

Intermountain Province Oversight Committee
Jim Caswell, Chair
C/O Office of Species Conservation
300 N. 6th, Suite 101
Boise, ID 83702

June 16, 2006

Dr. Tom Karier, Chair
Northwest Power and Conservation Council
705 West First Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201

Dear Dr. Karier,

As requested by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council), the Intermountain Province (IMP) Oversight Committee is submitting the attached list of fiscal year 2007, 2008 and 2009 project recommendations and associated budget adjustments for the IMP expense funding allocation of \$15,248,105 (Attachment A). This recommendation is consistent with Council decisions guiding the Project Selection and Review process for FY 2007 to 2009 Program funding. Also included in this recommendation are the capital portions of wildlife mitigation budgets at \$9,621,000 annually. This represents all identified funding requests or portions of those requests that would meet Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) criteria for capital spending. No other costs included in the expense recommendations meet those criteria. We understand and support the need for a capital spending plan and will work with the Council and BPA toward that goal.

Also attached is a ranked list of additional IMP projects that the Oversight Committee recommends for funding should additional funds become available i.e., if any of the projects in the Oversight Committee's initial group of projects are not approved for funding or if any additional funds are available (Attachment B).

Additionally, per request of the Council the Oversight Committee is also submitting an overview of the IMP review process and criteria (below and Attachment C).

Please don't hesitate to contact me, or any of the members of the Oversight Committee, if you have any questions about the IMP review process or results.

Sincerely,



Jim Caswell
Chair Intermountain Province Oversight Committee

Cc Stacy Horton, NPCC staff
Joanne Hunt, NPCC staff
Tony Grover, NPCC staff

Overview Intermountain Province Review

In late 2005 the Council requested that the IMP Oversight Committee coordinate local project review in the IMP and develop recommendations for the IMP funding allocation of \$15,248,105.

The Oversight Committee met in early January 2006 to initiate development of review criteria and a review process; identify all IMP project proposals and review the total anticipated funding allocation; and invite all IMP project sponsors look for opportunities to coordinate on projects, scrub budgets, combine projects, and seek additional cost share. The public was invited to this meeting and all subsequent Oversight Committee meetings. Meeting notices were sent to the IMP Advisory Council email list (approximately 100+ individuals) and posted on the Council's web site.

The Oversight Committee developed and refined draft review criteria between January and March 2006. The review criteria were derived from the goals and objectives identified in the IMP subbasin plans. The criteria also addressed management and technical criteria. A final draft of the project review criteria and proposed process and timeline was distributed to the IMP Advisory Council email list and posted on the Council's web site along with request for comment. After incorporating comment, the finalized IMP review process and criteria were distributed to the Advisory Council and Oversight Committee April 17, 2006, and posted on the Council's web site later (Appendix C).

Oversight Committee members invested 30 days reviewing the IMP project proposals in detail and scoring each project using the finalized criteria. During this review period Oversight Committee members also compiled a list of specific project questions, which were forwarded to project sponsors. Each of the Oversight Committee's preliminary project scoring workbooks was compiled in a single spreadsheet for comparison and review at a scheduled May Oversight Committee meeting.

The Oversight Committee met in person May 22, 23 and 24 to review all of the projects, seek clarification on projects from project sponsors if necessary, identify any additional budget reductions, and review/revise scoring of projects as appropriate. Project sponsors were invited to attend the meeting to respond to questions and/or observe the process. Since, the majority of project sponsors are also members of the Oversight Committee, those project sponsors who are not on the Oversight Committee were also invited to respond to questions in writing if they were not able to, or did not wish to, attend the meeting in person.

On May 24, the Oversight Committee developed a consensus agreement to recommend a non-ranked group of 26 projects for immediate funding. In addition the Oversight Committee agreed by consensus to forward a ranked list of additional projects that are also recommended for funding when, and if, additional funding becomes available.

During the review process project proponents agreed to: withdraw three project proposals from the IMP submissions; make substantial reductions to a number of project's budgets (see Appendix C detail); and in some cases, move funds between fiscal years.

