

Appendix A. Results from the CBFWA project proposal review for the Mountain Snake Province. The HP, RA, and DNF designations in the CBFWA Category represent high priority, recommended action, and do not fund, respectively. Note: Due to space constraints, text in the criteria fields shown as “n” over “a” should be interpreted as “n/a”.

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|---|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| 28004 | Lawyer Creek Subwatershed-Steelhead Trout Habitat Improvement Project | Lewis Soil Conservation District | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Significant cost share is described in the narrative portion of the proposal although it is not mentioned in the budget portion of the proposal. | Recommended Action |
| 28013 | RENOVATE SELWAY FALLS ANADROMOUS FISH PASSAGE TUNNEL | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This is a one-year budget proposal that will not require out year funding. | High Priority |
| 28017 | Monitoring the Selway Falls renovation project for passage of spring chinook salmon and steelhead | Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | | Recommended Action |
| 28020 | Nez Perce Tribe Harvest Monitoring Program | Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resource Management | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | This project is important for assessment of harvest impacts and the development of run reconstructions. Accuracy and completeness of past reporting has been inconsistent. This project should address the previous problems and insure a statistically valid sampling design. The projected returns for 2002 indicate that significant sampling effort will be required. | High Priority |
| 28021 | Lower Clearwater Habitat Enhancement Project | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | The intent of this project is to acquire riparian properties or highly erosive soil properties that will be available for cost share programs (i.e. CRP). --This project addresses RPA 154 and possibly 153. The Wildlife Committee rated the project as having significant wildlife benefits using the criteria of permanence, size, connectivity to other habitat, and juxtaposition to public lands. | High Priority |
| 28022* | Evaluate Bull Trout Life History In Dworshak Reservoir, N.F. Clearwater River Drainage, ID | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | This project would contribute towards meeting the terms and conditions stated in the FCRPS Biological Opinion for Dworshak Dam. Objective 4 of the proposal is considered a high priority from USFWS to measure entrainment of bull trout through Dworshak Dam. --This proposal is directly tied to hydrosystem impacts and Terms and Conditions set forth in the FCRPS BiOp. The addition of a fixed telemetry site in Dworshak Tailrace substantially | High Priority (Obj 4, see comments) Recommended Action (all else) |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | strengthened the project as a whole, in addition to the success of meeting Objective 4. --In past studies, the proponents have been used 400 kHz PIT tags. It is unclear in the proposal if the project intends switching over to 134 kHz PIT tags if awarded funding. Switching over to the 134 kHz tags would likely provide additional inter-gations of entrained fish below Dworshak Dam, and would also strengthen the proposal. --Through the Subbasin Team Review, Objective 4 of this proposal received a "High Priority" ranking while the other objectives were categorized as "Recommended Action." The RFC suggests that Objective 4 cannot be completed without making the following Objectives/tasks High Priority: Task 1.1, Task 1.3, Task 2.1, Objective 3, and Objective 4 for a total of approximately \$133,000. The remaining proposed work should be categorized as Recommended Action. --The USFWS indicates that the proposed work "will help implement reasonable and prudent measure 10.A.3.2 and terms and conditions 11.1 and 11.2 in the FCRPS biological opinion." | |
| 28023* | Evaluate and Control Brook Trout Populations – Addressing Competition and Hybridization Threats in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho. | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | NA | M5 - The Nez Perce Tribe doesn't support the objective to stock of tiger muskies. --The RFC suggests this project addresses one of the primary extinction threats to bull trout. The decline and local extirpation of bull trout stocks has been closely tied to invasion, competition, and hybridization with brook trout. Much work remains to be done on this issue, and this project evaluates one approach to the problem that may prove effective in areas where native fish have been displaced by introduced species. --The concept of using an introduced species to combat another introduced species is not uniformly accepted as a viable approach among the RFC. It would have been beneficial to the RFC if a more thorough summary of IDFG's existing tiger musky programs were included in the proposal. Without this summary, the RFC can only recommend a slower approach, looking at longer-term effects of the current program before a more aggressive program is implemented. --One issue worthy of discussion is the long-term management of the treatment lakes when/if the program is successful. The proposal could be strengthened if an additional objective were added to re-establish native species (bull and cutthroat trout) after eradication/control is complete. In addition, it would not be acceptable to continue the stocking of tiger muskies if a sport fishery develops as a result of this effort. | Recommended Action | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|---|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|--|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | --The RFC suggests Task 5.1 and 5.2 should be performed prior to any other objectives and indicated that the proposed stocking efforts would likely be subjected to the Three-Step Review process. | |
| 198709900* | Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigation | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | The proper project number was submitted under Project 28024. This is an ongoing project that received a new project number for an unknown reason. Although this project would address the primary threat to the Dworshak reservoir kokanee population, kokanee are not a listed species and therefore received a NO for this criteria. There is a significant increase in the revised budget submitted to the ISRP. --This project has a long history of past accomplishments and publications. Past work has focused on testing strobe lights in off-site lakes with high densities of kokanee, and the results are encouraging. Currently, the principal investigators are testing the use of strobe lights on one turbine of the dam. Results of this study will demonstrate if future mitigation efforts should include installing strobe lights on the reservoir outlets, and ultimately full implementation on the dam. Therefore, it is important to complete Objective 1 in order to direct future mitigation efforts. --Objective 2 will determine if bull trout are being entrained through the dam, assess if strobe lights repel bull trout, and correlate dam operations with the abundance and distribution of bull trout in the reservoir. The contention that bull trout are vulnerable to entrainment when kokanee are concentrated near the dam seems intuitively logical and needs further investigation. The objective would be more justified if the authors could cite a reference for the statement that "entrainment losses of bull trout may exceed 30% of the population per year." --Objective 3 requires collection of limnological data to characterize the productivity of the reservoir to assess the feasibility of improving growth and average size of kokanee. This objective seems logical and funding is warranted; however, a more detailed description is needed to determine the feasibility of nutrient enhancement to improve growth and survival of kokanee. As stated, this should be clarified in the future as information is obtained and analyzed. | High Priority | |
| 28025 | Potlatch River Watershed Restoration | Latah Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPA 152 and 154. This project occurs in a priority watershed for Snake River steelhead. Budget should be scrutinized, cost share contributions are unclear. | High Priority | |
| 28029 | Restore Lawyer Creek Habitat | Clearwater Economic | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project partially addresses RPA 154. Comprehensive watershed assessment should be | Recommended Action | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|---|---|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | Targeting Steelhead and Chinook Salmon | Development Association | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | completed prior to implementation. | |
| 28031 | Evaluation of Unclipped Hatchery Steelhead Released in the Clearwater and Salmon River Basins | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | This is a time sensitive study to evaluate returning fish that were released in previous years. Deferral of this task would sacrifice potential data. This project addresses RPA 107. Monitoring of unmarked fish was a priority in the 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program. US v OR Fall fishery agree-ment recommends securing funding for monitoring this production. | High Priority |
| 28032 | Assessment of A-run steelhead populations in the Clearwater River Basin | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPA 179 and 180. This project compliments other proposed work in the Potlatch drainage. The genetic work may be redundant and could possible be deferred. | High Priority |
| 28033 | Monitoring and evaluating coho salmon reintroduction in the Clearwater River Basin | Nez Perce Tribe, Department of Fisheries Resources Management | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | Coho supplementation is ongoing and data collection is needed to evaluate those efforts. Monitoring of juvenile survival, SAR, and adult return abundance of the hatchery origin coho is considered a high priority. The remaining tasks could be deferred. --Recommend that the priority ranking of HP be given to the a reduced scope of this proposal that would focus M&E efforts on: (1) juvenile survival, (2) SAR's, and (3) adult return abundance of the hatchery origin component. Reduced budget of \$240,000 required. Co-management commit through US vs Oregon fall fishery agreement to "use their best efforts to secure funding for monitoring and evaluation programs to implement the production actions in this agreement". NMFS 1999 BiOp on Art. Prop. Recommends the Clearwater River Coho Restoration program determine the most effective strategies for restoration, including marking and subsequent evaluation. | High Priority/ Recommended Action |
