Draft FY 2003-2005 Upper Snake River Province Work Plan

Prepared for the
Northwest Power Planning Council

by the
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority

May 17, 2002

Draft FY 2003-2005 Upper Snake River Province Work Plan

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Table of Figures

Introduction

The Rolling Provincial Review process was developed by the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) in February 2000 in response to recommendations by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) and the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA). Under this new province based process each individual project proposal within a province will be reviewed for technical merit and management relevance every three years. Under the previous process all project proposals for Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) funding under the Fish and Wildlife Program were reviewed annually. The purpose of the NWPPC's new multi-year process is to reduce the burden of reviewing large numbers of proposals, most of which had been reviewed just one year before, and to provide for a more thorough review of the project proposals in the context of a subbasin summary. Additionally, the process is intended to provide the opportunity for site visits by reviewers, project presentations with a question and answer period, and provide reviewers with more detailed background and planning documents which will reduce the reviewer's reliance strictly on the proposal form.

The subbasin summaries developed under this process are intended to be interim and will be replaced by subbasin plans developed to meet requirements of the recently amended Fish and Wildlife Program. The Upper Snake River Province was the eighth province to be reviewed under this new process. The results of this review are summarized here.

This document was developed collaboratively by the NWPPC staff, ISRP, fish and wildlife managers, other stakeholders, and CBFWA staff, culminating in project and budget recommendations for FY 2003-2005. The subbasin summaries are provided only as context for the project recommendations.

The CBFWA process for providing these recommendations utilized the ISRP preliminary findings and integrated manager evaluations of the technical and management merits of the project proposals relative to anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife management needs, and the goals and objectives identified in the subbasin summaries. A total of 13 project proposals were submitted and reviewed with one proposal (i.e., 33013) receiving a "Do Not Fund" recommendation. In addition, three proposals (i.e., 33012, 33005, and 33006) were withdrawn by the project sponsors. The recommended projects address needs identified in the subbasin summaries and include nine new and three ongoing projects totaling $9.4 million.

This draft work plan includes the subbasin summaries, which describe the physical and biological characteristics of each subbasin within the Upper Snake River Province. The summaries also identify past accomplishments, limiting factors, management objectives and strategies, current needs and recommended budgets for project implementation.

Geographic Description

The Upper Snake River Province (Figure 1) is located in southeastern Idaho and western Wyoming. It includes the Snake River and all tributaries from Shoshone Falls to headwaters, all closed basins within the Columbia Basin east of Shoshone Falls.

Figure 1. Upper Snake River Province

Project Review Process

Subbasin Summaries

The Upper Snake River Province Review was initiated at an August 3, 2001, meeting in Pocatello, Idaho. An invitation was sent to an extensive distribution list to encourage all interested parties (i.e. land and water managers, representatives of watershed councils, etc.) to attend and provide input. The purpose of this first meeting was to provide all interested parties with the opportunity to identify sources of information necessary for the development of subbasin summaries for this province (i.e. monitoring data, habitat restoration results, existing assessments, etc.). The intent was to ensure BPA expenditures for fish and wildlife projects compliment and enhance existing efforts and ensure that priority needs are addressed. Subsequent meetings were held to review draft summaries and identify goals and objectives.

Previously, ecosystem summaries for each subbasin were developed as a means of providing context for project proposals. Under the new process, a more formal structure with subbasin teams was formed to develop the more comprehensive subbasin summaries of the newly identified provinces. Other local interested parties also provided input to and participated on the subbasin teams (i.e. other land and water managers, representatives from watershed councils, etc.).

Subbasin summaries for the Upper Snake River Province were completed in October 2001. The BPA issued the solicitation for project proposals for the Upper Snake River Province on November 8, 2001, with project proposals due December 21, 2001. The project sponsors were asked to show a direct tie between their projects and the needs identified in the subbasin summaries.

Review by the ISRP

The ISRP reviewed 16 project proposals for the Upper Snake River Province. To ensure a consistent and fair evaluation, standard formats and criteria were applied to all proposals to generate comments and scores prior to the proposal review workshop. These scores and comments were not made available to the project sponsors at the workshop, but were used by the ISRP to develop questions for the site visits and workshop presentations. The workshops consisted of site visits and project presentations.

