



**Independent Scientific Review Panel**

for the Northwest Power Planning Council  
851 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
isrp@nwppc.org

## **Final Review: Arrowleaf/Methow River Conservation Project**



The Methow River at the Arrowleaf Property, October 24, 2001, photo by Rick Williams

ISRP Reviewers

Charles C. Coutant

Lyman McDonald

Richard R. Whitney

Richard N. Williams

with

Susan Hanna and Jack Griffith

**January 11, 2002**

**ISRP 2002-1**

## **Final ISRP Review of the Arrowleaf/Methow River Conservation Project Proposal 2001-037-00 (i.e. 23012)**

### **Introduction**

In a December 21, 2001 memorandum, the Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) requested that the ISRP conduct additional review of the Arrowleaf/Methow Proposal. The purpose of this review is to re-consider the project's consistency with the High Priority Solicitation, under which it was originally approved for partial funding as well as the biological benefits expected to be secured for listed species by acquiring the site. This additional review was proposed by BPA in response to new information observed by the ISRP and a BPA representative during a site visit in late October 2001 suggesting that lack of water in the Methow might limit the benefits claimed for listed species of spring chinook and steelhead.

The proposal was first reviewed by the ISRP in December 2000 as part of the High Priority project selection process (attachment 1). It was reviewed ahead of other high priority proposals because of the timeline involved in the potential land acquisition. It was asserted that if not acted upon by December 21, 2000, the conservation opportunity would be lost to other development alternatives. At that time, according to the proposal, there would be simultaneous closing in which TPL would purchase the property from the developer, convey the conservation easement to WDFW and sell four lots to conservation buyers. The budget for purchase is listed as \$16.4 million, and the conservation easement, which is the subject of the proposal, is \$3.75 million.

In its initial review, the ISRP stated:

The ISRP was unanimous in viewing the acquisition of the Arrowleaf property as an important opportunity that should be seized upon by the Council and the Bonneville Power Administration. The Arrowleaf property is clearly a desirable property with many wildlife and habitat features that approximate pristine condition. The proposers clearly describe the importance of the property, its near pristine condition, its position as a link between upper and lower habitats (particularly salmonid habitats), and the negative ecological consequences of not obtaining the property.

However, the ISRP noted that the proposal was lacking in many details, and it would have been better to review the proposal in the context of the Provincial Review Process. The ISRP expressed concern that exceptions to larger more formal processes, such as the Provincial Review Process, can erode the quality and consistency of the scientific review process in the Basin. ISRP review of the Arrowleaf proposal outside of the Provincial Review Process combined with the short time available for the proposal review, necessitated complete dependence upon the 20 page written proposal, without the benefit of an oral presentation by the authors, during which questions and answers would have been possible, and without the benefit of a site visit that would have provided a "ground truth" reference for evaluating the proposal.

With this report, the Arrowleaf proposal has essentially completed the full review process recommended by the ISRP and adopted by the Council for province reviews (written proposal, oral presentation, site visit, and response loop).

**Proposal Submittal and ISRP Review:** Arrowleaf/Methow River conservation proposals were submitted and reviewed several times including the pre-High Priority Review, the High Priority Review, and the 2001 Action Plan Review. The ISRP recommendation and comment for each of the solicitations was favorable and is accurately represented by the pre-High Priority Review quoted above (indented paragraph). In the High Priority project selection process, the proposal received a good faith funding recommendation or “B” ranking from the ISRP (attachment 2). The Council recommended that the proposal be funded for \$2.5 million of the \$3.75 million requested. Several months later in response to the Action Plan solicitation the project sponsors requested an additional \$1.25 million, the difference between what was requested and recommended for funding in the High Priority process (see attachment 3). The Council recommended not funding the Action Plan proposal for the additional \$1.25 million.

**Site Visit and Presentation:** On October 23 and 24, 2001, the ISRP conducted a site visit of the Columbia Cascade Province, of which the Arrowleaf/Methow Project is a part. During the site visit the ISRP heard an oral report on the Arrowleaf/Methow Project and was subsequently given a tour of the Arrowleaf Project. During the site visit, the Methow River streambed adjoining the property was dry. Questions arose about the frequency of dewatering and the potential effect on success of spawning of chinook and steelhead in the project area and in areas adjacent to the project. Such questions are a normal part of ISRP site visits, and are usually raised in a context where the sponsors are able to respond, either during the oral presentation, or in writing prior to finalizing the ISRP review.

