

5. Subbasin plans

5(a) Elements of a subbasin plan, including assessments

Source: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Recommendation No. 26

Recommendation: Oregon recommended that biological objectives and strategies for subbasins should be developed as part of a regional subbasin planning process and then adopted as part of the program. Subbasin plans should be consistent with the visions and objectives at province and basin levels. Actions to implement the program should principally be planned and evaluated at the subbasin level. Subbasin plans should provide the ultimate direction for fish and wildlife and water quality management activities funded by Bonneville and provide the context in which the Independent Scientific Review Panel will review fish and wildlife proposals for funding. Subbasin plans should also include strategies and actions funded by others. Each subbasin plan should not only serve the purposes of the Council under the Northwest Power Act, but should also serve the purposes of fish and wildlife, water, and land managers under the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and other laws governing natural resource management.

Each subbasin plan should include the following components:

- *Subbasin assessment*, providing a description of historical and existing conditions, an assessment of limiting factors and the biological potential of the subbasin and an identification of protection and restoration opportunities. The assessment also should include an inventory of existing and past projects and clearly and comprehensively describe what is being done and what has been accomplished in the subbasin.
- *Strategic plan*, with a 10- to 15-year time horizon, describing the vision and biological objectives for the subbasin and the strategies to be taken to achieve the biological objectives. The strategic plan should include a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan.
- *Implementation plan*, with a three-year time horizon, details the specific actions and measures to implement the strategies in the subbasin plan. The implementation plan should be a “living” document, that is, updated as projects sunset and new ones begin. It should be separate from the subbasin plan and should not be adopted into the program.

To assure that subbasin plans address the broadest set of needs, the region should develop and use a standard template for subbasin assessments and plans. Subbasin plans for a province should be developed in concert with each other, and should be evaluated to determine what, if any, impacts each has on the others.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with this recommendation for the function and structure of subbasin plans and their relationship to each other and to the province and basin elements of the program. The comprehensive revision of the program will include a “subbasin planning process” using the procedures provided in the Act for program amendments. The program calls for the subbasin plans to integrate Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act requirements as fully as possible. Section V; *see also* Sections II.B and C, VI.A.3, VIII.4.

The Council adopted the subbasin assessment template developed by a Subbasin Assessment Science Team as part of the Technical Appendix to the revised program. *See* Section V.A.3, Technical Appendix C. That template will be the foundation for subbasin assessments conducted for the program’s subbasin planning process in conjunction with the region’s state, federal, and tribal fish and wildlife managers and other interested parties. The Council also outlined the elements of the plan itself, *see*

Section V.A.1, A.2, A.4, A.5, but did not adopt at this time a subbasin plan template that describes with more specificity the content required for subbasin plans. The Council concluded that a subbasin planning template may in fact be desirable, but that it would be more productive and effective to work with interested parties in the region to further develop and finalize the draft template outside of this phase of the program amendment rather than adopt an incomplete product that has not been sufficiently considered by the majority of entities interested in subbasin planning throughout the region.

Source: National Marine Fisheries Service
Recommendation No. 54

Recommendation: The Fisheries Service recommended:

- The program at the subbasin scale should consist of two separate tasks and be done by two separate teams. Subbasin assessment should be a separate task from subbasin planning.
- Subbasin and watershed assessments and plans should build on and add to those that are already complete. A template should be used for all subbasin assessments and subbasin plans, and the Council should work with the states and tribes on templates for finer-scaled watershed assessments and plans. Consistent approaches to technical assessments and plans are necessary to feed a basin level system of monitoring, evaluation and reporting. Not all subbasin assessments and plans should look the same; NMFS expects plans to vary in substance across the subbasins. Templates will help to organize information and report on results in a manner that can be aggregated across the provinces and subbasins.
- Adopt the subbasin assessment template developed by the Subbasin Assessment Science Team. Fund and complete the analyses recommended in the template for at least all 33 of the anadromous fish subbasins. The template's value is that it will enable consistent and repeatable assessments across land ownerships and programs. This consistency will in turn enable program managers and stakeholders to collectively assess present fish and wildlife capability, coordinate priority actions, and measure progress at the basin, ESU, province and subbasin levels. The template should be viewed as a sound approach that should be implemented immediately with the understanding that new knowledge will call for iterative refinements in the future.
- In addition to the elements suggested in the Strawman, subbasin plans should identify priority watersheds for assessments, protection, restoration and priority strategies. These elements should be added to the template for subbasin plans when it is developed. Including elements that require subbasin plans to address priorities is important to ensure that resources are targeted for the greatest benefit.
- Subbasin plans should explicitly address how they respond to the findings of subbasin assessments and how proposed priorities and measures address the risks and opportunities identified in subbasin assessments. NMFS understands that the subbasin assessment is just one component that will influence decision-making in subbasin planning. However, it represents the synthesis of relevant science, and subbasin planners should be accountable for clearly describing how they applied the science to their decisions.
- Subbasin plans should not only inventory projects and accomplishments within the program, but also those within other programs in the subbasin. In order to take actions that are collectively valuable and synergistic, the accomplishments and plans of other programs must be taken into account.
- Subbasin plans should explain how proposed program priorities and measures are explicitly integrated with and complementary to other federal, state and local programs in the subbasin.
- Subbasin plans should provide clear context, expectations and guidance for watershed plans at smaller scales. The program's subbasins are typically 4th field HUCs (hydrologic unit codes).