Recommendations

Part 1 – Project Package for Immediate Funding

The IMP Oversight Committee recommends the following package of projects for immediate funding. The Oversight Committee believes that, if implemented, all of these projects will protect, enhance and mitigate fish and wildlife affected by the Federal Columbia River Power System. These 26 projects total \$15,248,105 in expense funding per year and are all deemed consistent with the Council’s 70/15/15 allocation policy as it is implemented in the blocked area.

The IMP Oversight Committee also identified capital budgets as part of this recommended package. The capital budget portion of these recommendations total \$9,621,000 per year. The Oversight Committee strongly recommends that the capital projects be formalized and memorialized in a *Capital Plan*. As part of the IMP review process the Oversight Committee confirmed that all projects included in the IMP capital recommendations are for unmitigated Habitat Units.

Additional details including revised total budgets for each fiscal year, capital budgets where applicable, project sponsors, and special notes, are included in Attachment A.

Table 1: IMP projects recommended for immediate funding (presented by subbasin)

Proposal	Project Title	Subbasin
199004400	Coeur D'Alene Reservation Habitat Enhancement (Coeur d'Alene Subbasin)	Coeur d'Alene
199502700	Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Recovery Project	Columbia Upper
199404300	Lake Roosevelt Fisheries Evaluation Program (formerly Data Collection)	Columbia Upper
199104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery - O&M	Columbia Upper
200737200	Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Conservation Hatchery Project	Columbia Upper
198503800	Colville Hatchery	Columbia Upper
199104600	Spokane Tribal (Galbr Sprgs) H	Columbia Upper
199500900	Lake Roosevelt Rainbow Trout Net Pens	Columbia Upper
200102900	Ford Hatchery Operations & Maintenance	Columbia Upper
199204800	Colville Confederated Tribes Wildlife Mitigation Project	Columbia Upper
200702700	Colville Confederated Tribes Acquisition Project*	Columbia Upper
199501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement	Columbia Upper (Lake Rufus Woods)
200704100	Kalispell Riparian Road Removal	Pend Oreille
199500100	Kalispel Tribe Resident Fish Project	Pend Oreille
199404700	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	Pend Oreille
200724600	Restoration of bull trout passage at Albeni Falls Dam	Pend Oreille
200714900	Pend Oreille Nonnative Fish Suppression Project	Pend Oreille
200702800	Pend Oreille River Basin Watershed Protection and Enhancement Project	Pend Oreille
199106000	Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project - Kalispel	Pend Oreille
199206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation	Pend Oreille
199700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams.	Province Wide
199001800	Lake Roosevelt Rainbow Tr Hab/Pass Impr Prog	San Poil
200103200	Coeur D'Alene Fisheries Enhancement, Hangman Creek	Spokane
200103300	Hangman Restoration Project**	Spokane
199800300	Spokane Tribe Wildlife Mitigation Operations & Maintenance	Spokane
199106200	Spokane Tribe Wildlife Mitigation	Spokane

* Project is not a new project, the old project number was 199506700.

** As part of the IMP Oversight Committee’s consensus agreement, the Committee agreed to request that if, or when, additional funding becomes available, an additional \$165,225 per year (total \$495,675) would be allocated to project #200103300, Hangman Restoration Project, prior to allocating funds to any other projects in the IMP. The project sponsors would prefer that the total of \$495,675 be made available in either 2008 or 2009 to more easily facilitate easement acquisitions.

Part 2 – Additional Ranked Funding Recommendations

The IMP Oversight Committee agreed by consensus to forward the following ranked list of additional projects that are recommended for funding when, and if, additional funding becomes available. The Oversight Committee recommends that these projects be funded in the order listed below.

Table 2: Additional IMP projects recommended for funding

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Subbasin</i>
1	200703800	Preserving/Enhancing Bull Trout and Westslope Cutthroat Trout within the Upper Pend Oreille Basin.	Pend Oreille
2	200727000	Lake Rufus Woods Subbasin Area Stock Assessment, Habitat Assessment and Fisheries Evaluation Program	Lake Rufus Woods
3	200704000	Upper Columbia Landowner Incentive Program	Columbia Upper
4	200204500	Coeur D'Alene Fish Habitat Acq	Coeur d'Alene
5	200706000	Lake Pend Oreille Invasive Fish	Pend Oreille
6	200103100	Intermountain Province Resident Fish Conference and E-Library	Columbia Upper
7	200702400	Coeur d'Alene Trout Ponds	Coeur d'Alene

Additional details including revised total budgets for each fiscal year, capital budgets where applicable, project sponsors, and special notes, are included in Attachment B.