**Re-review or “Response Loop”:** BPA and the Council became aware of the questions that arose during the site visit and requested this additional review. The ISRP assigned a subcommittee, consisting of Drs. Coutant, McDonald, Williams and Whitney to conduct the review. The subcommittee reviewed the original proposal, documents received from WDFW and others including comment from interested parties (attachment 4). The ISRP is pleased to have this opportunity for additional comment now that the full set of steps for review of this project has been completed. The fact that the process was conducted out of the usual order has led to some confusion and disruption. This report completes the response loop.

However, this review still misses an important component of the provincial review process, which is putting the proposal in the context of a subbasin summary and the larger set of proposals in the subbasin and province. The provincial review process allows the Council to compare the benefits likely to accrue from this project to those from alternative projects.

### **The Dewatering Issue**

Because the re-review was conducted in response to observations on dewatering, a brief discussion of that issue is warranted. WDFW and others raise a fundamental question as to whether the issue of dewatering was adequately addressed in the original proposal and was missed by the ISRP (Director Koenings' letter of November 30, 2001 to Chairman Cassidy, page 4). As noted by Director Koenings, the subject of dewatering is mentioned in the original proposal. We find that the subject is raised twice. Once in a sentence on page 5 under the heading of "The nature of the threat to be addressed by this proposal and the need for early action". The sentence reads, "Currently, an 11 mile stretch (which includes the 4 ½ miles within the property) is occasionally dewatered between September and March in dry years." The context within which the subject is raised could lead the reader to conclude that the project would help forestall more frequent dewatering that would likely occur with the drilling of wells associated with subdivision of the property. The ISRP apparently missed the significance of this statement, which would have been easy, given its ambiguity. We do not believe the issue of dewatering was adequately addressed in the original proposal, and are pleased to have the additional information provided by WDFW and others. The second mention of dewatering is in the discussion section "Endangered salmon." This section states that pools are important beyond their function as spawning habitat, as they are the last to dewater.

*The 4 1/2 miles of the Methow River bounded by the Arrowleaf property includes active Chinook redds in the 17 spawning pools greater than 5 feet deep (Hopkins 2000) and 10 side channels, 8 over 1000 ft long. These pools are important beyond their function as spawning habitat, as they are the last to dewater (Hopkins 2000) and serve as aquatic refugia for many ecosystem elements such as invertebrates in the dry season. (High Priority Proposal 23012, page 4)*

As noted in the quotation above, our interest focused on the matter of salmon spawning in the reach, particularly spring chinook. In addition, on page 3, the proposal states "Currently, 50% -75% of the depauperate contemporary population of salmon now spawn below the index reach [where redd counts are made]. The Arrowleaf property and an area just below it (< 2 mile) are the only productive habitats remaining in the upper river above the index reach." The list of objectives provided in the proposal (page 16) includes a numbered list, of which number 2 reads "Maintenance of excellent spawning and rearing habitat for listed salmonids as measured by Properly Functioning Conditions of the National Marine Fisheries Service – Tasks 4,5,6,8;". "Maintenance of spawning and rearing habitat for anadromous salmonids", is also given as a measurable biological objective on page 7. Given the statements regarding spawning habitat, it is clear why the ISRP was puzzled upon visiting this dry reach of river in October 2001.

One obvious question related to dewatering is "How often does dewatering occur, and what is its duration?" One of the respondents (headed "Limiting Factors – Executive Summary Water Resource Inventory Area 48) cited an observation of dewatering of the Methow River in 1898. Mullan, et al., 1992 found this reach dry in the period when they visited it in August to October 1987. That reference is not cited in the proposal, although

it would have been useful in this context and as a source of information on listed species. During the ISRP site visit, we heard from several participants (and see in the public comments) that the reach above Mazama and extending to above the Arrowleaf property is dry more often than not between September and December (and occasionally from as early as August to as late as April). The data given in the report by Vadas, Easterbrooks and Tweit attached to the Koenings letter (section “Hydrology of the Arrowleaf Reach”) provides the kind of information that should have been included in the original proposal. Data provided in that report show that flow in the reach of concern was less than 5 cfs (where some stranding/dewatering of redds occurs) for a period of three to five months in each of six years out of the eight years in which measurements were made.

