

FRANK L. CASSIDY JR.  
"Larry"  
CHAIRMAN  
Washington

Tom Karier  
Washington

Mike Field  
Idaho

Jim Kempton  
Idaho

## **NORTHWEST POWER PLANNING COUNCIL**

851 S.W. SIXTH AVENUE, SUITE 1100  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204-1348

ERIC J. BLOCH  
VICE CHAIRMAN  
Oregon

John Brogoitti  
Oregon

Stan Grace  
Montana

Leo A. Giacometto  
Montana

**Fax:**  
503-820-2370

**Phone:**  
503-222-5161  
1-800-452-5161

**Internet:**  
[www.nwccouncil.org](http://www.nwccouncil.org)

March 28, 2001

### **Council Recommendations to Bonneville for Funding Direct Program Projects in Fiscal Years 2001 through 2003**

#### **Content and Organization of the Recommendations**

The 1996 amendments to the Northwest Power Act (Act) direct the Council to make recommendations to Bonneville on how to expend its annual fish and wildlife budget. For Fiscal Year 2001, substantial changes were made to the project solicitation, review and selection process. The Council instituted a limited province-based solicitation and selection process -- the "rolling provincial review" -- in place of the unlimited basinwide solicitation and selection process used in Fiscal Year 2000 and prior years (see Council Document 2000-6 [[www.nwccouncil.org/library/2000/2000-6.htm](http://www.nwccouncil.org/library/2000/2000-6.htm)] for more information on the "rolling review"). Part I of this document explains the construct of the provincial review and the reasons for this new review model.

One major change in the format of the Council's funding recommendations for Fiscal Year 2001 was that its decision was bifurcated. The first part of that decision was made in September 2000, and dealt with recommendations for renewing contracts for Fiscal Year 2001 for multi-year projects approved by the Council and funded by Bonneville in prior fiscal years -- referred to as "ongoing projects." Part II of this document describes that "ongoing projects renewal" process, and details the decisions made by the Council in September regarding available budget for Fiscal Year 2001 and for funding ongoing projects. Attached Tables A through C correspond to the Council's ongoing project renewal recommendations and start of Fiscal Year 2001 budget.

Part III of this Fiscal Year 2001 recommendation pertains to project recommendations in the provinces that were subject to the detailed ISRP review for Fiscal Year 2001. The Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces were in the provincial review for Fiscal Year 2001 recommendations. This section describes the provincial review, and seeks to frame the major policy issues considered by the Council for the projects in these provinces. The Council's funding recommendation relates those policies to the projects that were recommended for implementation in Fiscal Years 2001 through 2003. Also included in Part III is the Council's response to project-specific recommendations of the Independent Scientific Review Panel required by the Act. Attached Tables D and E correspond to Council recommendations for project funding in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces, respectively.

Part IV of this recommendation document addresses the separate “innovative projects” initiative for Fiscal Year 2001. Building on prior years, for Fiscal Year 2001, the Council crafted a specific solicitation for innovative projects, and called upon Bonneville to earmark a portion of the available Fiscal Year 2001 funds for them. This process, and the innovative projects recommended for funding, are described in this Part IV.

Finally, as required by the Act, Part V of this document explain how the Council incorporated ocean considerations into its project recommendations, and Part VI is a statement relating to the cost-effectiveness all of the Council’s funding recommendations discussed in Parts I through IV.

## **PART I.**

### **The New Province-based Project Review Format**

The newly adopted 2000 Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program is structured around an explicit scientific foundation, and it includes a basin-level vision, and basin-level goals, objectives and strategies. Beneath the overall basin level, the program organizes the Columbia River Basin into 11 ecological provinces. Within these provinces there are 58 tributary subbasins. Subsequent program amendment phases will establish visions, objectives and strategies at the province and subbasin levels to complete the comprehensive program amendment process. At the subbasin level, the 2000 program states that visions, biological objectives and strategies will be components of subbasin plans. This new program organization facilitated the reformatting of the project review and selection process away from an annual full basin review to a more detailed province and subbasin oriented review.

The Council expects that subbasin plans will be developed and adopted into the program over the next several years. Once those subbasin plans are completed, they will be the context for review of the project proposals submitted annually for Bonneville funding. Providing this larger context for project review responds to advice that the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) has consistently given the Council in its project review reports. Specifically, the ISRP has advised the Council that in order to evaluate project proposals and make the findings and recommendations to the Council required under section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Act, it needs to have projects proposed in a more complete subbasin context. The ISRP advised that providing the necessary context did not appear to be possible with exclusive reliance on the project-specific proposal forms used. That is, the ISRP has advised the Council that it needs to better understand how different projects relate, one to the other, and to the goals and objectives and ecological conditions present in any particular subbasin in order to evaluate their scientific soundness and give an opinion on likely benefits to fish and wildlife.

However, while the program amendment process unfolds over the next several years, particularly the development of subbasin plans, the Council and region will continue to move forward with activities to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife. At the same time, given the desire to move forward with ongoing and new fish and wildlife projects, the Council wants to continue improving the quality of the ISRP review and its own annual review. Therefore, as an interim process, until subbasin plans are developed and adopted by the Council, those participating in fish and wildlife program implementation are developing documents called “subbasin summaries” for the subbasins in the Columbia Basin. The subbasin summaries, which will contain natural resource information collected from state, federal, tribal, local and private entities, will be the foundation for proposing fish and wildlife activities funded by Bonneville, and the context for the independent scientific review of those proposals.

### **Subbasin Summaries**

Subbasin summaries are a compilation of all the *existing information* about a subbasin. They document what is known about the physical and biological elements of the subbasin, past and ongoing fish and wildlife activities, and identify current management plans, objectives and policies - they are a “snapshot” of the subbasin. This “current snapshot” construct is an important feature that distinguishes the summaries from the full subbasin *plans* that the Council’s 2000 program contemplates. That is, a subbasin plan will be a plan that establishes a vision, objectives, and

strategies that describe what is desired for the subbasin in the *future* and how those involved plan to achieve that end. The process of developing and agreeing upon that future and a path to take in a subbasin plan requires a substantial public involvement process. This is very different than what is needed for subbasin summaries, which simply compile information and goals that have been established in the past. It is important to have this information, and particularly for the ISRP to have it for its project reviews, however, because until new subbasin plans replace existing plans, and until new information updates the old, fish and wildlife projects must be explained, understood and evaluated in the context of currently existing plans and information.

Each subbasin summary has five major components:

- 1) a subbasin description;
- 2) assessment type information;
- 3) a description of past and existing activities affecting fish and wildlife and habitat;
- 4) an explanation of existing management goals, objectives, policies, etc.,
- 5) a statement of near-term fish and wildlife project needs.

The subbasin description describes the subbasin in terms of location, drainage area, climate, predominant land uses, etc. Maps are encouraged. For the second element, each subbasin summary provides the best available subbasin information available relating to, or useful for, a subbasin assessment. The following types of information are provided when and where available: information regarding distribution of species and life stages; natural disturbance history; land and water uses; barriers to movement; topography/geomorphology; biological processes (vegetation, hydrology, competition/predation); and limiting factor analysis/identification. New primary data gathering and analyses assessment work is not to be done for subbasin summaries. Rather, the goal is to identify and compile the information that people already possess in the subbasin summaries.

The third element of the subbasin summary is a brief explanation of the existing activities occurring within the subbasin that affect fish and wildlife or their habitat. This explanation includes activities that are funded by BPA as part of the Council's program. The explanation should also include activities that are being conducted outside of the Fish and Wildlife Program that have a beneficial or detrimental impact on fish and wildlife or habitat. In addition, this component of the subbasin summary will be the vehicle through which the information required to implement the Artificial Production Review Report can be gathered.

One category of "past and existing" activities or projects in each of the provinces and subbasins to be identified in the subbasin summary are artificial production projects. The Council, in concert with managers and stakeholders, recently completed its report on artificial production, and submitted that report to congress (Council document 99-15). One of our first opportunities to begin implementing the Artificial Production Review Report (APR) recommendations will be the provincial rolling review. By using the province review, production projects funded under the direct program in any given province, or through the Bonneville reimbursable account (including the Corps of Engineers mitigation hatcheries and the Fish and Wildlife Service's Lower Snake River Compensation Plan) can be considered in light of the APR report. The ultimate goal is to have artificial production facilities, funded from whatever source, evaluated relative to the APR report.

As part of this rolling provincial review process, the Council asks project sponsors who have production programs in these provinces to answer several questions relating to the policy guidance in the APR report and to supply specific data on operations and objectives. For anadromous production programs, the Council will ask sponsors to use Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs)

to provide most of the needed information. For resident fish facilities a modified HGMP is being used.

The next component of the subbasin summary is an explanation of the currently existing management objectives for the subbasin. Where management objectives are derived from specific management plans, court orders, permits, etc., those should be identified and summarized. To be clear, the Council does not expect the sponsors and management agencies and tribes with fish and wildlife jurisdiction to negotiate or completely agree on management objectives for each subbasin for purposes of this project funding review. In fact, to the extent that existing management objectives or policies differ, the Council encourages the drafters of the umbrella to identify simply identify those disagreements, and briefly explain differing perspectives. The upcoming subbasin planning process will be the forum for resolving these differences. Similarly, the subbasin summaries do not require that fish and wildlife co-managers establish among themselves, and/or with other land and water managers and others the management goals, objectives, policies, etc. that will govern fish and wildlife and habitat management in the subbasins in the future. Rather, the subbasin summaries simply seek disclosure of what objectives are currently directing fish, wildlife, and habitat management.

The final element of the subbasin summary is an identification of both the ongoing projects that are proposed for continued funding, and a statement of new near-term needs. The justification for continuing ongoing projects and the rationale for the new needs should be made in light of the assessment information (or lack thereof) and existing management plan objectives and strategies.

### **Project Solicitation and Review in the Provincial Review**

The Council makes the subbasin summaries available to the public, and provides notice that the project solicitation for those provinces open to review will center upon the statement of near-term needs contained in those summaries. The Council's expectation is that near-term needs may be met by continuing ongoing projects, redirecting existing projects, and proposed new projects to be funded by Bonneville. Further, the Council expects that projects will be discontinued or prioritized lower where they do not have strong links to the needs identified in the subbasin summaries.

Anyone may submit a proposal to address needs that are identified in the subbasin summary. The process is not limited to fish and wildlife managers. The Council requires sponsors to use standardized project proposal forms, although project proponents will also be allowed to reference and submit for consideration the information and reports underlying the project proposal.

The subbasin summary provides the context and justification for the projects proposed in any subbasin. Sponsors need to explain how their proposed projects relate to the assessment information, to other activities occurring in the subbasin, and to existing management goals. The summary itself will *not* provide the detail of the projects. Individual project forms, and other project specific information and documentation will need to be provided for each of the projects proposed.

At the same time that project sponsors prepare and submit project proposals for review for direct program funding to implement the Council's Program, the federal agencies with reimbursable fish and wildlife activities in the province and subbasins will also be asked to prepare for review a description of the on-going and new fish and wildlife activities proposed for funding. If a project in this category is within one of the subbasins (e.g., reimbursable artificial production activities within a subbasin), the Council expects the project sponsor to work with other entities in the subbasin in the development of the subbasin summary *and* then to describe how their activities proposed for funding

fit within that subbasin context. Even though the Council will not be making funding recommendations for these programs, project specific forms need to be completed for those programs to provide the ISRP a uniform model for review. This will be the basis for the Council's annual report to congress on fish and wildlife activities and programs funded by Bonneville through reimbursement or other means.

After a short period to enable the ISRP, Council, and others to review the project proposals, a workshop is conducted where the project proponents present the subbasin summaries and their individual project proposals to the ISRP. The Council requires that each project proponent be given this opportunity. This workshop provides the opportunity for a question and answer session between the ISRP and those making project proposals. In addition, the ISRP may, in limited circumstances, request site visits as part of its review of a proposed project or collection of proposed projects.

The next step of the process is for the ISRP to issue preliminary reports, making its preliminary findings and recommendations as required under section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Act for the provinces being reviewed. Thereafter, the project proponents and the public are given the opportunity to make a response to the ISRP preliminary report. For Fiscal Year 2001, the Council asked CBFWA to coordinate those responses as it did in Fiscal Year 2000, and to provide that service to all project sponsors. After reviewing the responses, the ISRP provides a final report to the Council. For the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain Provinces, the Council received that report near the end of November 2000. Finally, the Council considers the recommendations made by the ISRP in its two reports, the public comment, and brings its own analysis and policy discretion to bear on the proposals and makes its project recommendations.

This process is scheduled in a staggered manner. That is, as the subbasin summaries are finished and the project solicitation begins in one set of provinces, the next provinces on the schedule begin the subbasin summary development process, and so on. This staggered process provides for review of all of the provinces over a period of three-years, and then the cycle begins again.

## **PART II**

### **Recommendations to Bonneville for funding “ongoing projects” in Fiscal Year 2001**

#### **A. Defining the budget for Fiscal Year 2001 -- Background**

The first step taken by the Council in making its funding recommendations in Fiscal Year 2001 was to reconcile the available direct program fish and wildlife budget. There is annually \$127 million available under the MOA setting forth Bonneville’s direct program funding commitment for Fiscal Year 2001, the final year of the MOA. As in prior years, there are a number of carry-forward or reserve items that augment or subtract from the base \$127 million available.

As requested by the Council, the CBFWA submitted a draft Annual Implementation Work Plan of Ongoing Projects (July 14, 2000). That proposed work plan made several assumptions about the use of carry-forwards, reserves, etc. for the purposes of establishing the base Fiscal Year 2001 budget. CBFWA assumed that the base \$127 million available for Fiscal Year 2001 would be augmented in the following ways:

- a. \$1.7 million in interest from unspent Fiscal Year 2000 funds.
- b. \$1.9 million from the Contingency/Inflation Reserve.
- c. All unallocated placeholders be made available (approximately \$4.3 million).
- d. \$5 million to be made available through de-obligating funds from completed projects.
- e. Make the \$1 million reserve established in Fiscal Year 1998 for Hydrosystem Biological Opinion requirements for steelhead available.
- f. Make the \$2.589 million reserve established in Fiscal Year 1996 for ESA related research available.

Bonneville provided written comments on CBFWA’s draft ongoing project workplan, including specific comments on these budget assumptions. Bonneville agreed with the first two assumptions made by CBFWA (a and b), but took exception to the remainder of the assumptions.

Regarding item c, the assumption that all unallocated placeholder funds be made available for allocation to ongoing projects, Bonneville noted that this would leave little or no funds available for contingencies that may arise throughout the year. Bonneville recommended that some amount be left in each placeholder to provide contracting flexibility and to meet contingencies.

Next, regarding item d, Bonneville commented that the reconciliation process for closed fish and wildlife projects is ongoing, and as of the date it submitted its comments, \$750,000 had been identified that could be made available for reallocation in Fiscal Year 2001. Bonneville stated that it has redoubled its efforts to de-obligate funds from completed projects, and would work towards the CBFWA estimate over time. In the meantime, Bonneville recommended that the amount of funds secured to date be used as the appropriate assumption.

Regarding items e and f, the ESA related reserves, Bonneville recommended that they be left in place. Bonneville stated that conversations with NMFS suggested that these funds may be needed for work under the current Biological Opinions in Fiscal Year 2001.

## **B. Council Recommendations to Bonneville on available budget for Fiscal Year 2001**

The Council accepted the recommendations made by CBFWA on items a, b, and c for purposes of planning. The Council accepted the assumptions recommended by Bonneville for items d through f, subject to the following guidance.

Regarding item c, the use of all unallocated placeholder funds, the Council did not believe that Bonneville's concern that there will be no funds available throughout the year for contingencies would be realized. Rather, as is seen in the discussion below, the available budget was not fully allocated when the ongoing projects were adjusted to stay within the bounds of the renewal process. In addition, the Council believed that additional funds would be made available to deal with in-year contingencies by the continuing reconciliation process that Bonneville has committed to. These funds would be returned to placeholders as they are identified, and Bonneville should be encouraged to aggressively and expeditiously complete this reconciliation.

For items d and e the Council recommended these reserves be maintained for ESA purposes as recommended by Bonneville, and not be made available for allocation to other ongoing project renewals. Again, these additional funds were not needed to bring the renewal component within the known available budget once the projects are properly scaled to comply with the instructions provided for the renewal process. However, the Council made this recommendation with the following admonition to Bonneville and NMFS.

It is worth noting that NMFS is a member and active participant in CBFWA. CBFWA's draft workplan for ongoing projects was approved with consensus by its membership as part of the regional project solicitation, and review process used for implementing the Council's program. Thus, it is difficult to understand how or why NMFS, as a CBFWA member, acquiesced in releasing a draft budget that called for the reallocation of these ESA reserves, but later, in separate conversations with Bonneville and Council staff, opposed that release, stating that these funds would be needed for ESA purposes and would not be available for reallocation as stated in the CBFWA budget. In future years, the coordination between NMFS' ESA- based requirements and the Council's program will require full participation in the regional process from NMFS and the Action Agencies. This is particularly so for implementing the type of off-site habitat work proposed under the draft hydrosystem Biological Opinion. The ESA implementing and Action Agencies will need to be diligent in identifying ESA based needs in a timely way, and working those into the annual regional funding process along with all other work proposed under the Council's program in any given year in the regional process. That type of participation and diligence is not evidenced in what seems to be mutually exclusive positions taken by NMFS this year on the use of these funds.

The Council proposed to Bonneville that its start-of-year available budget for the renewal of ongoing projects, in Fiscal Year 2001 conform to Table A (attached hereto at the end of Part II).

## **C. Council recommendations for funding "ongoing projects"**

In February the Council started an interim renewal process for ongoing projects in the program throughout the entire basin. An "ongoing project" is a project that has been reviewed by



the ISRP, CBFWA, and the Council in a prior project selection process and is the subject of a contract with Bonneville. The process is called “interim” because it is the process by which project budgets are established prior to their detailed review and approval in the rolling provincial review process.

Except in very limited circumstances, *only* those provinces in the “rolling review” are permitted to propose *new projects* or *add to the scope* of existing projects approved in prior years. The Council finds also that those detailed reviews are necessary to *increase the costs* of previously approved work. The Council strongly believes that expansions of effort, redirection of projects, and increasing the cost of any particular package of activities beyond that previously approved are issues that must be considered in a full subbasin context with the rigorous management, scientific, and policy reviews that collectively constitute the province based “rolling review.”

New, expanded, or redirected activities will need to be justified and explained in relation to the assessment type information and established management objectives in the subbasin, and demonstrate that scientifically sound methods will be employed. Similarly, before a project receives a substantially increased level of funding for the same scope or activities previously approved, it is necessary for a detailed review in the “rolling review.” That review is needed to understand why the costs have increased and to determine if this work, with its higher cost, and decide if this more expensive work continues to be a priority over other possible work in the subbasin.

### **The renewal process, and how it worked for Fiscal Year 2001**

Provinces not in the rolling review were (and are) required to maintain effort with existing projects. The Council’s ongoing project renewal process is a project management review of the ongoing project proposals to ensure that they are staying within the scope of prior approvals, and laying out their expenditure plan in an accountable and strategic manner. The Council achieved this management review primarily by having its staff apply six criteria (discussed in detail below) to each of the projects proposed for renewal, and then by recommending that Bonneville apply these criteria at a fine scale during its contracting processes.

For those ongoing projects that were scheduled to participate in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain province reviews, the Council’s renewal process recommendations for funding were provisional, and consistent with its recommendations for all other ongoing projects. While these projects needed to participate in the renewal process to establish the basinwide baseline budget, it is understood that if projects in the Columbia Gorge or Inter-Mountain province reviews are expanded, reduced, or eliminated as a result of the full CBFWA/ISRP/Council province review process, budgets will be adjusted accordingly in the Council’s recommendations coming out of those provincial reviews.

The project renewal process began with sponsors submitting budgets for their ongoing work on May 1, 2000. In an effort to assist in implementing the Council’s fiscal accountability strategy for project management, sponsors of ongoing projects broke down the components of each project into four phases: planning and design, construction and implementation, operation and maintenance, and monitoring and evaluation. This strategy was to define separate budgets for the “phases” of major projects. The proposed ongoing project budget form asked for cost estimates in two ways: by task and by materials, labor, indirect charges, etc. Bonneville has designed its budget management systems to support this fiscal accountability strategy. Project sponsors were asked to submit their renewal proposals to Bonneville in this format. They have done so and added more detail on costs by objective and task.

These proposed ongoing project budgets were referred to CBFWA for review by sub-regional teams in May and June. The sub-regional teams reviewed the proposed tasks for each project, recommended deferral of tasks they identified as new work and confirmed budget recommendations for each project. This work culminated in the June 14, 2000 draft Annual Implementation Work Plan for Ongoing Projects that was submitted for the Council's consideration.

The Council staff reviewed that workplan and proposed further revision to the numerous Fiscal Year 2001 project budgets. The fact that the Council staff did additional work is not to suggest the work completed by CBFWA and its members was insubstantial -- rather, it was very appropriate and helpful. CBFWA built upon and improved the efforts of sponsors to define projects by phase to assist in implementing the project management fiscal accountability guidance given by the Council last year. However, upon careful review, it was evident to Council staff that the proposed project budgets in the draft workplan needed to have an additional screening to ensure that they were staying within the confines of the renewal process discussed above.

Review of the CBFWA workplan, and discussions with project sponsors caused the Council to conclude that there was something of a misunderstanding about some of the fundamental elements of the renewal process. It was apparently not entirely understood by project sponsors that the renewal process is only to renew funding in a subsequent year for work in projects that has previously received ISRP review and specific Council recommendation for funding. This means that new, expanded, or different *work or activity* that has not been specifically approved by the Council should not be budgeted for in the renewal process, and that the same will not be approved by the Council as a project "renewal".

For future efforts, the Council seeks to be very clear about what is meant by a previous "specific Council recommendation" and "previous ISRP review." It appears that there was not a complete common understanding between the Council and CBFWA and its members on the scope of the renewal process prior to the development of the CBFWA draft workplan and budget for ongoing projects.

Some project sponsors took issue with additional Council budget reductions from the CBFWA draft workplan as part of its September decision for ongoing projects. Some sponsors stated that the funding that was eliminated was for work previously deferred by the Council that was contemplated in the out-years in projects that were previously "reviewed by the ISRP" and/or "approved by the Council." The Council agrees that, in most cases, the work or activity that was been deferred to the appropriate province review was suggested in Fiscal Year 2000 proposals. However, this is not the end of the inquiry. The treatment of each proposal throughout the Fiscal Year 2000 review and selection process determines what can be "renewed" in the renewal process.

That is, once proposals are submitted in response to a solicitation, they are often pared down, or work is deferred to future years at CBFWA during its review. Next, certain elements are often criticized and not recommended by the ISRP. Finally the Council considers the CBFWA, ISRP, and public input, and ultimately makes a recommendation for a project. Those formal recommendations come with *a specific budget derivative of and directly linked to the tasks or work that it is recommending for the proposed project*. Thus, there may certainly be projects that include work or activities that have been reviewed by the ISRP at some point in the past because it was included in a proposal as originally submitted, and "the project" was recommended by the Council. However, if that work or activity was not specifically linked to the associated funding recommendation made by

the Council and subsequently contracted for, it will not be renewed in the ongoing project renewal process.

Said another way, new, expanded, or different work contemplated or suggested by the proposals for out-years in projects previously approved by the Council will not automatically be recommended for funding by the Council as a *renewal* -- again, because the Council has never made multi-year funding recommendations in the past, such out-years work could not have been “specifically approved” in prior years. In most cases, this work within ongoing projects must be reviewed by the ISRP and complete the detailed planning and review process of the province based rolling review before the Council will consider recommending it for funding. The Council may make exceptions, on a case-by-case basis, where project sponsors and Bonneville concur that increased funding cannot is needed to continue tasks specifically approved in Fiscal Year 2000.

Finally, because of the changes to the project selection and review process for Fiscal Year 2001, a significant group of projects that were recommended as “fund for one year” in Fiscal Year 2000 were not subjected to ISRP scientific review this year -- they will be reviewed in the applicable province review.

### **Council renewal recommendations to Bonneville for ongoing projects and recommendations for budget placeholders for Fiscal Year 2001**

The Council renewal and budget recommendations for Fiscal Year 2001 contained three elements. Element 1 was an approval of six criteria to apply to ongoing project budgets proposed in the CBFWA draft Annual Implementation Work Plan for Ongoing Projects, and a recommendation that Bonneville apply them to all projects during contracting; Element 2 was a recommendation regarding the establishment of certain placeholder accounts within the known available Bonneville direct program fund; and Element 3 was a recommendation regarding specific projects or issues related to specific projects.

#### Element 1 -- Six criteria applied to all ongoing project budgets

The proposed budgets for ongoing projects were reviewed to ensure that they are remaining within the confines of the ongoing project renewal process. Said another way, the ongoing projects were screened to ensure that new work and new initiatives are being held for the appropriate detailed province review. The Council applied the following standards, in a relatively course-screen evaluation to the projects to accomplish this:

1. Was the project scope limited to that specifically approved in Fiscal Year 2000?
2. Does the project propose funding in anticipation of ESA requirements, fish and wildlife program requirement, or other requirements before those requirements have been finalized or made binding?
3. Do funds previously committed remain available for the scope of work approved in Fiscal Year 2000?
4. Does the proposal commit the program to substantial additional funding in future years that has not been approved in full in a Council action previously?

5. Is the budget increase for the scope of work approved in the Fiscal Year 2000 greater than percent 5 percent?
6. Is the project scheduled to be completed with existing funds?

*Criterion 1: Project Scope.* The scope of the project should not expand beyond that which was specifically approved by the Council in Fiscal Year 2000. To determine the appropriate scope, the sponsor and Bonneville should consult the final Fiscal Year 2000 workplan recommendation, including the associated budget (Council document 2000-6), and three-step review documents formally approved by the Council, and prior years' contracts. If questions about appropriate scope of the project or what the Council recommended in Fiscal Year 2000 remain after resort to these documents, Bonneville should consult with Council staff to either resolve the issue, or arrange for Council determination of the matter.

*Criterion 2: Anticipating requirements before they are binding.* A draft program and draft ESA related documents recently were released. Ongoing project sponsors have, in a number of cases, anticipated needs for personnel, coordination, planning, or other needs based on these (and perhaps other) documents. Increases in capacity to meet these needs should not be provided as part of the renewal process. Rather, increases to meet these needs should be dealt with programmatically when they are in fact made certain. This will prevent the subjective project-by-project estimation of the cost of such requirements, which is not likely to be cost-effective. Moreover, identifying and allocating the costs of requirements imposed by such programs in a uniform and programmatic way should foster accountability in those in a position to develop mandates that will require funding from others.

Similarly, some projects have sought increases in funding to address criticisms or issues raised by the ISRP in prior reviews. The desire to make improvements at this time in response to the independent critique is laudable. However, the appropriate time to detail the manner by which the sponsor proposes to respond to those critiques, and the costs for those responses, should await the detailed provincial review.

*Criterion 3: Substantial funds on hand for scope of work:* There are some cases where funding commitments have been made to projects in prior years for the scope of work proposed but those funds remain unspent. Where substantial commitments from those prior years remains to complete the scope of work previously approved, additional Fiscal Year 2001 funds should not be provided. If the sponsors believe that Fiscal Year 2001 funds will be required notwithstanding the funds on hand, they should articulate the rationale to Bonneville, and Bonneville should consult with Council staff.

*Criterion 4: Proposal brings substantial future funding commitments.* There are some ongoing projects in the three-step review that certainly carry the possibility of substantial out-year construction and other costs, and these have been previously recognized by the Council in various three-step decision documents. This criterion does not apply to those projects in the three-step review, and they should proceed as outlined in the step approval. However, there are other ongoing projects that contemplate a major future commitment of program resources that have not been formally acknowledged by the Council. The Council believes that projects that contemplate a funding commitment of \$1 million or more in the next three years in construction or other major capital investment, and depend upon that future commitment as a primary justification for the currently proposed project, should generally not be funded in the renewal process. Exceptions may

be made after specific Council consideration. The Council believes that major initiatives, and irretrievable commitments to them, should in most cases wait at least until they are reviewed in a subbasin context in the provincial review process, and perhaps even in a subbasin plan.

*Criterion 5: Increases greater than 5 percent for same scope of work.* First, the renewal process will not expand upon previously approved work scope. Decisions and approvals to fund new activities, expanded activities, and to redirect project work should be made during the full province review. Second, the Council recommends against automatic cost increases being approved in the renewal process. In some cases, even where project scope seems to have been maintained, sponsors estimate higher costs. These increased costs should be specifically identified and justified in a provincial review (all province reviews are scheduled to begin by July 2001). Therefore, expansions of proposed budgets greater than 5 percent for the same scope of work approved in Fiscal Year 2000 are presumed inappropriate for the renewal process. The Council recommends that project budgets be maintained at approved Fiscal Year 2000 levels, and that those projects seeking a greater than 5 percent increase during contracting should be carefully scrutinized by Bonneville relative to the other criteria 1 through 5. The Council recommends that initial project budgets be held to approximately their Fiscal Year 2000 levels.

The Council is hopeful that the application of the “10 percent rule” in the contracting process will be sparing, and not used in a way that renders this criterion (or others) meaningless (the Council understands that Bonneville has the flexibility to negotiate actual contracts within 10 percent of the budget recommendation). Moreover, the Council is recommending that Bonneville apply the “10 percent rule” to the individual project budget categories (planning and design, construction, operation and maintenance, monitoring and evaluation) rather than the total aggregate budget.

*Criterion 6: Project scheduled for completion with previously committed funds.* If a project sponsor or the Council recommendation has maintained that a project would be completed with Fiscal Year 2000 or previously committed funds, no Fiscal Year 2001 funds should be committed.

The Council applied these six criteria to the ongoing projects proposed in the CBFWA draft workplan. A table summarizing the result of this review is attached as Table B (attached at the end of this Part II). The allocation of project budgets by phase is defined in the attached spreadsheet. The Council recommended that Bonneville contract for these ongoing projects consistently with these budgets, or propose revisions in consultation with Council staff. Contracts should require closer accounting of actual project costs by the phases and objectives in the project proposals.