Many state and local watershed efforts have been organized at smaller 6th field HUCs. It is essential that approaches at these different scales be integrated or “nested.” It is also essential that subbasin assessment and planning build on and enhance existing watershed level assessment and planning efforts.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with these recommendations for the function and structure of subbasin plans. The program provides that subbasin assessments and plans shall be separate analytical and planning tasks, and that both assessments and plans should start from existing information and plans. The program also provides that the plans shall be responsive to the assessments, seek to integrate Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act requirements as fully as possible, and address the range of all fish and wildlife activities in each subbasin. Section V.A.2-5.

The Council adopted the subbasin assessment template developed by the Subbasin Assessment Science Team as part of the Technical Appendix to the program, and that template will be the foundation for subbasin assessments that will be completed or facilitated by the Council in conjunction with the region’s state, federal, and tribal fish and wildlife managers and other interested parties. Consistent with the recommendation that different people be responsible for assessments and planning, the program recognizes that subbasin assessment is a technical exercise, requiring expertise different from that required for making decisions on management activities based on the assessments. Section V.A.3, Technical Appendix C.

The Council also outlined the elements of a subbasin plan itself, *see* Section V.A.1, A.2, A.4, A.5, but did not adopt at this time a subbasin plan template that describes with more specificity the content required for subbasin plans. The Council concluded that a subbasin planning template may in fact be desirable, but that it would be more productive and effective to work with interested parties in the region to further develop and finalize the draft template outside of this phase of the program amendment rather than adopt an incomplete product that has not been sufficiently considered by the majority of entities interested in subbasin planning throughout the region.

Source: Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Recommendation No. 31

Recommendation: Montana recommended that subbasin plans contain a subbasin assessment; a fish and wildlife strategic plan; and a three- to five-year implementation plan. The main purpose should be to document activities necessary to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife resources in the basin, substantiate budgets and measure progress for accountability. Once the plans are adopted, on-the-ground work should proceed with greater efficiency due to a reduction in annual process. Subbasin plans should provide fish and wildlife information for a variety of related planning processes. Examples include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s and National Marine Fisheries Service’s (NMFS) Endangered Species Act (ESA) recovery planning, land management and water quality planning and long-range Bonneville budget planning, in addition to the Council’s project selection efforts.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions for the function and structure of subbasin plans consistent with the recommendation, including the coordination and integration with other recovery planning and land and water management actions. Section V.

Source: Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Recommendation No. 36

Recommendation: Idaho recommended that subbasin plans have the three major sections also recommended above: a scientific assessment, a long-term strategic plan, and a three-year implementation plan.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with the recommendation. Section V.

Source: Colville Confederated Tribes
Recommendation No. 33

Recommendation: Subbasin planning efforts should describe the activities necessary to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife resources in the basin in coordination with Endangered Species Act recovery planning, land management and water quality planning and long-range Bonneville budget planning. Subbasin plans should, at a minimum, have four inter-related sections: subbasin assessment, a fish and wildlife strategic plan, a three-year implementation plan, and monitoring and evaluation provisions.

