



Department of Energy

Official File


Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

ENVIRONMENT, FISH AND WILDLIFE

February 11, 2002

In reply refer to: KEW-4

Mr. Doug Marker
Director, Fish and Wildlife Division
Northwest Power Planning Council
851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97204-1348



Dear Mr. Marker:

Enclosed please find Bonneville's comments on the Blue Mountain and Mountain Snake project proposals submitted in response to the Bonneville/Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) provincial solicitation of June 8, 2001. Bonneville received and reviewed 171 proposals for the Blue Mountain and Mountain Snake provinces and of those, 27 proposals were part of the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan Program (LSRCP). Bonneville will provide comments on the LSRCP Program through a separate process. In addition, Bonneville will provide an initial "in lieu" review of new proposals under separate cover.

As these proposals had already been reviewed by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) and by the members of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority, Bonneville's evaluation relied significantly on their initial conclusions with respect to scientific merit and technical feasibility. This evaluation was, therefore, intended to complement these prior reviews by focusing primarily on policy and financial issues in prioritizing proposals to accomplish Bonneville's and the Council's fish and wildlife objectives. In addition, as an essential step in insuring that Bonneville is able to fully utilize the provincial reviews as a primary means of meeting off-site Endangered Species Act obligations, the evaluation provides guidance on how project proposals might be used to implement the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 2000 Biological Opinions as outlined in the Action Agencies' Annual Implementation Plan. We note that NMFS has provided their review of anadromous fish proposals and the USFWS has provided comments on proposals focused on bull trout in the Blue Mountain Province.

The Bonneville evaluation provides the Council with our views (based on the criteria and ranking factors below) on the full suite of project proposals submitted from which the Council will select a subset to recommend for Bonneville funding. We fully support the need to remain within the budget targets. With respect to proposed budgets for projects, it should be understood that Bonneville reserves the right to negotiate appropriate statements of work and refined budgets for projects after a decision has been made to fund the project.

In identifying project proposals that Bonneville judges would meet Biological Opinion implementation requirements and priorities as described in the Action Agencies' Implementation Plan, we have attempted to distinguish between those projects that we believe are critical to meeting specific, time-sensitive, NMFS Biological Opinion requirements and those where there are a variety of proposals that would address a given RPA.

Criteria and Ranking Factors for this evaluation were drawn from the solicitation letter of April 8, 2001, the ISRP Preliminary Review of Fiscal Year 2002 Project Proposals for the Mountain Snake and Blue Mountain Provinces, the Action Agencies' 2002 Annual Implementation Plan, NMFS's 2000 Biological Opinion, USFWS 2000 Biological Opinion, and the Council's 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

CRITERIA:

In order for a project to be considered for funding in this round of provincial reviews, whether a new proposal or an on-going project, the project must:

- Be consistent with the Council's Fish & Wildlife Program;
- Not be in conflict with NMFS' or USFWS 2000 Biological Opinions or the Action Agencies Implementation Plan;
- Be consistent with Federal trust and treaty responsibilities;
- Have scientific merit (rely largely on ISRP);
- Be implementable (technical feasibility); and,
- Include the appropriate level of effort and costs.

RANKING SYSTEM:

We gave **top priority** to existing (on-going) projects where the objectives have been, and still are, clear and where not funding the project would significantly jeopardize the investment that the region has made to date and to those on-going and new proposals that are technically sound and meet the need to implement a particular Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) action under the NMFS 2000 Biological Opinion or measure under the USFWS 2000 Biological Opinion (RPM) as described in the Action Agencies' Implementation Plan.

There are some on-going projects that we believe Bonneville should not continue funding into FY02/03. In addition, there are some on-going projects that we believe should be put on hold until the development of specific subbasin plans that may, or may not, call for their continuance.

New proposals and **on-going** projects were assigned to one of four categories based on the following:

Category A List - An **on-going** project that either addresses a specific RPA in NMFS' 2000 Biological Opinion or measures in the USFWS' 2000 Biological Opinion, or, if not, the objectives of the project have been, and still are, clear and where not funding the project would significantly jeopardize the investment that the region has made to date.

A **new** proposal that addresses a specific RPA in NMFS' 2000 Biological Opinion or RPM in USFWS' 2000 Biological Opinion and is consistent with the Action Agencies' Implementation Plan.

Category A List - Conditional

Some limitations in scope and funding level of projects are recommended.

Category B List -

An **on-going** project that should await completion of a Sub-Basin Plan as it involves: a) significant and unresolved policy issues, b) substantial costs, and/or c) complexities that should not be addressed until a Sub-Basin Plan is completed.

Category C List -

A **new** proposal that should await completion of a Sub-Basin Plan as it involves: a) significant and unresolved policy issues, b) substantial costs, and/or c) complexities that should not be addressed until a Sub-basin Plan is completed; or should await development of a regional research, monitoring and evaluation plan (RM&E).

Category D List -

New proposals or **on-going** projects that do not meet all of the above criteria.

In reviewing proposals' potential relationship to the Annual Implementation Plan (IP), projects were reviewed by strategy and the high-priority considerations outlined in the IP.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN STRATEGIES AND PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS

HABITAT PROPOSALS

Habitat Strategy 1: Protect and enhance tributary habitat

- Water quantity (RPAs 149, 151)
- Water quality (RPA 152)
- Passage and diversion improvements (RPA 149)
- Watershed health (RPAs 150, 153)
- Subbasin planning and assessment (RPA 154)

Habitat Strategy 2: Improve mainstem habitat on an experimental basis

- Watershed health (RPAs 155, 157)
- Subbasin planning and assessment (RPA 156)

Habitat Strategy 3: Protect and enhance estuary habitat (RPAs 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163)

High-Priority Considerations:

- Project has long-term benefits that permanently address underlying ecological processes or functions.
- Project focuses on currently productive non-Federal habitat or connects productive habitats.
- Project increases tributary flows and protects those flows in-stream.
- Project leverages funds from agricultural incentive programs.
- Project addresses barriers to fish passage.
- Project addresses water quality issues in spawning and rearing areas that limit productivity.

HATCHERY PROPOSALS

Hatchery Strategy 1: Implement a safety-net program as an interim measure to avoid extinction (RPAs 175, 176, 177, 178)

Hatchery Strategy 2: Reduce potentially harmful effects of artificial production to aid recovery through hatchery reform

- Develop Hatchery Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) (RPA 169)

Hatchery Strategy 3: Contribute to the development and implementation of a comprehensive marking plan (RPA 174)

Hatchery Strategy 4: Artificial production in support of tribal and other harvest, consistent with the needs of listed fish

High-Priority Considerations:

- Project prepares or updates an HGMP.
- Project addresses an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) or population at high risk of extinction (safety net artificial propagation program).
- Project implements hatchery reforms from a NMFS-approved HGMP or Section 7 consultation that provides benefit to ESA-listed species.
- Proposal addresses design and implementation of a comprehensive marking program of hatchery-origin fish.