Part 3 – Do Not Fund Recommendations and Withdrawn Projects

The IMP Oversight Committee agreed to the following *Do Not Fund* recommendations. Also listed below are the three projects that were withdrawn by the project sponsors.

Table 3: Do Not Fund recommendations and sponsor withdrawn projects

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Subbasin</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
200704400	Kettle River Tributaries Riparian Habitat Improvement Project	Columbia Upper	Do not fund
200705600	IDL Pend Oreille Area Fish Passage #2	Pend Oreille	Do not fund
200707300	Dynamics of Gravel Spawning Beds in Lake Pend Oreille, ID	Pend Oreille	Do not fund
200709900	Gold Creek (Lakeview District) Bull Trout Habitat and Migration Protection	Pend Oreille	Do not fund
200736300	IDL Pend Oreille Area Fish Passage	Pend Oreille	Do not fund
200737300	IDL Priest Lake Fish Passage	Pend Oreille	Do not fund
199004401	Lake Creek Land Acquisition	Coeur d'Alene	Withdrawn
200711400	Vulcan Mountain Weed Control for Mule Deer and Bighorn Sheep Habitat Improvement	Columbia Upper	Withdrawn
200731200	Albeni Falls Dam Operational Loss Assessment of Riparian Ecological Function in the Pend Oreille River Ecosystem	Pend Oreille	Withdrawn

Attachment A - IMP Recommendations for Immediate Funding (presented in order of subbasin)

