



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

911 NE. 11th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-4181

IN REPLY REFER TO:

AFR

2006010028

OCT 3 2006

Mark Walker
Director of Public Affairs
Northwest Power and Conservation Council
851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Mr. Walker:

The Fish and Wildlife Service respectfully submits the following comments regarding the process and draft recommendations for the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) regarding the FY2007-2009 project selection process for the Fish and Wildlife Program.

Overall, we commend the Council for their process for evaluating hundreds of potential fish and wildlife restoration projects across the Columbia Basin. We also commend the Council for their use of local and regional groups, the fish and wildlife managers, the Federal and State agencies, the Columbia Basin Tribes, and the public in reviewing and ranking these projects. The Council's effort to be inclusive of a wide range of interests and entities throughout the basin has resulted in a suite of projects that will make an important contribution to fish and wildlife conservation throughout the Columbia Basin.

However, we are concerned with the Council decisions regarding the Mainstem/Systemwide and Provincial recommendations for the Fish and Wildlife Program. The Council's draft recommendations appear to be inconsistent with the recommendations of the Mainstem Review Team, the Provincial Review Groups, the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program as amended in 2003, and the Northwest Power Act. We urge you to reconsider some of your decisions.

The enclosures outline our concerns and recommendations for ensuring the Council fulfills its mandate to provide the region with a balanced implementation plan for the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program for FY2007-2009. If you have any questions, please contact Dan Diggs or Mark Bagdovitz at (503) 872-2763.

Sincerely,


Acting Regional Director

Enclosures

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Concerns and Recommendations

Our specific comments on the Council's draft recommendations address several issues, broadly categorized as 1) the general process used and the Council recommendations and 2) the merits of priorities for specific projects.

The General Process

Balancing the Fish and Wildlife Program under the Northwest Power Act.—Instead of reanalyzing the projects or rebalancing the budget, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) recommends the Council focus on the important task of conducting an independent analysis to determine the appropriate size and scope of the Fish and Wildlife Program for FY07-09, comparing the overall scope of the Program with the potential costs to the region's electricity ratepayers.

As you know, the Fish and Wildlife Program is updated every five years, and is implemented through the annual implementation of the program budget. We understand the \$143 million annually for the Fish and Wildlife Program was established by the Bonneville Power Administration in their electricity rate setting process, not by an independent analysis by the Council. The Service is interested in understanding how the Council made their assessment of this funding level as you are obligated under the Northwest Power Act which requires you to determine the size and scope of the Fish and Wildlife Program and the cost to electricity ratepayers of the region. Our interest is prompted by the erosion of funding over the years as we have seen the program reduced from over \$180 million to the \$143 million level and how at this level we see many important programs identified by the regional co managers and processes you created, will go unfunded or be reduced.

We understand the difficult challenge the Council has to balance the fish and power needs of the people of the Pacific Northwest. In our perspective it is one of your most fundamental purposes. Balancing these competing societal needs is critical to the successful implementation of the Northwest Power Act; and we urge the Council to recognize and fulfill this important mission.

Mainstem/Systemwide Recommendations.—The Service would urge the Council to recommend projects and budgets that closely match those proposed by the Mainstem/Systemwide Review Team (MSRT) and the Provincial Review teams.

The Council established the MSRT to make recommendations for projects in the mainstem Columbia and for projects that span the entire basin. Over the past several months, the Council asked several local and regional entities and groups to review the fish and wildlife projects submitted to the Council for funding and to determine the highest priority management actions/projects and to develop a budget that supports these projects. Subsequently, the MSRT and the Provincial Review groups reviewed these projects and balanced the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program for FY07-09 (\$143 million annually). The MSRT deliberations were based on the process outlined by the Council, and final recommendations were completed on-time, on-budget, and were consistent with the Council's guidelines. We commend the Council for providing a wide variety of entities and interests the opportunity to participate in these discussions and for meaningful input into the Council's decision-making process. Input of this quantity and quality represents a scale of regional professional and public participation not seen before.

The Service does not see major problems with either the review process defined by the Council or the subsequent recommendations of the MSRT. We believe the Council should consider the MSRT recommendations as the “default” allocation and explain their logic where those recommendations are not accepted. Further, when major tasks and budgets are eliminated, the Council should ensure the projects can still meet biological objectives in a scientifically sound manner

Provincial Reviews.— The Council should seriously consider the Provincial recommendations, and evaluate the consistency between the recommendations and the priorities in the subbasin plans, which are an important component of the Fish and Wildlife Program. The Provincial recommendations were based on the process and the budget outlined by the Council. While the Provincial review process attempted to produce recommendations that were objective, it did not have the advantage of involvement from a wide spectrum of management entities. As a consequence, it appears some subjectivity and some prioritization occurred that was inconsistent with the subbasin plans. Further, though the Council is not bound by the Provincial recommendations, it should clearly explain the reasoning when it deviates from the Provincial allocations.

