

Final IMP Oversight Committee FY07-FY09 Project Review Process

1. IMP Oversight Committee Members Review and Score all IMP Projects (April 18 through May 12, 2006)

- a. IMP Oversight Committee members review all projects in detail.
- b. IMP Oversight Committee members develop list of any questions they have about specific projects.
- c. All IMP Oversight Committee members should supply their list of questions for project sponsors to Alison by close of business Friday, May 12 (same day that review of projects is due). Alison will forward questions to project sponsors by May 15, 2006. Depending on type and extent of questions, sponsors will be asked to provide written answers or to be present at May 22, 23, and 24 IMP Oversight Committee meeting to answer questions.
- d. Each IMP member entity (i.e., CCT, CDAT, IDFG in cooperation with OSC, KT, KTOI, STOI, USFWS, WDFW, PDCD) will score each project using Step 1, Step 2 and Step 3 review criteria. Result will be one scoring workbook per IMP member entity.
- e. Project sponsors will not score their own project(s) except in cases where there are multiple sponsors.
- f. Submit completed Excel scoring workbooks (one per entity) to Alison by close of business Friday, May 12, 2006. Alison will compile scores in one document for use at the late May IMP Oversight Committee meeting.

2. IMP OC Meeting (May 22, 23 and 24)

Note: As with other Oversight Committee meetings, this three-day May meeting will be open to interested members of the public as well as project sponsors. All meeting attendees will be required to abide by the meeting ground rules.

Round 1 Review:

- a. IMP Oversight Committee members review and discuss Step 1 scores. Reach consensus on which projects do not meet Step 1 criteria. After this point there will be no additional discussion of projects that don't meet Step 1 criteria.

Round 2 Review:

- a. IMP Oversight Committee members review and discuss Step 2 and Step 3 scores for each of the remaining projects.

- b. Consider responses provided by project sponsors to any questions as well as comments and discussion of IMP Oversight Committee members - and rescore projects if appropriate.
- c. IMP Oversight Committee will identify and separate all capital projects (to the best of their ability).
- d. IMP Oversight Committee will then identify the funding cut off point for the expense projects prioritization list (i.e., \$15,248,144).

Round 3 Review:

- a. IMP Oversight Committee will identify the two projects above, and the two projects below the cut off point identified in Round 2 for further review. If there is a large block of tied projects the IMP Oversight Committee will select the whole tied block for the next review step. IMP Oversight Committee will then review each of these projects based on Step 4 criteria.
- b. IMP Oversight Committee members “vote” for preferred priority (i.e., 1 to 5) based on discussion of Step 4 criteria.
- c. Repeat process with tied projects until tie is broken.
- d. Finalize agreed prioritized sequence of Tier 1 (immediate funding) and Tier 2 (secondary funding) projects.

3. IMP OC Meeting (early June – 1 day meeting, date to be determined)

- a. Review and discuss ISRP review of IMP projects.
- b. Decide if any changes to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 prioritization, based on ISRP review, are appropriate. Identify any projects the IMP Oversight Committee wishes to recommend for the fix-it loop.
- c. Finalize agreed prioritized sequence of Tier 1 projects (and list of Tier 2 projects) for submission to NPCC.
- d. Provide NPCC with IMP Oversight Committee Tier 1 and Tier 2 FY07-FY09 funding recommendations on or before June 16, 2006.

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. 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).
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).