlife Program. It appears to be waste water treatment.
20100	Characterize Historic Channel Morphology of the Columbia River: Mcnary Pool	No	• Clearly describe measurable biological benefits and milestones. • Is this activity more within the scope of the Corps' responsibility? • The project's success depends on numerous assumptions (i.e. data availability)
20101	Connectivity and Productivity of Mainstem Alluvial Reaches	No	• Demonstrate why this research is needed. Does it fill an identified data gap? Isn't this information already available? • Explain how information gained through this project translates into management actions.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20103	Indexing Salmon Carrying Capacity to Habitat, Population & Physical Fitness	No	• Proposal seems to be focused on temperature, but many other factors also drive the productivity of the system. • Question whether the proposal can meet its objectives. It will be difficult to detect the relative effect of the habitat versus the dams on salmonid survival. • Focus future efforts on refining the predictive capabilities of the temperature model for management applications.
20107	Reconnect the Westport Slough to the Clatskanie River	Yes	• Proposal lacks details. What is the current condition of the slough and tributaries? Will they support fish if reconnected?
20108	Recruit, Train, Organize & Support River Stewards	No	• Unclear which specific personnel are supported by the requested funding. The new subregion coordinators or the Portland staff? • Proposal doesn't clearly demonstrate direct on-the-ground benefits. How will this project benefit fish and wildlife?
20112	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Wenaha WMA Additions	Yes	• Low number of HU for acres and cost. • Concern about whether the land values are realistic. • Restoration budget will not cover the potential restoration activities. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
20113	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, South Fork Crooked River	No	• Not well connected to umbrella projects 20511 and 9705900. There appears to be little connection to the rest of Deschutes Basin. • Proposal not well written. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • The terms and conditions of the easement are unclear. • Unclear whether the easement has been acquired and unclear whether the budget will adequately support future O&M and restoration activities.
20114	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	No	• Good project, good area, questionable land transaction. It appears that BPA is paying for the property AND WRP is buying an easement on the same property. • Objective 1 is to develop a restoration plan, but the project history states that Ducks Unlimited recently developed a restoration plan. • Clarify the relationship between the existing plan and future work. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20115	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Irrigon WMA Additions	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • This appears to be a new proposal, but shows accomplishments/budget for last year. • Proposal is evaluated assuming property is/was purchased in 1999. • High annual operation and maintenance costs. • Abstract over the page limit.
20116	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Horn Butte	No	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Is buying conservation easements on BLM land an appropriate use of BPA mitigation dollars? • Abstract over page limit.
20117	Yakima River Subbasin Assessment	No	• Proposal lacks detail. • Not clear why additional monitoring is needed to assess watershed conditions since both the state and federal governments have already done this. • Tasks listed in methods section are redundant and not in a logical sequence. • Not clear how restoration activities will be monitored to gauge their effectiveness. No specific goals or targets in terms of habitat changes or fish productivity in response to restoration. • Why is the Little Naches important as a habitat for anadromous fish?

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20118	Klickitat River Subbasin Assessment	No	• How is this assessment integrated with the assessment proposed in 9705600? • Since there is so much information on the fisheries and water resources of this basin, why is this assessment needed? What is wrong with existing information? • Need more specific information on how the proponents will assess fisheries potential. How will they determine whether a reach has "high existing or potential fisheries value?" • What criteria will the fish biologist use to assess fisheries potential? Why is the Ecosystem Diagnostics and Treatment model appropriate for determining limiting factors? • Need more budget information, exactly how many hours will be allocated to each consultant? • Why is information transfer beyond the scope of this project? Disseminating this information is extremely important.
20119	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	Yes	• Costs appear to be high. • No mention of watershed size. • What information would lead the sponsor to believe this is a necessary project?
20125	Restore Riparian and Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Upper Sandy Basin	No	• Criteria difficult to apply to coordination proposals. • This project appears to fund Forest Service personnel. • Proximity to high population areas may lessen wildlife values in these projects.
20126	Habitat Enhancement Within Transmission Corridors	No	• High personnel and related expenses. • Transmission line safety is not a fish and wildlife objective. • Clearly explain expected outcomes and benefits. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20128	Riparian Restoration and Enhancement Planning for Multnomah Channel	Yes	• It is unclear how this project relates to umbrella project 9705900. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Clearly explain the objectives and expected accomplishments. • Unclear where property is located and if it is already protected. • Good cost-share. • Complete proposal Section 10. Information/technology transfer. • This project could be an urban showcase but proximity to high population areas may lessen wildlife values.
20130	Northeast Oregon Mitigation Trust Fund	No	• Provide clear objectives tied to biological outcomes. Explain the benefits to fish and wildlife. • Clarify what the money will actually buy. There are inconsistent statements throughout proposal. High personnel and associated costs. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
20131	Enhance North Fork John Day River Subbasin Anadromous Fish Habitat	No	• How is this tied to the North Fork John Day Watershed Council? • Proposed project would benefit from partnerships with NRCS/CREP. • Monitoring activities are poorly tied to objectives. • No specific habitat enhancement projects were identified, therefore it is unclear how the budget is related to the activities.
20132	Yakima River Basin Water Temperature Monitoring and Modeling Project	Yes	• Temperature is a critical water quality problem and has not been adequately addressed. • Basin-wide application. • Good advisory board.
20133	Irrigation as a Management Tool for Stream Temperature	No	• Relationship to Fish and Wildlife Program is unclear. • Clearly explain the biological objectives and demonstrate direct benefits to fish. • The proposal focuses on only one potential effect on temperature, justify why other potential effects on temperasture (e.g. solar radiation, etc.) are ignored.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20134	Acquire Oxbow Ranch -- Middle Fork John Day River	No	• This is a good management opportunity but it needs to be associated with a management plan and it needs to demonstrate accountability. • Considerable concern about whether this project is cost-effective. Costs per acre and costs per mile seem quite high. • What are the biological returns on investment? • Who owns the land, or who will own it, and who pays the taxes?
20137	Acquisition of Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site	Yes	• Explain how the project will achieve the fish and wildlife objectives. • Explain the goals for property and how they will be met. • Strengthen monitoring component. • High personnel and operation and maintenance costs. • Clarify funding. It appears this project received funding costs in FY 1999 from BPA. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. .
20140	Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions	No	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Is adding acreage to the wildlife refuge and funding wildlife refuge personnel an appropriate use of BPA funds? • Potentially high long-term O&M costs. • Unclear how many acres are being purchased. • Restoration activities are unclear.
20144	Create Stream Reference Condition Data Set for the Upper Flathead R Basin	Yes	• The proposal makes a good case for the baseline survey. • Provide a document when project is concluded showing how data are being used to drive restoration. • Is it appropriate for BPA to fund Forest Service stream inventory work (base operations and activities)?
20150	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	No	• Not enough detail on what will be involved in the feasibility study. • What happens to downstream flow when flow of the drain is diverted? Why was this drain chosen? • How exactly would it benefit fish and wildlife? • Provide information about key personnel (Section 9).
20151	Landowner Communication Program	No	• Why is this program expected to be effective? How will proponents gauge success? • What other agencies will be involved and how? • What landowners will be targeted? • How will the proponents track new water quality developments? • What schools and age groups will be targeted? • Information/technology transfer section is weak.
20152	Improve Yakima River Water Quality by Incorporating Buffer Strips	No	• Proposal lacks detail. • What criteria will be used to determine what sites get buffer strips? How will results be monitored? What parameters will be measured? • Provide information on key personnel (Section 9) and Information/technology transfer (Section 10).
20153	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	No	• Proposal lacks detail. For example, which water quality parameters will be used to decide where to put the ponds. • Provide more information about how the success of the project will be monitored. • Provide information on key personnel (Section 9) and Information/technology transfer (Section 10).

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
20154	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	No	• Explain why these two sites were selected for water quality monitoring. • Monitoring plan lacks details. How many samples will be collected and how? How many more sample locations and why? How exactly is the water quality monitoring plan tied to with restoration activities within the basin? • What equipment is needed and why? • Why are two technicians needed? • Provide more information on key personnel (Section 9) and Information/technology transfer (Section 10).
20155	Inventory On-Farm Irrigation Practices	No	• Proposal lacks detail. • Not sure why this task cannot be accomplished by the agency without support from BPA.
20509	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Umbrella Project		Not reviewed
20511	Deschutes River Umbrella Proposal		• Not reviewed.
20512	Grand Ronde River Basin Umbrella		Not reviewed
20514	John Day River Umbrella		• Not reviewed
20517	Libby Fisheries Mitigation		Not reviewed
20547	Yakima Subbasin Habitat/Watershed Project Umbrella		• Not reviewed.
20554	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Umbrella		Not reviewed
8346700	Mitigation for the Construction and Operation of Libby Dam	No	• Demonstrate the link between monitoring program and the long-term management benefits. • The proposal appears unfocused, includes too many disparate activities, and is heavy on monitoring while light on restoration. • $500,000 seems excessive for monitoring. • This appears to be an example of an agency maintaining a “program”. • The staff and resources do not seem to be adequate to support the project (limited personnel cost). • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
8402100	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the John Day Subbasin	Yes	• One of the best written proposals. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
8402500	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in Grande Ronde Basin Streams	Yes	• Very well prepared proposal that exceeds the page limit. • High personnel and equipment costs.
8506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	Yes	• Consider integrating these projects to save money. Why do we need two O and M contracts?
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	Yes	
8710002	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Umatilla River Subbasin	Yes	• Is this program cost effective? How many fish have returned lately? What has been the trend? • Long term projects (programs) need to be evaluated for effectiveness to date. • Is it appropriate for BPA to fund conservation easements/ improvements on a NWPPC Member’s property? • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
9001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements of Tribs. to Lake Roosevelt	Yes	• Well written. • Seems to be continuing good work since 1990 but no biological results shown. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9004400	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities: Coeur D'alene Reservation	Yes	• Proposal identifies tremendous land use management and water quality problems but corrective methods are limited by land ownership patterns. • Proposal includes a detailed description of past accomplishments and biological objectives. • Watershed assessment has been completed. • Technically sound, but too small a scale for the scope of the problem.
9004401	Lake Creek Land Acquisition and Enhancement	Yes	• These very small projects emphasize the economy involved in large-scale projects. It is more expensive to operate small projects.
9009200	Wanaket Wildlife Mitigation Project Operations & Maintenance	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • High personnel and related expenses. Sponsor should justify the costs and provide biological evidence for why the money is needed. What is the return on investment?
9101901	Flathead Lake Monitoring and Habitat Enhancement	No	• The stated goal is implementation but the project monitors activities beyond the described restoration activities. • Monitoring program is well written. Shows that the sponsor knows what they were doing and where they want to go, but it is unclear how the monitoring relates to on-the-ground objectives. • Concerned that this proposal is an example of too much monitoring and too little restoration.
9101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Watershed Restoration & Monitoring (MFWP Umbrella)	Yes	• Well written proposal that is organized in a clear hierarchical fashion. • Very aggressive goals for limited staff. • Great detail on monitoring, impressive biological objectives and past accomplishments.
9105700	Yakima Phase 2 [Fish] Screen Fabrication	Yes	• Consider integrating these projects to save money. Why do we need two O and M contracts?
9106000	Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project - Kalispel	Yes	• Explain how this project fits in a watershed context. • Good description of enhancement activities.
9106100	Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Include more restoration work
9107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	Yes	• Complete Section 4, measurable biological objectives and milestones. • A good proposal, but how does the progress reported relate to time-referenced accomplishments and objectives? What has been accomplished in 8 years? • This is a proven technique in Canada. • Concerned about cost-effectiveness because of passage barriers caused by hydro projects.
9107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	Yes	• Consider integrating these projects to save money. Why do we need two O and M contracts?
9107800	Burlington Bottoms Wildlife Mitigation	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • High expense for the benefit gained. • Proximity to high population areas may lessen wildlife values.
9200900	Yakima [Fish] Screens - Phase 2 - O&M	No	• Consider integrating these projects to save money. Why do we need two O and M contracts?
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program	Yes	• The proposal should demonstrate how the listed projects address the limiting factors and should explain the expected biological outcomes. • Expensive project. Clearly explain the budget request and dollar amounts tied to the objectives. Project costs (including project maintenance) should be more specific. It is hard to tell if the costs are appropriate. • Water conservation projects should have guaranteed in-stream water right. The landowners benefit from improvements in irrigation equipment but the project should be providing *public* benefit in form of in-stream water right for the saved water. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9202603	Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support	Yes	• The proposal is better written this year and provides more justification. • Project has been in operation since 1992 and should more fully demonstrate that it is meeting its biological objectives. Section 4 provides a good history but what are the tangible measures of success? Fishery improvements? Milestones? • Section 3 should include links to the umbrella plan for Salmon River subbasin. • Continue improving the program -level monitoring of accomplishments and results. • Coordination proposals should include a clearly developed performance plan (i.e. external and internal review of progress). • It is difficult to apply integrated technical criteria to coordination projects. • Isn't the coordinator's salary funded by another agency?
9204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation and Maintenance Project	Yes	• Good planning, successful projects. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
9205900	Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands Phase Two	Yes	• Project is expensive even given high cost of urban property. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Project success depends on willing sellers. • Proximity to high population areas may lessen wildlife.
9206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation	No	• Very expensive project on a per-acre basis. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Enhancement activities described are very general. • Provide more discrete milestones. Align the proposal with what can realistically be accomplished.
9206200	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	No	• Provide details on past accomplishments and how well they have met the biological objectives. How will success be measured? Project started in 1992 but there are few details about how it has benefited fish and wildlife. • Identify when the land will be purchased (this fiscal year?). The sponsor requests $1.2 million for land acquisition but does not provide an indication of where the land will be purchased. • Explain how HEP will be used. How will the success of specific activities be defined. What measure of increase/decrease will be used? • Provide more detail in Section 10. Information/technology transfer. It is difficult to know how well the project is faring. • Why is Objective 1.Task a. listed if it was completed in 1994? • This is a high budget but it includes few details on key personnel and their past activities and successes. • Clearly identify the target population. • Provide more details on information transfer. What talks have been given and where? What information has been shared and how? This is an expensive project but the proponents present little evidence of how the project is faring.
9206800	Implement Willamette Basin Mitigation Program	Yes	• Good proposal, well written, with identifiable objectives, tasks, and cost sharing. • Very expensive, but realize the limited opportunities and high cost of land in the area. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed	Yes	• This watershed is still being grazed and logged. There is considerable concern about the high cost and uncertain biological effectiveness. • Project proposes a major structural solution without addressing ongoing land management activities. • Proposal is well written but exceeds the page limit.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	No	• Proposal does not provide enough detail. The biological objectives are not clearly defined and it is difficult to determine if they can be met. The monitoring program is not clearly defined. • Consider retiring the grazing allotments. How cost effective is fencing compared to retiring the allotment? Does this project provide a return on investment in perpetuity? Project appears to buy temporary (rather than permanent) solutions and creates a liability over time. • How wide are the set-backs? • Is funding the Forest Service to fence riparian areas an appropriate use of BPA mitigation dollars?
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request Multi-Year Funding)	Yes	• High cost for O&M. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	No	• Proposal lacks specific detail on project activities. Sections 3 and 4 (including cost-shares) repeat information from the previous proposals (9202603 and 9401700). This proposal should provide more detail on project accomplishments and activities proposed for FY2000. • What is present versus potential fisheries recovery in this drainage?
9306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project - Fy'00 Proposal	Yes	• Provide a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan to assess biological response the fish screens.
9401002	Flathead River Native Species Project (MFWP Sub-proposal)	Yes	• How does the current proposal relate to past accomplishments? The past accomplishments show restoration work but current proposal is all monitoring and research.
9401500	Idaho Fish Screen Improvement - O&M	No	• Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, should provide more details and demonstrate links to the biological opinions and recovery plan goals. Proposal should include measurable biological objectives. • The effectiveness of the screens should be monitored. • What is the return on investment?
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	Yes	• Section 3 should include links to the umbrella plan for Salmon River subbasin. • Project has been in operation since 1994 and should more fully demonstrate that it is meeting its biological objectives. Section 4 provides a good history but what are tangible measures of success? Fishery improvements? Milestones? How much mitigation has been achieved? • Continue improving the program-level monitoring of accomplishments and results. • Coordination proposals should include a clearly developed performance plan (i.e. external and internal review of progress.) • The proposal is better written this year than last year and provides more justification. • Isn't the coordinator's salary funded by another agency? • Good cost share percentage.
9401805	Continued Implementation of Asotin Creek Watershed Projects	Yes	• Projects addressing headwater areas and riparian recovery are necessary elements in watershed recovery. • Sponsor should ensure the project does not become a long- term "program". • Proposal is complete. A good example of appropriately identified objectives, tasks and milestones.
9401806	Implement Tucannon River Watershed Plan to Restore Salmonid Habitat	No	• Address other limiting factors such as low stream flow due to irrigation withdrawal. Lack of water in lower river is likely creating thermal block for chinook salmon.
9401807	Continue With Implementation of Pataha Creek Model Watershed Projects	No	• The Pataha watershed is severely abused (e.g., riparian feedlots, agriculture up to the stream bank, vertical unstable banks up to 15' high). • Work in the Pataha Creek is intended to enhance fall chinook spawning habitat in the Lower Tucannon River, but that stretch of the river has other limiting factors that need to be addressed first. • What is the biological return on the investment in terms of mitigation achieved?

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planner	Yes	• Demonstrate why the planner is needed. • Show how coordination and presence of planner will result in expected benefits for fish. • This ongoing project should be able to list specific activities that result from this coordination effort.
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	No	• The proposal was not well organized or consistent. Objectives listed in Section 4 "objectives and tasks" table should match the objectives listed under "objectives schedules and costs" and Section 8e. • Project does not appear to be supported by a watershed assessment.
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M&E	No	• Considerable concern about whether this long-term project has improved fish production and survival. No information is presented in Section 4 (Objectives, Costs, Schedules) about biological objectives and milestones. • Overhead rate (68%) seems high. • It is not clear how the tasks will achieve the stated objectives. • Reports to BPA should be referenced.
9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	No	• This project is budgeted mostly to run bass hatchery and includes very little habitat restoration. It is probably not a watershed project. • Considerable concern about whether BPA should be involved in introducing or maintaining non-native species. The project benefits bass but it is unclear whether it benefits trout. Proposal does not demonstrate that bass won't impact trout.
9503300	O&M of Yakima Phase II Fish Facilities	No	• Consider integrating these projects to save money. Why do we need two O and M contracts?
9505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation	No	• High costs for personnel, vehicles, and office space. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
9506001	Protect & Enhance Wildlife Habitats in the Squaw Creek Watershed.	Yes	
9506700	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition	Yes	• Proposal very brief, but well described in umbrella proposal 20509. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon R	No	• Project has merit, but mirrors projects 9401500 and 9306200. All three projects should be combined into one. • Project should include an effective monitoring and evaluation plan to demonstrate how much flow and how many fish are "saved" over the baseline conditions. What is the long-term overall plan to restore the stream?
9601100	Walla Walla River Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	Yes	• Is this a cost-effective project? • If passage is improved, will there be quality habitat to support increased fish production?
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	No	• No evidence that past activities have met any biological objectives. • Monitoring and assessment plans do not provide enough detail. How will the sponsor assess surface/groundwater connections? • Tasks presented in the Methods section are redundant. • What land will be purchased and why? • What will happen to the money allocated for capital acquisitions if no land is purchased?
9604200	Restore and Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat in Salmon Creek	No	• The narrative is repetitive and confusing and provides a historical review rather than a tangible discussion of project accomplishments. • Cost-sharing (2%) is minimal. Primary sponsor should fund their own activities and other agencies should cover their own personnel. A major part of the funding request ($1,850,000) is not clearly explained. • What is the linkage to BPA's mitigation goals and objectives?
9604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	Yes	• What specifically will be accomplished in FY2000?
9605300	Upper Clear Creek Dredge Tailings Restoration	No	• Proposal should provide more detailed information including a clear link to the expected biological response (fish production). • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9607000	Mckenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	Yes	• Well written proposal. • Project provides needed coordination within the basin. • Include a mechanism that shows how coordination is providing benefits to fish and wildlife. • Include a clearly developed internal and external performance plan to monitor and evaluate the progress and success of coordination activities. • Good range of cost-share partners.
9607708	Protect and Restore the Lolo Creek Watershed	No	• This is another example of a BPA-funded watershed program operating on Forest Service land to repair damage resulting from Forest Service land management practices. The Forest Service is still logging the drainage. • Need more on-the-ground projects. Specifics on treatments are lacking. • Forest Service should fund restoration and road obliteration.
9607709	Protect and Restore the Squaw to Papoose Creeks Watersheds	No	• This is another example of a BPA-funded watershed program operating on Forest Service land to repair damage resulting from Forest Service land management practices. Since the Forest Service is planning more roads and timber sales, they should pay for restoration. • There is no evidence that this project is meeting its biological objectives. • It is unclear how many FTEs are supported. The same personnel have been listed as one full FTE on multiple projects.
9607711	Restore Mccomas Meadow/ Meadow Creek Watershed	No	• This is another example of a BPA-funded watershed program operating on Forest Service land to repair damage resulting from Forest Service land management practices. The Forest Service should consider eliminating grazing. • Considerable concern about cost effectiveness. $50,000 for NEPA is excessive. • This project should fall under a “Categorical Exclusion” and would benefit from more on-the-ground work.
9608000	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation Project	No	• Same proposal as 20130, but for one year only. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
9608300	Ctuir Grande Ronde Basin Watershed Restoration	No	• Project seems to overlap (includes many of the same activities) the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program. The objectives should be more specific and provide a better focus for the individual projects. • Budget should be more specific. • Proposal doesn’t demonstrate how funding an additional person will result in meeting biological objectives. The same person is listed for multiple FTEs.
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - Iscc	No	• The proposal is better written this year than last year and provided more justification. • Coordination proposals should include a clearly developed performance plan (i.e. external and internal review of progress). • Biological objectives and milestones are not clear. Monitoring plan needs more detail. • Provides diversity in experience and training to the Clearwater watershed program. • This project has been funded for several years but has not demonstrated past accomplishments and has not met biological objectives.
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	No	• It is difficult to apply integrated technical criteria to coordination projects. • Coordination proposals should include a clearly developed performance plan (i.e. external and internal review of progress.) • Some of the objectives (e.g., identifying watershed entities, evaluating condition of watershed, identifying limiting factors) seem like they should been completed already. • The proposal clearly states that there are no biological objectives at the program level.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	No	• It is difficult to apply the Integrated Technical Criteria to coordination projects. • Some of the objectives (e.g., compile information on limiting factors, establish monitoring and evaluation process) seem like they should have been completed already. • Coordination proposals should include a clearly developed performance plan (i.e. external and internal review of progress). • Clearly describe proposed on-the-ground activities. • If 30% of land area is privately owned, is that area significantly affecting water quality? Coordinators are most effective where there is a large percentage of privately owned land. • Clearly show contributions from cost-share partners.
9609400	WDFW Habitat Unit Acquisition	No	• Poorly written and edited proposal (many spelling errors) that lacks measurable biological objectives and milestones. • No specific detail on the methods or what the sponsor intends to accomplish.
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	No	• Inadequate proposal that provides little detail about past accomplishments or new implementation. • Is there a watershed assessment or overall plan? This is the third year of operation but the proposal does not describe where the project is heading. • Provide a specific monitoring and evaluation plan.
9701100	Enhance and protect habitat and riparian areas on the DVIR	Yes	• Explain how these objectives are tied to overall objectives for trout restoration. • Quantify the objectives (e.g. number of miles to be surveyed, number of springs protected). • How will the assessment relate to the proposed plans. • Develop a plan to monitor and evaluate project implementation and accomplishments. • High personnel and related costs. • Explain how this project fits into a watershed context.
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan	No	• Combine with the previous proposal (9403900). Analysis and coordination activities overlap. • Clearly define the project objectives. • Budget indicates that the sponsor intends to implement projects, but projects are not listed in the proposal or outlined in the objectives. Funding should be tied to specific projects.
9703400	Monitor Fine Sediment and Sedimentation in John Day and Grande Ronde Rivers	Yes	• Well written proposal that fills an identified data gap.
9705000	Little Naches River Riparian & In-channel Enhancement Project	No	• What leases will be purchased and why? Will it be enough to restore flows? This information is critical to deciding whether this project should proceed.
9705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	No	• No specific information has been provided. • Tie past accomplishments to proposed work. • If so much work has been done in the basin, why is this assessment needed? Provide a better rationale for conducting this assessment. What is wrong with the existing information? • How will the fish biologist determine regions of high productivity? What criteria will be used to separate sites into high, indeterminate, and low fisheries potential? Why not use PFC (Properly Functioning Condition) in areas of high productivity? • Provide more details on budget, including personnel. How much time will be spent on different tasks and at what rate? • Provide more information in Section 10 Information/technology transfer.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration and Assessment	No	• Not adequate justification for the data collection activities. Are these data necessary for management restoration action? • No information on why restoration methods were chosen or how effective they are. • Clearly define the link between restoration activities and moderating the flow regime. • How much water is needed to maintain summertime flow? • How much will fish production increase if the flow is augmented? Consider monitoring the fish response. • O& M part of budget seems excessive for office rental, vehicles, etc. Provide more detail on why this much is needed.
9705600	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	No	• How will fish production increase two to three fold? • How will the sponsor monitor flow and fine sediment delivery? • The proposal discusses the importance of improving temperature regimes but there is no mention of water temperature monitoring. • There is no information on how data will be analyzed to assess the performance of restoration efforts. • The project has been ongoing since 1997 but there was no mention of the biological outcomes of the past accomplishments.
9705900	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites – Oregon	No	• Proposal lacks detail. Not enough information to determine significant on-the-ground benefits to fish and wildlife. • The participating agencies and tribes should contribute funding for personnel to do the work. • The GAP analysis seems to be biased toward rare and endangered habitats thereby creating small isolated mitigation areas.
9706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT	No	• Projects 9706000 and 9608600 are redundant. • It is difficult to determine whether the restoration activities are the direct result of the coordination activities. • Coordination proposals should include a clearly developed performance plan (i.e. external and internal review of progress). • Biological objectives and milestones are not clear. Monitoring plan needs more detail. • The proposal is better written this year than last year and provides more justification.
9801700	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams on Lower North Fork John Day	Yes	• Well written proposal that demonstrates good benefits.
9801800	John Day Watershed Restoration	Yes	• Well written proposal that demonstrates the benefit of working with others. • What is the disposition of the saved water? Will it be protected as an in-stream water right? What is the direct hydrologic benefit and what guarantee is there that the next junior water-right holder will not use the water? What is the in-stream benefit in dry years? • Proposal does not tie project activities to direct biological benefits. • Unclear what the SWCD budget actually purchases. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
9801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	No	• Project does not appear to be well thought out. The WTWG assumes that the assessment phase is occurring now and hopes the assessment will be completed in the outyears. However, the projects seem to come before the assessment. • Clearly describe links between sampling/watershed analysis and restoration. • Considerable concern about whether the project will produce substantive benefit to fish and wildlife • High cost, mostly personnel. Extensive funding of federal employees.
9802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	Yes	• Clarify relationship between passage at these diversions and the overall plan for the basin. Demonstrate that habitat issues will be addressed after passage has been improved. • Show that these are the most important projects. State expected results (e.g. specific fish benefits). • Analysis has clearly been done. • Describe longer- term strategy to address other issues.
9802200	Pine Creek Ranch Acquisition	Yes	