ESA Funding Needs.—The Service recommends not designating portions of the Council’s program to undefined ESA related projects. We understand the Council is considering setting aside a portion of the Fish and Wildlife Program budget to accommodate future needs related to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and implementation of a Proposed Action and a future biological opinion from the National Marine Fisheries Service for the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS). It is not possible to predict what ESA obligations and projects will result from the FCRPS remand process. However, some projects, with Council recommendations and BPA funding, will assist the remand Action Agencies determine benefits and legal certainty as they positively affect the ESA environmental baseline

Project-specific Concerns

To the extent decisions to cut funding of projects on non-anadromous species in tributaries results from a Council policy perspective emphasizing mainstem impacts and work, the FWS would respectfully disagree. We believe the Northwest Power Act allows for work in tributaries. In fact an ecological approach would consider the entire range of species we are working with. Ultimately, impacts from the FCRPS are reflected and need to be measured at the population level (defined at the tributary level). This is consistent with the approach being used for anadromous salmon under the Fish and Wildlife Program. To not fund research, monitoring, and evaluation of species in tributaries is to risk not being able to define holistic solutions to conservation of these and other species.

Overall, the Council’s project recommendations appear to be focused almost exclusively on compensating for the impacts on Pacific salmon and steelhead. Other important fish and wildlife species have been, and are being, adversely affected by the FCRPS and should be supported in the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program. The Council’s draft recommendations eliminate or sharply reduce funding for projects for Pacific lamprey, Columbia River white sturgeon, as well as bull trout and coastal cutthroat trout even though these projects are scientifically justified and have management support. Considered as a whole, the Council’s recommendations for these species go from very little funding to almost zero

We also note that Pacific lamprey, Columbia River white sturgeon, and coastal cutthroat trout are culturally important to the Columbia River tribes. The Federal government has a specific legal obligation to ensure the healthy status of these species, given the Federal trust responsibility to the tribes. We believe the Council needs to recommend funding for these species to ensure they do not continue to decline.

Pacific Lamprey.—It is clear that mainstem hydropower operations are having an adverse affect on upstream migration of adult Pacific Lamprey and the downstream migration of juveniles. There is a long-term reference project below Bonneville Dam which gives regional biologists some ability to evaluate the impact of the FCRPS.

Pacific lamprey is an important species in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, and has been identified as important in subbasin plans. Although no species of lamprey is currently listed under ESA in the Pacific Northwest, we are concerned that recent estimates indicate their numbers are alarmingly low and decreasing rapidly. Because of their key role in the Columbia River ecosystem, the demonstrated impact of the FCRPS, and the need to provide information to make informed management decisions regarding the status of these species, we believe it is essential for the Council to support projects for Pacific lamprey.

Columbia River White Sturgeon.—For Columbia River white sturgeon, the impact of construction and operation of the FCRPS has had a major impact on their spawning habitat and early rearing conditions, particularly the area around Bonneville Dam. In addition, the FCRPS has severely limited the upstream migration of mature white sturgeon which have great difficulty ascending the fish passage facilities at the mainstem dams. For white sturgeon, we believe that substantially more work needs to be done to better understand their life history and the affects of FCRPS operations have on their spawning habitat , rearing habitat, and migration routes.

Coastal Cutthroat Trout – For Columbia River coastal cutthroat trout there are potential impacts of anthropogenic activity in the mainstem and estuary of the lower Columbia River. Anadromous populations of coastal cutthroat have plummeted in recent years and therefore anthropogenic activities should consider the relative impacts on cutthroat trout. While the Service has recently found listing of coastal cutthroat trout to be not warranted at this time, concern was expressed for the lack of information available to make informed decisions (67 FR 44934). Changes in hydrology are understandably linked to the declines of upper Columbia River salmonid stocks through passage impacts, but regulated flow has also resulted in a shift in the amplitude and timing of high flow events. This shift in hydrological character influences mainstem flows, plume structure, salinity profiles, tidal range, and productivity. Other projects on the mainstem and estuary, such as maintenance and deepening of the navigation channel, also perturb these physical factors that define available habitat. Coastal cutthroat trout make extensive use of the mainstem and estuary (as both juveniles and adults) and are believed to be more susceptible to changes in productivity than any other Pacific salmonid. Work needs to be funded for providing information toward temporal use of the mainstem and estuary in order to gauge potential impacts of activities associated with FCRPS operations.