Proposal Number	Project Title	Project Sponsor	Subbasin	Species Type	Revised Project Expense Budget - FY07	Revised Project Capital Budget - FY07	Revised Total Expense & Capital FY07	Revised Project Expense Budget - FY08	Revised Project Capital Budget - FY08	Revised Total Expense & Capital FY08
199004400	Coeur D'Alene Reservation Habitat Enhancement (Coeur d'Alene Subbasin)	CDAT	Coeur d'Alene	Resident	\$ 1,469,899	\$ -	\$ 1,469,899	\$ 1,503,127	\$ -	\$ 1,503,127
199502700	Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Recovery Project	STOI	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$547,517	\$ -	\$ 547,517	\$484,318	\$ -	\$ 484,318
199404300	Lake Roosevelt Fisheries Evaluation Program (formerly Data Collection)	STOI	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$1,171,031	\$ -	\$ 1,171,031	\$1,219,306	\$ -	\$ 1,219,306
199104700	Sherman Creek Hatchery - O&M	WDFW	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$280,780	\$ -	\$ 280,780	\$294,816	\$ -	\$ 294,816
200737200	Lake Roosevelt White Sturgeon Conservation Hatchery Project	STOI	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$0	\$ -	\$ -	\$250,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000
198503800	Colville Hatchery	CCT	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$ 1,003,333	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333	\$ 1,003,333	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333
199104600	Spokane Tribal (Galbr Sprgs) H	STOI	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$874,000	\$ -	\$ 874,000	\$640,280	\$ -	\$ 640,280
199500900	Lake Roosevelt Rainbow Trout Net Pens	LRDA	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$144,000	\$ -	\$ 144,000	\$145,000	\$ -	\$ 145,000
200102900	Ford Hatchery Operations & Maintenance	WDFW	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$121,190	\$ -	\$ 121,190	\$127,254	\$ -	\$ 127,254
199204800	Colville Confederated Tribes Wildlife Mitigation Project	CCT	Columbia Upper	Wildlife	\$ 953,333	\$ -	\$ 953,333	\$ 973,333	\$ -	\$ 973,333
200702700	Colville Confederated Tribes Acquisition Project	CCT	Columbia Upper	Wildlife	\$129,000	\$ 1,371,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$129,000	\$ 1,371,000	\$ 1,500,000
199501100	Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement	CCT	Columbia Upper (Lake Rufus Woods)	Resident	\$ 473,749	\$ -	\$ 473,749	\$ 473,749	\$ -	\$ 473,749
200704100	Kalispell Riparian Road Removal	WDFW	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$58,117	\$ -	\$ 58,117	\$153,493	\$ -	\$ 153,493
199500100	Kalispell Tribe Resident Fish Project	KT	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$520,815	\$ -	\$ 520,815	\$544,049	\$ -	\$ 544,049
199404700	Lake Pend Oreille Fishery Recovery Project	IDFG	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$944,262	\$ -	\$ 944,262	\$980,176	\$ -	\$ 980,176
200724600	Restoration of bull trout passage at Albeni Falls Dam	KT	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$756,658	\$ -	\$ 756,658	\$385,662	\$ -	\$ 385,662
200714900	Pend Oreille Nonnative Fish Suppression Project	KT	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$596,785	\$ -	\$ 596,785	\$405,591	\$ -	\$ 405,591
200702800	Pend Oreille River Basin Watershed Protection and Enhancement Project	KT	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$336,890	\$ -	\$ 336,890	\$285,550	\$ -	\$ 285,550
199106000	Pend Oreille Wetlands Wildlife Mitigation Project - Kalispel	KT	Pend Oreille	Wildlife	\$80,000	\$ -	\$ 80,000	\$80,000	\$ -	\$ 80,000
199206100	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation	KT	Pend Oreille	Wildlife	\$1,949,297	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 7,949,297	\$2,103,022	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 8,103,022
199700400	Resident Fish Stock Status Above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams.	KT	Province Wide	Resident	\$622,049	\$ -	\$ 622,049	\$682,120	\$ -	\$ 682,120
199001800	Lake Roosevelt Rainbow Tr Hab/Pass Impr Prog	CCT	San Poil	Resident	\$ 679,385	\$ -	\$ 679,385	\$ 649,533	\$ -	\$ 649,533
200103200	Coeur D'Alene Fisheries Enhancement, Hangman Creek	CDAT	Spokane	Resident	\$572,020	\$ -	\$ 572,020	\$627,168	\$ -	\$ 627,168
200103300	Hangman Restoration Project	CDAT	Spokane	Resident	\$566,407	\$ -	\$ 566,407	\$699,403	\$ -	\$ 699,403
199800300	Spokane Tribe Wildlife Mitigation Operations & Maintenance	STOI	Spokane	Wildlife	\$287,588	\$ -	\$ 287,588	\$295,522	\$ -	\$ 295,522
199106200	Spokane Tribe Wildlife Mitigation	STOI	Spokane	Wildlife	\$110,000	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,360,000	\$113,300	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,363,300
TOTAL BUDGETS					\$ 15,248,105	\$ 9,621,000	\$ 24,869,105	\$ 15,248,105	\$ 9,621,000	\$ 24,869,105

Attachment A - IMP Recommendations for Immediate Funding (presented in order of subbasin)

Proposal Number	Revised Project Expense Budget - FY09	Revised Project Capital Budget - FY09	Revised Total Expense & Capital FY09
199004400	\$ 1,474,634	\$ -	\$ 1,474,634
199502700	\$477,305	\$ -	\$ 477,305
199404300	\$1,239,716	\$ -	\$ 1,239,716
199104700	\$309,558	\$ -	\$ 309,558
200737200	\$250,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000
198503800	\$ 1,003,333	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333
199104600	\$670,720	\$ -	\$ 670,720
199500900	\$146,000	\$ -	\$ 146,000
200102900	\$133,623	\$ -	\$ 133,623
199204800	\$ 973,333	\$ -	\$ 973,333
200702700	\$129,000	\$ 1,371,000	\$ 1,500,000
199501100	\$ 473,749	\$ -	\$ 473,749
200704100	\$16,281	\$ -	\$ 16,281
199500100	\$568,061	\$ -	\$ 568,061
199404700	\$975,483	\$ -	\$ 975,483
200724600	\$411,495	\$ -	\$ 411,495
200714900	\$400,959	\$ -	\$ 400,959
200702800	\$292,265	\$ -	\$ 292,265
199106000	\$80,000	\$ -	\$ 80,000
199206100	\$2,312,004	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 8,312,004
199700400	\$663,233	\$ -	\$ 663,233
199001800	\$ 499,533	\$ -	\$ 499,533
200103200	\$621,139	\$ -	\$ 621,139
200103300	\$706,271	\$ -	\$ 706,271
199800300	\$303,710	\$ -	\$ 303,710
199106200	\$116,700	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,366,700
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 15,248,105	\$ 9,621,000	\$ 24,869,105