In addition, the Council recommended that Bonneville apply the six criteria to all projects during contracting. The review conducted by the Council staff was relatively coarse-screen, and in order to ensure that all projects are equally reviewed, Bonneville should use the guidance provided here to apply the six criteria to all ongoing projects during contracting. If the project sponsor and Bonneville concurred that the projects should be increased beyond the levels recommended in Table B, they were advised to contact Council staff to arrange for a discussion of their rationale. The Council designated Doug Marker act as the lead contact for these matters.

Although a majority of the projects that had budgets adjusted as a result of the Council’s application of the renewal criteria did not seek to have funds reinstated, a substantial number of them did. These project sponsors did consult with Bonneville, and secured its agreement that the activities proposed in the contract required the reinstatement of the funds that Council staff recommended withdrawing from the project. It was important for the Council to understand that Bonneville supported the reinstatement of these funds, as it is ultimately its mitigation obligation. The projects

that had funds reinstated, and the amounts restored, are identified in Table C (attached at the end of this Part II).

#### Element 2 -- Council recommendations for budget placeholders for Fiscal Year 2001

The Council recommended that Bonneville plan for the following placeholders in its known Fiscal Year 2001 annual direct program budget:

- 1) Maintain the existing ESA placeholders, including the placeholder for Hydrosystem Biological Opinion requirements for steelhead.

As indicated above, NMFS and the Action Agencies are encouraged to integrate their ESA related fish and wildlife needs that they expect Bonneville to fund with the Council's annual prioritization process. A successful and meaningful integration requires these agencies to anticipate their ESA-related project needs in advance of the annual prioritization process, and to actively participate in that process by submitting their proposals for full review and integration along with other proposals for Bonneville other fish and wildlife funding. The five-year plan identified in the Draft 2000 Hydrosystem Biological Opinion can lay the groundwork for further defining the annual needs that can be proposed in the annual review. Further, to the extent possible, NMFS and the other action agencies should seek to align the implementation of its ESA projects in a manner consistent with the schedule for the province based rolling review. At the present time, all provinces with listed salmonids (including the Columbia River Estuary Province) are scheduled to begin their provincial reviews by July 2001.

- 2) Establish a placeholder for funding the design of a data management and analysis system for the Columbia Basin.

Data management and analysis in the Columbia Basin has been the subject of independent reviews, and its improvement and reform is a high priority of the Council. As part of its Fiscal Year 2000 recommendation regarding PATH projects, the Council committed to work with others in the region to propose a data management and analysis system with certain attributes (see Council document 2000-6, p. 62). The Council recommended that a placeholder in the amount of \$900,000 be established in the known available Bonneville Fiscal Year 2001 budget. This figure represents the amount of funds not spent on proposed PATH related projects in Fiscal Year 2000 due to the completion of those projects as recommended by the ISRP.

- 3) The Council has an interest in Bonneville establishing a placeholder to fund activities associated with developing subbasin plans that may be adopted into the Council's program in a future amendment proceeding. While no placeholder amount was recommended at the time, the Council wished to put Bonneville and others on notice that there will be a need to provide funding for these activities in the near future.

The Council's recommendations for Fiscal Year 2001 placeholders are presented in Table A (attached at the end of Part II).

#### Element 3 -- Projects not immediately recommended in order to allow for additional information

There were a small number of specific projects with issues not related to those discussed above that required additional Council consideration and consultation with the sponsor and

Bonneville. Therefore, recommendations were not ready for these specific projects when the full block of ongoing projects was recommended. The following projects were considered individually over the course of the next several Council meetings from December through March 2001.

1. 1998-115-25 (YIN); YKFP Design and Construction.

Issue: Council needed to seek additional information on and consider the sponsor's proposal to develop office building, interpretive center and Klickitat facilities at this time.

2. Clearwater Watershed Project

Issue: Council needed to seek information and consider addition of implementation budgets pending completion of watershed assessment activities.

3. 1996-042-00 Salmon Creek Project

Issue: Council needed to seek information on and consider the proposal's plan that seeks significant new commitment of program funds in coming years.

4. Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery

Issue: Pending review of construction budget consistency with prior Council recommendations.

5. Fish Passage Center

Issue: Council needed information and dialogue on issues raised in May 11, 2000 ISRP review.

6. Northern Pikeminnow program

Issue: Pending review of coordination and administrative components of the project.

Each of the above projects had additional information developed and considered by the Council. Each of the projects were ultimately recommended for funding, with conditions. The specific conditions and recommendations were communicated to Bonneville on a project by project basis as the decisions were made.

**Table A - Start of the Year Budget Assumptions**

**NPPC Assumptions for FY 2001 Direct Program Budget**

	<b>CBFWA</b>	<b>NWPPC</b> <small>Notes</small>
<b>Where the funds come from:</b>		
<b>New FY 2001 Funds</b>		
Scheduled Bonneville commitment	127,000,000	127,000,000
Interest on funds unspent to date	1,700,000	1,700,000
Total new funds	128,700,000	128,700,000
<b>Reallocated from previous placeholders</b>		
Anadromous fish placeholder	1,878,603	4,091,034 <small>after \$1.2 million for '00 Yak. Side Channels</small>
Resident fish placeholder	2,354,710	2,997,944 <small>After August allocations of \$331,000</small>
Wildlife placeholder	100,075	768,859
Remaining "contingency/inflation" reserve	1,915,673	1,915,673
"ESA" requirements placeholder	2,589,327	0
1998 Steelhead Bi-Op placeholder	1,000,000	0
1995-083-00 contract audit placeholder		50,000 <small>was included in CBFWA's anadromous placeholder</small>
1996-006-01 PATH transition balance		21,991 <small>was included in CBFWA's anadromous placeholder</small>
2000-042-00 CBFWA placeholder		384,057 <small>was included in CBFWA's anadromous placeholder</small>
2000-045-00 Program analysis placeholder		415,656 <small>was included in CBFWA's anadromous placeholder</small>
2000-040-00 Capital project placeholder		5,513,446
<b>Total from previous placeholders</b>	<b>9,838,388</b>	<b>16,158,660</b>
<b>Total available from uncommitted funds</b>	<b>138,538,388</b>	<b>144,858,660</b>
Estimated deobligation from current contracts	5,000,000	750,000
<b>Total base budget</b>	<b>143,538,388</b>	<b>145,608,660</b>
<b>Where the funds go:</b>		
<b>Commitments</b>		
Anadromous fish projects	99,647,081	90,749,467 <small>Assumes 1,642,565 in project-specific carry-forward</small>
Resident fish projects	17,683,714	15,158,958 <small>Assumes 1,800,160 in project-specific carry-forward</small>
Wildlife projects	14,898,796	13,838,524 <small>Assumes \$6,569,217 in project-specific carry-forward</small>
Bonneville program support	8,000,000	8,000,000
Bonneville technical support	0	1,043,446 <small>Assumes \$156,554 from carry-forward.</small>
Independent Scientific Review Panel	500,000	500,000
Innovative project grants	2,000,000	2,000,000
Data management placeholder	0	900,000
ESA placeholder funded projects	0	845,000
"ESA" requirements placeholder	0	928,328
1998 Steelhead Bi-Op placeholder	0	1,000,000
<b>Total Commitments</b>	<b>142,729,591</b>	<b>134,963,723</b>
<b>Remaining uncommitted</b>		
Anadromous placeholder	376,522	to be determined
Resident fish placeholder	350,996	to be determined
Wildlife placeholder	81,279	to be determined
Undistributed from base budget available		10,644,937
<b>Total Remaining uncommitted</b>	<b>808,797</b>	<b>10,644,937</b>
<b>Total Budget allocations</b>	<b>143,538,388</b>	<b>145,608,660</b>



Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
20007	Acquire And Conserve Priority Bull Trout Habitat In Trestle Creek Watershed	River Network	FWRES	Flathead	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
20017	Restore Habitat Within Dredge Tailings On The Yankee Fork Salmon River	USFS, IDFG, SBT	FWANA	Salmon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
20028	Purchase Conservation Easement from Plum Creek Timber Company along Fisher River	MDFWP	FWRES	Flathead	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
20094	Assess Resident Fish Stocks Of The Owyhee Basin, D.V.I.R.	SPT	FWRES	Owyhee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6 Project has full funding recommendation from FY 2000. No additional funding pending completion of initial scope of work	0
20138	Design and Construct Walla Walla Hatchery	CTUIR	FWANA	Walla Walla	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	3 Retain existing budget as carry-forward	-100,000
20156	Identification of Redband and Rainbow Trout in the North Fork Clearwater Basin	NPT	FWRES	Clearwater	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
9502700	Collect Data On White Sturgeon Above Grand Coulee Dam	STOI	FWRES	Upper Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
9802600	Document Native Trout Populations	WA Trout	FWRES	Wenatche	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
20000550	Protect Critical Salmonid Habitat And Habitat Restoration Investments	SBT	FWANA	Salmon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:

- PD = Planning and design
- CI = Construction and implementation
- OM = Operation and maintenance
- ME = Monitoring and evaluation
- SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA	
195505500	Umatilla Tribal Fish & Wildlife Enforcement	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
198201300	Coded-Wire Tag Recovery Program	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	1,923,498	2,179,728	13	0	0	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	5	-179,728	
198331900	New Marking and Monitoring Techniques for Fish	NMFS	FWANA	Systemwide	1,388,800	1,836,885	32	0	1,400,000	0	0	1,400,000	3	Check need for carry-forward. 9/8 balance is \$541,368	-436,885
198335000	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery	NPT	FWANA	Clearwater	6,791,000	13,094,298	93	671,000	10,459,000	2,878,000	0	14,008,000	See comment	Budget allocations reflect NPPC step review recommendations. Hold O&M pending submission of detail requested June, '00.	913,702
198335003	Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery Monitoring And Evaluation	NPT	FWANA	Clearwater	903,000	1,347,003	49	0	0	0	1,392,000	1,392,000		Contract requires NPPC review of scope (per NPPC approval)	44,997
198343500	Operate And Maintain Umatilla Hatchery Satellite Facilities	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	775,000	925,977	19	4,954	0	916,023	0	920,977	M&E plan for objective 4 not received.	-5,000	
198343600	Umatilla Basin Fish Facilities Operation and Maintenance	WID	FWANA	Umatilla	502,000	445,411	-11	0	0	445,411	0	445,411		0	
198402100	Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In The John Day Subbasin	ODFW	FWANA	John Day	426,046	439,936	3	56,835	218,964	141,774	22,363	439,936		0	
198402500	Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In Grande Ronde Basin Streams	ODFW	FWANA	Grande Ronde	273,000	287,500	5	43,273	68,776	140,000	20,600	272,649	5	-14,851	

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see decision)	Additional NPPC comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
198503800	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	CCT	FWRES	Upper Columbia	360,973	789,642	119	0	0	351,034	0	351,034	3	Budget assumes O&M only. Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-438,608
198506200	Passage Improvement Evaluation	PNNL	FWANA	Yakima	100,000	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000	100,000			0
198605000	White Sturgeon Mitigation And Restoration In The Columbia And Snake Rivers	ODFW	FWRES	Systemwide	1,919,161	2,165,043	13	0	950,000	0	1,040,925	1,990,925	5		-174,118
198709900	Dworshak Dam Impacts Assesment and Fisheries Investigation	IDFG	FWRES	Clearwater	285,000	299,000	5	0	211,000	47,000	36,000	294,000	5		-5,000
198710001	Enhance Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	260,000	340,710	31	113,951	87,000	42,709	27,327	270,987	5		-69,723
198710002	Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Subbasin	ODFW	FWANA	Umatilla	353,000	425,263	20	63,980	170,000	103,426	24,022	361,428	5		-63,835
198712700	Smolt Monitoring by Federal and Non-Federal Agencies	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	1,870,449	2,295,433	23	0	0	0	2,295,433	2,295,433		Bonneville supports increase due to inclusion of carry-forward in FY2000 budget.	0
198740100	Assessment of Smolt Condition: Biological and Environmental Interactions	USGS/CRRL	FWANA	Systemwide	199,046	206,000	3	0	0	0	206,000	206,000			0
198740700	Dworshak Impacts/M&E and Biological/Integrated Rule Curves	NPT	FWRES	Clearwater	93,000	120,667	30	0	0	0	95,000	95,000	5		-25,667

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
198802200	Umatilla River Fish Passage Operations	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	360,000	327,600	-9	0	0	0	327,600	327,600		0
198805301	Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan	NPT	FWANA	Imnaha	0	2,309,038	0	2,309,038	0	0	0	2,309,038	Depended on NPPC step 1 decision	0
198805302	Design and Construct Umatilla Hatchery Supplement	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	0	250,000	0	35,000	0	0	0	35,000	2 Fund only for completion of master plan. Additional funds depend on Council approval.	-215,000
198805303	Hood River Production Program - M&E	CTWSRO	FWANA	Hood	499,888	519,959	4	0	0	0	519,959	519,959		0
198805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E	ODFW	FWANA	Hood	424,000	431,331	2	0	0	0	431,331	431,331		0
198805305	Northeast Oregon Hatcheries Planning and Implementation (ODFW)	ODFW	FWANA	Grande Ronde	226,000	230,477	2	5,669	0	176,408	48,400	230,477		0
198805307	Hood River Production Program: Powerdale, Parkdale, Oak Springs O&M (88-053-07 & 88-053-08)	CTWSRO /ODFW	FWANA	Hood	506,000	562,733	11	0	0	562,733	0	562,733	Increase is one-time only facility costs.	0
198806400	Kootenai River White Sturgeon Studies and Conservation Aquaculture	KTOI	FWRES	Kootenai	1,095,202	1,128,568	3	50,000	164,000	622,375	292,193	1,128,568		0
198806500	Kootenai River Fisheries Recovery Investigations	IDFG	FWRES	Kootenai	561,103	647,420	15	0	0	0	570,000	570,000	5 Budget increase will depend on provincial review	-77,420

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
198810804	StreamNet	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	1,936,453	2,189,343	13	0	0	1,950,000	0	1,950,000	2,5 SOY is level with 2000. Scope proposed subbasin planning support which should be defined in provincial review.	-239,343
198811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	YN	FWANA	Yakima	1,565,000	978,000	-38	403,000	575,000	0	0	978,000	Hold for review of construction proposed.	0
198812025	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Management, Data and Habitat	YN	FWANA	Yakima	750,000	1,141,232	52	0	0	800,000	0	800,000	5 Bonneville supports total budget of \$1 million - project has \$100,000 carry forward to add to budget.	-341,232
198815600	DVIR Resident Fish Stocking Program	Sho-Pai Tribes	FWRES	Owyhee	119,903	138,307	15	0	117,978	20,329	0	138,307	Work scheduled as part of completed production project.	0
198902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in the Lower Umatilla River Basin	ODFW	FWANA	Umatilla	250,785	297,489	19	0	0	260,000	0	260,000	5	-37,489
198902700	Power Repay Umatilla Basin Project	BPA	FWANA	Umatilla	800,000	800,000	0	0	0	800,000	0	800,000		0
198902900	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder - Hatchery	ODFW	FWANA	Hood	115,029	139,534	21	0	0	120,000	0	120,000	5 Budget increases should be determined in provincial review.	-19,534
198903500	Umatilla Hatchery Operation and Maintenance	ODFW	FWANA	Umatilla	850,000	893,293	5	0	0	860,000	0	860,000	5	-33,293
198906201	Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation	CBFWA	FWANA	Systemwide	2,000,000	2,188,849	9	0	0	2,000,000	0	2,000,000	5 Evaluate carry-forward from 2000	-188,849

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
198906500	Annual Stock Assessment - CWT (USFWS)	USFWS	FWANA	Systemwide	110,586	114,094	3	0	0	20,130	93,964	114,094		0
198906600	Annual Stock Assessment-Coded Wire Tag Program (WDFW)	WDFW	FWANA	Systemwide	373,852	411,213	10	0	0	0	400,000	400,000	5	-11,213
198906900	Annual Stock Assessment - Coded Wire Tag Program (ODFW)	ODFW	FWANA	Systemwide	215,800	208,247	-4	0	0	0	208,247	208,247		0
198907201	Independent Scientific Advisory Board Support	DOE/ORN L	FWANA	Systemwide	99,918	100,027	0	0	100,027	0	0	100,027		0
198909600	Monitor and evaluate genetic characteristics of supplemented salmon and steelhead	NMFS	FWANA	Systemwide	175,000	249,200	42	0	165,000	0	14,510	179,510	5	-69,690
198909800	Idaho Supplementation Studies	IDFG	FWANA	Salmon	974,229	975,000	0	0	975,000	0	0	975,000		0
198909801	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation in Idaho Rivers (ISS)	USFWS-IFRO	FWANA	Clearwater	129,965	134,740	4	0	134,740	0	0	134,740		0
198909802	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	NPT	FWANA	Salmon	377,455	388,818	3	0	388,818	0	0	388,818		0
198909803	Evaluate Salmon Supplementation Studies in Idaho Rivers	SBT	FWANA	Salmon	228,438	213,569	-7	19,976	0	12,798	180,795	213,569		0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment		NPPC change from CBFWA
198910700	Statistical Support for Salmonid Survival Studies	UW	FWANA	Systemwide	184,930	0	-100	0	246,560	0	0	246,560		Bonneville requires - verify source from BPA internal overhead or anadromous project budget	246,560
198910800	Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support	UW	FWANA	Systemwide	411,300	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0		Bonneville will fund any future contracts from technical support placeholder	0
199000500	Umatilla Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation	ODFW	FWANA	Umatilla	650,000	757,422	17	0	0	193,311	500,000	693,311	5		-64,111
199000501	Umatilla Basin Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	480,000	318,333	-34	0	0	0	318,333	318,333			0
199001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tribs. To Lake Roosevelt	CCT	FWRES	San Poil	189,636	199,019	5	147,014	46,605	0	0	193,619	5	Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-5,400
199004400	Implement Fisheries Enhancement Opportunities on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation	CDA Tribe	FWRES	Coeur d'Alene	685,254	799,550	17	136,873	160,000	153,189	278,032	728,094	5		-71,456
199004401	Lake Creek Land Acquisition and Enhancement	CDA Tribe	FWILD	Coeur d'Alene	140,423	200,000	42	72,571	0	77,429	0	150,000	5	Project has balance of \$2.4 million. Reduction is from O&M, pending provincial review	-50,000
199004402	Coeur d'Alene Tribe Trout Production Facility	CDA Tribe	FWRES	Coeur d'Alene	1,500,000	2,045,088	36	0	2,025,355	19,733	0	2,045,088		Project also retains carry-forward of \$1.5 million from 2000.	0
199005200	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation.	BRD	FWANA	Systemwide	460,000	527,706	15	0	460,000	0	0	460,000	5		-67,706

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CFWA
199005500	Steelhead supplementation studies in Idaho rivers	IDFG	FWANA	Clearwater	407,744	532,865	31	13,106	390,000	0	0	403,106	5 Project held to 2000 budget. As a research project, should not be classified as O&M.	-129,759
199007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	2,506,000	3,153,103	26	0	0	2,180,000	325,933	2,505,933	5 Budget holds project costs to FY 2000 level pending provincial review. Reductions are from O&M phase	-647,170
199007800	Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-scale patterns	USGS / CRRL	FWANA	Systemwide	117,880	123,193	5	0	0	0	0	0	6 Project was scheduled for completion of tasks in 2000.	-123,193
199008000	Columbia River Basin PIT Tag Information Systems	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	1,364,976	1,506,301	10	0	0	1,450,000	0	1,450,000	5	-56,301
199009200	Wanaket Wildlife Area Operations and Maintenance	CTUIR	FWILD	Umatilla	200,000	209,536	5	19,773	35,867	135,000	13,798	204,438	5	-5,098
199009300	Genetic Analysis of Oncorhynchus nerka (Modified to include Chinook Salmon)	U of I	FWANA	Systemwide	139,434	130,564	-6	0	130,564	0	0	130,564		0
199101901	Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation - Flathead Lake	CSKT	FWRES	Flathead	95,000	166,048	75	7,956	63,068	2,400	92,624	166,048	Project budget incorporates implementation costs from 1996-087-01	0
199101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation	MFWP	FWRES	Flathead	783,000	831,432	6	123,100	302,496	152,400	203,436	781,432	Project does not have sponsor's estimated carry-forward available.	-50,000
199101904	Stocking of offsite waters for Hungry Horse Mitigation - Creston National Fish Hatchery	USFWS	FWRES	Flathead	159,417	173,292	9	0	0	160,000	0	160,000	5	-13,292

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget



Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale		NPPC change from CFWA	
													(see Additional NPPC decision)	comment		
199102800	Monitoring smolt migrations of wild Snake River sp/sum chinook salmon	NMFS	FWANA	Salmon	325,200	325,000	0	0	325,000	0	0	0	325,000			0
199102900	Life History and Survival of Fall Chinook Salmon in Columbia River Basin	USGS/CR RL; USFWS	FWANA	Lower Mid-Columbia	743,558	699,000	-6	0	699,000	0	0	0	699,000			0
199104600	Spokane Tribal Hatchery (Galbraith Springs) Operation and Maintenance	STOI	FWRES	Upper Columbia	521,934	549,856	5	0	0	525,000	0	0	525,000	5	Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-24,856
199104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery Operations and Maintenance	WDFW	FWRES	Upper Columbia	201,397	269,898	34	0	0	269,898	0	0	269,898		Budget increase reflects past capital expansion	0
199105100	Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support	UW	FWANA	Systemwide	340,357	0	-100	0	340,357	0	0	0	340,357		Bonneville requires, but has not defined planned budget. This assumes same as FY2000.	340,357
199105500	NATURES [Formerly Supplementation Fish Quality (Yakima)]	NMFS	FWANA	Systemwide	500,000	525,000	5	0	500,000	0	0	0	500,000	5		-25,000
199105700	Yakima Phase 2 [Fish] Screen Fabrication	WDFW, YSS	FWANA	Yakima	293,113	71,875	-75	0	71,875	0	0	0	71,875			0
199106000	Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project - Kalispel	KNRD	FWILD	Pend Oreille	153,917	156,000	1	0	72,600	66,530	16,870	0	156,000			0
199106100	Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area (SLWA)	WDFW	FWILD	Crab Creek	247,500	255,921	3	0	0	255,921	0	0	255,921			0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see decision)	Additional NPPC comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199106200	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Mitigation Project	STOI	FWILD	Spokane	0	300,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	Project was not funded or reviewed in 2000. In current provincial review.	-300,000
199107100	Snake River Sockeye Salmon Habitat and Limnological Research	SBT	FWANA	Salmon	427,000	412,260	-3	28,667	0	45,682	337,911	412,260			0
199107200	Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program	IDFG	FWANA	Salmon	680,096	714,102	5	0	700,000	0	0	700,000	5		-14,102
199107300	Idaho Natural Production Monitoring And Evaluation	IDFG	FWANA	Salmon	767,512	838,439	9	46,909	86,303	0	667,000	800,212	5		-38,227
199107500	Yakima Phase II Screens - Construction	USBOR	FWANA	Yakima	1,000,000	1,048,800	5	0	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000		Project has \$293,113 remaining in FY 2000; review for application to recommended budget.	-48,800
199107800	Burlington Bottoms Wildlife Mitigation Project	ODFW	FWILD	Willamette	116,822	120,932	4	3,762	106,566	5,463	5,141	120,932			0
199200900	Yakima [Fish] Screens - Phase 2 O&M	WDFW, YSS	FWANA	Yakima	133,591	141,120	6	0	0	135,000	0	135,000	5		-6,120
199201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	SBT	FWRES	Upper Snake	132,821	169,600	28	35,000	50,000	30,000	30,000	145,000	5		-24,600
199202200	Physiological assessment of wild and hatchery juvenile salmonids.	NMFS	FWANA	Yakima	349,589	350,024	0	0	350,024	0	0	350,024			0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see decision)	Additional NPPC comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199202409	Enhanced Conservation Enforcement for Fish & Wildlife, Watersheds of the Nez Perce	NPT	FWANA	Clearwater	425,236	461,310	8	4,300	330,000	66,569	26,047	426,916	5	\$5500 added from 9/21 draft to equal base 2000 budget.	-34,394
199202601	Implement the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program Administration and Habitat Restoration Projects	GRMWP	FWANA	Grande Ronde	930,000	1,196,000	29	346,000	584,000	0	0	930,000	5	Expansion of project should be determined in provincial review - reduction proposed in implementation	-266,000
199202603	Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support	ISCC	FWANA	Salmon	185,400	272,440	47	131,096	0	24,374	26,274	181,744	5	Review disposition of implementation budget w/BPA.	-90,696
199202604	Investigate Early Life History of Spring Chinook Salmon and Summer Steelhead in the Grande Ronde River Basin	ODFW	FWANA	Grande Ronde	700,000	725,423	4	0	725,423	0	0	725,423			0
199204000	Redfish Lake sockeye salmon captive broodstock rearing and research	NMFS	FWANA	Salmon	475,000	560,000	18	0	0	500,000	0	500,000	5	Budget increase will depend on step review	-60,000
199204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation And Maintenance Project	CCT-FWD	FWILD	San Poil	350,000	388,071	11	0	0	300,000	53,500	353,500	5	Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-34,571
199205900	Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands Phase Two	TNC	FWILD	Willamette	50,000	493,373	887	12,500	408,670	48,133	24,070	493,373			0
199206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation Project	AFIWG	FWILD	Pend Oreille	2,195,237	3,310,000	51	418,609	2,550,272	268,892	72,227	3,310,000			0
199206200	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	YN	FWANA	Yakima	1,550,000	570,000	-63	104,600	170,852	238,355	56,193	570,000		Previously funded as a wildlife project - YN comment requested Council reconsideration.	0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199206200	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	YN	FWANA	Yakima	0	800,000	0	0	550,000	250,000	0	800,000		0
199206800	Implement Willamette Basin Mitigation Program	ODFW	FWILD	Willamette	230,000	2,619,237	1,039	91,750	2,469,612	17,250	40,625	2,619,237		0
199302900	Survival Estimates for the Passage of Juvenile Salmonids Through Snake and Columbia River Dams and Reservoirs	NMFS/NWFSC	FWANA	Systemwide	1,198,950	1,194,700	0	38,900	1,155,800	0	0	1,194,700		0
199303501	Enhance Fish, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitat Within the Red River Watershed	ISWCD	FWANA	Clearwater	450,000	570,000	27	51,250	330,000	5,000	67,250	453,500	5	-116,500
199303701	Technical Assistance with Life Cycle Modeling	PER Ltd	FWANA	Systemwide	180,000	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0	Bonneville will fund any future contracts from technical support placeholder	0
199304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request For Multi-Year Funding)	ODFW	FWANA	Fifteenmile Creek	246,856	220,040	-11	0	0	213,420	6,620	220,040		0
199304001	15-Mile Creek Steelhead Smolt Production	ODFW	FWANA	Fifteenmile Creek	27,180	33,704	24	0	0	0	30,000	30,000	5 Check project status - still has FY 2000 balance uncontracted	-3,704
199305600	Assessment of Captive Broodstock Technology	NMFS	FWANA	Systemwide	1,236,923	1,400,200	13	0	1,300,000	0	0	1,300,000	5	-100,200
199306000	Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project	WDFW, ODFW & CEDC	FWANA	Lower Columbia	1,400,000	1,649,842	18	0	0	1,029,273	470,569	1,499,842	1 Estimated \$150,000 cut from expanded site preparation and added project staff	-150,000

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199306200	Salmon River Anadromous Fish Passage Enhancement	LSWCD & CSWCD	FWANA	Salmon	100,000	200,000	100	0	100,000	0	0	100,000	5 Project has \$50,000 remaining uncontracted from FY 2000.	-100,000
199306600	Oregon Fish Screening Project	ODFW	FWANA	John Day	641,621	641,621	0	0	641,621	0	0	641,621		0
199401500	Idaho Fish Screen Improvement - O-M	IDFG	FWANA	Salmon	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	28,300	870,815	70,957	29,928	1,000,000		0
199401700	Idaho Model Watershed Habitat Project	LSWCD & CSWCD	FWANA	Salmon	400,000	490,000	23	60,000	330,000	19,500	10,500	420,000	5	-70,000
199401805	Continued Implementation of Asotin Creek Watershed Habitat Projects	ACCD	FWANA	Asotin	235,000	235,000	0	13,000	149,000	3,000	70,000	235,000		0
199401806	Implement Tucannon River Model Watershed Plan to Restore Salmonid Habitat	CCD	FWANA	Tucannon	253,000	330,000	30	27,875	150,000	0	79,500	257,375	5	-72,625
199401807	Continued Implementation of Pataha Creek Model Watershed Plan to Restore Habitat for Salmonids	PCD	FWANA	Tucannon	120,000	148,700	24	10,200	100,000	0	13,500	123,700	5	-25,000
199402600	Pacific Lamprey Research and Restoration Project	CTUIR	FWANA	Umatilla	381,190	453,267	19	0	453,267	0	0	453,267	Tasks should be categorized as a research project, not M&E.	0
199403300	The Fish Passage Center (FPC)	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	1,079,363	1,203,144	11	0	0	0	1,100,000	1,100,000	5 Council requests additional review prior to renewal	-103,144