The subbasin assessment section should identify populations targeted for management and provide information on the current condition or status of the fish and wildlife resources and their habitat. This section will also detail the factors or conditions that limit or reduce the target fish and wildlife populations, based on the best science that is available. The fish and wildlife strategic plan should define the management intentions of the tribes and agencies for the identified target populations under their jurisdiction. The strategic plan should include the managers' goals, management objectives, biological objectives for fish and wildlife populations, the location and quality of the habitat needed in the subbasin, and recommendations for methods, approaches, or strategies to achieve the objectives. The three-year implementation plan should detail specific actions or measures that the subbasin team recommends be carried out over the next three years and may also include descriptions of what has been accomplished for fish and wildlife. The implementation plan should evolve over time as monitoring and evaluation provide information to update and or improve the subbasin plans.

The monitoring and evaluation plan should detail evaluation criteria for performance measures, performance standards, standardized methods, reporting criteria to assess the relative effectiveness of actions implemented in the subbasin towards biological and management objectives and goals. Analysis of monitoring and evaluation data will improve our understanding of the resource response to implementation actions and will be critical to improving a strategies and implementation plans over time.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with the recommendation for the structure and function of subbasin plans. Section V. The subbasin management plan is to include goals, objectives and strategies developed by the interested parties in the subbasin, including objectives and strategies that are consistent with the activities, objectives and legal rights of the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes in that subbasin. Section V.A.5.

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Source: | Spokane Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 28 |
| Source: | Burns-Paiute Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 34 |
| Source: | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes |
| Recommendation No. | 38 |
| Source: | Coeur d'Alene Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 42 |
| Source: | Kalispel Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 48 |
| Source: | Kootenai Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 50 |

Recommendation: The recommendations from these tribes overlap with the subbasin plan recommendations summarized above:

The central focus of the program should be subbasin plans, describing what they are, how they are to be created and amended into the program, and how they will affect fish and wildlife actions in the Columbia River basin. Subbasin planning is an on-going cyclic effort. First, assessment activities address the question, “Where are we now?” or “What is the status of the resources?” Next the managers must address the question, “Where do we want to be?” by setting objectives and defining strategies. Third, the managers develop an action implementation plan to address “How will we get there?” Finally, monitoring and evaluation must be done to address the question, “How will we know when we get there?” The results of monitoring and evaluation will improve our understanding of the resource status allowing update of the assessment.

Subbasin plans should have at least three interrelated sections: subbasin assessment; fish and wildlife strategic plan; and a three-year implementation plan:

The subbasin assessment section should provide information on the current condition or status of the fish and wildlife resources and their habitat and assess risks and opportunities for restoration. Although the principal intent is to describe the activities necessary to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife resources in the basin under the program and the Power Act, the subbasin plans should also provide fish and wildlife information for a variety of related planning processes, such as ESA recovery planning, land management and water quality planning, and long-range Bonneville budget planning.

The fish and wildlife strategic plan should identify populations targeted for management and define the management intentions of the tribes and agencies for the identified focal populations under their jurisdiction. The strategic plan will include the managers’ objectives for fish and wildlife populations, the location and quality of the habitat needed in the subbasin, and recommendations for methods, approaches, or strategies to achieve the objectives.

The three-year implementation plan should detail specific actions or measures that the subbasin team recommends be carried out over the next three years. The implementation plan also will include monitoring and evaluation activities that should be undertaken, thus providing the information needed to update or improve the subbasin plans during their subsequent revisions.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with these recommendations regarding the function and structure of subbasin plans. Sections II.B, II.C, V. While all geographic levels of the program are important, the program recognizes that the subbasin level is where implementation strategies are principally planned and implementation occurs. The program explains the function and structure of

subbasin plans and how they are intended to affect fish and wildlife management in the Columbia basin in a manner consistent with the recommendation. And, the program describes how subbasin plans will be created, the schedule and process for adopting them into the program, and the fact that the plans are meant to be dynamic, that is, the Council anticipates refinement of subbasin plans over time as more is learned through careful monitoring and evaluation. Sections V.A.6, VIII.4.