HARVEST PROPOSALS

Harvest Strategy 1: Develop fishing techniques to enable fisheries to target non-listed fish while reducing harvest-related mortality on ESA-listed species (RPAs 164, 167, 168)

Harvest Strategy 2: Improve harvest management assessments, decisions, and evaluations (RPAs 166, 165, 167)

Harvest Strategy 3: Support sustainable fisheries for the meaningful exercise of tribal fishing rights and non-tribal fishing opportunities consistent with the recovery effort

Harvest Strategy 4: Fishery effort reduction programs

High-Priority Considerations:

- Project tests and deploys selective fishing methods or gear to target non-listed fish.
- Project improves estimates of incidental harvest mortalities.
- Project contributes to improved information for comprehensive fishery analysis and management.

RESEARCH MONITORING & EVALUTION PROPOSALS
--

RM&E Strategy 1: Status monitoring

- Status of fish populations and the environment at the system level (RPAs 179, 180, 181, 193, 198)
- Status of fish populations and the environment in the tributary habitat zone (RPAs 180, 190)
- Status of fish populations and the environment in the hydrosystem corridor zone (RPAs 191, 192)
- Status of fish populations and the environment in the estuary and ocean zone (RPAs 196, 197)

RM&E Strategy 2: Effectiveness monitoring and research

- Effectiveness of mitigation actions at the system level (RPAs 183, 184)
- Effectiveness of tributary habitat actions (RPA 183)
- Effectiveness of hydrosystem corridor actions (82, 83, 100, 107, 183)
- Effectiveness of estuary and ocean actions (RPA 102, 194)

RM&E Strategy 3: Critical uncertainties research

- Critical uncertainties at the system level (RPAs 182, 195)
- Critical uncertainties at the tributary-habitat level
- Critical uncertainties at the hydrosystem corridor level (RPAs 185, 186, 189)
- Critical uncertainties at the estuary and ocean level (RPA 187)

RESIDENT FISH PROPOSALS

Resident Fish Strategy 1: Promote the reproduction and recruitment of Kootenai River White Sturgeon (KWS)

Resident Fish Strategy 2: Determine the impacts of the FCRPS on Bull Trout and mitigate for those impacts.

PROGRAMMATIC COMMENTS

Bonneville offers some programmatic comments that arose during the course of our review of proposals in these provinces but most of which we believe are generally applicable throughout the Fish and Wildlife Program. We fully support NMFS's observation that future project proposals should contain a clear statement of biological benefits related, if possible, to limiting factors, risk assessments or other available information regarding target species and associated habitat. In addition, we offer the following:

1. Where appropriate, evaluate programs rather than projects. When large-scale programs such as the Grande Ronde Spring Chinook Supplementation Program (GRESOSP) and Idaho Supplementation Studies (ISS) are divided into small pieces sponsored by several different entities, it is very difficult to apply evaluation criteria to them. Wherever possible, programs should be presented as a single, fully coordinated proposal, complete with objectives, performance milestones and budgets. These budgets may be subdivided among several entities. Thus, all aspects of the project, from on-the-ground work to coordination, are viewed as a whole and held to one set of performance measures. This would produce proposals that reflect consensus in prioritization of work among cooperators, make any duplication or redundancy among proposals and budgets more immediately evident, and would also reduce the number of individual proposals that must be reviewed. It would also make coordination of various functions and aspects of these programs more evident.

2. Projects should be limited in duration. We note that some proposals show ten years of project history, and five years of out-year budget requests, with no completion milestones and no identified project end date. Limiting the duration of most projects would accomplish two objectives. First, it would provide a clear opportunity to measure the project's performance against its stated performance measures (an audit function). Second, it would provide a more level playing field among project proponents (because ongoing projects will lose their "ongoing" status at a certain point). With very few exceptions, we believe that projects should have performance objectives that indicate when they are completed, and should be considered "new" after they reach that completion date.

The Council will be establishing regular performance reviews for artificial production programs as provided in its Artificial Production Review report. These reviews will assess a program's performance against its standards as provided in its HGMP. We fully support this approach.

3. New habitat protection/restoration work included in ongoing habitat projects. In some cases, project proponents appear to be using the “umbrella” of ongoing projects to fund new work on new sites. In doing so, adequate information is not always provided about the new sites and the type of work proposed to weigh the merit of initiating habitat work on these new sites. Some watersheds benefit from active leadership and strong technical resources and are clearly capable of prioritizing and carrying out habitat work on an ongoing basis with minimal oversight (the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program is a good example). As a general rule, however, new habitat protection or restoration work proposed for new sites should be evaluated on its own merit, taking into consideration the current condition of the habitat (high-quality vs. highly degraded), the treatment proposed, and other factors such as land ownership (federal vs. non-federal).

When subbasin planning is completed, proposed habitat work should be evaluated against the subbasin plan. Combining completed or in-progress work, which has presumably been reviewed and found to be meritorious, with proposed new work that may or may not be meritorious, transfers the “ongoing” status of the existing work to the new work without appropriate evaluation and often without sufficient site-specific information. For this reason, we suggest that “ongoing” habitat projects should include only actual continuing work on the same sites, or M&E and O&M on completed sites.

4. Accountability for funding for coordination and administration projects.

We are interested in seeking further clarity and accountability for funding requests to support staffing, planning, coordination or other processes. A list of past project accomplishments that cite attending meetings and writing reports to BPA has not proved adequate to provide this accountability. We believe implementation of the following recommendations would help improve accountability for coordination and administration projects:

Coordination and administration projects should be tied to on-the-ground performance objectives. Planning and coordination are important activities, but only as they relate to specific, identifiable impacts for fish and wildlife. This type of project should not be exempt from performance-based evaluation. For example, a watershed council coordinator position should be evaluated on the number and quality of habitat protection and restoration proposals implemented through the council in the subbasin. We understand that it may be necessary to provide some guidance to project sponsors to help them identify specific outcomes resulting from their work.

Consider closer scrutiny of administrative costs. In some cases, there is not enough information provided in project proposals to make judgments on whether relatively high administrative, personnel and equipment costs are actually justified. Some proposed project budgets raise “red flags” about what appear to be excessive administrative costs that may merit gathering further information to evaluate the relationship of these costs to the overall project.

Consider structure to coordination activities. Proposals with significant coordination costs should include a proposed or existing structure through which coordination is to occur. Proposals should include the forum for coordination, participants, frequency of interaction and the results. BPA and proposal reviewers could then evaluate the need and costs for such activities. Generic coordination objectives with costs of \$5,000 to \$70,000 per proposal could then be better evaluated for cost effectiveness or for possible alternatives for achieving the intended result.

5. Developing co-management plans. In many cases, BPA and the Council are being requested to fund the development of fishery management plans (e.g. Hells Canyon Sturgeon), Hatchery Genetic Management Plans, or Hatchery Master Plans. Funding for plan development is often requested independently by each fishery manager rather than as an integrated, joint proposal. This appears to be creating two problems. First, there appears to be considerable overlap in staffing to achieve many of the tasks. Cumulative costs for drafting of plans are becoming inordinately expensive. Secondly, it is evident that, at least in many instances, there is not yet agreement between the fishery co-managers on the goals and objectives of such plans. BPA funds may then be used to develop and solidify individual approaches rather than co-management plans or programs. An unwanted outcome may be that highly detailed fishery management plans or HGMPs can be developed that only reflect the position of a given fishery manager that must later be negotiated against the well-developed (and Bonneville funded) plan of another entity.