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199403400	Assessing Summer And Fall Chinook Restoration In The Snake River Basin	NPT	FWANA	Clearwater	316,822	105,058	-67	0	105,058	0	0	105,058		0
199403900	Watershed Restoration Planner	NPT	FWANA	Grande Ronde	55,313	61,095	10	58,000	0	0	0	58,000	Corrected total from 9/18 (Phase budget was not reflected in SOY)	-3,095
199404200	Trout Creek Habitat Restoration Project	ODFW	FWANA	Deschutes	358,847	358,846	0	30,228	0	242,968	85,650	358,846		0
199404300	Monitor, Evaluate, Research and Model the Lake Roosevelt Fishery	STOI	FWRES	Upper Columbia	1,500,000	1,113,584	-26	50,000	315,000	0	748,584	1,113,584		0
199404700	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	IDFG	FWRES	Pend Oreille	379,000	380,000	0	0	380,000	0	0	380,000		0
199404900	Improve the Kootenai River Ecosystem	KTOI	FWRES	Kootenai	270,000	323,333	20	0	0	0	273,333	273,333	5 Planning and design of additional work should depend on provincial review	-50,000
199405000	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement M&E	SBT	FWANA	Salmon	245,000	240,000	-2	12,250	30,000	10,000	187,750	240,000		0
199405300	Bull Trout Assessment - Willamette/Mckenzie	ODFW	FWRES	Willamette	59,240	68,732	16	0	0	0	63,000	63,000	5	-5,732
199405400	Bull trout life history, genetics, habitat needs, and limiting factors in central and northeast Oregon.	ODFW, CTWSRO	FWRES	Deschutes	380,000	387,182	2	0	387,182	0	0	387,182		0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education	BOR	FWANA	Yakima	125,186	127,500	2	0	0	127,500	0	127,500		0
199406900	Develop Spawning Habitat Model to Aid Recovery Plans for Snake River Fall Chinook Salmon	PNNL	FWANA	Lower Mid-Columbia	149,907	225,000	50	0	225,000	0	0	225,000	CBFWA recommends increase for this stage of research plan.	0
199500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish	KNRD	FWRES	Pend Oreille	297,000	400,000	35	27,100	52,000	159,000	61,900	300,000	5 Expansion of effort should depend on provincial review	-100,000
199500400	Mitigation For The Construction And Operation Of Libby Dam	MFWP	FWRES	Kootenai	800,000	795,000	-1	188,338	202,637	181,981	222,044	795,000		0
199500600	Shoshone-Bannock/Shoshone Paiute Joint Culture Facility	SBT	FWRES	Upper Snake	282,621	1,205,905	327	0	1,205,905	0	0	1,205,905	Project has 2000 balance of \$1.6 million. Hold construction per conditions of NPPC step review	0
199500700	Hood River Production Program - PGE: O&M	PGE	FWANA	Hood	50,010	51,517	3	0	0	51,517	0	51,517		0
199500900	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	LRDA	FWRES	Upper Columbia	100,000	110,550	11	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	5 Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-10,550
199501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	CCT	FWRES	Upper Columbia	317,057	1,060,762	235	0	0	0	0	0	5 Council guidance in 2000 was to complete and report on stock assessment. Additional work is in provincial review	-1,060,762
199501101	Hydroacoustic and Sonic Tracking and ADCP Velocity Mapping at Grand Coulee Dam	PNNL	FWRES	Upper Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:

- PD = Planning and design
- CI = Construction and implementation
- OM = Operation and maintenance
- ME = Monitoring and evaluation
- SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CFWA
199501300	Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program	NPT	FWRES	Clearwater	478,081	259,654	-46	0	0	259,654	0	259,654		0
199501500	Lake Billy Shaw Operations and Maintenance	Sho-Pai Tribes	FWRES	Owyhee	221,550	221,550	0	0	0	92,550	129,000	221,550		0
199502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	WDFW	FWRES	Crab Creek	234,890	213,072	-9	0	213,072	0	0	213,072		0
199503300	O&M Of Yakima Phase II Fish Facilities	USBR	FWANA	Yakima	99,520	108,799	9	0	0	100,000		100,000	5	-8,799
199505700	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation	IDFG and SBT	FWILD	Upper Snake	1,153,964	2,507,424	117	372,869	1,527,131	576,951	30,473	2,507,424	Wildlife acquisitions	0
199506001	Protect and Enhance Wildlife Habitat in Squaw Creek Watershed	CTUIR	FWILD	Umatilla	200,589	215,661	8	34,717	65,000	93,332	12,139	205,188	5	-10,473
199506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring And Evaluation	YN	FWANA	Yakima	4,309,934	4,136,432	-4	313,953	0	0	3,394,979	3,708,932	3 Per BPA end-of-year review. \$427,500 carry forward available for M&E tasks.	-427,500
199506425	Policy/Technical Involvement and Planning in the Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project	WDFW	FWANA	Yakima	275,000	260,000	-5	0		15,000	0	15,000	3 Per BPA end-of-year review. Carry-forward \$185,000 to complete budget of \$200,000.	-245,000
199506700	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition	CCT-FWD	FWILD	Upper Columbia	400,000	950,000	138	0	950,000	0	0	950,000	Wildlife acquisitions	0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget



Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale		NPPC change from CFWA
													(see decision)	Additional NPPC comment	
199600500	Independent Scientific Advisory Board	CBFWF	FWANA	Systemwide	683,580	704,124	3	0	704,124	0	0	704,124			0
199600700	Irrigation Diversion Consolidation and Water Consolidation	LSWCD	FWANA	Salmon	293,113	250,000	-15	0	250,000	0	0	250,000		As of 9/8 the project has a balance of \$293,113.	0
199601100	Walla Walla River Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	CTUIR	FWANA	Walla Walla	2,840,000	1,851,000	-35	0	0	0	0	0	3	Project has 2.4 million already committed but not contracted - carried \$1million from 1999.	-1,851,000
199601700	Provide Technical Support to BPA and Regional Analytical Forums	BioAnalysts, Inc.	FWANA	Systemwide	109,000	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0		Bonneville will fund any future contracts from technical support placeholder	0
199601900	Second-Tier Database Support	UW	FWANA	Systemwide	195,000	0	-100	0	170,000	0	0	170,000		Bonneville requires. Budget assumption from BPA comment because of continuation of other related contracts.	170,000
199602000	Comparative Survival Rate Study (CSS) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook & Comparative Survival Study Oversight Committee	PSMFC & CBFWF	FWANA	Systemwide	936,201	851,979	-9	0	0	0	851,979	851,979		Determine if this work should be classified as implementation (CI) of a research plan, not an M&E plan.	0
199602100	Gas bubble disease research and monitoring of juvenile salmonids	USGS-BRD, CRRL	FWANA	Systemwide	43,711	23,269	-47	0	0	0	23,269	23,269			0
199603501	Satus Watershed Restoration	YN	FWANA	Yakima	472,252	160,000	-66	0	80,000	40,000	40,000	160,000			0
199604000	Evaluate The Feasibility And Risks Of Coho Reintroduction In Mid-Columbia	YN	FWANA	Wenatche	100,000	2,053,201	1,953	200,000	280,000	938,978	634,223	2,053,201			0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:

- PD = Planning and design
- CI = Construction and implementation
- OM = Operation and maintenance
- ME = Monitoring and evaluation
- SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CFWA
199604200	Restore & Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat in Salmon Creek	CCT	FWANA	Okanogan	577,983	2,177,766	277	1,523,277	0	0	0	1,523,277	4 Hold for consultation with Council concerning commitment to full scale of proposal.	-654,489
199604300	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement	NPT	FWANA	Salmon	2,800,000	0	-100	0	-1,772,398	0	0	-1,772,398	3 Reallocate \$1,772,398 of FY 2000 budget	-1,772,398
199604601	Walla Walla Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	CTUIR	FWANA	Walla Walla	240,000	260,909	9	49,642	100,000	90,760	10,720	251,122	5	-9,787
199605300	North Fork John Day Dredge Tailings Restoration Project	USFS / CTUIR	FWANA	John Day	85,000	85,000	0	0	78,500	0	6,500	85,000		0
199606700	Manchester Spring Chinook Broodstock Project	NMFS	FWANA	Systemwide	450,000	570,000	27	0	500,000	0	0	500,000	5	-70,000
199607000	McKenzie River Focus Watershed Coordination	MWC	FWANA	Willamette	105,000	135,000	29	30,000	30,000	30,000	25,000	115,000	5 Expansion of project should be determined in provincial review	-20,000
199607708	Protect and Restore the Lolo Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	203,750	367,044	80	27,151	90,000	48,901	47,694	213,746	5 Corrected from 9/21 draft. 2001 budget was not calculated	-153,298
199607709	Protecting and Restoring the Squaw Creek to Papoose Creek Analysis Area Watersheds	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	303,607	399,698	32	58,710	150,000	0	91,289	299,999	5 Consider implementation needs on completion of pending assessment?	-99,699
199607711	Restore McComas Meadows/ Meadow Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	166,622	120,025	-28	44,727	45,768	5,635	23,895	120,025		0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199608000	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Project: "Precious Lands"	NPT	FWILD	Grande Ronde	235,325	184,037	-22	0	0	184,037	0	184,037		0
199608300	CTUIR Grande Ronde Basin Watershed Restoration	CTUIR	FWANA	Grande Ronde	125,000	130,000	4	48,772	0	58,703	22,525	130,000		0
199608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Program	ISCC	FWANA	Clearwater	89,450	143,062	60	95,000	0	0	0	95,000	5	-48,062
199608701	Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed	CSKT	FWRES	Flathead	103,000	65,303	-37	51,191	0	14,112	0	65,303		0
199608720	Focus Watershed Coordination in the Kootenai River Watershed	MFWP	FWRES	Kootenai	99,919	100,000	0	98,500	0	1,500	0	100,000		0
199609400	Scotch Creek Wildlife Area	WDFW	FWILD	Okanogan	1,912,335	261,622	-86	0	0	261,622	0	261,622		0
199700100	Captive Rearing Project for Salmon River Chinook Salmon	IDFG	FWANA	Salmon	546,385	460,500	-16	19,798	440,702	0	0	460,500		0
199700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams	KNRD	FWRES	Upper Columbia	421,000	485,000	15	105,000	0	0	350,000	455,000	5 Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-30,000
199700900	Evaluate Rebuilding the White Sturgeon Population in the Lower Snake Basin	NPT	FWRES	Snake Hells Canyon	409,494	473,461	16	0	0	410,000	0	410,000	5	-63,461

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

**Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA	
199701100	Habitat Enhancement and Protection on the DVIR	Sho-Pai Tribes	FWRES	Owyhee	294,722	309,997	5	0	300,000	0	0	300,000	5	-9,997	
199701325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance	YN	FWANA	Yakima	2,260,160	2,482,880	10	0	0	2,350,000	0	2,350,000	5	Bonneville supported CBWA recommended level.	-132,880
199701400	Evaluation of Juvenile Fall Chinook Stranding on the Hanford Reach	WDFW	FWANA	Lower Mid-Columbia	217,000	341,784	58	0	341,784	0	0	341,784		Council approved increase in project budget in 2000, but cost and completion of project needs review.	0
199701500	Imnaha River Smolt Monitoring Program Project	NPT	FWANA	Imnaha	188,722	190,067	1	0	0	0	190,067	190,067			0
199701900	Evaluation of the Life History of Native Salmonids in the Malheur Basin	BPT	FWRES	Malheur	201,184	208,996	4	0	156,919	52,077	0	208,996			0
199701901	Evaluation of the Life History of Native Salmonids in the Malheur Basin (2)	BPT	FWRES	Malheur	113,826	99,083	-13	0	80,495	0	18,588	99,083			0
199702400	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River	OSU/CRI TFC/RTR	FWANA	Lower Columbia	642,600	642,000	0	32,800	233,000	114,000	262,200	642,000			0
199702500	Wallowa County/Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan and Multi-species Habitat Strategy	NPT	FWANA	Grande Ronde	20,000	47,000	135	20,000	0	0	0	20,000	3,5	Project has \$20,000 balance from FY 2000	-27,000

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see decision)	Additional NPPC comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199702600	Ecology Of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence On Salmonid Ocean Survival	NMFS/NWFSC	FWANA	Systemwide	0	180,000	0	0	180,000	0	0	180,000		Previously funded from ESA placeholder; CBFWA recommends funding from anadromous budget	0
199703000	Monitor Listed Stock Chinook Salmon Escapement	NPT	FWANA	Salmon	156,122	179,025	15	0	0	0	160,000	160,000	5		-19,025
199703400	Monitoring Fine Sediment Grande Ronde and John Day Rivers	CRITFC	FWANA	John Day	32,145	39,846	24	0	33,000	0	0	33,000	5		-6,846
199703800	Preserve Salmonid Gametes	NPT	FWANA	Snake River	163,122	213,660	31	0	120,000	43,000	0	163,000	5		-50,660
199705000	Little Naches River Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement	YN Fisheries	FWANA	Yakima	0	120,417	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	Project as not funded in 2000. Proposal appears to be extension of old project.	-120,417
199705100	Yakima Side Channels	YN Fisheries	FWANA	Yakima	601,673	546,553	-9	0	0	0	0	0	3	Assumes carry-forward of \$1,141,016 in unspent FY2000 balance. Allocate to CI	-546,553
199705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration and Assessment	YN Fisheries	FWANA	Yakima	163,544	237,503	45	75,000	14,365	80,000	37,328	206,693	5		-30,810
199705600	Lower Klickitat Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YN	FWANA	Klickitat	269,666	300,000	11	53,344	200,000	3,000	12,288	268,632	5	Budget increases should be determined in provincial review.	-31,368
199705700	Salmon River Production Program	SBT	FWANA	Salmon	0	419,491	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	Previous commitments depend on approval of step review.	-419,491

Notes on NPPC budget codes:

- PD = Planning and design
- CI = Construction and implementation
- OM = Operation and maintenance
- ME = Monitoring and evaluation
- SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199705900	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon	ODFW	FWILD	Systemwide	3,900,000	6,195,068	59	383,494	5,811,574	0	0	6,195,068	Wildlife acquisition, but project still has \$3.8 million balance.	0
199706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	98,737	452,998	359	0	452,998	0	0	452,998	Increase is for watershed assessment approved by NPPC	0
199800100	Analytical Support - ESA Biological Assessments	HES	FWANA	Systemwide	125,000	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0	Bonneville will fund any future contracts from technical support placeholder	0
199800200	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	IDFG	FWRES	Middle Snake	225,208	263,837	17	0	230,000	0	0	230,000	5	-33,837
199800300	Spokane Tribe of Indians Operations and Maintenance	STOI	FWILD	Upper Columbia	97,187	182,497	88	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	5 Expansion of project should be determined in provincial review	-82,497
199800401	Electronic Fish and Wildlife Newsletter	Intermountain Communications	FWANA	Systemwide	150,450	165,605	10	0	0	155,000	0	155,000	5	-10,605
199800702	Grande Ronde Supplementation: Lostine River O&M and M&E	NPT	FWANA	Grande Ronde	384,800	524,331	36	0	0	329,289	150,000	479,289	5 Acknowledges some transfer of costs but maintenance within M&E.	-45,042
199800703	Facility O&M And Program M&E For Grande Ronde Anadromous Salmonids	CTUIR	FWANA	Grande Ronde	489,000	619,131	27	0	0	300,000	217,210	517,210	5	-101,921
199800800	Regional Forum Facilitation Services	DSConsulting	FWANA	Systemwide	75,000	154,500	106	0	71,000	0	0	71,000	Per Bonneville comment and cost sharing.	-83,500

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA	
199801001	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	ODFW	FWANA	Grande Ronde	616,097	674,023	9	0	0	400,000	254,648	654,648	5		-19,375
199801003	Spawning distribution of Snake River fall chinook salmon	USFWS	FWANA	Snake Hells Canyon	177,666	191,422	8	0	0	0	180,000	180,000	5		-11,422
199801004	Monitoring and Evaluation Of Yearling Snake River Fall Chinook Released Upstream Of Lower Granite Dam	NPT	FWANA	Snake Hells Canyon	272,798	277,860	2	0	0	0	277,860	277,860			0
199801005	Pittsburg Landing, Capt. John Rapids, Big Canyon Fall Chinook Acclimation Facilities	NPT	FWANA	Snake Hells Canyon	654,400	694,033	6	0	0	660,000	0	660,000	5		-34,033
199801006	Captive Broodstock Artificial Propagation	NPT	FWANA	Grande Ronde	131,031	152,044	16	0	0	0	145,000	145,000	5		-7,044
199801400	Ocean Survival Of Juvenile Salmonids In The Columbia River Plume	NWFSC/N MFS	FWANA	Lower Columbia	0	845,000	0	0	845,000	0	0	845,000		Fund from ESA placeholder per BPA comment.	0
199801600	Monitor Natural Escapement & Productivity of John Day Basin Spring Chinook	ODFW	FWANA	John Day	159,800	157,057	-2	0	157,057	0	0	157,057			0
199801700	Eliminate Gravel Push-up Dams in Lower North Fork John Day	North Fork John Day Watershed Council	FWANA	John Day	90,250	103,600	15	11,600	80,000	2,000	1,500	95,100	5	Project has not used \$90,250 budgeted for 2000. Check availability of carry-forward.	-8,500
199801800	John Day Watershed Restoration	CTWSRO	FWANA	John Day	424,575	475,590	12	60,938	310,000	15,000	46,412	432,350	5		-43,240

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
199801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	UCD,USF S,USGS-CRRL,WD FW	FWANA	Wind	553,717	658,532	19	119,700	216,000	6,877	215,753	558,330	5 Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-100,202
199802000	Assess Fish Habitat and Salmonids in the Walla Walla Watershed in Washington	WDFW	FWANA	Walla Walla	169,723	158,490	-7	158,490	0	0	0	158,490		0
199802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWSRO	FWANA	Hood	227,934	299,953	32	0	230,000	0	0	230,000	5 Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-69,953
199802200	Pine Creek Ranch	CTWSRO	FWILD	John Day	94,600	175,870	86	10,820	33,200	120,000	11,850	175,870	Completing project acquisitions and conducting management planning.	0
199802800	Trout Creek watershed Improvement	Jeff. Co. SWCD	FWANA	Deschutes	231,126	118,100	-49	77,100	41,000	0	0	118,100		0
199803100	Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Vit Watershed Assessment and Restoration Plan Now	CRIFC	FWANA	Systemwide	267,471	336,464	26	59,618	200,000	8,010	21,673	289,301	5	-47,163
199803300	Restore Upper Toppenish Creek Watershed	YN	FWANA	Yakima	194,583	190,000	-2	0	120,000	40,000	30,000	190,000		0
199803400	Reestablish Safe Access into Tributaries of the Yakima Subbasin	YN Fisheries	FWANA	Yakima	771,918	784,794	2	183,026	586,345	3,750	11,673	784,794		0
199808001	PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution	PSMFC	FWANA	Systemwide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This account will receive funds for PIT tag purchases from specific project budgets.	0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget



Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CFWA	
199900301	Evaluate Spawning of Salmon Below the Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams	WDFW, ODFW, USFWS, PSMFC	FWANA	Lower Mid-Columbia	355,838	403,805	13	0	126,169	0	240,000	366,169	5		-37,636
199900600	Restoration of Riparian Habitat in Bakeoven / Deep Creeks	Wasco County SWCD	FWANA	Deschutes	80,000	116,121	45	0	80,000	0	0	80,000	5		-36,121
199901000	Mitigate Effects Of Runoff & Erosion On Salmonid Habitat In Pine Hollow and Jackknife	Sherman SWCD	FWANA	John Day	33,937	40,255	19	5,700	25,000	0	2,165	32,865	5	Project does not have carry-forward assumed by sponsor.	-7,390
199901200	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	SCW RC & D	FWANA	Yakima	70,496	55,093	-22	0	0	0	0	0	3	Project has \$96,000 unspent	-55,093
199901300	Ahtanum Creek Watershed Assessment	YN	FWANA	Yakima	240,191	200,192	-17	95,520	26,825	35,542	42,305	200,192			0
199901400	Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Little Canyon Creek Subwatershed	LSCD	FWANA	Clearwater	196,855	196,654	0	25,530	171,124	0	0	196,654			0
199901500	Restore anadromous Fish Habitat in the Nichols Canyon Subwatershed	NPSWCD	FWANA	Clearwater	186,237	181,755	-2	26,603	155,152	0	0	181,755			0
199901600	Protect & Restore Big Canyon Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	61,276	100,000	63	70,000	0	0	0	70,000	5		-30,000
199901700	Protect & Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	61,276	100,000	63	70,000	0	0	0	70,000	5		-30,000

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA	
199901800	Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho	USFWS	FWANA	Clearwater	84,365	107,670	28	0	0	0	85,000	85,000	5		-22,670
199901900	Restore Salmon River (Challis ,ID) Area	CSWCD	FWANA	Salmon	50,000	325,500	551	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	5	Project has opportunity for cost share with Corps. SOY budget is consistent with NPPC guidance. Consider for early action?	-275,500
199902000	Analyze the Persistence and Spatial Dynamics of Snake River Chinook Salmon	RMRS	FWANA	Salmon	50,000	108,754	118	0	0	50,000	0	50,000	5	Project has full balance of \$50,000 uncontracted from 2000. Check ability to initiate.	-58,754
199902200	Assessing Genetic Variation Among Columbia Basin White Sturgeon Populations	U of I	FWRES	Systemwide	146,938	136,043	-7	0	136,043	0	0	136,043			0
199902500	Lower Columbia River Wetlands Restoration and Evaluation Program	USFS-CRGNESA	FWILD	Sandy	125,000	145,500	16	15,000	130,500	0	0	145,500		Wildlife acquisitions	0
199902600	Sandy River Delta Riparian Reforestation	USFS-CRGNESA	FWILD	Sandy	24,000	22,875	-5	0	22,875	0	0	22,875			0
199903200	Oxbow/Hells Canyon reservoirs consumptive sturgeon fishery	NPT	FWRES	Snake Hells Canyon	36,000	250,000	594	0	0	0	0	0		Project was not approved in step review	-250,000
199908800	Water Right Acquisition Program (Multi-Year FY 2000-2002)	OWT	FWANA	Systemwide	130,000	0	-100	0	140,000	0	0	140,000		Restored by Council at 9/20 meeting	140,000

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale		NPPC change from CBFWA
													(see decision)	Additional NPPC comment	
200000100	Improvement of Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage In Omak Creek	CCT	FWANA	Okanogan	349,661	113,266	-68	69,754	41,000	0	2,512	113,266			0
200000400	Monitor and Protect Bull Trout for Koocanusa Reservoir	BCE	FWRES	Kootenai	60,000	60,400	1	0	0	0	60,400	60,400			0
200000500	Protect Bear Valley Wild Salmon, Steelhead, Bull Trout Spawning Habitat	IDFG	FWANA	Salmon	310,000	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0			0
200000700	Infrastructure To Complete FDA Registration of Erythromycin	UI-CNR	FWANA	Systemwide	71,022	71,766	1	0	71,766	0	0	71,766			0
200000900	Logan Valley Wildlife Mitigation Project	BPT	FWILD	Malheur	0	188,140	0	143,090	45,050	0	0	188,140		Project acquisition completed in FY 2000	0
200001100	Rock Creek Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project	YN Fisheries	FWANA	Rock Creek	156,206	52,744	-66	0	0	0	0	0	3	Project has not contracted for \$156,000 budgeted in 2000.	-52,744
200001200	Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum Salmon Populations	USFWS	FWANA	Columbia Gorge	189,853	238,704	26	0	190,000	0	0	190,000	5	Project expansion should be determined in provincial review	-48,704
200001300	Evaluate An Experimental Re-introduction of Sockeye Salmon into Skaha Lake	CCT	FWANA	Okanogan	171,171	229,357	34	0	180,000	0	0	180,000	5		-49,357
200001400	Evaluate Habitat Use and Population Dynamics of Lampreys in Cedar Creek	USFWS	FWANA	Lewis	134,790	185,000	37	0	150,000	0	0	150,000	5		-35,000

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
200001500	Acquire Oxbow Ranch--Middle Fork John Day River	CTWSRO	FWANA	John Day	1,300,000	1,774,120	36	25,364	1,660,220	58,114	38,848	1,782,546		8,426
200001600	Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions - First Addition/Oleson Parcel	USFWS	FWILD	Willamette	250,000	274,250	10	33,000	241,250	0	0	274,250		0
200001700	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts	CRITFC	FWANA	Systemwide	72,752	153,992	112	0	153,992	0	0	153,992	5 Project expansion recommendation from CBFWA pending	-80,002
200001800	Lake Roosevelt Kokanee Net Pens	WDFW	FWRES	Upper Columbia	185,825	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0		0
200001900	Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	WDFW	FWANA	Tucannon	134,049	98,420	-27	0	25,000	37,850	35,570	98,420		0
200002000	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Wenaha Wildlife Area Additions	ODFW	FWILD	Grande Ronde	42,302	42,302	0	12,067	18,324	6,911	5,000	42,302		0
200002100	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Ladd Marsh Wildlife Area Additions	ODFW	FWILD	Grande Ronde	144,637	285,700	98	102,100	152,600	23,600	7,400	285,700	Wildlife acquisitions	0
200002300	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Horn Butte	ODFW	FWILD	Columbia Gorge	42,302	42,302	0	12,067	18,324	6,911	5,000	42,302		0
200002500	Eagle Lakes Ranch Acquisition and Restoration	USFWS	FWILD	Columbia Gorge	287,134	700,000	144	151,600	528,400	0	20,000	700,000	Wildlife acquisitions	0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA	
200002600	Rainwater Wildlife Area Operations & Maintenance	CTUIR	FWILD	Walla Walla	274,966	287,377	5	38,168	97,000	120,000	24,576	279,744	5		-7,633
200002700	Malheur Wildlife Mitigation Site	BPT	FWILD	Malheur		184,318	0	184,318	0	0	0	184,318		Assumes completion of project acquisition	0
200002800	Evaluate Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Clearwater River Drainage, Idaho	IDFG	FWANA	Clearwater	73,000	90,967	25	0	75,000	0	0	75,000	5		-15,967
200002900	Identification of larval Pacific lamprey, river lamprey, and western brook lamprey and thermal requirements of early life history stages	USGS/CR RL	FWANA	Systemwide	78,700	77,280	-2	0	77,280	0	0	77,280			0
200003100	Enhance North Fork John Day River Subbasin Anadromous Fish Habitat	CTUIR	FWANA	John Day	205,544	236,200	15	84,760	100,000	19,572	16,873	221,205	5		-14,995
200003300	Walla Walla River Fish Passage Operations	CTUIR	FWANA	Walla Walla	73,000	118,607	62	0	0	80,000	0	80,000	5		-38,607
200003400	Protect and Restore The North Lochsa Face Analysis Area Watersheds	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	154,782	248,552	61	48,064	100,000	0	28,442	176,506	5		-72,046
200003500	Rehabilitation of Newsome Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	301,689	401,198	33	156,162	130,000	0	23,522	309,684	5	Consider implementation needs on completion of pending assessment?	-91,514
200003600	Protect and Restore Mill Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	FWANA	Clearwater	63,036	76,379	21	16,700	35,000	8,466	12,286	72,452	5		-3,927

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

Table B - Adopted Council recommendations for FY 2001 project budgets

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	Type	Subbasin	FY00 Funding	CBFWA FY 01 Total	Percent Increase	NPPC PD	NPPC CI	NPPC OM	NPPC ME	NPPC SOY	Rationale (see Additional NPPC decision) comment	NPPC change from CBFWA
200003700	Evaluate Sediment Transport in Spawning Habitat, Kootenai R., Idaho	USGS	FWRES	Kootenai	96,550	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0		0
200003900	Walla Walla Basin Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	CTUIR	FWANA	Walla Walla	134,000	330,880	147	0	0	0	140,000	140,000	3,5	-190,880
200004100	BPA Technical Support Placeholder	BPA	FWPRS	BPA PR	1,176,311		-100	0	1,043,446	0	0	1,043,446	Bonneville requirement - less balance from FY 2000	1,043,446
200004800	Yakima Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI)	WT	FWANA	Systemwide	189,822	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
200005200	Upstream migration of Pacific lampreys in the John Day River: behavior, timing, and habitat preferences	USGS/CR RL	FWANA	John Day	199,644	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0		0
200005600	Protect Anadromous Salmonids In The Mainstem Corridor	CRITFE	FWANA	Systemwide	388,427	419,808	8	4,300	269,932	89,068	36,700	400,000	5	-19,808
200005800	Effects of supersaturated water on reproductive success of adult salmonids	USGS/CR RL	FWANA	Systemwide	149,972	0	-100	0	0	0	0	0	6	0

Notes on NPPC budget codes:  
 PD = Planning and design  
 CI = Construction and implementation  
 OM = Operation and maintenance  
 ME = Monitoring and evaluation  
 SOY = Start of Year total budget

**Table C - Council recommended adjustments to initial FY 2001 project budgets through February, 2001**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Funding	FY01 Requested	NPPC SOY	Amount added	To Phase	From project	Date	Notes
198811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	YN	1,565,000	4,628,000	978,000	-400,000	From CI	To: 199507400	1/17/2001	Remaining funds approved w/conditions
198331900	New Marking and Monitoring Techniques for Fish	NMFS	1,388,800	1,836,885	1,400,000	436,855	CI	199507400		
198710002	Protect And Enhance Anadromous Fish Habitat In The Umatilla River Subbasin	ODFW	353,000	425,263	361,428	63,835	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
198805305	Northeast Oregon Hatcheries Planning and Implementation (ODFW)	ODFW	226,000	230,477	230,477	170,000	PD	199507400	12/6/2000	
198810804	StreamNet	PSMFC	1,936,453	2,289,627	1,950,000	97,500	OM	199507400		Reinstated w/conditions
198812025	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Management, Data and Habitat	YN	750,000	1,141,232	800,000	341,232	OM	199507400	12/6/2000	
198902401	Evaluate Juvenile Salmonid Outmigration and Survival in the Lower Umatilla River Basin	ODFW	250,785	297,489	260,000	87,489	ME (SOY budget used wrong phase)	199507400	12/6/2000	50,000 for earlier billings