Site Visits (October 9-10, 2001)

The ISRP, subbasin teams, fish and wildlife managers, the CBFWA province review team and other stakeholders toured the province to gain a better understanding of the existing ecological conditions and limiting factors as well as view some ongoing projects in each subbasin. During the tour, managers provided oral presentations for areas/projects within the province that the group was unable to visit.

Project Presentation (January 22-23, 2002)

Prior to the presentation of individual project proposals, subbasin team leaders provided a general overview for their respective summaries. Following each subbasin summary

presentation, project proposals relative to that subbasin were presented to the ISRP, CBFWA province review team, fish and wildlife managers, NWPPC staff, CBFWA staff and other stakeholders. All project sponsors were provided 15 minutes to present their proposal and answer questions. During this review, the CBFWA province review team applied Subbasin Project Review Criteria (Table 1) to each project. Every effort was made to be consistent among all project proposals reviewed.

Table 1. The CBFWA subbasin project review criteria.

Technical Criteria	
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	**Y or N**
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	**Y or N**
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	**Y or N**
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	**Y or N**
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	**Y or N**
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	**Y or N**
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	**Y or N**
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	**Y or N**
Management Criteria	
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin summaries?	**Y or N**
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	**Y or N**
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	**Y or N**
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	**Y or N**
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	**Y or N**
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	**Y or N**
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	**Y or N**

Preliminary ISRP Report

On March 1, 2002, the ISRP released a *Preliminary Review of Fiscal Year 2003 Project Proposals for the Upper and Middle Snake, Columbia Cascade, and Lower Columbia and Estuary Provinces* (ISRP 2002-2 at NWPPC). This report summarized the ISRP's preliminary review of each project proposal and identified areas of concern where they had requested a written response to questions. The due date for written responses to this report was March 15, 2002.

CBFWA Province Review Group

During April 3-4, 2002, the CBFWA Province Review Group reviewed all project proposals within the province using criteria listed in Table 1 which resulted in a consensus Yes or No. Subbasin team members also participated in the review of the project proposals. The following elements were considered during the review:

- How well does the project relate to the criteria (Table 1)
- Validation of existing work- is the current funding level appropriate (Section 6 O&M and Section 7 M&E of existing projects)? Is it appropriate to continue implementation of existing work (Section 4 P&D and Section 5 C&I of existing projects)?
- Evaluation of proposed new work- does a new project proposal demonstrate a priority need over implementation strategies within existing projects (Sections 4 and 5 of existing projects)?

Project proposals were grouped by subbasin during their review. The preliminary ISRP technical review of all proposals was utilized while discussing the technical merits of each project. Following the technical and management review, the project proposals were prioritized within each subbasin according to the fish and wildlife needs within that subbasin. The following definitions were used for the subbasin prioritization:

- High Priority - These projects or tasks within a project are high priority within the subbasin. The project addresses a specific need within the subbasin summaries.
- Recommended Actions - These are good projects that cannot demonstrate a significant loss by not funding this year. These projects should be funded, but under a limited budget could be delayed temporarily without significant loss.
- Do not fund - These projects are either technically inadequate or do not address a need within the subbasin summaries. These projects may be inappropriate for BPA funding.

CBFWA Review and Approval of Project Recommendations and Subbasin Summaries

The final step in the project proposal review process was the consensus approval of the project recommendations by CBFWA Members. The CBFWA Members Review and the recommendations in the subbasin summaries and province work plan demonstrate regional support by the fish and wildlife managers.

On April 22, 23, and 24, 2002, the province recommendations and subbasin summaries were discussed in the CBFWA Wildlife, Resident Fish, and Anadromous Fish committees, respectively. The committees made some modifications to the province recommendations based on technical or regional management concerns.

Proposal Review Results

A total of 13 project proposals were reviewed in the Upper Snake River Province (10 ongoing projects and three new proposals, (Appendix A)). Three proposals (i.e., 33012, 33005, and 33006) were withdrawn by the project sponsors. Of the 13 proposals, only Project Proposal 33013 was categorized as "Do Not Fund."

Project Proposal 33013, *Evaluation of Pisces Fish Protective Water Intake System*, lacked of cost share and coordination with IDFG. In addition, reviewers questioned whether it is appropriate for BPA funds to be used in the development of a product that the reviewers perceived will then be sold for profit. The reviewers recommended that the proposal be submitted for consideration in the Mainstem/Systemwide Province and/or through the Innovative Process.