The Council and Bonneville could consider requiring joint, integrated proposals for development of plans to ensure that funds are focused towards a common, negotiated objective. Prior to incurring the expense of creating detailed facility plans or management plans, we could consider requiring a milestone report that provides strategic options for a given program. Agreement on a preferred option by the co-managers with co-management authority should be considered prior to development of a detailed plan. A requirement for early consensus at the strategic level would ensure efficient use of ratepayer funds and encourage co-management agreements. In order for this approach to avoid creating a barrier to implementation of important projects, Bonneville and the Council could consider providing appropriate facilitation assistance to enhance co-managers' ability to move forward with projects.

6. Scope and objectives of research, monitoring and evaluation. The NMFS 2000 Biological Opinion and the Annual Implementation Plan calls for the development of a regional comprehensive RM&E Plan in 2002. This work is to identify among many things, appropriate funding levels and responsibilities for the RM&E work.

The Council's 2000 F&W Program also lays out an ambitious strategy for conducting research, monitoring, and evaluation. In addition, in its 2001-9 report, the ISRP offers suggestions for routine, effectiveness, and research monitoring. The required scope, purpose and related funding requirements for these RM&E recommendations is not clear or consistent across these documents and needs further consideration and focus at a programmatic level.

It is evident in reviewing proposals from three provinces (Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountain, and Mountain Snake), that M&E costs will be substantial depending on how the region defines the scope of a needed RM&E program. A simple, limited subbasin such as Asotin Creek carries a proposed \$350,000 subbasin M&E annual cost (projects #27002 and #200116). Additionally, project-specific M&E for 5 ongoing and proposed projects (projects #199401805, 27001, 27009, 27014, 27025) contain total annual costs of \$295,000. This totals to \$645,000 of proposed M&E annually for Asotin Creek.

For more complicated subbasins, such as the Grande Ronde, M&E (including projects 199202604, 199405400, 200109, 200120, 27003, 27007, 27006, 27019) is proposed at \$4,000,000 annually. The total project-specific M&E from 27 proposals (16 ongoing and 11 new proposals) annually totals an additional \$2,200,000. Therefore, the total proposed M&E for the Grande Ronde Basin in 2002 is \$6.2 million.

If these proposed M&E costs are projected to the 32 subbasins containing anadromous fish within the Columbia Basin, M&E costs could total \$110 million annually, or 73% of the forecasted Bonneville expense budget of \$150 million ($\$0.645 + \$6.2 \text{ million} / 2 \times 32 \text{ subbasins} = \110 million). This cost estimate does not include the costs of research on the mainstem Columbia River, the costs for new research on critical uncertainties, or the costs of RM&E in subbasins without anadromous fish. It is critical that development and implementation of a comprehensive RM&E Plan address cost issues through a more comprehensive and programmatic planning approach.

A related issue is the frequency of M&E activities. We believe that there must be a balance in determining what data are needed to adequately address progress toward specifically identified regional and subbasin goals and objectives and what data may be desirable to satisfy intellectual curiosity. A regional RM&E Plan is clearly needed to identify priorities for M&E, appropriate protocols and designs, appropriate funding levels for all participating entities, and a more programmatic approach and guidance for selecting project proposals.

7. Duplication of effort and infrastructure. As with the Columbia Plateau Province, the review of projects in the Blue Mountain and Mountain Snake Provinces reveals considerable overlap between projects and agencies addressing the same activities and/or objectives within each of the major subbasins. While it appears that many of these projects may be coordinated between various fishery agencies, tribes, and land management entities, the layering of implementing entities appears to be resulting in inefficient use of BPA funds. This overlapping characteristic is found in habitat work and monitoring activities. For example, in the Clearwater subbasin both a fishery co-manager and the U.S. Forest Service are jointly planning, implementing, maintaining, and evaluating the same habitat improvement projects on Federal lands.¹

¹ We believe that in this case it is the U.S. Forest Service's responsibility to appropriately involve a co-manager in the development of its environmental analysis at the watershed level (EAWS).

Whatever the rationale was for initiating projects in this manner, it now appears that an alternative approach may be more cost effective. “Packages” of related habitat protection and restoration activities in a given watershed may be more efficiently implemented by a single entity. Separable tasks should be allocated to different entities, thereby reducing the annual costs of personnel and administrative overhead.

8. Snake River Fall Chinook. The ESA-threatened Snake River fall chinook ESU consists of a single population occupying the mainstem Snake River. Efforts are now underway to expand its abundance and distribution into the Clearwater subbasin. Proposals addressing the ESU are split between the Columbia Plateau and Blue Mountain Province reviews. Between these two provincial reviews and the LSRCP program, there were 14 fall chinook proposals submitted requesting \$7.7 million.

Additionally, the Corps of Engineers is funding RM&E addressing Snake River fall chinook at its hydroelectric projects. Other federal and state funds may also be allocated to recover this ESU. Consideration should be given to hosting or sponsoring an ESU-specific workshop to undertake a comprehensive review of all funding dedicated toward this ESU. The purpose of the cross-program review could be to ensure that 1) all essential RM&E needs are being met in the most cost-effective manner; 2) production programs are adequate and appropriate for ESA recovery; 3) production programs are compatible with current and anticipated harvest programs; and 4) the cross-program level of effort for Snake River fall chinook is reasonable relative to other Columbia Basin fish and wildlife goals. Such a cross-program and cross-provincial workshop could serve as a model for similar reviews where a provincial review focused solely on BPA funding might not comprehensively address all related activities and funds allocated to improve the status of a listed ESU.

9. Land acquisitions. The efficacy of land purchases to provide mitigation for fish needs thoughtful consideration. In general, land purchases are a relatively expensive means of rehabilitating fish habitat. Section A.6. (Implementation Provisions) of the 2000 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program recommends establishing a dedicated amount in Bonneville’s fish and wildlife budget for acquisition of land and water. Further, it notes that the Council will establish a mechanism, including an advisory entity, to approve funding for these acquisitions. Bonneville is also developing a land acquisition policy that we will fully discuss with the Council and interested regional entities before adopting. These measures have not been implemented yet, but as envisioned they will provide an appropriate policy and technical review for using ratepayer funds for purchase of water rights and land. Although there will no doubt be exceptions, in general, purchases might better be considered in the context of overall subbasin plans and funding processes.

We hope that this information is helpful to the Council as they formulate funding recommendations to Bonneville. If you have further questions regarding our review of these proposals or our programmatic comments please feel free to call me directly at (503) 230-4748 or Mark Shaw at (503) 230-5239.