**Table C - Council recommended adjustments to initial FY 2001 project budgets through February, 2001**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Funding	FY01 Requested	NPPC SOY	Amount added	To Phase	From project	Date	Notes
198909600	Monitor and evaluate genetic characteristics of supplemented salmon and steelhead	NMFS	175,000	249,200	179,510	75,000	CI	199507400	11/2/2000	Corrects initial NPPC staff error
199005200	Performance/Stock Productivity Impacts of Hatchery Supplementation.	BRD	460,000	527,706	460,000	67,706	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199005500	Steelhead supplementation studies in Idaho rivers	IDFG	407,744	532,865	403,106	129,759	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199007800	Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-scale patterns	USGS / CRRL	117,880	123,193	0	123,193	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199101903	Hungry Horse Mitigation	MFWP	783,000	781,432	781,432	88,755	CI	199609600	12/6/2000	
199106200	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Mitigation Project	STOI		1,528,806	0	300,000	CI	199780000	11/2/2000	Corrects initial NPPC staff error
199201000	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation	SBT	132,821	169,600	145,000	24,600	PD: 3150 CI:11,150 OM: 5150 ME 5150	199609600	12/6/00	



**Table C - Council recommended adjustments to initial FY 2001 project budgets through February, 2001**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Funding	FY01 Requested	NPPC SOY	Amount added	To Phase	From project	Date	Notes
199202603	Idaho Model Watershed Administration/Implementation Support	ISCC	185,400	272,440	181,744	140,696	CI: 90,696; PD: 50,000	199507400	12/6/2000	
199404900	Improve the Kootenai River Ecosystem	KTOI	270,000	323,333	273,333	50,000	PD	199609600	12/6/2000	
199601100	Walla Walla River Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	CTUIR	2,840,000	1,851,000	0	450,000	CI	199507400	1/17/2001	Reinstatement was reduced from request w/conditions
199604200	Restore & Enhance Anadromous Fish Populations & Habitat in Salmon Creek	CCT	577,983	5,289,196	1,523,277	506,723	PD: 206723, CI: 300,000	199507400	11/2/2000	Conditions
199604300	Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Enhancement	NPT	2,800,000	751,898	-1,772,398	150,000	PD	199507400	11/2/2000	
199607709	Protecting and Restoring the Squaw Creek to Papoose Creek Analysis Area Watersheds	NPTFWP	303,607	399,698	299,999	99,699	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199608600	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Program	ISCC	89,450	143,062	95,000	48,062	PD	199507400	12/6/2000	

**Table C - Council recommended adjustments to initial FY 2001 project budgets through February, 2001**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Funding	FY01 Requested	NPPC SOY	Amount added	To Phase	From project	Date	Notes
199703400	Monitoring Fine Sediment Grande Ronde and John Day Rivers	CRITFC	32,145	39,846	33,000	6,486	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199703800	Preserve Salmonid Gametes	NPT	163,122	220,000	163,000	50,660	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199705000	Little Naches River Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement	YN Fisheries	0	134,950	0	120,417	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199705100	Yakima Side Channels	YN Fisheries	601,673	346,553	0	546,553	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
199705300	Toppenish-Simcoe Instream Flow Restoration and Assessment	YN Fisheries	163,544	237,503	206,693	30,810	OM: 17625 PD: 13185	199507400	12/6/2000	
199706000	Clearwater Subbasin Focus Watershed Program - NPT	NPTFWP	98,737	452,998	452,998	0			11/2/2000	Approved
199800200	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment	IDFG	225,208	263,837	230,000	33,837	CI	199800200	12/6/2000	

**Table C - Council recommended adjustments to initial FY 2001 project budgets through February, 2001**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Funding	FY01 Requested	NPPC SOY	Amount added	To Phase	From project	Date	Notes
199800703	Facility O&M And Program M&E For Grande Ronde Anadromous Salmonids	CTUIR	489,000	654,531	517,210	101,921	OM	199507400	12/6/2000	
199801003	Spawning distribution of Snake River fall chinook salmon	USFWS	177,666	191,422	180,000	11,422	ME	199507400	12/6/2000	
199900301	Evaluate Spawning of Salmon Below the Four Lowermost Columbia River Dams	ODFW	355,838	653,061	366,169	249,256	CI	199507400	#####	
199900304	Chum Spawning below Mainstem Dams	USDOE	0	0	0	100,921	CI	199601000	#####	From ESA placeholder
199901200	Coordinate/Facilitate Watershed Project Planning/Implementation	SCW RC & D	70,496	37,593	0	30,000	PD	199507400	11/2/2000	Corrects initial NPPC staff error, but Council requests
199901800	Characterize and quantify residual steelhead in the Clearwater River, Idaho	USFWS	84,365	107,670	85,000	22,670	ME	199901800	12/6/2000	
199901900	Restore Salmon River (Challis ,ID) Area	CSWCD	50,000	325,500	50,000	275,000	PD	199901900	12/6/2000	

**Table C - Council recommended adjustments to initial FY 2001 project budgets through February, 2001**

Project ID	Title	Sponsor	FY00 Funding	FY01 Requested	NPPC SOY	Amount added	To Phase	From project	Date	Notes
200001200	Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Gorge Chum Salmon Populations	USFWS	189,853	452,200	190,000	48,704	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
200001300	Evaluate An Experimental Re-introduction of Sockeye Salmon into Skaha Lake	CCT	171,171	229,357	180,000	49,357	CI	199507400	1/17/2000	
200001400	Evaluate Habitat Use and Population Dynamics of Lampreys in Cedar Creek	USFWS	134,790	318,881	150,000	35,000	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
200001700	Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts	CRITFC	72,752	227,982	153,992	73,990	CI	199507400	#####	Conditions
200003500	Rehabilitation of Newsome Creek Watershed	NPTFWP	301,689	401,198	309,684	91,514	CI	199507400	12/6/2000	
200003900	Walla Walla Basin Natural Production Monitoring and Evaluation	CTUIR	134,000	330,880	140,000	190,880	ME	199507400	12/6/2000	
new	John Day subbasin habitat acquisitions	CTWSRO	0	0	0	25,000	PD	199507400	12/6/2000	

## **PART III.**

### **Council Project Funding Recommendations for Fiscal Years 2001 through 2003 for Projects in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain Provinces.**

This Part III provides the Council's funding recommendations for project proposals in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces. These are the first three-year provincial review decisions under the Council's new approach to fish and wildlife funding recommendations.

Subpart A below is an introduction explaining how the new provincial review process was conducted in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces. It also explains general issues (not applying to any particular project or type of project) that the Council considered in making its project funding recommendations in these two provinces. Following that, in subpart B, are seven synopses specific to each subbasin within the Columbia Gorge province, and a province summary for the Inter-Mountain province where subbasin specific issues were consolidated due to their similarity. Each of these synopses are organized with the following sections:

1. A very general staff recitation of the Program's past funding in the subbasin, the context for project funding decisions and the priority recommendations of the fish and wildlife managers.
2. A statement of the major issues in the Independent Scientific Review Panel's recommendations.
3. Tables showing the projects and budgets that were proposed in each subbasin. The **consensus priorities** of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority and the Independent Scientific Review Panel are shaded and totaled.
4. Issues that the Council resolved in order to make final funding recommendations. These issues included the project recommendations of the ISRP. To the extent that the Council deviated from project-level recommendations of the ISRP, its reasons for doing so are explained, as required by the Northwest Power Act.

#### **A. General Considerations and Background Related to the Council's Funding Recommendations for proposals in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain Provinces.**

For Fiscal Year 2001, the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces were subject to the in-depth province-based review. The first step in this new process was to facilitate the development of a "subbasin summary" for each subbasin in these two provinces (described in detail in Part I above). The subbasin teams developed eleven subbasin summaries, and they were delivered by CBFWA on the established schedule. Bonneville and the Council then jointly issued a project proposal solicitation. The solicitation yielded sixty-two proposals for the two provinces combined (34 new and 28 ongoing).

The Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) conducted site visits in the provinces, and heard project and summary presentations from the proposal sponsors. The ISRP issued a preliminary report critiquing each proposal, and rated them as "fundable" where they believed that they met the statutory review criteria (16 proposals); "fundable if an adequate response is provided"

(36 proposals); or “do not fund” if the project was determined not to meet the review criteria (9 proposals). Sponsors of proposals initially rated as “fundable if adequate response is provided” had the opportunity to respond to the ISRP critique. After the response review, the ISRP ranked 13 proposals as “do not fund” (11 of those were new proposals, 2 were ongoing proposals).

The Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority’s fish and wildlife manager members (CBFWA) also conducted a review of the proposals. This has been the norm throughout the term of the 1996-2001 Bonneville fish and wildlife funding agreement. The fish and wildlife managers at CBFWA review the technical merit of the proposals, but they also review the proposals for their consistency and relevance to fish and wildlife management activities within their jurisdictions. The fish and wildlife managers ranked each of the 62 proposals as “urgent/high priority,” “recommended action,” or “do not fund.” The fish and wildlife managers ranked each of the 28 of the ongoing proposals as “urgent/high priority.” In addition, 13 new proposals were ranked as “urgent/high priority” (5 in the Columbia Gorge, and 8 in the Intermountain). Nine proposals were ranked as secondary priorities as “recommended actions” by the managers.

The CBFWA multi-tier recommendations and ISRP ranking system presented an issue for the Council. That is, the Council had to determine what is the appropriate suite of projects to work from as it develops its recommendations to Bonneville.

**Council decision: The Council decided that the proper core group of projects to be presumptively recommended to Bonneville for funding are the consensus priorities of the ISRP and CBFWA -- the group of projects rated as “fundable” by the ISRP and were also rated as “high priority/urgent” by the fish and wildlife managers. The Council began with this list and then considered specific policy reasons to add or subtract from this list on a project-by-project basis.**

There were other reasonable core project packages that the Council considered as a starting place to work from. For example, the Council could also have assumed that projects found “fundable” by the ISRP that were rated in the lower priority tier as “recommended actions” by CBFWA should also be added to the consensus priority core group. However, the Council continues to believe that it should be conservative in initiating new projects prior to having subbasin plans completed. Including the proposals rated as “recommended actions” would substantially increase the number of new project starts in these provinces.

When the ISRP and CBFWA recommendations were compared, there was a high level of agreement on the project priorities. That is, the ISRP final report noted only six direct conflicts with the recommendations of CBFWA in the Columbia Gorge province.<sup>1</sup> In the Intermountain, there were seven direct conflicts between the ISRP and CBFWA recommendations.<sup>2</sup>

It should be noted that, as is typically the case, even when the ISRP rated a proposal as “fundable” it often identified areas that could be improved or where questions remain unanswered.

---

<sup>1</sup> In two of those instances, the ISRP disagrees with CBFWA’s lower “recommended action” ranking, and would *elevate* the proposal for funding. In the four other cases, CBFWA has ranked a project as either “recommended action” or “high priority/urgent” and the ISRP rates it as do not fund. However, in that second group of four, there is *only a single project that the fish and wildlife managers rank as “urgent/high priority” that ISRP rates as “do not fund”* -- the other three were in the CBFWA lower tier ranking.

<sup>2</sup> In three cases, the ISRP would elevate projects for funding that the fish and wildlife managers ranked in the lower “recommended action” or “do not fund” category. In the remaining four cases, CBFWA has ranked projects as “urgent/high priority” and the ISRP as “do not fund”

Similarly, the Council and CBFWA reviews also sometimes reveal that a technically sound project has a policy or management issue that requires consideration. The revelation of these flaws or shortcomings in otherwise sound projects often leads to the Council needing to craft conditional funding recommendations. The issue that this presents is framed below, followed by the Council decision on this general issue.

**Issue:** How should the Council treat deficiencies or shortcomings in projects that the ISRP rated as “fundable.”<sup>3</sup> Similarly, how does the Council treat policy or management issues raised by itself or CBFWA in projects that are otherwise scientifically sound and part of the consensus priority group?

**Council decision:** The Council decision has two levels of treatment depending on the nature of the issue. First, where the ISRP rated projects as “fundable,” but noted specific science-based deficiencies *without specifically recommending* that those deficiencies be addressed by the Council or in contracting, the Council should *encourage, but not require* the sponsors to address these deficiencies as it contracts with Bonneville. The second level of treatment is for those projects rated as “fundable,” but *also included* one or more of the following:

- 1. A specific science-based recommendation from the ISRP that the deficiency should be addressed as part of contracting or in some other review process; or**
- 2. A management or policy issue raised by the Council or CBFWA. In a number of cases, the Council added specific conditions or requirements as terms for its recommendations for project funding.**

**For these projects, the Council chose to follow the recommendation of the ISRP, and advise Bonneville and project sponsors that its funding recommendation is made with a condition that written documentation of how the issues have been addressed prior to or as part of contracting with Bonneville. The application of this approach is part of the project specific recommendations that follow.**

In the way of further background, and a very significant change from prior years, the fish and wildlife managers at CBFWA did not have a baseline budget for either the provinces or the program to guide its recommended project workplan. Neither the Council nor Bonneville asked CBFWA to assume any baseline budget as it prepared its Fiscal Year 2001 - 2003 project recommendations for these two provinces. Neither the Council nor Bonneville insisted that CBFWA proceed under an assumption that the direct funding amount available for Fiscal Year 2001 would be constrained by the existing MOA allocation. Rather, the Council, with Bonneville’s knowledge, advised CBFWA that it should define the fish and wildlife project needs in each subbasin for Fiscal Years 2001 through 2003 in subbasin summaries and respond to those needs with project proposals.<sup>4</sup>

Going into the project selection phase of the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain province reviews, the Council estimated that there was currently remaining \$8 to 10 million in funds under the

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, many projects were rated by the ISRP as “fundable” but, nonetheless, had specific shortcomings of one element or another identified in the ISRP final comments.

<sup>4</sup> On this issue of the level of funding, the Council should recall that it suggested in a letter seeking public input that it was considering recommending that Bonneville dedicate additional funds to the direct program budget even for Fiscal Year 2001, which is the final year of the MOA. See Council letter to Interested Parties dated October 20, 2000.

MOA amount for Fiscal Year 2001 is \$8-10 for anadromous projects. This was due in significant part to the Council's decision to defer allocations for a number of ongoing capital construction projects to future fiscal years. There also remained approximately \$2 million under the MOA Fiscal Year 2001 dedicated amount for resident fish projects. Those amounts were to be confirmed in a quarterly budget review with Bonneville in late February. Wildlife funds under the MOA for Fiscal Year 2001 were almost fully allocated. Therefore, the Council was aware that in recommending that Bonneville fund the consensus priority group of projects in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces, it was aware that Bonneville may need to augment the amount of funding dedicated for Fiscal Year 2001 under the funding MOA. This was not a new issue for the region, Bonneville or the Council. The Council had previously indicated in a letter soliciting comment from regional interests that it believed that the MOA dedicated amount should be augmented by Bonneville for new needs identified in the province reviews and for other initiatives such as subbasin planning.<sup>5</sup>

As part of its public deliberations, the Council's Fish and Wildlife Committee discussed assumptions for Bonneville's budget to fund these projects from Fiscal Year 2001 through Fiscal Year 2003. Bob Austin, Bonneville's deputy manager of fish and wildlife said that Bonneville was not prepared to commit additional funds for these recommendations above the amounts remaining unallocated in the 2001 fish and wildlife budget. Bonneville estimated that \$17 million remained unallocated to projects in the 2001 budget. Mr. Austin said that Bonneville intends to fund its fish and wildlife obligations in Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003 consistent with the previously proposed range assumed in Bonneville's rate case, but that it needs to see more definition of Endangered Species Act requirements and other mitigation needs developed in additional provincial reviews.

The Council's assumptions going into its funding recommendations, in light of the above discussion relating to availability of funds, was that the following principles guide its adoption of three-year work plans for the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces:

- a. The Council adopts a presumptive work plan for 2001.
- b. Bonneville has not yet committed additional funds for 2001.
- c. The Council's work plans in the Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces are adopted by the Council as the presumed funding need for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003 and will be refined as additional provincial reviews are completed.
- d. Bonneville will respond to the Council's recommendations on a project-specific basis in developing final budgets in Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003.

Finally, before turning to the specific project issues below, it is very important to be clear about what is being recommended by the Council in terms of out-year budget impacts in its recommendations on the following projects. The Council is making *multi-year funding recommendations for the projects it recommends in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces*. In the project specific budgets presented for each subbasin, there are both Fiscal Year 2001 budgets and Fiscal Year 2001 through 2003 budgets. Given that the Council will not conduct another in-depth review of these provinces until Fiscal Year 2004, the Council recommends the out-

---

<sup>5</sup> See Council letter to "Interested Parties" dated October 20, 2000, wherein the Council indicated that it may recommend that the base direct fish and wildlife budget be augmented by up to \$19 million to meet additional needs identified in the provincial reviews completed in FY 2001. That letter also identifies other initiatives that the Council may recommend needs augmented funding in FY 2001.



year budgets to Bonneville as well as the Fiscal Year 2001 budget. The Council will review these projects each Fiscal Year in the “ongoing project renewal process”, but the purpose of that review is to ensure that projects previously approved are staying within the scope of the prior Council recommendation and Bonneville contract and within the approved budget -- scientific and policy issues outside of those parameters will not normally be addressed or investigated in that yearly renewal process.

## **Columbia Gorge Province**

The following subbasins lie within the Columbia Gorge Province. The following sections, organized by subbasin, contains the Council’s specific recommendations and conditions for project funding for projects in this province. Table D presents the summary of those funding recommendations, and is attached at the end of this Part III. Bonneville should *not* rely on the this table only, but should reference the project specific narrative in this section for a full statement of project specific conditions recommended by the Council. The Council also emphasizes that the general conditions regarding addressing issues raised by the ISRP highlighted above in bold text applies to all projects.

### **Hood River Subbasin**

#### **Council staff summary:**

Bonneville funding in the Hood River has supported a suite of closely related projects. The primary focus is the Hood River Production Program, jointly managed by the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Bonneville funding also contributes to the support of the Hood River Watershed Council which assists in developing landowner support for the habitat restoration components of Hood River restoration efforts.

The Hood River Production Program (HRPP) was adopted into the Program by the Council in 1987 as part of the Northeast Oregon Hatchery (NEOH) initiative, a complex of artificial production measures for several subbasins in Oregon. The Council separated the Hood River program from the other NEOH programs in 1991 and the program was initiated in the mid 1990s. The subbasin summary identifies goals of the HRPP of reestablishing natural, self-sustaining populations of spring chinook (extirpated in the 1960s), rebuilding natural self-sustaining populations of winter and summer steelhead (currently depressed), protecting and restoring habitat, and contributing to tribal and non-tribal fisheries. Hood River incubation, acclimation and adult holding and spawning facilities were completed at Parkdale in 1998 and Bonneville funds an adult trapping and sorting facility at Powerdale Dam. However, the HRPP relies on Round Butte and Oak Spring hatcheries in the Deschutes subbasin for incubation and rearing for each of these stocks.

Natural populations of steelhead in the Hood River are listed as threatened species under the ESA as part of the Lower Columbia River ESU (note, however, that the 2000 hydrosystem biological opinion did not find the Lower Columbia River ESU was “jeopardized” by the operation of the Federal hydrosystem). Bull trout are also present in the Hood River subbasin and are also a threatened species under the ESA.

The fish manager recommendations are for continued funding of the operations of the Hood River facilities and continuing the habitat restoration efforts of the watershed council. The significant new initiatives in the managers’ recommendations are to expand the Parkdale facility to

shift juvenile incubation and rearing from the Round Butte hatchery. Additionally, the managers propose an expansion of monitoring and evaluation components of the project.

### ISRP review

The ISRP final report was generally supportive of the Hood River programs. It stated that it believed that “the Hood River group is on the right track with their watershed assessments and rehabilitation plans listed by priority of action.” However, in its final comments, the Panel expressed several concerns about the program’s monitoring and evaluation plans, and the supplementation activities. The ISRP expressed a desire to have the managers revisit these particular issues in their comprehensive review of the Hood River program scheduled for 2002. The ISRP’s concerns, expressed in its preliminary comments, about a lack of data being presented appear to have been addressed, at least temporarily, by the sponsors in the “fix-it” phase of the review. This is evidenced by the ISRP’s comments in its final recommendations that it believes that by 2002, additional data sets will be complete enough to revisit many of its about the monitoring and evaluation program and supplementation activities. The ISRP also urged attention to density limits in the Bonneville pool and harvest management practices.

<b>Hood River project proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
198805303	Hood River Production Program - CTWSRO M&E	CTWSRO	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$519,959	\$1,609,959
198805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E	ODFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$431,331	\$1,321,331
198805307	Hood River Production Program: Powerdale, Parkdale, Oak Springs	CTWSRO and ODFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$1,082,983	\$4,796,653
198902900	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder Hatchery	ODFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$139,534	\$254,545
199500700	Hood River Production - PGE: O&M	PGE	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$46,300	\$96,300
199802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWSRO	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$299,953	\$1,699,953
<b>Consensus priority recommendations:</b>					<b>\$2,520,060</b>	<b>\$9,778,741</b>

### **HOOD RIVER ISSUE 1. Funding assumption for consolidating spring chinook production at Parkdale facility**

The Council addressed the Warm Spring Tribes’ proposal to centralize spring chinook production facilities at Parkdale (Project 1988-053-070). The proposal requires additional facilities at Parkdale and shifting current operations from the Pelton/Round Butte facilities on the Deschutes

River. The budget assumptions presented in provincial review provide for capital funding of \$2.5 million in Fiscal Year 2002. This funding is the estimated costs for additional hatchery facilities at the production site. Once the spring chinook program is moved to Parkdale, operation and maintenance costs at the current Pelton/Round Butte facilities (Project 1989-029-00) would decline.

The shift in production requires a sequence of additional evaluation and decisions in the Council's "Three-Step" process for artificial production facilities. "Three-Step" review will address the concerns noted by the Independent Scientific Review Panel in its evaluation of the Hood River Production Project's supplementation goals.

**Council decision:** The project sponsors and Council staff should define decision points for three-step review and associated budget for a reasonably optimistic decision schedule. The scheduled 2002 program review should evaluate the scope of major production facility changes as called for in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Hood River program. This schedule would place the likely capital construction need in Fiscal Year 2003 and extend the proposed planning and design budget over two years.

The Council recommends that Bonneville fund land acquisition for potential expansion subject to determination of the adequacy of water supply. The Council believes this preliminary acquisition is reasonable because the land could be sold if construction at the site is ultimately foreclosed.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** Project 1988-053-07: Modification of the Fiscal Year 2001 planning and design budget to extend through 2002. Reschedule capital costs, except for land acquisition to 2003. Reserving the capital budget will depend on continued approvals in the "Three-Step" process and a determination of the Program's scheduled capital investment capacity.

**FY 01: -\$355,250**

**FY 02: -2,160,000**

**FY 03 +2,515,250**

<b>HOOD RIVER ISSUE 2 - ISRP criticisms of monitoring and evaluation program</b>
--

The ISRP comments focused questions on the monitoring components of the Hood River Production Program. The ISRP called for an overall monitoring and evaluation plan and improved presentation of the results of past work. While concluding that the monitoring projects are fundable, the ISRP urged attention to its concerns in the scheduled Fiscal Year 2002 program review.

**Council decision:** The ISRP's concerns should be specifically addressed in the scheduled review of the Hood River Production Program in 2002. While, the ISRP's preliminary concerns for funding the program were sufficiently resolved in the response of the project sponsor, the ISRP stressed the need to make progress on an overall monitoring and evaluation plan. The combined costs for monitoring and evaluation approach \$1 million a year and so the Council asks for a report on a coordinated plan as part of the Hood River Program's 2002 review and "Three-Step" review. Further, the Council requests Bonneville to establish a specific contractual requirement for reporting of the program's monitoring data to Streamnet.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** None.

**Response to ISRP recommendations:** The Council finds that its funding recommendations for project proposals in the Hood River subbasin incorporate the recommendations of the Panel.

## Fifteenmile Creek

**Council staff summary:** Bonneville has funded a passage improvement and habitat protection and restoration initiative in Fifteenmile Creek since 1987. Bonneville investments have supported a series of instream habitat structures and 98 miles of riparian fencing on Fifteenmile Creek and its tributaries. Salmonid production in the subbasin is entirely natural; there are no artificial production programs. The population of winter steelhead in the subbasin is the easternmost in the Columbia River. This steelhead population was listed as a threatened species in 1999 as part of the Mid-Columbia ESU. Spring chinook have been known to spawn in the subbasin since 1996. This population of spring chinook is not listed under the ESA. The Mitchell Act has also funded irrigation diversion screening in the subbasin.

The subbasin summary identifies several existing plans for fish and wildlife in Fifteenmile Creek. Two of the major plans that guide fish and wildlife activities that have been funded by Bonneville in Fifteenmile Creek are the *Fifteenmile Creek Basin Fish Habitat Improvement Implementation Plan* (USFS & ODFW 1987) and the *Fifteenmile Creek Subbasin Salmon and Steelhead Production Plan* (ODFW & CTWS 1990). Native winter steelhead is most actively targeted for active management (goal of 1,500 wild adult escapement to the mouth of Fifteenmile Creek). Spring chinook and pacific lamprey management goals are being discussed by co-managers.

The recommendations of the fish and wildlife managers would continue the ongoing funding for operation and maintenance of the fencing, water gaps and in-stream habitat structures installed since 1987. When the fencing program was initiated, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife established 15-year agreements with landowners to maintain the fencing and access for repairs to in-stream habitat structures. The recommendations seek to renew installation of additional riparian fencing at a rate of ten miles a year.

The managers proposed work plan also placed a high priority on funding for the Oregon Water Trust to acquire senior water rights in the subbasin for in-stream flows. An ongoing monitoring program to trap migrating smolts to estimate production in the basin is a priority in the CBFWA work plan. The managers supported the proposal by the Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District to fund technical assistance to enroll landowners in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), but stated that Bonneville funding for the proposal raises an issue of conflicting with the Northwest Power Act's restriction on funding the legal obligations of other government agencies. The CREP program compensates landowners for withdrawing marginal lands from agricultural production specifically to aid riparian restoration.

### **ISRP Review:**

**Subbasin Level** While supporting the core habitat restoration and maintenance projects in the CBFWA work plan, the ISRP did have some guidance and concerns at the overall subbasin level. First, the ISRP was concerned that the projects proposed by ODFW, Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Wy'East Resource Conservation District did not appear to relate to an overall coordinated rehabilitation plan with priorities based on an assessment and with monitoring and evaluation. In a nutshell, even though the ISRP favored the great majority of the projects individually (discussed below), it remained concerned that there did not appear to be a well-articulated assessment-based strategic plan to maximize the benefits of these varied efforts.

Second, implicit in the ISRP comments, but very evident to the Council, is an apparent subbasin level coordination issue between the project priorities of the fish and wildlife managers, and the participation and support by landowners through federal soil and water conservation programs. This coordination issue is exemplified by the review of the project proposals by the Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District. The fish and wildlife managers accorded those proposals lower priority and expressed concern about the alignment of agricultural conservation programs with the strategies of the fish and wildlife managers. The staff has discussed this matter with ODFW and Wasco SWCD, both of which acknowledge the issue and appear willing to work to better coordinate.

**Project Level:** The ISRP disagreed with CBFWA's lower priority for the Wasco SWCD CREP enrollment and a project and a second demonstration project for integrated pesticide application proposed by Wy'East RC&D. Both CBFWA and the ISRP noted that Bonneville funding these projects posed "policy" issues for the Council to consider.

The ISRP recommended no funding for the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's steelhead smolt monitoring project, even after a response from the Department in the "fix-it" review.

The ISRP also noted a concern with the relatively short duration of the landowner agreements for maintenance of the fencing and in-stream habitat structures installed with Program funds.

<b>Fifteenmile Creek project proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
21019	Fifteenmile Subbasin Water Right Acquisition Program	OWT	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$32,000	\$128,000
199304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request For Multi-Year Funding)	ODFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable. Concerns should be addressed in Council review or BPA contracting process.	\$220,040	\$670,113
21001	Fifteenmile Creek Riparian Fencing / Physical stream Survey Project	ODFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable. Concerns should be addressed in Council review or BPA contracting process.	\$151,685	\$471,843
<b>Consensus priority recommendations</b>					<b>\$403,725</b>	<b>\$1,269,956</b>
199304001	15-Mile Creek Steelhead Smolt Production	ODFW	Urgent/High Priority	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$33,704	\$92,204
21014	Mitigate Streambank Sediment Sources in Fifteenmile Watershed using Bioengineering Techniques	Wasco SWCD	Recommended Action	Agree, Fundable	\$159,355	\$202,934
21016	Accelerate the Application of Integrated Fruit Management to Reduce the Risk of Pesticide Pollution in Fifteenmile Sub-basin Orchards	Wy'East RC&D	Do Not Fund	Disagree, this proposal is fundable.	\$308,772	\$738,457
21015	Riparian Buffers	Wasco SWCD	Do Not Fund	The position looks valid and offers potential benefit. However, funding the position is a policy decision.	\$73,414	\$226,914

**FIFTEENMILE CREEK ISSUE 1: Bonneville funding for technical assistance to support enrolling riparian land in the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)**

Specifically related to Issue 1, CBFWA recommended no funding for a staff position to provide technical assistance to willing landowners in the CREP program (proposal 210250). The ISRP supported the project. The Wasco County Soil and Water Conservation District stated that more than 30 landowners in the Fifteenmile Creek and Deschutes River subbasins have applied for enrollment in the CREP program. Current staffing is not adequate to process the enrollments. Both the ISRP and CBFWA say this funding represents a policy issue for the Council because of potential “in lieu” concerns.

The 2000 Biological Opinion for the federal hydropower system has a specific requirement for Bonneville to fund assistance for CREP enrollment. Fifteenmile Creek offers a possible “pilot” opportunity for unlocking CREP assistance. In doing so, the Council should be satisfied that CREP enrollments will be coordinated with the overall habitat restoration priorities.

***Council decision:*** The Biological Opinion calls for Bonneville to fund technical assistance to enroll landowners in the CREP program with a target of 100 miles of riparian protection a year. The Wasco Soil and Water Conservation District is the first proposal to demonstrate the value of funding technical assistance.

The Council considered the concern raised by the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority that such funding raises the concern of violating the “in lieu” restrictions of the Northwest Power Act. The Council concludes that the CREP program is a federal incentive program, not a regulatory or management responsibility of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. There is no funding currently in place in the SWCD budget for the position that Bonneville funds would displace. Bonneville funding for needed technical assistance to qualify landowners for CREP enrollment is similar to supporting watershed coordinators who apply for other watershed restoration funds. Bonneville advised the Council that it concurred that such funding would not likely to be a violation of the Power Act’s “in lieu” prohibition.