FCRPS and Bull Trout.—As you know, the FCRPS Action Agencies have completed their section 7 consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the effects of FCRPS operations on the threatened bull trout. Our biological opinion resulting from this consultation includes various measures

to minimize the impacts of incidental take of bull trout caused by the operation of the FCRPS. We are hopeful that the final Council program will be consistent with and support this Biological Opinion, particularly in regards to large unmet needs for specific research, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Unfortunately, the Council rejected numerous research, monitoring, and evaluation projects for bull trout on the mainstem Columbia River and several tributaries. If implementing the Council's final recommendations appear inconsistent with the Action Agencies ESA obligations for bull trout, we will work with the Action Agencies to outline the various options and to determine the best course of action to avoid conflicts between their Northwest Power Act and Endangered Species Act obligations.

Fish Passage Center.—We recognize the Council has not made a recommendation regarding the Fish Passage Center or its functions. However, we understand the Council will make a funding recommendation for the Fish Passage Center functions once the current litigation is settled. The funding is expected to be at or about \$1.3 million/year for three years (FY07-09). We are raising this issue to inform any future action or recommendation by the Council.

We note the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA), which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is a member, has submitted a proposal to assume the Fish Passage Center functions. CBFWA developed their proposal to be entirely consistent with the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, as amended in 2003. That is, the CBFWA proposal reflects the structure and function of the Fish Passage Center and its associated oversight board and technical committee precisely as outlined in the current Fish and Wildlife Program. It also includes an important role for the regional fish and wildlife managers, as required by the Fish and Wildlife Program. We strongly believe the Northwest Power Act places a high substantive standard on the Council to support its Fish and Wildlife Program. We strongly urge the Council to uphold and support their Fish and Wildlife Program, in its entirety, when making recommendations to the Bonneville Power Administration and other Federal agencies.

We understand there is another proposal to assume the functions of the Fish Passage Center sponsored by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. We take no position on this proposal. However, we note there is nothing to prevent the Council from recommending funding for both proposals for the Fish Passage Center functions.

Comparative Survival Study (CSS).—The Service is very concerned over the level of funding that has been recommended by the Council for the Comparative Survival Study (CSS Project 19960200 – PIT tagging spring/summer Chinook). This project was recommended for funding by the MSRT as a Core Project (essential to the Fish and Wildlife program). It has been recommended by the MSRT to fund project 19960200 at the FY 2007 level of \$1,365,000. In addition, the MSRT included the caveat that this funding level was sufficient only if the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) proposal for replacement of the Fish Passage Center functions was fully funded. If the CBFWA proposal for Fish Passage Center duties was not funded, there would need to be an increase in these funds to implement the CSS tasks that the MSRT consider to be Core to the Fish and Wildlife program. The Service concurs with the need for additional funds for the CSS project if the CBFWA proposal is not funded.

The CSS project has been reviewed on numerous occasions over the past years by both the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) and the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB). The CSS project oversight/implementation team has consistently revised their approaches based on ISRP/ISAB

recommendations. This is a project that has been closely monitored over the past ten years and has adapted to scientific peer review recommendations. In fact, the ISAB detailed review of March 2006 concluded that: *'The Council should view the CSS as a good, long-term monitoring program the results of which will become increasingly valuable to managers as years pass. Scrutiny from periodic peer reviews and agency comments will help ensure that the methods and analytical approaches improve. The project is definitely worthy of Council support.'* The ISRP agreed with the ISAB conclusions for the CSS project and recommended, consistent with the ISAB, that the CSS project produce a ten year summary report. The project sponsors agreed with and welcome ISAB/ISRP feedback on the 10 year summary report.

According to the spreadsheet on the Council WEB page for Basinwide research, monitoring and evaluation, and coordination projects, the Council allocated \$765,000 to fund CSS at a reduced level for FY 07-09. However, Mr. John Shurts' memorandum to interested parties (Shurts 2006), states that monitoring and evaluation projects (which includes CSS/PIT 199602000) are at level funding until the Council resolves issues concerning the monitoring and evaluation framework. The funding amount of \$765,000 is below level funding for CSS.

The Council also identified that the interim funding is pending further Council consideration of a regional monitoring and evaluation framework. In addition, the Council noted that the ISRP recommendation is fundable (qualified): project sponsors need to address ISRP concerns during further consideration. However, the ISRP has recommended to add more down river marking sites for the project and to increase funding to accommodate the additional sites. The Council draft recommendations appear inconsistent with their guidance from the ISRP/ISAB recommendations concerning the direction of the CSS project.

At the reduced FY 07 funding level (from the MSRT recommended level) the sponsors of the CSS project will be able to focus only on maintaining the wild marking program in the Snake, John Day and Warm Springs rivers. Also, at this funding level we would complete the ten year summary report requested by the ISRP/ISAB. We would not be able to maintain the long time series of marking for the Snake and down river Chinook hatchery programs, or implement the Snake River hatchery steelhead program (recommended by the ISRP and the MSRT). The loss of these hatchery groups would have a large impact on a myriad of management issues concerning the listed and non-listed populations. For example, the salmon managers use these hatchery marking groups to evaluate fish response to in-season management of the hydrosystem (e.g. timing, project delay, and travel time responses of Chinook and steelhead). In addition, IDFG uses hatchery returns of CSS tagged fish to assist in in-season harvest management actions. Also, the fish agencies use tagged returning CSS fish to estimate adult passage survival through the hydrosystem (particularly in years of poor wild fish returns). For these and numerous other reasons, fish managers (along with FWS) feel these PIT-tagged hatchery groups from CSS are a CORE component of the Fish and Wildlife program.