Sincerely,



Robert J. Austin
Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife

Enclosures:

- 1 - BPA Blue Mountain Project Review
- 2 - BPA Mountain Snake Project Review

cc:

Mr. Frank L. Cassidy, Northwest Power Planning Council
Ms. Jann Eckman – Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Mr. Brian Brown – National Marine Fisheries Service
Mr. William Shake – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Bcc:

S. Wright – A-7	K. Hunt – KR-7
A. Smith – KE-4	J. Smith – KT/Spok
S. McNary – KEW-4	All KEW
Official File – KEW (FW-24)	

SMcNary:kmk:4748:2/12/02 (W:\Kew\Kew02\Fw\Fw-24\Final Funding Decision Blue Mtn Mtn Snake.doc)

Blue Mountain

Line #	Proposal Number	Sub-basin	Proposal Title	BPA Rank	ISRP Rank	BPA RPA RPM	NMFS RPA/ USFWS RPM	Comments
1	199701501	Imnaha	Imnaha Smolt Survival and Smolt to Adult Return Rate Quantification	A Conditional	Fundable	184 185 189	184 185 189	Recommend funding of ongoing objectives only at this time. New proposed objectives should be reviewed and recommended after regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for these objectives can be properly assessed.
2	27017	Imnaha	Bull trout population assessment and life history characteristics in association with habitat quality and land use; template for recovery planning.	C	Fundable in part	Not BiOp Related	USFWS BiOp Related	Do not recommend funding at this time. Actions proposed are not described by any RPM. Most, if not all of this work, is in tributaries and not the mainstem. This project could be reviewed after Subbasin Planning is completed. (Note that the Action Agencies and USFWS are discussing their differences with regard to the scope of the USFWS 2000 FCRPS BiOp.)
3	27021	Imnaha	Steelhead Status Monitoring	A Conditional	Fundable	193	180 179	Recommend funding only Objective 2 (resistivity counter) in Lightning Creek to implement RPA 193 at this time. Although it is important to have good estimates or indices of abundance of steelhead in the Imnaha, we do not support the scale and cost proposed. Eight new weirs are proposed in addition to the four already in place. Other new proposed objectives should be reviewed and recommended after a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for these objectives can be properly assessed. This project is related to project numbers 27019, 28052 and 1997-030-00. We do not recommend funding new enumeration technologies in these projects.
4	198402500	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde Basin Habitat Enhancement	A	Fundable	152 153 154	400 (153)	Recommend project for implementation of RPA's 152, 153, and 154.
5	198805301	Grande Ronde	NE OR Hatchery Master Plan	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend.
6	198805305	Grande Ronde	NE OR Hatcheries Planning	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend, but see programmatic comments on evaluation of programs rather than projects.
7	199202601	Grande Ronde	Implement the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program Administration and Habitat Restoration Projects	A	Fundable	150 152 153 154	500	Recommend funding consistent with the Council's subbasin planning and as implementation of RPA's 150, 152, 153 and 154.

Blue Mountain

8	199202604	Grande Ronde	Investigate Life History of Spring Chinook Salmon and Summer Steelhead in the Grande Ronde River Basin and Monitor Salmonid Populations and Habitat	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	180	180 184	Recommend funding in part. Do not recommend EMAP portion of project at this time until further review is conducted. EMAP is potentially a very important monitoring method, that we may want to implement within three years if pilot project #1998-016-00 proves successful in the John Day basin. EMAP portion of project is scattered throughout several projects, and final analysis of planning has not been completed.
9	199403900	Grande Ronde	Watershed Restoration Planner		Not Fundable		154	This project should be evaluated in the context of its role in the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program and in light of BPA's programmatic comments on accountability for funding of coordination and administration projects.
10	199405400	Grande Ronde	Characterize Migratory Patterns of Bull Trout	B	Fundable Medium	Not BiOp Related	USFWS BiOp Related	Do not recommend funding at this time. We note that this project should have been evaluated as new rather than ongoing, because most of the proposed objectives and tasks (accounting for approximately 75% of the budget) were new. This project could be reviewed after subbasin planning is completed. Actions proposed are not described by any RPM. Most, if not all of this work, is in tributaries and not the mainstem. (Note that the Action Agencies and USFWS are discussing their differences with regard to the scope of the USFWS 2000 FCRPS BiOp.)
11	199608000	Grande Ronde	NE OR Wildlife Mitigation Project - "Precious Lands"	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	NA	NA	Recommend funding in part only. Recommend funding development of a management and M&E plan, to be submitted for independent scientific review. Future funding of wildlife mitigation in this area will be contingent upon resolution of wildlife crediting issues.
12	199608300	Grande Ronde	CTUIR Grande Ronde Subbasin Restoration	A	Fundable	150 153	Base 400 (153)	Recommend project for implementation of RPA's 150 and 153.
13	199702500	Grande Ronde	Implement The Willowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan		Not Fundable		154	This project should be evaluated in the context of its role in the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program. This is the implementation funding link for 199403900, Watershed Restoration Planner, and should be considered for funding if the planner position is funded.
14	199800702	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde Supplementation: Lostine River O&M and M&E	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend.

Blue Mountain

15	199800703	Grande Ronde	Facility O&M And Program M&E For Grande Ronde Spring Chinook Salmon and Summer Steelhead	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend.
16	199800704	Grande Ronde	Northeast Oregon Hatcheries Implementation (ODFW)	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend.
17	199801001	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend, but agree with NMFS, that the project should be reviewed under SNAPP.
18	199801006	Grande Ronde	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend as part of larger Grande Ronde supplementation project. Agree with need for review of the adequacy of marking rates to compare the three types of spring Chinook production, and if so, what level of difference in performance may be detectable.
19	200002100	Grande Ronde	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Ladd Marsh WMA Additions	A Conditional	Fundable In Part		NA	Recommend funding in part only. Recommended funding development of a management plan for current properties. Future funding of wildlife mitigation in this area will be contingent upon resolution of wildlife crediting issues. It appears that there are no further construction/inundation wildlife credits available to be applied against this proposed project.
20	27003	Grande Ronde	Characterize and Assess Wildlife-Habitat Types and Structural Conditions for Subbasins within the Blue Mountain Province	D	Fundable in Part		NA	Do not recommend. Any future evaluation of this project should be made in light of its relationship to EDT.
21	27004	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde and Imnaha Stream Channel Complexity and Fish Passage Barrier Inventory, Prioritization and Remediation	D	Not Fundable		154	Do not recommend.
22	27005	Grande Ronde	Increase CREP Enrollment and Enhance Riparian Protections in the Grande Ronde and Imnaha basins	D	Not Fundable		400 (153)	Do not recommend.