Three-year Budget Recommendation

Appendix B provides a three-year funding recommendation for the Upper Snake River Province that strives to meet the goals, objectives and needs of the Province. A total of 12 projects that address needs identified in the subbasin summaries are recommended for funding and include new and ongoing projects totaling $9.4 million for Fiscal Year 2003. All of the projects recommended here should be initiated within the next three years.

Upper Snake River Headwaters Subbasin (Headwater)

One existing project is recommended for continued funding in the Headwater Subbasin (Table 2). Project 199505700, *Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation – Upper Snake* will continue to protect, enhance, restore, and maintain wildlife habitats to mitigate for construction losses at Palisades and Minidoka dams.

One new project proposal is recommended for funding in this subbasin (Table 2). Project Proposal 33009, *Improve Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout Recruitment and Survival in the South Fork of the Snake River*, will allow for the initiation of work that will increase juvenile cutthroat trout recruitment and survival in the South Fork of the Snake River by minimizing entrainment losses and side channel stranding mortality, and restoring tributary habitat.

Table 2. Projects recommended for funding in the Upper Snake River Headwaters Subbasin

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor
199505700	*Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation – Upper Snake*	IDFG
33009	*Improve Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout Recruitment and Survival in the South Fork of the Snake River*	IDFG

The suite of recommended project proposals addresses the key needs identified in the Headwater Subbasin Summary including:

- Management and removal of non-native plant invasions
- Management of wild lands for fire suppression and other practices which have greatly reduced the extent and health of open ponderosa pine habitat.
- Restore the dry, open, multi-aged ponderosa pine system.
- Maintain and restore a dynamic sagebrush ecosystem within the shrubsteppe including no further net loss of healthy sagebrush, and restoration of fragmented and degraded areas.
- Protect existing wetlands, and restore water regimes.
- Manage livestock grazing and restore levels of water tables.
- Reliable source of plant materials (seed and seedlings)
- Comprehensive inventory of winter range quality and quantity including the status and terms of enrollment of CRP lands
- Protecting wildlife and habitat value in existing wetlands
- Development of conservation partnerships should focusing on wetland protection and restoration efforts especially on private and public lands with high wildlife and habitat values.

Upper Snake River /Henry's Fork Subbasin

Two existing projects are recommended for continued funding in the Upper Snake River/Henry's Fork Subbasin (Table 3). Project 199201000, *Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation*, will continue to provide conditions to maintain a self-perpetuating Tribal subsistence and trophy trout fishery through implementation of habitat restoration, enhancement and protection activities on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation. Project 199505702, *Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation Program*, will continue to protect, enhance, restore and maintain wildlife habitats to mitigate for construction losses at Palisades and Minidoka dams.

Seven new project proposals are recommended for funding in the Upper Snake River Subbasin (Table 3). Project Proposal 33010, *Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fish Production Program*, will allow for the identification of current population status and future fish production needs of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes in the Upper Snake Subbasin. Project Proposal 33011, *Implementing Land-use for Resource and Community Sustainability at the County and Regional Level*, will allow for the collection of resource and community

information into a GIS decision support system to be used by county commissioners and planners in implementing land use. Project Proposal 33008, *Assessing Effects of Columbia River Basin Flow Management on the Aquatic Ecology of the Henry's Fork Watershed*, would allow for the assessment of effects of the Columbia River Basin hydroelectric operations on aquatic ecology of the Upper Snake River Subbasin, specifically the Henry's Fork watershed. Project Proposal 33001, *Assessment of Population Structure at Risk of Introgression and Hybridization to Native trout in the Middle and Upper Snake River Provinces*, will detect and quantify levels of hatchery produced O. mykiss introgression within, and assess genetic diversity and genetic population structure of native Yellowstone cutthroat trout and redband trout in the Middle and Upper Snake River provinces. Project Proposal 33002, *Establish Instream Flow and Reservoir Pool Habitat for Native and other Trout in the Upper Snake River/American Falls*, will assess instream flows and American Falls Reservoir fishery pool shortfall for sustainable Yellowstone cutthroat trout and other game fish species as well as identify options and long-term strategies for improving water quantities where necessary. Project Proposal 33003, *Sage Grouse Distribution and Habitat Use in the Upper Snake River Basin, Blackfoot and Willow Creek Drainages*, will document sage grouse trends, movements, habitat use and survival to develop a recovery plan. Project Proposal 33004, *Survival of Adfluvial Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout in the Upper Blackfoot River*, will identify which life stage survival is most limiting the population growth of Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the upper Blackfoot River drainage.