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9802400	Monitor Watershed Conditions on the Warm Springs Reservation	Yes	• Eliminate the macro invertebrate work. It is unclear how this ties to overall project results. Provide a more detailed discussion about the link to restoration.
9802800	Trout Creek Watershed Improvement Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	No	• Not well connected to umbrella project 20511. • Provide more detail about the projects and the expected biological response. • Show the link to project 9404200.
9803100	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Assessment & Restoration Plan	Yes	• It is difficult to apply Watershed Integrated Technical Criteria to coordination projects. • What are the measurable biological objectives? • Is it appropriate to use BPA monies as cost share for other BPA projects? • Budget appears excessive. • Proposal exceeds the page limit.
9803300	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	No	• Provide a better justification for restoration activities since there appear to be only 50-100 fish returning. How much do you expect production to increase. • Clearly describe the existing condition within the watershed. • Demonstrate the link between actions and direct biological benefits.
9803400	Reestablish Safe Access Into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin.	Yes	• Sounds like a good idea, but how do you know fish will use these areas? Consider constructing one fish screen first to see if it works (as a pilot project), then implement other screens later. • Identify where the easements and land purchases will occur? What will you do with money if land is not purchased? • Does Wilson Creek include one of the ten tributaries mentioned in Objective 2? • Provide more detail about how rearing and spawning habitat in these tributaries was assessed. • How will other supplementation efforts in the basin complicate monitoring? • Objectives and tasks are redundant. • Are the cost/benefit analyses based solely on cost? Consider the potential for increasing fish production. • How will the most productive riparian and in-stream habitats be identified. (Objective 6) • How will the fish be marked? How many?
9803500	Watershed Scale Response of Stream Habitat to Abandoned Mine Waste	Yes	• Good proposal, but narrative timelines and deliverables are not aligned with the schedule. The narrative is also repetitive and confusing in places. • Demonstrated strong linkage between past accomplishments and ongoing activities. Good quantifiable summary of past accomplishments. Logical objectives, tasks, and milestones. • How many years of data will be needed to develop a viable management product (remediation plans)? What assurances are there that the data will be used?
9900600	Restoration of Riparian Habitat in Bakeoven / Deep Creeks	Yes	• Outlines a logical sequence of events. • Clearly describe the monitoring plan. • Not well connected to umbrella project 20511.
9901000	Mitigate Effects of Runoff & Erosion on Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow	Yes	• Good use of CREP/ BPA cost-share. • Improves upland areas first.
9901100	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	Yes	

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9901200	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	Yes	• No performance standard outlined for coordination project or for the coordinator. • Can the sponsor demonstrate that the proposed activities will improve fish habitat? • How exactly will the limiting factors analysis be done? • It is not clear how the Council will actually implement projects. It appears this is a coordination project. • The link between limiting factors analysis and ranking of proposals is unclear. How is the council involved in ranking proposals and why? • Objective 2 is unfocussed. What will be accomplished? Task "a" states that a science-based criteria for ranking proposals will be established, while Task "b" describes another evaluation system. This seems redundant. • How will the sponsors adapt themselves to changing needs within the basin as stated in Objective 5?
9901300	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	No	• Project title overstates the project activities. • There is merit to a detailed assessment of the water balance in the irrigated area in order to address flow limitations in the lower reaches of the stream. • Proposal lacks sufficient detail in the methods section to assess whether the sponsor can accomplish the proposed activity. • This is written as a one-year proposal, but the budget shows out-year costs through 2004. • The stated objective in the abstract is to determine the most effective measures for salmon and steelhead restoration. However the proposed project does not collect the appropriate data on the factors that may be affecting the species, and therefore, there will not be enough information to lead to the most effective measures for salmon and steelhead restoration. • Budget seems high for this type of assessment activity.
9901400	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	Yes	• Proposal is more complete than last year, but still lacks project implementation specifics. • BMP efficacy is questionable in this watershed.
9901500	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	Yes	• Proposal is more complete than last year, but still lacks project implementation specifics. • BMP efficacy is questionable in this watershed. • Proposal 9901400 and 9901500 are very similar in content.
9901600	Protect & Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed	Yes	• Proposal needs more specific information on project implementation. • The relationship between Objectives 2 and 3 is unclear. The kind of monitoring proposed in Objective 2 is not needed to carry out Objective 3.
9901700	Protect & Restore Lapwai Creek	No	• Concern about the assumption that passive restoration will not achieve the biological objective. Given the limited availability of funding, maybe this money could be spent in areas where passive restoration will provide good benefits. • Watershed is severely degraded and there is a limited potential to improve BMPs. • The non-structural approach should be given stronger consideration. Planning a structural approach in unstable watershed is very risky. • This project does not appear to be biologically, ecologically or hydrologically effective.
9901900	Restore the Salmon River, in the Challis, ID area, to a Healthy Condition	No	• Good concept but the proposal lacks enough detail to adequately review the project. The proposal should demonstrate that landowner cooperation is secured. • Sections 3 and 4 are incomplete. Section 5 (costs) are vague for FY2000. • Proposal should include implementation activities and an effective monitoring plan. • Sponsor should provide an annual progress report to BPA.
9902500	Lower Columbia River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Logical sequence of events, good monitoring program, good wetland restoration plans. • Methods are unclear. • Proximity to high population areas may lessen wildlife values.

ProjectID	Title	Status	Comments
9902600	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	Yes	• Explain how this project fits into a watershed context. • Logical sequence of events, good monitoring program, good riparian restoration plans. • In contrast to project 20125 above, this proposal clearly shows the Forest Service's contribution of personnel and support, and only requests subcontracting costs for construction activities. • Strong cost-sharing involvement. • Proximity to high population areas may lessen wildlife values. • Will the sponsor be able to clear, plant and maintain 50 acres per year?

Non-watershed Technical Work Group

(Anadromous non-mainstem proposals)

Process

The Anadromous Fish Managers (AFM) of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) developed a process and criteria for selecting FY2000 non-mainstem non-watershed 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 Non-Watershed Technical Review Group (NTWG) was formed to review these proposals for technical merit and feasibility.

The NTWG was made up of five individuals with appropriate technical qualifications, three 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 "yes" if a criterion was met and a "no" for any criterion not 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 January 16, conducted their review, and met as a group February 3 and 4 to discuss all proposals. The product of the group review was then provided in draft to individual reviewers for their approval. On February 11, 1999 consensus was reached on all recommendations.

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?

Results

See the next table for projects and responses to criteria. Comments are provided where criteria were not met.

Table 4. Non-watershed technical work group evaluation

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
20006	Yakima Basin Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-Ibi)	Washington Trout	1	NA	
			2	yes	Well done and innovative. However, the index (IBI) is not widely accepted by benthic macroinvertebrate biologists.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20012	Develop New Technology for Telemetry and Remote Sensing of Fish Quality	OCFWRU	1	yes	
			2	no	Dependent on the ability to develop the prototype. Application will be sample size limited.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20016	Snake River Steelhead Hooking Mortality Study	WDFW	1	yes	Effects on hatchery fish = effects on wild? - questionable
			2	No	Achievable results limited to hatchery
			3	No	Objectives are actually tasks
			4	Yes	
20019	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	IDFG	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Ambitious but achievable
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
20020	Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	WDFW	all	N/A	
20021	Estimate natural steelhead production in two tributaries of the Walla Walla	WDFW	1	yes	
			2	yes	
			3	no	Yes for objectives proposed. The problem is that too few objectives are proposed. A real opportunity exists to learn about these systems by connecting the data gathered to current habitat conditions and constraints. What is proposed is fish counting.
			4	yes	
20022	NE Oregon Hatchery Planning & Coordination - WDFW	WDFW	1	NA	
			2	NA	Coordination is needed but is it appropriate to fund state management input in the F&W Program?
			3	NA	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			4	NA	
20023	Hanford Reach Steelhead Stock Investigation	WDFW	1	no	Give rationale for using Wells stock at Ringold
			2	no	Too many objectives
			3	no	See 9406900 below. How are these related?
			4	yes	
20024	Evaluate Fall Chinook Natural Production and Spawning Habitat Conditions in	WDFW	all	Yes	
20025	Deschutes River Stray Summer Steelhead Assessment	ODFW	1	no	Need to provide more detail on how objectives will be accomplished.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20026	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout Above Bonneville Dam	ODFW	1	yes	Appears to overlap 8805304. Needs better explanation for BPA funding
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	See comment on 20109
20029	Electronic Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Research Report	Intermountain Communications	all	yes	
20030	Impact of Nutrients on Salmon Production in the Columbia River Basin	U of BC	1	no	Question how this study fits in with a method that is already being applied.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20035	Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi-Year Fy 2000-2002)	Oregon Water Trust	all	yes	
20043	Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection: Genetic Retrieval From Single Sperm	U of I	all	yes	Question the applicability of this research.
20044	Endocrine Control of Ovarian Development in Salmonids	U of I	all	yes	Question the applicability of this research.
20045	Analyzing Genetic and Behavioral Changes During Salmonid Domestication	WSU	all	yes	Strategy of ongoing programs is to avoid domestication. Possible overlap with #9005200.
20046	Induction of Precocious Sexual Maturity and Enhanced Egg Production in Fish	U of I	1	no	Changing the timing of maturation may not fit with the goal of increasing the natural runs.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
20047	Enhancement of salmonid gamete quality by manipulation of intracellular ATP	U of I	all	yes	Question the applicability of this research.
20048	Viral Vaccines and Effects on Reproductive Status	WSU	1	no	The proposal does not make a clear case as to why a new vaccine is necessary and why the vaccines already developed using BPA funding cannot be used.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20055	Evaluate a Mark-Resight Survey for Estimating Numbers of Redds	RMRS	all	Yes	Well thought out and written
20056	Elucidate Traffic Patterns of Ihn Virus in the Columbia River Basin	USGS-WFRC	all	yes	
20058	Leavenworth Hatchery Complex	BOR	1	yes	Include cost sharing it appears to be significant.
			2	no	The background seems to suggest that the main problems at hatcheries are lack of adequate water, deteriorating infrastructure and the need to develop strategies to minimize impacts on wild fish.
			3	no	The goals, objectives and tasks are composed of rather vague terms, such as "Continue to develop….","Actively participate.." and "Cooperate with…" and contain few measurable objectives.
			4	no	There is some suggestion of developing strategies to minimize effects on wild fish and improving smolt-to-adult survival, but there is no information as to how these will be accomplished. The proposal also lacks past accomplishments, schedule of objective
20059	Infrastructure to Complete FDA Registration of Erythromycin	U of I-FWR	all	yes	Managers may want to explore the long term implications
20061	Influence of Marine-Derived Nutrients on Juvenile Salmonid Production	USGS-BRD	all	yes	
20064	Upstream migration of Pacific lampreys in the John Day R: behavior, timing	USGS-BRD, CRRL	all	yes	
20065	Identification of larval Pacific lampreys (Lampetra tridentata), river lamp	USGS-BRD, CRRL	all	yes	Recommend that the managers look at all the lamprey projects being proposed for funding in FY2000 as one package so as to prevent overlap.
20075	Engineered Anadromous Salmonid Habitat	U of I	1	no	Significant overlap between this and the previous proposal.
			2	no	Success should be measured in terms of adults, not smolts. Question the logic of putting the artificial stream in a hatchery that already has water quality problems. Suggest looking at the Entiat channel instead.
			3	no	The objectives are not clearly defined.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			4	yes	
20079	Assessing Adult Steelhead Escapement & Genetics in the South Fork Salmon	NPT	1	Yes	
			2	No	Task 2d likely?; Task 2e redundant?
			3	Yes	
			4	No	Personnel is top-heavy
20080	Evaluate a Modified Feeding Strategy to Reduce Residualism and Promote Smoltification	IFRO-USFWS	1	Yes	
			2	No	Tasks do not address Objectives 2-4
			3	No	Is meeting objectives really feasible?
			4	Yes	
20093	Evaluate the Feasibility for Anadromous Fish Reintroduction in the Owyhee	SPT - DVIR	all	N/A	This proposal could not be evaluated using our technical criteria.
20102	Research/Evaluate Restoration of NE Ore Streams and Develop Mgmt Guidelines	OSU/UO	1	NA	Good detail.
			2	no	Needs more detail.
			3	no	Needs more detail.
			4	no	Needs more detail.
20104	Sources of Myxobacterial Pathogens in Propagated Salmonids	USFWS/SCTC	all	yes	
20105	Develop New Feeds for Fish Used in Recovery and Restoration Efforts	USFWS/SCTC	all	yes	Question how this project relates to ongoing NATURES. Potential overlap.
20106	Heritability of Disease Resistance and Immune Function in Chinook Salmon	USFWS	all	yes	Question the need for the study and the applicability of results to hatchery management practices.
20109	Cedar Creek Natural Production and Watershed Monitoring Project	WDFW	1	no	Duration/agency management needs more explanation
			2	no	Objectives are not clearly defined.
			3	no	Appeared to be under-staffed for workload
			4	no	Appears to simply be a new funding source for state program
20111	Preserve Cryogenically the Gametes of Selected Mid-Columbia Salmonid Stocks	CRITFC	all	yes	
20120	Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum Salmon Populations	USFWS	all	yes	
20121	Evaluate Habitat Use and Population Dynamics of Lampreys in Cedar Creek	USFWS	all	yes	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
20122	Test guidance flows and strobe lights at a SBC to increase smolt FCE & FGE	WDFW	1	no	Without this knowledge why is reintroduction occurring
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20123	Restoration of Sockeye Salmon Into Palmer Lake	Salmonsoft	1	NA	
			2	no	Need to discuss disease risk and genetic background in tech section
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20124	Evaluate An Experimental Re-Introduction of Sockeye Salmon Into Skaha Lake	CCT	1	no	Justification for budget is lacking in details.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20127	Walla Walla River Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Project	CTUIR	1	no	Costs for personnel seem too high. Once traps are in place requirements to check traps and tag fish should be relatively low. One or 2 crews of techs & one part-time bio should suffice.
			2	yes	How do you have past accomplishments for a new project?
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20138	Design and Construct Neoh Walla Walla Hatchery	CTUIR	1	NA	
			2	NA	Build a hatchery - doesn't fit in this review. Proposal is not well prepared and budget justification lacking adequate details.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20139	Walla Walla River Fish Passage Operations	CTUIR	1	yes	
			2	no	In background section it is stated that this project was began in 1998. Why is it proposed as a new project for 2000?
			3	no	Objectives are not clearly defined.
			4	yes	
20141	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts	CRITFC	1	yes	
			2	yes	Project is based on appropriate up to date scientific methods. This project should be given strong consideration as a potential way to increase available spawners while increasing genetic diversity.
			3	yes	The only area for potential difficulty appears to be in adequate sample size. Continuing the project for 3 years should alleviate this problem.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			4	yes	The author should check the box for multi-year funding in section 2.
20145	Evaluate Little Walla Walla Screening Facility	ODFW	1	NA	
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
20149	Develop Research Priorities for Fall Chinook in the Columbia River Basin	PNNL	1	no	This is a proposal to conduct workshops. All of this is already being accomplished under the fall chinook studies. The proposal is a complete overlap with #20541.
			2	no	
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20510	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project -- Umbrella	YIN	1	yes	
			2	NA	Inadequate
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20513	Hood River / Fifteenmile Creek Umbrella	ODFW and CTWSRO	all	NA	Well written proposal.
20516	Umatilla Subbasin Umbrella	ODFW	all	NA	This is by far the best umbrella document produced and should be used as the model for all the other umbrella documents (project # 20541 may be the exception as it is fairly complete). The other umbrella documents and multi-year plans are inadequate.
20519	Multi-Year Hood River Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20520	Multi-Year Fifteen Mile Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20521	Multi-Year Deschutes Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20522	Multi-Year John Day Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20523	Multi-Year Umatilla Subbasin Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20524	Multi-Year Walla Walla Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	1	NA	
			2	NA	Inadequate and is too general to fill the need for planning and integration.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20525	Multi-Year Klickitat Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20526	Multi-Year Yakima Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	NA	
20527	Multi-Year Wenatchee River Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	1	NA	While there are descriptions of the facilities, which are adequate for raising fish (they've been doing it for over 50 yrs), the proposal does not indicate who will be responsible or even how many FTEs will be used or what specifically the budget is to coordinate.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			2	NA	Inadequate
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20528	Multi-Year Methow Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	1	NA	
			2	NA	Inadequate
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20529	Multi-Year Okanogan Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	1	no	Costs for field work objectives ($851k for objs. 1 - 9, and 14) appear to be extraordinarily high. The objectives appear to be priced as if a separate field crew would be required to complete each objective. Single crew could do more than 1 objective.
			2	NA	
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20530	Multi-Year Tucannon Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	N/A	
20531	Multi-Year Grande Ronde Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	N/A	
20532	Multi-Year Imnaha Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	N/A	
20533	Multi-Year Lower Snake River Mainstem Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	1	yes	
			2	NA	Inadequate
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20534	Multi-Year Clearwater Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	N/A	
20535	Multi-Year Salmon Anadromous Fish Plan	CBFWA	all	N/A	
20541	Snake River Fall Chinook Salmon Studies (Umbrella Proposal)	NPT, USFWS, USGS	1	NA	
			2	NA	Well done for an umbrella document. This one really explains the relationship of all projects and the rationale for the overall goals.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20545	Idaho Supplementation Studies - Umbrella Proposal	IDFG	all	N/A	
20550	Willamette Basin Mitigation Program Umbrella	ODFW	all	NA	
20556	Grande Ronde Endemic Spring Chinook Supplementation Program Umbrella		all	N/A	
8201300	Coded-Wire Tag Recovery	PSMFC	all	yes	
8335000	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery	NPT	all	N/A	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
8335003	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	NPT	all	Yes	
8343500	Operate and Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities	CTUIR	1	yes	
			2	yes	O&M - na for these criteria?
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
8343600	Umatilla Passage Facilities O & M	Westland Irrigation District	1	yes	
			2	yes	O&M - na for these criteria.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
8712703	Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project	NPT	all	Yes	
8802200	Umatilla River Fish Passage Operations	CTUIR	1	yes	
			2		
			3	no	Objectives are too general, need to be more clearly defined.
			4	yes	
8805301	Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan	NPT	all	Yes	
8805302	Plan, Site, Design and Construct Neoh Hatchery - Umatilla/Walla Walla Comp.	CTUIR	1	yes	
			2	NA	Capital construction project. Should be reviewed by architects and engineers.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
8805303	Hood River Production Program - M&E	CTWSRO	all	yes	
8805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E	ODFW	all	yes	Provide better basis for removing hatchery fish at Parkdale.
8805305	Northeast Oregon Hatcheries Planning and Implementation - ODFW	ODFW	all	Yes	
8810804	Streamnet: the Northwest Aquatic Information System	PSMFC	all	yes	How can streamnet improve data quality?
8811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	YIN	1	NA	
			2	NA	Construction project - doesn't fit in this review.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
8812025	Ykfp Management, Data and Habitat	YIN	1	NA	
			2		Major details lacking.
			3	no	Objectives not clearly defined and not measurable.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			4	no	Inadequate resources to achieve objectives.
8816000	Willamette Hatchery Oxygen Supplementation	ODFW	all	yes	
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in the Lower Umatilla	ODFW	1	yes	
			2	yes	Well prepared.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
8902700	Power Repay Umatilla Basin Project	BPA	1	yes	
			2	NA	Criteria don't work for this one.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
8902900	Hood River Production Program-Pelton Ladder-Hatchery	ODFW	all	yes	
8903500	Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance	ODFW	1	NA	
			2	yes	Well prepared.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
8906200	Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation	CBFWA	all	yes	
8906500	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (USFWS)	USFWS	all	yes	
8906600	Annual Stock Assessment- Coded Wire Tag Program (WDFW)	WDFW	all	yes	
8906900	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (ODFW)	ODFW	all	yes	
8907201	Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support	DOE/ORNL	all	NA	Describe basis for characterization of "independent".
8909600	Monitor and evaluate genetic characteristics of supplemented salmon & stlhd	NMFS	1	Yes	
			2	No	Some objectives not clearly defined
			3	No	10 year project now a 20 year project?
			4	Yes	
8909800	Idaho Supplementation Studies	IDFG	all	Yes	
8909801	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation in Idaho Rivers (ISS)	USFWS-IFRO	all	Yes	
8909802	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	NPT	all	Yes	
8909803	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	SBT	all	Yes	
9000500	Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	ODFW	1	yes	
			2	yes	Well prepared.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
9000501	Umatilla River Basin Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	CTUIR	all	yes	
9005200	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation	BRD	1	no	Question the need to continue conducting the study.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
9005500	Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	IDFG	all	Yes	
9009300	Genetic Analysis of Oncorhynchus Nerka (Modified to Include Chinook Salmon)	U of I	all	yes	This ongoing project is changing direction and now including chinook. Question if similar straying studies are proposed for chinook as this could expand the project significantly.
9102900	Life History and Survival of Fall Chinook Salmon in Columbia River Basin	USGS	1	yes	This is an ongoing study that is significantly changing direction.
			2	no	Questionable whether sample sizes will allow the comparisons between Snake and Mid Columbia fish suggested in this proposal.
			3	no	Same comment as above.
			4	yes	
9105500	N a T U R E S [Formerly Supplemental Fish Quality (Yakima)]	NMFS	all	yes	
9107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	SHO-BAN	all	Yes	
9107200	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	IDFG	1	Yes	
			2	No	Objectives do not meet definition.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9107300	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	IDFG	1	Yes	
			2	No	Tasks do not address Objectives 1 & 2
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9202409	Enhance Conser. Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife,Watersheds of the Nez Perce	NPT	1	yes	But need more detail in budget (eg. major equipment should be specifically - 56k)
			2	NA	Criterion doesn't fit this proposal.
			3	NA	Objectives are too general, need to be more clearly defined. List the objectives of the Nez Perce Tribe's Fisheries Resource Mgt. Program and how enforcement objectives support those objectives.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			4	NA	Same as above.
9202604	Life History of Spring Chinook Salmon and Summer Steelhead	ODFW	all	Yes	
9204000	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research	NMFS	all	Yes	
9301900	Powerdale, Parkdale, and Oak Springs O&M	ODFW and CTWSRO	all	NA	
9304001	Fifteenmile Creek Wild Steelhead Smolt Production	ODFW	1	yes	Describe how objectives can be accomplished with the uncertainty of operating trap during freshets.
			2	yes	Defined yes - Achievable and measurable?
			3	yes	What is final outcome?
			4	yes	
9305600	Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology	NMFS	all	yes	How do you assess the connection between this proposal and the sockeye recovery goal.
9306000	Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project	ODFW, WDFW, CEDC	1	yes	Explain how subjected to NPPC 3 step process
			2	yes	
			3	yes	How will mass marking affect program?
			4	yes	
9402600	Pacific Lamprey Research and Restoration	CTUIR	all	Yes	Since this is a feasibility study it is difficult to apply criteria to all objectives
9403300	The Fish Passage Center (FPC)	PSMFC	all	yes	
9403400	Assessing Summer and Fall Chinook Restoration in the Snake River Basin	NPT	1	NA	
			2	no	Critical assumptions about working with threatened fall chinook is that sufficient numbers of PIT tagged fish willbe detected to provide observations, qualitative data, or quantitative results related to objectives # 1 & 3. If sample size is too small SUR
			3	no	Reporting is behind, draft '95-'96 not published?
			4	no	See #2.
9405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	ESD 105	1	NA	
			2	NA	Doesn't seem to belong in program. Very poorly prepared and missing information.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
9406900	A Spawning Habitat Model to Aid Recovery Plans for Snake River Fall Chinook	PNNL	1	no	Need more rationale for collecting data in Hanford Reach.
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	no	Need input from fisheries co-managers
9500700	Hood River Production Program - PGE: O & M	PGE	all	N/A	Hatchery O&M funding proposal.
9506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring and Evaluation	YIN	1	no	Are specific individual's time counted many times? Eg. - Three full year FTEs assigned to one person across three projects (8812025, 9506325, and 9701325)?
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
9506425	Ykfp - Wdfw Policy and Technical Involvement in the YKFP	WDFW	1	no	The budget breakdown and justification section needs to be greatly expanded and many more details included for a project proposal of this size and scope
			2	yes	Doesn't seem to belong in program.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
9600500	Independent Scientific Advisory Board	CBFWF	1	NA	Selection process does not include tribes
			2	NA	How will independence be maintained?
			3	NA	SRT report not independent
			4	NA	Need improved selection process to acquire independent reviewers
9604000	Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia	YIN	1	NA	
			2	yes	
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
9604300	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Project	NPT	all	Yes	
9606700	Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project	NMFS	1	Yes	
			2	No	Very poorly written objectives and tasks. No time or thought?
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9700100	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	IDFG	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	A bit vague