Blue Mountain

23	27006	Grande Ronde	Establishing Baseline Key Ecological Functions of Fish and Wildlife for Subbasin Planning	D	Not Fundable			Do not recommend.
24	27007	Grande Ronde	Assessment of spring/summer Chinook salmon habitat within the Grande Ronde Subbasin.	C	Not Fundable		183	Recommend not funding pending development of a regional RM&E plan. This project was merged with 28005 in Mt. Snake.
25	27008	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde River Riparian Restoration	C	Fundable (low priority)		400	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
26	27011	Grande Ronde	Lookingglass Creek land purchase for watershed protection (spawning and rearing habitat continuity and water quality at Lookingglass Hatchery).	D	Not Fundable		150	Do not recommend. Agree with ISRP and CBFWA that the proposal does not include an adequate property management plan. Agree with NMFS that the project may not address limiting factors.
27	27012	Grande Ronde	Restore and Enhance Grande Ronde Valley Deciduous Riparian Habitat	C	Not Fundable		400 (153)	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed. Project sponsors have the option of going through the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program for funding.
28	27013	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde River Stream Restoration - La Grande, Oregon	C	Not Fundable		500	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed. Project sponsors have the option of going through the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program for funding.
29	27018	Grande Ronde	Oregon Plan Blue Mountain Province Fish Screening/Fish Passage.	A	Fundable		500	Recommend. This project will have immediate benefits to address fish passage at irrigation diversions and is consistent with the intentions of RPA 149. This project also has a high level of cost share and is a project of limited duration. We also note that O&M will be assumed by the project sponsor.
30	27019	Grande Ronde	Adult Salmon Abundance Monitoring	D	Fundable In Part		180	Do not recommend. This project is related to 1997-030-00, 27021 and 28052. Recommend limited funding of 27021 to test new technologies and do not recommend funding new technologies employed in 1997-030-00 or 28052.

Blue Mountain

31	27020	Grande Ronde	Grande Ronde Subbasin Water Right Acquisition Program	A	Fundable	151	150	Recommend project for implementation of RPA 151 through the regional water entity. We note that this project could have immediate benefits to instream flows for listed anadromous fish.
32	27022	Grande Ronde	Wallowa Culvert Inventory	C	Fundable		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
33	27023	Grande Ronde	Precious Lands Habitat Expansion	C	Fundable		NA	Do not recommend. Future funding of wildlife mitigation in this area will be contingent upon resolution of wildlife crediting issues. It appears that there are no further construction/inundation wildlife credits available to be applied against this proposed project.
34	27024	Grande Ronde	Life history strategies in <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> : interactions between anadromous and resident forms.	D	Not Fundable		184	Do not recommend. Agree with ISRP and CBFWA that the study design and methods need more detail.
35	199401805	Asotin	Continued Asotin Creek Watershed Projects	A	Fundable	150 152 153 154	400 (153)	Recommend funding consistent with the Council's subbasin planning and as implementation of RPA's 150, 152, 153 and 154.
36	27001	Asotin	Asotin County Riparian Buffer and Couse and Tenmile Creeks Protection and Implementation Project	A	Fundable	153	400 (153)	Recommend project for implementation of RPA 153. We note that both streams have high CREP signup rates.
37	27002	Asotin	Assess Salmonids in Asotin Creek Watershed	C	Fundable		180	Do not recommend funding at this time, but project appears to have high potential and should be reviewed after the regional RM&E plan is completed.
38	27009	Asotin	SSHAP Blue Mtn. Province	D	Fundable		154	Do not recommend funding. Appears to be a State of Washington ongoing program.
39	27014	Asotin	Protect and Restore Asotin Creek Watershed	C	Fundable		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.

Blue Mountain

40	27025	Asotin	Acquire South Fork Asotin Creek Property	D Conditional	Fundable		150	Do not recommend. Future funding of wildlife mitigation in this area will be contingent upon resolution of wildlife crediting issues. It appears that there are no further construction/inundation wildlife credits available to be applied against this proposed project. However, this project could be reconfigured to target riparian protection as implementation of RPA 150.
41	199700900	Snake Hells Canyon	Rebuilding Sturgeon Populations	A	Fundable			Recommend.
42	199801003	Snake Hells Canyon	Spawning distribution of Snake River fall Chinook salmon	A	Fundable	184	184	Recommend. This project should be considered for inclusion under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan.
43	199801004	Snake Hells Canyon	Monitor and Evaluate Yearling Snake River Fall Chinook Released Upstream Of Lower Granite Dam	A Conditional	Not Fundable	184	184	Recommend funding conditioned upon receipt of a detailed and comprehensive research plan to be submitted for independent science review. Project review will also consider the necessity of all proposed objectives/tasks.
44	199801005	Snake Hells Canyon	Pittsburg Landing (199801005), Capt. John Rapids (199801007), Big Canyon (199801008) Fall Chinook Acclimation Facilities	A	Fundable		Base	Recommend.
45	27010	Snake Hells Canyon	Snake River Hells Canyon Tributary Enhancements	D	Not Fundable		154	Do not recommend.
46	27015	Snake Hells Canyon	Develop Long-Term Management Plan for Snake River (Hells Canyon Reach) White Sturgeon	D	Not Fundable		0	Do not recommend.
47	27016	Snake Hells Canyon	Evaluate the effects of hyporheic discharge on egg pocket water temperature in Snake River fall Chinook salmon spawning areas	C	Fundable		190	Recommend not funding until regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.

Mountain Snake

Line #	Proposal Number	Sub-basin	Proposal Title	BPA Rank	ISRP Rank	BPA RPA RPM	NMFS RPA/USFWS RPM	Comments
1	198909800	Salmon	Idaho Supplementation Studies	A Conditional	Not Fundable	182 184	182 184	Recommend funding of ongoing scope of work only after ISRP concerns are addressed and conditioned upon timely submission of reports for implementation of RPA's 182 and 184. We note that this project has consistently struggled with timely submission of annual progress reports. This project now proposes additional objectives that may have merit and could be considered after the ISRP's concerns are addressed and a regional RM&E plan is developed.
2	198909801	Salmon	Evaluate Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers (ISS)	A Conditional	Not Fundable	182 184	182 184	Recommend funding of ongoing scope of work only after ISRP concerns are addressed and conditioned upon timely submission of reports for implementation of RPA's 182 and 184. We note that this project has consistently struggled with timely submission of annual progress reports. This project now proposes additional objectives that may have merit and could be considered after the ISRP's concerns are addressed and a regional RM&E plan is developed.
3	198909802	Salmon	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers- Nez Perce Tribe	A Conditional	Not Fundable	182 184	182 184	Recommend funding of ongoing scope of work only after ISRP concerns are addressed and conditioned upon timely submission of reports for implementation of RPA's 182 and 184. We note that this project has consistently struggled with timely submission of annual progress reports. This project now proposes additional objectives that may have merit and could be considered after the ISRP's concerns are addressed and a regional RM&E plan is developed.
4	198909803	Salmon	Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho-Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	A Conditional	Not Fundable	182 184	182 184	Recommend funding of ongoing scope of work only after ISRP concerns are addressed and conditioned upon timely submission of reports for implementation of RPA's 182 and 184. We note that this project has consistently struggled with timely submission of annual progress reports. This project now proposes additional objectives that may have merit and could be considered after the ISRP's concerns are addressed and a regional RM&E plan is developed.