The steelhead marking is part of a continuing set of recommendations from the ISRP concerning the direction of the CSS study; these tags provide critical information for assessing hydrosystem actions for these important production groups.

The FWS agrees with the findings of the MSRT that the CSS is a project that is Core to the Fish and Wildlife program. The FWS and state and tribal sponsors are willing to discuss the details of the CSS proposal with Council and their staff.

Summary

The Service has outlined for you our concerns and recommendations regarding the Council's FY 07-09 project selection process. The Service urges the Council to:

- Focus on the important task of conducting an independent analysis to determine the appropriate size and scope of the Fish and Wildlife Program for FY07-09.
- Recommend projects and budgets that closely match those proposed by the MSRT and the Provincial Review teams.
- Consider the Provincial recommendations, and evaluate the consistency between the recommendations and the priorities in the subbasin plans.
- Not designate portions of the Council's program to undefined ESA related projects.
- Reconsider cuts in funding for projects on non-anadromous species in tributaries and that the Northwest Power Act does allow for work in tributaries.
- Reconsider for funding the specific projects outlined in this discussion paper.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service appreciates the opportunity to work with the Council on the FY07-09 project selection process and we thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft recommendations. Following are project specific details.

Project Specific Details:

Proposal ID	500			
Brief Title	ai R White Sturgeon Inventory			
Sponsor	Department of Fish and Game			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Vague for habitat work
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	Y

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

Although the title of the project indicates work on White Sturgeon, the project addresses: burbot, interior redband trout, bull trout, kokanee, mountain whitefish, northern pike, and westslope cutthroat trout. Project objectives are quite broad, such as rehabilitate Kootenai River Burbot to a self-sustaining population, but the sequence of events to get there, and productivity milestones are not clearly identified. Project is ongoing and has a record of successful implementation although positive changes in the status of species investigated has not occurred to any appreciable degree. Project addresses objectives of the sturgeon recovery plan as well as other local and regional plans. Project identified as fundable by the ISRP.

Proposal ID	199004400			
Brief Title	Coeur D'Alene Reservation Habitat Enhancement (Coeur D'Alene Subbasin).			
Sponsor	Coeur D'Alene Tribe			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project that in the latest iteration, focuses on habitat improvement and evaluation for westslope cutthroat, monitoring abundance and productivity of westslope cutthroat trout, and removing brook trout from Benewah Creek. This project is related to a number of other projects that focus on either evaluating or maintaining aquatic habitat for resident fishes. The project is identified as fundable by the ISRP and identified for funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	199500100			
Brief Title	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish Program			
Sponsor	Kalispel Tribe			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund all Project Elements.
-------------	-----------------------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project. This project focuses on restoring aquatic habitat, coordinating bull trout restoration, and enhancing habitat and stocking largemouth bass in the Pend Oreille River basin. The Service cannot support the objectives concerning stocking and enhancing habitat for largemouth bass. The ISRP evaluated this project as fundable in-part, concluding that the bass work elements were inherently in conflict with management for native species. The project is identified for full funding by the Council, including the bass stocking and habitat enhancement.

Proposal ID	199501500				
Brief Title	Duck Valley Fisheries Project				
Sponsor	Shoshone Paiute Tribes				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This project is an ongoing mitigation program for the Owyhee/Bruneau Subbasins, replacing anadromous fish losses with a resident fish program. Although bull trout inhabit the headwaters of the Bruneau this project is unlikely to contribute toward meeting objectives for the bull trout Snake River biological opinion (BO). Project was ranked as fundable by the ISRP. Monitoring is being conducted to provide feedback on management of the fishery. In addition, vegetation management is geared toward controlling non-natives, and maintaining native vegetation.

Proposal ID	199700400			
Brief Title	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams			
Sponsor	Kalispel Tribe			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action.
-------------	---------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project that focuses on survey and monitoring native fish species (redband trout, burbot and others encountered) and non-native (northern pike and non-native fish in the Spokane River). The project is identified as fundable by the ISRP and identified for funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	199701100			
Brief Title	Duck Valley Habitat Enhancement and Protection			
Sponsor	Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Vague
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Vague

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This project is an ongoing mitigation program for the Owyhee/Bruneau Subbasins, replacing anadromous fish losses with a resident fish program. It is related to Project 199501500. Although bull trout inhabit the headwaters of the Bruneau this project is unlikely to contribute toward meeting objectives for the bull trout Snake River biological opinion (BO). Project was ranked as fundable by the ISRP. Monitoring is being conducted to provide feedback on management of the fishery. Vegetation management is geared toward controlling non-natives, and maintaining native vegetation as well as limiting riparian grazing impact, and grazing impact to springs.