The Council conditioned its approval of this project with specific direction that the priority for the focus of the technical assistance be in support of past and scheduled riparian protection in *Fifteenmile Creek*. The quarterly performance report for the project should show on maps where the efforts have been focused. The Council was made aware by the project sponsor that the original project proposal contemplated spreading the effort funded by the project throughout Wasco County, including substantial effort in the Deschutes subbasin. The Council recommends that the approval in this review be directed to a priority of effort in the Fifteenmile Creek subbasin because the region needs a quick demonstration of the effectiveness of aligning CREP enrollment with a planned strategy for riparian protection in a subbasin. The Council expects a proposal for similar assistance in the Deschutes subbasin during the provincial review for the Columbia Plateau province, as well as in other subbasins. The Council believes the best evaluation of supporting CREP enrollment with funding for technical assistance will come from a focused effort in Fifteenmile Creek.

***Adjustment to consensus priority budget:***

If proposal 21025 is funded as submitted, the additional funding would be roughly for one full-time-equivalent staff position plus support costs.

**FY 01: +\$73,414**

**FY 02: +\$75,616**

**FY 03 +\$77,884**

## **FIFTEENMILE CREEK ISSUE 2: Long-term maintenance for fencing.**

An issue noted by the ISRP, but more of a management concern, is maintenance of the installed fencing in the subbasin. Bonneville originally used 15-year leases to have access to maintain the fences and funds the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to do the work. The first of the leases will soon expire. The Council should address with Bonneville alternatives to ensure that longer-term maintenance is provided. This issue also exists in the John Day, Grande Ronde and other subbasins, so there is a precedent in how we handle Fifteenmile Creek maintenance.

The Council notes that the CREP program is also limited to 15-year commitments, so the problem developing in the Council program is also a concern for federal programs.

**Council decision:** The Council considered whether to fund more fencing without a provision for long-term maintenance. The fencing protects, in the short term, a listed species and responds to a measurable performance standard of the hydro Biological Opinion. As noted, the lack of long-term planning for maintenance of Bonneville-funded fencing is shared with restoration efforts in other subbasins (i.e. John Day, Grande Ronde, and the Clearwater). The Council requests that Bonneville adopt a schedule for developing long-term maintenance plans for riparian fencing or else factor into future funding decisions some form of a trust fund to pay for maintenance in perpetuity.

The Council recommends the following course of action in Fifteenmile Creek: Bonneville should fund the resumption of fencing if the National Marine Fisheries Service will affirm that Bonneville's funding of fencing will be credited as partial completion of the measurable performance standards of the Biological Opinion. The Council staff should work with Bonneville and the fish and wildlife managers to develop a proposal for alternatives to permanent funding for maintenance and review the issue again in the Plateau Review. Bonneville should consider hosting a Columbia basinwide workshop on the subject.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** None.

## **FIFTEENMILE CREEK ISSUE 3: ISRP “do not fund” recommendation for Fifteenmile Creek monitoring project**

The ISRP recommended no funding for ODFW's proposed monitoring project. The panel's report concluded that the monitoring design is not adequate for estimating smolt yield and of limited value without data on adult escapement. ODFW responded that designing a monitoring strategy to respond to the ISRP's review has feasibility challenges and additional costs. ODFW stated that it was seeking funding for adult trapping facility in the High Priority solicitation process -- one of the elements mentioned by the ISRP. ODFW maintains that the information from the project is still of benefit given the relatively low cost of the project.

**Council decision:** The monitoring issues in Fifteenmile Creek represent the larger monitoring and evaluation questions raised in the ISRP's provincial report. The report emphasizes that the ISRP does not call for “major research level” data collection for all projects. Rather, the report suggests that monitoring should be coordinated among related projects. In the case of Fifteenmile Creek, the monitoring issues are likely common with other tributary riparian protection and restoration strategies and some common monitoring approach is likely to be more cost-effective than investing in a full suite of monitoring facilities for every project.



Given the ISRP's negative review, and the need to address these questions on a programmatic level, the Council agreed with its staff's recommendation that Bonneville should convene a work group involving the monitoring staff of the fish and wildlife management agencies to develop a cooperative monitoring strategy for riparian protection projects. The Council expects to see similar issues in the Plateau provincial review and suggest that a programmatic review of habitat protection monitoring is the most effective way to resolve these questions.

The Council does recommend that the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife have the opportunity to revise its proposed monitoring project for Fifteenmile Creek in light of the above discussion and return it to the ISRP for additional review. To maintain the project's ability to proceed if the proposed redesign is successful, the Council recommends reserving a budget placeholder of \$33,704 for the remainder of FY 2001.

***Adjustment to base budget:***

**FY 01: +\$33,704**

**FY 02: 0**

**FY 03 0**

**FIFTEENMILE CREEK ISSUE 4: Testing integrated pesticide management for fish benefits.**

The ISRP reiterated its support for proposal 21016 which would test integrated pesticide management in Fifteenmile Creek orchards. CBFWA gave a "do not fund" recommendation

***Council recommendation:*** Bonneville should fund a scaled-down demonstration project. The ISRP noted that the strength of the proposal lies in the collaboration, outreach and education of the orchardists. The Council's staff contacted the project sponsors in an effort to reduce the scale of the project, maintain its strengths, and address ISRP concerns about monitoring and evaluation for effects on fish and wildlife.

***Adjustment to budget recommendation:*** Sponsors agreed to reduce the number of weather station data inputs and eliminate the tower sprayer component of the project. The budget for the information delivery and grower outreach (the ISRP's identified project strengths) would be maintained. The monitoring and evaluation budget for Fiscal Year 2002 and Fiscal Year 2003 would return to the Council for review once sponsors get an agreed upon plan with Oregon DEQ and fish and wildlife managers, subject to ISRP review. The Council recommends reserving a placeholder of \$64,000 for the monitoring and evaluation budget component in Fiscal Year 2002 and Fiscal Year 2003, subject to Council review and approval.

**FY01: \$146,100 FY02: \$168,410 FY03: \$168,410**

***Response to ISRP recommendations:*** The Council finds that its project recommendation in the Fifteenmile Creek subbasin incorporate the recommendations of the Panel. Specifically, the Council did recommend funding the SWCD CREP enrollment position and the Wy East pesticide management proposal as recommended. Its recommendation for the ODFW Fifteenmile Creek Monitoring and Evaluation proposal delayed funding the proposal until project specific deficiencies can be remedied after a more programmatic review of similar efforts is conducted. In prompting a more programmatic review of monitoring and evaluation, the Council is incorporating and responding to the programmatic or province level recommendation in the ISRP report pertaining to monitoring and evaluation activities.

## Klickitat River

### Council staff summary:

The primary fish and wildlife management activities in the Klickitat subbasin have been passage and artificial production initiatives, dating back to the early 1950s. Most of this work was funded by sources other than Bonneville, with Mitchell Act funding being a substantial contributor. More recently, Bonneville funding has been dedicated to the Klickitat as a component of the Yakama Nation's Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP). To date, most of that Bonneville funding has been directed toward planning and analysis. There has been Bonneville funding of a riparian and in-channel habitat project since 1997. This project has focused on tributaries to the Klickitat River.

The species receiving the most management attention are spring chinook, steelhead, fall chinook, and coho. Spring chinook and steelhead (both winter and summer race) are native to the Klickitat system, while fall chinook and coho are not. Those latter species were introduced into the Klickitat in the early 1950s. It does not appear that any of these salmonid populations is listed under the Endangered Species act.

From the subbasin summary it appears that major management plans driving the management approach within the Klickitat are artificial production agreements in the U.S v. Oregon forum and the Klickitat component of the YKFP project. The subbasin summary candidly describes the Klickitat fisheries enhancement element of the YKFP as "qualitatively different than its sister program in the Yakima." That is, the Klickitat component is still relatively new, it contains a major harvest augmentation element, and basic elements of the supplementation plan (for spring chinook and steelhead), monitoring plan, and watershed assessment are still being developed.

The Yakama Nation proposes to complete the design phase of passage improvements and upgrading existing production facilities in the Klickitat subbasin to implement an artificial production program (supplementation and augmentation) for spring chinook, fall chinook and coho salmon and steelhead. Spring chinook and steelhead production is aimed at increasing natural spawners, while the coho and fall chinook elements are primarily aimed at augmenting harvest opportunity. The riparian and in-channel habitat project is proposed to continue as well.

The managers' proposal for Bonneville funding in Fiscal Year 2001 to 2003 includes the following major capital projects:

- Completion of final design for passage improvements, and adult broodstock collection and monitoring facilities at Lyle Falls near the mouth of the Klickitat River;
- Completion of final design to repair and improve the existing fish ladder at Castile Falls in the upper part of the Klickitat River;
- Upgrades of the water supply and additional facilities at the Klickitat Hatchery, currently funded by the National Marine Fisheries Service with Mitchell Act Funds and operated by the Washington Department of Fisheries. The hatchery would be managed by the Yakama Nation for YKFP production objectives.
- Construction of one on-site acclimation facility at the Klickitat Hatchery and construction of four additional acclimation sites elsewhere in the subbasin.

The Klickitat Hatchery and the existing passage facilities at Lyle and Castile Falls were originally funded by the Mitchell Act. The Council staff understand that the National Marine Fisheries Service has funding available for repairs to the Castile Falls fishway but not for upgrades at Lyle Falls. NMFS does not have funding for operations and continued maintenance of the fishways after 2002.

Bonneville funding, as proposed by the manager's recommendation, would fund operation and maintenance of the passage facilities and the upgraded Klickitat Hatchery as well as Yakama Nation management of the supplementation program. The managers also recommend increased Bonneville funding for the ongoing habitat restoration project.

### **ISRP review:**

The Independent Scientific Review Panel expressed a number of concerns about implementing the Yakama Nation's artificial production objectives. Its rating of "fundable" was conditioned upon having its concerns addressed in further review. The ISRP concerns focused on three issues:

- 1) Design of the strategy for the artificial production program;
- 2) Organization of the program proposals, and;
- 3) Sequence of proposed implementation program.

On point 1), the ISRP expressed concern that the artificial production strategy that had dual objectives -- restoration of natural populations, and augmentation of fisheries -- would be difficult to balance, implement and evaluate without much better stock assessment information. The ISRP recommended that a quantitative stock assessment program for natural populations be initiated, and that the hatchery production goals be phased in over time.

On point 2), the ISRP continues to struggle with the organization of the proposals. The ISRP found the budgets as presented to lack the clarity they felt supported scientific review.

On point 3), the ISRP recommended funding first the project proposed by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (Proposal 21004) that would monitor the energy expended by adult fish attempting passage through Lyle and Castile Falls. The ISRP anticipated that the information from the study would guide the design and funding priority for the projects.

Finally, the ISRP also found the ongoing habitat restoration project (Project 1997-056-00) fundable but only on an interim basis with specific milestones. The ISRP recommended that these milestones include the completion of a watershed assessment, setting up a watershed council and verifying the preliminary results of Ecosystem Diagnosis and Analysis.

## Klickitat project proposals

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	CBFWA	ISRP	FY01	FY01-FY03
			Category	Comparison		
199705600	Lower Klickitat Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YN	Urgent/High Priority	Fundable if funding is based on achievement	\$313,318	\$1,090,459
198811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	YN	Urgent/High Priority	Fundable on interim basis.	\$3,683,000	\$5,867,000
198812025	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Management, Data and Habitat	YN	Urgent/High Priority	Fundable on interim basis.	\$363,510	\$1,170,964
199506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring And Evaluation (Klickitat Only)	YN	Urgent/High Priority	Fundable on interim basis.	\$447,723	\$1,468,082
199701725	Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Operation and Maintenance (Klickitat Only)	YN	Urgent/High Priority	Fundable on interim basis.	\$0	\$2,530,000
<b>Consensus priority recommendations:</b>					<b>\$4,807,551</b>	<b>\$12,126,505</b>
21027	Inventory and Assess Amphibian Populations in the Klickitat Subbasin	YN	Recommended Action	Agree, Fundable	\$135,797	\$401,391
21004	Determination of difficult passage areas by examining swimming activity of upriver migrating salmon implanted with EMG transmitters	PNNL	Recommended Action	Disagree with CBFWA priority. This is a high priority project that deserves funding.	\$212,929	\$632,929
21026	Inventory and Restore Beaver and Beaver Habitats	YN	Recommended Action	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$205,440	\$675,440
21028	Klickitat Watershed and Habitat Enhancement Project	YN	Recommended Action	NA	\$2,741,360	\$9,001,360

**KLICKITAT ISSUE 1: Response to ISRP concerns for Klickitat production and passage programs.**

The ISRP anticipated that its concerns about implementing the Klickitat production program as proposed would return to them for review in the Council's "Three-Step" process for artificial production projects.

***Council decision:***

The Council staff worked with the Yakama Nation fisheries staff to outline a "three-step" review sequence encompassing the proposed passage and production facilities. This sequence is a reasonably optimistic schedule considering National Environmental Policy Act requirements and other necessary reviews. The actual schedule also depends on completion of an agreement between the Yakama Nation and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for transfer or co-management of the Klickitat Hatchery.

Using the "Three-Step" review process, the entire program will return to the Council, with the recommendations of the ISRP, for decisions to continue planning, design and proceed with construction at key planning milestones. These reviews will also define long term operation, maintenance and monitoring costs. The Council specifically intends this guidance to mean that master planning and NEPA review must be completed before the Council will consider recommending project construction funding.

***Adjustment to consensus priority budgets:***

The Council's recommendation is to defer \$3.7 million in FY '01 capital funding to FY '03. As stated above, approval of the capital budget (Project 1988-115-25) will depend on completion of environmental review, continued approvals in the "Three-Step" process and a determination of the Program's scheduled capital investment capacity. The Council assumes that the operation and maintenance budget (Project 1997-017-25) is deferred, reflecting the modified construction schedule and current lack of agreement for management of the Klickitat Hatchery.

**FY '01: - \$3,450,000      FY '02 - \$1,300,000      FY '03 + 2,449,000**

<b>KLICKITAT ISSUE 2: Funding for an experimental salmon exertion study at Klickitat passage sites</b>
--

The Independent Scientific Review Panel recommended funding Proposal 21004 to study the energy expended by adult passage in the Klickitat River and funding the study is appropriate before initiating passage improvement projects at Lyle and Castile Falls. The Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority opposes deferring repairs and upgrades at those sites for the completion of the study.

***Council decision:*** The Council concluded from the sponsor's comment and the design issues at Lyle and Castile Falls that the proposal is unlikely to inform passage project design - the emphasis at Lyle Falls is on adult collection, not passage; and Castile Falls is undergoing repairs to flood-caused damages.

Nevertheless, the project is strongly supported by the ISRP, both for specific application in the Klickitat and for application to passage problems elsewhere. The Council supports a scaled-

down project test in the Klickitat because of the innovative qualities of the proposal and its potential to establish baseline information in the Klickitat.

***Adjustment from consensus priority budget:***

**FY 01: +\$319,542**

***Response to ISRP recommendations:*** The Council finds that it incorporated the recommendations of the ISRP in its funding recommendations for projects in the Klickitat subbasin. As discussed above, the Panel's recommendation was to address its questions about the artificial production initiatives in the 3-step review process, and that is what the Council has recommended. The Council will also continue to work with the Yakama Nation and Bonneville to organize proposals in a way that meets Bonneville and sponsor needs and better facilitates the science review. Finally, the Council did recommend the exertion study due to its innovation and potential for basinwide application.

## White Salmon subbasin

### **Council staff summary:**

There is not a history of Bonneville funded activities in the White Salmon River subbasin. This is primarily due to the presence of the Condit Dam and powerhouse both located within the lower three miles of the river. Condit Dam has blocked anadromous fish passage since the early 1900's. The Council's fish and wildlife program, however, has long had a measure calling for fish passage at Condit Dam so that anadromous species may recover access to their historical range in the subbasin.

Pacificorp has agreed to remove Condit Dam to provide for passage of salmon into the White Salmon subbasin. As part of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing proceedings, it entered into a settlement agreement to remove Condit dam in 2006. Anticipating the dam's removal, the Underwood Conservation District, cooperating with the Yakama Indian Nation and the U.S. Geological Survey propose to document current habitat conditions in Rattlesnake Creek, a major tributary of the White Salmon River believed to provide some of the anadromous habitat with the most potential, to establish baseline information to measure the results of Condit Dam removal. The proposal notes that there is a unique opportunity to evaluate biological and environmental parameters pre and post-reintroduction of anadromous stocks.

Fall and spring chinook, winter and summer steelhead, and coho are present in the White Salmon River below Condit Dam, with some natural spawning occurring. Some natural spawning of fall and chinook and coho spawning occurs below Condit Dam as well. Chinook are part of the Lower Columbia River ESU, but do not appear to be "listed" or protected under the ESA (also, this ESU was not found to be "jeopardized by the operation of the federal hydrosystem). The steelhead are part populations are part of the Middle Columbia River ESU, but it is not clear if the natural spawning populations are "listed" for purposes of ESA protection.

A second proposal sponsored by the Underwood Conservation District is to initiate watershed restoration activities, and coordinate those activities and monitoring by supporting the White Salmon River Watershed Management and Technical Committees. This proposal was accorded lower priority as a "recommended action" by the fish and wildlife managers. The managers said that the lower ranking was a prioritization of funding within the subbasin pending the removal of Condit Dam. As dam removal gets nearer, the subbasin summary recommends that the proposal should become a higher priority.

### **Independent Scientific Review Panel :**

The ISRP found the Rattlesnake Creek baseline assessment project proposal to be fundable, and agreed that it presented a unique data collection opportunity. The recommendation was conditioned with advice that the proposed costs should be validated in contracting. The panel also ranked the conservation district watershed restoration proposal as "fundable," stating that a "convincing case" had been made for the restoration, coordination, and education activities proposed. The Panel did not, however, disagree with the lower "recommended action" priority assigned to this project by the fish and wildlife managers as a budgeting priority matter.

<b>White Salmon project proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
<b>21009</b>	Assess current and potential salmonid production in Rattlesnake Creek associated with restoration efforts	UCD, YN, USGS	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$227,951	\$736,756
<b>Consensus priority recommendations</b>					<b>\$227,951</b>	<b>\$736,756</b>
<b>21033</b>	White Salmon River Watershed Enhancement Project	UCD	Recommended Action	Agree, Fundable	\$242,221	\$801,748

**WHITE SALMON ISSUE 1: Response to ISRP criticisms of priority proposal for baseline information collection**

The ISRP supports collection of baseline information before removal of Condit Dam (proposal 21009) but lists enough concerns for Council to condition any approval on clearer scope definition.

**Council decision:** The Council recommends the project be funded, but before contracting, Bonneville should report on how the sponsor will address the ISRPs concerns.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** None.

**WHITE SALMON ISSUE 2: Priority for initiating watershed restoration proposal**

The White Salmon River watershed enhancement proposal (proposal 21009) is a second-tier priority for CBFWA, but was rated as fundable by the ISRP. If the Council holds to “urgent/high priority” projects as the baseline of recommended projects, this project will not be started.

**Council decision:** The Council found that CBFWA’s recommendation was appropriate - this proposal is a lower priority until the schedule for removal of Condit Dam is set and responsibilities for associated restoration activities are defined.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** None.

**Response to ISRP recommendations:** The Council incorporated the recommendations of the ISRP into its project funding recommendations in the White Salmon subbasin as described above.



## Wind River

Bonneville funding in the Wind River supports ongoing watershed coordination by the Wind River Watershed Council. The watershed council coordinates projects funded from a variety of state, federal and tribal sources. The subbasin summary displays a history of completed habitat restoration projects totaling over \$1 million (page 29) and a schedule of 36 projects to be implemented that were identified by limiting factors analysis estimated to cost nearly \$2 million (page 34). As demonstrated by these lists, a major fish and wildlife protection and restoration strategy in this subbasin is to make site-specific habitat improvements as funds and opportunity permits.

A second major fish and wildlife activity in the subbasin is the operation of the Carson National Fish Hatchery, which was constructed in 1938 as mitigation for the construction of Bonneville Dam. It is funded under the Mitchell Act program. The facility is now focused on spring chinook production, with a 1.4 million smolt on-station release goal.

The Wind River supports several species of anadromous fish, including spring and fall chinook, coho, winter and summer steelhead, and coastal cutthroat trout. The naturally spawning steelhead population is listed as threatened under the ESA and is part of the Lower Columbia River Steelhead ESU. The subbasin summary notes that the naturally spawning chinook (fall and spring combined) are part of the threatened Lower Columbia River chinook ESU (note, also however, that the 2000 Biological Opinion finds that neither this chinook nor this steelhead ESU is “jeopardized” by the operation of the federal hydrosystem). Bull trout are present in the Wind River subbasin, and are listed as threatened under the ESA. The subbasin summary identifies other fish and wildlife present in the subbasin, including some that are rated as ESA candidate, sensitive or species “of concern” under federal, state, and tribal law.

The subbasin summary identifies the list of smaller habitat restoration projects that the watershed council wants to pursue should the Council recommend that funding for that watershed council coordination project continue. The single largest capital feature for watershed restoration in the subbasin on that list is the removal of Hemlock Dam, a small Forest Service-constructed impoundment on Trout Creek in the subbasin. While the dam has adult passage, the subbasin summary cites lethal water temperatures behind the dam and fish passage impacts as the reason for proposing removal, rather than further modification to the dam.

The budget proposed in the CBFWA work plan includes \$750,000 as a share of funding for dam removal. The fish and wildlife managers state a preference for full funding of dam removal by the Forest Service.

The National Marine Fisheries Service proposed Bonneville funding for undertaking a study of hatchery smolt survival rates at the Carson National Fish Hatchery using “NATUREs” technology - experimental methods to imitate natural conditions in hatcheries. The National Marine Fisheries Services proposes the study to implement Biological Opinion requirements for artificial production as well as provisions of the Council’s program. The Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority gave the proposal lower priority as a “recommended action” and noted that an experiment of NATUREs technology on a large scale is underway at the Yakima Production Facility at Cle Elum, Washington, and is also proposed for the Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery program.

**Independent Scientific Review Panel review:**

**Subbasin level** The ISRP’s final review of the Wind River work plan provided by CBFWA was generally positive. They encouraged the project to publish the results of their monitoring and suggested that the project could provide a key demonstration site if a full level of monitoring and evaluation is accomplished. On this last point about the Wind River possibly being a “demonstration site,” the ISRP report indicates that the detailed monitoring and evaluation of the habitat restoration initiative, if pursued and reported in a rigorous way, could reduce the need for such detailed monitoring and evaluation at other subbasins in this province where more routine monitoring may suffice.

**Project level** The ISRP recommended that the study of NATUREs technology not be funded. After the response from the project sponsor to the preliminary ISRP review, the ISRP still found that the experimental design was “carelessly presented” (p. 15, ISRP report). CBFWA rated this project as a lower priority “recommended action” project, noting that investigations of NATUREs techniques are currently underway elsewhere, and that a production-scale study should await more results from them.

<b>Wind River proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
<b>199801900</b>	Wind River Watershed Restoration	UCD,USFS, USGS-CRRL, WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$658,532	\$2,770,221
<b>Consensus priority recommendations:</b>					<b>\$658,532</b>	<b>\$2,770,221</b>
<b>21024</b>	Evaluate Hatchery Reform Principles	NMFS	Recommended Action	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$1,063,200	\$3,351,307
<b>21010</b>	Feeding, growth, and smoltification of juvenile steelhead	USGS-CRRL, USFWS	Do Not Fund	Agree, Do Not Fund	\$106,988	\$467,132

**WIND RIVER ISSUE 1: “Do not fund” recommendation for Carson Hatchery test of artificial production improvements**

CBFWA and the ISRP were both critical of the NMFS-proposed NATUREs study at Carson Hatchery. CBFWA listed the work as a lower priority “recommended action” but called for further review, and the ISRP reiterated a “Do Not Fund” recommendation in its final recommendation. The question is whether NMFS will define the study as a reasonable and prudent alternative requirement under the hatchery reform off-site mitigation requirements for Bonneville. The National Marine Fisheries Service, in its regulatory role, should conclude whether or not Bonneville should fund this research project which is sponsored by the Service in its fisheries research role. The project’s proposed Fiscal Year 2001 budget is \$1,063,200 and totals \$3,351,307 over three years. If funding is reserved for this project, it would be an addition to the base budget assumed by staff for the Columbia Gorge projects.

**Council decision:** The Council recommends that Bonneville not plan funding for this project. However, if the National Marine Fisheries Service requires Bonneville to fund this study, Bonneville should so notify the Council and require:

1. The experimental design be again submitted to the ISRP and reviewed for a funding recommendation by the Council;
2. A comprehensive summary of NATUREs research be presented to the Council, and;
3. The National Marine Fisheries Service should explain to the Council why this research need is not being addressed by the ongoing experimental design at the Cle Elum facility or the proposed design at the Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** None.

<b>WIND RIVER ISSUE 2: Bonneville cost-sharing for Hemlock Dam removal</b>
--

The Wind River watershed restoration proposals won support from both the fish and wildlife managers and the ISRP for expanded Program funding. The watershed restoration efforts are aimed at the wild steelhead population in the subbasin which are listed for protection by the Endangered Species Act. Bonneville funding for these measures may be responsive to off-site mitigation requirements of the Biological Opinion for the federal hydropower system. The single issue raised for Council consideration is whether Bonneville funding is appropriate for removal of the Hemlock Dam. Because further review and design is necessary, funding for dam removal (the actual deconstruction) is not an immediate issue except that a three-year provincial review would schedule this funding in 2003. Funds for planning and environmental review are, however, requested for Fiscal Year 2001.

**Council recommendation:** The Council does not support reserving a budget for Bonneville funding for Hemlock Dam removal (although assistance for planning and design is supported). The Forest Service needs to complete the NEPA process and review with the Council a rationale for Bonneville funding for removal when other funding sources are committed.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget**

**FY '01: 0                      FY '02: 0                      FY '03: -\$750,000**

**Response to ISRP Recommendations:** The Council incorporated the recommendations of the Panel in its recommendations for project funding in the Wind River. The NATURES study is not recommended, and will require additional Panel review and a policy level response relating this research to Bonneville's obligations under the Biological Opinion. The watershed council project was recommended as suggested by the ISRP, except for that component that may be a funding responsibility of another federal agency.

## **Bonneville pool**

**Organizing comment:** Under the Council’s province based format, sections of the mainstem Columbia and Snake Rivers are treated much like a subbasin in that a separate summary is produced for each segment within the province. In the Columbia Gorge province the mainstem Columbia River between Bonneville and The Dalles dams (the “Bonneville Pool”) is included. This section addresses provincial-scale issues and project proposals as well as habitat recommendations that apply to multiple subbasins in the Columbia Gorge province or particular to the Bonneville Pool segment of the main-stem.

[Note: the entire mainstem Columbia and Snake Rivers will be treated as a whole in a “Systemwide” province review at a later time].

### **Council staff summary:**

The proposed projects in the Columbia Gorge not assigned to a specific subbasin address specific fish and wildlife species. They include surveys of coastal cutthroat trout populations (Proposal 21012), bull trout population surveys (Project 199405400) and the experimental reintroduction of western pond turtles to a wildlife refuge in the Gorge (Proposal 21013). The three projects would be new starts for the Program. Although the bull trout project was proposed using the project number for an ongoing regional survey of bull trout, the work proposed is new.

The fish and wildlife managers recommended that the status review of coastal cutthroat trout be funded only for its first objective at an estimated \$39,000 as a “high priority/urgent” activity. They recommended that future funding be conditioned on additional review.

There was also a proposal to evaluate resident fish assemblage in the Bonneville pool that was rated only as a recommended action by the managers, and received a “do not fund” rating by the ISRP.

### **Independent Scientific Review Panel recommendations:**

The ISRP rated the bull trout assessment and the western pond turtle experimental reintroduction as “fundable”. They agreed with the fish and wildlife managers that only the first objective of the cutthroat trout survey be funded at this time and any additional funding depend on further review. Thus, the bull trout and coastal cutthroat trout surveys, and the western pond turtle projects are consensus priorities.

The ISRP report also raised the issue of smolt densities in the Bonneville Pool, noting that natural and artificially produced seaward-migrating juveniles all arrive in the lowermost section of the Columbia River -- the Bonneville Pool. The ISRP recommended that density may be a limiting factor in salmon productivity in the Bonneville Pool and lower Columbia River, and that stock assessment and survival studies in these areas are needed.

<b>Bonneville Pool project proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
199405400	Bull trout population assessment in the Columbia River Gorge,	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$155,938	\$500,938
21013	Western Pond Turtle Recovery - Columbia River Gorge	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$167,025	\$361,225
21012	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout in the Columbia River Basin above Bonneville Dam	USGS-CRRL	Urgent/High Priority	Partially agree, objective 1 is fundable, funding of any other objective should require further review per the ISRP comments.	\$39,770	\$533,734
<b>Consensus priority recommendations:</b>					<b>\$362,733</b>	<b>\$1,395,897</b>
21005	Characterize and Assess Wildlife-Habitat Types and Structural Conditions for Sub-Basins within the Columbia Gorge Ecoprovince	NHI	Do Not Fund	Technically sound. Fundable if needed in subbasin assessment by EDT.	\$58,521	\$58,521
21011	Assess the Current Status and Biotic Integrity of the Resident Fish Assemblage in Bonneville Reservoir	USGS/CRRL	Recommended Action	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$351,700	\$1,099,700

**BONNEVILLE POOL ISSUE 1: Coastal cutthroat trout survey**

If the Council funds the initial survey objective for proposal 21012 as recommended by fish and wildlife managers and the ISRP, it needs to define a process for the project to return for additional funding after a successful review.