| 28041 | Dworshak Zooplankton Entrainment | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | NA | N | N | Y | NA | Entrainment of zooplankton through Dworshak Dam has not been identified as a limiting factor on kokanee populations in the reservoir. There is some information available that shows entrainment is occurring, but it is not clear how that is affecting the fish populations. The impact of strobe lights on the zooplankton populations should be investigated under project 28024. --This project uses hydroacoustic technology to monitor zooplankton movements in the forebay above Dworshak Dam, and then proposes to apply the information to manage dam operations to curtail zooplankton entrainment. The proposal further links zooplankton loss to problems with kokanee management, and ultimately suggests this as an impediment to bull trout recovery. The problem (zooplankton loss), is referenced as a "potential" negative impact, and was "suggested" as a "possible" explanation for poor kokanee | Recommended Action |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|---|-----------------|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>growth in '91 and '92 in the proposal. The RFC suggests that the proposal fails to discuss the excellent kokanee growth rates observed in Dworshak in the past 5 years. As a result, the acceptance of zooplankton loss as a management issue is not compelling. There are questions as to whether the proposed methods will be able to differentiate <i>Cladocera</i>s from other zooplankters, suspended detritus, small fish, or <i>Chaoborus</i> spp.</p> <p>--The RFC believes that the proposal reads as a concept paper rather than a project proposal and suggest that the proposal be rewritten so that more detail is provided and a stronger argument is presented as for why entrainment is a limiting factor to the system.</p> <p>--The RFC suggests that a more acceptable approach to this issue may be to first conduct a problem assessment using conventional methods by sampling zooplankton drift in the tailrace. Loss could be quantified and related to gatelwell selectors, and diel movement patterns could be inferred (see Novotny and Faler, 1982). An approach such as this could be done for less than ¼ of the existing project's cost as proposed, and then analyzed to see if corrective measures are needed or feasible.</p> <p>--Novotny, J. and M. P. Faler. 1982. Diurnal Characteristics of Zooplankton and Macro-invertebrates in the Tailwater Below a Kentucky Flood Control Reservoir. Journal of Freshwater Ecology, Vol. 1, No. 4, April, 1982.</p> | |
| 28042 | Timing and location of spawning by pure and introgressed cutthroat trout in the North Fork Clearwater River | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | N | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | N | Y | NA | <p>This project could be improved if it were more closely tied to the new stocking strategy employed by the IDFG for Dworshak reservoir. IDFG would place a higher priority on identifying solutions to the introgression problem.</p> <p>--The objective of the proposed research project is to identify the timing and location of spawning by pure and introgressed westslope cutthroat trout (WCT) using radio-telemetry in the North Fork Clearwater drainage, Idaho. The project objectives will aid with recovery efforts and is consistent with the goals of the Northwest Power Planning Council's 2000 Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, Idaho Fish and Game, and the Nez Perce Tribe.</p> <p>--The construction/implementation budget seems high for the proposed work statement, especially since only 40 fish will be monitored annually. It is unclear why the supporting agency needs to contract out these services to a subcontractor for \$227,774 during FY2002 and 2003; possibly hiring a well-trained seasonal technician will</p> | Recommended Action | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | | |
|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|---|---|---------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | reduce costs. A more detailed justification is needed to address the cost breakdown. Clearly, the PI's are well-established authorities in the field of radio-telemetry. The sponsor should reconsider using a subcontractor to perform the described duties. The RFC views the concept of the proposal as a High Priority. | | |
| 28043 | Crooked River Ecosystem Assessment at the Watershed Scale | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Some habitat restoration efforts are proposed for implementation prior to completion of assessments, for these efforts the criteria would be yes. This project addresses RPA 150 and 154. The watershed assessment should be completed prior to funding implementation activities. The budget for the implementation phase should be refined, as appropriate, based on the results of the assessment. | High Priority | |
| 28045 | Evaluating stream habitat using the Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries and Watershed | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | NA | | High Priority | |
| 28046 | Impacts of Salmon Carcasses on Chinook Salmon and Watershed Restoration in Subbasins of the Clearwater River | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries/Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | NA | | Recommended Action | |
| 28047 | Restore and Protect Red River Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPA 154 and 400. The watershed assessment should be completed prior to funding implementation activities. The budget for the implementation phase should be refined, as appropriate, based on the results of the assessment. | High Priority |
| 28048 | Protect and Restore Crooked Fork Creek to Colt Killed Analysis Area | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries and Watershed | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | There is a 5% personnel cost share by the USFS for FY2002 that was not listed in the budget portion of the proposal. This project addresses RPA 150 and 154. | High Priority |
| 28055 | Four-Step Safety-Net Plan for Upper Lochsa River B-Run Steelhead | Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | NA | There is a current effort to combine all 4-step process proposals into one unified effort to insure that overlap and redundancy are avoided. Refer to Safety Net Artificial Production Program proposal. | Withdrawn-defer to SNAPP proposal | |
| 28059 | Restoring anadromous fish habitat in the Lapwai Creek watershed. | Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project complements the activities proposed in project number 199901700. This project focuses on the water quality affects by private landowners. | High Priority |
| 28060 | Assess Stream Quality for Salmonid Recovery in the Lower Clearwater Subbasin | Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | | Recommended Action | |
| 198335000 | Nez Perce Tribal | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | NA | | High Priority | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | | |
|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | | |
| | Hatchery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 198335003 | Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring And Evaluation | Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resources Management | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | | | Fall chinook monitoring only. | High Priority |
| 198740700 | Dworshak Integrated Rule Curves/M&E | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | | | The RFC suggests that past investments in this project would be lost if the model were not completed. The resulting tool will be useful in assessing tradeoffs between biological impacts in Dworshak Reservoir and the river downstream. Although the federal Biological Opinions (BiOps) and electrical generation tend to drive the system, models of this type have been useful in the development and implementation of BiOps on the operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System. | High Priority |
| 199005500 | Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | Y | Y | NA | | | This project addresses RPAs 175, 182, and 184. | High Priority |
| 199303501 | Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed | Idaho County Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | CBFWA supports the acquisition of the conservation easements and continuation of O&M and M&E for the first phases of this project. These tasks should be considered High Priority. The results of the EAWS developed through project number 28047 should guide any future instream work for this project. Until that assessment is completed, restoration of the lower channel should be considered a Recommended Action. | High Priority/ Recommended Action |
| 199501300 | Resident Fish Substitution Program | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | | | | High Priority |
| 199607702 | Protect and Restore Lolo Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | Project addresses RPA 500. Completion of a watershed assessment should be prioritized. The budget for the implementation phase should be refined, as appropriate, based on the results of the assessment. | High Priority |
| 199607703 | Protecting and Restoring the Waw' aatamnima (Fishing)(Squaw) Creek to 'Imnaamatnoon (Legendary Bear)(Papoose) Creek Watersheds Analysis Area | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | This project addresses RPA 500. The implementation activities for this project are guided by a completed watershed assessment. | High Priority |
| 199607705 | Restore McComas Meadows/Meadow Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | This project addresses RPA 500. The implementation activities for this project are guided by a completed watershed assessment. | High Priority |
| 199608600 | Clearwater Focus | Idaho Soil | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | | | This project coordinates assessment and | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|---|---------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | Program | Conservation Commission | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | implementation activities in the Clearwater subbasin. The project does not fit the criteria well since most of the implementation activities that are coordinated by this project are implemented through other projects. This project addresses RPA 152 and 154. | |