Budget Notes/ Other Special Notes	Total Budget Reduction
Moved \$30,000 from FY09 to FY07, and \$20,000 from FY09 to FY08.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
Withdrew purchase RBT fr net pens. Reduced \$12,171 FY07, \$52,791 FY08, \$95,036 FY 09.	\$ 64,962
Reduced by \$100,000 FY07, result of housing cost reduction.	\$ 100,000
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
Withdrew enhancements. Reduced budget by \$226,667 in FY07, 08, and 09.	\$ 453,334
No change to proposed budget. This is an ongoing, not new project. Old project number was 199506700.	\$ -
Withdrew hatchery upgrades. Reduced budget by \$126,053 FY07, \$207,893 FY08, \$126,053 FY09.	\$ 459,999
Reduced by \$15,000 FY07, \$5,600 FY08, \$4,500 FY09. Details for reductions?	\$ 25,100
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
Budget reduced by \$30,000 in FY07, \$38,000 in FY08, and \$44,000 in FY09. Attempt to reduce by combining with AFWG project # 199206100.	\$ 30,000
Withdrew \$30,000 from FY09 expense budget. Error in proposal budget.	\$ 30,000
Reduced by \$10,000 in FY08. Correction of error in proposal budget.	\$ 10,000
Moved some funds from FY09 to FY07 and reduced budget. Increased budget \$37,499 in FY07, decreased budget \$93,317 in FY08, decreased budget \$43,317 in FY09. Reductions related to withdrawal of LR temp array.	\$ 99,135
Moved \$30,000 from FY09 to FY07, and \$20,000 from FY09 to FY08.	\$ -
Budget reduced by \$787,843 in FY07, \$872,882 in FY08, \$886,702 in FY09. If, and when, additional funds are available this project's budget will be made whole to include an additional average \$165,225 per year in FY07, FY08 and FY09. The project sponsors would prefer that the total of \$495,675 be made available in either 2009 or 2008 to more easily facilitate easement acquisition. If and when this occurs, the CDAT will work with BPA in contracting to identify specific changes to work elements and associated budgets.	\$ 2,547,427
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -

\$3,819,957

Attachment B - IMP Ranked Additional Recommendations When Funding is Available

IMP Project Rank	Proposal Number	Project Title	Project Sponsor	Subbasin	Species Type	Revised Project Expense Budget - FY07	Revised Project Capital Budget - FY07	Revised Total Expense & Capital FY07	Revised Project Expense Budget - FY08
1	200703800	Preserving/Enhancing Bull Trout and Westslope Cutthroat Trout within the Upper Pend Oreille Basin.	IDFG	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$373,233	\$ -	\$ 373,233	\$356,401
2	200727000	Lake Rufus Woods Subbasin Area Stock Assessment, Habitat Assessment and Fisheries Evaluation Program	CCT	Lake Rufus Woods	Resident	\$ 644,932	\$ -	\$ 644,932	\$ 644,932
3	200704000	Upper Columbia Landowner Incentive Program	WDFW	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$386,227	\$ -	\$ 386,227	\$386,227
4	200204500	Coeur D'Alene Fish Habitat Acq	CDAT	Coeur d'Alene	Resident	\$ 118,210	\$ -	\$ 118,210	\$ 1,021,167
5	200706000	Lake Pend Oreille Invasive Fish	IDFG	Pend Oreille	Resident	\$182,400	\$ -	\$ 182,400	\$190,529
6	200103100	Intermountain Province Resident Fish Conference and E-Library	LRF	Columbia Upper	Resident	\$25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$0
7	200702400	Coeur d'Alene Trout Ponds	CDAT	Coeur d'Alene	Resident	\$201,345	\$ -	\$ 201,345	\$236,007
TOTAL BUDGET						\$1,931,347	\$0	\$1,931,347	\$2,835,263