**Council decision:** Fund only the initial survey objective. Upon completion and report, the sponsor can return to the Quarterly Review for consideration of additional funding.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:**

**FY '01:**       None                   **FY '02:** **-\$240,926**                   **FY '03** **-\$253,038**

<b>BONNEVILLE POOL ISSUE 2: Smolt density issues:</b>
---

This issue flows out of the ISRP's statement about the Bonneville Pool in general, and not any specific project that was presented for Council consideration. The Council reviewed the ISRP's concerns about density acting as a limiting factor in this area, and how that may inform production activities throughout the basin. The Council understands the perspective of the managers that these are larger issues than just the Hood River and Klickitat programs.

***Council decision:*** After staff consultation with fish and wildlife managers in the Columbia Gorge, the Council concludes that these are significant issues for Council attention, but beyond the scope of this particular provincial review to resolve. These concerns may be highlighted for management discussion and possible project solicitation in the Systemwide project review. Also, these issues should be considered in implementing the 2000 Biological Opinion's requirements of the federal action agencies.

***Adjustment to consensus priority budget:*** None

***Response to ISRP recommendations:*** The Council incorporated the recommendations of the Panel in its recommendations for projects in the Bonneville Pool as discussed in the issues descriptions and Council action statements above.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY 2000	FY01	2001		Plan	Const/Imp	Total
			Budget	Renewal	O&M	M&E			
<b>Hood River projects</b>									
198805303	Hood River Production Program - CTWSRO M&E	CTWSRO	499,888	519,959		519,959			519,959
198805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E	ODFW	424,000	431,331		431,331			431,331
198805307	Hood River Production Program: Powerdale, Parkdale, Oak Springs O&M (88-053-07 & 88-053-08)	CTWS and ODFW	506,000	562,733	562,733		165,000		727,733
198902900	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder - Hatchery	ODFW	115,029	120,000	139,534				139,534
199500700	Hood River Production - PGE: O&M	PGE	50,010	51,517	46,300				46,300
199802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project	CTWSRO	227,934	230,000				299,953	299,953
<b>Total for Hood River project budgets</b>			<b>1,822,861</b>	<b>1,915,540</b>	<b>748,567</b>	<b>951,290</b>	<b>165,000</b>	<b>299,953</b>	<b>2,164,810</b>

**Fifteenmile Creek projects**

21001	Fifteenmile Creek Riparian Fencing / Physical stream Survey Project	ODFW					17,917	133,768	151,685
21015	Riparian Buffers	Wasco SWCD						73,414	73,414
21016	Accelerate the Application of Integrated Fruit Management to Reduce the Risk of Pesticide Pollution in Fifteenmile Sub-basin Orchards	Wy'East RC&D						146,100	146,100
21019	Fifteenmile Subbasin Water Right Acquisition Program	OWT				1,280	6,720	24,000	32,000
199304001	15-Mile Creek Steelhead Smolt Production	ODFW	27,180	30,000		33,704			33,704
199304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request For Multi-Year Funding)	ODFW	246,856	220,040	213,420	6,620			220,040
<b>Total for Fifteenmile Creek project budgets</b>			<b>274,036</b>	<b>250,040</b>	<b>213,420</b>	<b>41,604</b>	<b>24,637</b>	<b>377,282</b>	<b>656,943</b>

**Klickitat projects**

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY 2000	FY01	2001			Const/Imp	Total
			Budget	Renewal	O&M	M&E	Plan		
21004	Determination of difficult passage areas, migration patterns and energetic use of upriver migrating salmon and steelhead	PNNL						319,542	319,542
198811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction	YN					203,000	30,000	233,000
198812025	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Management, Data and Habitat (Klickitat Only)	YN					363,510	0	363,510
199506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring And Evaluation (Klickitat Only)	YN					447,723		447,723
199701725	Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Operation and Maintenance (Klickitat Only)	YN							0
199705600	Lower Klickitat Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	YN	269,666	268,632	9,650	15,150	57,150	231,368	313,318
<b>Total for Klickitat project budgets</b>			<b>269,666</b>	<b>268,632</b>	<b>9,650</b>	<b>15,150</b>	<b>1,071,383</b>	<b>261,368</b>	<b>1,677,093</b>

These projects were previously included in Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project budgets

**White Salmon projects**

21009	Assess current and potential salmonid production in Rattlesnake Creek associated with restoration efforts	UCD, YN, USGS					227,951		227,951
-------	---	---------------	--	--	--	--	---------	--	---------

**Total for White Salmon project budgets** 0 0 0 227,951 0 0 227,951

**Wind River projects**

199801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	UCD,USF S,USGS-CRRL,WD FW	553,717	558,330	6,877	215,753	119,700	316,202	658,532
-----------	----------------------------------	---------------------------	---------	---------	-------	---------	---------	---------	---------

**Total for Wind River project budgets** 553,717 558,330 6,877 215,753 119,700 316,202 658,532

**Bonneville Reservoir projects**

21012	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout in the Columbia River Basin above Bonneville Dam	USGS-CRRL					39,770		39,770
-------	---	-----------	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--------



ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY 2000	FY01	2001			Const/Imp	Total
			Budget	Renewal	O&M	M&E	Plan		
21013	Western Pond Turtle Recovery - Columbia River Gorge	WDFW			36,000		69,025	62,000	<b>167,025</b>
199405400	Bull trout population assessment in the Columbia River Gorge, WA.	WDFW						155,938	<b>155,938</b>
<b>Total for Bonneville Reservoir projects</b>			<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>39,770</b>	<b>69,025</b>	<b>217,938</b>	<b>362,733</b>
<b>Total project budgets for Columbia Gorge</b>			<b>2,920,280</b>	<b>2,992,542</b>	<b>1,014,514</b>	<b>1,491,518</b>	<b>1,449,745</b>	<b>1,472,743</b>	<b>5,748,062</b>

**2002**

ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Const/Imp	Total
<b>Hood River projects</b>						
198805303	Hood River Production Program - CTWSRO M&E		540,000			<b>540,000</b>
198805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E		438,000			<b>438,000</b>
198805307	Hood River Production Program: Powerdale, Parkdale, Oak Springs O&M (88-053-07 & 88-053-08)	593,948			355,250	<b>949,198</b>
198902900	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder - Hatchery	115,011				<b>115,011</b>
199500700	Hood River Production - PGE: O&M	50,000				<b>50,000</b>
199802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project				700,000	<b>700,000</b>
<b>Total for Hood River project budgets</b>		<b>758,959</b>	<b>978,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,055,250</b>	<b>2,792,209</b>

**Fifteenmile Creek projects**

21001	Fifteenmile Creek Riparian Fencing / Physical stream Survey Project			20,811	136,768	<b>157,579</b>
21015	Riparian Buffers				75,616	<b>75,616</b>
21016	Accelerate the Application of Integrated Fruit Management to Reduce the Risk of Pesticide Pollution in Fifteenmile Sub-basin Orchards				168,410	<b>168,410</b>
21019	Fifteenmile Subbasin Water Right Acquisition Program		1,775	8,800	31,200	<b>41,775</b>
199304001	15-Mile Creek Steelhead Smolt Production					
199304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request For Multi-Year Funding)	216,420	6,951			<b>223,371</b>
<b>Total for Fifteenmile Creek project budgets</b>		<b>216,420</b>	<b>8,726</b>	<b>29,611</b>	<b>411,994</b>	<b>666,751</b>

**Klickitat projects**

ProjectID	Title	2002				Total
		O&M	M&E	Plan	Const/Imp	
21004	Determination of difficult passage areas, migration patterns and energetic use of upriver migrating salmon and steelhead					
198811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction			234,000		234,000
198812025	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Management, Data and Habitat (Klickitat Only)			391,780		391,780
199506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring And Evaluation (Klickitat Only)			474,586		474,586
199701725	Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Operation and Maintenance (Klickitat Only)					0
199705600	Lower Klickitat Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	35,000	26,510	59,700	258,517	379,727
<b>Total for Klickitat project budgets</b>		<b>35,000</b>	<b>26,510</b>	<b>1,160,066</b>	<b>258,517</b>	<b>1,480,093</b>

#### White Salmon projects

21009	Assess current and potential salmonid production in Rattlesnake Creek associated with restoration efforts		255,921			255,921
<b>Total for White Salmon project budgets</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>255,921</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>255,921</b>

#### Wind River projects

199801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	18,000	259,631	125,685	298,921	702,237
<b>Total for Wind River project budgets</b>		<b>18,000</b>	<b>259,631</b>	<b>125,685</b>	<b>298,921</b>	<b>702,237</b>

#### Bonneville Reservoir projects

21012	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout in the Columbia River Basin above Bonneville Dam					0
-------	---	--	--	--	--	---

ProjectID	Title	2002				Total
		O&M	M&E	Plan	Const/Imp	
21013	Western Pond Turtle Recovery - Columbia River Gorge	35,000		7,600	62,000	<b>104,600</b>
199405400	Bull trout population assessment in the Columbia River Gorge, WA.				186,000	<b>186,000</b>
<b>Total for Bonneville Reservoir projects</b>		<b>35,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,600</b>	<b>248,000</b>	<b>290,600</b>
<b>Total project budgets for Columbia Gorge</b>		<b>1,063,379</b>	<b>1,528,788</b>	<b>1,322,962</b>	<b>2,272,682</b>	<b>6,187,811</b>

**2003**

ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Const/Imp	Total
<b>Hood River projects</b>						
198805303	Hood River Production Program - CTWSRO M&E		560,000			<b>560,000</b>
198805304	Hood River Production Program - ODFW M&E		452,000			<b>452,000</b>
198805307	Hood River Production Program: Powerdale, Parkdale, Oak Springs O&M (88-053-07 & 88-053-08)	604,472			2,515,250	<b>3,119,722</b>
198902900	Hood River Production Program - Pelton Ladder - Hatchery	137,520				<b>137,520</b>
199500700	Hood River Production - PGE: O&M	54,000				<b>54,000</b>
199802100	Hood River Fish Habitat Project				700,000	<b>700,000</b>
<b>Total for Hood River project budgets</b>		<b>795,992</b>	<b>1,012,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,215,250</b>	<b>5,023,242</b>

**Fifteenmile Creek projects**

21001	Fifteenmile Creek Riparian Fencing / Physical stream Survey Project			22,811	139,768	<b>162,579</b>
21015	Riparian Buffers				77,884	<b>77,884</b>
21016	Accelerate the Application of Integrated Fruit Management to Reduce the Risk of Pesticide Pollution in Fifteenmile Sub-basin Orchards				168,410	<b>168,410</b>
21019	Fifteenmile Subbasin Water Right Acquisition Program		2,165	11,500	40,560	<b>54,225</b>
199304001	15-Mile Creek Steelhead Smolt Production					
199304000	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Restoration Project (Request For Multi-Year Funding)	219,420	7,282			<b>226,702</b>
<b>Total for Fifteenmile Creek project budgets</b>		<b>219,420</b>	<b>9,447</b>	<b>34,311</b>	<b>426,622</b>	<b>689,800</b>

**Klickitat projects**

ProjectID	Title	2003				Total
		O&M	M&E	Plan	Const/Imp	
21004	Determination of difficult passage areas, migration patterns and energetic use of upriver migrating salmon and steelhead					
198811525	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Design and Construction				5,629,000	5,629,000
198812025	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Management, Data and Habitat (Klickitat Only)			415,674		415,674
199506325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring And Evaluation (Klickitat Only)			545,773		545,773
199701725	Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Operation and Maintenance (Klickitat Only)					0
199705600	Lower Klickitat Riparian and In-Channel Habitat Enhancement Project	40,000	32,830	64,584	260,000	397,414
<b>Total for Klickitat project budgets</b>		<b>40,000</b>	<b>32,830</b>	<b>1,026,031</b>	<b>5,889,000</b>	<b>6,987,861</b>

#### White Salmon projects

21009	Assess current and potential salmonid production in Rattlesnake Creek associated with restoration efforts		252,884			252,884
<b>Total for White Salmon project budgets</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>252,884</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>252,884</b>

#### Wind River projects

199801900	Wind River Watershed Restoration	18,900	272,612	54,073	313,867	659,452
<b>Total for Wind River project budgets</b>		<b>18,900</b>	<b>272,612</b>	<b>54,073</b>	<b>313,867</b>	<b>659,452</b>

#### Bonneville Reservoir projects

21012	Evaluate Status of Coastal Cutthroat Trout in the Columbia River Basin above Bonneville Dam		0			0
-------	---	--	---	--	--	---

ProjectID	Title	2003				Total
		O&M	M&E	Plan	Const/Imp	
21013	Western Pond Turtle Recovery - Columbia River Gorge	20,000		7,600	62,000	<b>89,600</b>
199405400	Bull trout population assessment in the Columbia River Gorge, WA.				159,000	<b>159,000</b>
<b>Total for Bonneville Reservoir projects</b>		<b>20,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,600</b>	<b>221,000</b>	<b>248,600</b>
<b>Total project budgets for Columbia Gorge</b>		<b>1,094,312</b>	<b>1,579,773</b>	<b>1,122,015</b>	<b>10,065,739</b>	<b>13,861,839</b>

## Intermountain Province

### Organizing comment:

The Council's summary and issues analysis will be presented for the Inter-Mountain province as a whole. The subbasins with proposed projects in the Intermountain Province include the Spokane, San Poil, and Lake Roosevelt. The Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority prepared separate summaries for each of these subbasins and also for Lake Rufus Woods and its tributaries (Lake Rufus Woods is the reservoir behind Chief Joseph Dam). However, Council believes that the fish and wildlife management issues are closely related among these subbasins and organized its decisions for project funding at the provincial level. This organization is for convenience and economy of presentation only, and should not be interpreted to discount or signal any type of retreat from the subbasin level focus taken in subbasin summaries or in the desire to ultimately adopt into the program plans for each subbasin in the Inter-Mountain province.

Table E, attached at the end of this part, presents a summary of the Council's recommendations for projects in this province. Again, Bonneville should not rely on the table as a full statement of the funding conditions apply to the recommended projects. Bonneville should look to the text in the following section for project specific guidance, and also remember to apply the general conditions stated at the beginning of this section in bold text related to addressing project specific issues raised by the ISRP.

### Council staff summary:

The fish and wildlife management issues in the Inter-Mountain province are grounded in the loss of anadromous fish from the completion of Grand Coulee Dam in 1941 and Chief Joseph Dam in 1961. The construction of Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams completely blocked anadromous fish migrations to the upper Columbia River. Prior to these hydropower developments, the area above the current "blocked area" supported large and diverse fish populations, including eleven salmonid stocks. Studies estimate that the complete extirpation of anadromous fish stocks from this area reduced native salmonid species assemblage by approximately 64 percent and that approximately 14 percent of the total Columbia River anadromous fish runs historically estimated to total 12-16 million fish annually were destined for this area.

The salmon fishery in the Columbia River and its tributaries were central to the culture, religion, economy and subsistence of the members of the Colville Confederated Tribes, the Spokane Tribe and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe. The Council's program recognized the significance of these losses beginning in the 1980's has included in the program a number of specific initiatives to mitigate for these losses. Mitigation has chiefly focused on artificial production for fisheries in Lake Roosevelt and its tributaries to replace the salmon fisheries lost to dam construction, and the continued acquisition of wildlife habitat to compensate for the habitat lost to dam construction.

To date, the program has funded the construction and operation of hatcheries managed by the Colville Tribes, the Spokane Tribe and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife which support tributary and Lake Roosevelt fisheries as well as a cooperative rainbow trout program operated by volunteers associated with Lake Roosevelt fisheries and recreation. Managers calculate that this current hatchery fish production to mitigate for anadromous fish losses provides for 3.4 percent of the harvest, and 1.0 to 1.7 percent of the production lost in the upper Columbia River above Chief Joseph Dam due to hydropower development. The Lake Roosevelt fishery is monitored



by an extensive collaborative program managed by the Spokane Tribe, which provides the core information about effects of Grand Coulee flood control and power generation operations on the fish in Lake Roosevelt. In 1997 the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife initiated a fisheries evaluation of Moses Lake through the program. The program has funded wildlife acquisitions under the interim Washington Wildlife Agreement and the operation and maintenance costs for those acquisitions.

The three-year funding recommendations of the Inter-Mountain province fish and wildlife managers would continue the mitigation for construction of Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams. Proposed activities would continue the existing base program of ongoing projects aimed at operating the hatcheries, wildlife acquisitions and the Lake Roosevelt monitoring program. The new proposals submitted by the managers in this year's project selection process are chiefly to continue wildlife acquisitions toward completing the mitigation for construction of Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams, and to enhance sensitive native species, and expand monitoring and evaluation of fishery production programs. A new proposal to address fish entrainment at Grand Coulee Dam is also supported by the managers. The shift to more native broodstocks and the expansion of monitoring and evaluation within these proposals are, in part, a response to the standards of the Council's Artificial Production Review and previous reviews by the Independent Scientific Review Panel. The managers endorse funding upgrades at the Ford Hatchery near Welpinit, Washington for incorporation into the Lake Roosevelt production programs. The managers also recommend initiating a fisheries evaluation of Banks Lake, the storage reservoir above Grand Coulee Dam.

### **Independent Scientific Review Panel review**

The ISRP generally supported the projects recommended by the managers, particularly the core fisheries programs and the wildlife acquisitions. The final review of the panel specifically acknowledged improvements in the design, presentation and definition of projects that they have criticized in the past. The panel did call to the Council's attention several significant issues, particularly questions about the focus of the Lake Roosevelt monitoring program on the fisheries program it supports, interest in an economic evaluation of artificial production costs, and longer-term concerns about the viability of the kokanee production program. The panel placed priority on funding a symposium on Lake Roosevelt fisheries, which was rated lower by the managers. The panel also placed a high priority on a proposal to study the effects on rainbow trout from limited over-wintering habitat in the Inter-Mountain province.

The panel recommended no funding for the Moses Lake fisheries evaluation project. This was the only ongoing project supported by the managers that received a "do not fund" finding from the panel.

<b>San Poil project proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
<b>199501100</b>	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	CCT	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$1,145,762	\$3,987,762
<b>199001800</b>	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tributaries To Lake Roosevelt	CCT	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$199,019	\$826,019
<b>Consensus priority recommendations</b>					<b>\$1,344,781</b>	<b>\$4,813,781</b>
<b>21002</b>	Early life history and survival of adfluvial rainbow trout in the San Poil River Basin	PNNL	Recommended Action	Disagree with CBFWA priority. This is a high priority project.	\$155,092	\$495,092

<b>Spokane River project proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
<b>21017</b>	Implement Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Watershed.	Coeur d'Alene Tribe	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$158,252	\$3,738,752
<b>21018</b>	Implement Fisheries Enhancement on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Creek	Coeur d'Alene Tribe	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, fundable if project addresses ISRP concerns in Council review or BPA contracting process.	\$179,483	\$775,062
<b>Consensus priority recommendations:</b>					<b>\$337,735</b>	<b>\$4,513,814</b>
<b>21022</b>	Evaluate Fish Habitat on the Middle Spokane / Little Spokane Rivers	Spokane County	DNF	Agree, Do Not Fund	\$93,000	\$156,000
<b>21030</b>	Forest Carnivore Surveys for Spokane Subbasin	WDFW	DNF	Agree, Do Not Fund	\$70,000	\$140,000
<b>21031</b>	Land Use Analyses of Spokane County	WDFW	DNF	Agree, Do Not Fund	\$47,000	\$94,000

<b>Lake Roosevelt and Intermountain-wide proposals</b>						
<b>ProjectID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>CBFWA Category</b>	<b>ISRP Comparison</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY01-FY03</b>
<b>21008</b>	Evaluation of the Banks Lake Fishery	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$170,408	\$857,908
<b>21021</b>	Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation And Maintenance	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$213,249	\$768,463
<b>21029</b>	A cooperative approach to identifying the role of forage quality in affecting physical condition....of mule deer in north central Washington.	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, fundable if addresses ISRP concerns in Council review or BPA contracting process.	\$133,650	\$325,250
<b>21034</b>	Colville Tribes Restore Habitat for Sharp-tailed Grouse	CCT-FWD	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$169,400	\$508,200
<b>198503800</b>	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	CCT	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$789,642	\$2,489,346
<b>199104600</b>	Spokane Tribal Hatchery (Galbraith Springs) Operation and Maintenance	STOI	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$549,856	\$1,735,856
<b>199104700</b>	Sherman Creek Hatchery Operations and Maintenance	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$269,898	\$802,864
<b>199106200</b>	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Mitigation Project	STOI	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$1,528,806	\$4,787,306
<b>199204800</b>	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation And Maintenance Project	CCT-FWD	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$388,071	\$1,263,471
<b>199404300</b>	Lake Roosevelt Fisheries Evaluation Program	STOI	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$1,113,584	\$3,112,168
<b>199500900</b>	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	LRDA	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$100,550	\$328,328
<b>199502700</b>	Develop and Implement Recovery Plan for Depressed Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Populations.	STOI	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$152,000	\$537,000
<b>199506700</b>	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition	CCT-FWD	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$1,500,000	\$4,500,000

<b>199800300</b>	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Operations and Maintenance	STOI	Urgent/High Priority	Agree, Fundable	\$182,497	\$558,974
<b>Consensus priority recommendations</b>					<b>\$7,261,611</b>	<b>\$22,575,134</b>
<b>21025</b>	Intermountain Province Resident Fish Symposium	LRF	Recommended Action	Disagree with CBFWA priority. This is a high priority project.	\$41,000	\$129,297
<b>21020</b>	Monitor and Enhance the Lakes and Streams of the Spokane Indian Reservation	STOI	Urgent/High Priority	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$92,177	\$281,177
<b>199502800</b>	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$213,072	\$653,676
<b>21035</b>	Phalon Lake Native Redband Rainbow trout Trap Construction and O & M	WDFW	Urgent/High Priority	Disagree, Do Not Fund	\$126,000	\$199,671
<b>21003</b>	Upper Columbia Subbasin Native Rainbow Population Study	WT	DNF	Agree, Do Not Fund	\$44,850	\$135,450
<b>21032</b>	Eastern Washington Survey for Townsend's big-eared bat	WDFW	DNF	Agree, Do Not Fund	\$73,000	\$143,500
<b>21023</b>	Determine causes of mule deer population declines in the IM Columbia Basin: a test of the "apparent competition " hypothesis	WSU	DNF	Disagree. This research proposal is fundable and should be of equal or higher priority than project 21029.	\$205,532	\$531,625
<b>21006</b>	Characterize and Assess Wildlife-Habitat Types and Structural Conditions for Sub-Basins within the Inter Mountain Ecoprovince	NHI	DNF	Technically sound. Fundable if needed in subbasin assessment by EDT.	\$84,571	\$84,571

**SAN POIL ISSUE 1: Funding study of rainbow trout survival**

CBFWA and ISRP disagree on the priority for funding a study (proposal 21002) of overwintering survival of rainbow trout. The ISRP (p. 55) says that this project has generic application across the province and what is learned could eliminate a significant bottleneck for resident

salmonids. CBFWA ranked the project only as a “recommended action” “based on the fact that these populations have survived these conditions for generations” (San Poil summary p. 31).

**Council decision:** The Council does not recommend funding this project. The Council accepted the fish and wildlife managers’ assessment of priorities for mitigation of the hydrosystem which placed this project as a lower priority.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:** None.

### **LAKE ROOSEVELT ISSUE 1:**

The ISRP urges funding the Lake Roosevelt Forum symposium proposal (proposal 21025). CBFWA prioritized the proposal as a “recommended action.” While recognizing the value of the proposal, CBFWA suggested that the funding would more appropriately come from subbasin planning budgets. The ISRP (p. 54) said the proposal should be a high priority and “would help remedy some of the problems pervading the suite of fisheries projects in the Inter-Mountain Province.”

**Council decision:**

The Council recommends funding the symposium. The ISRP’s review of the Lake Roosevelt management program has yielded increasing support for the scope of efforts funded by the Program. At the same time, the ISRP has encouraged the Lake Roosevelt project managers to seek additional peer review and insight into the unique challenges of that ecosystem. The ISRP’s support of the symposium is central to their support of the suite of efforts in Lake Roosevelt. The Council took CBFWA’s support of the proposal as at least a “recommended action” as a show of warmth to the idea.

**Adjustment to consensus priority budget:**

**FY 01: \$41,000      FY 02:43,050      FY 03: 45,247**

### **LAKE ROOSEVELT ISSUE 2: “Do not fund” recommendation for Moses Lake study**

ISRP opposes funding Moses Lake restoration project (project 1995-028-00). While CBFWA ranked it as “urgent/high priority” the ISRP (p. 64) said the response and the original proposal do not demonstrate a scientifically sound project. The Council should determine whether the project should be closed down with remaining FY 2001 funds.

**Council decision:** The Council was informed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife that the department intends to rewrite the study design in response to the ISRP’s review. The revised design will receive full departmental review to ensure that it meets the department’s scientific

standards. The Council agreed to seek further ISRP review when the department completes its revision of the project design. In the meantime, the Council asks Bonneville to reserve a placeholder for the project pending ISRP review and a positive funding recommendation.

***Adjustment to consensus priority budget:***

**FY 01: +\$213,072                      FY 02: +\$217,902      FY 03 +\$222,702**

<b>LAKE ROOSEVELT ISSUE 3: Mule deer research</b>
---

The ISRP strongly disagrees with the CBFWA recommendations for two research proposals for mule deer populations. CBFWA recommended priority for proposal 21029, a five-year study of forage quality as a factor in declining mule deer populations. CBFWA gave a “do not fund” recommendation to proposal 21023 which proposes an experiment to test whether competition and predation are factors in the population decline. The ISRP said that proposal 21023 is a “better proposal” and should be funded with or before proposal 21029. Further, the ISRP strongly disagreed with CBFWA’s proposal that elements of proposal 21023 be funded under proposal 21029. The ISRP said that transferring tasks from one proposal to another, without the free consent of the project director, would be a “major violation of intellectual property rights” and compromise the integrity of Bonneville-funded research.

***Council decision:*** The Council requests that Bonneville work with the sponsors to develop a combined proposal responsive to the ISRP review. The Council recommends reserving an initial annual budget of \$250,000 for the combined proposals (with the ability to return to the Quarterly Review process for adjustments) and report to the Council staff on the completion of the project design before contracting any work for either of the proposals.

***Adjustment to consensus priority budgets:***

**FY ‘01: +\$116,350                      FY ’02 +\$165,500                      FY ’03 +\$142, 900**

***Response to ISRP recommendations:*** The Council incorporated all of the ISRP’s recommendations into its funding recommendations for proposals for projects in the Inter-Mountain province as discussed above, with one exception. It did not adopt the ISRP’s recommendation to fund new proposal 21002. Rather, the Council deferred to the management priorities of the fish management entities in the area that this work was a lower priority in a budget limited program. Further, given the lack of priority given to the research by fish management entities, the Council was not satisfied that the research would be anything more than an academic exercise that would not be embraced in implementation in the future by fish managers with jurisdiction.