| 199706000 | Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program – NPT | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries/Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | | This project coordinates assessment and implementation activities in the Clearwater subbasin. The project does not fit the criteria well since most of the implementation activities that are coordinated by this project are implemented through other projects. This project addresses RPA 152 and 154. | High Priority |
| 199901400 | Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed-Steelhead Trout Habitat Improvement Project | Lewis Soil Conservation District | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | | This project is one component of a watershed approach to habitat restoration and therefore there is significant cost share that was not reported in the proposal. | High Priority |
| 199901500 | Restoring Anadromous Fish Habitat in Big Canyon Watershed | Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District 3113 East Main Street Lewiston, Idaho 83501 | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | High Priority |
| 199901600 | Protect and Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | A significant cost share is identified in the narrative of the proposal but not in the budget portion of the proposal. The implementation activities for this project are guided by a completed watershed assessment. This project addresses RPA 154 and 500. | High Priority |
| 199901700 | Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | The implementation activities for this project are guided by a completed watershed assessment. This project addresses RPA 400 and 500. | High Priority |
| 199901800 | Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | Y | Y | NA | | This project addresses RPA 184. This project was required by a previous biological opinion. | High Priority |
| 200002800 | Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | NA | | | High Priority |
| 200003400 | Protect and Restore The North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries/Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | CBFWA's concern with transfer of information from this project has been adequately addressed in the response to the ISRP. | High Priority |
| 200003500 | Rehabilitate Newsome Creek Watershed - South | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | | Completion of the watershed assessment should be prioritized. Partially addresses RPA 154. The budget for the implementation phase should be | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|---|--|------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|--|--------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | Fork Clearwater River | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | refined, as appropriate, based on the results of the assessment. | |
| 200003600 | Protect & Restore Mill Creek | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Implementation activities should closely follow results from the South Fork Clearwater Landscape Assessment. | High Priority |
| 28001 | Evaluate Factors Influencing Bias and Precision of Chinook Salmon Redd Counts | USDA Forest Service- Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | RPA 180 - Over 50% of the redd counts in the Middle Fork of the Salmon River are conducted via air. This ongoing research is allowing for the estimation of the precision that is associated with aerial and ground counts. The ability to identify the factors that could be influencing the precision of the counts is essential due to the fact that an aerial approach to counting redds is the only feasible method to count redds in the Middle Fork. The managers have identified this research as essential for future management activities. | High Priority | |
| 28002 | Fluvial Bull Trout Migration and Life History Investigations in the upper Salmon River Subbasin | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This proposal addresses data gaps in bull trout distribution and life history in the upper Salmon River Subbasin. The RFC suggests this information is needed for the development of recovery actions for the Salmon River Bull Trout Recovery Unit; however, the geographical scope of this project appears too large for the proposed approach, and the 50 fish radio tagging sample seems too small for the size of the subbasin. --The RFC suggests a more systematic approach would lend itself well to project success. The project could be strengthened by concentrating on one major drainage at a time. Each of the 3 drainages (Yankee Fork, Mainstem, and East Fork) should receive about 50 tagged fish and 2-3 years sampling effort. It appears the proponents need to include more specific information on telemetry equipment to be used, and details such as transmitter life, size, frequencies and costs. There may be remote tracking sites currently available in the subbasin that could be utilized for this project, and if so, the project efficiency could be greatly improved by utilizing them. If there are no remote sites currently in place, it would be wise to establish some. The use of data loggers would also narrow the focus of equipment manufacturers and save time and money in data collection. Specific plans for radio-tracking are lacking in the proposal. Some additional plans need to be prepared in regards to tracking methods, frequency, and approach. --"The USFWS feels if the proposal can meet the above concerns and those raised by the ISRP, there are elements of the project that warrant funding." | Recommended Action |
| 28003 | Characterize and | Northwest | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | This activity is currently being funded under the | Recommended | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|--|--|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | Assess Wildlife-Habitat Types and Structural Conditions for Subbasins within the Mountain Snake Province | Habitat Institute | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment project at NWPPC. The need for expansion of this project to produce finer resolution within each province should be determined through the EDT assessment process. If that process determines that finer resolution is necessary for regional planning, then funding for expansion should be provided through the NWPPC subbasin assessment effort. | Action |
| 28005 | Assessment of spring/summer chinook salmon habitat within the Salmon River Subbasin. | USDA Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Geological Survey, Utah State University | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Although this proposal has been identified as a pilot project by the sponsor, select components are presently implemented through a USFS project that exists in the upper Columbia Basin. In addition, the sponsor indicated that the USFS spends \$500,000/year collecting such data. Although the USFS has been in communication with the IDFG, the USFS has not discussed the proposed work with the SBT due in part to the fact that the proposed work will be performed on federal lands. Due to the innovative nature of the project the reviewers recommend that the project sponsor submit the proposal for consideration in the Innovative Project process. | Recommended Action |
| 28006 | Tag and evaluate PIT-tag retention in sub-yearling chinook salmon | Biomark, Inc. | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | Y | N | NA | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | Thousands of fish of this size are tagged and released on a yearly basis; however, the managers have not expressed a concern regarding tag retention during this time period. Some reviewers suggest that research similar to what is being proposed may have already been performed by the agencies or tribes. Addresses RPA 174. | Recommended Action | |
| 28007 | Causes and effects of nonnative trout invasions in the Salmon and Clearwater River subbasins | USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | Reviewers suggest that benefits from this project will persist over the long-term only if the results/recommendations can be applied in a management scenario. Presently, there is little collaboration with the management agencies (i.e., this research was not sought by the managers). The managers acknowledge that the proposal is well written; however, the proposed work appears innovative and should be submitted for funding through the Innovative Project process. Project addresses RPAs 152 and 183. --The project is designed to investigate the ecological and genetic impacts of nonnative trout invasions at various spatial scales in the Salmon and Clearwater River subbasins. The multi-spatial scale approach by the sponsors could provide comprehensive information on the dynamics of trout invasions. --The RFC agrees with the broad-scale modeling approach (i.e., data collection and analysis) of Phase 1 of the study and strongly encourage the sponsor to coordinate in a more deliberate fashion with other agencies and ongoing efforts in the North Fork Clearwater. In addition, the | Recommended Action | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|---|--|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | habitat, and juxtaposition to public lands. The project sponsors have agreed to combine this proposal with Project Number 28018. During BPA contracting, if the projects are combined, the implementation schedule can be extended to 6 years and the total cost for both projects can be reduced by one half. | |
| 28011 | Incidental Mortality in Selective Sport Fisheries | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | Addresses RPA 167. The reviewers believe this proposal should be submitted for review through the Systemwide/Mainstem Province review due to systemwide implications. | Recommended Action |
| 28012 | Four-Step Planning to Identify Safety-Net Projects for Idaho Steelhead | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | Addresses RPA 175. There is a current effort to combine all 4-step process proposals into one unified effort to ensure that overlap and redundancy are avoided. Refer to Safety Net Artificial Production Program proposal. | Withdrawn-defer to SNAPP proposal |
| 28014 | Bull trout population assessment and life history characteristics in association with habitat quality and land use: template for recovery planning. | Utah Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, USGS | Salmon | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This proposal was not reviewed. Per the ISRP's request, the sponsors have resubmitted the proposal for review in just one subbasin (i.e., Imnaha Subbasin in the Blue Mountain Province (Proposal 27017)). | Withdrawn |