Mountain Snake

5	199102800	Salmon	Monitoring smolt migrations of wild Snake River sp/sum Chinook salmon	A	Fundable		190	Recommend but note that RPA 190 as currently written applies to Snake River wild juvenile fall Chinook only.
6	199107100	Salmon	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	A	Fundable In Part	184 185	184 185	Recommend as critical to implement RPA's 184 and 185. This project directly supports the endangered Snake River (SR) sockeye captive broodstock (safety-net) program (Project 199107200 and 199204000). The captive broodstock program is intended to prevent extinction of SR sockeye salmon, and Project 199107100 should be continued as long as the captive broodstock program is necessary. Project sponsors should consult with the ISRP to further define the elements of an operational plan.
7	199107200	Salmon	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	A	Fundable	177	600 176 177	Recommend as critical to implement RPA 177. This project is part of the ongoing artificial propagation safety-net program intended to prevent extinction of Snake River sockeye salmon.
8	199107300	Salmon	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	A	Fundable	180 190	180 190	Recommend as critical implementation of RPA's 180 and 190, but the project should be reassessed when a regional RM&E plan is developed.
9	199202603	Salmon	Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project Administration/Implementation Support	A	Fundable In Part	152 154	154 152	Recommend funding consistent with Council's subbasin planning and as implementation of RPA's 152 and 154. This is the administrative function of the Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project, which covers proposals 28036, 28037, 28038, 28039, 28040. We are recommending funding of limited habitat improvements for BiOp RPA purposes in these projects. This project is needed for planning and implementation support of those projects.
10	199204000	Salmon	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Rearing and Research	A	n/a	175 177	Base	Recommend as critical to implement RPA's 175 and 177. This project is part of the ongoing artificial propagation safety-net program intended to prevent extinction of Snake River (SR) sockeye salmon. BPA may explore options with the project sponsor for securing this facility for the length of the project.
11	199401500	Salmon	Fish Screen Improvement	A	Fundable	149	149 500	Recommend as critical to implementation of RPA 149.

Mountain Snake

12	199405000	Salmon	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M & E	A Conditional	Fundable	183	Base 150 152 183	Recommend conditioned upon timely submittal of data to Stream Net or other public data bases for implementation of RPA 183.
13	199604300	Salmon	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement Program	A Conditional	Not Fundable		Base	Recommend funding only HGMP development, base level M&E program, and other planning actions called for under the Council's approved three step process for artificial production facilities. We note that the ISRP's comment on this project stated that Johnson Creek was part of the ISS project. However, we would point out that Johnson Creek is not a control stream within the ISS. JCAPE was initiated as an emergency action to address declining adult salmon returns to Johnson Creek. ISS cooperators (USFWS, NPT, SBT, IDFG) agreed to change Johnson Creek from a control stream to a treatment stream following the determination to begin an emergency supplementation action in Johnson Creek (letter dated March 12, 1996, no subject, from NMFS to John N. Etchart, Chairman, NWPPC).
14	199700100	Salmon	Captive Rearing Project for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	A Conditional	Fundable (low priority)	175	Base	Recommend contingent upon reassessment of objectives and full integration with SNAPP for implementation of RPA 175.
15	199703000	Salmon	Chinook Salmon Adult Abundance Monitoring	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	180	180 193	Recommend funding at current project level only for implementation of RPA 180. Do not recommend expansion into new technologies until regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for new technologies can be properly assessed. Limited testing of new technologies is recommended in project 27021. This project is related to project numbers 27019 and 28052. Do not recommend funding new enumeration technologies in these projects.
16	199703800	Salmon	Preserve Salmonid Gametes and Establish a Regional Salmonid Germplasm Repository	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	177	177	Recommend funding at current project level only for implementation of RPA 177. Project should be evaluated for integration with SNAPP.
17	199901900	Salmon	Holistic Restoration of the Twelvemile Reach of the Salmon River near Challis,	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	152153	149 152	Recommend funding only permanent easement, fencing and temperature study objectives of this project for implementation of RPA's 152 and 153.

Mountain Snake

			Idaho					
18	199902000	Salmon	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	180	180	Recommend funding only aerial surveys (task 1.b) in support of project number #28001, analysis, peer review and publication of data from 1995 to present for implementation RPA 180. Past project results need to be presented, peer reviewed, and progress shown. This project should be evaluated when regional RM&E plan is completed.
19	28001	Salmon	Evaluate Factors Influencing Bias and Precision of Chinook Salmon Redd Counts	A	Fundable	180	180	Recommend as critical to implement RPA 180. BPA notes that the project might be improved by incorporating some of the BPA-funded surveys being conducted by SBT, NPT, and IDFG in the Middle Fork of the Snake River, because their surveys provide the population data most heavily relied upon by managers.
20	28002	Salmon	Fluvial Bull Trout Migration and Life History Investigations in the upper Salmon River Subbasin	D	Not Fundable	Not USFWS BiOp Related		Do not recommend.
21	28003	Salmon	Characterize and Assess Wildlife-Habitat Types and Structural Conditions for Subbasins within the Mountain Snake Province	D	Fundable In Part			Do not recommend. Any future evaluation of this project should be made in light of its relationship to EDT.
22	28005	Salmon	Assessment of spring/summer Chinook salmon habitat within the Salmon River Subbasin.	C	Not Fundable		155	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
23	28006	Salmon	Tag and evaluate PIT-tag retention in sub-yearling Chinook salmon	C	Fundable (medium)			Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed. This project is not a NMFS BiOp priority.

Mountain Snake

24	28007	Salmon	Causes and effects of non-native trout invasions in the Salmon and Clearwater River subbasins	C	Fundable (low priority)		152 183	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed and roles and responsibilities among federal agencies for conducting research has been resolved.
25	28008	Salmon	Riparian Conservation Easement Purchase of Scarrow Property on Lake Creek a Tributary to the Secesh River, Idaho.	A	Fundable (medium)	150	150	Recommend project for implementation of RPA 150. BPA notes that this permanent easement would protect the headwaters of spawning habitat for a natural population of Chinook salmon and would protect previous BPA funded easement investment downstream. The status of mineral rights on the property must be investigated.
26	28009	Salmon	Smolt Condition and Adult Returns: An Indirect Method of Assessing the Potential Mitigation Benefits of Nutrient Enhancement Projects	C	Not Fundable		190	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
27	28010	Salmon	Nez Perce Salmon River Terrestrial	D	Fundable In Part			Do not recommend. Future funding of wildlife mitigation in this area will be contingent upon resolution of wildlife crediting issues. It appears that there are no further construction/inundation wildlife credits available to be applied against this proposed project.
28	28011	Salmon	Incidental Mortality in Selective Sport Fisheries	D	Not Fundable		167	Do not recommend. This proposal does not identify the inadequacies of the existing studies, or estimate the degree to which they may be inaccurate. Without this information, it is not possible to determine whether a new study is warranted.
29	28012	Salmon	Four-Step Planning to Identify Safety-Net Projects for Idaho Steelhead	Withdrawn see 28061	N/A		175	Withdrawn from consideration.