Proposal ID	199701900			
Brief Title	Evaluate the Life History of Native Salmonids in the Malheur Subbasin			
Sponsor	Burns Paiute Tribe			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Vague

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project. Bull trout are a focal species for this project as are resident redband trout. However, due to the location, at the headwaters of the Malheur River, there is likely no relationship to terms and conditions in the Upper Snake River bull trout BO. The actions however, are consistent with the draft bull trout recovery plan chapter for the Malheur River. The project was classified as fundable by the ISRP. The project is primarily geared to survey and monitoring that will be used to help determine the loss of Tribal resources, as well as provide information necessary for protection and recovery of redband and bull trout.

Proposal ID	199800200			
Brief Title	Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment			
Sponsor	Idaho Department of Fish and Game			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project to determine distribution and abundance of native fish, the relationship of distribution and abundance to physical, environmental and biologic variables, and identify solutions where viability of native fish is questionable. Brook trout removal and re-establishing native species is also indicated as a task. This project is rated as fundable by the ISRP and identified for full funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	198806500			
Brief Title	Kootenai R White Sturgeon Inventory			
Sponsor	Idaho Department of Fish and Game			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Vague for habitat work
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	Y

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

Although the title of the project indicates work on White Sturgeon, the project addresses: burbot, interior redband trout, bull trout, kokanee, mountain whitefish, northern pike/minnow, and westslope cutthroat trout. Project objectives are quite broad, such as rehabilitate Kootenai River Burbot to a self-sustaining population, but the sequence of events to get there, and productivity milestones are not clearly identified. Project is ongoing and has a record of successful implementation although positive changes in the status of species investigated has not occurred to any appreciable degree. Project addresses objectives of the sturgeon recovery plan as well as other local and regional plans. Project identified as fundable by the ISRP.

Proposal ID	200001200			
Brief Title	Evaluate Factors Limiting Columbia River Chum Salmon			
Sponsor	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia River Fisheries Program Office			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project. This project provides extensive information on the Hamilton and Hardy Creek chum salmon populations. Access to spawning habitat in these two systems is dependent on Bonneville Dam tail water elevations. These populations are identified as primary populations for recovery planning. The project has three major components: fry production and abundance, adult spawning and movement, and assessing spawning habitat quality. Information from this project is the basis for the times series analysis used by NOAA Fisheries in recovery planning. This is a BiOp project. The project was identified as fundable by the ISRP. The funding level identified by the Council is substantially different from that requested with no rationale for the funding disparity. Project spending has been \$263,888 annually, which is substantially more than the \$151,666 budget proposed by Council.

Proposal ID	200001400			
Brief Title	Evaluate Population Dynamics And Habitat Use Of Lampreys In Cedar Creek			
Sponsor	USFWS-Columbia River Fisheries Program Office			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plans?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	Y
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Urgent
-------------	--------

Brief Description of Reasoning

This proposal should be funded for several reasons. The work in Cedar Creek represents one of the longest time series of lamprey monitoring in the basin. The Cedar Creek system is downstream of all hydropower facilities and therefore serves as a comparison to all upriver lamprey populations. It is critical to maintain this baseline data collection. The project is working on sampling efficiency problems specific to lamprey monitoring and applicable to lamprey research throughout the basin and would provide a legacy of important information. Without this information status and distribution throughout the lamprey range will be difficult to determine. The project is addressing critical uncertainties specifically outlined by the Columbia River Basin Lamprey Technical Workgroup. This group was established by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council and is now a subcommittee of the Anadromous Fish Committee of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority and was instituted for the purpose of guiding lamprey research in the basin. It seems counterproductive to stress the importance of lamprey research in the Columbia River Basin by establishing a lamprey workgroup and then recommend that no lamprey research be funded. Additionally, the Cedar Creek project addresses issues outlined in several subbasin plans calling for lamprey research and monitoring (Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery and Fish and Wildlife Subbasin, Lower Columbia and Columbia Estuary Bi-State Subbasin and NF and EF Lewis River Subbasin plans). Finally, there is no merit in the idea that because there is limited funding it should all go to projects studying listed species. If the goal is to preclude species from being listed, now is exactly the time for lamprey research to be funded.

Proposal ID	200002800			
Brief Title	Evaluate Pacific Lamprey In Clearwater			
Sponsor	Idaho Department of Fish & Game			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	N

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	unclear
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	Y
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	---------------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

We support the ISRP review and concur that movement forward with an official management plan with recommendations restoration actions be completed.