Table 3. Projects recommended for funding in the Upper Snake River/Henry's Fork Subbasin.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor
199201000	*Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation*	SBT
199505702	*Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation Program*	SBT
33010	*Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fish Production Program*	SBT
33011	*Implementing Land-use for Resource and Community Sustainability at the County and Regional Level*	IDFG, UI, MSU, IOSC
33008	*Assessing Effects of Columbia River Basin Flow Management on the Aquatic Ecology of the Henry's Fork Watershed*	HFF
33001	*Assessment of Population Structure at Risk of Introgression and Hybridization to Native trout in the Mid and Upper Snake River Provinces*	IDFG, IOSC
33002	*Establish Instream Flow and Reservoir Pool Habitat for Native and other Trout in the Upper Snake River/American Falls*	IDFG
33003	*Sage Grouse Distribution and Habitat Use in the Upper Snake River Basin, Blackfoot and Willow Creek Drainages*	IDFG
33004	*Survival of Adfluvial Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout in the Upper Blackfoot River*	IDFG

This suite of recommended project proposals addresses the key needs identified in the Upper Snake River/ Henry's Fork Subbasin Summary including:

- Continue to inventory native salmonids in the Upper Snake River Province to determine current status and major factors limiting their distribution and

abundance, and based on these findings, develop and implement plans and strategies for recovery where populations are at risk of extirpation.

- Use genetic markers to detect and quantify levels of hatchery produced *O. mykiss* introgression within native Yellowstone cutthroat trout populations and to delineate genetic population structure of Yellowstone cutthroat trout throughout their historic range. This fundamental genetic information with regards to introgressive hybridization and genetic population structure is needed to identify remaining pure populations, preserve existing genetic variability, and identify population segments for the development of management plans and the designation of conservation units/management units.
- Compare rates of hybridization and introgression between hatchery produced *O. mykiss* and native populations of Yellowstone cutthroat, redband trout, and westslope cutthroat trout. A greater understanding of the phenomenon of hybridization and introgression observed within *Oncorynchus* populations throughout the Middle and Upper Snake River provinces should allow a better assessment of the impacts of past hatchery produced *O. mykiss* introductions and allow a better evaluation of the possible future genetic risks native *Oncorynchus* populations face with regards to hybridization and introgression.
- Develop genetic-DNA markers for redband trout so that the degree of introgression with introduced rainbow trout can be quantified and the degree of variability between and among populations of redband trout can be determined.
- Continue coordinated collection of water temperature data throughout the Upper Snake River subbasin.
- Minimum instream flow study for winter habitat and trout production in the Snake River below American Falls Reservoir, and a conceptual plan and strategy for providing that winter flow.
- Minimum fishery pool study for sustained trout production in American Falls Reservoir and a conceptual plan and strategy for providing that minimum fishery pool.
- Minimum instream flow study for winter and late summer habitat and trout production in the Snake River between American Falls Reservoir and Gem State dam, and a conceptual plan and strategy for providing those minimum flows.
- Life history study of the ecology of remnant sage grouse populations in the Blackfoot River and Portneuf River subbasins, including recommendations and strategy for restoring these populations.
- Identify impacts of flow regime to various fish and wildlife populations in all reaches of the Henrys Fork so that informed decisions can be made on utilization of available water for the benefit of the maximum number of species.
- Develop comprehensive water management plans with water management/user agencies, organizations, and/or individuals to optimize fisheries, irrigation, flood control, and power production. Obtain suitable resource maintenance flows and minimum pool levels.
- Acquire water rights for fish and wildlife benefits.
- Identify and address low flow and dewatering problems in lotic and lentic systems.

- Evaluate impacts of various ramping rates of flows from dams on fish and wildlife habitat and populations.
- Develop and implement plans for ramping rates, shape and timing of flow releases.
- Develop comprehensive water management plans to obtain appropriate maintenance flows, minimum pool levels, water temperatures, and nutrient and sediment levels for fish and wildlife.
- Identify and correct fish passage and entrainment problems.