Mountain Snake

30	28014	Salmon	Bull trout population assessment and life history characteristics in association with habitat quality and land use: template for recovery planning.	C	N/A			Withdrawn from consideration.
31	28015	Salmon	Benefit/Risk Analysis to Promote Long-Term Persistence of Chinook Salmon in the Middle Fork Salmon River	Withdrawn see 28061	N/A		175	Withdrawn see project number 28061.
32	28016	Salmon	Restoration of the Yankee Fork Salmon River	C	Fundable In Part		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed. The bio-accumulation monitoring of heavy metals should be conducted prior to consideration of planning and design of this project. Potential heavy metal problems would have to be addressed before any further actions could take place on this project.
33	28018	Salmon	Lower Salmon River Tributary Protection and Enhancement	C	Fundable In Part		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
34	28019	Salmon	Improve Stream Habitat by Reducing Discharge from Animal Feeding Operations	C	Not Fundable			Do not recommend. This project appears to propose BPA funding of Idaho State Department of Agriculture's responsibility under state legislation.
35	28026	Salmon	Develop HGMP's for LSRCP Programs to address artificial production reforms identified in the FCRPS Biological Opinion and other regional processes.	A	N/A	169	169	This project is under the Direct Funding MOA. This will not require additional funds from the Integrated Fish and Wildlife Program. Costs appear to be high compared to previous HGMP development, and BPA will work with the USFWS to refine these estimates.

Mountain Snake

36	28027	Salmon	Protect and Restore Deer Creek		Not Provided			This project was not reviewed by the ISRP and does not appear on the CBFWA web site.
37	28028	Salmon	Crooked River Ecosystem Assessment		Not Provided		No Review	This project appears to be a duplication of project number 28043.
38	28030	Salmon	Salmon River Native Resident Fish Assessment	D	Not Fundable	Not USFWS BiOp Related		Do not recommend.
39	28034	Salmon	Chinook Salmon Smolt Survival and Smolt to Adult Return Rate Quantification, South Fork Salmon River, Idaho	C	Fundable (medium)		Mult. Esp 180	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
40	28035	Salmon	Geomorphic Controls on Watershed-Scale Availability of Chinook Salmon spawning Habitat in the Salmon River	C	Not Fundable		155	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed and roles and responsibilities among federal agencies for conducting research has been resolved.
41	28036	Salmon	Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands in the Pahsimeroi Watershed, Idaho	A Conditional	Not Fundable	150	150 154	Recommend limited funding for habitat projects to implement RPA 150. These projects could include riparian easements and riparian exclusion fencing, but exclude active channel restoration. This limited funding would also maintain landowner support for fish recovery, and protect prior habitat investment. Consideration of funding of this project at proposed levels should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
42	28037	Salmon	Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands in the Lemhi Watershed, Idaho	A Conditional	Not Fundable	149 150	149 150 154	Recommend limited funding for habitat projects to implement RPA's 149 and 150. These projects could include riparian easements, riparian exclusion fencing, irrigation diversion consolidation or elimination, and fish passage barrier removal, but exclude active channel restoration. This limited funding would also maintain landowner support for fish recovery, and protect prior habitat investment. Consideration of funding of this project at proposed levels should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.

Mountain Snake

43	28038	Salmon	Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands, East Fork Salmon Watershed, Idaho	A Conditional	Not Fundable	149 150	149 150 154	Recommend limited funding for habitat projects to implement RPA's 149 and 150. These projects could include riparian easements, irrigation diversion consolidation or elimination, and fish passage barrier removal, but exclude active channel restoration. This limited funding would also maintain landowner support for fish recovery, and protect prior habitat investment. Consideration of funding of this project at proposed levels should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
44	28039	Salmon	Holistic Restoration of Habitat on Non-federal Lands, Middle Salmon-Panther Watershed, Idaho	A Conditional	Not Fundable	150	149 150 154	Recommend limited funding for habitat projects to implement RPA 150. These projects could include riparian easements, and riparian exclusion fencing, but exclude active channel restoration. This limited funding would also maintain landowner support for fish recovery, and protect prior habitat investment. Consideration of funding of this project at proposed levels should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
45	28040	Salmon	Holistic Restoration of Critical Habitat on Non-federal Lands, Upper Salmon Watershed, Idaho	A Conditional	Not Fundable	149 150	149 150 154	Recommend limited funding for habitat projects to implement RPA's 149 and 150. These projects could include riparian easements, riparian exclusion fencing, irrigation diversion consolidation or elimination, and fish passage barrier removal, but exclude active channel restoration. This limited funding would also maintain landowner support for fish recovery, and protect prior habitat investment. Consideration of funding of this project at proposed levels should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
46	28044		Duplicate: See #28027					
47	28049	Salmon	Protect and Restore Slate Creek Watershed	C	Fundable (medium)		400	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
48	28050	Salmon	Protect and Restore Little Salmon River	C	Fundable In Part		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed. We also not that this project is proposed above a passage barrier which should be addressed before this proposal is considered.

Mountain Snake

49	28051	Salmon	Assess and Monitor Steelhead in the Middle Fork Salmon River Subbasin	C	Not Fundable		179 180	Do not recommend. The project should be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
50	28052	Salmon	Adult Snake River steelhead monitoring in the South Fork Salmon River Basin.	C	Fundable In Part	193	179 180 193	Do not recommend. This project is related to 1997-030-00, 27019 and 27021. Recommend limited funding of 27021 to test new technologies and do not recommend funding new technologies in 1997-030-00 and 27019.
51	28054	Salmon	Evaluation of Pisces Fish Protective Guidance and Monitoring System	C	Not Fundable		149	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
52	28056	Salmon	Four-Step Safety-Net Plan for South Fork Salmon River B-Run Steelhead		N/A		175	This proposal was withdrawn from consideration.
53	28057	Salmon	Four-Step Safety-Net Plan for Lower Salmon River A-Run Steelhead		N/A		175	This proposal was withdrawn from consideration.
54	28058	Salmon	Restore Fish Passage and Habitat	C	Fundable (medium)		Not Reviewed	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
55	28061	Salmon	Safety Net Artificial Propagation (SNAPP)	A	Not Yet Reviewed by ISRP	175	Not Reviewed	Recommend as critical to implement RPA 175. The project will provide planning for the Artificial Propagation Safety-Net Program to intervene with artificial production techniques, if appropriate, to prevent extinction of ESA-listed populations of salmon and steelhead. In response to ISRP comments, it is a comprehensive proposal that consolidates several safety-net proposals that were submitted to the Mountain Snake Provincial Review and later withdrawn. We will work with the Council to schedule review of this combined proposal by ISRP.
56	198335000	Clearwater	Nez Perce Hatchery	A	Fundable In Part			Recommend funding Phase I Production Level (goal of approximately 2 million sub-yearlings and pre-smolts) only.
57	198335003	Clearwater	Nez Perce Hatchery Monitoring and Eval.	A	Fundable In Part			Recommend funding the M&E Plan commensurate with the Phase 1 Production Level.