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			3	Yes	Questionable at best; how is this really going to happen?
			4	Yes	
9701325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance	YIN	1	yes	
			2	NA	o&m
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
9701400	Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on the Hanford Reach	WDFW	all	yes	
9702600	Ecology of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence on Salmonid Ocean Survival	NMFS/NWFSC	all	yes	
9703000	Monitor Listed Stock Adult Chinook Salmon Escapement	NPT	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Poorly written objectives-vague
			3	Yes	Questionable
			4	Yes	
9703800	Preserve Listed Salmonid Stocks Gametes	NPT	all	Yes	
9705700	Salmon River Production Program	SBT	all	Yes	
9800401	Electronic Fish and Wildlife Newsletter	Intermountain Communications	all	yes	
9800702	Grande Ronde Supplementation - O&M/M&E - Nez Perce Tribe Lostine	NPT	1	Yes	
			2	No	Objectives do not meet definition.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9800703	Facility O&M and Program M&E for Grande Ronde Spring Chinook Salmon	CTUIR	1	Yes	
			2	No	Objectives do not meet definition.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9800800	Regional Forum Facilitation Services	DS Consulting	1	NA	
			2	NA	How are nonmembers being engaged?
			3	NA	All critical entities not participating
			4	NA	
9801001	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	ODFW	all	Yes	
9801003	Spawning distribution of Snake River fall chinook salmon	USFWS	1	yes	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Recommendations
			2	no	Major critical assumption should be stated explicitly - see para.3 under Summary of major results. May not achieve sample size needed.
			3	yes	
			4	yes	
9801004	M&E of Yearling Snake R. Fall Chinook Released Upstream of Lower Granite	NPT	1	yes	
			2	yes	
			3	no	Needs more details and measurable objectives are lacking. Three years of results not yet reported
			4	no	See #2.
9801005	Pittsburg Landing,Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Acclimation Facilities	NPT	1	yes	
			2	yes	Very limited use of references.
			3	no	No evidence of reports or reporting mechinisms.
			4	no	See #2.
9801006	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	NPT	all	Yes	
9801600	Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	ODFW	all	yes	
9901800	Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho	USFWS-IFRO	all	Yes	Is this information really needed?
9902000	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	RMRS	1	Yes	
			2	No	Objectives 1 and 2 are not objectives
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	

Fish Passage Advisory Committee

(Anadromous mainstem proposals)

Process

The Anadromous Fish Managers (AFM) of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) developed a process and criteria for selecting FY2000 mainstem non-watershed 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 the mainstem non-watershed proposals were reviewed for technical merit and feasibility by members of the Fish Passage Advisory Committee (FPAC).

The FPAC review committee was made up of five individuals with appropriate technical qualifications. Representatives from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) participated in the review process.

FPAC reviewed a total of 51 projects (32 ongoing and 19 new). Each committee member was assigned approximately 10 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. FPAC members were provided with four criteria approved by the AFM and instructed to respond with a "yes" if a criterion was met and a "no" for any criterion not 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 FPAC members received the proposals by January 15, conducted their review, and met as a group February 12 to discuss all proposals. The product of the group review was then provided in draft to individual reviewers for their approval. On February 18, 1999 consensus was reached on all recommendations and a summary report was submitted to CBFWA.

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?

Results

See the next table for projects and responses to criteria. Comments are provided where criteria were not met.

Table 5. Fish Passage Advisory Committee evaluation

PojectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Comments
20011	Evaluate Whole System Effects on Migration and Survival of Juvenile Salmon	OCFWRU	all	Yes	Question the management application of the proposal. Don't feel there is much you can do to manipulate either transport, or run of river smolts.
20052	Strategies to Limit Disease Effects on Estuarine Survival	OSU, NMFS	1	Yes	Questionable management application; linking release data to estuarine survival difficult maybe impossible.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
20053	Anadromous Salmonid Transit System	Morrison-Knudsen Corp	all	No	Not recommended. This is a poor idea which was dropped by NMFS two years ago. The concept is filled with complex detail challenges, all remedies would have to be perfectly aligned (weakest line probably applies). The only way to test for sure is to expend billions of dollars to construct.
20054	Evaluate Effects of Hydraulic Turbulence on the Survival of Migratory Fish	ORNL	1	No	Scope of work is somewhat narrower than for proj. 20060. "nice to know", especially injury in hydraulic jump but proposal for lab work only. Prefer 20060 pending additional discussion. Question management application
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
20060	Juvenile Anadromous Fish Prototype-Scale Evaluation Facility	Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, Inc.	all	No	Regional needs/priorities need to be established and considered first. Proposal is premature.
20067	Effects of Supersaturated Water on Reproductive Success of Adult Salmonids	USGS	all	Inc	Need to structure work to be part of comprehensive study not only TDG. Fall chinook from Spring Creek and Abernathy proposed as test species. Question application for in-river fish (spring/summer chinook).
20068	Numerical Study of Flow-Field Structure on Salmonid Migration	UMICH	all	No	Not recommended. Would conduct work (currently proposed in a more concise and compatible manner) that is to be addressed in CRFM-SWRG. CRFM modeling is to be developed to allow superimposition of fish behavior and hydraulics. This proposal more disassociated.
20076	Diet, Distribution & Life History of Neomysis Mercedis in John Day Pool	UMT	1	Inc	Proposal is based on "potential" food web problems, no convincing data to suggest such a problem is likely.
			2	Yes	No potential management application.
			3	Yes	Study is possible, but Neomysis is probably not manageable since it is a deep water species.
			4	Yes	
20095	Evaluate Interactions of American Shad With Salmon in the Columbia River	USGS-BRD	1	Yes	Objectives 2 and 3 are unnecessary at this time. Obj. 1 should be expanded to include estuarine information collection.

PojectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Comments
			2	Inc	
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	
20098	Develop and Evaluate Selective Commercial Fishing Gear: Tangle Nets	WDFW	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	Need greater resolution for Objective 4.
			4	Yes	
20099	System for Salmon Migrating Through Dams	Krick Salmon Survival Systems	all	No	Not recommended. Proposal ignores evidence of contrary behavior by smolt, assuming isolated forebay collector can draw fish into entrances by conventional food. Recent studies show fish avoid most entrances.
20110	Develop Wheels, Pools and Falls Approach for Fish Passage at Dams	Sun Mountain Reflections	all	No	Concept does not allow for engineering realities of energy dissipation and resultant harmful biological effects. NMFS bio-engineer has met with proponent and described pitfalls.
20142	Snake River Temperature Control Project, Phase III	CRITFC, UI, OGI	all	Yes	How does this study fit in with Corps' temperature monitoring efforts?
20143	Monitor Symptoms of Gas Bubble Trauma in Adult Salmonids	CRITFC	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Data from ceremonial catch and 3-mile dam trap need to be evaluated. Have not been made available.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
20515	Mainstem Columbia River Umbrella Proposal	ODFW	all	NA	
20537	Bonneville Power Administration Non-Discretionary Projects Umbrella	BPA	all	NA	
20542	Biological Monitoring of Columbia River Basin Salmonids	Multi-agency	1	NA	This is an umbrella over an umbrella. It is not necessary since it is already included in 20552.
			2	NA	20552 is the SMP Umbrella. Therefore, this can be eliminated.
			3	NA	
			4	NA	
20543	Coded Wire Tag Program	WDFW, ODFS, USFWS, PSMFC	1	NA	This is an umbrella proposal. However, it includes a budget. Each of the contracts under the umbrella also include budgets, therefore, it may cause double counting.
			2	NA	
			3	NA	Some concern expressed regarding the timelines associated with data entry.
			4	NA	

PojectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Comments
20552	Smolt Monitoring Program Umbrella	PSMFC, IDFG, NP, USGS	all	NA	
8331900	New Fish tagging System	NMFS	all	Yes	Work necessary to develop adult fish PIT tag detection capability
8332300	Smolt Monitoring at the Head of Lwr. Granite Reservoir & Lwr. Granite Dam	IDFG	all	Yes	
8401400	Smolt Monitoring Program Marking	USFWS	all	Yes	
8712700	Smolt Monitoring by Federal and Non-Federal Agencies	PSMFC	all	Yes	
8712702	Comparative Survival Rate Study (CSS) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook	PSMFC	all	Yes	Continuing study
8740100	Assessment of Smolt Condition: Biological and Environmental Interactions	USGS-BRD, CRRL	1	Yes	Question the need to continue this work. What is needed is a summary of the results of the past 10+ years work.
			2	Yes	
			3	No	
			4	Yes	
8910700	Statistical Support for Salmonid Survival Studies	UW	all	No	It is unclear who is using this study and why. NMFS says they are not using this and CZES is not. It is not used by PATH therefore why continue funding?
8910800	Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support	UW	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	No regional application
			3	Yes	
			4	No	Too much money!
9007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	PSMFC	all	Yes	Not supported by PATH SRP weight of evidence report. Independent scientists selected 0% rather than 25% effect in modeling.
9007800	Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-Scale Patterns	USGS	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	Question whether Obj. 2 is achievable
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9008000	Columbia River Basin Pit Tag Information System	PSMFC	all	Yes	
9102800	Monitoring Smolt Migrations of Wild Snake River Sp/Sum Chinook	NMFS	all	No	Is there a justifiable need to continue collecting these data? The impacts to the population (particularly as a result of electrofishing) appear greater than the information need.
9105100	Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support	UW	1	Inc	Objectives not clearly defined
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	

PojectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Comments
			4	Yes	
9202200	Physiological Assessment of wild and hatchery juvenile salmonids	NMFS	all	NA	Not a mainstem project.
9202400	Protect Anadromous Salmonids in the Mainstem Corridor	CRITFE	all	NA	Law enforcement proposal. Question why FPAC is reviewing.
9204101	Lower Columbia River Adult Study	COE	1	Yes	Cost-shared with BPA. Important work that has provided insights leading to overall passage improvements. Important from an adaptive management perspective.
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	Timely submission of annual/final reports needed.
			4	Yes	
9302900	Survival Estimates for the Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Dams and R	NMFS/NWFSC	1	Inc	Question whether flat plate detectors can be used in tributaries or whether they can answer questions about juvenile fish mortality upstream of LGR. No milestones provided.
			2	Yes	
			3	Inc	Questionable interpretation of data.
			4	Yes	
9303701	Stochastic Life Cycle Model Technical Assistance	PER Ltd.	all	Yes	Part of 9600600 umbrella. 3% budget increase over FY99
9600600	Facilitation, Technical Assistance and Peer Review of Path	ESSA	all	Yes	
9600800	Stufa Participation in a Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses (Path)	ODFW	all	Yes	
9600801	Technical Support for Path	NMFS	all	Yes	
9601700	Provide Technical Support for Path	BioAnalysts, Inc.	all	Yes	
9601900	Second Tier Database Support for Ecosystem Focus	BPA	all	No	Unclear of the need. Duplicative of other database programs, not necessary for regional needs.
9602100	Gas bubble disease research and monitoring of juvenile salmonids	USGS-BRD, CRRL	1	Yes	
			2	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	No	0.5 FTE is excessive. Involves hosting 2-day workshop and some sites visits
9700200	Path - UW Technical Support	UW	1	Yes	Needs to be put under PATH umbrella. Needs multi-year budget.
	Path Technical Support - James J. Anderson	Anderson Consulting	1	Yes	Question what aspect of PATH is being covered here that is not covered in the above project. Put under the PATH umbrella if it is not duplicative of 9700200.
			2	Yes	

PojectID	Title	Sponsor	Criteria	Met	Comments
			2	Inc	
9700200			3	Yes	
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
			4	No	
9701000	PIT Tag System Transition	COE; PSMFC; NMFS-CZES	all	Yes	
9702400	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River	OSU/CRITFC	1	Yes	
			2	Inc	Given the wide variability associated with the estimate of the impact of the bird predation, is it likely that a quantifiable change in mortality can be demonstrated by this study?
			3	Yes	
			4	Inc	Budget seems somewhat high.
9800100	Analytical Support-Path and ESA Biological Assessments	Hinrichsen Environmental Services	1	No	Scientific Review Panel did not support objective 1B (In the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Weight of Evidence Report).
			2	No	Question the role of the individual in the process. He was formerly funded under the Anderson - UW PATH contract. Funded occurred in 1998 without going through the process, question whether the UW contract decreased by the same amount when the funding moved from the contract?
			3	No	In general, activities in support of PATH should be separated from BPA/COE assessment.
			4	No	
9801400	Ocean Survival of Juvenile Salmonids in the Columbia River Plume	NMFS/NWFSC	1	Inc	
			2	Inc	Unclear if sufficient tagged fish can be recaptured to accomplish objectives.
			3	Yes	
			4	Yes	
9808001	PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution	PSMFC	all	NA	
9900300	Evaluate Spawning of Salmon Below the Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams	WDFW, ODFW, USFWS, PNNL	all	Yes	

Management Evaluations

Anadromous fish proposals

Process

A total of 316 anadromous fish projects were forwarded to the Authority for review and evaluation ($147,325,000). The Anadromous Fish Managers (AFM) referred the projects to sub-regional teams (SRT) for management review. Each SRT was given a "target" budget, based on the allocation of funds among the sub-regions in FY 1999, and were instructed to develop its project recommendations with that target in mind. Projects were evaluated and assigned a "tier" designation. For those projects assigned to Tier 1, each SRT reviewed the scope of work and budget and recommended adjustments they believed were warranted given available funds in FY 2000. These adjustments included deferring or eliminating specific tasks or objectives that did not warrant a high management priority. Some important projects were assigned to Tier 2, and were thus deferred until additional funding became available. The results of each SRTs work were forwarded to the AFM with one of three recommendations: fund (Tier 1); fund if sufficient money is available (Tier 2); or do not fund (Tier 3).

High priority (Tier 1) anadromous fish projects recommended by the SRTs and their associated budgets were scrutinized by AFM and appropriate adjustments were made during a three-day management review. During the management review, it became apparent that additional reductions in the scope of Tier 1 projects were not feasible given the critical and urgent nature of the projects. To "balance" the budget recommended by the SRTs with the "target operating" budget for AFM, some ongoing, high priority activities would need to be curtailed or important new projects deferred.

The AFM concluded that all projects designated as Tier 1 by the SRTs were core activities critical to sub-region management goals and objectives necessary to meet ESA requirements contained in the 1995 Biological Opinion and the 1998 Steelhead supplement. These projects also contemplated actions that are consistent with the recent salmon and steelhead listings and are likely to be embodied in forthcoming biological opinions in FY 2000.

Anadromous Fish Management Criteria

Watershed Project Management Criteria

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. Is the project urgent, or more urgent?

Non-watershed Project Management Criteria

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. Is the project urgent, or more urgent?

Results

See the next two tables for responses to criteria for anadromous fish projects and comments during evaluation.

Table 6. Anadromous fish management evaluation

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
20001	Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore instream and riparian habitat on	USFWS	Wenatchee	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
20003	Enhance Fish Habitat by Improving Water Quality	SYCD	Yakima	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20004	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	White Salmon River Watershed Management Committee c/o Underwood Conservation District	Little White Salmon	N	N	N	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	3
20006	Yakima Basin Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-Ibi)	Washington Trout	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	N								3
20010	Improve Fish Habitat by Reducing Farm Sediment Runoff	Benton Conservation District	Yakima	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20011	Evaluate Whole System Effects on Migration and Survival of Juvenile Salmon	OCFWRU	Lower Columbia Mainstem	N	NA	Y	?	NA	Y	N								2
20012	Develop New Technology for Telemetry and Remote Sensing of Fish Quality	OCFWRU	Mainstem	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N								3
20013	Restore Unobstructed Fish Passage to Duncan Creek	SLOA	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N/Y?	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	3
20016	Snake River Steelhead Hooking Mortality Study	WDFW	Lower Snake Mainstem	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N								2
20017	Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	SBT, IDFG, USFS	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	1
20018	Tucannon River and Asotin Creek Riparian Enhancement	WDFW	Tucannon	N	N	Y, but	Y	Y, small	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	2
20019	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	IDFG	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y/Y	Y	NA	N								1
20020	Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	WDFW	Tucannon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y								1
20021	Estimate natural steelhead production in two tributaries of the Walla Walla	WDFW	Walla Walla	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N	Y	N								2
20022	NE Oregon Hatchery Planning & Coordination - WDFW	WDFW	Walla Walla	Y	Y,but	N	Y	N	NA	N								1
20023	Hanford Reach Steelhead Stock Investigation	WDFW	Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y								1
20024	Evaluate Fall Chinook Natural Production and Spawning Habitat Conditions in	WDFW	Tucannon	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N	Y	N								2
20025	Deschutes River Stray Summer Steelhead Assessment	ODFW	Deschutes	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								1
20026	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout Above Bonneville Dam	ODFW	Hood	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	N	N								2
20027	Electronic Columbia Basin Watershed Newsletter	Intermountain	Systemwide	N	N	Y	N	NA	N	N								3

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
		Communications																
20029	Electronic Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Research Report	Intermountain Communications	Systemwide	N	N	Y	N	NA	N	N								3
20030	Impact of Nutrients on Salmon Production in the Columbia River Basin	U of BC	Systemwide	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								2
20031	Community Ecology and Food Web Studies in the Columbia River Basin	USFS	Chelan	N	Y	N	N	N	NA	N								3
20032	Protect Bear Valley Wild Salmon, Steelhead, Bull Trout Spawning Habitat	SBT & IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
20033	Rehabilitate instream and riparian habitat on the Similkameen and Okanogan	USFWS	Okanogan	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20035	Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi-Year Fy 2000-2002)	Oregon Water Trust	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
20037	Improvement of Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage in Omak Creek	CCT	Okanogan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
20038	Assess Habitat and Passage For Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph	CCT	Mainstem	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y								2
20042	Integrating Okanogan and Methow Watershed Data for Salmonid Restoration	Okanogan Conservation District	Mainstem	N	NA	NA	N	Y	N	NA	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	3
20043	Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection: Genetic Retrieval From Single Sperm	U of I	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20044	Endocrine Control of Ovarian Development in Salmonids	U of I	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20045	Analyzing Genetic and Behavioral Changes During Salmonid Domestication	WSU	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20046	Induction of Precocious Sexual Maturity and Enhanced Egg Production in Fish	U of I	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20047	Enhancement of salmonid gamete quality by manipulation of intracellular ATP	U of I	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20048	Viral Vaccines and Effects on Reproductive Status	WSU	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20050	Remove Excess Heat From Streams and Store It for Future Application	Parker's Inc (a close held general corp) dba BETTERFISH	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								3
20051	Decrease Sedimentation and Temp. in Streams, Educate Resource Managers	OSU EXT	Grande Ronde	N	N	Y, but	N	Y	N,N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	3
20052	Strategies to Limit Disease Effects on Estuarine Survival	OSU, NMFS	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	Y	Y,	NA	Y	Y								2
20053	Anadromous Salmonid Transit System	Morrison-Knudsen Corp	Lower Snake Mainstem	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N								3
20054	Evaluate Effects of Hydraulic Turbulence on the Survival of Migratory Fish	ORNL	Systemwide	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								3
20055	Evaluate a Mark-Resight Survey for Estimating Numbers	RMRS	Salmon	N	N	Y	Y/N	N	NA	N								3