| 28015 | Benefit/Risk Analysis to Promote Long-Term Persistence of Chinook Salmon in the Middle Fork Salmon River | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | The Middle Fork Chinook population is regarded by the managers as depressed. In 2000, IDFG initiated a process to use a population viability model developed by the University of Idaho (UI). The UI model was not referenced in the proposal. The IDFG suggests that some of the proposed work has been performed by the IDFG. There is a current effort to combine all Four-Step process proposals (the Four-Step process is mandated in the BiOp) into one unified effort to ensure that overlap and redundancy are avoided. --Defer to the consolidated SNAPP proposal, in which the unique tasks from this proposal have been maintained. If the consolidated SNAPP proposal does not received funding, this proposal should be considered as a stand alone proposal for funding, as it was the only "original RPA 175/SNAPP type proposals" specifically addressing chinook salmon. The IDFG PVA analysis was not coordinated with NPT and was not available at time of proposal submittal. | Withdrawn-defer to SNAPP proposal |
| 28016 | Restoration of the Yankee Fork, Salmon River | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District, Idaho Governor's | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Although IDFG identified the Yankee Fork as a major source of sedimentation to the mainstem Salmon River, reviewers question the benefit/cost issue. The reviewers suggest that the proposed work appears expensive and are | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|---|--|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|--------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | | Office of Species Conservation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | concerned about the ability to achieve proposed goals in a timely manner. The work proposed is high priority, there are some concerns about the cost of implementation. | |
| 28018 | Lower Salmon River Tributary Protection and Enhancement | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPA 154. This proposal is linked to project 28010. Reviewers identified this proposed work to be a high priority if managers and stakeholders agree as to which easements should be purchased or are in agreement relative to the section of the plan that tentatively identifies properties that could be purchased. When funding this project, project 28010 funding levels should be considered. The development of the restoration plan should be a priority for this project. The Wildlife Committee rated the project as having significant wildlife benefits using the criteria of permanence, size, connectivity to other habitat, and juxtaposition to public lands. The project sponsors have agreed to combine this proposal with Project Number 28010. During BPA contracting, if the projects are combined, the implementation schedule can be extended to 6 years and the total cost for both projects can be reduced by one half. | High Priority |
| 28019 | Improve Stream Habitat by Reducing Discharge from Animal Feeding Operations | Idaho State Department of Agriculture / Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Sponsors suggest that the proposed work will provide the tool needed to reach the private landowners, a tool that is currently absent. Based on experience elsewhere in Idaho, the sponsors indicated that \$10,000-20,000/feedlot would be required to implement the prescribed corrective measures; however, the sponsors are unsure of the number of unregulated feed lots that would require corrective measures in the Salmon River subbasin and thus are unable to calculate the reduction of inputs that will occur until the cattle operations are identified. Based on conversations with the owners of the cattle operations, the sponsors anticipate the ability to address approximately 80% of the unregulated sites. Because the number of feedlots that may need corrective measures is unknown, the reviewers expressed concern whether the requested amount would be enough to correct all the identified operations. The sponsors indicated that they were unsure if the requested amount would be sufficient but also suggested that the funding request may exceed their needs. The sponsors indicated that there are no out-year costs associated with the proposed work since landowners and other programs are responsible for maintenance costs. Reviewers questioned why a needs assessment was not proposed as the first step for this proposed project. The sponsors suggested that implementing an assessment process could disturb the synergy that exists | Recommended Action |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|---|---|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|----------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | among the existing regulatory programs. The sponsors further stated that the Governor of Idaho has asked what actions could be taken relative to livestock that would immediately benefit fish and wildlife. The sponsors indicated that the fencing of unregulated feedlots is considered the best solution to addressing livestock induced problems. Although monitoring was not identified in the proposal, monitoring activities will be performed through other ongoing programs. The reviewers suggest there this a lack of coordination and believe the prioritization process could be enhanced through coordination with the state and tribes. The managers acknowledge that if the right operations are selected the tagged species will significantly benefit from the activity. Until the reviewers can be assured the work occurs in areas that the managers have identified as key areas, the reviewers are unable to recommend the proposal as a high priority. The reviewers suggest that through the TMDL process there is EPA money for this type of activity. Furthermore, reviewers question the benefit/cost issue and subsequently believe the proposed work appears expensive and are concerned about the ability to achieve the proposed goals in a timely manner. | |
| 28026 | Develop HGMP's for LSRCP Programs to address artificial production reforms identified in the FCRPS Biological Opinion and other regional processes. | US Fish and Wildlife Service, Lower Snake River Compensation Plan | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | Y | Y | NA | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | Development of the HGMP's (for the LSRCP program) are directed specifically to address hatchery reforms identified in the FCRPS BiOp (RPA 169). These reform measures are identified as reform measures that go beyond existing (or non-existing since they have not completed their hatchery production Biop.) NMFS jeopardy criteria (related to hatchery production programs) to obtain additional (off-site mitigation) benefits to get the hydrosystem out of jeopardy. The HGMP was chosen by NMFS, NWPPC, and Federal Caucus as the format for addressing those reforms. These reform actions (unless developed in the normal LSRCP process and fundable under our existing budget) are now mandated to the hydrosystem action agencies (not the LSRCP program). The proposal outlines a coordinated approach to 1) assess our existing programs, 2) identify potential reform measures, 3) coordinate those measures with the other ongoing regional processes (ESA, US v Oregon, NWPPC, etc. along with our tribal trust and compensation responsibilities), and 4) develop HGMP's for agreed upon reform measures. Presently, funding does not exist in the LSRCP budget to accomplish this task (and it is not a LSRCP | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | | |
|------------|---|---|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | funding responsibility). This proposal would provide all of the LSRCP co-managers the staff to accomplish the above objectives within the processes we are legally mandated to participate in to address off-site mitigation. Existing LSRCP programs are not legally mandated to develop HGMP's. | |
| 28030 | Salmon River Native Resident Fish Assessment | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Objective 1 (plan) is recommended as high priority and the implementation phase should be funded pending the completion/review and coordination of all management groups in the proposed study area. | High Priority (Obj 1) Recommended Action (all else) |
| 28034 | Chinook Salmon Smolt Survival and Smolt to Adult Return Rate Quantification, South Fork Salmon River, Idaho | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | NA | | This project addresses RPA 180. | High Priority |
| 28035 | Geomorphic controls on watershed-scale availability of Chinook salmon spawning habitat in the Salmon River | University of Idaho, USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | | This project should be incorporated into project number 199902000. See the comments for project 199902000. | Do not fund as stand alone project. See project 199902000. |
| 28036 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands in the Pahsimeroi Watershed, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149, 150 and 154. Similar to the ISRP's review, the CBFWA reviewed Proposals 28036, 28037, 28038, 28039, 28040 and 199901900 as a collection of proposals. Except for proposal 28039, all the proposed work would protect and enhance spawning habitat. Proposal 28039 would protect a migration corridor that is also characterized by the presence of rearing habitat, habitat types that do not exist in the other watersheds. The reviewers and project sponsors are in agreement with the ISRP regarding the development of a well-defined watershed assessment; however IDFG expressed concern that landowner support could be lost if additional planning efforts were required during the next couple of years at the expense of implementation. Recognizing that nearly 90% of the spawning activities occur on private lands, IDFG realizes landowner participation is essential to the management and conservation of the resources. As a result, managers have spent over a decade developing working relationships with private landowners through extensive planning processes. Based on their working relationships with the landowners, the managers indicated that requiring the development of assessments prior to implementing actions that have already been discussed/planned with the landowners will result in the loss of public | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|--|---|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | support and subsequently the inability to manage the areas that have been identified as critical through a decade of planning. Although the proposals have new project numbers they are ongoing projects (i.e., 199401700, 199306200, 19960700). The BPA COTR, who was present during the review, indicates that these proposals are not characterized by a change of scope. Although the tasks are considered a high priority, there is concern among CBFWA reviewers about the size of the proposed budgets and the ability to implement actions at the proposed rate. In each proposal, a professor, graduate student and writing contractor are identified. Are these separate individuals for each project? Could cost savings be achieved through coordination of these projects during funding? The budget for the implementation phase should be refined, as appropriate, based on the results of the assessment. The budget needs reconciling in terms of cost of assessments and scheduling of implementation tasks. | |