Mountain Snake

58	198740700	Clearwater	Dworshak Integrated Rule Curves/M&E	A Conditional	Not Fundable			Recommend funding to obtain data gathered to date and a final report. Then recommend terminating the project pending the comprehensive and consolidated plan for Dworshak Reservoir.
59	199005500	Clearwater	Steelhead Supplementation Studies	A Conditional	Not Fundable	182 184	182 184	Recommend funding of ongoing scope of work only after ISRP concerns are addressed for implementation of RPA's 182 and 184. This project now proposes additional objectives that may have merit and could be considered after the ISRP's concerns are addressed and a regional RM&E plan is developed.
60	199303501	Clearwater	Enhance Habitat within Red River Watershed	A Conditional	Fundable In Part	150	400	Recommend funding O&M of current investment and maintaining ongoing M&E to continue evaluation of previously constructed phases. Also recommend limited funding for acquisition of key permanent easements to protect current habitat investments and for implementation of RPA 150.
61	199501300	Clearwater	Resident Fish Substitution Program	A Conditional	Fundable In Part			Recommend funding only O&M until scientific and policy issues are resolved such as poor results from stocking and current M&E program.
62	199607702	Clearwater	Protect and Restore Lolo Creek Watershed	B	Fundable		500	Recommend not funding at this time. This project should wait until it is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
63	199607703	Clearwater	Restoring the Waw'aatamnima	B	Fundable		500	Recommend not funding at this time. This project should wait until it is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
64	199607705	Clearwater	Restore McComas Meadows	B	Fundable		500	Recommend not funding at this time. This project should wait until it is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
65	199608600	Clearwater	Clearwater Focus Program	A	Fundable	154	152 154	Recommend funding consistent with Council's subbasin planning process and as implementation of RPA 154.
66	199706000	Clearwater	Clearwater Subbasin Watershed Program.	A Conditional	Fundable	154	152 154	Recommend funding consistent with Council's subbasin planning process and as implementation of RPA 154. BPA recommends not funding the subbasin assessment part of this project because it is a duplication of the Council's subbasin planning process.
67	199901400	Clearwater	Steelhead/Trout Habitat Project	A Conditional	Fundable (low)		400	Recommend funding only after ISRP concerns about the level of detail in the monitoring plan are addressed. Monitoring plan should be maintained at current level. Any expansion should await development of the regional RM&E plan.

Mountain Snake

68	199901500	Clearwater	Restoring Anadromous Fish Habitat in Big Canyon Creek	B	Not Fundable		400	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
69	199901600	Clearwater	Protect and Restore Big Canyon Creek	B	Not Fundable		154 500	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
70	199901700	Clearwater	Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed	A	Fundable (high)		500	Recommend.
71	199901800	Clearwater	Characterize/Quantify Residual Steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho	A	Fundable	184	184	Recommend.
72	198709900	Clearwater	Dworshak Dam Impact Assessment	A Conditional	Fundable In Part			Recommend funding next phase of ongoing strobe light study only to test the the effectiveness of the strobe lights at the face of the dam under varying flow conditions to test effects on entrainment of kokanee salmon.
73	200002800	Clearwater	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	A	Fundable			
74	200003400	Clearwater	Protect and Restore The North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds	B	Fundable			Recommend not funding at this time. This project should wait until it is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
75	200003500	Clearwater	Rehabilitate Newsome Creek Watershed - South Fork Clearwater River	B	Fundable		154	Recommend not funding at this time. This project should wait until it is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
76	200003600	Clearwater	Protect & Restore Mill Creek	B	Fundable		500	Recommend not funding at this time. This project should wait until it is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
77	28004	Clearwater	Lawyer Creek Subwatershed-Steelhead Trout Habitat Improvement Project	D	Not Fundable		400 (153)	Do not recommend.

Mountain Snake

78	28013	Clearwater	Renovate Selway Falls Anadromous Fish Passage Tunnel	C	Fundable In Part		500	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
79	28017	Clearwater	Monitoring the Selway Falls renovation project for passage of spring Chinook salmon and steelhead	D	Not Fundable			Do not recommend.
80	28020	Clearwater	Nez Perce Harvest Monitoring Program	C	Fundable			Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
81	28021	Clearwater	Lower Clearwater Habitat Enhancement	D	Fundable In Part		400 (153) 154	Do not recommend. This project appears to be focused on wildlife habitat. It appears that there are no further construction/inundation wildlife credits available to be applied against this proposed project. We also note that any future watershed assessments will be conducted under the Council's subbasin planning process.
82	28022	Clearwater	Evaluate Bull Trout Life History In Dworshak Reservoir, N.F. Clearwater River Drainage, ID	D	Fundable In Part	Not USFWS BiOp Related		Do not recommend. This project appears to be fully funded by the Corps, Walla Walla District, through AFEP.
83	28023	Clearwater	Evaluate and Control Brook Trout Populations - Addressing Competition and Hybridization Threats in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho.	C	Fundable (low)			Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
84	28025	Clearwater	Potlatch River Watershed Restoration	C	Fundable In Part		152 154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
85	28029	Clearwater	Restore Lawyer Creek Habitat Targeting Steelhead and Chinook Salmon	C	Fundable In Part		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.

Mountain Snake

86	28031	Clearwater	Evaluation of Unclipped Hatchery Steelhead Released in the Clearwater and Salmon River Basins	D	Fundable In Part	107 184	Do not recommend. The proposed studies are the responsibility of the USFWS and are not appropriate for Bonneville funding.
87	28032	Clearwater	Assessment of A-Run Steelhead populations in the Clearwater River Basin	C	Not Fundable	179 180	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.
88	28033	Clearwater	Monitoring and evaluating Coho salmon reintroduction in the Clearwater River Basin	D	Not Fundable		Do not recommend.
89	28041	Clearwater	Dworshak Zooplankton Entrainment	D	Not Fundable		Do not recommend.
90	28042	Clearwater	Timing and location of spawning by pure and introgressed cutthroat trout in the North Fork Clearwater River	D	Not Fundable		Do not recommend.
91	28043	Clearwater	Crooked River Ecosystem Assessment at the Watershed Scale	C	Fundable In Part	154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
92	28045	Clearwater	Evaluating stream habitat using the Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries/Watershed Watershed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	C	Fundable In Part	183	Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed.

Mountain Snake

93	28046	Clearwater	Impacts of Salmon Carcasses on Chinook Salmon and Watershed Restoration in Subbasins of the Clearwater River	C	Fundable In Part			Do not recommend. The project could be reconsidered when a regional RM&E plan is completed and the need for the project can be properly assessed. We note that this proposal appears to contain significant duplication of ongoing salmon nutrient studies funded by BPA.
94	28047	Clearwater	Protect and Restore Red River Watershed	C	Fundable		154 400	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
95	28048	Clearwater	Protect and Restore Crooked Fork Creek to Colt Killed Analysis Area	C	Fundable		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and is reviewed under BPA's policy for funding habitat projects on federal lands.
96	28055	Clearwater	Four-Step Safety-Net Plan for Upper Lochsa River B-Run Steelhead				175	Proposal withdrawn. See project 28061.
97	28059	Clearwater	Restoring anadromous fish habitat in the Lapwai Creek watershed.	C	Fundable		154	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.
98	28060	Clearwater	Assess Stream Quality for Salmonid Recovery in the Lower Clearwater Subbasin	C	Fundable (low)		183	Do not recommend. This project should wait until Subbasin Planning is completed and the need for this project can be properly assessed.