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	of Redds																	
20056	Elucidate Traffic Patterns of Ihn Virus in the Columbia River Basin	USGS-WFRC	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20057	Strategies for Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon	OSU	Systemwide	N	N	Y, but	Y	Y, miNimal	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	3
20058	Leavenworth Hatchery Complex	BOR	Mainstem	Y	N	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								3
20059	Infrastructure to Complete FDA Registration of Erythromycin	U of I-FWR	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y								1
20060	Juvenile Anadromous Fish Prototype-Scale Evaluation Facility	Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, Inc.	Mainstem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								3
20061	Influence of Marine-Derived Nutrients on Juvenile Salmonid Production	USGS-BRD	Systemwide	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								2
20064	Upstream migration of Pacific lampreys in the John Day R: behavior, timing	USGS-BRD, CRRL	John Day	Y,but	Y	Y	Y&N	N	NA	N								2
20065	Identification of larval Pacific lampreys (Lampetra tridentata), river lamp	USGS-BRD, CRRL	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N								1
20067	Effects of Supersaturated Water on Reproductive Success of Adult Salmonids	USGS	Mainstem	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								3
20068	Numerical Study of Flow-Field Structure on Salmonid Migration	UMICH	Mainstem	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								3
20069	Innovation Proposal Fund: Construct fuzzy logic decision support system…	E&S Environmental Chemistry, Inc.	Systemwide	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20072	Restoring Perennial Instream Flows At Ahtanum Creek	Dames and Moore	Yakima	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	3
20075	Engineered Anadromous Salmonid Habitat	U of I	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N								2
20076	Diet, Distribution & Life History of Neomysis Mercedis in John Day Pool	UMT	Mainstem	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								3
20077	Inventory & Assessment of Irrigation Diversion Alternatives to Push-up Dams	USBOR	John Day	N	N	Y	Y, but	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	3
20079	Assessing Adult Steelhead Escapement & Genetics in the South Fork Salmon	NPT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/N	Y	NA	N								1
20080	Evaluate a Modified Feeding Strategy to Reduce Residualism and Promote Smolt	IFRO-USFWS	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y/N	Y	NA	N								1
20083	Evaluate, restore & enhance 14 miles of instream and riparian habitat on…	USFWS	Crab	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	3
20084	Protect and Restore the North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
20085	Analyze and Improve Fish Screens	NPT	Lower Snake Mainstem	N	N	N	N	N	Y									3
20086	Rehabilitate Newsome Creek - S.F. Clearwater River	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
20087	Protect and Restore Mill Creek Watershed	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y,	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
20088	Assess Mckenzie Watershed Habitat and Prioritize Projects	McKenzie River Focus	Willamette	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
		Watershed Council																
20089	Increase Instream Water Rights for Crabtree Creek	SSWC	Willamette	N	N	N	N	Y	N/Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20093	Evaluate the Feasibility for Anadromous Fish Reintroduction in the Owyhee	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	N	Y	N	Y/N	N	NA	Y								3
20095	Evaluate Interactions of American Shad With Salmon in the Columbia River	USGS-BRD	Mainstem	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								2
20098	Develop and Evaluate Selective Commercial Fishing Gear: Tangle Nets	WDFW	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N								2
20099	System for Salmon Migrating Through Dams	Krick Salmon Survival Systems	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								3
20100	Characterize Historic Channel Morphology of the Columbia River: Mcnary Pool	PNNL	Mainstem															2
20101	Connectivity and Productivity of Mainstem Alluvial Reaches	PNNL	Mainstem	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20102	Research/Evaluate Restoration of NE Ore Streams and Develop Mgmt Guidelines	OSU/UO	Grande Ronde	N	N	Y, but	Y	N	N	Y, but	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	2
20103	Indexing Salmon Carrying Capacity to Habitat, Population & Physical Fitness	OSU	Systemwide	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20104	Sources of Myxobacterial Pathogens in Propagated Salmonids	USFWS/SCTC	Systemwide	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N								2
20105	Develop New Feeds for Fish Used in Recovery and Restoration Efforts	USFWS/SCTC	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								3
20106	Heritability of Disease Resistance and Immune Function in Chinook Salmon	USFWS	Systemwide	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								2
20107	Reconnect the Westport Slough to the Clatskanie River	LCRWC	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	3
20108	Recruit, Train, Organize & Support River Stewards	Oregon Trout	Lower Columbia Mainstem	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N	3
20109	Cedar Creek Natural Production and Watershed Monitoring Project	WDFW	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N								3
20110	Develop Wheels, Pools and Falls Approach for Fish Passage at Dams	Sun Mountain Reflections	Systemwide	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								3
20111	Preserve Cryogenically the Gametes of Selected Mid-Columbia Salmonid Stocks	CRITFC	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y								2
20117	Yakima River Subbasin Assessment	YIN	Yakima	N	NA	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	3
20118	Klickitat River Subbasin Assessment	YIN	Klickitat	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1
20119	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	YIN		Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1
20120	Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum	USFWS	Lower	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N								1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	Salmon Populations		Columbia Mainstem															
20121	Evaluate Habitat Use and Population Dynamics of Lampreys in Cedar Creek	USFWS	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N								1
20122	Test guidance flows and strobe lights at a SBC to increase smolt FCE & FGE	WDFW	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N								3
20123	Restoration of Sockeye Salmon Into Palmer Lake	Salmonsoft	Okanogan	N	N	Y	N	N	NA	N								2
20124	Evaluate An Experimental Re-Introduction of Sockeye Salmon Into Skaha Lake	CCT	Okanogan	Y	N	Y	N	NA	NA	Y								1
20125	Restore Riparian and Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Upper Sandy Basin	Mt. Hood NF	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	3
20127	Walla Walla River Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Project	CTUIR	Walla Walla	Y	Y, but	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N								1
20131	Enhance North Fork John Day River Subbasin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
20132	Yakima River Basin Water Temperature Monitoring and Modeling Project	Yakima Basin Joint Board	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
20133	Irrigation as a Management Tool for Stream Temperature	OSU	Grande Ronde	N	N	Y, but	N	N	N,N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	3
20134	Purchase Oxbow Ranch		John Day															1
20138	Design and Construct Neoh Walla Walla Hatchery	CTUIR	Walla Walla	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N	N	N								1
20139	Walla Walla River Fish Passage Operations	CTUIR	Walla Walla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	N								1
20141	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts	CRITFC	Yakima	N	N	N	Y	Y	NA	N								1
20142	Snake River Temperature Control Project, Phase III	CRITFC, UI, OGI	Lower Snake Mainstem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								3
20143	Monitor Symptoms of Gas Bubble Trauma in Adult Salmonids	CRITFC	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
20145	Evaluate Little Walla Walla Screening Facility	ODFW	Walla Walla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	N								2
20149	Develop Research Priorities for Fall Chinook in the Columbia River Basin	PNNL	Systemwide	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N								3
20150	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	RSBOJC	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20151	Landowner Communication Program	RSBOJC	Yakima	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20152	Improve Yakima River Water Quality by Incorporating Buffer Strips	RSBOJC	Yakima	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	3
20153	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	RSBOJC	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20154	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	RSBOJC	Yakima	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
20155	Inventory On-Farm Irrigation Practices	RSBOJC	Yakima	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
20157	Gas Bubble Trauma Monitoring In The Clearwater River, Id.	IDFG	Clearwater															1
20515	Mainstem Columbia River Umbrella Proposal	ODFW	Mainstem															
20537	Bonneville Power Administration Non-Discretionary Projects Umbrella	BPA	Systemwide	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								
20542	Biological Monitoring of Columbia River Basin Salmonids	Multi-agency	Systemwide	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								
20543	Coded Wire Tag Program	WDFW, ODFS, USFWS, PSMFC	Systemwide	Y	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y								
20552	Smolt Monitoring Program Umbrella	PSMFC, IDFG, NP, USGS	Mainstem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								
8201300	Coded-Wire Tag Recovery	PSMFC	Systemwide															1
8331900	New Fish Tagging System	NMFS	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8332300	Smolt Monitoring at the Head of Lwr. Granite Reservoir & Lwr. Granite Dam	IDFG	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8335000	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8335003	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8343500	Operate and Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities	CTUIR	Umatilla	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NA	Y/ N								1
8343600	Umatilla Passage Facilities O & M	Westland Irrigation District	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	NA	Y								1
8401400	Smolt Monitoring Program Marking	USFWS	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8402100	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the John Day Subbasin	ODFW	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
8402500	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in Grande Ronde Basin Streams	ODFW	Grande Ronde	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N,N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
8506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	PNNL	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	Umatilla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N, N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
8710002	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Umatilla River Subbasin	ODFW	Umatilla	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N, N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
8712700	Smolt Monitoring by Federal and Non-Federal Agencies	PSMFC	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8712702	Comparative Survival Rate Study (CSS) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook	PSMFC	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8712703	Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project	NPT	Imnaha	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8740100	Assessment of Smolt Condition: Biological and Environmental Interactions	USGS-BRD, CRRL	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8802200	Umatilla River Fish Passage Operations	CTUIR	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
8805301	Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan	NPT	Grande Ronde	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N, but	NA	N								1
8805302	Plan, Site, Design and Construct NEO Hatchery - Umatilla/Walla Walla Comp.	CTUIR	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y, but	N	N	N								1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
8805303	Hood River Production Program - M&E	CTWSRO	Hood	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
8805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E	ODFW	Hood	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
8805305	Norheast Oregon Hatcheries Planning and Implementation - ODFW	ODFW	Grande Ronde	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
8810804	Streamnet: the Northwest Aquatic Information System	PSMFC	Systemwide	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								1
8811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	NA	Y								1
8812025	Ykfp Management, Data and Habitat	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8816000	Willamette Hatchery Oxygen Supplementation	ODFW	Willamette	N	N	N	N	N/A	N	N								1
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in the Lower Umatilla	ODFW	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
8902700	Power Repay Umatilla Basin Project	BPA	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	NA	Y								1
8902900	Hood River Production Program-Pelton Ladder-Hatchery	ODFW	Hood	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
8903500	Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance	ODFW	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	N	Y								1
8906200	Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation	CBFWA	Systemwide	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								1
8906500	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (USFWS)	USFWS	Systemwide															1
8906600	Annual Stock Assessment- Coded Wire Tag Program (WDFW)	WDFW	Systemwide															1
8906900	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (ODFW)	ODFW	Systemwide															1
8907201	Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support	DOE/ORNL	Systemwide	Y	N	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
8909600	Monitor and evaluate genetic characteristics of supplemented salmon & stlhd	NMFS	Tucannon	Y	Y, but	N	Y, but	N	Y	N								1
8909800	Idaho Supplementation Studies	IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8909801	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation in Idaho Rivers (ISS)	USFWS-IFRO	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8909802	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	NPT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8909803	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	SBT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
8910700	Statistical Support for Salmonid Survival Studies	UW	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N								3
8910800	Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support	UW	Mainstem	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N								3
9000500	Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	ODFW	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9000501	Umatilla River Basin Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	CTUIR	Umatilla	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9005200	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation	USGS-BRD	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N								1
9005500	Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	PSMFC	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9007800	Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-Scale Patterns	USGS	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9008000	Columbia River Basin Pit Tag Information System	PSMFC	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9009300	Genetic Analysis of Oncorhynchus Nerka (Modified to Include Chinook Salmon)	U of I	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
9102800	Monitoring Smolt Migrations of Wild Snake River Sp/Sum Chinook	NMFS	Salmon	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N								1
9102900	Life History and Survival of Fall Chinook Salmon In Columbia River Basin	USGS	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9105100	Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support	UW	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	NA	N	N								3
9105500	N A T U R E S (Formerly Supplemental Fish Quality (Yakima))	NMFS	Systemwide	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N								1
9105700	Yakima Phase 2 [Fish] Screen Fabrication	WDFW	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	SBT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9107200	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9107300	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	USBOR	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9200900	Yakima [Fish] Screens - Phase 2 - O&M	WDFW, YSS	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9202200	Physiological Assessment of wild and hatchery juvenile salmonids	NMFS	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	N								1
9202400	Protect Anadromous Salmonids in the Mainstem Corridor	CRITFE	Mainstem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								
9202409	Enhance Conser. Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife,Watersheds of the Nez Perce	NPT	Lower Snake Mainstem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								1
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program	GRMWP	Grande Ronde	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9202603	Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support	SCC	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9202604	Life History of Spring Chinook Salmon and Summer Steelhead	ODFW	Grande Ronde	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	N/ Y								1
9204000	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research	NMFS	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9204101	Lower Columbia River Adult Study	COE	Systemwide	Y	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9301900	Powerdale, Parkdale, and Oak Springs O&M	ODFW, CTWSRO	Hood	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
9302900	Survival Estimates for the Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Dams and R	NMFS/NWFSC	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed	ISWCD	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9303701	Stochastic Life Cycle Model Technical Assistance	PER Ltd.	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	USFS	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	2
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request Multi-Year Funding)	ODFW	Fifteenmile	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9304001	Fifteenmile Creek Wild Steelhead Smolt Production	ODFW	Fifteenmile	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
9305600	Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology	NMFS	Systemwide	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N								1
9306000	Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project	ODFW, WDFW, CEDC	Lower Columbia	Y	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N								1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
			Mainstem															
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	LSWCD, CSWCD	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project - Fy'00 Proposal	ODFW	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9401500	Idaho Fish Screen Improvement	IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	LSWCD, CSWCD	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9401805	Continued Implementation of Asotin Creek Watershed Projects	Asotin County Conservation District	Lower Snake Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9401806	Implement Tucannon River Watershed Plan to Restore Salmonid Habitat	Columbia Conservation District	Tucannon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9401807	Continue With Implementation of Pataha Creek Model Watershed Projects	PCD	Tucannon	Y	Y	Y, but	Y, but	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	1
9402600	Pacific Lamprey Research and Restoration	CTUIR	Systemwide															1
9403300	The Fish Passage Center (FPC)	PSMFC	Mainstem	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N								1
9403400	Assessing Summer and Fall Chinook Restoration in the Snake River Basin	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planner	NPT	Grande Ronde	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	ODFW	Deschutes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M&E	SBT	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	ESD 105	Yakima	Y	N	N	Y	N	NA	N								1
9406900	A Spawning Habitat Model to Aid Recovery Plans for Snake River Fall Chinook	PNNL	Mainstem	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NA	N								1
9500700	Hood River Production Program - PGE O&M Pelton Ladder	PGE	Deschutes															1
9503300	O&M of Yakima Phase II Fish Facilities	USBOR	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring and Evaluation	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9506425	Ykfp - Wdfw Policy and Technical Involvement in the YKFP	WDFW	Yakima	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9600500	Independent Scientific Advisory Board	CBFWF	Systemwide	Y	N	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9600600	Facilitation, Technical Assistance and Peer Review of PATH	ESSA	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon R	LSWCD	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9600800	STUFA Participation in a Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses (PATH)	ODFW	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9600801	Technical Support for PATH	NMFS	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9601100	Walla Walla River Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	CTUIR	Walla Walla	Y	Y	Y, but	Y	Y, but	N,N	Y	N A	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	1
9601700	Provide Technical Support for PATH	BioAnalysts, Inc.	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
9601900	Second Tier Database Support for Ecosystem Focus	BPA	Systemwide	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								3
9602100	Gas bubble disease research and monitoring of juvenile salmonids	USGS-BRD, CRRL	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9603201	Begin Implementation of Year 1 of the K Pool Master Plan Program	YIN	Mainstem	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NA	N								2
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9604000	Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia	YIN	Wenatchee	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9604200	Restore and Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat in Salmon Creek	CCT	Okanogan	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9604300	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Project	NPT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/N	Y	NA	Y								1
9604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	Walla Walla	Y	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N,N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9605300	Upper Clear Creek Dredge Tailings Restoration	USFS/CTUIR	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9606700	Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project	NMFS	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9607000	Mckenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	McKenzie Watershed Council	Willamette	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1
9607708	Protect and Restore the Lolo Creek Watershed	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9607709	Protect and Restore the Squaw to Papoose Creeks Watersheds	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9607711	Restore Mccomas Meadow/ Meadow Creek Watershed	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9608300	CTUIR Grande Ronde Basin Watershed Restoration	CTUIR	Grande Ronde	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - ISCC	ISCC	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9700100	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	IDFG	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9700200	PATH - UW Technical Support	UW	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9701000	PIT Tag System Transition	COE; PSMFC; NMFS-CZES	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9701325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9701400	Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on the Hanford Reach	WDFW	Mainstem	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y								1
9702400	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River	OSU/CRITFC	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan	NPT	Grande Ronde	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9702600	Ecology of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence on Salmonid Ocean Survival	NMFS/NWFSC	Lower Columbia Mainstem															1
9703000	Monitor Listed Stock Adult Chinook Salmon Escapement	NPT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9703400	Monitor Fine Sediment and Sedimentation in John Day and Grande Ronde Rivers	CRITFC	John Day	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	Y								1
9703800	Preserve Listed Salmonid Stocks Gametes	NPT	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
9705000	Little Naches River Riparian & In-channel Enhancement Project	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	2
9705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration and Assessment	YIN	Yakima	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9705600	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YIN	Klickitat	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9705700	Salmon River Production Program	SBT	Salmon	Y	Y	N	Y/N	Y	NA	Y								1
9706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9800100	Analytical Support-Path and ESA Biological Assessments	Hinrichsen Environmental Services	Systemwide	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9800401	Electronic Fish and Wildlife Newsletter	Intermountain Communications	Systemwide	N	N	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9800600	PATH Technical Support - James J. Anderson	Anderson Consulting	mainstem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								3
9800702	Grande Ronde Supplementation - O&M/M&E - Nez Perce Tribe Lostine	NPT	Grande Ronde	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9800703	Facility O&M and Program M&E for Grande Ronde Spring Chinook Salmon	CTUIR	Grande Ronde	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9800800	Regional Forum Facilitation Services	DS Consulting	Systemwide	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N								1
9801001	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	ODFW	Grande Ronde	Y	Y, but	Y	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9801003	Spawning distribution of Snake River fall chinook salmon	USFWS	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9801004	M&E of Yearling Snake R. Fall Chinook Released Upstream of Lower Granite	NPT	Lower Snake Mainstem	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9801005	Pittsburg Landing,Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Acclimation Facilities	NPT	Lower Snake Mainstem	Y	Y	N	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1
9801006	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	NPT	Grande Ronde	Y	Y, but	N	Y	N	Y	Y								1
9801400	Ocean Survival of Juvenile Salmonids in the Columbia River Plume	NMFS/NWFSC	Lower Columbia Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9801600	Monitor Natural Escapement and Productivity of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	ODFW	John Day	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	Y								1
9801700	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams on Lower North Fork John Day	NFJDWC	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9801800	John Day Watershed Restoration	CTWSRO	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	UCD, USFS, USGS, WDFW	Wind	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWSRO	Hood	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9802400	Monitor Watershed Conditions on the Warm Springs	CTWSRO	Deschutes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Criteria														Tier
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	Reservation																	
9802800	Trout Creek Watershed Improvement Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	JCSWCD	Deschutes	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1
9803100	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Assessment & Restoration Plan	CRITFC	Systemwide	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9803300	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	1
9803400	Reestablish Safe Access Into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin.	YIN	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9803500	Watershed Scale Response of Stream Habitat to Abandoned Mine Waste	UW	Methow	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	3
9808001	PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution	PSMFC	Systemwide	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								NA
9900300	Evaluate Spawning of Salmon Below the Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams	WDFW, ODFW, USFWS, PNNL	Mainstem	Y	NA	N	Y	NA	Y	Y								1
9900600	Restoration of Riparian Habitat in Bakeoven / Deep Creeks	WCSWCD	Deschutes	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9901000	Mitigate Effects of Runoff & Erosion on Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow	Sherman SWCD	John Day	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N& Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	1
9901100	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	WDFW	Walla Walla	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y, small	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	1
9901200	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	Ki-Yak	Yakima	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9901300	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	YIN	Mainstem	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
9901400	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	ISCC	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9901500	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	ISCC	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9901600	Protect & Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9901700	Protect & Restore Lapwai Creek	NPT	Clearwater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9901800	Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho	USFWS-IFRO	Clearwater	Y	Y	N	Y/N	Y	NA	N								1
9901900	Restore the Salmon River, in the Challis, ID area, to a Healthy Condition	Custer Co	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
9902000	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	RMRS	Salmon	Y	Y	Y	Y/Y	Y	NA	Y								1