| 28037 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands in the Lemhi Watershed, Idaho | Lemhi Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149, 150, and 154. See comments for Project Number 28036. | High Priority |
| 28038 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands, East Fork Salmon Watershed, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149, 150, and 154. See comments for Project Number 28036. | High Priority |
| 28039 | Holistic Restoration of Habitat on Non-federal Lands, Middle Salmon-Panther Watershed, Idaho | Lemhi Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149, 150, and 154. See comments for Project Number 28036. | High Priority |
| 28040 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands, Upper Salmon Watershed, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149, 150, and 154. See comments for Project Number 28036. | High Priority |
| 28044 | Protect and Restore | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPA 154. This proposal | Recommended |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|--|---|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|------------------------------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | Deer Creek Watershed | Fisheries/Watershed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | will directly benefit redband trout; however, the presence of bull trout was not identified. Improved water quality will benefit anadromous fish located below the falls. The reservoir project is not currently planned for this area. | Action |
| 28049 | Restore and Protect Slate Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Slate Creek is a known production site for anadromous and resident fish. This project addresses RPA 400. | High Priority |
| 28050 | Protect and Restore Little Salmon River | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPA 149 and 154. The goal is to eventually establish anadromous fish populations above the falls where good habitat would have been established through this project. Although no biological monitoring is identified, it has been proposed for this site through Proposal 28045. The existing monitoring appears to be of low intensity and may not be sufficient since it is performed downstream of the implementation. Reviewers expressed concerns that there needs to be more intensive monitoring (e.g., fish presence/ absence and abundance). Monitoring of biological characters is important due to the due to the presence of resident fish (e.g., redband trout) at the site of implementation. The sponsors indicated that a plan to monitor biological parameters is currently being developed. | High Priority |
| 28051 | Assess and Monitor Steelhead in the Middle Fork Salmon River Subbasin | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | Although the IDFG has completed genetic analyses in this area, this project would complement and expand what has been completed to date. This project addresses RPA 179 and 180. | High Priority |
| 28052 | Adult Snake River steelhead monitoring in the South Fork Salmon River Basin. | Nez Perce Tribe/Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | Presently, adult steelhead monitoring (i.e., abundance trends of Snake River steelhead ESUs) occurs only at Lower Granite Dam. Reviewers suggested that population specific information (e.g., status and viability) is needed for the development of management actions. The NMFS BiOp (2000) also identified the need for accurate population abundance. This project addresses RPAs 179, 180 and 193. | High Priority |
| 28054 | Evaluation of Pisces Fish Protective Guidance and Monitoring System | Balaton Power, Inc. | Salmon | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not part of this province - referred to Upper Snake Province. Project sponsor should resubmit proposal in the Upper Snake Province solicitation. | Defer to Upper Snake Province |
| 28056 | Four-Step Safety-Net Plan for South Fork Salmon River B-Run Steelhead | Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | Addresses RPA 175. There is a current effort to combine all 4-step process proposals into one unified effort to ensure that overlap and redundancy are avoided. Refer to Safety Net Artificial Production Program proposal. | Withdrawn, defer to SNAPP proposal |
| 28057 | Four-Step Safety-Net Plan for Lower Salmon River A-Run Steelhead | Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | Addresses RPA 175. There is a current effort to combine all 4-step process proposals into one unified effort to ensure that overlap and redundancy are avoided. Refer to Safety Net Artificial Production Program proposal. | Withdrawn, defer to SNAPP proposal |
| 28058 | Restore Fish Passage and Habitat on the | Idaho Department of | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149. Although monitoring does not exist in the proposal, activities would take | Recommended Action |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | | |
|------------|--|--|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | | |
| | Upper East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River | Environmental Quality - Idaho Office of Species Conservation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | place through other projects funded outside the BPA process. Removal of the passage barrier would allow passage to areas suitable for anadromous fish spawning as well for use by fluvial bull trout. This project will immediately provide information for the management of bull trout and cutthroat trout and eventually anadromous fish. Reviewers question why the removal of this barrier is now a desire of the sponsor. The IDFG, NPT, and NMFS support the concept that has been proposed but NPT questions the priority of the removal versus other proposed actions that have been submitted by proposal sponsors. --The RFC expressed concern relative to the lack of inclusion of fisheries information. The RFC suggests that without specific goals and objectives related to fisheries benefits this project should not be funded. If specific fisheries goals and objectives can be determined than this project could be considered as a recommended action if the proponents address information about downstream effects and hazards as a result of this large scale project. Until downstream effects are better addressed the RFC questions whether possible downstream damage might out weigh up stream gains. In addition, the RFC questions whether the work could be completed in one year as proposed. The RFC believes the tie to the Federal Hydropower system is unconvincing. | |
| 198909800 | Idaho Supplementation Studies | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | ? | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPAs 174, 182 and 184. | High Priority | |
| 198909801 | Evaluate Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers (ISS) | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Idaho Fishery Resource Office | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPAs 174, 182 and 184. | High Priority | |
| 198909802 | Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers- Nez Perce Tribe | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | ? | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPAs 174, 182 and 184. | High Priority | | |
| 198909803 | Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho-Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | ? | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPAs 174, 182 and 184. | High Priority | | |
| 199102800 | Monitoring smolt migrations of wild Snake River sp/sum chinook salmon | National Marine Fisheries Service | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | Reviewers question the duration of projects of this type and its duplicative nature. In addition, the reviewers question how much this type of work should be continued. These concerns have | High Priority | | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|--|---|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | also been expressed, in the past, by the Fish Passage Center. This project addresses RPA 190. | |
| 199107100 | Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPAs 184 and 185. | High Priority |
| 199107200 | Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | This project is considered a BASE project by NMFS since it contributed to the baseline survival of sockeye salmon during the generation of the Biological Opinion. Some managers believe the project goals/target could be firmer. | High Priority |
| 199107300* | Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPAs 180 and 190. | High Priority |
| 199202603 | Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project Administration/Implementation Support | Idaho Soil Conservation Commission and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPAs 152 and 154. The reviewers are curious how the administrative costs in this proposal tie in with the significant administrative costs included in project numbers 28036, 28037, 28038, 28039, and 28040. Watershed assessments have been requested for the past several years. Are those assessments being completed? | High Priority |