Finally, the respondent (headed “Limiting Factors – Executive Summary Water Resource Inventory Area 48) refers to a Centennial Clean Water Grant of \$500,000 to Okanogan County to initiate a comprehensive hydrological study in the Methow watershed. We hope that hydrological studies underway in the Methow River will be useful in resolving issues similar to the dewatering issue confronted here. From input we received during the site visit, such a study needs to take into account the complex geological features of the basin. The depth of bedrock relative to the thickness of overlying cobble and other loose substrate in the Methow Valley probably varies considerably from one reach to another, which alone could account for dewatering of mid-basin reaches. The hydrological studies may identify specific reaches in the Methow Valley where dewatering can be countered by water-saving actions and other reaches where such actions will have little effect on dewatering.

## Findings

Per the Council’s request, the ISRP’s review findings are provided in the context of the High Priority solicitation criteria, which were much more specific than those provided by the 1996 amendment to the Power Act.<sup>1</sup> The criteria were organized in three tiers.

**TIER 1 CRITERIA:** The threshold (Tier 1) criteria specified that the proposal address problems of ESA-listed anadromous fish,<sup>2</sup> be designed for one-time funding, and result in immediate on-the-ground benefits. The threshold criteria required that a proposal justify expedited consideration by establishing that the proposed action addressed imminent risks to the survival of one or more species listed under the ESA. In addition, the proposed project must be 1) a time-limited opportunity (e.g. the opportunity to address the risk to the species may be lost if the proposal is not implemented in 2001) **or** 2) broadly recognized to achieve direct benefits to anadromous fish. In interpreting “imminent risk,” the ISRP focused on whether the project was likely to provide direct

---

<sup>1</sup> ISRP recommendations are based on a determination that projects: 1) are based on sound science principles; 2) benefit fish and wildlife; 3) have a clearly defined objective and outcome; and 4) contain provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results. In addition, the ISRP considers whether a project is consistent with the Fish and Wildlife Program. These criteria were woven into the high priority criteria.

<sup>2</sup> The ISRP understands that there was enough confusion regarding eligibility of resident fish proposals that the ISRP reviewed the five resident fish focused high priority proposals on their merits and reviews this project for its ESA listed anadromous and resident fish benefits.

benefits to an ESA-listed species. Two of the high priority threshold criteria were not within the ISRP's scientific purview and are subject to Council and BPA analysis, namely *in lieu* and permitting (NEPA, ESA, etc.) issues.

***ISRP FINDINGS:*** As is in our initial high priority review, the ISRP finds that the Arrowleaf project meets the basic threshold criteria. However, the observations from the site visit and subsequent information regarding dewatering of the Arrowleaf reach of the Methow River shift the emphasis of benefits claimed in the original proposal. The ISRP findings on the potential benefits to listed species given the dewatering are provided by species below.

**Spring Chinook.** Because of the dewatering, the Arrowleaf Reach does not approach what is generally considered suitable spring chinook spawning habitat. Passage and rearing for spring chinook would be the main attributes protected by the project. Spring chinook are affected by the dewatering, but not to the extent that lack of water in this reach represents a threat to their continued existence. Adults migrate upstream in spring when the reach is watered and oversummer in the watered reaches, or oversummer and spawn below the property. Spawning occurs in the fall in much of the upper watershed when the Arrowleaf reach is dewatered or at low water levels. Most spawning is necessarily accomplished above or below the dewatered reach; only a few fish apparently spawn in the dewatered reach in those years when water is there. Especially fine spawning habitat apparently occurs in the upwelling zone immediately downstream of the Arrowleaf property. Quality of this upwelling water and spawning habitat would be offered a certain, but unknown level of, protection by the proposed conservation easements.

Annually, the dewatered reach serves as valuable juvenile rearing habitat in the spring and summer when it is typically watered. In higher water years, the reach probably provides important juvenile rearing into the fall and winter months relative to the amount of water in it. Additionally, the spring-summer flooding of adjacent once-dry flood plain zones probably provides abundant food for the first-year fish. The Vadas et al., report also points out the value of the reach for passage of juvenile salmonids that are produced upstream. Juveniles produced upstream and from within the Arrowleaf project area migrate out in spring when there is always water. However, dewatering the reach in the fall months may strand a few young fish. The juvenile rearing, riparian flooding, and juvenile passage functions of the reach are important for spring chinook salmon and might be adversely affected by development in the reach.