Attachment B - IMP Ranked Additional Recommendations When Funding is Available

<i>Proposal Number</i>	<i>Revised Project Capital Budget - FY08</i>	<i>Revised Total Expense & Capital FY08</i>	<i>Revised Project Expense Budget - FY09</i>	<i>Revised Project Capital Budget - FY09</i>	<i>Revised Total Expense & Capital FY09</i>
200703800	\$ -	\$ 356,401	\$330,308	\$ -	\$ 330,308
200727000	\$ -	\$ 644,932	\$ 944,932	\$ -	\$ 944,932
200704000	\$ -	\$ 386,227	\$386,227	\$ -	\$ 386,227
200204500	\$ -	\$ 1,021,167	\$ 124,283	\$ -	\$ 124,283
200706000	\$ -	\$ 190,529	\$199,035	\$ -	\$ 199,035
200103100	\$ -	\$ -	\$45,000	\$ -	\$ 45,000
200702400	\$ -	\$ 236,007	\$220,998	\$ -	\$ 220,998
iET	\$0	\$2,835,263	\$2,250,783	\$0	\$2,250,783

<i>Budget Notes/ Other Special Notes</i>	<i>Total Budget Reduction</i>
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
Withdrew improvements. Reduced budget by total \$95,609. Average \$644,932/year	\$ 95,609
Reduced budget by \$64,000 in FY07, 08 and 09.	\$ 192,000
Reduced budget by \$900,000 in FY07 and FY09. Easement acquisitions are now targeted for 2008 only.	\$ 900,000
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
Reduced budget \$45,000 in FY08. Conference will occur every 18 months. Have carryover funding from previous funding cycle - BPA approved to use for conference after proposals submitted.	\$ 45,000
No change to proposed budget.	\$ -
	\$1,232,609

Attachment C

Final IMP FY07-FY09 Project Review Criteria

Important note: Pay attention to scoring instructions for each individual question. In some cases the score for a given question must be multiplied by 2 or 3 in order to weight the score and/or balance scores between aquatic and terrestrial projects.

Step 1: Consistency with Northwest Power Act and the NPCC's 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program

Total possible points = 3

Projects that do not receive a score of 3 in Step 1 do not proceed to Step 2 and Step 3. ¹

1. Is the project consistent with the Fish and Wildlife Program's vision of protecting, mitigating and enhancing the natural ecological functions, habitats, and biological diversity of the Columbia River basin fish and wildlife populations (and/or the Program's resident fish substitution policy)?
[No = 0, Yes = 1]
2. Is project within the authority of BPA to fund (e.g., project addresses the impacts of construction and operation of the Columbia River Federal Hydropower System to affected populations).
[No = 0, Yes = 1]
3. Does another entity have a clear and direct legal obligation to remedy the situation the project is designed to address?
[Yes another entity does have a clear obligation = 0, No another entity does not have a clear obligation = 1]

Step 2: Relationship to subbasin and provincial objectives and strategies (aquatic and terrestrial)

Note: Review aquatic projects based on aquatic criteria, terrestrial projects based on terrestrial criteria. If a project is designed to address both aquatic and terrestrial criteria, score using both the aquatic and terrestrial criteria. We will divide that total score in half when compiling the final scores for the IMP.

Aquatic Projects

Total possible points = 42

1. Will implementation of the project address priority objectives and strategies identified in the relevant IMP subbasin plan(s)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 3 (e.g., score of 3 multiplied by 3 = 9).

¹ Note: In conducting the project review May 22, 23, and 24 the Oversight Committee agreed they would not reach consensus on these initial three criteria and agreed to move forward with review of all projects.