Table 7. Anadromous fish management SRT evaluation comments

ProjectID	Title	Comments
20001	Remove 23 migrational barriers and restore instream and riparian habitat on	Replacing and recovering habitat addresses a primary strategy within the subbasin, however, there is no comprehensive description how the project fits into the overall watershed. A map would have been helpful with a priority list of where culverts will be replaced. Proponents have not addressed ongoing O&M needs. Good objectives, however, there is no overall integration with other important variables in the watershed. They have not described how the changes will contribute to the overall salmon production within the watershed. We would like to see the project get started and report how fish are reacting to the initial actions. Our recommendation would be to start at the downstream most site and work upstream, observing fish utilization. We would also like to see a significant cost share in capital construction costs. We've reduced the budget to reflect our desire to see a reduction in number of culverts installed during the first year. Once progress has been proven, additional culverts could be added
20003	Enhance Fish Habitat by Improving Water Quality	Proponents do not specify allocation of conserved water for fish use. SRT would support this project if conserved water were specified for instream flow. SRT does not believe the purpose of FWP is to subsidize irrigation improvements with no assurance of usable habitat improvement.
20004	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	Until Condit Dam is removed or passage is provided, the need for an anadromous watershed assessment in this system is not a priority. Once a settlement is reached, then reconsideration of this project would be appropriate.
20006	Yakima Basin Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-Ibi)	This is an interesting research project, however, a direct link to management applications is unclear. Current food web studies are ongoing in this area, funded by BOR, and will provide much of the same information as sought by this project.
20010	Improve Fish Habitat by Reducing Farm Sediment Runoff	Proponents do not specify allocation of conserved water for fish use. WA SRT would support this project if conserved water were specified for instream flow. Sedimentation is a problem that should be addressed by other agency regulations and not funded by the FWP.
20011	Evaluate Whole System Effects on Migration and Survival of Juvenile Salmon	Does not appear to address a direct management need, but might be addressing an important uncertainty. Not well coordinated with other research. This work could be tied with other BPA funded tagging and collection projects.
20012	Develop New Technology for Telemetry and Remote Sensing of Fish Quality	#1-research on this topic is not a priority. #2-basic research. #3-in-kind. #5-other alternatives were not adequate. #6-but possible in the future. New & innovative research.
20013	Restore Unobstructed Fish Passage to Duncan Creek	Do they need all that they are requesting?? Ought to be able to complete for $200,000. They have already received at least one grant. Some of the stated costs may be related to needed dam maintenance. Preferred alternative is to remove the dam on Duncan Cr. Homeowners built the dam, now they are asking for funds to correct the problem created. Concern with limited expertise for conducting M & E. #1-Demonstrated support, but proposal overstates its case on some points. Proposal would be better if coordinated more closely with WDFW. #2-WDFW work priorities only. #3- This doc't lists Chum and its needs. #6-Assuming WDFW will pick up O&M. #8-WDFW work priorities are not based on WSA. #8-Did not state relation to WDFW M&E. #9-Dam removal would foster "normative." #10-Drawdown for 6 months will promote "connectivity" for Chum. #12&13-Proposal is silent. #14-Status quo if not done.
20016	Snake River Steelhead Hooking Mortality Study	
20017	Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings on the Yankee Fork Salmon River	Planning not completed but no O&M expected.
20018	Tucannon River and Asotin Creek Riparian Enhancement	
20019	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	This is a good project, however, it does not address more urgent management priorities in this area. We recommend funding at a reduced rate, agreed upon by IDFG, in order to accomplish other important tasks in the subbasin.
20020	Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	Shift $110K in capital to LSRCP leaving $66K in BPA Direct Funding. Objectives and costs were moved to a more appropriate project.
20021	Estimate natural steelhead production in two tributaries of the Walla Walla	Fund out of ESA placeholder.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
20022	NE Oregon Hatchery Planning & Coordination - WDFW	General reduction in the scope of the project.
20023	Hanford Reach Steelhead Stock Investigation	This is an important project. During the proposal presentation to WA SRT, WDFW agreed to the budget reduction shown under our recommendation. This project should be considered under ESA funding if a specific placeholder is established. This study would contribute to the knowledge of the unique Hanford Reach ecosystem in terms of natural production.
20024	Evaluate Fall Chinook Natural Production and Spawning Habitat Conditions in	
20025	Deschutes River Stray Summer Steelhead Assessment	This project addresses a specific need identified for ESA.
20026	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout Above Bonneville Dam	Not an urgent and critical need at this time.
20027	Electronic Columbia Basin Watershed Newsletter	Not an essential element of the management plan. Articles and information could be provided in Columbia Basin Bulletin. No demonstrated need for this project.
20029	Electronic Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Research Report	Not an essential element of the management plan. Articles and information could be provided in Columbia Basin Bulletin. No demonstrated need for this project. Research results are currently available through BPA website.
20030	Impact of Nutrients on Salmon Production in the Columbia River Basin	May be considered an innovative project. Not clear what contribution the results from this study would have for management application. Does not meet a critical and urgent management need. Before this type of study should be funded, more coordination with existing water quality studies should be provided.
20031	Community Ecology and Food Web Studies in the Columbia River Basin	Sound scientific research project but we are unsure how this research would apply to the propagation and restoration of anadromous fish runs in the region. We question using Lake Chelan as the template for a naturally occurring lentic system.
20032	Protect Bear Valley Wild Salmon, Steelhead, Bull Trout Spawning Habitat	Retire the allotment. Important production area, degraded exclusively by grazing. Covered by 1993 B.O.. USFS involved. Lost opportunity, fund it now. Fencing very expensive. Would this abrogate treaty grazing rights?
20033	Rehabilitate instream and riparian habitat on the Similkameen and Okanogan	
20035	Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi-Year Fy 2000-2002)	Split costs with NEOSWW. #2&3&7 p.16-17 lists plans.#5 big cost share #6 small ongoing cost of monitoring instream flows with commitment of Non-BPA (ODFW). #12 water right does have legal protection past efforts have been successful when purchased.
20037	Improvement of Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage in Omak Creek	Technically feasible fix to a passage problem.
20038	Assess Habitat and Passage For Anadromous Fish Upriver of Chief Joseph	We support this project as a high priority funded by COE SCT funds.
20042	Integrating Okanogan and Methow Watershed Data for Salmonid Restoration	The framework for this information is currently being provided under another BPA project through Streamnet. The proposers should approach Streamnet to provide and retrieve information for their area. The high level of hidden costs under the subcontractors heading is questionable. There was no specific long term strategy to keep data base updated into the future.
20043	Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection: Genetic Retrieval From Single Sperm	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.
20044	Endocrine Control of Ovarian Development in Salmonids	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.
20045	Analyzing Genetic and Behavioral Changes During Salmonid Domestication	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.
20046	Induction of Precocious Sexual Maturity and Enhanced Egg Production in Fish	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.
20047	Enhancement of salmonid gamete quality by manipulation of intracellular ATP	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.
20048	Viral Vaccines and Effects on Reproductive Status	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
20050	Remove Excess Heat From Streams and Store It for Future Application	A technical fix to an ecological problem does not seem appropriate. See Watershed TWG comments.
20051	Decrease Sedimentation and Temp. in Streams, Educate Resource Managers	
20052	Strategies to Limit Disease Effects on Estuarine Survival	Disease is important management concern and may be limiting in the estuary. Multi-year research will require a multi-year funding commitment. The tasks and objectives of this project could be easily dove tailed with Project #9801400.
20053	Anadromous Salmonid Transit System	Considered and dropped 2 years ago. The concept is filled with complex detail challenges, all remedies would have to be perfectly aligned (weakest link probably applies). The only way to test for sure is to expend billions of dollars.
20054	Evaluate Effects of Hydraulic Turbulence on the Survival of Migratory Fish	Scope of work is somewhat narrower than for Proposal 20060. "Nice to know", especially injury in hydraulic jump but proposal for lab work only. Prefer 20060 pending additional discussion. Question management application.
20055	Evaluate a Mark-Resight Survey for Estimating Numbers of Redds	This is a valid task that would provide good information. It is not a priority within this region at this time. Because this project could refine and improve a current technique, it should be funded in future years. There is concern about adequate sample sizes in FY00 and FY01.
20056	Elucidate Traffic Patterns of Ihn Virus in the Columbia River Basin	Sounds like pure theoretical research. Unclear what the application is for the recovery of listed species.
20057	Strategies for Riparian Recovery: Plant Succession & Salmon	May be considered an innovative project.
20058	Leavenworth Hatchery Complex	BPA FWP is not the proper funding source for this project.
20059	Infrastructure to Complete FDA Registration of Erythromycin	Needed for chinook rearing programs.
20060	Juvenile Anadromous Fish Prototype-Scale Evaluation Facility	Should be considered within System Configurations Team, appears to be a Corps capital issue. Regional needs/priorities need to be established and considered first.
20061	Influence of Marine-Derived Nutrients on Juvenile Salmonid Production	May be considered an innovative project. Not clear that results from this study would affect current management actions. This work is currently taking place. Should be revisited in FY01 in the context of monitoring and evaluating ongoing implementation of carcass placement.
20064	Upstream migration of Pacific lampreys in the John Day R: behavior, timing	#1 weak yes, but too focused, limited scope. #2 , #4 yes complements Mgmt actions, no coordination with mgrs.#5 SRT unaware of any alts considered. #7 other priorities, not a lot of S/T regulation.
20065	Identification of larval Pacific lampreys (Lampetra tridentata), river lamp	This is a well developed proposal that addresses critical uncertainties and needs identified in the lamprey status report. We encourage proponents to coordinate their identification work with other lamprey investigations and remove redundant objectives.
20067	Effects of Supersaturated Water on Reproductive Success of Adult Salmonids	Important question regarding effects of many factors on reproductive success, but this study addresses only one factor among the many. How do you separate the other factors? Question the applicability of fall chinook results to spring chinook present when spill is likely. Management action is to meet existing WQ standards and this study won't provide input for that action.
20068	Numerical Study of Flow-Field Structure on Salmonid Migration	Unclear how this study would complement current COE study. More appropriately considered in SCT, particularly if study is focused on power operations.
20069	Innovation Proposal Fund: Construct fuzzy logic decision support system…	This project is more appropriate for funding as part of the Multi-Species Framework which is not part of the direct budget process. Focus of work is not based in the Columbia Basin.
20072	Restoring Perennial Instream Flows At Ahtanum Creek	Proposal does not provide enough information to justify feasibility study. It appears that the proposed storage reservoir would not hold enough water to maintain flow in Ahtanum Creek at sufficient levels for fish use. We are not sure if increased flows in Ahtanum Creek will be used for fish or for additional irrigation by senior water rights holders.
20075	Engineered Anadromous Salmonid Habitat	This work appears redundant with some of the existing NATURES work in the Yakima sub basin.
20076	Diet, Distribution & Life History of Neomysis Mercedis in	Mainstem food webs may be important. Consider some research as "Innovative," however, this study may be too narrow.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
	John Day Pool	Not tied to salmon diet.
20077	Inventory & Assessment of Irrigation Diversion Alternatives to Push-up Dams	#1 has not coordinated with ODFW or tribe. Scale of proposal is too large…should focus on engineering on needed fixes. Duplicates some inventory work already being done (e.g Shawn R.). #2, 3 &7 #4 will promote but actual tasks won't help, just an inventory
20079	Assessing Adult Steelhead Escapement & Genetics in the South Fork Salmon	This is a good project, however, it does not address more urgent management priorities in this area. Reduce budget from $175,000 to $150,000.
20080	Evaluate a Modified Feeding Strategy to Reduce Residualism and Promote Smolt	This is a good project, however, it does not address more urgent management priorities in this area. We recommend funding at a reduced rate. The recommended budget allocation was derived by dropping Objective 3.
20083	Evaluate, restore & enhance 14 miles of instream and riparian habitat on…	The causal mechanisms for the temperature problem are not described. Other funding sources may be available (CREP, WHIP, et al.).
20084	Protect and Restore the North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds	This would be in addition to USFS work correcting problems. Public awareness done cooperatively with the USFS.
20085	Analyze and Improve Fish Screens	There are very few or no irrigation withdrawals in the Clearwater. Proposal appears to fund staff, with little purpose. Proposal is vague and incomplete. No coordination. The WTWG comments are based on policy, not technical review. Costshare and mitigation practices are spelled out in proposal, but ignored by WTWG. The 1855 treaty gives the Nez Perce regulatory authority to protect, restore, and enhance all resources. The Idaho watershed SRT believes the WTWG should change the status of this project to Yes.
20086	Rehabilitate Newsome Creek - S.F. Clearwater River	The WTWG comments are based on policy, not technical review. Costshare and mitigation practices are spelled out in proposal, but ignored by WTWG. The 1855 treaty gives the Nez Perce regulatory authority to protect, restore, and enhance all resources. The Idaho watershed SRT believes the WTWG should change the status of this project to Yes.
20087	Protect and Restore Mill Creek Watershed	Prime steelhead spawning area. Should not wait. USFS Ecosystem Analysis at Watershed Scale, USFS Landscape Analysis done. Should allotment be retired, instead of investing in fence? Will require BPA O&M. Proposal could be improved. Mill Creek is a high priority for steelhead spawning as indicated in USFS Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale and Landscape Analysis. USFS will provide administrative support, NEPA, cultural surveys, etc. under cost share agreement. Will require BPA funding for O&M. The Idaho watershed SRT believes the WTWG should change the status of this project to Yes.
20088	Assess Mckenzie Watershed Habitat and Prioritize Projects	A comprehensive definition of "Watershed Assessment" has not yet been developed by CBFWA, ISRP and NPPC. Lack an overall assessment of need in the basin. This is the kind of WSA that we are looking for. Wont overlap with coordination grant. #2-Will develop the assessment: Linked to other planning efforts. #5-Some shown but slight. #12-Has to consider other activities.
20089	Increase Instream Water Rights for Crabtree Creek	Questioned amount of water saved going to the irrigation district (proposee). Cost is high and unsure benefits. Temp problems appear to be severe, but only addressed incrementally. Hydro project creating the problem. Question whether BPA's responsibility. Proposal lacks detail on many aspects. #1- ID supports. Unclear about any others. #2-No info provided. #3- No info. #4-Low flows and high temps will remain even with project, incremental benefits but not enough to meet full needs of Sthd. #5-but only slight. #8-Intent of proposal is a 60 inch pipe. #9-Already connected.
20093	Evaluate the Feasibility for Anadromous Fish Reintroduction in the Owyhee	This funding should be provided from other sources. This would support policy participation for an individual agency, which should be provided internally.
20095	Evaluate Interactions of American Shad With Salmon in the Columbia River	A piece of the larger food web question. Premature to summarize potential methods to control shad populations. Removal methods will have to be coordinated with COE and NMFS. Not viewed as a high priority management need.
20098	Develop and Evaluate Selective Commercial Fishing Gear: Tangle Nets	Consider as "Innovative Research" as a part of selective fisheries generally.
20099	System for Salmon Migrating Through Dams	Concur with FPAC comments.
20100	Characterize Historic Channel Morphology of the	How does this project compliment other work done by PNNL. Would this project be more appropriately funded under the

ProjectID	Title	Comments
	Columbia River: Mcnary Pool	COE draw down feasibility review?
20101	Connectivity and Productivity of Mainstem Alluvial Reaches	Is this an expansion from previously funded research on the lower Snake River? Has the previous work been reported and reviewed? Premature to fund until results are known.
20102	Research/Evaluate Restoration of NE Ore Streams and Develop Mgmt Guidelines	
20103	Indexing Salmon Carrying Capacity to Habitat, Population & Physical Fitness	Objective 2 has already been addressed in PATH. No specifics on methods to accomplish Objective 3. May be considered an innovative project.
20104	Sources of Myxobacterial Pathogens in Propagated Salmonids	Management is currently controlling the disease on a case by case basis. This can be controlled with existing methods.
20105	Develop New Feeds for Fish Used in Recovery and Restoration Efforts	Proposal doesn't specify investigation into the precise diet of wild fish in order to determine a new diet for recovery populations.
20106	Heritability of Disease Resistance and Immune Function in Chinook Salmon	Budget seems high considering long term need of collecting data to determine heritability. Probability of success for this project is low considering science and history of salmonid diseases.
20107	Reconnect the Westport Slough to the Clatskanie River	While proposal will increase rearing habitat, that is not likely to be limiting in that area. Many other sloughs near by. Habitat mainly for zero-aged or local coho. Would be better to take out blockage entirely, except would have to build a bridge. Proposal is not very clear. #1-Good cost share indicates support. #2-unclear in proposal. #3-Oregon Plan. #6-ongoing monitoring. #7-nebulous. #12-No info. #13-No info.
20108	Recruit, Train, Organize & Support River Stewards	Seems like a good idea, but unclear what funding the proposal will buy. This would appear to duplicate WS council activities. Proposal is pretty vague on what and how. #1-Not coordinated with ODFW or WS councils, apparently. #2-No info provided. #3-Oregon Plan & some WS action plans. #5-a little. #6-ongoing funding needed. #7-Addresses strategies in Ore. Plan, but don't appear to be linked to watershed specifics. #8-not as currently written. #9-if successful. #10-if successful. #11-if successful.
20109	Cedar Creek Natural Production and Watershed Monitoring Project	Work Group technical concerns. #1-collects basic info needed for watershed assessment. #3-in the past. #6- if effective. Basic monitoring that would serve as basis for watershed assessment. Would continue an ongoing, but unfunded effort.
20110	Develop Wheels, Pools and Falls Approach for Fish Passage at Dams	Same concept being addressed and more appropriately funded through the COE process.
20111	Preserve Cryogenically the Gametes of Selected Mid-Columbia Salmonid Stocks	Not a high priority in the basin but it is an innovative study. Effort should compliment other ongoing work in this area.
20117	Yakima River Subbasin Assessment	The WA SRT is not content that there is a need for additional comprehensive documents in this basin, however, this project is designed to meet the need and requirement of the NPPC to address watershed assessments. Enough information exists in this watershed to support a comprehensive document. The scope of this project should be limited to compiling and integrating existing data into a comprehensive watershed assessment. A similar study was conducted for YRBWEP in 1998-99 covering a review and synthesis of data related to instream flow provisions in the Yakima River Ecosystem. The watershed assessment would include information such as the report from the BOR that, for the most part, has already been developed.
20118	Klickitat River Subbasin Assessment	This project addresses the need for a compilation of existing data in the subbasin. The analytic methods and use of the information are not clearly defined in this proposal. We recommend not funding Objectives 2 and 3 until a comprehensive definition of "Watershed Assessment" has been developed by CBFWA, ISRP and NPPC. Once this has been defined, the objectives for these watershed assessments will need to be revisited. This project does address an area where comprehensive documents do not currently exist.
20119	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	This project addresses the need for a compilation of existing data in the subbasin. We recommend funding Objective 2 only, until a comprehensive definition of "Watershed Assessment" has been developed by CBFWA, ISRP and NPPC. Once this has been defined, the objectives for these watershed assessments will need to be revisited. This project also

ProjectID	Title	Comments
		addresses an area where comprehensive documents do not currently exist.
20120	Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum Salmon Populations	
20121	Evaluate Habitat Use and Population Dynamics of Lampreys in Cedar Creek	Recommend reducing the budget by 5% by dropping Objective 5. This objective is redundant to other BPA funded lamprey projects. Re-submitted with more details. Basic life-cycle data collection.
20122	Test guidance flows and strobe lights at a SBC to increase smolt FCE & FGE	New & innovative research. Should this be covered under the FERC? #1-5B41. #2-reduces incidental take by dam. #3-No info. #4-none shown.
20123	Restoration of Sockeye Salmon Into Palmer Lake	WA SRT does not believe enough is known about Palmer Lake (flows, available spawning habitat, passage at Enloe Dam, predator abundance) to suggest long term success of this program. If passage was certain at Enloe Dam, we would support sockeye releases in Palmer Lake. This project seems premature until more baseline information has been collected. This information could be provided by the cost share partners currently working in this area. Efforts for sockeye restoration would be better focused on determining limiting factors for Lake Osoyoos sockeye.
20124	Evaluate An Experimental Re-Introduction of Sockeye Salmon Into Skaha Lake	Limiting factors need to be determined for existing sockeye populations (Lake Osoyoos) in order to guide other sockeye restoration work. This project shows promise for getting fish further upstream. This appears to be a key area for continued work on this issue. We recommend funding only Objectives 1, 2 and 3. We also do not recommend funding the capital acquisition portion of the budget. We would like to see Objective 4 accomplished but do not support funding it for this funding cycle.
20125	Restore Riparian and Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Upper Sandy Basin	This proposal provides some explanation for the "river keeper" concept, but is vague on how its ambitious goals will be met specifically. #3-Sandy R. Basin Management Plan. #6-Will require ongoing funding. #7-Subbasin Plan
20127	Walla Walla River Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Project	Reduce Objectives 1,2 &4. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. General reduction in the scope of the project.
20131	Enhance North Fork John Day River Subbasin Anadromous Fish Habitat	Proposal is vague; implementation tasks not clearly defined #1- Coordinated with local ODFW . #2/3/7-WSAssess identified on p.1. Proposal filling a need that is not currently being met. #5 - 21% non-BPA. #6-Will need O&M to sustain improvements, but pr
20132	Yakima River Basin Water Temperature Monitoring and Modeling Project	WA SRT views this project as supportable, meeting a defined need and use that should seek other more appropriate funding sources. This project would provide critical information pertinent to the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project (YRBWEP), Systems Operations Advisory Committee and could possibly be funded in that arena.
20133	Irrigation as a Management Tool for Stream Temperature	
20134	Purchase Oxbow Ranch	Split 1/2 with Wildlife
20138	Design and Construct Neoh Walla Walla Hatchery	
20139	Walla Walla River Fish Passage Operations	General tightening. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies.
20141	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts	We question the contribution of kelts to the spawning population this far upstream. The supporting documentation references 17% contribution from a stream much lower in the system. We believe this is an outlier and not an average contribution. Similar work is currently planned in the Yakima basin.
20142	Snake River Temperature Control Project, Phase III	Refer to SCT as a power operations issue.
20143	Monitor Symptoms of Gas Bubble Trauma in Adult Salmonids	Straightforward and would provide important data to DEQ. This data is critical regarding adult monitoring and represents an exception to the CBFWA dissolved gas plan.
20145	Evaluate Little Walla Walla Screening Facility	
20149	Develop Research Priorities for Fall Chinook in the Columbia River Basin	This work can be done without targeted funding. Does not provide new information. This work can be included in existing annual review of BPA projects or other management forums.
20150	Evaluate Return Flow Recovery	The RSBOJC projects sound like individual tasks that should be bundled under one project. They are also available for other funding sources (e.g. CREP) and should not be funded under BPA FWP funds. Target species listed in proposal do not currently reside in the identified project area which indicates that the proponents may not have a complete

ProjectID	Title	Comments
		understanding of the problem they are trying to address. Proposed actions are contrary to the need for improvements in instream flow.
20151	Landowner Communication Program	The RSBOJC projects sound like individual tasks that should be bundled under one project. They are also available for other funding sources (e.g. CREP) and should not be funded under BPA FWP funds. Target species listed in proposal do not currently reside in the identified project area which suggests a high potential for misinforming public on existing biology.
20152	Improve Yakima River Water Quality by Incorporating Buffer Strips	The RSBOJC projects sound like individual tasks that should be bundled under one project. They are also available for other funding sources (e.g. CREP) and should not be funded under BPA FWP funds. Target species listed in proposal do not currently reside in the identified project area which indicates that the proponents may not have a complete understanding of the problem they are trying to address. Opportunity exists in this project to have positive outcomes. Buffer strip size is not defined by measurable outcome.
20153	Construct Sediment Settling Basins	The RSBOJC projects sound like individual tasks that should be bundled under one project. They are also available for other funding sources (e.g. CREP) and should not be funded under BPA FWP funds. Target species listed in proposal do not currently reside in the identified project area which indicates that the proponents may not have a complete understanding of the problem they are trying to address. Settling basins have not proven to be an effective strategy for water quality restoration. High ongoing O&M costs.
20154	Improve Water Quality Monitoring Program	The RSBOJC projects sound like individual tasks that should be bundled under one project. They are also available for other funding sources (e.g. CREP) and should not be funded under BPA FWP funds. Target species listed in proposal do not currently reside in the identified project area which indicates that the proponents may not have a complete understanding of the problem they are trying to address.
20155	Inventory On-Farm Irrigation Practices	The RSBOJC projects sound like individual tasks that should be bundled under one project. They are also available for other funding sources (e.g. CREP) and should not be funded under BPA FWP funds. Target species listed in proposal do not currently reside in the identified project area which indicates that the proponents may not have a complete understanding of the problem they are trying to address.
20157	Gas Bubble Trauma Monitoring In The Clearwater River, Id.	Placeholder. This project is considered urgent and critical by AFM.
20515	Mainstem Columbia River Umbrella Proposal	
20537	Bonneville Power Administration Non-Discretionary Projects Umbrella	Justification for Non-Discretionary projects. No unified theme for these projects. Some of the individual projects should be reviewed in conjunction with other "umbrellas." It would have been useful to have an umbrella for Non-Agency/Tribal PATH proposals.
20542	Biological Monitoring of Columbia River Basin Salmonids	Included to cover physiological monitoring that is not included with the Smolt Monitoring Program (Project #20552).
20543	Coded Wire Tag Program	Budget for this ISRP-requested umbrella is included with the individual projects.
20552	Smolt Monitoring Program Umbrella	Individual components reviewed below. These are critical and urgent priorities. Check integration of Project #8712703 Imnaha Smolt monitoring.
8201300	Coded-Wire Tag Recovery	
8331900	New Fish Tagging System	This project should be re-named. This tagging system is no longer new.
8332300	Smolt Monitoring at the Head of Lwr. Granite Reservoir & Lwr. Granite Dam	Part of SMP.
8335000	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery	Capital Funding source ($20,188,949). This project will complete the Step 3 process with NPPC. Design is at 60-90%. NPPC Step 3 will be completed in July.
8335003	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	This project has been funded under capital construction and should continue to be. This is a required component of the NPT hatchery (Project #8335000).
8343500	Operate and Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities	Reducing staff time.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
8343600	Umatilla Passage Facilities O & M	Reduced duplication, increased focus and efficiency. Potential excessive costs were reduced. General reduction in the scope of the project. Evaluation may change after US v OR.
8401400	Smolt Monitoring Program Marking	Part of SMP.
8402100	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the John Day Subbasin	Most cost increase due to ODFW indirect rate increase. Kudos for including songbird and morphology studies. #5-Donated leases on substantial acreage and in-kind; no $ quantified. #6 - Will need O&M to sustain improvements, but proposal shows some landowner support
8402500	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in Grande Ronde Basin Streams	Reduce Objectives 1&2. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. General reduction in the scope of the project.
8506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	How does this project break up between the different states? Is this only for the WA segment? Although a long history of BPA funding exists for these projects, they should be funded under another source. For subsequent construction and O&M, we recommend transferring the responsibility to the Bureau of Reclamation starting in FY01.
8710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	Reduce Objective 1. Reducing personnel time. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies. General reduction in the scope of the project.
8710002	Protect and Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Umatilla River Subbasin	Reducing implementation. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies. General reduction in the scope of the project.
8712700	Smolt Monitoring by Federal and Non-Federal Agencies	Part of SMP.
8712702	Comparative Survival Rate Study (CSS) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook	Part of SMP.
8712703	Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project	Part of SMP.
8740100	Assessment of Smolt Condition: Biological and Environmental Interactions	This project should be re-named. Provides tech. support for other smolt physiology projects. Does not fit only under SMP.
8802200	Umatilla River Fish Passage Operations	Hold to last year's costs. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies. Unclear objectives were more clearly defined.
8805301	Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan	
8805302	Plan, Site, Design and Construct NEO Hatchery - Umatilla/Walla Walla Comp.	The title of this project should be “Design and Construct Umatilla Hatchery Supplement”.
8805303	Hood River Production Program - M&E	#1 objective/task overlap with 8805304 but activities distinct. Implements Obj 1-4.#3 92%BPA. #7 lost prior BPA investment. Need to maintain data stream for re-evaluate project in 2002. Becomes more important as populations listed.
8805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E	#1 objective overlap with 8805303 but activities distinct. Implements Obj 1-4. #3 in kind, no $ assigned. #7 lost prior BPA investment. Need to maintain data stream for re-evaluate project in 2002.Becomes more important as populations listed.
8805305	Norheast Oregon Hatcheries Planning and Implementation - ODFW	
8810804	Streamnet: the Northwest Aquatic Information System	
8811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	How many houses are going to be provided and how many housed are necessary for project success? Costs seem high.
8812025	Ykfp Management, Data and Habitat	There appears to be a duplication of effort assigned to specific participants among the 4 FYKP proposals. Could this administrative manpower be removed from the other budget proposals? Is Objective 6a already being addressed within existing YIN management processes? Subcontractor assignments are unclear? Who will be performing what tasks at what level of funding is not clearly defined. Purpose and need for subcontractors is unclear.
8816000	Willamette Hatchery Oxygen Supplementation	Fund, to complete final report only. Proponents implied that FY99 would be the final year of funding. Why is there continuation into FY00? #1-research on this topic is no longer a priority. #4-none shown. Write final report by 6/2000. Finish it.
8902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in	Hold to last year's cost. General reduction in the scope of the project.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
	the Lower Umatilla	
8902700	Power Repay Umatilla Basin Project	10% increase over last year 's allocation. Potential excessive costs were reduced.
8902900	Hood River Production Program-Pelton Ladder-Hatchery	#1 Obj1 &3&4, #2rearing SpCh to re-establish in Hood; #3 in kid 94%BPA #5 Alts reviewed in NEPA.#7 critical to reestablishing SpCh in Hood.
8903500	Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance	Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies.
8906200	Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation	Increase from FY99 is due to NPPC approval of integrated agency funding. Budget has been reduced to reflect reduction in number of tasks within integrated agency funding objective.
8906500	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (USFWS)	
8906600	Annual Stock Assessment- Coded Wire Tag Program (WDFW)	
8906900	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (ODFW)	
8907201	Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support	Due to budget constraints and emphasis of tasks, AFM suggests that the BPA Direct Program fund 50% of this project and the remaining funds be provided by the capital and reimbursable portion of the MOA.
8909600	Monitor and evaluate genetic characteristics of supplemented salmon & stlhd	Drop, but fund Little Sheep Cr. Work under ESA StS placeholder. Low priority objectives were reduced or eliminated. Objectives and costs were moved to a more appropriate project. This work should be considered under an alternate funding source (NMFS) and not the BPA direct FWP budget.
8909800	Idaho Supplementation Studies	These projects provide a critical component for monitoring Spring and Summer chinook in Idaho, including supplemented and wild populations. These are ongoing critical projects and we recommend funding at the requested levels in order achieve management objectives in this region. See umbrella proposal #20545.
8909801	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation in Idaho Rivers (ISS)	These projects provide a critical component for monitoring Spring and Summer chinook in Idaho, including supplemented and wild populations. These are ongoing critical projects and we recommend funding at the requested levels in order achieve management objectives in this region. See umbrella proposal #20545.
8909802	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	These projects provide a critical component for monitoring Spring and Summer chinook in Idaho, including supplemented and wild populations. These are ongoing critical projects and we recommend funding at the requested levels in order achieve management objectives in this region. See umbrella proposal #20545.
8909803	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	These projects provide a critical component for monitoring Spring and Summer chinook in Idaho, including supplemented and wild populations. These are ongoing critical projects and we recommend funding at the requested levels in order achieve management objectives in this region. See umbrella proposal #20545.
8910700	Statistical Support for Salmonid Survival Studies	BPA Non-Discretionary. Services listed are not used by the managers, in general. Should include such services as a part of other projects.
8910800	Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support	BPA Non-Discretionary. Services listed are not used by the managers, in general. Should include such services as a part of other projects. Should be linked to a PATH umbrella. Appears to duplicate work proposed in another proposal by J. Anderson. Fails to inform critical management decisions.
9000500	Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	Reduce Objectives 10 & 11 (M&E). Low priority objectives were reduced or eliminated. General reduction in the scope of the project. Evaluation may change after decision in US v OR.
9000501	Umatilla River Basin Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	Reduce Objectives 1, 2 & 4. Genetic samples but no analysis. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9005200	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation	Proposed budget does not show reductions for objectives that are coming to conclusion (e.g. Objective 7). As tasks are completed, this budget should be reducing each year to zero in FY03. FY99 proposal showed outyear costs winding down in FY00, yet overall proposal has increased in FY00.
9005500	Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	This is an ongoing project and we recommend funding in order achieve management objectives in this region. We question whether all of the samples can be run within FY00. We recommend reducing the budget by $160,000 for sample