**Steelhead:** Passage and rearing, and perhaps some spawning, would be the main attributes protected by the project. Steelhead are likely little affected by the dewatering of the reach adjacent to the Arrowleaf property. Steelhead migrate to the upper watershed when the Methow is watered in spring and summer, and smolts move downstream in spring when it is again watered. Steelhead apparently spawn adjacent to the Arrowleaf property in spring when there is water in the reach, so the fall-dewatered reach could be used for spring spawning. We were informed that the river is too high and turbid to have actual data on redd counts of steelhead. As with chinook (above), there should be

excellent rearing habitat when there is floodwater in spring-summer, even though habitat and some fish are probably lost during the drying phase.

**Bull Trout:** The value of the property to bull trout is less clear. Bull trout of all ages would be expected to be mostly above the Arrowleaf reach during the warmer seasons. When dewatering occurs in fall and winter, downstream passage to lower elevations for overwintering is likely limited for bull trout. But if dewatering has been a common feature for a very long time in this system, these fish must have adapted to it. Washington fisheries biologists report that spawning of bull trout does occur on occasion adjacent to the property. Rearing and seasonal passage are probably the main attributes protected by the project.

**Westslope Cutthroat Trout:** The Arrowleaf reach does not seem to be especially critical for westslope cutthroat during the fall and winter dewatered period. Spring spawning could occur in the Arrowleaf reach, as would spring-summer rearing. Lost passage during dewatered periods does not seem to be critical. Rearing and seasonal passage are probably the main attributes protected by the project.

**Imminent Risk and Direct Benefits:**

The proposal presented a certain and sound strategy involving land acquisition, perpetual conservation easements, and limited property sales with conservation easements and strict development guidelines to preserve the Arrowleaf/Methow River project area and the near pristine nature of its habitat. These actions should protect the important fisheries and wildlife habitat attributes of the existing property. Listed anadromous fish species, spring chinook and steelhead, are likely to continue to use the area as they now do, for passage and rearing, and in a limited fashion, for spawning.

The Methow River through the Arrowleaf property provides an important connection between upriver spawning and rearing habitats (primarily steelhead) and the major spring chinook spawning habitat immediately below the Arrowleaf property. Protection of the ecological attributes of the Arrowleaf property safeguards the critically important adjacent downstream upwelling reach that supports most spring chinook spawning in the area. Indeed, this latter point may be one of the most compelling aspects of the proposed land acquisition. Hopefully, the protections being sought here for the Arrowleaf property are also being sought, or are already in place, for the primary spring chinook spawning area immediately downstream of the Arrowleaf property.

Protections provided by the proposed project are in contrast with potential risks of unknown development without the easements in place. Clearly, conservation easements are broadly recognized as sound methods to achieve direct benefits to anadromous fish; thus, that portion of the threshold criteria is met.

**TIER 2 CRITERIA:** Proposals were asked to address two additional tiers of criteria. Six Tier 2 criteria were generated from the Fish and Wildlife Program:

- The proposal has measurable, quantitative biological objectives and will result in clear benefits to species survival;

*ISRP Finding:* Met criteria. As a land acquisition project, the proposal did not have measurable, quantitative biological objectives. Rather, the project is an attempt to secure land and perpetual conservation easements as a way of protecting fish, wildlife, and habitat against habitat degradation that might result from other potential land use and development. As noted in the proposal, future monitoring will be required to ensure that the present ecological benefits (continued fish use and lack of habitat degradation) are maintained.

- The proposal has immediate, measurable benefits to ESA-listed species;

*ISRP Finding:* Met criteria. Again, the project provides immediate benefits that are in fact already occurring by guarding against future land use and development that could negatively impact fish, wildlife, and habitat in the Arrowleaf project area.

- The proposal will produce largely self-sustaining habitat after activities are completed;

*ISRP Finding:* Met criteria.

- The proposal will connect patches of high-quality habitat or extend habitat out from a core area;

*ISRP Finding:* Met criteria. This is the primary strength of this proposal.

- The proposal will improve conditions in a 303d water-quality limited stream; and/or,

*Not Applicable*

- The proposal addresses a habitat enforcement issue and results in the protection of fish or wildlife habitat (including marine habitats of anadromous species).