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY 2000	FY 2001	2001				
			budget	renewal	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
<b>Lake Roosevelt projects</b>									
21008	Evaluation of the Banks Lake Fishery	WDFW					170,408		<b>170,408</b>
21021	Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation And Maintenance	WDFW			75,149	75,536	62,564	0	<b>213,249</b>
21034	Colville Tribes Restore Habitat for Sharp-tailed Grouse	CCT-FWD					169,400		<b>169,400</b>
21025	Intermountain Province Resident Fish Symposium	LRF						41,000	<b>41,000</b>
198503800	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	CCT	<b>360,973</b>	<b>351,034</b>	376,939	412,703			<b>789,642</b>
199104600	Spokane Tribal Hatchery (Galbraith Springs) Operation and Maintenance	STOI	<b>521,934</b>	<b>525,000</b>	549,856				<b>549,856</b>
199104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery Operations and Maintenance	WDFW	<b>201,397</b>	<b>269,898</b>	269,898				<b>269,898</b>
199106200	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Mitigation Project	STOI	<b>0</b>	<b>300,000</b>	26,606	2,200		1,500,000	<b>1,528,806</b>
199204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation And Maintenance Project	CCT-FWD	<b>350,000</b>	<b>353,500</b>	327,671	60,400			<b>388,071</b>
199404300	Lake Roosevelt Fisheries Evaluation Program	STOI	<b>1,500,000</b>	<b>1,113,584</b>		748,584	50,000	315,000	<b>1,113,584</b>
199500900	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	LRDA	<b>100,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	110,550				<b>100,550</b>
199502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery	WDFW	<b>234,890</b>	<b>213,072</b>				213,072	<b>213,072</b>
199502700	Develop and Implement Recovery Plan for Depressed Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Populations.	STOI	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		145,000	227,000		<b>372,000</b>

ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY 2000	FY 2001	2001				
			budget	renewal	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
199506700	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition	CCT-FWD	400,000	950,000				1,500,000	1,500,000
199800300	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Operations and Maintenance	STOI	97,187	182,497	136,698	45,799			182,497
<b>Total for Lake Roosevelt project budgets</b>			<b>3,766,381</b>	<b>4,358,585</b>	<b>1,873,367</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>679,372</b>	<b>3,569,072</b>	<b>7,602,033</b>

### San Poil projects

199001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tributaries To Lake Roosevelt	CCT	189,636	193,619	5,400		147,014	46,605	199,019
199501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	CCT	317,057	0	13,072		946,889	185,801	1,145,762
<b>Total for San Poil project budgets</b>			<b>506,693</b>	<b>193,619</b>	<b>18,472</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,093,903</b>	<b>232,406</b>	<b>1,344,781</b>

### Spokane projects

21018	Implement Fisheries Enhancement on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Creek	Cd'A			23,116	114,361	33,332	8,673	179,483
21017	Implement Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Watershed.	Cd'A			12,000		146,252		158,252
<b>Total for Spokane projects</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35,116</b>	<b>114,361</b>	<b>179,584</b>	<b>8,673</b>	<b>337,735</b>

### Intermountain province-wide projects



ProjectID	Title	Sponsor	FY 2000	FY 2001	2001				
			budget	renewal	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
21029, 2102	A cooperative approach to identifying the role of forage quality in affecting physical condition....of mule deer in north central Washington.	WDFW, WSU						250,000	250,000
<b>Total for Intermountain province-wide projects</b>			0	0	0	0	0	250,000	250,000
<b>Total project budgets for Intermountain</b>			<b>4,273,074</b>	<b>4,552,204</b>	<b>1,926,955</b>	<b>1,604,583</b>	<b>1,952,859</b>	<b>4,060,151</b>	<b>9,534,549</b>

**2002**

ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
<b>Lake Roosevelt projects</b>						
21008	Evaluation of the Banks Lake Fishery			22,500	325,000	<b>347,500</b>
21021	Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation And Maintenance	78,906	79,312		230,868	<b>389,086</b>
21034	Colville Tribes Restore Habitat for Sharp-tailed Grouse			169,400		<b>169,400</b>
21025	Intermountain Province Resident Fish Symposium				43,050	<b>43,050</b>
198503800	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	395,786	433,338			<b>829,124</b>
199104600	Spokane Tribal Hatchery (Galbraith Springs) Operation and Maintenance	650,000				<b>650,000</b>
199104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery Operations and Maintenance	262,545				<b>262,545</b>
199106200	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Mitigation Project	150,000	5,000		1,500,000	<b>1,655,000</b>
199204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation And Maintenance Project	350,000	60,400			<b>410,400</b>
199404300	Lake Roosevelt Fisheries Evaluation Program		748,584	150,000	150,000	<b>1,048,584</b>
199500900	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	112,761				<b>112,761</b>
199502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery				217,902	<b>217,902</b>
199502700	Develop and Implement Recovery Plan for Depressed Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Populations.		135,000			<b>135,000</b>

**2002**

ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
199506700	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition				1,500,000	<b>1,500,000</b>
199800300	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Operations and Maintenance	140,115	45,799			<b>185,914</b>
<b>Total for Lake Roosevelt project budgets</b>		<b>2,140,113</b>	<b>1,507,433</b>	<b>341,900</b>	<b>3,966,820</b>	<b>7,956,266</b>

**San Poil projects**

199001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tributaries To Lake Roosevelt	10,000	40,000	58,500	250,000	<b>358,500</b>
199501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	221,000	200,000	50,000	1,000,000	<b>1,471,000</b>
<b>Total for San Poil project budgets</b>		<b>231,000</b>	<b>240,000</b>	<b>108,500</b>	<b>1,250,000</b>	<b>1,829,500</b>

**Spokane projects**

21018	Implement Fisheries Enhancement on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Creek	24,107	120,792	58,366	88,440	<b>291,705</b>
21017	Implement Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Watershed.	75,000	9,900	1,590,600	50,000	<b>1,725,500</b>
<b>Total for Spokane projects</b>		<b>99,107</b>	<b>130,692</b>	<b>1,648,966</b>	<b>138,440</b>	<b>2,017,205</b>

**Intermountain province-wide projects**

**2002**

ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
21029, 2102	A cooperative approach to identifying the role of forage quality in affecting physical condition....of mule deer in north central Washington.				250,000	250,000
<b>Total for Intermountain province-wide projects</b>		0	0	0	250,000	250,000
<b>Total project budgets for Intermountain</b>		2,470,220	1,878,125	2,099,366	5,605,260	12,052,971

**2003**

ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
<b>Lake Roosevelt projects</b>						
21008	Evaluation of the Banks Lake Fishery			15,000	325,000	<b>340,000</b>
21021	Ford Hatchery Improvement, Operation And Maintenance	82,851	83,277			<b>166,128</b>
21034	Colville Tribes Restore Habitat for Sharp-tailed Grouse			169,400		<b>169,400</b>
21025	Intermountain Province Resident Fish Symposium				45,247	<b>45,247</b>
198503800	Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery	415,575	455,005			<b>870,580</b>
199104600	Spokane Tribal Hatchery (Galbraith Springs) Operation and Maintenance	536,000				<b>536,000</b>
199104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery Operations and Maintenance	270,421				<b>270,421</b>
199106200	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Mitigation Project	100,000	3,500		1,500,000	<b>1,603,500</b>
199204800	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range Operation And Maintenance Project	405,000	60,000			<b>465,000</b>
199404300	Lake Roosevelt Fisheries Evaluation Program		750,000	100,000	100,000	<b>950,000</b>
199500900	Rainbow Trout Net Pen Rearing Project	115,017				<b>115,017</b>
199502800	Restore Moses Lake Recreational Fishery				222,702	<b>222,702</b>
199502700	Develop and Implement Recovery Plan for Depressed Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Populations.		135,000	115,000		<b>250,000</b>

		<b>2003</b>				
ProjectID	Title	O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	Total
199506700	Colville Tribes Performance Contract for Continuing Acquisition				1,500,000	<b>1,500,000</b>
199800300	Spokane Tribe of Indians Wildlife Operations and Maintenance	143,618	46,945			<b>190,563</b>
<b>Total for Lake Roosevelt project budgets</b>		<b>2,068,482</b>	<b>1,533,727</b>	<b>399,400</b>	<b>3,692,949</b>	<b>7,694,558</b>

#### San Poil projects

199001800	Evaluate Rainbow Trout/Habitat Improvements Of Tributaries To Lake Roosevelt	10,000	100,000	58,500	100,000	<b>268,500</b>
199501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement Project	971,000	200,000	50,000	150,000	<b>1,371,000</b>
<b>Total for San Poil project budgets</b>		<b>981,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>108,500</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>1,639,500</b>

#### Spokane projects

21018	Implement Fisheries Enhancement on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Creek	26,517	153,871	74,202	49,284	<b>303,874</b>
21017	Implement Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation: Hangman Watershed.	100,000	5,000	1,650,000	100,000	<b>1,855,000</b>
<b>Total for Spokane projects</b>		<b>126,517</b>	<b>158,871</b>	<b>1,724,202</b>	<b>149,284</b>	<b>2,158,874</b>

#### Intermountain province-wide projects

ProjectID	Title	2003				Total
		O&M	M&E	Plan	Cons/Imp	
21029, 2102	A cooperative approach to identifying the role of forage quality in affecting physical condition....of mule deer in north central Washington.				250,000	250,000
<b>Total for Intermountain province-wide projects</b>		0	0	0	250,000	250,000
<b>Total project budgets for Intermountain</b>		3,175,999	1,992,598	2,232,102	4,342,233	11,742,932

## **PART IV.**

In previous reviews of projects sponsored under the fish and wildlife program, the Independent Scientific Review Panel has recommended that the Council establish a special funding category to encourage “innovative” projects. The objective is to infuse new or non-traditional concepts and thinking into the fish and wildlife efforts in the Columbia basin, recognizing that each and every one may not prove to have an application, but expecting that some will. Further, by seeking non-traditional projects, the solicitation of innovative projects was encouraged to gain the participation of sponsors that are not part of the majority fish and wildlife management community that proposes and implements the bulk of the projects funded by Bonneville. The Council has committed to do an “innovative projects” solicitation and selection annually for the reasons suggested by the ISRP

For the purpose of the Fiscal Year 2001 innovative project solicitation, the Council defined “innovative projects” as those which rely primarily on a method or technology that (1) has not previously been used in a fish or wildlife project in the Pacific Northwest, or (2) although used in other projects, has not previously been used in an application of this kind. The purpose of “innovative” projects is to explore new methods and technologies and new applications for existing methods and technologies designed to directly benefit fish and wildlife.

Continuing on the course established in Fiscal Year 2000, the Council asked Bonneville to reserve \$2 million in the Fiscal Year 2001 budget for innovative projects. A notice was broadly sent advising potential project sponsors that they may submit proposals that do not exceed a total cost of \$400,000. The notice advised that proposed projects need to be consistent with the Council’s Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. Finally, and without excluding any other types of innovative projects, the Council stated in its notice that it had an interest in projects demonstrating the effect of nutrient supplementation and those testing experimental selective fisheries gear.

Funding for innovative projects is a one time only contract for the complete scope of work. There are no specific conditions on the duration of the performance period for each proposed project. Subsequent funding of innovative projects will be subject to two conditions: first, they need to satisfy the agreed-upon reporting and product delivery requirements. Second, these projects will no longer be eligible for funding under the innovative category, and will be subject to the same selection and prioritization process as other projects funded through the Fish and Wildlife Program.

A total of 66 proposals were submitted for consideration for Fiscal Year 2001. The Independent Scientific Review Panel reviewed and ranked each of these proposals on the basis of their scientific merit, “innovative” contribution, and potential benefit to fish and wildlife. Likewise, the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority completed a review based on the potential application of each proposal to management needs. The public was also invited to submit comment on the process, proposals, and reviews considered under the innovative category in Fiscal Year 2001. To ensure a wide distribution of information and invite broad participation, all documents, announcements, reports, and proposals were posted and constantly updated on the World Wide Web at [www.cbfwa.org/2001/innovative](http://www.cbfwa.org/2001/innovative).

The starting point for the Council’s funding recommendations for the innovative category was the ISRP’s rankings. The report presented by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) included a proposed funding list prioritized according to the technical adequacy of each proposal. The panel indicated that the top twenty proposals in its proposed ranking offer innovative and



scientifically sound approaches that will benefit fish and wildlife, and are worthy of funding. The panel divided the proposals into four categories: *A*, *B*, and *C* reflected a decreasing level of innovation, scientific soundness, and likelihood of success, and *not innovative* (proposals that did not meet the innovative definition).

The CBFWA also assigned projects to one of four categories: *Urgent*, *High priority*, and *Recommended action* reflected a decreasing management priority, and *do not fund* in the cases where proposals did not meet the Council's or the Authority's criteria for the innovative project category.

The table below presents the Council's funding recommendations for innovative projects in Fiscal Year 2001. The few departures from the ISRP's ranking, and the evaluation and resolution of specific issues raised by the Panel, were made on the basis of information presented in the original proposals, the recommendations provided by the ISRP and the Basin Authority, public comment and additional information collected from specific sponsors. There were four projects warrant further explanation regarding how the Council treated them:

**Proposal 22063 (ISRP #3).** This proposal was also submitted for funding in the Columbia Gorge province review (Klickitat subbasin) as proposal #21004. While its innovative version is proposed to last only one year at a cost of \$319,542, the province review Klickitat version is proposed for 3 years at a total cost of \$969,542. The proposal outlines a study to address passage difficulties experienced during adult migration under different flow regimes. This work will occur at Lyle and Castille Falls, on the Klickitat River, where local managers are involved in adult collection and repairs to flood-caused damages. The ISRP strongly supported both versions of this proposal and indicated its preference to fund this project through the Gorge province. The Basin Authority, on the other hand, urged passage improvement projects in the Klickitat River not wait for results of such a study.

The Council supported the scaled-down version of this proposal (shorter, less expensive) because of the innovative qualities of the proposal and its promise to provide information on flow specific passage conditions that result in increased swimming activity in the Klickitat. The Council recommended the funding of this proposal in the province process rather than as part of the innovative projects process. The Council believed that this shorter version of the proposal should not delay or interfere with the progress of fishway improvements planned at Lyle and Castille Falls. Funding under the Gorge province would provide an incentive for the project sponsor and local managers to coordinate their efforts and work cooperatively.

**Proposal 22047 (ISRP #8).** This proposal outlines a study to compare different methods of nutrient supplementation: stocking salmon carcasses, inorganic nutrients, and a carcass analog. While this study is well articulated and statistically robust, the development and testing of the carcass analog is considered under a separate study proposal (Proposal 22002, ISRP #4). In addition, the shortcomings of carcass addition and inorganic fertilization have been well documented in the literature and recognized by the sponsors of proposal 22002.

This project was not recommended by the Council. The Council concurred with the observation of the ISRP that indicates that the implementation of proposal #22047 should take place after the completion of proposal #22002 which develops and tests the carcass analogs that #22047 proposes to use.

**Proposal 22010 (ISRP#18)** The Council recognized that the concept to be tested by this proposal has been advanced for some time by the irrigated agriculture community, but that it has not been

picked up as a project in the prior “traditional” project solicitations because fish and wildlife managers did not make it a priority. Thus, when the Council received the Echo Meadows proposal rated highly by the ISRP, it believed that this year presented an excellent opportunity to finally test the concept. If successful, this concept may have broad applicability throughout the basin. The coincidence of irrigated agriculture, low stream flows and high stream temperatures is common in many areas of the basin. This project may prove or disprove a tool that can be applied in these areas. In addition, the Council reviewed the specific issues noted by the ISRP about the design of the project and secured additional information addressing each of these issues. The Council concluded that this project, rated as one of the most “sound” and likely beneficial top-twenty proposals by the ISRP, was on par with the others ranked ahead of it, and believed that sound policy reasons supported the exercise of its discretion to recommend it for funding. A more detailed explanation of the considerations of the Council in regards to the proposal was provided in a letter from Bob Lohn to Sarah McNary, dated March 12, 2001, and should be referred to if additional information is desired.

**Project 22033 (ISRP #7)** The Council provided the principal investigators of proposal 22033 an opportunity to provide additional information to discuss and elaborate on technical aspects of their proposed work. A period of 90 days from this notice was agreed upon to resolve these pending issues. In the meantime, a placeholder of \$197,155 should be reserved for the project.

By way of a letter to Bonneville Fish and Wildlife Directory Sarah McNary dated February 8, 2001, the Council requested that Bonneville initiate the contracting process with the eight proposals identified in the Table below (all except #22033 as discussed immediately above). The Council continued the course set in previous years, and encouraged Bonneville to clearly articulate and include the following principles and expectations of innovative projects during the contracting process:

1. Innovative proposals should be funded on a one-time basis.
2. Innovative proposals recommended for funding in Fiscal Year 2001 are not eligible to participate in the “innovative proposals” solicitation in future years. Rather, if additional Bonneville funds are sought, the proposals will compete with all other proposals in the province based solicitation and review process.
3. Bonneville should work with project sponsors to best implement their projects on an appropriate time-scale within the total funding amount recommended.
4. Projects funded under the innovative category will not be allowed to receive additional funding of any kind until the initial work has been completed and a final report submitted.
5. As a condition for funding, the principal investigators agree to submit a report to the Council documenting any findings, conclusions, or noteworthy observations made as a result of the study.

ID	Title	Sponsor	Sponsor Request	Council Recomm.	Council comments
22001	A Feasibility Study for Pacific Ocean Salmon Tracking (POST)	Kintama Research Corporation	\$228,600	\$228,600	
22013	Genetic sex of chinook salmon in the Columbia River Basin	University of Idaho	\$99,736	\$99,736	
22002	Influences of stocking salmon carcass analogs on salmonids in Columbia River tributaries	WDFW, Bio-Oregon, Shoshone-Bannock Tribe, NMFS, Yakama Nation, Weyerhaeuser Co.	\$399,829	\$399,829	Funding should be forfeited if Clean Water Act permits are not secured within 6 months of Council decision.
22022	Using Induced Turbulence to Assist Downstream-Migrating Juvenile Salmonids	Washington State University	\$219,923	\$219,923	
22050	Habitat Diversity in Alluvial Rivers	Confederated Tribes of	\$319,860	\$319,860	

		the Umatilla Indian Reservation			
22033	Evaluate new methodologies for monitoring Pacific salmon and steelhead: methods for evaluating the effectiveness of restoration and recovery programs	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	\$353,376	\$197,155	Establish placeholder until sponsor clarifies, together with NMFS and BPA, issue of tag size and fish size, and if they can be read by current detection devices : dams. Forfeit funding if issue not resolved within 90 days after Council decision.
22042	Evaluate the effects of nutrient supplementation on benthic periphyton, macroinvertebrates, and juvenile sturgeon in the Kootenai River	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	\$170,635	\$170,635	
22057	Waterbody and Aquatic Habitat Characterization Utilizing High Resolution Satellite Imagery and Aerial Imagery	Teasdale Environmental Associates	\$126,371	\$126,371	
22010	Echo Meadow Project - Winter Artificial Recharge to Cool Rivers	IRZ Consulting	\$660,714	\$232,000	Sponsor broke down lumped budget into annual costs. Fund for one year only. After that, sponsor should secure funds through provincial review cycle.
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,298,586</b>	<b>\$1,994,109</b>	

**Response to ISRP Recommendations:** The Council incorporated the recommendations of the ISRP into its recommendations to fund innovative projects in Fiscal Year 2001. The Council recommended funding each of the top ten ranked projects, except project 22047, which the ISRP recommended should be funded after other nutrient supplementation proposals are completed. The Council incorporated the ISRP recommendation in its decision to recommend funding project 22010 in that the project was rated as one in the top group of twenty proposals that the ISRP distinguished, and also in the way that the Council sought modifications and clarifications on the proposal regarding matters raised by the ISRP in its report.

## **PART V.**

### **Consideration of the Impact of Ocean Conditions on Fish and Wildlife Populations**

The 1996 amendment to the Northwest Power Act expanded the scope of the Council's functions to incorporate new concepts and the latest understanding on the effects of ocean conditions on Columbia River salmonids. In that amendment, Congress instructed the Council to "...*consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations...*" in making its recommendation regarding funding hydropower mitigation projects to the Bonneville Power Administration. The Council's initial policy response to this charge was adopted in an issue paper entitled "*Consideration of ocean conditions in the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*" (Issue Paper 97-6, posted on [www.nwcouncil.org/library/1997/97-6.htm](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/1997/97-6.htm)), on June 3, 1997<sup>6</sup>.

The Council has continued to respond to the charge to consider ocean impacts in the context of its funding recommendations to Bonneville. Efforts to-date have resulted in substantive progress in the incorporation of concepts of ocean<sup>7</sup> variability and its effects on salmonid populations. The Council's awareness and understanding of these additional complexities have resulted in a permanent recognition of this portion of the salmon ecosystem as an integral part of the Council's fish and wildlife agenda.

During FY 2001, there were several items that illustrate the Council's interests and activities in pursuing an adequate understanding of the role of ocean conditions on salmonid populations. The following categories summarize this progress:

1. Ongoing projects funded by the Bonneville Power Administration.
2. New projects funded by the Bonneville Power Administration.
3. Fish and Wildlife Program amendment.
4. ISAB review of estuary work.
5. Relevant efforts by other agencies.

#### **1. Ongoing projects funded by the Bonneville Power Administration**

Table 1 lists a collection of proposals submitted for funding by the Bonneville Power Administration in FY 2000, that fully or partially include activities in the estuary, nearshore and ocean. These projects are multi-year endeavors, and continue to be funded in Fiscal Year 2001. A full description of each one of these projects can be accessed at the Bonneville web site: [www.efw.bpa.gov/Environment/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2000/2000cd/readme.htm](http://www.efw.bpa.gov/Environment/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2000/2000cd/readme.htm)

An important clarification applies to this project list. Consistent with its policy statement released in 1997, the Council defined the ocean environment relative to the saltwater migration of Columbia River salmon. This includes the Columbia River estuary, the Columbia River plume, and

---

<sup>6</sup> An edited version of the Council's Issue Paper was peer-reviewed and added to the available scientific literature as Bisbal, G.A., and W.E. McConnaha. 1998. Consideration of ocean conditions in the management of salmon. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 55:2178-2186.

<sup>7</sup> As part of its policy statement released in 1997, the Council defined the ocean environment relative to the saltwater migration of Columbia River salmon. This includes the Columbia River estuary, the Columbia River plume, and the nearshore and offshore areas of the northeastern Pacific Ocean extending from northern California to the Gulf of Alaska.

the nearshore and offshore areas of the northeastern Pacific Ocean extending from northern California to the Gulf of Alaska. Therefore, Bonneville projects included in Table 1 may be implemented in one or more of these areas. At the same time, it is important to understand that many of these projects may include activities elsewhere in the system as well. The northern pikeminnow management program is a good example of this, since it includes the removal of these predators that consume salmon smolts in several areas along the Columbia River mainstem. The primary impact of this predation, however, takes place below Bonneville Dam which, by definition, corresponds to the estuary. Thus the northern pikeminnow management project appears on the table. In some cases, the component of each project that corresponds strictly to actions in the “marine environment” (i.e., estuary, plume, ocean) is hard to estimate, and no attempt was made here to break up those budgets and costs. Thus, the budget figures presented in table 1 do not reflect solely investments in the estuary and nearshore areas alone.

**Table 1. Proposals for estuary, nearshore and ocean studies submitted for funding by the Bonneville Power Administration in FY 2001.**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>COUNCIL FY01 Recomm.</b>	<b>Short Description</b>
199801400	Ocean Survival Of Juvenile Salmonids In The Columbia River Plume	National Marine Fisheries Service	\$845,000	Measure the effects of time of entry, smolt quality, food habits, growth, and health status of juvenile coho and chinook salmon on survival in relation to oceanographic features of the ocean environment associated with the Columbia River plume.
199702600	Ecology Of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence On Salmonid Ocean Survival	National Marine Fisheries Service	\$180,000	This study will identify and document the relationships between the distribution, abundance, and food habits of marine fish predators and forage fishes off the Columbia River and salmonid ocean survival.
199306000	Select Area Fishery Evaluation Project	ODFW, WDFW, Clatsop County Economic Development Council	\$1,500,000	Develop and enhance fisheries in the lower Columbia River utilizing hatchery stocks, while protecting depressed wild stocks, through application of net-pen rearing, and monitor and evaluate rearing effects on habitat at net-pen sites.
199702400	Avian Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Columbia River	Oregon State University/Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission	\$642,000	Monitor and evaluate the efficacy of management initiatives to reduce predation by colonial waterbirds on juvenile salmonids in the lower Columbia River. Assist resource managers in the development of a long-term avian predation management plan.
199007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission	\$2,779,992	Reduce predation on juvenile salmonids by implementing fisheries to harvest northern Pikeminnow in the mainstem Columbia and Snake rivers. Monitor effects of fisheries on predation by northern Pikeminnow and other resident fish.

Another ocean related initiative was initiated in the Council’s Annual Implementation Work Plan for FY 1998. It identified near-ocean and estuary uncertainties as a new research initiative, at a suggested cost of \$150,000 from Bonneville’s direct fish and wildlife budget. The study, *“Impacts of hydroelectric development and operation on the Columbia River estuary and nearshore plume”* (project 199800404), was originally conceived as a target for an open solicitation process. Almost simultaneously, however, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) announced the initiation of a long-term study in the estuary and plume of the Columbia River (199801400, listed in table 1). Because of the close relationship between the Council’s proposed study (199800404) and the effort by NMFS, a decision was made in April, 1998 to merge both needs under the common umbrella provided by project 199801400.

Even with the merge described above, the original analysis and write-up envisioned by the Council for project 199800404 maintained an identity of its own and a draft final report was

completed and submitted for review on January, 2001. The report is entitled “*Salmon at River’s End: the role of the estuary in the decline and recovery of Columbia River salmon.*” The NMFS’ team leading this effort has indicated a desire to publish this report as a book to be printed by the University of Washington Press. Besides the customary review applied to submittals of this kind, the Council has secured the review of independent referees as well. Completion of a revised final report is estimated for the May-June 2001 timeframe. A presentation by the sponsors to the Council will be scheduled shortly thereafter.

## **2. New projects funded by the Bonneville Power Administration**

In FY 2001, the Council conducted its annual solicitation for innovative project proposals (See Part IV above, “Innovative Project Proposals Solicitation and Recommendations”). One of the proposed new starts entitled “*A Feasibility Study for Pacific Ocean Salmon Tracking (POST)*” (proposal # 22001) received a favorable review and endorsement from both the regional fish managers and the Independent Scientific Review Panel. The proposal was submitted by the Kintama Research Corporation, with a total budget request of \$228,600.

The proposal included two main objectives: (1) Evaluate new acoustic tracking technology to verify its capabilities for use on the West Coast and (2) Design an acoustic monitoring network to track movement of juvenile chinook, steelhead, and coho salmon smolts into the ocean and along the continental shelf to areas of ocean residency. The use of sonic tags for tracking is particularly attractive because they also work in saltwater, unlike traditional radio tags currently in use in the region. Success of this project should allow design of studies for better estimation of survival rates of emigrating juveniles through the estuary and into the ocean. Ability to track fish in saltwater would also provide needed information on the use of estuary habitat. The sonic tags also work in freshwater allowing fish to be tracked from some point upstream through the estuary and into the ocean plume. The sponsor also proposed to consider the design of a series of detection sites to track the migration of fish along the coasts of Oregon, Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska. For some species, this would potentially provide valuable information on mortality in the ocean, migration to the open ocean, residence in areas along the coast for an extended period, and exposure to ocean fisheries.

This proposal ranked the highest in the innovative project category because, according to the review and recommendations provided by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP), it promises the greatest potential benefit to the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program, among the innovative proposals submitted for funding in FY 2001

## **3. Fish and Wildlife Program amendment**

In October 2000, the Council amended its Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. The first phase of this amendment process reshaped the program into a framework that established a basinwide management vision, biological objectives and action strategies based on an underlying set of scientific principles. Phase II of the Council’s process for amending its program calls for the development and adoption of subbasin plans, which are expected to prescribe specific management actions that answer fish and wildlife needs.

In the revised Program, the Council recognized the critical importance of including the ocean as part of sound planning, and the immediate need to improve our understanding of the ecological processes taking place in the marine environment (defined as the freshwater plume, the near-shore, and the high seas)(Strategies, Section 8). The Council further recognized that management actions

in general should strive to help anadromous salmonids and other species accommodate a variety of ocean conditions and regional climates by providing a wide array of life history types. In addition, the Council's program also indicates that monitoring and evaluation actions should recognize and take into account the effect of varying ocean conditions and, to the extent feasible, separate the effects of ocean-related mortality from that caused in the freshwater part of the life cycle.

Phase I of the revised Fish and Wildlife Program specifically addresses the estuary within the habitat strategies section (Strategies, Section 3). The new language acknowledges that the estuary "...is an important feature [of the Columbia River ecosystem] that is negatively affected by upriver management actions and local habitat change." The Council recognized that while knowledge about the estuary is relatively limited, there are opportunities for substantial improvements in this area that may benefit most of the anadromous fish populations.

A unique feature of the Northwest Power Act is its direction for the Council to consider the Columbia River as an integrated system. The 2000 Council's Program reflects such guidance and was constructed around an architecture of ecologically meaningful planning units while stressing the inter-relationships of the many parts of the Columbia River ecosystem. This approach is based on a hierarchical description of the system at different spatial and time scales and provides an ecologically based way to structure fish and wildlife recovery efforts. Within this broader geographic structure, the estuary, plume and open ocean were explicitly recognized for the sound planning and implementation of the Council's program.

The ecosystem encompassed by the Council's program is immense, and includes a vast array of physical, biological and human elements. At the broadest scale, the Council recognized the Columbia River Ecosystem based on the biological and physical elements associated with the focal species that represent the native ecological system. This geographic scale addresses regional, hemispherical and global functions and processes that set the overall constraints for the Columbia River and its species. The Columbia River Ecosystem encompasses two Regimes: 1) the inland and freshwater portion of the Columbia River basin, and 2) that portion of the northeast Pacific Ocean inhabited by anadromous salmonids of Columbia River origin. The ocean range of chinook salmon, the most abundant anadromous salmonid in the Columbia, extends from Oregon into Southeast Alaska and a considerable distance offshore.

The Council's organizes the Columbia River Ecosystem into 14 ecological provinces -- 10 inland and freshwater; and 4 ocean provinces. An ecological province describes the largest geographic/ecological unit of similar biological/physical characteristics. This term is equivalent to the concept of "domain" utilized in the oceanographic literature. Ecological Provinces in the Ocean Regime are distinguished by ocean currents, temperatures, salinities, and other properties that define ecological and biological patterns in the ocean. The four ocean provinces are referred to as the "marine" area and include: 1) Transitional, 2) Ridge, 3) Coastal Upwelling, and 4) Coastal Downwelling. The geographic scope of these areas is illustrated in the Appendix to the Fish and Wildlife Program (Section FF).

This proposed partitioning of the Columbia River Ecosystem facilitates planning, administrative and implementation activities on a province-by-province basis (*See Part II above describing the Province based project selection and review process*) The inclusion of the oceanic provinces is intended to both facilitate the understanding within the Council's program of the full scope of the salmonid environment and to also provide projects related to the oceanic environment a planning framework equivalent with the freshwater environment within which they may be proposed and considered.

#### **4. ISAB review of estuary work**

On October, 1999, the Council requested that the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) undertake a review of the impacts of estuarine conditions and management on the Council's mission to "...*protect, mitigate and enhance...*" fish and wildlife in the Columbia River as affected by development and operation of the hydroelectric system. The ISAB is a panel of 10 independent, nationally recognized members that provides both the Council and the National Marine Fisheries Service scientific advice on fish and wildlife issues.

On November 28, 2000, the ISAB presented the report "*The Columbia River Estuary and the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*" (Council Document ISAB 2000-5, available at <http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2000-5.pdf>). The report focused on detailing the forces that have altered the estuary and recommending what actions might be taken to identify impacts wrought by a complex set of changes. The board acknowledged that the interface between a highly modified freshwater system and the open ocean environment has been beset by dramatic changes to both the physical habitat and biological communities. Some of the major changes listed in the report result from the "development of peripheral wetlands and their isolation from the estuary, development and deepening of the federal navigation channel, and regulation of upper Columbia River flows for hydrosystem needs and flood control."

According to the report, large-scale manipulations -- such as through dike removal, changes in hydrosystem-controlled flow regimes and altered predation management -- may be necessary to assess the impact human development has had on Columbia River estuarine habitats and their fish and wildlife populations. The ISAB proposes to determine the impacts of removal of dikes in the lower river and upper estuary to restore connections between floodplains and the river. These habitats are important to the early rearing, survival and growth of chum salmon, sub-yearling fall chinook and smaller coho salmon.

The report also cited the extent of change to seasonal flows resulting from development of the hydrosystem. Those changes from historic flows include an estimated 40 percent increase in winter, largely for power production, and 50-55 percent decrease in the spring/summer, for flood control. The report states that the reduction in peak seasonal discharge under the current hydrosystem is one of the most significant changes in the river-estuary system. The controlled flows also reduce variability, not allowing peak flood events that can cause damage but also serve to create habitat and refresh the estuary with nutrients. The ISAB suggested that an allocation of water within the annual Basin water budget should be established to simulate peak seasonal discharge, increase the variability of flows during salmonid emigration and restore tidal channel complexity.