ProjectID	Title	Comments
		analysis and associated costs that should be provided in future years.
9007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	Based on FY99 contract, there will be $800,000 in carry forward for FY00.
9007800	Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-Scale Patterns	Evaluation of predator control benefits. This will be the last year. Future work should be conditioned on the results of this project. Responses to criteria assumes this study is wrapping up not starting a new study.
9008000	Columbia River Basin Pit Tag Information System	
9009300	Genetic Analysis of Oncorhynchus Nerka (Modified to Include Chinook Salmon)	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding at a reduced rate in order to meet other management priorities within this sub region.
9102800	Monitoring Smolt Migrations of Wild Snake River Sp/Sum Chinook	Not coordinated well with managers. Data could be collected in conjunction with other studies. Concerns with tagging populations on the verge of extinction. Data gathered may not be worth the risk to the populations. Information only marginally useful. Objective 4 not supported by co-managers. This project is viewed by NMFS as a requirement under the Biological Opinion.
9102900	Life History and Survival of Fall Chinook Salmon In Columbia River Basin	The project sponsor has agreed to modify Objective 4 in order to reduce the budget by $55,967.
9105100	Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support	BPA Non-Discretionary. Objectives not clearly defined. Open-ended contract for statistical support on retainer. Fails to inform critical management decisions. Should include such services as a part of other projects tried to specific tasks or products.
9105500	N A T U R E S (Formerly Supplemental Fish Quality (Yakima))	We would like to see more discussion of Objectives 6 and 7. These are new objectives their need more justification and rationale of their need. We also question why Objectives 2 and 5 are listed in the proposal as being completed, yet 20% of the budget has been assigned to these objectives. Innovative project.
9105700	Yakima Phase 2 [Fish] Screen Fabrication	Although a long history of BPA funding exists for these projects, they should be funded under another source. For subsequent construction and O&M, we recommend transferring the responsibility to the Bureau of Reclamation starting in FY01.
9107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding at a reduced rate in order to meet other management priorities within this sub region. The reduction would occur by reducing Objective 2 by approximately 10%. We would like to see an umbrella for all of the sockeye projects in this area.
9107200	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding in order achieve management objectives in this region. We would like to see an umbrella for all of the sockeye projects in this area for FY01.
9107300	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding in order achieve management objectives in this region.
9107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	Although a long history of BPA funding exists for these projects, they should be funded under another source. For subsequent construction and O&M, we recommend transferring the responsibility to the Bureau of Reclamation starting in FY01.
9200900	Yakima [Fish] Screens - Phase 2 - O&M	Although a long history of BPA funding exists for these projects, they should be funded under another source. For subsequent construction and O&M, we recommend transferring the responsibility to the Bureau of Reclamation starting in FY01.
9202200	Physiological Assessment of wild and hatchery juvenile salmonids	Proposal is not clear as to objectives and applicability of results. While a small amount is related to YKFP, does not appear to be well-coordinated. Project sponsor agreed to reduced funding in order to accomplish other management priorities in the region.
9202400	Protect Anadromous Salmonids in the Mainstem Corridor	Defer to other conservation enforcement consultations.
9202409	Enhance Conser. Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife,Watersheds of the Nez Perce	This project is being reviewed under a separate conservation enforcement forum.
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program	Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. Unclear objectives were more clearly defined.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
9202603	Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support	BPA contracting splits the Id.Model WS effort (9202603, 9306200, 9401700)
9202604	Life History of Spring Chinook Salmon and Summer Steelhead	Objective 4 reduced, drop Objective 8. Low priority objectives were reduced or eliminated. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9204000	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding at a reduced rate in order to meet other management priorities within this sub region. We would like to see an umbrella for all of the sockeye projects in this area.
9204101	Lower Columbia River Adult Study	Fund under MOA Capital source due to shortfall in Direct Program available funds.
9301900	Powerdale, Parkdale, and Oak Springs O&M	#1 Obj1-4, #3 in kind, no $ assigned, #4 Skamania Stock fishing leads to some incidental catch.#5 Alts reviewed in NEPA. #7 critical to reestablishing SpCh & StHd in Hood.
9302900	Survival Estimates for the Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Dams and R	See Technical Questions from FPAC.
9303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed	
9303701	Stochastic Life Cycle Model Technical Assistance	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. Question amount of hours. Needs to be related through an umbrella. Due to budget constraints, AFM suggests holding these projects to the FY99 funding level.
9303800	North Fork John Day Area Riparian Fencing	Minimal proposal. Concerns in Granite Cr. ChS trending down. Watch for in lieu, Is Forest Service management supporting- heavily cut, grazing continues. Lacks definition of where work is being done. #1-A/T support restoration but have concerns with in lieu.
9304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request Multi-Year Funding)	Cost increase due to ODFW indirect rate increase. #2/3/7-Plans listed. #5-big cost share. #6-existing landowner agreements include O&M. #12-Land owner cooperation and environmental factors will be critical to maintaining improvements. No demonstration in proposal
9304001	Fifteenmile Creek Wild Steelhead Smolt Production	#1 m&e on Obj1-3; #2 studying it, #3 in kind, no $ assigned also Mitchell Act equipment, #7-Population proposed, sunk costs would be lost.
9305600	Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology	This proposal has the form of an umbrella contract. The specific objectives should be separated into independent projects. We recommend removing Objective 1.3 and reducing the budget to reflect that change.
9306000	Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project	Defer Obj 5 =$100K. Concerns that the majority of Subregion budget going to harvest study. #6-future harvest options. #7-but loss of half the study's info.
9306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	BPA contracting splits the Id.Model WS effort (9202603, 9306200, 9401700)
9306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project - Fy'00 Proposal	Costs are all in JD and Deschutes. What are outyear costs increases based on? #5-Mitchell Act pays O&M. SRT is aware of additional c/s that is not included. #6-Needs O&M but NMFS will cover . #12-No demonstration in proposal. #13-Needs more public awareness
9401500	Idaho Fish Screen Improvement	Capital project. $1 M requested. Title is misleading; Mitchell Act pays the O & M.
9401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Projects	BPA contracting splits the Id.Model WS effort (9202603, 9306200, 9401700)
9401805	Continued Implementation of Asotin Creek Watershed Projects	Reduce implementation. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9401806	Implement Tucannon River Watershed Plan to Restore Salmonid Habitat	Hold at FY99 allocation. Reduce Objectives 1 and 2 . General reduction in the scope of the project.
9401807	Continue With Implementation of Pataha Creek Model Watershed Projects	Reduce Objective 5-monitoring, + implementation. Low priority objectives were reduced or eliminated. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9402600	Pacific Lamprey Research and Restoration	This is a well developed proposal that addresses critical uncertainties and needs identified in the lamprey status report.
9403300	The Fish Passage Center (FPC)	
9403400	Assessing Summer and Fall Chinook Restoration in the Snake River Basin	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding in order achieve management objectives in this region. This project is covered under the umbrella project #20541.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
9403900	Wallowa Basin Project Planner	Keep at FY99 Allocation. Unclear objectives were more clearly defined. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	Coordination improved between this project and SWCD project (98028) but more improvement needed. #6 Needs O & M, and commitments in place from landowners. #8-Ambiguous about number and location of smolt trapping. #12-No demonstration in proposal.
9405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M&E	Will require BPA O&M
9405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	The criteria are not suitable to evaluate this type of project. This is a good educational program that should be funded. The role of the subcontractor is not clearly defined. We recommend that a fixed funding source be sought for future years. The development of the program has been firmly established, and funding should be moved from the BPA FWP.
9406900	A Spawning Habitat Model to Aid Recovery Plans for Snake River Fall Chinook	This is a solid project that compliments much of the management decision making processes in the Hanford Reach. Due to priorities and budget constraints, we recommend funding only Objective 1 for FY00. We recommend the Idaho Non Watershed SRT review Objective 3 for possible additional funding. ID Non Watershed SRT reviewed this proposal and determined that Fall chinook are not a high priority species in their region. Due to limited funds available, they do not support funding the Idaho portion of the proposal.
9500700	Hood River Production Program - PGE O&M Pelton Ladder	Will be combined with #8902900 in the future.
9503300	O&M of Yakima Phase II Fish Facilities	Although a long history of BPA funding exists for these projects, they should be funded under another source. For subsequent construction and O&M, we recommend transferring the responsibility to the Bureau of Reclamation starting in FY01.
9506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring and Evaluation	There appears to be a duplication of effort assigned to specific participants among the 4 FYKP proposals. Could the administrative manpower be removed from this budget proposal? This project appears to be very heavy on personnel. There is no definition of specific tasks for the subcontractors. There appears to be redundancy between tribal and state biologists among the monitoring and evaluation tasks listed in the proposal. There appears to be staff members listed for funding on this proposal that are also listed on additional projects (i.e. fishery biologist listed for 12 mo of support also identified in project #9604000 as a research manager).
9506425	Ykfp - Wdfw Policy and Technical Involvement in the YKFP	Should some of this manpower be provided as standard operating costs for the agency. There appears to be duplication of policy and technical tasks within FYKP with YIN and WDFW. The duplication of effort should be reduced as the project continues to progress.
9600500	Independent Scientific Advisory Board	Due to budget constraints and emphasis of tasks, AFM suggests that the BPA Direct Program fund 50% of this project and the remaining funds be provided by the capital and reimbursable portion of the MOA.
9600600	Facilitation, Technical Assistance and Peer Review of PATH	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. PATH proposals should be covered under an umbrella.
9600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidations & Water Conservation; Upper Salmon R	
9600800	STUFA Participation in a Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses (PATH)	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. PATH proposals should be covered under an umbrella.
9600801	Technical Support for PATH	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. PATH proposals should be covered under an umbrella.
9601100	Walla Walla River Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	
9601700	Provide Technical Support for PATH	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. Question amount of hours. Needs to be related through an umbrella. Due to budget constraints, AFM suggests holding these projects to the FY99 funding level.
9601900	Second Tier Database Support for Ecosystem Focus	Duplicates other information management services.
9602100	Gas bubble disease research and monitoring of juvenile salmonids	

ProjectID	Title	Comments
9603201	Begin Implementation of Year 1 of the K Pool Master Plan Program	Well written objectives. Premature to fund for implementation. Master plan not approved by NPPC.
9603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	Project budget appears high in personnel costs. Due to the nature of the demonstration project and continued support, we would like to follow through with our commitment to complete the restoration project. We expect to see allocation of technical staff time reduced in future years. There should be funding available through CREP for riparian restoration.
9604000	Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia	This is a very worthwhile project but the costs seem excessive at this point. We recommend funding for FY00 at the same level as FY99. Based on the outcome of joint discussions between the mid Columbia managers, the work plan should be revised. There appears to be staff members listed for funding on additional projects (i.e. research manager in this proposal also identified in project #9506325 listed for 12 mo of support as a fisheries biologist, project manager in this proposal is identified as the enhancement manager position in project #9701325 for 12 mo of support). Project sponsor has reviewed the proposal and agreed to a reduced funding level of $100,000.
9604200	Restore and Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat in Salmon Creek	This is an ongoing project with positive strides and should continue. There are established agreements in place regarding instream flows, passage, and land acquisition that should not be compromised. However, a clear demonstration that enough water will be provided in the stream on a sustainable basis has not been provided. If results from FY99 determine funds should be used for land acquisition, an option should be available to transfer these funds from the implementation project. Only objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 should be funded.
9604300	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Project	Capital Funding source ($2,800,00). This project is moving through the NPPC step process. Brood stock has been collected and smolts will released in the spring of 2000.
9604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	Reduce implementation. General reduction in the scope of the project. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies. Unclear objectives were more clearly defined.
9605300	Upper Clear Creek Dredge Tailings Restoration	#2/3/7-listed. #5-USFS contributing. #6 O&M not needed. #9-Example of restoring "normative" ecosystem. #12-No demonstration in proposal.
9606700	Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project	Personnel and resources appear duplicative of the Redfish lake sockeye program.
9607000	Mckenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	#6-ongoing funding needed.
9607708	Protect and Restore the Lolo Creek Watershed	This is a state, Potlatch, USFS, private, tribal, and permittee cost-share project. Will require BPA funding for O&M. Treatment design will be completed during 1999 field season. The WTWG review comments are policy related, not technical. The 1855 treaty gives the Nez Perce regulatory authority to protect, restore, and enhance all resources. The Idaho watershed SRT believes the WTWG should change the status of this project to Yes.
9607709	Protect and Restore the Squaw to Papoose Creeks Watersheds	M&E coordination will be included when quantitative methods are developed. Public awareness/education done in cooperation with the USFS. The WTWG review comments are policy related, not technical. The 1855 treaty gives the Nez Perce regulatory authority to protect, restore, and enhance all resources. The Idaho watershed SRT believes the WTWG should change the status of this project to Yes.
9607711	Restore Mccomas Meadow/ Meadow Creek Watershed	Will require some BPA funding for O&M. Cost-effectiveness is a policy decision, however, the NEPA is a maximum estimate. If NEPA cost is less, we will work with our CTOR to put excess dollars on-the-ground. Again, WTWG comments are based on policy, not technical review. The Idaho watershed SRT believes the WTWG should change the status of this project to Yes.
9608300	CTUIR Grande Ronde Basin Watershed Restoration	Reduce Objectives 4 and 5. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. Objectives and costs were moved to a more appropriate project.
9608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - ISCC	All on-the-ground projects are a direct result of this coordination position. There is a repeated concern of redundancy by the WTWG reviewers. There are two coordinators due to the political, private ownership, state and federal public lands, and Nez Perce ceded territory, which requires co-coordination.
9700100	Captive Rearing Initiative for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	Move to Capital Funding source ($546,385). Current capital and outyear capital expense justifies moving the funding from the ID NW SRT funding base.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
9700200	PATH - UW Technical Support	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. Appears to duplicate Project #9800600. Question amount of hours. Needs to be related through an umbrella. Due to budget constraints, AFM suggests holding these projects to the FY99 funding level.
9701000	PIT Tag System Transition	
9701325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance	There appears to be a duplication of effort assigned to specific participants among the 4 FYKP proposals. Could the administrative manpower be removed from this budget proposal? There appears to be staff members listed for funding on additional projects (i.e. enhancement manager position identified for 12 mo of support is also listed under project #9604000 as project manager). We question funding $8,320 for janitorial service for an interpretive center that may not have been completed by the end of FY01.
9701400	Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on the Hanford Reach	This has been a productive study. Results have directly affected river operations. We recommend continued funding, however, this should be the final year of significant levels of funding.
9702400	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River	
9702500	Implement the Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan	Reduce Objectives 2 and 3. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. Objectives and costs were moved to a more appropriate project.
9702600	Ecology of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence on Salmonid Ocean Survival	According to FY99 recommendation, this project should be funded from the ESA reserve account in FY00. In FY01 funding will be provided from the BPA Direct Program.
9703000	Monitor Listed Stock Adult Chinook Salmon Escapement	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding at a reduced rate in order to meet other management priorities within this sub region. This reduction could occur by dropping Objective 3h.
9703400	Monitor Fine Sediment and Sedimentation in John Day and Grande Ronde Rivers	
9703800	Preserve Listed Salmonid Stocks Gametes	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding in order achieve management objectives in this region.
9705000	Little Naches River Riparian & In-channel Enhancement Project	This project occurs on Forest Service land and mitigates impacts of Forest Service activities. Funding for this project should be provided from USFS for mitigative actions.
9705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	This project is a mix of protection of important habitat strongholds and well focused restoration.
9705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration and Assessment	We are concerned about future support by landowners to actually implement actions recommended by the assessment. Purchase of land is premature until assessment is complete. We support the assessment but question the follow up required until results are known. Objectives 4 and 5 should be delayed until assessment is complete.
9705600	Lower Klickitat River Riparian & In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	An evaluation of the sediment basins used in this project should be performed according to water quality, water quantity and instream flow in regards to salmon restoration in order to demonstrate continuation of this aspect of the study. We do not recommend funding Objective 3a.
9705700	Salmon River Production Program	Move to Capital Funding source ($931,376). Current capital and outyear capital expense justifies moving the funding from the ID NW SRT funding base. Proposal is vague and does not provide a complete project description. Unclear of progress and plans for the NPPC step process.
9706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT	The Idaho Watershed SRT believes the status in the final version of the WTWG review has incorrectly changed the status of this project from Yes to No.
9800100	Analytical Support-Path and ESA Biological Assessments	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. Question amount of hours. Needs to be related through an umbrella. Due to budget constraints, AFM suggests holding these projects to the FY99 funding level.
9800401	Electronic Fish and Wildlife Newsletter	
9800600	PATH Technical Support - James J. Anderson	PATH projects reviewed in detail last year, little has changed. Question amount of hours. Needs to be related through an umbrella. Appears to duplicate work in Project #9700200.
9800702	Grande Ronde Supplementation - O&M/M&E - Nez Perce	Reduce Objectives 2 and 3, dropped 2500 PIT, $10k. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies. Potential

ProjectID	Title	Comments
	Tribe Lostine	excessive costs were reduced. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9800703	Facility O&M and Program M&E for Grande Ronde Spring Chinook Salmon	Reduced Objectives 2 and 3, dropped genetic analysis, some personnel & travel+ drop trailer. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9800800	Regional Forum Facilitation Services	Nonmembers are not being engaged. The value of facilitating an incomplete process is questionable. At this point, alternative funding sources should be explored. Due to budget constraints and emphasis of tasks, AFM suggests that the BPA Direct Program fund 50% of this project and the remaining funds be provided by the capital and reimbursable portion of the MOA.
9801001	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. Costs reduced as a result of improved efficiencies.
9801003	Spawning distribution of Snake River fall chinook salmon	This project is needed, however, we recommend funding at a reduced rate to meet other management priorities in this region. This reduction could be absorbed by other cooperator's in this project. This project is covered under umbrella project #20541.
9801004	M&E of Yearling Snake R. Fall Chinook Released Upstream of Lower Granite	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding in order to meet management priorities within this sub region. This project is covered under umbrella project #20541.
9801005	Pittsburg Landing,Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Acclimation Facilities	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding at a reduced rate in order to meet other management priorities within this sub region. This project is covered under umbrella project #20541.
9801006	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	reduce Objective 2. Potential duplicative efforts were reduced and/or coordination was improved. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9801400	Ocean Survival of Juvenile Salmonids in the Columbia River Plume	Consider with other estuary research. The tasks and objective of Project #20052 should be dove tailed with this project due to similarities in tasks. This project should be continued to be funded through NMFS ESA reserve.
9801600	Monitor Natural Escapement and Productivity of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	Can funding for Objective 4 be deferred given the fact it comprises 33% of the budget and partially occurs in out years. We encourage the proponents to find alternatives for some of the capital acquisitions listed in the project. When questioned, the project sponsor determined that the jet boat for this study could be borrowed or leased for FY00, although a jet boat will be necessary for future work. The budget should be reduced by $20,000 to reflect delaying the purchase of the jet boat.
9801700	Eliminate Gravel Push-Up Dams on Lower North Fork John Day	#1-ODFW concerns with use of infiltration galleries. #6-Needs O&M, requesting some BPA O&M, shows no other sources. #12-No demonstration in proposal.
9801800	John Day Watershed Restoration	ODFW has concerns with broad use of infiltration galleries. #5- Big cost share. In past c/s from locals and BOR, but not definitely arranged yet, but will likely occur. #6 Needs O & M, and commitments in place from landowners. #12-some risk of failure. Increase in cost reflects new habitat implementation opportunities. In order to meet other priorities in this region, funding has been reduced.
9801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	We question the high proportion of BPA funding for mitigating impacts of Forest Service activities in this basin. A well defined game plan has not been clearly stated. Specific causal mechanisms have not been clearly defined for the detrimental affects on salmon. It is not clear that the project is following results from the watershed assessment referenced in their proposal. The Wind River represents an important area that can be studied with results pertaining to several other river systems. There is also an ESA listed species in the basin and funding should be continued at some level. We concur with Watershed TWG comments. Justification for the expansion of this project has not been well documented. We recommend focusing on Objectives 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d and particularly 3b and funding only these objectives.
9802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	
9802400	Monitor Watershed Conditions on the Warm Springs Reservation	Approve only culvert inventory. Reduce to Obj. 3
9802800	Trout Creek Watershed Improvement Project Multi Year Funding Proposal	Cut WS coordinator & technician to 1/2; eliminate other personnel $; emphasize upland treatment & riparian fencing. No funding for sediment retention basins;$1000 for riparian reveg.; $107 K for stream channel restoration.