*Not Applicable*

These Tier 2 criteria proved critical in the ISRP's identification of technically sound projects that best meet the intent of the high priority solicitation.

**TIER 3 CRITERIA:** While not "pass/fail", the criteria were provided to allow a proposal to improve its priority position by demonstrating one or more of the following:

- The proposal fulfills more than one of the above criteria.

*ISRP Finding:* Yes

- The proposal shares some of the cost of the action with other entities.

*ISRP Finding:* Yes

- The proposal is part of a collaborative effort with other entities or have synergistic effects with actions implemented by other entities.

*ISRP Finding:* Likely.



- The proposal is recommended by an action plan derived from a science-based assessment.

*ISRP Finding:* Yes, as noted in the first ISRP review.

- The proposal implements high-priority actions approved by a tribal or state governmental authority with fish and wildlife protection responsibility and identified by a tribal or state plan as necessary to protect or rebuild fish and/or wildlife in the Columbia River Basin.

*ISRP Finding:* Yes

- The proposal either collects or identifies data that are appropriate for measuring biological outcomes identified in the objectives.

*ISRP Finding:* This is an area of weakness in the proposal and responses, although the proposal notes that future monitoring will be required to ensure that the present ecological benefits (continued fish use and lack of habitat degradation) are maintained.

Tier 3 criteria are not all scientific, but are elements that are regularly included in the ISRP proposal review. These elements link a project to other actions and increase the likelihood of project success.

## **Conclusion**

No new information has been provided in the responses that would call for a change in our original recommendation to fund this project. The intact ecosystem, strange as it is with seasonal dewatering of sections, seems to have been productive of salmonids and worth protecting with the Arrowleaf project. The Methow River upstream and downstream of the section that dewatered is good to excellent habitat for listed fish species, by all accounts. Although the benefits to spring chinook probably would not be substantial, particularly given the size of the present population, water quality for downstream spawning, downstream and on site rearing habitat, and passage for fish are important attributes that would be protected by the project.

The upwelling zone at the downstream end of the dewatered zone is likely a primary reason the fish did well here historically. Without the dewatered zone, associated underground flows and upwelling of ground temperature water (cool in the summer, warm in the winter), the downstream spawning area might be less suitable for spawning. It is too bad the Arrowleaf project does not actually include the upwelling zone, for that zone seems to be the especially unique and valuable chinook spawning habitat that is loosely (and uncritically) connected to the property in many of the documents we reviewed. Protection of properly functioning floodplain and riparian habitat along the upper Methow River from the Lost River confluence, inclusive, downstream to the town of Winthrop was identified as the most important recommendation by the Technical Advisory Group in a document entitled “Habitat Limiting Factors, Executive Summary, Water resource Inventory Area 48, Methow Watershed.” An intact properly functioning

ecosystem is a primary attribute offered some additional level of protection by the project.

The land and riparian-floodplain zone of the subject property has considerable wildlife, scenic, and other esthetic and recreational values in addition to fish benefits. The proposed project would protect most of this wildlife habitat, except for the few relatively isolated home sites. Wildlife habitat is a primary attribute that would be protected by the project.

Some of the issues raised in the material provided to the ISRP were policy issues beyond ISRP purview. The relative merits of who develops the land and whether their zoning would have protected the fish and wildlife values is beyond the charge of the ISRP. The frequent seasonal drying does look bad for fish (as it did to our surprise during our site visit), but was judged to be less critical when factored in with the life cycles of affected fish and the entire functioning ecosystem. There are many other water-use issues in the Methow Basin that are also beyond the charge of the ISRP. We note that the Council must consider these other water issues as well as social and economic issues in arriving at a policy decision concerning protection of this property.

Attachment 1. First ISRP Review of the Arrowleaf Project

## INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL

Northwest Power Planning Council  
851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
[Emerrill@nwppc.org](mailto:Emerrill@nwppc.org)  
1.800.452.5161

---

December 18, 2000

Mr. Frank L. Cassidy, Chair  
Northwest Power Planning Council  
851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, Oregon 97204

**Review of the High Priority Proposal:  
“Arrowleaf/Methow River Conservation Project”**

Dear Mr. Cassidy,

At the request of Council and Council Staff (Bob Lohn communication to ISRP Chair Rick Williams on 6 December 2000), the ISRP reviewed the “Arrowleaf/Methow River Conservation Project” high priority proposal ahead of other High Priority Proposals. This is due solely to the timeline involved in the potential land acquisition; if not acted upon by December 21, 2000, the conservation opportunity will be lost to other development alternatives.