| 199204000 | Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research | National Marine Fisheries Service | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | This project is considered a BASE project by NMFS since it contributed to the baseline survival of sockeye salmon during the generation of the Biological Opinion. The NMFS is currently under a lease that has contract language that allows for the lease to be terminated with a 90-day notice, language that subsequently gives the owner flexibility for purposes of selling the property. Presently, the owner of the property is actively marketing the property as "for sale." The property, which has been identified as desirable for development, is located in Kitsap County, one of the fastest growing counties in the Washington. The NMFS conducted a survey of other existing facilities throughout western Washington and identified this site as the most acceptable based on issues such as water availability, water quality, etc. The market analysis by NMFS indicated that the property is worth \$850,000 for a lease purpose. Presently, there are no other hatcheries that could provide the facilities required to raise this particular group of fish. | High Priority |
| 199401500 | Idaho Fish Screen Improvement | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | A new position has been established/filled to develop and implement an M&E program. In addition, an element of the program will be to construct and maintain fences around the screening facilities. This program is essential to the continued protection/management of | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category |
|------------|--|---|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | protected species/populations. This projects addresses RPAs 149 and 500. | |
| 199405000 | Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M & E | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | Y | This project addresses RPAs 150, 152 and 183. | High Priority |
| 199604300 | Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Project | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | This project is considered a BASE project by NMFS. | High Priority |
| 199700100 | Captive Rearing Project for Salmon River Chinook Salmon | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | The results from this work will significantly benefit the target populations. This project has had significant peer review and is guided by a technical oversight committee. This project is considered a BASE project by NMFS in regards to the 2000 Biological Opinion. This project should eventually be tied into the Safety Net Artificial Production Program (SNAPP) process. | High Priority |
| 199703000 | Chinook Salmon Adult Abundance Monitoring | Nez Perce Tribe/Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPAs 180 and 193. | High Priority |
| 199703800 | Preserve Salmonid Gametes and Establish a Regional Salmonid Germplasm Repository | Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resources Management | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | Academic, management, and regulatory agencies have discussed and conferred the merits of a regional program such as what is proposed in this work. This project addresses RPA 177. The significant increase in budget is due to capital construction of a regional germ plasm repository facility. | High Priority |
| 199901900* | Holistic Restoration of the Twelvemile Reach of the Salmon River near Challis, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District/Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Addresses RPA 149 and 152. Similar to the ISRP's review, the CBFWA reviewed Proposals 28036, 28037, 28038, 28039, 28040 and 199901900 as a collection of proposals. These budgets are a significant portion of the total Salmon subbasin budget and need additional scrutiny. The reviewers and project sponsors are in agreement with the ISRP regarding the need for the development of a well-defined watershed assessment; however the managers expressed concern that landowner support could be lost if additional planning efforts were required during the next couple of years at the expense of implementation. Recognizing that nearly 90% of the spawning activities occur on private lands, the managers realize landowner participation is essential to the management and conservation of the resources. As a result, the managers have spent over a decade developing working relationships with private landowners through extensive planning processes. Based on their working relationships with the landowners, the managers indicated that requiring the development of assessments prior to implementing actions that have already been | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|--|--|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | discussed/planned with the landowners will result in the loss of public support and subsequently the inability to manage the areas that have been identified as critical through a decade of planning. Although the proposals have new project numbers they are ongoing projects (i.e., 199401700, 199306200 19960700). The BPA COTR, who was present during the review, indicates that these proposals are not characterized by a change of scope, however there was significant disagreement with this statement. Although the tasks are considered a high priority, there is concern among CBFWA reviewers about the size of the proposed budgets and the ability to implement actions at the proposed rate. In each proposal the same writing contractor and the University of Idaho is identified. Are the U of I employees separate individuals for each project? Baseline M&E (i.e., juvenile counts and redd counts since 1998 and physical data collection since 1985) data is being collected through IDFG activities Detailed M&E plans have not been developed to date but will be developed as the project moves forward. Data collected to date show that rearing populations are higher then elsewhere and that by opening the side-channels the population will greatly benefit. The sponsor understands a watershed assessment is important and indicated that other agencies are working towards performing the activity. Considering the magnitude of implementation proposed, the sponsor should seek CREP implementation funding as cost share as has been done by similar SWCD proposals in the Columbia Plateau Province. See comments for Project 28036. | | |
| 199902000 | Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon | USDA Forest Service- Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | NA | This project addresses RPA 180. During this past year, this project has been funded at 1/2 the required budget (i.e., \$50,000 of the needed/ approved \$100,000). The sponsors indicated is they only receive \$50,000/year in the upcoming years the funding level will be insufficient to allow them to continue the proposed work in the original proposal. Reviewers suggest that the Project meets critical needs for long-term monitoring, indexing, acquisition of life history information, and analysis of the spatial structure of a wild chinook salmon population. The reviewers identified similarities between Objective 4 and work proposed in proposal 28035. Sponsors of Project 199902000 recognized that the existing tasks (i.e., strategies to achieve the task) were inadequate to meet Objective 4. Although completing the existing tasks under Objective 4 would produce useful | High Priority |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | |
|------------|-------|---------|----------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>preliminary information, the analysis would be incomplete and difficult to defend in the physical sciences community. As a result, Objective 4 was refined into a Proposal 28035. The refined approach for addressing Objective 4 examines the physical controls of basin hydrology and sediment supply on spawning habitat availability at watershed scales. The extensive spawning habitat data available for the Middle Fork Salmon River through Project # 199902000 provides an excellent test site for the physical model. The model is robust, however, and once validated can be applied to any river basin. The model could have immediate use for identifying critical habitats and examining scenarios for best management practices for maintaining or optimizing spawning habitat. Moreover, the model would provide a physically-based, defensible method for assessing spawning habitat and prioritizing management actions at watershed scales.</p> <p>--Per the reviewers request, the following tasks from Proposal 28035 should be considered for funding through Objective 4 of 199902000:</p> <p>--Objective 4. Relate the location, size, and quality of spawning patches to basin geomorphic features.</p> <p>Task a. Compile databases to describe basin landscape features.</p> <p>--Task b. Develop models to predict patch distribution and empirically validate models.</p> <p>--Subtask b.1. Predict grain size and the spatial distribution of suitable spawning habitat as a function of channel hydraulics and boundary shear stress.</p> <p>--b.1.1. Determine baneful flow depth and channel slope at watershed scales.</p> <p>--b.1.2. Determine grain sizes suitable for chinook spawning.</p> <p>--Subtask b.2. Modify predictions of grain size and spawning habitat availability to account for channel type and consequent hydraulic roughness.</p> <p>--b.2.1. Predict and field verify channel type, hydraulic roughness, and consequent modification of surface grain size.</p> <p>--Subtask b.3. Quantify the effects of sediment supply on surface grain size and spawning habitat availability.</p> <p>--b.3.1. Identify sources and magnitudes of sediment supply.</p> <p>--b.3.2. Model the long-term effects on spawning habitat availability due to sediment input and routing through the channel network.</p> <p>--Subtask b.4. Validate predictions of grain size</p> | |

| Project ID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Technical Criteria | | | | | | | | Management Criteria | | | | | | | Project Review Comments | CBFWA Category | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|----------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | and spawning habitat availability. --The cost savings resulting from the merger of these two Projects would total \$30,841 (\$18,636 for Project # 28035 and \$11,845 for Project # 199902000). If this project is not fully funded, Objective 4 is the lowest priority task. | |
| 28061 | Safety-Net Artificial Production Program (SNAPP) | CRITFC, NPT, SBT, NMFS, IDFG, CTUIR | Mountain Snake Province | Y | Y | Y | NA | NA | Y | NA | Y | Y | Y | NA | N | Y | Y | NA | | | This proposal combines all safety net projects for the Mountain Snake and Blue Mountain Province. This project addresses RPA 175. | High Priority |
| *Revised budget submitted as part of response to ISRP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix B. The CBFWA 3-Year Project Recommendations for the Mountain Snake Province.