Finally, the ISAB suggested programs for "actively managing sources of salmonid predation in the estuary through restoration of natural habitats, removal of habitats artificially created due to channel construction and/or maintenance, or controlling predator populations."

#### **6. Relevant efforts by other agencies**

Consideration of the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations is not exclusive to the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. A number of multidisciplinary efforts and programs, whether regional, national, or international, continue to devote significant efforts on research, monitoring and evaluation to understand the forces driving variability in the northeastern Pacific Ocean and how these affect ecosystem productivity. The Council continues to learn about



the progress and accomplishments of these efforts and explores possibilities for cooperation and interaction to achieve a reasonable balance of efforts within its statutory obligations. Staff continues to monitor these and other activities and keep the Council informed of significant developments. What follows is a summary -not intended to be an exhaustive list- of recent developments:

<b>TITLE</b>	<b><i>2000 Biological Opinion - Reinitiation of consultation on operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System</i></b>
<b>WEB SITE</b>	<a href="http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/1hydrop/hydroweb/docs/Final/2000Biop.html">www.nwr.noaa.gov/1hydrop/hydroweb/docs/Final/2000Biop.html</a>
<b>SPONSOR</b>	National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
<b>CONTACT</b>	Donna Darm, Acting Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region, 7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Bldg 1, Seattle, WA 98115, phone: (206) 526-6150, Fax: (206) 526-6426, e-mail: <a href="mailto:donna.darm@noaa.gov">donna.darm@noaa.gov</a>

**Brief description:** On December 21, 2000, the NMFS released a Biological Opinion for the federal hydrosystem. This Opinion contains a proposed set of hydrosystem passage improvements and habitat, hatchery and harvest changes intended to avoid jeopardy. Section 9.6.22. of this document includes actions related to estuarine habitat. Actions 158 through 163 call primarily on the Corps, and cost-sharing funding provided by Bonneville, to fully coordinate their estuary coordination efforts consistent with the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan prepared by the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program (see below).

<b>TITLE</b>	<b><i>The Anadromous Fish Evaluation Program (AFEP)</i></b>
<b>WEB SITE</b>	<a href="http://www.nwd.usace.army.mil/ps/research.htm">www.nwd.usace.army.mil/ps/research.htm</a>
<b>SPONSOR</b>	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Northwestern Division
<b>CONTACT</b>	Doug Arndt, Chief, Fish Management Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CENWD-CM-F, P.O. Box 2870, Portland, OR 97208-2870, phone: (503) 808-3720, Fax: (503) 808-3725, e-mail: <a href="mailto:Doug.P.Arndt@nwd01.usace.army.mil">Doug.P.Arndt@nwd01.usace.army.mil</a>

**Brief description:** The Anadromous Fish Evaluation Program (AFEP) is the set of Corps-funded evaluation and monitoring studies designed to give the region better biological information and insights related to fish passage and survival at hydropower dams. Specifically, studies include such topics as effects of juvenile fish transportation, evaluation of fish guidance devices and surface collection, effects of gas supersaturation on fish, and adult fish passage at the dams. Through the years, this program has also funded a number of projects addressing estuarine conditions. AFEP studies are carried out in the Portland District and Walla Walla District offices of the Corps' Northwestern Division (Table3).

**Table 3. Estuary and nearshore studies funded by the Corps of Engineers Anadromous Fish Evaluation Program in FY 2001.**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Contractor</b>	<b>FY 2001 Budget</b>	<b>Short Description</b>
ESE-01-New-a (Portland District)	A study to estimate salmonid survival through the Columbia River estuary using acoustic tags.	National Marine Fisheries Service and Battelle Pacific Northwest	\$654,000	Goal of the study is to determine the feasibility of developing an acoustic tag to estimate survival of both stream and ocean type juvenile salmonids through the Columbia River Estuary. First year focus on feasibility of developing a new acoustic tag with adequate specifications, size and strength, for use in ocean type fish and

				develop a detection array system that works in the complex environment of the Columbia River estuary.
ESE-01-New-b (Portland District)	Estuarine Habitat and Juvenile Salmon – Current and Historic Linkages in the Lower Columbia River and estuary	National Marine Fisheries Service	\$276,000	Primary focus of this work will be to determine the relationship between habitat and the presence, use, and benefit to juvenile salmon in the Lower Columbia River and estuary. Also to understand changes in flow, sediment input, and availability of habitat in the Lower Columbia River and estuary.
ESE-01-New-c (Portland District)	Evaluation of the relationship among time of ocean entry, physical, and biological characteristics of the estuary and plume environment and adult return rates	National Marine Fisheries Service	\$55,000	This study will examine the relationship among time of juvenile salmon ocean entry, physical and biological characteristics of the estuary and nearshore ocean plume environment, and smolt-to-adult return rates for yearling chinook and coho. Feasibility level study in 2001 getting facilities secured. Fish will be tagged in winter 01 and released in spring of FY02.
BPS-W-00-10 (Walla Walla District)	Evaluation of delayed mortality of juvenile salmonids in the near ocean environment following passage through the Columbia River hydrosystem	Oregon State University	~\$ 160,000 plus equipment.	The first year of this work (FY00) focused on developing the requirements of hydro-acoustic telemetry detection system. The primary goals of this study compares the differences in the behavior and mortality of juvenile salmon that have different passage histories through the hydrosystem into the near – shore ocean environment. A sub element of this work evaluates passage rates and behaviors of juvenile salmon as they pass through a known area of delay at the salt-water interface.
BPS-W-11 b (Walla Walla District)	Electronic recovery of PIT tags from piscivorous bird colonies in the Columbia River Basin	National Marine Fisheries Service	~\$ 215,000	The recovery of PIT tags from piscivorous bird colonies in the Columbia River with a special focus on the bird colonies in the estuary is used to evaluate the estuarine survival and the relative vulnerability of different groups of fish to avian predation.
BPS-W-11a (Walla Walla District)	Evaluate the migration behavior of PIT-tagged juvenile salmonids in the Columbia River estuary	National Marine Fisheries Service	~\$ 700,000	This study uses electronic detection of PIT tagged juvenile salmon with a PIT tag trawler to evaluate differential effects of passage histories of juvenile salmon through a comparison of their abundance, survival, passage rates and migration patterns in the estuary and to obtain ocean entry timing.
TPE-W-00-1 (Walla Walla District)	Evaluation of migration and survival of juvenile steelhead and fall chinook following transportation	Oregon State University	~\$ 250,000 plus equipment	The goal of this study is to obtain information that will allow us to make recommendations concerning how the fish transportation program may be managed to minimize the loss of fish in the Columbia River estuary.

<b>TITLE</b>	<b><i>The Lower Columbia River Estuary Program – LCREP</i></b>
<b>WEB SITE</b>	<a href="http://www.lcrep.org/">www.lcrep.org/</a>
<b>SPONSOR</b>	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and States of Oregon and Washington
<b>CONTACT</b>	Debrah Richard Marriott, Director, LCREP, 811 SW Naito Park Way, Suite 120, Portland, OR 97204-3330, phone: (503) 226-1565 (x227), fax: (503) 226-1580, or e-mail: <a href="mailto:marriott.debrah@lcrep.org">marriott.debrah@lcrep.org</a>

**Brief description:** The LCREP is a bi-state program (Oregon and Washington) dedicated to the preservation and conservation of the Lower Columbia River. In 1999 the LCREP capped a three-year research and planning process with the signing of an implementation agreement by Washington Gov. Gary Locke, Oregon Gov. John Kitzhaber and the EPA. The plan outlined 43 actions focused on preventing further habitat loss in the estuary and restoring degraded habitats. Taken together, the actions form a comprehensive plan to restore and maintain the biological integrity of the Columbia River estuary.

On December 1999, the LCREP launched a study that combined ground and airborne observations and satellite remote sensing imagery to gather high-resolution information in the lower Columbia River estuary. The study will provide a comprehensive, geographically accurate data set on basic estuarine and tidal freshwater habitat types and help identify specific habitats and features important to endangered species and other species and extended from the mouth of the Columbia River to river mile 46. Other agencies involved in this project included Earth Design Consultants, Ecotrust, University of Washington, Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce, Sea Resources, U.S.

Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Geological Survey. The final product for this project is expected by June 2001, and will consist of a report that describes the project and analyzes habitat type and function, together with a set of GIS maps that classifies habitat types from the mouth of the Columbia River to Bonneville Dam.

Legislation promoted as part of the Water Resources Development Act received congressional authorization to spend \$30 million to restore habitat in the Columbia River and Tillamook Bay estuaries. The legislation, sponsored by U.S. Rep. Earl Blumenauer, D-Ore., Oregon Sen. Ron Wyden, and supported by tribal and conservation group officials and others, authorizes and directs the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to help implement habitat restoration components of management plans developed by the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program and the Tillamook Bay National Estuary Project. Final appropriation of these funds is anticipated during the 2001 session of the U.S. Congress.

<b>TITLE</b>	<i>The Columbia River Channel Improvement Study</i>
<b>WEB SITE</b>	<a href="http://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/pm/projects/crnci/">http://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/pm/projects/crnci/</a>
<b>SPONSOR</b>	Portland District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and seven lower Columbia River ports
<b>CONTACT</b>	Laura Hicks, Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, CENWP-PM, P.O. Box 2946, Portland, OR 97208, phone: (503) 808-4705, fax: (503) 808-4505, or e-mail: <a href="mailto:Laura.L.Hicks@usace.army.mil">Laura.L.Hicks@usace.army.mil</a> .

**Brief description:** There are two concurrent studies being conducted by the Corps' Portland District in the Columbia River navigation channel. The first is the Dredged Material Management Study. This study evaluates current maintenance dredging practices for the existing authorized 40-foot navigation channel in the lower Columbia River. The goal is to determine the most cost-effective manner to maintain the channel over the next 20 years. The study was completed in June 1998.

The second study is the Columbia River Channel Improvement Study. In August 1999, the Corps released its *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report for Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement: Columbia and Lower Willamette River Federal Navigation Channel*. This document recommends deepening 105 miles of the Columbia River channel, between Portland and Astoria from its 40-foot depth to a depth of 43 feet to accommodate larger, deep-draft ships. Congress, which authorized the project during its 1999 session, must still appropriate funds for the channel improvement work. The estimated cost of the proposed 43-foot channel including environmental restoration of 250 acres in the estuary and \$5.6 million of wetland and riparian habitat restoration at Shillapoo Lake, WA, is \$188.3 million.

The Corps, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, jointly agreed to resolve fishery issues delaying the channel project. Consultation among the three agencies began in 1998, and resulted in the Corps receiving two biological opinions, one from NMFS and one from USFWS. The no-jeopardy biological opinion for the channel project was issued by NMFS in December 1999 and withdrawn in August 2000. A no-jeopardy biological opinion meant that the Corps could proceed with the action as proposed because the channel project did not significantly impact the long-term survival of the twelve listed fish species.

<b>TITLE</b>	<i>The U.S. Global Ocean Ecosystems Dynamics (U.S. GLOBEC)</i>
<b>WEB SITE</b>	<a href="http://www.usglobec.org">www.usglobec.org</a>
<b>SPONSOR</b>	U.S. National Science Foundation Division of Ocean Sciences, and the Coastal Ocean Program Office(COP) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
<b>CONTACT</b>	Michael Fogarty, Chair, Scientific Steering Committee, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, P.O. Box 38 / One Williams Street Solomons, MD 20688, phone: (508) 495-2386, Fax: (508) 495-2258, e-mail: <a href="mailto:fogarty@usglobec.org">fogarty@usglobec.org</a>

**Brief description:** U.S GLOBEC is a research program organized by oceanographers and fisheries scientists to address the question of how global climate change may affect the abundance and production of animals in the sea. The program currently has major research effort underway in the Northeast Pacific (with components in the California Current and in the Coastal Gulf of Alaska). In 1997, fourteen projects were funded to begin U.S. GLOBEC's scientific research program in the ecosystems of the Northeast Pacific. An additional 20 projects were funded in 1999, and 14 projects in 2000. These studies focus on the effects of past and present climate variability on the population ecology and population dynamics of marine biota and living marine resources, in an attempt to predict how the ecosystems of the Northeast Pacific may respond to future global climate change. Annual and interannual variability are studied directly through long-term observations and detailed process studies; variability at longer time scales is examined through retrospective analysis of directly measured data.

<b>TITLE</b>	<i>Columbia Land Trust</i>
<b>WEB SITE</b>	<a href="http://www.columbialandtrust.org/">www.columbialandtrust.org/</a>
<b>SPONSOR</b>	National Resources Conservation Service, North American Wetlands Coordinating Council, National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Act, and the Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board.
<b>CONTACT</b>	Glenn Lamb, Executive Director, Columbia Land Trust, 1351 Officers' Row, Vancouver, WA 98661, phone: (360) 696-0131, fax: (360) 696-1847, or e-mail: <a href="mailto:glamb@columbialandtrust.org">glamb@columbialandtrust.org</a>

**Brief description:** The Columbia Land Trust is a private, non-profit organization, founded in 1990. The Trust works exclusively with willing landowners to find ways to conserve the scenic and natural values of the land and water. Landowners donate the development rights or full ownership of their land to the Land Trust. Columbia Land Trust manages the land under a stewardship plan and, if necessary, will legally defend its conservation values. Using financial contributions from private donors, the Land Trust acquires lands with significant scenic, recreation, or habitat qualities.

In January 2001, the Trust acquired 871 acres, or nearly two-thirds, of the Chinook River floodplain. The stream feeds into the Columbia River near Chinook, WA, just a few miles upstream from the river's mouth. The land trust immediately donated the property to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, which will coordinate the restoration of the property with the Natural Resource Conservation Service. The property was once a part of the tidal estuary, replete with backwaters for migrating fish, and wildlife, to rest and feed. The restored habitat is expected to provide high quality rearing and overwintering habitat for coho, chum, chinook, steelhead, and sea-run cutthroat produced within the Columbia River basin. Restoration activities will include removal

of tidegates to restore tidal function, filling drain ditches, restoring tidal swales, reforesting riparian areas, and building a new levee with sufficient tidegates to protect adjacent landowners.

## **Conclusion**

The Council's charge to take the impact of ocean conditions into account in making its annual recommendation to Bonneville for its fish and wildlife expenditures is certainly not a mathematical or mechanistic exercise that produces "fund" or "do not fund" recommendations on a project-by-project basis. The Council, in fact, does not understand this to be what is required under the Act. Rather, the Council has endeavored to develop for itself, and for the region, a better understanding of the impacts of the ocean environment upon salmonids, and seeks to bring that knowledge to bear on Bonneville's expenditures in a programmatic way. That is, through targeted research and specific projects, as well as a restructuring of the fish and wildlife program to recognize the ocean environment and connect it with the freshwater, the Council seeks to develop over time a more comprehensive knowledge and approach to the region's efforts to protect, mitigate, and enhance the fish and wildlife affected by the development and operation of the hydrosystem. This should lead to better decisions on the use of the Bonneville fund in both the freshwater and ocean environments. The Council believes that it is succeeding in this effort by taking actions such as those described above in Fiscal Year 2001 and in prior years.

## **PART VI.**

### **Determination that Projects Recommended Employ Cost Effective Measures to Achieve Program Objectives**

Under the 1996 amendment to the Northwest Power Act, the Council must, in making its annual fish and wildlife project funding recommendations to Bonneville, “determine whether the projects employ cost effective measures to achieve program objectives.” As noted in each of the years since this determination has been required, the legislation did not specify any particular approach to cost-effectiveness analysis. It does not require, for example, the use of a single measure of biological effectiveness as a basis for comparison among projects, nor the use of strictly quantitative analysis. Because of this, the Council has taken several steps over the years since this provisions was added to the Act to understand the state of the art in natural resource economics and cost-effectiveness analysis to make the determination required by the Power Act.

First, to respond to this new charge, the Council established an Independent Economic Analysis Board (Economic Board, also known as the IEAB) to provide advice on and improve economic analysis of fish and wildlife recovery measures. The Economic Board members have substantial experience in areas of natural resource economics; irrigation and agricultural economics; water use and policy; river transportation economics; fishery economics; local-area economic impact assessment; non-market valuation of natural resources; electricity system configuration and economics; and U. S. Army Corps of Engineers project evaluation. The Economic Board has helped the Council determine how to analyze the proposed projects and make funding recommendations that are consistent with the statute’s call for cost-effectiveness review.

Second, the Council produced, with the Economic Board’s help, a discussion of “Methods of Economic Analysis for Salmon Recovery Programs” (July 30, 1997, Council Document No. 97-12), for the purposes of initiating the cost-effectiveness review in Fiscal Year 1998. The Economic Board reviewed the paper and supported the analysis and conclusions. The methods analysis concluded that several problems make it difficult for the Council to undertake a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison among fish and wildlife projects using a single, quantified, measure of benefits to determine which projects produce the greatest benefit per dollar. The problems include the lack of agreement on measures of biological effectiveness; the fact that the complex life-cycle of anadromous and resident fish makes it difficult to isolate the biological effects of particular activities or to compare different biological effects of different kinds of projects; and the fact that in the prioritization process, different project sponsors provide different kinds of cost and economic information, which makes cost comparisons difficult.

Based on the methods analysis and the Economic Board’s advice, to date, the Council has concluded that it could not undertake a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison of the projects, primarily due to the inability to quantify the expected benefits of particular projects. Whether a more quantitative approach will be possible in future years is still not known. A quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison would require a far greater understanding of the biological effectiveness of actions than we have now.

In prior years the Council noted that a more quantitative cost-effectiveness determination would also require a better defined set of biological goals and objectives for the Council’s Program to be able to make a quantified analysis of whether projects are cost effective in meeting “program objectives.” That is, a clearer, more comprehensive Program framework could provide a sounder basis for

establishing measures of effectiveness, perhaps allowing in the future for a multi-variable quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison of projects as described in the Council's methods paper. The 2000 amendments to the fish and wildlife program has made the first step of progress in crafting this more definite set of program objectives. This is the first of several efforts over the last year, discussed below, undertaken by the Council efforts to create a program and project selection process that increases the cost-effectiveness of the projects it recommends for funding.

### **Council proposal to clarify program objectives**

In order to make determinations as to which project will be most cost-effective in meeting program objectives, it is necessary to have discreet and understandable program objectives. In previous versions of the fish and wildlife program, there was not a conceptual framework that permitted a clear understanding of the relationship between objectives at the smallest or site-specific scale or project level and the broader basin-wide or overall program levels. This confounded the ability to evaluate how any specific project or suite of projects proposed for implementation at a specific site or within a specific area responded to program level objectives.

The fish and wildlife program amendment concluded in 2000 begins the process of a comprehensive restructuring of the program around a conceptual hierarchical framework that includes related visions, objectives, and strategies at three spatial scales -- basin-wide, province, and subbasin. The 2000 amendments adopted this hierarchical framework for the program, and started the to fill in the substance of the vision, objectives, and strategies at the broadest scale -- the basin. Subsequent amendment proceedings are planned that will establish visions, objectives, and strategies at the intermediate province level and also at the subbasin level. Working from the smallest scale up, the framework of the program will provide for objectives at each subbasin that are consistent with the objectives for the province in which it is located, and each province must have goals and objectives that are consistent with the basin wide goals and objectives.

Once the amendment process is completed, if successful, the Council will be evaluating proposed projects for their "fit" with visions, objectives, and strategies set out for each subbasin. Those that are most consistent for the subbasin plan, will receive a priority for funding. Thus, the projects that best fit the subbasin level objectives, will also be the best matches for the applicable province objectives as well as the basin level objectives. In this way, when looking across all of the projects taking place in each of the 58 subbasins, the Council can be confident that they have the best fit collection of projects in each of the subbasins, all consistent with higher order objectives that have been designed to achieve the vision for the fish and wildlife program.

The Council expects the amendment cycle to do the complete restructuring of the program to adopt the substance of the province and subbasin level visions, objectives, and strategies may take several years. The 2000 amendments did make the critical first step in that the Council and region committed to this approach for the fish and wildlife program, and by filling in objectives at the basin level.

The Council does not intend to suggest here that the purpose of pursuing a more definitive framework and biological objectives for the program will ensure that a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison can or will be completed for the annual project selection process after the program is amended. The challenges in quantifying expected benefits of proposed projects will remain even if the program objectives are clarified as planned. However, the Council does believe that more definitive program objectives, and the requirement for "nested" objectives at all three geographic scales will at

least permit a much more transparent and rigorous qualitative review of the cost-effectiveness of projects proposed each year.

**Cost-effectiveness through project review, selection and management procedures -- continuing to refine and build upon strategies identified in the methods analysis.**

As highlighted in the past, there is more to cost effectiveness than a quantitative comparison of the costs of alternative ways to achieve a single biological objective. Cost-effectiveness review may suggest procedures for project review, selection and management that emphasize efficiency and accountability, making it more likely that projects funded will be effective and efficient, even if these changes cannot be reliably quantified. The methods analysis completed in 1997 recommended four strategies to help improve the cost-effectiveness of projects proposed for funding: (1) emphasizing the role of independent scientific review in increasing the cost effectiveness of the Council's Program; (2) improving the level and nature of cost information provided; (3) evaluating the results of specific projects; and, (4) improving contract selection and management procedures. As in previous years, a description of what the Council has done and is doing to implement these strategies is the bulk of this year's statement. The Council does believe that it has made significant progress on several of these four cost-effectiveness strategies in the fiscal year 2001 project selection and review process, and this is discussed below.

**Role of independent science review in cost-effectiveness review.**

The purpose of the Scientific Panel is to provide an independent scientific assessment of the biological effectiveness of the proposed projects. The independent science review process has proven useful in raising questions about the effectiveness of certain types of projects, project management and funding priorities.

The Fiscal Year 2001 project review and selection process saw major improvements and changes in the way that science review of proposed projects is conducted. In Fiscal Year 2001, the science review was limited to a smaller set of projects in order to provide for a more thorough and detailed review. As discussed above in Part I of this document, under the rolling provincial review format only two provinces were reviewed. This enabled the ISRP to focus much more on the sixty - two proposals submitted for these two provinces, whereas before it reviewed 400 plus projects in a year. In addition, parties participating in the Council process developed additional contextual information in subbasin summaries to allow the Panel to understand how a project fit, or did not fit, with other activities and existing management objectives in each subbasin (*see* Part I for more discussion on subbasin summaries). Further, the new format includes site visits where the ISRP actually goes into the field to learn first-hand about the areas or projects that they are reviewing. Finally, the new format includes a proposal presentation and defense component where the principle investigators of the proposals present their work, and the ISRP asks questions. The ISRP is very supportive of the new format. In its final report on projects in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces the ISRP reported:

*This marks the end of the ISRP's duties in the first iteration of the provincial review process, and although the process can use some fine-tuning, the ISRP is enthusiastic about the new approach. The ISRP found the addition of subbasin summaries, site visits, project sponsor presentations, and a formal response loop to be a major improvement in the peer review process. (ISRP 2000-9, page 1).*



The ISRP reviewed each project that was proposed for Fiscal Year 2001 funding, and provided project specific comments for each. The ISRP's rating system was very specific as to whether or not it found the project to meet the statutory review criteria. If the ISRP found the project wholly satisfactory, it rated it as "fundable." If the proposal was not judged to be satisfactory, it was rated as "not fundable," and where the proposal had deficiencies that precluded a "fundable" rating that the Panel considered relatively minor, it was rated "fundable with conditions." Regarding this last category, the Panel would explicitly describe the nature of the deficiency, and noted that it should be remedied by the sponsor when the specific project contract terms were agreed to with Bonneville.

This year, as was the case for Fiscal Year 2000, the ISRP reviewed proposals and issued a preliminary report noting which projects needed to be improved and in what way. Project sponsors were provided an opportunity to respond to that report with and provide their explanations as to how they could respond to the deficiencies noted in the preliminary report. The ISRP then reviewed these responses, and rated the proposals a second time. In a great number of instances, this "fix-it loop" was able to improve marginal or deficient proposals into those that the ISRP found did meet the standards of the Act.

### **Improved cost information/increased fiscal review of capital investments and operation and maintenance obligations.**

A second strategy recommended by the methods analysis has been to bring better cost information into the decision-making process. Council staff has worked with Bonneville, the managers and the project sponsors to develop and provide enhanced cost information about projects and about the Program allocations in general.

More important than the simple display of cost information for the total annual workplan or an entire project, however, continues to be increased scrutiny of the components of those costs and their long-term financial implications for the Council's Program. Consistent with the Council's recommendations in the past three fiscal years, the past year has seen increased fiscal scrutiny by the Council, Bonneville and others of both new and ongoing projects. Efforts of previous years in this area were built upon in Fiscal Year 2001, primarily by requiring more detailed budgeting information in project proposals.

In Fiscal Year 2001, all projects, whether in one of the provinces being reviewed or not, completed project proposal forms in the "ongoing projects renewal process" (*see* Part I. above). For the first time ever, each project was required to break its budget into four separate components: planning and design; capitol construction; operation and maintenance; and monitoring and evaluation. Further, objectives and tasks within each budget subcategory were required. Finally, sponsors were required to budget by task within each of the four budget subcategories. When the Council made its project funding recommendations to Bonneville, it recommended to Bonneville that it contract for the project on the basis of the work breakdown structure in the four phase proposals, and to administer the contracts on a going forward basis on that basis. This should ensure that projects continue to stay focused on the objectives and tasks approved by the Council at the level of effort approved for each task.

One of the methods to bring increased fiscal scrutiny in the interest of ensuring cost-effectiveness that has been developed by the Council since the amendment to the Act that continues to be critical is the "3-Step Review Process" that was developed in 1998 for new production initiatives. These projects tend to be some of the most capitol intensive in the program, and are also

those that usually require several years to move from concept to operation. In order to bring budget discipline to these larger projects, and reduce the possibility that large investments are irretrievably committed at those early concept phases, the 3-Step process segments these proposals into three discreet phases. This segmentation facilitates a more transparent and discreet allocation among conceptual planning, preliminary design, final design and construction, and operational phases of these projects. Each step of the process requires Council approval and scientific review. Further, under this process, the Council approves funding only for the phase or step that the project is in, rather than for all phases as had sometimes been done in the past.

The 3-Step Review was originally conceived as an interim strategy and it set forth both the procedural and substantive elements for the review of artificial production proposals. The original documents adopting this review stated that it would be interim until the then ongoing Artificial Production Review (APR) being conducted was completed. The original belief was that the APR report and implementation plan would supercede the 3-Step Review process. That original thinking has turned out to be only partially correct. The APR does in fact add to and modify significantly the *substance* of the issues that need to be explored when artificial production projects are proposed. However, the APR recognizes that artificial production improvement or reform will take time, and it recognizes that existing processes should be used as implementation vehicles for the reforms called for in the report. The fact of the matter has been that in the absence of a new process or implementation vehicle coming out of the APR, the Council has found the 3-Step Review design continues to be a very useful process design for considering these types of projects. Thus, as a matter of process, the Council continues to review artificial production proposals at a step 1 conceptual phase (Master Planning), a step 2 preliminary design phase, and a final step 3 final design proposal and construction phase. It is just that the APR dictates many of the substantive issues that are now considered in each of those steps.

A third strategy recommended by the Council's methods analysis is to evaluate the record of existing projects. To reiterate from last year, projects that have been ongoing for some time should have yielded measurable effects or have contributed concrete knowledge about fish and wildlife problems. A sampling of projects could be evaluated to determine what benefits they have yielded for the money expended. This exercise should introduce accountability into the process as well as provide a better understanding of how to specify measurable objectives in future project information sheets. On-going project reviews are essential for an adaptive management approach to Program design and implementation. For Fiscal Year 2001 funding recommendations, the Council, as in past years, scrutinized a set of projects for concerns about effectiveness, questions about cost, or both. These included the predator control program, the fish passage center, and Streamnet. The Council then made use of the results of these reviews in making its funding recommendations this year.

Similar effort occurred during Fiscal Years 1998 through 2000-- the Council initiated reviews of several projects or program areas, reviews which resulted in (or may yet result in) better defined and more efficient projects and contributed to the Fiscal Year 2000 funding recommendations. The Council sought to ensure this year that the conditions or guidance that it had outlined in the past two fiscal years had been followed before it would recommend funding, even where the ISRP had rated a project as "fund".

### **General project decision rules used by the Council in Fiscal Year 2001**

Again in Fiscal Year 2001 the Council sought to employ general rules that required a high level of agreement that a project should be funded between the ISRP, and the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes as a requisite of a positive funding recommendation. This was especially

emphasized in the case of proposed new projects. The Council believes that the reviews offered by these institutions overlap in part, but also address very different issues. That is, while the fish and wildlife managers and ISRP both have scientific and technical expertise, the reviews conducted by the fish and wildlife managers is particularly useful for a statement of a project's management relevance. Therefore, when the ISRP and fish and wildlife managers agree that a project should be funded as a priority, the Council can have confidence that it is scientifically sound and that it is also relevant to meeting the management objectives of those with fish and wildlife jurisdiction in the area.

What all of these activities add up to is that the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, as implemented and funded through the set of projects, is being more closely scrutinized than before in terms of effectiveness, accountability, cost, and efficiency, although much still needs to be done. One result should be a Program that is more cost-effective, satisfying the direction of Congress in the 1996 Power Act amendment. The Council makes this conclusion while recognizing that improvements in cost-effectiveness have not and cannot be quantified. As discussed in the first portion of this document, what is especially lacking is a satisfactory way of understanding and measuring the biological effectiveness of particular projects or of the Program as a whole, as well as a comprehensive and consistent framework of goals and objectives for the Program that could be based on a better understanding of biological effectiveness. The Council believes that it has made significant progress in this area in Fiscal Year 2001 in advancing efforts to develop a multi-species scientific framework for the Council's Program and fish and wildlife restoration in the basin as a whole.