2. Fully mitigate fish losses related to construction and operation of federally-licensed and federally operated hydropower projects. (Provincial Objective 1A)
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 3.
3. Protect and restore in-stream and riparian habitat to maintain functional ecosystems for resident fish, including addressing the chemical, biological, and physical factors influencing aquatic productivity. (Provincial Objective 1B)
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 2.
4. Will implementation of the project protect, enhance, restore, and increase distribution of native resident fish populations and their habitats in the IMP with primary emphasis on sensitive, native salmonid stocks (Provincial Objective 1C1)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3]
5. Will implementation of the project maintain and enhance self-sustaining, wild populations of native game fish and subsistence species to provide for harvestable surplus (Provincial Objective 1C2)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3]
6. Will implementation of the project minimize negative impacts (e.g., competition, predation, introgression) to native species from nonnative species and stocks (Provincial Objective 1C3)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3]
7. Will implementation of the project increase cooperation and coordination among stakeholders throughout the province (Provincial Objective 1C4)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3]
8. Will implementation of the project contribute to restoring resident fish species (subspecies, stocks and populations) to near historical abundance throughout their historical ranges where suitable habitat conditions exist and/or where habitats can be restored (Provincial Objective 1C6)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3]
9. Will implementation of the project provide short- and long-term harvest opportunities that meet management objectives, support subsistence activities and sport-angler harvest (Provincial Objective 2C2)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3]

Terrestrial Projects:

Total possible points = 42

1. Will implementation of the project address priority objectives and strategies identified in relevant IMP subbasin plan(s)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 3 (e.g., score of 3 multiplied by 3 = 9).
2. Will implementation of the project protect, enhance or restore Habitat Units as specified in the construction loss assessments for Chief Joseph, Grand Coulee, and Albeni Falls dams (includes coordinated planning, operations and maintenance, and effectiveness monitoring)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 3
3. Will implementation of the project contribute to completion of quantitative operational loss assessments for Chief Joseph Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and Albeni Falls projects (Provincial Objective 1B)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 2

4. Will implementation of the project contribute to completion of secondary loss assessments for Chief Joseph Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and Albeni Falls projects (Provincial Objective 2A)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 2
5. Will implementation of the project mitigate for wildlife losses that have occurred through secondary effects of hydrosystem development (strategies may include land acquisition, conservation easements, management contracts, and/or partnerships with other landowners) (Provincial Objective 2B)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 2
6. Will implementation of the project address habitat fragmentation (e.g., restore habitat connectivity) (Provincial Objective 2B1)?
[Scale 1-3: No = 1, Yes = 3] Multiply score by 2

Step 3: Technical and management criteria

Total possible points = 35

1. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute to accomplishment of the objectives?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
2. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
3. Is the proposed budget consistent with the identified project objectives and deliverables comparable to similar project budgets?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
4. Are project benefits likely to persist over the long term and not be compromised by other activities in the basin?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
5. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
6. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
7. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]
8. Will the project provide or protect habitat(s) that may benefit both fish and wildlife?
[Scale 1-5: No = 1, Yes = 5]

Step 4: Discussion questions to assist in final prioritization (i.e., tie-breaker questions)

1. What is the relationship of the project to other projects in the subbasin and/or province (e.g., will implementation of the project facilitate the effectiveness of other prioritized projects)?

2. Are there time constraints related to the project that should be taken into account? Is there a compelling reason to sequence the project prior to another project?
3. Is there a substantial existing investment in ongoing projects that would be lost if the project were not funded (ongoing projects)?
4. Consider overall balance of funding distribution:
 - a. Distribution of funds per Council's 70/15/15 = IMP 50% resident fish substitution, 25% mitigate wildlife, 25% mitigate resident fish.
 - b. Allocation of funds based on percent of federal hydropower impacts within subbasin.
 - c. Distribution within province (i.e., \$ allocation by subbasin).
5. Other factors that should be considered:
 - a. Duplicative efforts being proposed by multiple agencies within a subbasin?
 - b. Has an ongoing project changed scope from what the project was initially funded to do?
 - c. Are project proponents meeting the requirements of their existing projects?
 - d. Funding distribution in years 1, 2 and 3 (e.g., is it possible to fund smaller project in some years).