Upper Snake River (Closed Basin) Subbasin

One new project proposal is recommended for funding in the Upper Snake River (Closed Basin) Subbasin (Table 4). Project Proposal 33007*, Implement Best Management Practices to Improve Riparian Habitat and Upland Conditions in the Medicine Lodge Watershed*, will enhance riparian habitat and reduce non-point source pollution within the Medicine Lodge watershed through the development and implementation of conservation plans on private lands, coordinated with local, state, and federal land managers.

Table 4. Projects recommended for funding in the Upper Snake River (Closed Basin) Subbasin.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor
33007	*Implement Best Management Practices to improve Riparian Habitat and Upland Conditions in the Medicine Lodge Watershed*,	CSCD

Appendix A. Results from the CBFWA Project Proposal Review for Upper Snake Province*

*Note: Due to space constraints, text in the criteria fields shown as "n" over "a" should be interpreted as "n/a".

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Technical Criteria								Management Criteria							Project Review Comments	CBFWA Category
				T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	M 1	M 2	M 3	M 4	M 5	M 6	M 7		
Headwaters																				
33006	Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship on Mitigation Lands and Sensitive Habitats in the Upper Snake Headwaters	TREC, Inc.	Headwaters																proposal withdrawn	
33009	Improve Yellowstone cutthroat trout recruitment and survival in the South Fork of the Snake River	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Headwaters	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y		High Priority
199505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation - Upper Snake	Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Headwaters	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	The proposed work provides for ongoing O&M activities. Project sponsors indicate credits will be applied to Palisades and Minidoka.	High Priority
Upper Closed Basin																				
33005	Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship in Sensitive Habitats in the Upper Closed Basin	TREC, Inc.	Upper Closed Basin																proposal withdrawn	

ProjectID	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		
33007	Implement Best Management Practices to improve riparian habitat and upland conditions in the Medicine Lodge watershed.	Clark Soil Conservation District	Upper Closed Basin	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	na	y	y	y	na	y	Although the proposal calls for instream work (e.g., rock weirs, in stream barbs, etc.), CBFWA questions whether passive restoration techniques have been considered. CBFWA found that local fish and wildlife managers view the proposed work as a good idea but question the priority of the project. The proposed work would implement BMPs, which should already be in place in the subbasin. In addition, CBFWAF identified a lack of coordination with the Tribes.	Recommended Action
Upper Snake (& Henry's Fork)																				
33001	Assessment of genetic population structure and risk of introgression and hybridization to native trout in the Mid and Upper Snake River Provinces	Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Upper Snake	y	y	y	na	na	na	y	y	y	na	na	y	y	y	na	This project would utilize samples that have already been collected. Information from this study is essential for the development of the Yellowstone cutthroat plan. Although the CBFWA believes the proposed work should be categorized as a "High Priority" since management efforts would benefit from the activities, the CBFWA identified four issues that need to be addressed. First, although the proposed genetic techniques are technically valid, the CBFWA suggests that using existing fin clip samples to determine population structure can be problematic due to collection design (e.g., samples need to be collected over a large area of stream and samples need to represent various age classes). Typically no more than 10 fish per 100m section of stream should be collected. In addition, lengths and sometime weights need to be collected as well. This is to ensure that adults make up the majority of samples. If only juveniles are collected from a short section of stream, in essence siblings could make up the entire sample, thus providing inaccurate population structure makeup. Samples and sample locations need to be geo-referenced. In addition, samples need to be archived for future use. This and other resident fish genetic	High Priority

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Technical Criteria								Management Criteria							Project Review Comments	CBFWA Category
				T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	M 1	M 2	M 3	M 4	M 5	M 6	M 7		
																			projects need to be coordinated among all labs to determine which loci are used and to ensure that methods and techniques are the same. Second, regarding management applications of resultant genetic data, notably lacking from the discussion is the need or potential to replace the stocking of nonnative rainbow trout with progeny from broodstock developed from pure populations of Yellowstone cutthroat trout or redband. In previous reviews the ISRP has indicated that, if a management decision is made to continue stocking fish to augment fisheries in waters inhabitable to native fishes, the brood stock source for such stocking should be from the native fishes. The proposal suggests that Idaho's stocking database may be useful in predicting hybridization and introgression levels and therefore a good predictor of genetic risks to resident trout populations from historical rainbow trout stocking. Using an historical stocking model as a guide to suggest where it may be "safe" to stock non-native rainbow trout, especially where unimpeded access (connectivity) is involved, appears to be playing with fire. Changing environmental conditions could render historic stocking/introgression risk assumptions/relationships invalid. A more comprehensive policy of using progeny from native broodstock for stocking purposes would be less risky. Third, per the ISRP's comments, the sponsors have modified, through the "fix-it loop", their proposal to include the analysis of redband trout from Oregon waters. Although the proposal sponsors include a personal communication reference (BPT personnel) with respect to the allocation of samples from Malheur	