Proposal ID	200102600			
Brief Title	Status, Genetics, and Life History of Coastal Cutthroat Trout above Bonneville Dam			
Sponsor	US Geological Survey (USGS) - Cook			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plans?	N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	-------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

Recently the USFWS in cooperation with the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, U.S. Geological Survey, and the states of Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and British Columbia formed A Coastal Cutthroat Trout Technical Working Group. The purpose of the group is to develop a consistent framework to help guide and prioritize conservation, management, research, and restoration of coastal cutthroat trout throughout their native range. At the first working group meeting, several data gaps including distribution, abundance, and variations in life history strategies were identified. One repeated theme throughout the workshop, and identified as the priority research need, was the need to better understand the plasticity of life history forms. The ability, or inability, of resident forms to produce migratory forms (which have suffered the most evident declines) is a central issue for coastal cutthroat conservation. While the current proposal would add to the base of information regarding distribution and genetic variation, we believe that USGS would be uniquely positioned to address the plasticity issue. A future proposal address this issue would be fully supported by the USFWS.

Proposal ID	200103200			
Brief Title	Coeur D'Alene Fisheries Enhancement, Hangman Creek.			
Sponsor	Coeur D'Alene Tribe			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project that focuses on redband trout, and stream restoration activities on Hangman Creek, a tributary to the Spokane River. The project takes an ecosystem approach to watershed restoration and includes monitoring habitat and population response to restoration efforts. This project was determined to be fundable by the ISRP and funded at near requested levels by the Council.

Proposal ID	200105300			
Brief Title	Reintroduction of Chum Salmon into Duncan Creek.			
Sponsor	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is an ongoing project. This project is attempting to reintroduce chum salmon into Duncan Creek, where they were extirpated from in 1969. Past work has been used to set the stage for reintroduction: replacing the dam and culvert restricting access, and constructed spawning channels. Three reintroduction methods are evaluated: natural straying, direct adult supplementation, and fry supplementation. Project information will be used to guide other chum recovery efforts. This is a BiOp project. The project was identified as fundable by the ISRP. The funding level identified by the Council is substantially different from that requested with no rationale for the funding disparity

Proposal ID	200200800				
Brief Title	Reconnect Kootenai River with the historic floodplain				
Sponsor	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	unclear
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	unclear
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

The proposal was somewhat vague in the land acquisition process. Specific ties to existing habitat management plans and priorities made evaluation more difficult. While securing quality habitat for westslope cutthroat trout is undoubtedly important, a more complete proposal would be more competitive.

Proposal ID	200201600			
Brief Title	Evaluate the Status of Pacific Lamprey in the Lower Deschutes River Subbasin, Oregon			
Sponsor	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plans?	N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	Y
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

The proposal is worthy of continued funding because it addresses critical uncertainties for lamprey. The study seeks to elucidate the relationship and importance between water temperatures and larval through adult life stages. In addition, the determination of lamprey migratory patterns, spawn timing, redd characteristics, and suitable habitat would be valuable information for better understanding lamprey requirements. Finally, the Lamprey Technical Working has identified the determination of lamprey status as a need, and the estimation of adult escapement and harvest would assist in this effort.

Proposal ID	200203700			
Brief Title	Freshwater Mussel Research and Restoration Project			
Sponsor	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is primarily a research project to identify basic information to allow an understanding of mussel ecology necessary to maintain and restore their populations. Although conducted in the Umatilla and John Day Rivers, information should be applicable to other Columbia Basin streams. Little information is available on the identity, status and distribution of freshwater mussels in the Columbia Basin, so this project fills a severe information gap on a major faunal component. The project also translocates mussels as a restoration method, and monitors the status of the translocated populations. This project is not on the Council's funding list, and was identified as fundable (qualified) by the ISRP.

Proposal ID	200204500			
Brief Title	Coeur D'Alene Fish Habitat Acquisition			
Sponsor	Coeur D'Alene Tribe			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	unclear
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	unclear
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

The proposal was somewhat vague in the land acquisition process. Specific ties to existing habitat management plans and priorities made evaluation more difficult. While securing quality habitat for westslope cutthroat trout is undoubtedly important, a more complete proposal would be more competitive.

Proposal ID	200700700			
Brief Title	Determine Status and Limiting Factors of Pacific Lamprey in Fifteenmile Subbasin, Oregon			
Sponsor	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plans?	N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	-------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

Authors do a good job of describing a need for lamprey research and how the proposal ties into regional plans including the critical uncertainties outlined by the Lamprey Technical Workgroup. However, the similarity to the ongoing Deschutes River project may make the results redundant.