The ISRP was unanimous in viewing the acquisition of the Arrowleaf property as an important opportunity that should be seized upon by the Council and the Bonneville Power Administration. The Arrowleaf property is clearly a desirable property with many wildlife and habitat features that approximate pristine condition. The proposors clearly describe the importance of the property, its near pristine condition, its position as a link between upper and lower habitats (particularly salmonid habitats), and the negative ecological consequences of not obtaining the property.

The ISRP typically looks for evidence in habitat restoration and acquisition projects, that the project is justified based on a prioritized identification through a watershed assessment process. While this does not appear to have been done at the subbasin level for the Methow subbasin, the proposal presented convincing documentation from Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and Yakama Nation analyses that the Arrowleaf property is a priority fish and wildlife acquisition. The map (Figure 2) makes it evident that the property is situated where development can have a major effect on the Methow River and

its immediate environs, through various means including water withdrawals. Recent analysis by WDFW identified the Arrowleaf property and the property immediately downstream as the most important elements in the watershed.

The proposal was somewhat non-standard, which made reviewing it difficult, as did reviewing it “out-of-context” with other proposals. As the ISRP has discussed in regard to the general subject of land acquisition for wildlife enhancement, it is best to have proposals tied to the larger Fish and Wildlife Program framework and based on a watershed assessment. The newly established Provincial Review Process is providing this context. Without explicit reference to the Fish and Wildlife Program, a subbasin plan, or a watershed assessment, it is difficult to assess a single proposal. Putting the proposal in the context of a larger set of proposals, such as occurs within the Provincial Review Process, would allow the Council to compare the benefits likely to accrue from this project to those from an alternative project.

Finally, the proposal was lacking in many details, but did include a general recognition of the need for future monitoring and evaluation. It stated:

“As described above, the collection of data for Monitoring and Evaluation of variables reflecting the project objectives is a commitment accompanying the acquisition. These will include the continuing collection of stream survey data by the USFS, the spawning surveys by YIN fisheries, the determination of target species, Habitat Suitability Indices, Habitat Units and HEP-based mitigation credits, the development of an ecosystem model and collecting data for its parameterization and driving variables as described above.”

We encourage further refinement in this area.

The ISRP recognized the special nature of this project and the need to review it on a very short timeframe independently from other projects. Nevertheless, the ISRP is concerned that exceptions to larger more formal processes, such as the Provincial Review Process, can erode the quality and consistency of the scientific review process in the Basin.

Sincerely,

/s/

Richard N. Williams  
ISRP Chair

ISRP Reviewers: Jack Griffith, Susan Hanna, Lyman McDonald, Richard Whitney, and Richard Williams.

## Attachment 2. High Priority Review Excerpts

### **Category B Proposals - Good Faith Recommendation**

These nineteen proposals [of 96 submitted] were judged to meet the threshold criteria and likely offer important benefits to ESA listed or threatened species. However, many of the proposals failed to provide adequate detail for technical review on issues ranging from biological justification, stock status, lack of indication of priority of projects within a watershed, or protection and quantification of instream water saving. In spite of these deficiencies, the reviewers had some confidence that the proposals would yield important benefits to fish and wildlife.

#### **Project ID: 23012**

Arrowleaf/Methow River Conservation Project

**Province:** Columbia Cascade

**Subbasin:** Methow

**Sponsor:** TPL and WDFW

**Funding Request:** \$17,055,000

**Short Description:** The project is an acquisition of the 1020-acre Arrowleaf property on the Methow River-- critical habitat for 9 ESA listed species. If not purchased the property will be subdivided into 70 lots and much of the upland and riparian habitat will be destroyed.

**ISRP Rank:** B

**Comments:**

See previous ISRP review: *“The ISRP was unanimous in viewing the acquisition of the Arrowleaf property as an important opportunity that should be seized upon by the Council and BPA. The Arrowleaf property is clearly desirable property with many wildlife and habitat features that approximate pristine condition. The proposors clearly describe the importance of the property, its near pristine condition, its position as a link between upper and lower habitats (particularly salmonid habitats), and the negative ecological consequences of not obtaining the property.”* Council should look at the cost of this purchase relative to other purchases.