| ProjectID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Total of 2002 | Total Of 2003 | Total Of 2004 |
|----------------------------|--|--|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Clearwater Subbasin | | | | | | |
| 28004 | Lawyer Creek Subwatershed-Steelhead Trout Habitat Improvement Project | Lewis Soil Conservation District | Clearwater | \$246,500.00 | \$216,500.00 | \$216,500.00 |
| 28013 | RENOVATE SELWAY FALLS ANADROMOUS FISH PASSAGE TUNNEL | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | \$344,700.00 | | |
| 28017 | Monitoring the Selway Falls renovation project for passage of spring chinook salmon and steelhead | Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Clearwater | \$134,350.00 | \$138,165.00 | \$141,477.00 |
| 28020 | Nez Perce Tribe Harvest Monitoring Program | Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resource Management | Clearwater | \$326,646.00 | 343232 | 360128 |
| 28021 | Lower Clearwater Habitat Enhancement Project | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$1,428,000.00 | \$7,395,000.00 | \$1,203,000.00 |
| 28025 | Potlatch River Watershed Restoration | Latah Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | \$505,125.00 | \$418,750.00 | \$378,750.00 |
| 28029 | Restore Lawyer Creek Habitat Targeting Steelhead and Chinook Salmon | Clearwater Economic Development Association | Clearwater | \$342,750.00 | 754210 | 798351 |
| 28031 | Evaluation of Unclipped Hatchery Steelhead Released in the Clearwater and Salmon River Basins | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Clearwater | \$484,993.00 | \$278,990.00 | \$274,046.00 |
| 28032 | ASSESSMENT OF A-RUN STEELHEAD POPULATIONS IN THE CLEARWATER RIVER BASIN | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$686,800.00 | 505800 | 531090 |
| 28033 | Monitoring and evaluating coho salmon reintroduction in the Clearwater River Basin | Nez Perce Tribe, Department of Fisheries Resources Management | Clearwater | \$240,000.00 | \$240,000.00 | \$240,000.00 |
| 28041 | Dworshak Zooplankton Entrainment | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$434,463.00 | 496463 | 252000 |
| 28042 | Timing and location of spawning by pure and introgressed cutthroat trout in the North Fork Clearwater River | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$311,878.00 | \$312,910.00 | \$312,910.00 |
| 28043 | Crooked River Ecosystem Assessment at the Watershed Scale | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed | Clearwater | \$131,213.00 | 150000 | 320000 |
| 28045 | Evaluating stream habitat using the Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed Watershed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries and Watershed | Clearwater | \$381,108.00 | \$404,700.00 | \$404,900.00 |
| 28046 | Impacts of Salmon Carcasses on Chinook Salmon and Watershed Restoration in Subbasins of the Clearwater River | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries/Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$179,002.00 | 275000 | 302500 |
| 28047 | Restore and Protect Red River Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed | Clearwater | \$199,567.00 | \$183,821.00 | \$387,574.00 |
| 28048 | Protect and Restore Crooked Fork Creek to Colt Killed Analysis Area | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries and Watershed | Clearwater | \$423,365.00 | 556200 | 577500 |

| ProjectID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Total of 2002 | Total Of 2003 | Total Of 2004 |
|-----------|---|--|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 28059 | Restoring anadromous fish habitat in the Lapwai Creek watershed. | Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | \$372,060.00 | 297028 | 292028 |
| 28060 | Assess Stream Quality for Salmonid Recovery in the Lower Clearwater Subbasin | Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | \$95,148.00 | \$50,500.00 | \$19,000.00 |
| 198335000 | Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$3,485,000.00 | 2325000 | 4435000 |
| 198335003 | Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring And Evaluation | Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resources Management | Clearwater | \$1,974,430.00 | \$2,050,129.00 | \$2,152,635.00 |
| 198740700 | Dworshak Integrated Rule Curves/M&E | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$201,291.00 | 170000 | 170000 |
| 199005500 | Steelhead Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | \$686,307.00 | \$686,307.00 | \$637,145.00 |
| 199303501 | Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed | Idaho County Soil and Water Conservation District | Clearwater | \$561,000.00 | 552000 | 553000 |
| 199501300 | Resident Fish Substitution Program | Nez Perce Tribe | Clearwater | \$243,355.00 | \$410,656.00 | \$418,175.00 |
| 199607702 | Protect and Restore Lolo Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$502,192.00 | 712924 | 709805 |
| 199607703 | Protecting and Restoring the Waw'aatamnima (Fishing)(Squaw) Creek to 'Imnaamatnoon (Legendary Bear)(Papoose) Creek Watersheds Analysis Area | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$489,300.00 | \$506,300.00 | \$522,900.00 |
| 199607705 | Restore McComas Meadows/Meadow Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$573,832.00 | 326482 | 320987 |
| 199608600 | Clearwater Focus Program | Idaho Soil Conservation Commission | Clearwater | \$103,626.00 | \$103,626.00 | \$103,626.00 |
| 199706000 | Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries/Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$218,000.00 | 233000 | 251000 |
| 199901400 | Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed-Steelhead Trout Habitat Improvement Project | Lewis Soil Conservation District | Clearwater | \$236,500.00 | \$206,500.00 | \$206,500.00 |
| 199901500 | Restoring Anadromous Fish Habitat in Big Canyon Watershed | Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District 3113 East Main Street Lewiston, Idaho 83501 | Clearwater | \$203,452.00 | 203452 | 203452 |
| 199901600 | Protect and Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$355,000.00 | \$641,700.00 | \$591,600.00 |
| 199901700 | Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$436,600.00 | 641700 | 591600 |
| 199901800 | Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Clearwater | \$101,950.00 | \$33,000.00 | |
| 200002800 | Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Spec. Conserv. | Clearwater | \$144,550.00 | 160000 | 160000 |

| ProjectID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Total of 2002 | Total Of 2003 | Total Of 2004 |
|------------------------|--|--|------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| 200003400 | Protect and Restore The North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds | Nez Perce Tribal Fisheries/Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$285,835.00 | \$330,710.00 | \$380,317.00 |
| 200003500 | Rehabilitate Newsome Creek Watershed - South Fork Clearwater River | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed | Clearwater | \$287,732.00 | 431014 | 705588 |
| 200003600 | Protect & Restore Mill Creek | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed Program | Clearwater | \$105,560.00 | \$184,718.00 | \$192,233.00 |
| 28022* | Evaluate Bull Trout Life History In Dworshak Reservoir, N.F. Clearwater River Drainage, ID | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Clearwater | \$133,000.00 | 133000 | 133000 |
| 28023* | Evaluate and Control Brook Trout Populations – Addressing Competition and Hybridization Threats in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho. | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Clearwater | \$153,800.00 | \$183,800.00 | \$180,000.00 |
| 198709900* | Dworshak Dam Impacts Assessment and Fisheries Investigation | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Clearwater | \$344,200.00 | 357000 | 290000 |
| | | | Total | 19094180 | 24600287 | 20920317 |
| | | | | | | |
| Salmon Subbasin | | | | | | |
| 28001 | Evaluate Factors Influencing Bias and Precision of Chinook Salmon Redd Counts | USDA Forest Service- Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | \$198,738.00 | 208675 | 219109 |
| 28002 | Fluvial Bull Trout Migration and Life History Investigations in the upper Salmon River Subbasin | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | \$163,440.00 | \$143,000.00 | \$145,000.00 |
| 28003 | Characterize and Assess Wildlife-Habitat Types and Structural Conditions for Subbasins within the Mountain Snake Province | Northwest Habitat Institute | Salmon | \$375,935.00 | 363854 | 378408 |