Objective A: Larval lamprey presence (let alone distribution) is difficult to assess even when using lamprey specific electroshocking equipment. There is a high incidence of false negatives when the ammocoete density is low or patchy. Two passes is often inadequate for detecting presence. If a lot of zeros (absence of ammocoetes) are generated during surveying, the data becomes hard to analyze especially when combined with habitat associations. However, larval lamprey research is generally performed this way despite the limitations mentioned here.

The Columbia River Fisheries Program office (CRFPO) performed an identical distribution and habitat analysis in Western Washington in 2000-2002. Stone, J. and S. Barndt. 2005. Spatial Distribution and Habitat Use of Pacific Lamprey (*Lampetra tridentata*) Ammocoetes in a Western Washington Stream. J. Fresh. Ecol. 20(1):171-185.

Objective B: Adult lamprey methodology seems well conceived.

Objective C: The precision and accuracy of lamprey redd enumeration can affect determination of the extent and duration of Pacific lamprey spawning as well as the calculation of a fish per redd ratio. Test digs and steelhead redds can alter the total count of lamprey redds. Some validation techniques probably should be used in conjunction with lamprey redd surveys.

Objective D: The proposed period of screw trap operation is very short and therefore the determination of migration timing and its association with flows, etc. will be limited to that 10 week period.

Objective E: Electroshocking ammocoetes has limitations (mentioned above). Multiple passes may be required to determine presence. In low densities, presence may not be detected. As authors mention, visual observations of the areas above the culvert should help in determining if spawning and rearing habitat is available.

Proposal ID	200702200			
Brief Title	Characterizing stress responses in lampreys: assessments based on cDNA microarrays			
Sponsor	Columbia River Research Laboratory			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plans?	N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	-------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This proposal is well written and the science sound. There is a need for lamprey stress research and it makes sense to use a modern method such as microarray technology. Stress research could directly affect the how lamprey are handled, tagged, and passed through hydrofacilities especially if lamprey are listed in the future. Other reviews of the proposal state that adjustments in passage facilities for salmonids were due to obvious signs of stress such as death and visible signs of injury. It would be helpful to determine if other, more subtle signs of stress are present since the true condition of fish that “safely” pass is often unknown.

Description

Proposal ID	200703200			
Brief Title	Potential Effects of the Invasive New Zealand Mudsail (<i>Potamopyrgus antipodarum</i>) in Tributaries of Bonneville Reservoir and the Deschutes River.			
Sponsor	U.S. Geological Survey Cook WA			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N/A
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	None Indicated
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N/A
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This project would be a new start if funded. This is a research project to determine adequate detection methods for New Zealand mudsnail infestations, and identify and model the potential impact of varied densities of mudsnails on native aquatic biota. The project is identified as fundable by the ISRP, and is not recommended for funding by the Council.

Description

Proposal ID	200703800				
Brief Title	Preserving/Enhancing Bull Trout and Westslope Cutthroat Trout within the Upper Pend Oreille Basin				
Sponsor	Idaho Department of Fish & Game				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	unclear
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This proposal is worthy of support. While certain deficiencies exist, specifically the design of a monitoring and evaluation program, the overall benefit for increasing the knowledge base for bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout is important.

Proposal ID	200706900			
Brief Title	Determine status of migratory bull trout in the South Fork Payette River			
Sponsor	Idaho Department of Fish & Game			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	unclear
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	unclear
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	unclear
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

We agree with the ISRP review of this proposal. Generically speaking, any new information on the migratory patterns of bull trout would be useful. However, this proposal has information gaps regarding specific methodologies, data interpretation, and how the project will facilitate the management of the species.

Proposal ID	200709900			
Brief Title	Gold Creek (Lakeview District) Bull Trout Habitat and Migration Protection			
Sponsor	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	unclear
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	N
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	unclear
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	---------------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This proposal has merit and would most likely improve habitat conditions for bull trout in a critical area for bull trout. The main problem with this proposal is the lack of clear and explicit monitoring and evaluation which will occur post project completion.

Proposal ID	200713700				
Brief Title	Open Channels				
Sponsor	Friends of the Teton River				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	unclear
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	unclear
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	N

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	unclear
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	unclear
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

The proposal to open up habitat for cutthroat trout has merit. Monitoring of success in this endeavor is the main concern for this project. The connection to larger scale initiatives for Yellowstone cutthroat trout are unclear

Proposal ID	200714100			
Brief Title	Bull Trout Effective Population Size in Isolated Populations			
Sponsor	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia River Fisheries Program Office			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N/A
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N/A
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	Y

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This project is a new start. The project conducts research to determine effective population size of bull trout populations that are isolated over a known period of time. Both demographic and genetic methods will be investigated, requiring population estimation and detecting movement between populations. Determining minimum viable population levels for bull trout is very important to determine recovered levels. Investigations exploring different methods to conduct this analysis should be transposable to all other bull trout populations/core areas. This project was identified as not fundable by the ISRP, and is not identified for funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	200714600			
Brief Title	Bull Trout Population Status Monitoring in the Snake River Basin of Southeast Washington			
Sponsor	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	unclear
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	unclear
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

We agree with the ISRP review. Collection of specific information in the basin would provide a fill a valuable information data gap. As the ISRP points out additional information should be collected during the course of sampling proposed under this project, since it may prove valuable in the future.