ProjectID	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		
																			Subbasin waters, the CBFWA has identified an oversight. The Statement of Work that the BPT has submitted to BPA for Project 199701900 provides for the collection of samples (i.e., fin samples) and genetic analysis of salmonid species, which includes redband trout, from the locations identified in the revised Proposal 33001. The CBFWA suggests that the BPT should make available, if requested by the sponsors of Proposal 33001, the results from the genetic analyses (techniques used in Project 199701900 are the same as those proposed in 33001) that have and will be obtained through Project 199701900. The CBFWA believes the allocation of funds to Proposal 33001 for the analysis of samples from Oregon would result in unnecessary duplicative efforts in a province where only $500,000 is available for new work. The CBFWA suggests that funding the Oregon portion of the Proposal 33001 would create a duplication of effort and entail an inefficient use of resources. In addition, the CBFWA expressed concern relative to the lack of coordination with the ODFW's staff, specifically their geneticist. Given the CBFWA concerns about duplicative efforts, the geneticists from ODFW, IDFG and MDFWG should meet to coordinate their efforts.	
33002	Establish Instream Flow and Reservoir Pool Habitat for Native and Other Trout in the Upper Snake River/American Falls Fragment Area	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Upper Snake	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y		Recommended Action

ProjectID	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		
33003	Sage Grouse Distribution and Habitat Use in the Upper Snake River Basin, Blackfoot and Willow Creek Drainages.	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Upper Snake	n	n	y	na	na	na	y	y	y	na	na	y	y	y	na		Recommended Action
33004	Survival of adfluvial Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the upper Blackfoot River drainage	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Upper Snake	y	y	y	na	na	na	y	y	y	na	na	y	y	y	na	This work will allow for the collection of survival/mortality data which is needed for developing development management strategies for this species.	Recommended Action
33008	Assessing effects of Columbia River Basin anadromous fish flow management on the aquatic ecology of the Henry's Fork watershed	Henry's Fork Foundation	Upper Snake	y	n		na	na	na	y	y	y	na	na	y	y	y	na	CBFWA believes that the proposal does not address how it mitigates for losses created by the Federal Hydrosystem. The hydrologic problems in the Henry's Fork watershed are a result of over allocating water for irrigation needs and not the operations of the Federal Hydroelectric Dams. Additional monitoring will likely confirm that over-winter survival is the limiting factor, but this is already well established. Past attempts to reduce this limiting factor have had minimal success, so how will information collected result in new and innovative management alternatives? Responses to ISRP concerns link this data to reservoir operations but a long history both in the Missouri River and Columbia River basins where reservoir operators are not inclined to modify water flows for fish and wildlife unless mandated, makes this an unlikely outcome.	Recommended Action

ProjectID	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		
33010	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fish Production Program	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Upper Snake	y	y	y	na	na	na	na	y	y	na	na	y	y	y	na	CBFWA found that it was difficult to decipher what was being proposed. Bringing a group of experts together chosen from all competing entities within a specific geographical area would provide direction for resident fish resources in the upper Snake River province; however, specific rules for who and how they will be selected, and safeguards that would ensure independence of the board are not supplied. Once established, would this group continue? If so, why were no funds allocated to out-year budgets? CBFWA believes that the general concept is good but unless the proponent provides additional detail, the current proposal is inadequate. Responses to ISRP concerns still do not provide specifics about this process. CBFWA proposes that the sponsors consult with the CDAT to develop procedures to appoint board members.	High Priority
33011	Implementing land use for resource and community sustainability at the county and regional level.	Idaho Department of Fish and Game, University of Idaho, Montana State University, Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Upper Snake	y	y	y	na	na	na	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	na	The Henry's Fork watershed has a wealth of information while other watersheds have far less information to work with. The amount of work done within this watershed has clearly identified the limiting factor as over winter juvenile survival; however, the fishery continues to support heavy use so the limiting factors maybe a normal condition. Areas that are highly impacted and are poorly studied would likely result in greater benefits to fish, fisheries, ecology of the area, and the watershed.	High Priority
33012	Flow Augmentation In The Upper Snake River Sub-Basin To Benefit Anadromous, Resident Fish And Wildlife Species.	Upper Snake River Basin Water Users	Upper Snake																proposal withdrawn	