| 28006 | Tag and evaluate PIT-tag retention in sub-yearling chinook salmon | Biomark, Inc. | Salmon | \$82,044.00 | | |
| 28007 | Causes and effects of nonnative trout invasions in the Salmon and Clearwater River subbasins | USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | \$64,900.00 | \$303,000.00 | \$309,000.00 |
| 28008 | Riparian Conservation Easement Purchase of Scarrow Property on Lake Creek a Tributary to the Secesh River, Idaho. | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$68,500.00 | | |
| 28009 | Smolt Condition and Adult Returns: An Indirect Method of Assessing the Potential Mitigation Benefits of Nutrient Enhancement Projects | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$44,600.00 | | |
| 28010 | Nez Perce Salmon River Terrestrial | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | \$2,801,996.00 | 2955486 | 3069260 |
| 28011 | Incidental Mortality in Selective Sport Fisheries | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$200,000.00 | \$200,000.00 | \$300,000.00 |

| ProjectID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Total of 2002 | Total Of 2003 | Total Of 2004 |
|-----------|---|---|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 28016 | RESTORATION OF THE YANKEE FORK SALMON RIVER | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District, Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$799,785.00 | \$1,226,860.00 | \$1,186,860.00 |
| 28018 | Lower Salmon River Tributary Protection and Enhancement | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Salmon | \$101,000.00 | 406000 | 541000 |
| 28019 | Improve Stream Habitat by Reducing Discharge from Animal Feeding Operations | Idaho State Department of Agriculture / Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$2,026,000.00 | | |
| 28026 | Develop HGMP's for LSRCP Programs to address artificial production reforms identified in the FCRPS Biological Opinion and other regional processes. | US Fish and Wildlife Service, Lower Snake River Compensation Plan | Salmon | \$856,292.00 | 899107 | |
| 28030 | Salmon River Native Resident Fish Assessment | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$250,000.00 | \$200,000.00 | \$200,000.00 |
| 28034 | Chinook Salmon Smolt Survival and Smolt to Adult Return Rate Quantification, South Fork Salmon River, Idaho | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | \$660,000.00 | 600000 | 630000 |
| 28036 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands in the Pahsimeroi Watershed, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$2,606,341.00 | 2623700 | 2696000 |
| 28037 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands in the Lemhi Watershed, Idaho | Lemhi Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$3,238,682.00 | \$3,257,000.00 | \$3,343,500.00 |
| 28038 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands, East Fork Salmon Watershed, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$2,608,084.00 | 2604300 | 2667600 |
| 28039 | Holistic Restoration of Habitat on Non-federal Lands, Middle Salmon-Panther Watershed, Idaho | Lemhi Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$1,863,326.00 | \$1,881,500.00 | \$1,943,700.00 |
| 28040 | Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands, Upper Salmon Watershed, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District / Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$2,567,545.00 | 2599500 | 2680000 |
| 28044 | Protect and Restore Deer Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed | Salmon | \$155,213.00 | \$184,000.00 | \$330,000.00 |
| 28049 | Restore and Protect Slate Creek Watershed | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries Watershed | Salmon | \$231,841.00 | 422554 | 311704 |
| 28050 | Protect and Restore Little Salmon River | Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed | Salmon | \$262,896.00 | \$155,048.00 | \$142,594.00 |
| 28051 | Assess and Monitor Steelhead in the Middle Fork Salmon River Subbasin | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | \$416,147.00 | 406954 | 427301 |
| 28052 | Adult Snake River steelhead monitoring in the South Fork Salmon River Basin. | Nez Perce Tribe/Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Salmon | \$708,000.00 | \$474,000.00 | \$495,000.00 |
| 28058 | Restore Fish Passage and Habitat on the Upper East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River | Idaho Department of Environmental Quality - Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$842,000.00 | \$31,000.00 | \$21,000.00 |

| ProjectID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Total of 2002 | Total Of 2003 | Total Of 2004 |
|------------|--|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 198909800 | Idaho Supplementation Studies | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$996,726.00 | 985000 | 990000 |
| 198909801 | Evaluate Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers (ISS) | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Idaho Fishery Resource Office | Salmon | \$126,320.00 | \$140,000.00 | \$140,000.00 |
| 198909802 | Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers- Nez Perce Tribe | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | \$676,476.00 | 644750 | 676988 |
| 198909803 | Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho-Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | \$213,569.00 | \$229,322.00 | \$240,767.00 |
| 199102800 | Monitoring smolt migrations of wild Snake River sp/sum chinook salmon | National Marine Fisheries Service | Salmon | \$350,000.00 | 350000 | 350000 |
| 199107100 | Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | \$441,369.00 | \$454,420.00 | \$474,769.00 |
| 199107200 | Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$853,229.00 | 1312821 | 878470 |
| 199202603 | Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project Administration/Implementation Support | Idaho Soil Conservation Commission and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$285,364.00 | 290000 | 295000 |
| 199204000 | Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research | National Marine Fisheries Service | Salmon | \$1,600,000.00 | \$780,000.00 | \$811,200.00 |
| 199401500 | Idaho Fish Screen Improvement | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$1,000,000.00 | 1048550 | 1099500 |
| 199405000 | Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M & E | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes | Salmon | \$249,500.00 | \$260,000.00 | \$245,500.00 |
| 199604300 | Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Project | Nez Perce Tribe | Salmon | \$4,410,100.00 | 1136750 | 1193838 |
| 199700100 | Captive Rearing Project for Salmon River Chinook Salmon | Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$750,482.00 | \$1,800,000.00 | \$1,500,000.00 |
| 199703000 | Chinook Salmon Adult Abundance Monitoring | Nez Perce Tribe/Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Salmon | \$1,033,000.00 | 914000 | 772000 |
| 199703800 | Preserve Salmonid Gametes and Establish a Regional Salmonid Germplasm Repository | Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries Resources Management | Salmon | \$1,279,000.00 | \$2,094,000.00 | \$1,010,000.00 |
| 199902000 | Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon | USDA Forest Service- Rocky Mountain Research Station | Salmon | \$215,194.00 | \$215,194.00 | \$215,194.00 |
| 199107300* | Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation | Idaho Department of Fish and Game | Salmon | \$831,000.00 | \$969,000.00 | \$945,000.00 |
| 199901900* | Holistic Restoration of the Twelvemile Reach of the Salmon River near Challis, Idaho | Custer Soil & Water Conservation District/Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation | Salmon | \$1,844,000.00 | 1784000 | 1784000 |
| 28005 | Assessment of spring/summer chinook salmon habitat within the Salmon River Subbasin. | USDA Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Geological Survey, Utah State University | Salmon | \$115,750.00 | | |
| | | | Total | 41464384 | 37553345 | 35659262 |

| ProjectID | Title | Sponsor | Subbasin | Total of 2002 | Total Of 2003 | Total Of 2004 |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| All Subbasins | | | | | | |
| 28061 | Safety-Net Artificial Production Program (SNAPP) | CRITFC, NPT, SBT, NMFS, IDFG, CTUIR | all | \$523,000.00 | \$300,000.00 | 0 |
| | | | | \$523,000.00 | \$300,000.00 | 0 |
| *Revised budget submitted as part of response to ISRP | | | | TOTAL | 61081564 | 62453632 |

h:\work\province\MtnSnake\113001Final\Appendices A&B.doc