Proposal ID	200715700				
Brief Title	Bull Trout Status and Abundance Monitoring in the Waters in and Bordering the Warm Springs Reservation, Oregon.				
Sponsor	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N/A
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N/A
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	Y

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This project is identified as a new start although components have been funded previously through project 199405400. This project provides basic information on bull trout status (abundance and trend) and movement patterns in the lower Deschutes River and tributaries. This project is identified as fundable (qualified) by the ISRP, and is identified for funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	200716500				
Brief Title	Relative abundance, distribution, and population structure of lampreys in the Columbia River Basin				
Sponsor	Columbia River Research Laboratory				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	NA
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	Y
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	NA

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

We support the ISRP review. However, this proposal was developed in cooperation with and support of, the Lamprey Technical Working Group. The study was designed to be an umbrella project to guide lamprey work throughout the basin. After ISRP problems are addressed, this project should be fully funded, and regarded as a urgent, or high priority fundable proposal.

Proposal ID	200716600			
Brief Title	Lower Columbia River Coastal Cutthroat Trout Population Response to Habitat Restoration			
Sponsor	Columbia River Fisheries Program Office			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plans?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	-------------

Brief Description of Reasoning

There is definitely a need for increased data collection on coastal cutthroat trout in the lower Columbia River and estuary. In addition, performance monitoring for restoration projects is essential for future on-the-ground efforts to conserve the species. However, we agree with the ISRP regarding several deficiencies regarding technical aspects of the proposal. We believe that restructuring the proposal to address these areas of concern would significantly improve the study for future submission.

Proposal ID	200718600			
Brief Title	Middle Fork Willamette River Bull Trout Habitat Mitigation			
Sponsor	U.S. Forest Service			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	N

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Not Apparent
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is a new start project. The intent of this project is to restore in-stream structure (primarily) to six miles of the middle Fork Willamette River over a three year period, and restore access to Indigo Springs by removing an existing culvert and replacing it with an engineered structure that will pass all life stages of fish and other aquatic organisms. There is little information on the details of this project, including monitoring and evaluation. The project was identified as fundable (qualified) by the ISRP, and not identified for funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	200722100	Reviewer	T. Cummings	Date	9/28/06
Brief Title	Native Trout Restoration in the Methow, Entiat, and Wenatchee Subbasins				
Sponsor	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	N
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	N

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	unclear
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

The proposal lacks sufficient detail to fully evaluate the potential positive outcomes of the study. While increased information on the target species would most likely be beneficial, a more detailed description of project goals and benefits is necessary.

Proposal ID	200727200	Reviewer			
Brief Title	Conservation and Recovery of Endangered Species Act listed Floodplain Fishes in the Willamette Basin, with Emphasis on Oregon Chub				
Sponsor	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	High Priority
-------------	---------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is a new start project. The intent of this project is undertake floodplain habitat enhancement on private land and public National Wildlife Refuge lands in the Willamette Basin, provide an outreach and education program for floodplain function and threatened and endangered species, and monitor re-introduced and existing Oregon chub populations to detect progress toward recovery. This project is consistent with the Biological Opinion for the Oregon Chub in the Willamette Valley. This project is a cooperative project with the Forest Service, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Corps of Engineers, and Oregon State Parks. The project was identified as fundable (qualified) by the ISRP, and not identified for funding by the Council.

Proposal ID	200729100			
Brief Title	Developing and Assessing Freshwater Mussel Distribution, Abundance, and Life History Survey Methods in the Columbia Basin in Washington.			
Sponsor	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N/A
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	N

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Do Not Fund
-------------	-------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

This is a proposal to design and conduct a survey for freshwater mussels. The proposal is too general to determine how results would be used, beyond the initial survey, to conserve freshwater mussels. There are existing mussel projects in the Columbia Basin that could be consulted for appropriate design and other conservation measures. This project is rated as not fundable by the ISPR and not identified for funding by the Council

Proposal ID	200734900			
Brief Title	Monitoring resident salmonid populations and the aquatic food web in the upper Icicle Creek subbasin of the Wenatchee River basin			
Sponsor	Washington Trout			

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	Y
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	unclear
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	unclear
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	N

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	NA
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description of Reasoning:

We agree with the ISRP review, that while the proposal has merit, there exists several technical questions which need to be resolved. These include the potential benefit of the genetic analysis, the lack of cutthroat trout as a focus species, and a more cohesive linkage between objectives and products is necessary.