ProjectID	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		
33013	Evaluation of Pisces Fish Protective Water Intake System	Balaton Power, Inc.	Upper Snake	y	y	y	y	na	na	na	y	y	na	na	n	n	n	na	There appears to be a lack of coordination with IDFG and the reviewers question the lack of cost share. In addition, the reviewers question whether it is appropriate for BPA funds to be used in the development of a product that the reviewers perceive will then be sold for profit. The proposal should be submitted for consideration in the Mainstem/Systemwide Province the "Innovative" process.	Do Not Fund
199201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Upper Snake	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	CBFWA questions the rationale used to select and prioritize the various enhancement projects. It was clear that monitoring and evaluation of projects is occurring; however, it was not clear how disturbances elsewhere in the subbasin are affecting the completed habitat projects and what strategies are being used to protect past and future investments.	High Priority
199505702	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation Program	The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Upper Snake	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	The proposed work provides for ongoing O&M activities. Project sponsors indicate credits will be applied to Palisades and Minidoka.	High Priority

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

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Total of 2003	Total of 2004	Total of 2005
Headwaters						
33006	Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship on Mitigation Lands and Sensitive Habitats in the Upper Snake Headwaters	TREC, Inc.	Headwaters	$56,789	$33,160	$34,571
33009	Improve Yellowstone cutthroat trout recruitment and survival in the South Fork of the Snake River	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Headwaters	$264,700	$600,000	$620,000
199505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation - Upper Snake	Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Headwaters	$4,068,153	$4,331,361	$4,525,768
Upper Closed Basin						
33005	Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship in Sensitive Habitats in the Upper Closed Basin	TREC, Inc.	Upper Closed Basin	$76,233	$43,207	$44,969
33007	Implement Best Management Practices to improve riparian habitat and upland conditions in the Medicine Lodge watershed.	Clark Soil Conservation District	Upper Closed Basin	$98,902	$116,402	$116,402
Upper Snake (& Henry's Fork)						
33001	Assessment of genetic population structure and risk of introgression and hybridization to native trout in the Mid and Upper Snake River Provinces	Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Upper Snake	$228,458	$237,596	$247,100
33002	Establish Instream Flow and Reservoir Pool Habitat for Native and Other Trout in the Upper Snake River/American Falls Fragment Area	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Upper Snake	$104,100	$318,800	$228,200
33003	Sage Grouse Distribution and Habitat Use in the Upper Snake River Basin, Blackfoot and Willow Creek Drainages.	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Upper Snake	$211,716	$168,300	$168,300

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	Subbasin	Total of 2003	Total of 2004	Total of 2005
33004	Survival of adfluvial Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the upper Blackfoot River drainage	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Upper Snake	$137,500	$56,650	$58,350
33008	Assessing effects of Columbia River Basin anadromous fish flow management on the aquatic ecology of the Henry's Fork watershed	Henry's Fork Foundation	Upper Snake	$211,596	$203,342	$203,342
33010	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fish Production Program	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Upper Snake	$90,000		
33011	Implementing land use for resource and community sustainability at the county and regional level.	Idaho Department of Fish and Game, University of Idaho, Montana State University, Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Upper Snake	$243,051	$214,100	$264,500
33012	Flow Augmentation In The Upper Snake River Sub-Basin To Benefit Anadromous, Resident Fish And Wildlife Species.	Upper Snake River Basin Water Users	Upper Snake	$1,117,911	$3,526,375	$3,649,799
33013	Evaluation of Pisces Fish Protective Water Intake System	Balaton Power, Inc.	Upper Snake	$273,500		
199201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Upper Snake	$175,000	$179,000	$183,000
199505702	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation Program	The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Upper Snake	$3,592,141	$5,030,256	$4,960,284