ProjectID	Title	Comments
9803100	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit Watershed Assessment & Restoration Plan	Increase from last year is due primarily to watershed assessment component. Intent is to achieve agreement between CBFWA, NPPC and ISRP on a "watershed assessment" definition. Until such an agreement is reached, training on an agreed upon product may be premature. Watershed assessments are important. We recommend funding at a reduced rate for FY00. Reduced budget reflects the removal of training and reduction of assessments from 4 to 2 basins.
9803300	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	No specific actions are listed to address the direct cause of the problems (land management activities). We would like to see the document that shows a prioritized list of needs for the Toppenish Creek watershed as referenced in the proposal. This project should be tied to the Satus Creek project (#9603501) due to similarities in goals, activities and target species in order to reduce outyear budget obligations.
9803400	Reestablish Safe Access Into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin.	This program should be the responsibility of the water diverter. Fishway and screen construction (Objective 5) is 78% of the budget- this portion of the budget should be funded through capital construction.
9803500	Watershed Scale Response of Stream Habitat to Abandoned Mine Waste	This is an interesting project but we do not see a logical link to salmon recovery. This is an interesting scientific study, however, this research will not lead to changes in current management decisions.
9808001	PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution	Serves as an "umbrella" for purchase of PIT tags used in individual projects.
9900300	Evaluate Spawning of Salmon Below the Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams	The evaluation of the effect of ocean tides on the hydraulic conditions downstream of Bonneville Dam could be delayed until FY01. The budget should be reduced to reflect the change in scope of work for FY00.
9900600	Restoration of Riparian Habitat in Bakeoven / Deep Creeks	
9901000	Mitigate Effects of Runoff & Erosion on Salmonid Habitat in Pine Hollow	
9901100	Assess Fish Habitat & Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	Reduce parts of Objectives 1 and 3. General reduction in the scope of the project.
9901200	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	We believe this project will assist in directing salmon recovery and watershed projects in this area (from all funding sources) towards unified management objectives.
9901300	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	Ongoing project. FY00 funding represents the bulk of the watershed assessment funding. We recommend that outyear costs focus on implementation of findings of this assessment.
9901400	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	
9901500	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	
9901600	Protect & Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed	Implementation specifics and BMP efficiency will result from the completion of the watershed assessment being completed in 1999.
9901700	Protect & Restore Lapwai Creek	The watershed assessment being completed in 1999 will determine priorities within this watershed. Based on the similarities between proposals 9901600 and 9901700, the WTWG comments show an inconsistency in reviewing these proposals. Why in one rated Yes and the other No?
9901800	Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho	This project is important and should continue. We recommend funding in order to meet management priorities within this sub region.
9901900	Restore the Salmon River, in the Challis, ID area, to a Healthy Condition	Proposal lacked much detail. Sponsor filled in details by phone.
9902000	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	This project is needed, however, we recommend funding at a reduced rate to meet other management priorities in this region. Continue to pursue in house funding sources specifically for Objectives 2 and 3 for future years. Objectives stated in Project #20055 are important and could be included within this project in future years.

Resident Fish Proposals

Process

For Fiscal Year 2000, the Resident Fish Managers (RFM) used a multi-phased process to evaluate proposals. The RFM applied a total of 3 screening criteria, 9 technical criteria, 8 programmatic criteria and 5 milestone-based criteria. The Screening Criteria were intended to ensure that the proposed projects addressed the measures and priorities in the Council's Program and were consistent with the management objectives of the Agencies and Tribes. The Technical Criteria assessed the proposed project's technical merit, objectives, monitoring, and benefits. The Programmatic Criteria dealt with the broader scientific, regional and strategic aspects of the proposed projects. The Milestone-Based Evaluation Criteria addressed completion of milestone-based work plans, importance to regional plans, contractual performance record, and milestone-based goals, objectives and tasks.

For three days in March, 1999, the RFM met in Spokane, Washington to evaluate 75 proposed resident fish projects. The step-wise process used for this evaluation session was as follows:

1. The RFM read all 75 individual proposals (and 3 umbrella proposals) and scored "yes" or "no" for all pertinent criteria prior to the March 2-4, 1999 session.

2. RFM held ten-minute question and answer sessions with the project sponsors. A note taker compiled a detailed transcript of this interchange. The RFM individually refined specific criteria evaluations based on the question and answer sessions (Table 9).

3. RFM individually condensed the refined criteria evaluations into the four criteria categories (screening, technical, management, and milestone-based, Table 8).

4. RFM achieved consensus on the "yes" and "no" ratings for the four criteria categories for each proposal. Project sponsors were not allowed to provide additional information or block consensus.

5. The RFM assigned each proposal to one of the four status categories: Status 1 - pass screening, technical and programmatic criteria (successful milestone-based proposals were noted). Status 2 - pass screening criteria and technical or programmatic criteria.
6. Status 3 – fail screening criteria. Not eligible for funding. Status 4 – withdrawn proposals, proposals referred to other caucus for evaluation, etc.

7. The RFM identified projects that were ESA related (Kootenai River white sturgeon, bull trout, NMFS BIOP for hydrosystem).

Subsequent to the primary March evaluation session, the RFM met again twice to refine budgets and ESA designated projects. ESA funding designations for bull trout were withdrawn due to absence of a Biological Opinion for this threatened species. The RFM met once more on April 1 to develop a FY 2000 budget proposal. The RFM agreed to recommend a balanced budget of $17,927,534 to fund all Status 1 proposals and the highest ranked ongoing Status 2 proposals. The final RFM recommendation constitutes a prioritized list of projects as follows: Tier I:

Recommended for FY 2000 funding. Tier II: Merits funding when money becomes available in the future. Tier III: Not recommended for funding.

The RFM have procedures and policies in place to process within-year budget actions and changes in scopes of work

Criteria

Screening Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

Technical Criteria

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

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

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

4. 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)

   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.

5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations? (Yes / No)

   Project provides direct benefits to target species/indicators populations.

6. 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 clearly describes the long-term picture. Supporting documentation clearly demonstrates that activities within the basin complement each other.

7. 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)

8. 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)

   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.

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

   Specific transfer plans included in the proposal.

Programmatic Criteria

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

1. 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)

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

2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection? (Yes / No) (BCH C-8)

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

3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes? (Yes / No) (WS C 4-9)

4. Does the project promote or maintain desirable community diversity? (Yes / No) (WS C 4-4)

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

5. Provides for an important fishery that does not target or adversely affect a weak but recoverable native stock (e.g., consumption, subsistence, cultural, recreation)

   - 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.
     - Second level bullet

6. 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)

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

7. Is there cost-share for the construction/implementation, and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project? (Yes / No) (WS C 4-5)

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

Milestone Based Evaluation Criteria

1. The project is tied to a complete and comprehensive milestone-based work plan/project management plan/mitigation plan that includes clearly stated goals, objectives, tasks, and schedules.

2. The project sponsor has completed a milestone-based proposal form and the goals, objectives, tasks, project design, statistical validity, personnel expertise, likelihood of success, and budgets have been thoroughly evaluated and approved by the appropriate caucus.

3. The project is critical (based on management-level evaluation) to achieving the objectives described in one or more Regional plans (MYIP, Biological Opinion or Recovery Plan, Tribal Plan, Mitigation Plan, Wildlife Written Plan, or Councils Fish and Wildlife Program).

4. There would be little or no biological or management benefit from implementing the project for less than the proposed duration.

5. The project has met its BPA budget and contract management obligations.

Results

Table 8 summarizes the RFM's detailed evaluation of the proposals relative to the criteria and includes the following responses: Y (yes), N (no), and NA (not applicable). Tier 1 projects are listed first, followed by Tier 2 and Tier 3. Table 9 includes responses to the criteria for each project, sorted by ProjectID.

Table 8. Resident fish management evaluation

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Tier	Screen	Tech	Prog	Mile	Issues to be addressed
20008	Monitor And Protect Wigwam River Bull Trout For Koocanusa Reservoir	B.C. Min Envir Lands Parks	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
20049	Evaluate Sediment Transport In Spawning Habitat, Kootenai R., Idaho	USGS	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
20135	Consumptive Sturgeon Fishery-Hells Canyon And Oxbow Reservoirs	NPT	Upper Snake	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
20146	Lake Roosevelt Kokanee Net Pens	WDFW	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8346700	Mitigation For The Construction And Operation Of Libby Dam	MFWP	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8503800	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	CCT	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	
8605000	White Sturgeon Mitigation And Restoration In The Columbia And Snake Rivers	ODFW	Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8709900	Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigation	IDFG	Clearwater	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8740700	Dworshak Impacts/M&E And Biological/Integrated Rule Curves	NPT	Clearwater	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8806400	Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies And Conservation Aquaculture	KTOI	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8806500	Kootenai River Fisheries Recovery Investigations	IDFG	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
8815600	Implement Fishery Stocking Program Consistent With Native Fish Conservation	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tribs. To Lake Roosevelt	CCT	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9004400	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities: Coeur D'alene Reservation	CDA Tribe	Coeur d'Alene	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9004402	Coeur D' Alene Tribe Trout Production Facility	CDA Tribe	Coeur d'Alene	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9101901	Flathead Lake Monitoring And Habitat Enhancement	CSKT	Flathead	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Watershed Restoration & Monitoring (MFWP Umbrella)	MFWP	Flathead	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9101904	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Nonnative Fish Removal / Hatchery Production	USFWS	Flathead	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9104600	Spokane Tribal (Galbraith Springs) Hatchery Operation & Maintenance	STOI	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery O&M.	WDFW	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9106700	Idaho Water Rental: Resident Fish And Wildlife Impacts - Phase III	IDFG	Upper Snake	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	SBT	Upper Snake	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9401001	Mitigation For Excessive Drawdowns At Libby Reservoir	MFWP and CSKT	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9401002	Flathead River Native Species Project (MFWP Sub-proposal)	MFWP	Flathead	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9404300	Monitor, Evaluate, And Research The Lake Roosevelt Fishery	STOI	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9404700	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	IDFG	Pend Oreille	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9404900	Improve The Kootenai River Ecosystem	KTOI	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	N	N	Drop Obj. 4 (fertilization experiments); Clarify & better

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Tier	Screen	Tech	Prog	Mile	Issues to be addressed
									define objectives;
9405300	Bull Trout Assessment - Willamette/Mckenzie	ODFW	Willamette	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9405400	Bull Trout Genetics, Habitat Needs, L.H., Etc. In Central And N.E. Oregon	ODFW	Deschutes	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	KNRD	Pend Oreille	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9500600	Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone Paiute Joint Culture Facility	SBT	Upper Snake	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9500900	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	LRDA	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	CCT	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	N	Y	N	Reduce Obj 4 (entrainment studies) to one powerhouse; Clarify & better defined goals & objectives
9501300	Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program	NPT	Clearwater	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9501500	Lake Billy Shaw Operations and Maintenance and Evaluation (O&M, M&E)	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9501600	Genetic Inventory of Westslope Cutthroat Trout in the NF Clearwater Basin	NPT	Clearwater	1	Y	N	Y	N	Minimize personnel costs; Last year-produce recommendations from the study.
9502500	Flathead River Instream Flow Project (MFWP Umbrella Subproposal)	MFWP	Flathead	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	WDFW	Crab	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	CSKT	Flathead	1	Y	Y	Y	NA	
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	MFWP and CSKT	Kootenai	1	Y	Y	Y	NA	
9700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph And Grand Coulee Dams	KNRD	Upper Columbia Mainstem	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9700900	Evaluate Rebuilding The White Sturgeon Population In The Lower Snake Basin	NPT	Lower Snake Mainstem	1	Y	N	Y	N	Minimize personnel costs; refine objectives between this proposal and the Hells Canyon study to minimize duplication and to accomplish work at minimum risk.
9701100	Enhance and protect habitat and riparian areas on the DVIR	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9701900	Evaluate The Life History Of Native Salmonids In The Malheur Basin	BPT	Malheur	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9701901	North Fork Malheur River Bull Trout And Redband Life History Study	BPT	Malheur	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9800200	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	IDFG	Upper Snake	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
9902200	Assessing Genetic Variation Among Columbia Basin White Sturgeon Populations	U of I	Systemwide	1	Y	Y	Y	N	
20007	Acquire And Conserve Priority Bull Trout Habitat In Trestle Creek Watershed	River Network	Pend Oreille	2	Y	Y	N	N	
20009	Fertilization Of Kootenay Lake And Arrow Reservoir	B.C. Min Envir Lands Parks	Kootenai	2	Y	N	N	N	
20028	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber Company along Fisher	MFWP	Kootenai	2	Y	N	Y	N	*Needs to develop a crediting system to Libby Losses * Clearly define tasks and objectives in manner where biological accomplishments are measureable

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Tier	Screen	Tech	Prog	Mile	Issues to be addressed
20036	Evaluate bull trout movements in the Tucannon and Lower Snake rivers.	USFWS-IFRO	Lower Snake Mainstem	2	Y	Y	N	N	*This appears to be the responsibility of the Lower Snake Compensation Project. *Don't fund project if the 99 Decision is to breach 4 lower Snake Dams
20094	Assess Resident Fish Stocks Of The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	2	Y	N	Y	N	*Eliminate either the GIS equipment costs or GIS subcontract. * Information from assessment should be used to guide stocking program.
20096	Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation and Maintenance	WDFW	Upper Columbia Mainstem	2	Y	N	N	N	
20097	Phalon Lake Wild Rainbow Trap Improvements and O&M	WDFW	Upper Columbia Mainstem	2	Y	N	Y	N	*Red Band trout appear to be more appropriete for stocking in tributaries of Lake Roosevelt rather than directly in the lake. Address potential lake impacts prior to releasing into Lake Roosevelt.
20144	Create Stream Reference Condition Data Set For The Upper Flathead R Basin	Flathead National Forest	Flathead	2	Y	N	N	N	
20147	Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R. - Npt	NPT	Clearwater	2	Y	N	N	N	
20148	Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R - Idfg	IDFG, NPT	Clearwater	2	Y	N	N	N	
9502700	Collect Data On White Sturgeon Above Grand Coulee Dam	STOI	Upper Columbia Mainstem	2	Y	N	Y	N	*Limit first year of scope of work to writing a recovery plan.
9802600	Document Native Trout Populations	Washington Trout	Little White Salmon	2	Y	N	N	N	
9902400	Bull Trout Population Assessment In The Columbia River Gorge, WA	WDFW	Wind	2	Y	N	N	N	
20002	Hydrologic Study Of Stangland, Tyler And Clear Lake Area	Stangland-Tyler Aquifer Study	Crab	3	N	N	N	N	
20005	West Fisher Watershed Restoration	USFS	Kootenai	3	N	N	N	N	
20039	Comparative Population Study: Naneum, Coleman, Cooke Creeks	WA Trout	Yakima	3	N	N	N	N	
20040	Develop A Fish & Wildlife Management Plan For The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	3	N	N	N	N	
20041	Develop A Fish & Wildlife Conservation Law Enforcement Plan, D.V.I.R.	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	3	N	N	N	N	
20062	Adaptive Management Of White Sturgeons	USGS-BRD, CRRL	Systemwide	3	N	N	N	N	
20063	Evaluate Effects Of Catch And Release Angling On White Sturgeon	USGS, IDFG	Lower Snake Mainstem	3	N	Y	N	N	
20066	Inventory Resident Fish Populations in the Bonneville, The Dalles, and John	USGS-BRD	Mainstem	3	N	N	N	N	
20070	Water Conservation And Stream Enhancement Project	Tumalo Irrig Dist	Deschutes	3	N	N	N	N	
20071	Restore Crab Lake And Adjacent Reaches Of Crab Creek.	Ducks	Crab	3	N	N	N	N	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Tier	Screen	Tech	Prog	Mile	Issues to be addressed
		Unlimited, Inc.							
20073	Evaluate Relationship Between Land Use,Water Quality, And Fish Health	USGS	Okanogan	3	N	N	N	N	
20091	Construct Warm Springs Wetland	SWID RC&D	Upper Snake	3	N	N	N	N	
20156	Identification of Redband and Rainbow Trout in the NF Clearwater Basin	NPT	Clearwater	3	N	N	N	N	
20517	Libby Fisheries Mitigation	MFWP	Kootenai	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	
20536	Develop Management Plan & Assess Fish &Wildlife - Owyhee Basin, D.V.I. R.	SPT - DVIR	Owyhee	3	N	N	N	N	
20554	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Umbrella	MFWP	Flathead	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	
20557	Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R. - NPT & IDFG	NPT	Clearwater	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	KNRD	Pend Oreille	3					Withdrawn by sponsor

Table 9. Resident fish management evaluation comments

Project ID	Title	Comments
20002	Hydrologic Study Of Stangland, Tyler And Clear Lake Area	***Screening Criteria:*** no- There are no Resident fish measures listed. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It does not clearly state direct benefits to resident fish. Any fish contributions are incidental. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It does not address urgent requirements, and It doesn't meet Criteria 12,15,16. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones in the proposal. ***General Comments:*** Looks like an excellent project, but not a BPA responsibility.
20005	West Fisher Watershed Restoration	***Screening Criteria:*** no- It doesn't meet criteria 1B, almost exclusively wildlife benefits. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- 50% of the project costs relates grizzly objectives, to criteria 6. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It is inappropriate to fund mitigation for poor forestry practices. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is not connected to the loss statement , nor does it have a long term mitigation plan. ***General Comments:*** Duplication in the goals of this project and the overall goals of 20028. This needs collaboration. There should be a cost share with the wildlife mitigation trust. The cost share itself is with the USFS. A question to benefit of fish when 1/3 of the cost goes to NEPA.
20007	Acquire And Conserve Priority Bull Trout Habitat In Trestle Creek Watershed	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It is a disproportionate (3 to 1) ratio between BPA and AVISTA funding request. This would be a great habitat purchase for AVISTA. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones listed. ***General Comments:***
20008	Monitor And Protect Wigwam River Bull Trout For Koocanusa Reservoir	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones identified. ***General Comments:*** I would like to see some specific plans on how the info will be used in reservior and forest management. This should be included in ongoing Koocanusa work as a subcontract.
20009	Fertilization Of Kootenay Lake And Arrow Reservoir	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It doesn't meet criteria 3, and the objectives are poorly defined. This needs references in the narrative part of the proposal to show basis for benefits. This is an incomplete proposal, and it is poorly written. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It goes beyond the intent of the NPPC Resident Fish Measure because of Arrow Lake. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones listed. ***General Comments:***
20028	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber Company along Fisher	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-This is not as directed towards fish as the Trestle Creek project. There is an overall benefit to fish in question,and a long term need for restoration before we see fish benefits. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There is no long term budget beyond 2000. ***General Comments***: This is a one time cost. The Wildlife fund will take on monitoring. This commitment is only secure if the wildlife mitigation is also secured.
20036	Evaluate bull trout movements in the Tucannon and Lower Snake rivers.	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It does not meet criteria 14-17. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- This is a short lived research project. ***General Comment:*** no- There is no relevance to lower snake comp. program. Should it be in the reimburseable program? Not sure it will meet the

Project ID	Title	Comments
		scientific objectives to describe migration behavior. Concern over the number of fish tagged. Could this be piggybacked on another project in the region? Does address criteria 12 very well. If the 1999 decision is to remove the 4 lower snake dams, this project should be terminated.
20039	Comparative Population Study: Naneum, Coleman, Cooke Creeks	***Screening Criteria:*** no- There is no link to the RFM program measures. ***Technical Criteria:*** no-It should be absorbed into ongoing work in the Yakama River basin. It is too small of a sample size. In Criteria 2, the brook trout risk to native species is well documented, and there is no need to reinvent the wheel. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It does not meet Criteria 11 because there is no hydro related loss assessment. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a short lived assessment project. ***General comments:*** There is no planning document and no indication of collaboration with management agencies.
20040	Develop A Fish & Wildlife Management Plan For The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	***Screening Criteria:*** no- I could not find specific resident fish program measures. It is not consistent with F & W program. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- I question the need for the project. It is not cost effective. This should be either biologist or consultant funded, but not both and not at that rate for five years. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It is not an urgent threat to the populations. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-It is a planning effort. ***General Comments:*** Separate wildlife from Resident fish components. Include task into 20536**.**
20041	Develop A Fish & Wildlife Conservation Law Enforcement Plan, D.V.I.R.	***Screening Criteria:*** no- It does not meet a resident fish measure-10.1 and 10.1E. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- There are no demonstrated enforcement problems. The staffing is not appropriate for objectives. It lacked methodological detail. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It does not meet criteria 11, (MYIP, other planning documents) It doesn't meet urgent requirements, and It doesn't promote sustainable ecosystem. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones listed.
20049	Evaluate Sediment Transport In Spawning Habitat, Kootenai R., Idaho	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a one and ½ year research project. ***General Comments:*** This should be absorbed as a sub-contract into 8806400 and substantially reduced in scope and budget.
20062	Adaptive Management Of White Sturgeons	***Screening Criteria :*** no- This doesn't meet RFM 1B. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- This doesn't meet the majority of the technical criteria for 2-10. I felt number 9 wasn't cost effective and the budget was excessive for the Oakridge Nat'l Lab. I am not convinced the model would meet objectives. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- This doesn't meet criteria 11. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There is no loss statement.
20063	Evaluate Effects Of Catch And Release Angling On White Sturgeon	***Screening Criteria:*** no-It doesn't meet the intent of the measures in the F & W program. Addresses adequacy of existing fishing regulations. ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It is not an urgent requirement for this population (does not resolve an immediate threat to the populations) ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- This is a short lived research project. ***General Comments:*** This could be an In lui issue. This was an interesting and well-thought out proposal.
20066	Inventory Resident Fish Populations in the Bonneville, The Dalles, and John	***Screening Criteria:*** no-It doesn't meet screening criteria because it develops methods for doing stock assessments, but does not do stock assessments. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It does not benefit the target species because work has been done previously. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It doesn't meet criteria 12, 11, 13, 15. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It's a short lived research based project.
20070	Water Conservation And Stream Enhancement Project	***Screening Criteria:*** no-It is not in the Council's program for Resident Fish and not a BPA responsibility to fix or maintain irrigation projects under 10.8b in the Resident fish program. There is no tie to hydro-related losses, and it is not a BPA responsibility to mitigate state water appropriations law. It doesn't meet criteria 1B. It is not consistant with management objectives. ***Technical Criteria:*** no-There are no benefits to fish because it does not describe use of water saved. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It doesn't meet criteria 11-17, It does not describe use of water saved.