### **Attachment 3. 2001 Action Plan Review**

**Project ID: 23012**

Arrowleaf/Methow River Conservation Project

**Sponsor:** TPL and WDFW

**Province:** Columbia Cascade

**Subbasin:** Methow

**FY01 Request:** \$1,250,000

**Short Description:** The project is an acquisition of the 1020-acre Arrowleaf property on the Methow River-- critical habitat for 9 ESA listed species. If not purchased the property will be subdivided into 70 lots and much of the upland and riparian habitat will be destroyed.

**ISRP Recommendation:**

Fundable? Under the high priority solicitation, the Council recommended and BPA committed to funding this project at \$2.5 million of the \$3.75 million requested. They are now asking for \$1.25 million to fully fund this conservation easement transaction. Although the sponsors did not revise their proposal to justify it under the Action Plan criteria, this project offers long-term benefit to species targeted under the Action Plan solicitation. Also, the proposal may meet the scope of activities under this solicitation in that it would protect some water rights for instream use. However, it is not clear whether these rights will be exercised this year or how significant the additions will be to the overall flow of the Methow. It is not clear that additional funding under this solicitation will provide immediate benefits.

See previous ISRP review: “The ISRP was unanimous in viewing the acquisition of the Arrowleaf property as an important opportunity that should be seized upon by the Council and BPA. The Arrowleaf property is clearly desirable property with many wildlife and habitat features that approximate pristine condition. The proposers clearly describe the importance of the property, its near pristine condition, its position as a link between upper and lower habitats (particularly salmonid habitats), and the negative ecological consequences of not obtaining the property.” Council should look at the cost of this purchase relative to other purchases.

Per the cover letter from the Trust for Public Lands for the 2001 Action Plan solicitation, the ISRP notes that in our review we discussed that the request to BPA was a portion of the \$17M total cost for the project. The ISRP made a “B-list” recommendation for this project in the High Priority solicitation for a variety of reasons.

**ATTACHMENT 4. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>RECD.</b>	<b>FROM</b>	<b>ORG</b>	<b>TO</b>
01	11/30/01	11/30/01	Jeff Koenings	WDFW	Larry Cassidy
02	12/17/01	12/19/01	Michael D. Gage		NWPPC Members
03	12/07/01	12/10/01	Paul E. Christen		Doug Marker
04	12/11/01	12/11/01	Dick Ewing		Larry Cassidy
05	11/21/01	11/27/01	Mel Stone	Okanogan County Citizens Coalition	
06	10/19/01	10/24/01	Robert Turner	National Marine Fisheries Service	Vaugh Jolley, Methow Valley Irrigation Dist.
07	08/08/01	08/14/01	Robert Turner	National Marine Fisheries Service	Vaugh Jolley, Methow Valley Irrigation Dist.
08	03/12/01	03/12/01	Calvin J. Treser		Mark Walker
09	03/05/01	03/05/01	Patty Murray	United States Senate	Larry Cassidy
10	03/12/01	03/14/01	Dueane Calvin	Water & Irrigation Division	Larry Cassidy
11	02/21/01	02/26/01	Richard Penny	American Rivers	Larry Cassidy
12	02/20/01	02/22/01	Frank J. Urabeck	Trout Unlimited	Larry Cassidy
13	02/14/01	02/14/01	Daulot Fountain	MV Citizens Council	NWPPC
14	02/21/01	02/26/01	Travis S. Thornton	The Trust for Public Land	Larry Cassidy
15	02/20/01	02/22/01	Barbara Gordon Nicholas Lovejoy	Gordon-Lovejoy Foundation	Mark Walker
16	02/14/01	03/13/01	Frank Chopp	WA. House of Representatives	Larry Cassidy
17	02/12/01	02/15/01	Mel Stone	Okanogan County Citizens Coalition	Mark Walker
18	02/12/01	02/13/01	Mike Petersen	The Land Council	Mark Walker
19	02/12/01	02/14/01	David A. Bricklin	Bricklin & Gendler, LLP	Mark Walker
20	02/11/01	02/13/01	Bonnie Lawrence	Okanogan Resource Council	Mark Walker