Project ID	Title	Comments
		Milestone Criteria: no-There are no specific milestones listed. ***General Comments***: The cost of the project exceeds the RFM annual budget.
20071	Restore Crab Lake And Adjacent Reaches Of Crab Creek.	***Screening Criteria:*** no- There are no Resident fish measures listed. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It does not clearly state direct benefits to Resident fish. Any fish contributions are incidental. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It does not address urgent requirements, and it doesn't meet Criteria 12,15,16. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones in the proposal. ***General Comments***: It looks to be a wildlife project-please forward to Wildlife Caucus.
20073	Evaluate Relationship Between Land Use,Water Quality, And Fish Health	***Screening Criteria:*** no- There are no RFM related fish measures listed in the proposal. ***Technical Criteria:*** no-The data use is not clear. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-There are no clear hydro-related issues being addressed. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones listed. General Comments: It appears to be an Anadromous fish project, and it should be forwarded to the Anadromous fish caucus.
20091	Construct Warm Springs Wetland	***Screening Criteria:*** no- It is not a resident fish measure. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- There is no demonstrated benefit to Resident fish. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It doesn't address Resident fish strategies as identified in criteria 11. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a short term project.
20094	Assess Resident Fish Stocks Of The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- I am concerned about cost effectiveness, and concerned that implementation has preceded the assessment. The subcontractor should not be designing sampling protocol- that is the role of the biologist. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a survey project. ***General Comments:*** Potential misuse of GIS technology. If funded, there are budget concerns that need to be worked out.
20096	Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation and Maintenance	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It does not pass Criteria 4, 9 (inclusion of the building was not well justified) ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- The project exceeds the NPPC measure. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There is no milestones listed. ***General Comments:*** The building replacement is not part of the NPPC measure.
20097	Phalon Lake Wild Rainbow Trap Improvements and O&M	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-There is no scientific documentation for the stated problem. We are concerned about cost effectiveness. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- The milestones are production criteria and the measurable objectives and milestones should be directed at the fishery. ***General Comment:*** This is an application of three step process. The projects appear to be costly.
20135	Consumptive Sturgeon Fishery-Hells Canyon And Oxbow Reservoirs	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no specific biological objectives. ***General Comments:*** Coordinate with IDFG and ODFW about non-tribal sturgeon harvest.
20144	Create Stream Reference Condition Data Set For The Upper Flathead R Basin	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- The restoration efforts are going along fairly well without this. The results won't be very applicable because of the small sample size. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-This doesn't appear to be a threat or need to fish population. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is only a one year project.

Project ID	Title	Comments
20146	Lake Roosevelt Kokanee Net Pens	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones listed. ***General Comment:*** We are looking at a one time capital equipment cost. O and M should be included in Sherman Creek.
20147	Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R. - Npt	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- There is no evidence that the population is in poor shape. It doesn't meet Criteria 6-8. Projects 20148, 20147, 20156, 9501600, are all doing native fish surveys in the same basin for $650,000. Unnecessary detail on a very small area (over researching the area) ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It does not address urgent threat to population ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a survey based proposal. ***General Comments:*** This is inappropriate use of umbrella project, It should have been one project with two separate sponsors. The bulltrout tracking in the reservoir in the project should be under project # 8709900.
20148	Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R - Idfg	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-There is no evidence that the population is in poor shape. It doesn't meet Criteria 6-8. Projects 20148, 20147, 20156, 9501600, are all doing native fish surveys in the same basin for $650,000. Unnecessary detail on a very small area (over researching the area) ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It does not address urgent threat to population. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a survey based proposal. ***General Comments:***
20156	Identification of Redband and Rainbow Trout in the NF Clearwater Basin	***Screening Criteria:*** no-The measures listed don't address redband. ***Technical Criteria:*** no-There is no evidence that the population is in poor shape. It doesn't meet Criteria 6-8. Projects 20148, 20147, 20156, 9501600, are all doing native fish surveys in the same basin for $650,000. Unnecessary detail on a very small area (over researching the area) ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It does not address urgent threat to population ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-It is a survey based proposal. ***General Comments:*** This could have been sub-component of other project.
20517	Libby Fisheries Mitigation	***Screening Criteria:*** N/A ***Technical Criteria:*** N/A ***Programmatic Criteria:*** N/A ***Milestone Criteria:*** N/A
20536	Develop Management Plan & Assess Fish &Wildlife - Owyhee Basin, D.V.I. R.	***Screening Criteria:*** no- I could not find specific resident fish program measures. It is not consistent with F & W program. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- I question the need for the project. It is not cost effective. This should be either biologist or consultant funded, but not both and not at that rate for five years. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It is not an urgent threat to the populations. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-It is a planning effort. ***General Comments:*** Separate wildlife from Resident fish components. The proposal was verbose and hard to follow.
20554	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Umbrella	***Screening Criteria:*** N/A ***Technical Criteria:*** N/A ***Programmatic Criteria:*** N/A ***Milestone Criteria:*** N/A
20557	Evaluate Bull Trout Population Status/N.F. Clearwater R. - Npt & Idfg	***Screening Criteria:*** N/A ***Technical Criteria:*** N/A ***Programmatic Criteria:*** N/A ***Milestone Criteria:*** N/A

Project ID	Title	Comments
8346700	Mitigation For The Construction And Operation Of Libby Dam	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones listed. The milestones and loss statements are currently being reviewed by the NPPC.
8503800	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** yes
8605000	White Sturgeon Mitigation And Restoration In The Columbia And Snake Rivers	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It was never intended to be a perpetual project, it doesn't have an overall framework, and there is no loss statement.
8709900	Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigation	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-Until further deliberations. ***General Comments:*** One of the very few projects that is solution-oriented.
8740700	Dworshak Impacts/M&E And Biological/Integrated Rule Curves	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no measurable biological objectives listed.
8806400	Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies And Conservation Aquaculture	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There is no recovery plan as of yet. ***General Comments:*** The price is awfully high for the project compared to where we were three years ago. We need to investigate the possibility of BPA ESA, and Capital dollars for funding. A new hatchery should be as cost effective as possible.
8806500	Kootenai River Fisheries Recovery Investigations	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no clear milestones listed beyond 2000. ***General comments:*** It seems pricey for the product.
8815600	Implement Fishery Stocking Program Consistent With Native Fish Conservation	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones listed. ***General Comments:*** Borderline on programmatic, not enough info to score some criteria. Potential connection with Joint Culture facility.
9001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tribs. To Lake Roosevelt	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no There is no measurable biological objectives and no milestones listed.
9004400	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities:	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes

Project ID	Title	Comments
	Coeur D'alene Reservation	***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones listed. ***General Comments:***
9004402	Coeur D' Alene Tribe Trout Production Facility	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There is no long term plan describing milestones. ***General Comments:*** Analysis, strategies, objectives are not compatible with bulltrout. There is financial uncertainty, we need to check availability of BPA, ESA, and Capital dollars. A serious analysis and planning effort needs to be incorporated into the bulltrout portion of the project.
9101901	Flathead Lake Monitoring And Habitat Enhancement	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-The milestones are not specifically listed in this proposal.
9101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Watershed Restoration & Monitoring (MFWP Umbrella	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- Until further deliberation. ***General Comments:*** BPA long term agreements should be attached to the proposal.
9101904	Hungry Horse Mitigation - Nonnative Fish Removal / Hatchery Production	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-Until further deliberation.
9104600	Spokane Tribal (Galbraith Springs) Hatchery Operation & Maintenance	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no long term milestones. General comments: ***Specific milestones should be described relative to the benefit to the fisheries and not in the context of fish production.***
9104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery O&M.	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-All objectives have an end date of 2000.
9106700	Idaho Water Rental: Resident Fish And Wildlife Impacts - Phase III	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones listed. ***General comments:*** When is this project going to end? Justification for the 2005 end date.
9201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria***: yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no biological objectives. ***General Comments:*** Why did the sponsor choose the fencing technique?

Project ID	Title	Comments
9401001	Mitigation For Excessive Drawdowns At Libby Reservoir	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones listed. The milestones and loss statements are currently being reviewed by the NPPC. ***General Comments:*** How did the expense of this program become part of the direct program?
9401002	Flathead River Native Species Project (MFWP Sub-proposal)	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-Until further deliberation
9404300	Monitor, Evaluate, And Research The Lake Roosevelt Fishery	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- Until the plan is in place, this should be an annually reviewed project. ***General Comment:*** The project direction should be peer reviewed.
9404700	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no long term milestones. There is no loss statement and no long term management plan. ***General Comments:*** There are differing scientific opinions as to proposed limiting factors.
9404900	Improve The Kootenai River Ecosystem	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-The scope of work has changed from temporary to a conceivably more permanent project. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones listed.
9405300	Bull Trout Assessment - Willamette/Mckenzie	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- This is an assessment based project. No milestones were identified.
9405400	Bull Trout Genetics, Habitat Needs, L.H., Etc. In Central And N.E. Oregon	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It's a short lived assessment project. ***General Comments:*** This violates the 10% rule and there is a change in the scope of work. It is an ongoing monitoring project that does not provide on the ground action. It doesn't meet criteria 13,12--it is not hydro-related and doesn't have a loss statement. It doesn't represent an urgent requirement based on the intent of the program.
9500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There is no long term mitigation plan. They need to clearly explain and justify the milestones.
9500600	Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone Paiute Joint Culture Facility	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no biological objectives yet.

Project ID	Title	Comments
9500900	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- The biological objectives are ending in 2000, and there are no long term milestones.
9501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-This already fulfilled it's objectives. The proposal is poorly written and tasks & accomplishments as well as objectives are not well presented. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-Most of the objectives are really tasks and not true milestones. ***General comments:*** This is not cost effective.
9501300	Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes- The sponsor was not able to clerify budget concerns. budget should be investigated for criteria 9. Is above 10% rule. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes (these are for trout pond use) ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-The biological objectives are actually tasks. ***General comments:*** This is a substitution project whose intent is to raise fish for harvest. concerned about building more dams.
9501500	Lake Billy Shaw Operations and Maintenance and Evaluation (O&M, M&E)	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There is no biological objectives listed. ***General Comments:*** I urge that the native species receive top priority in this reservoir. What we stock should be compatible with the native redband. Peer review of the program direction and cost analysis.
9501600	Genetic Inventory of Westslope Cutthroat Trout in the NF Clearwater Basin	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- The project has completed it's objectives. There is enough info to determine there is a problem- use the information to determine a management action. It should be a low cost item in 2000. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-The project ends in 2000. ***General Comments:*** The expectations are that this project will be completed in 2000 at reduced funding level. Is not addressing the threat to the population-outlived the usefulness of research. It does not meet Criteria 12, 13, 14, 16. Room for cost reduction.
9502500	Flathead River Instream Flow Project (Mfwp Umbrella Subproposal)	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-Until further deliberation
9502700	Collect Data On White Sturgeon Above Grand Coulee Dam	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-The project accomplishments would most likely be compromised by reservior operation and dissolved gas from Canada. The proposal should explain how it benefits sturgeon. The budget is excessive. The project should be more compatable and not duplicative of Canadian work. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones or biologicial objectives listed. ***General Comments:*** This should be part of project 9404300. The budget request has increased. The results of genetic analysis have important implications to this project.
9502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no There is insufficient detail on milestones and no established track record.

Project ID	Title	Comments
		General Comment: There is a lot of funding discrepancies on this project. There is also concern about how FY98 funds were allocated and expended.
9603201	Begin Implementation Of Year 1 Of The K Pool Master Plan Program	***Screening Criteria:*** no-It's an Anadromous fish project in Resident fish clothing. It doesn't meet the intent of Resident fish measures. ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It doesn't meet criteria 3,2,8,5,9. There are no clearly defined objectives or benefits to wild fish. It didn't clearly explain the potential impacts to existing wild fish populations. There is no M and E. I am concerned about number of subcontractors, and it doesn't explain how subcontractors are coordinated. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- It doesn't meet criteria 12,16,14. There is no indication that these fish are weak. There is no demonstrated link to other sturgeon projects. It doesn't promote community diversity. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-There are no milestones identified. ***General Comments:*** The proposal does not adequately describe ongoing activities.
9608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria: N/A***
9608720	Focus Watershed Coordination-Kootenai River Watershed	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria: N/A***
9700300	Box Canyon Watershed Project	***Screening Criteria:*** NA ***Technical Criteria:*** NA ***Programmatic Criteria:*** NA ***Milestone Criteria:*** NA
9700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph And Grand Coulee Dams	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-This is a survey based project. ***General Comments:*** There is a concern in spending time and money radio tagging non-native fish.
9700900	Evaluate Rebuilding The White Sturgeon Population In The Lower Snake Basin	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-The objectives could be accomplished in other areas. Tasks may not be investigated as limiting factor in adult fish. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-Until furthur review. ***General Comments:*** There may be some budget review carryover. Top heavy in personnel for a field project.
9701100	Enhance and protect habitat and riparian areas on the DVIR	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes- ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- There are no milestones listed. ***General Comments:*** The subcontractor is not appropriate in this budget.
9701900	Evaluate The Life History Of Native Salmonids In The Malheur Basin	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- This is a short term survey project. ***General Comments:*** The sponsor informed us that #9701900 and 9701901 would be combined into one for next year's proposal.

Project ID	Title	Comments
9701901	North Fork Malheur River Bull Trout And Redband Life History Study	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It is a short term survey project. ***General Comments:*** Using screw trap to quantify entrainment was weak.
9800200	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes- But there are misalignment between budget costs and remaining out year objectives. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-This is a survey project. ***General Comments:*** objective 5 appears to go beyond the intended scope of the project, which may require budget discussions.
9802600	Document Native Trout Populations	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no- It doesn't meet criteria 2,4,6,9 and there is no benefit to target species. There is an overlap with project 9902400-They should fund both at 9902400 funding level. There are no valid strategies. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no- There is an inappropriate characterization of cost share. It doesn't meet criteria 12,13,15,16,17. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-It's a short lived survey project.
9902200	Assessing Genetic Variation Among Columbia Basin White Sturgeon Populations	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** yes ***Programmatic Criteria:*** yes ***Milestone Criteria:*** no-It's a research based project.
9902400	Bull Trout Population Assessment In The Columbia River Gorge, WA	***Screening Criteria:*** yes ***Technical Criteria:*** no-The current info suggests bulltrout does not exist in two of the four watersheds. It doesn't meet criteria 2,6,7,9. This area is managed for Anadromous not Resident fish. The method section lacks detail. ***Programmatic Criteria:*** no-It does not meet criteria 12,13,16. This is not urgent or a high priority for this budget. The inventory does not meet sustainable process. There is no demonstrated collaboration with Anadromous work. ***Milestone Criteria:*** no- It's a short lived assessment project. ***General Comments:*** This project should absorb 9802600 without an increase in budget.

Wildlife Proposals

Process

The Wildlife Caucus(WC) reviewed and scored each FY2000 wildlife proposal using the Council-approved Wildlife Mitigation Criteria, which address both technical and management issues. Proposal sponsors were invited to attend one of two project evaluation sessions (January 27-28 in Portland, February 24-26 in Boise). Sponsors were provided with questions relating to how their proposal met the criteria and asked to respond to them in writing. Project sponsors were present during the evaluation to provide an overview of their project and answer questions from the caucus. Some wildlife proposals were also reviewed by the WTWG. Information generated in the WTWG review was considered on an advisory basis by the Wildlife Caucus.

The result of this review is a prioritized list of projects in which:

- All Tier 1 projects are recommended for funding because they meet the Caucus' and Council's goals of acquiring, protecting and enhancing wildlife habitat to mitigate hydropower-induced wildlife losses in the most biologically- and cost-effective manner.
- Tier 1a is for non-discretionary projects where there is a long term memorandum of agreement with BPA for funding.
- Tier 1b is for ongoing operation, maintenance, and enhancement projects based on existing HEP and management plans.
- Tier 1c is for first year operation and maintenance projects with contingencies for land acquisition and/or HEP or management plan completion.
- Tier 1d is for all new and ongoing acquisition projects which are funded according to the ranking process. The difference between the Amount Requested column and the FY00 Approved column for is the amount donated by high priority projects for reallocation by the WC in an attempt to provide some level of funding for as many tier 1 projects as possible. The Caucus will also reallocate funds that become available through the BPA Quarterly Review Process to try to make tier 1d donators whole.
- Tier 2 lists projects that are to receive funding only after fully funding all tier 1 projects.
- Tier 3 projects are not recommended for funding because they are either inconsistent with the wildlife program and/or have technical deficiencies.

Criteria

The following definitions and weighting factors assigned to Wildlife Mitigation Criteria were 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
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 high-quality habitat)	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.

Results

Table 10 summarizes the Wildlife Caucus' recommended budget for wildlife projects. Table 11 includes project rankings and additional comments.

Table 10. Wildlife management evaluation

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Requested	FY00 Recommended	Rank
Tier 1a	**Non-Discretionary (obligated)**				
9608000	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation Project	NPT	235,325	235,325	No Review
9609400	Washington Agreement	WDFW	1,912,335	1,912,335	No Review
Subtotal			**2,147,660**	**2,147,660**	
Tier 1b	**Ongoing O&M and Enhancement based upon existing HEP and Management Plans (obligated)**				
9205900	Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands Phase II	TNC	50,000	50,000	Review
9107800	Burlington Bottoms Wildlife Mitigation Project	ODFW	116,822	116,822	Review
9506001	Enhance Squaw Creek Watershed for Anadromous Fish & Wildlife Habitat	CTUIR	200,589	200,589	Review
9106100	Swanson Lakes Wildlife Areas	WDFW	247,500	247,500	Review
9106000	Kalispel Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project	KNRD	153,917	153,917	Review
9009200	Wanaket Wildlife Mitigation Project	CTUIR	200,000	200,000	Review
9800300	O & M Funding of Wildlife Habitat on STOI Reservation For Grand Coulee Dam	STOI	97,187	97,187	Review
9204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range	CCT	383,500	350,000	Review
9206800	Implementation of Willamette Basin Mitigation Program--Wildlife	ODFW	230,000	230,000	Review
9206200	Yakama Riparian Wetlands	YIN	565,955	565,955	No Review
9505700	Southern Idaho Mitigation	IDFG, SBT	327,000	327,000	No Review
9206100	Albeni Falls	Albeni Falls Interagency Work Group	195,237	195,237	No Review
Subtotal			**2,767,707**	**2,734,207**	
Tier 1c	**First Year O&M with Contingencies for land acquisition and/or HEP/MP completion (Unobligated)**				
9004401	Lake Creek Land Acquisition and Enhancement	CDA Tribe	140,423	140,423	Review
20082	Rainwater Wildlife Area O&M	CTUIR	274,966	274,966	Review
9802200	Acquisition of Pine Creek Ranch	CTWSRO	94,600	94,600	Review
20116	OWC, Horn Butte	ODFW	42,302	42,302	No Review
20112	OWC, Wenaha WMA Additions	ODFW	42,302	42,302	No Review
20114	Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	ODFW	144,637	144,637	No Review
9902500	Lower Columbia Wetlands Restoration	USFS-CRGNSA	125,000	125,000	No Review
9902600	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	USFS-CRGNSA	24,000	24,000	No Review
20140	Tualatin R. NWR	USFWS	250,000	250,000	No Review
20128	OWC, Multnomah Channel	Metro	65,000	30,000	Review
20115	OWC, Irrigon WMA Additions	ODFW	25,394	25,394	Review
Subtotal (unobligated)			**1,228,624**	**1,193,624**	
Total obligated & unobligated				**6,075,491**	

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Requested	FY00 Recommended	Rank
Tier 1d	**New and ongoing acquisition projects**				
9705900	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites – Oregon	ODFW, CTWS, CTUIR, BPT…	5,000,000	3,900,000	NR
20116	OWC, Horn Butte	ODFW	400,000		26.5
20090	Logan Valley Wildlife Mitigation Project	BPT	2,002,301		26.3
9206200	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	YIN	1,184,045	984,045	23
20137	Acquisition of Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site	BPT	2,030,079		21.6
9206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation Project	Albeni Falls Interagency Work Group	4,222,449	2,000,000	20.8
9506700	Colville Confederated Tribes Performance Contract (Credits For Habitat)	CCT	1,500,000	400,000	20.6
20114	OWC, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	ODFW	216,000		20.3
20140	Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions	USFWS	1,000,000		19.9
20074	Eagle Lakes Ranch	USFWS	853,500	287,134	19.5
9505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation	IDFG, SBT	4,007,510	826,964	19.3
Total Budget Request			**28,559,875**	**14,473,634**	
Tier 2	**Projects recommended for funding as available once tier 1 is fully funded**				
9205900	Amazon Basin Phase II	TNC	2,376,020		17.6
20112	OWC, Wenaha WMA Additions	ODFW	100,000		16.3
20081	STOI Wildlife Land Acquisition and Enhancement	STOI	2,032,750		11.5
Tier 3	**Proposals not recommended for funding**				
20014	Evaluate Songbird Use of Riparian Areas	U of I	32,760		NR Research
20015	Characterize and Assess John Day-Landsat	Northwest Habitat Institute	215,380		NR Research
20034	Impact of Flow on Cottonwood Ecosystems	BioQuest International Consulting Ltd.	148,034		NR Research
20136	Burns Paiute Mitigation Coordinator	BPT	50,494		NR Other
20126	Habitat Enhancement in Transmission Corridors	USFS	308,500		NR In-Lieu
20130	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Mitigation O&M Trust Fund	NPT	4,500,000		NR Funding
20129	Dworshak Mitigation Cultural Resource Survey	NPT	45,000		NR Funded
20092	Inventory Wildlife DVIR	SPT - DVIR	185,985		NR
20113	OWC, South Fork Crooked River	ODFW	13,877		Review

* Funding for new acquisitions under project numbers 20090, 20114, 20116 and 20137 will be allocated from project 9705900.

Table 11. Wildlife management evaluation comments

ProjectID	Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Comments
Tier 1a															
9608000															
9609400															
Subtotal															
Tier 1b															
9205900															
9107800															
9506001															
9106100															
9106000															
9009200															
9800300															
9204800															Proponent need is actually $350,000
9206800															
9206200															
9505700															
9206100															
Subtotal															
Tier 1c															
9004401															
20082															
9802200															
20116															
20112															
20114															

	Criteria														
ProjectID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	**Comments**
9902500															FY 99 funds to be used for this request
9902600															FY 99 funds to be used for this request with $2,500 from FY 00
20140															
20128															$30,000 reflects proponent need
20115															
Subtotal (unobligated)															
Total obligated & unobligated															
Tier 1d															
9705900															Proponent reduction with inclusion of all individual projects identified as OWC above funding line
20116	2	1	1	1	1	2	2.5	0	3	3	3	1	3	3	OWC
20090	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	2.8	3	3.5	1	3	3	OWC
9206200	2	1	2	1	0.5	1.5	2	1	3	3	2.5	1	2	2	Proponent reduction
20137	2	1	2	1	0.5	1	1	2	2.1	3	2	1	0	3	OWC
9206100	1	0.1	2	1	1	0.1	2	1.5	2.6	3	2.5	1	1.5	1.5	Proponent reduction
9506700	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	2.5	1.5	2.6	3	2	1	1.5	2	Proponent reduction
20114	2	1	2	1	0	2	1.5	0	3	3	2	0.5	1	2	OWC
20140	1	1	2	1	1	1	1.5	0	2.9	3	2	1	2	2	OWC
20074	2	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	0	3	3	1.5	0	2	3	Proponent reduction with WA coalition funding available, includes in-lieu concerns by caucus members
9505700	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	2	1	1.8	3	2	0.5	2	2	
Total Budget Request															
Tier 2															
9205900	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	0.5	2.1	3	2	1	2	1	
20112	2	0.5	2	1	0	1	1.5	0	1.6	3	1.5	0	2.5	3	
20081	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	0	2.5	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	

ProjectID	Criteria														Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
Tier 3															
20014															Reasearch criteria applied - rejected
20015															Reasearch criteria applied - rejected
20034															Reasearch criteria applied - rejected
20136															Contained within OWC projects above the line
20126															In-lieu concerns
20130															Policy issue
20129															Policy issue
20092															Policy issue
20113															Project scope changed significantly