The recommendations from these tribes focused on the roles of fish and wildlife managers in the subbasin planning process. Consistent with these recommendations, the subbasin management plan is to include goals, objectives and strategies that are consistent with the activities, objectives and legal rights and obligations of the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes in that subbasin. Section V.A.5, A.6. The special considerations owed to fish and wildlife management entities are derived from the Power Act provisions, which the Council will follow to adopt subbasin plans into the program. The Council did not interpret the recommendation to suggest that fish and wildlife managers should have sole responsibility for developing the subbasin plans. Subbasin plans will depend for their success in significant part on the support of all the people whose land and water activities will be affected in that subbasin, and that encompasses a group much larger than just the fish and wildlife managers. Thus, the Council called for a subbasin planning process that is open to land and water managers, local governments, landowners, watershed councils and others with an interest or expertise in the subbasin, as well as fish and wildlife managers.

Source: Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
Recommendation No. 40

Recommendation: The Commission's recommendation began with the subbasin planning provisions proposed in the Council's Strawman, which were substantively similar to, if more general than, the recommendations subsequently received from various fish and wildlife agencies and tribes summarized above. The Commission then added that substantial justification is needed to convince the region that subbasin planning is a worthwhile effort. The Commission supported subbasin planning only if truly critical to evaluation of project proposals and to producing a uniform approach to fish and wildlife restoration across the entire Columbia River basin. The purpose of subbasin planning is to have future management and funding decisions be based on solid scientific assessment of ecosystems, an analysis of risk and benefits of different restoration options, and concerted planning efforts among agencies that take into account current governmental regulations.

More detail is needed than proposed in the Strawman on what a subbasin assessment will entail. At a minimum the program should reference a different document that explains the requirements of a subbasin assessment, or explain that any well-established assessment protocol can be followed, or provide that the Council will make a decision on this in the future.

Finding: The Council understood the recommendation to support what the Council adopted for the function and structure of subbasin plan. To provide guidance on the components of a subbasin assessment, as recommended, the Council adopted as part of its Technical Appendix a subbasin assessment template developed by an ad hoc Subbasin Assessment Science Team, which included participation by Commission staff.

Source: Bonneville Power Administration
Recommendation No. 37

Recommendation: Bonneville recommended:

- The assessment component of the plan should not dwell too much or take too much time to document the historical habitat conditions.
- The management plans should be 100-year plans with a 5-year action plan.

Finding: The Council adopted as part of its Technical Appendix a subbasin assessment template that does call for, among many other things, an assessment of historical habitat conditions to serve as a foundation for evaluation both the changes that have occurred in habitat conditions and the potential of the area for habitat. Section V.A.3, Technical Appendix C. This template was developed and agreed upon by a group of federal, state, and tribal scientists and others. The Council is confident that this group of experts struck an appropriate balance among the assessment components.

The Council called for subbasin plans to have a “management plan component” that contains a 10-15 year plan as well as a three-year action plan and budget. The Council is not calling for these plans to include objectives and strategies with a 100-year focus, but the plans should contain a long-term vision of at least many decades that is framed in the context of the long-term vision and near-, medium- and long-term (100 year) biological objectives for the program as a whole. *See* Sections III.A.1, III.C.2. The Council anticipates that subbasin plans, including their assessment component and management plan component will be refined, updated, and changed over time as they are implemented in response to new information gathered through the monitoring and evaluation activities. Further, if the activities being undertaken on behalf of fish and wildlife modify the environment or fish and wildlife populations in beneficial or detrimental ways, management plans will need to be modified to take into account these changes. The Council finds that a management plan with a shorter planning term will be more effective in assimilating this new information, and many other recommendations agree. However, the program does require the development of a “vision” at each level -- basin, province, and subbasin -- and these visions are to be “end state” descriptions of a desired condition or suite of attributes for the planning unit at some point in the relatively distant future. To the extent that the recommendation calling for a 100-year planning horizon is intended to give a long-term perspective and anchor to the management actions selected over time, the provisions adopted by the Council requiring an end-state vision for the basin, each province and each subbasin plan are consistent with the second element of this recommendation.

Source: U.S. Geological Survey and Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Recommendation No. 22

Recommendation: The Survey and the Colville Tribes recommended that the fish and wildlife program include water quality considerations in its overall assessment and management goals at the subbasin level. This does not mean that all subbasins need to have a detailed water quality assessment. There are three ways in which water quality needs to be integrated into the program:

- Preliminary assessments of subbasins should include a review of existing water quality information with a preliminary ranking of parameters that may be limiting to the protection and/or restoration of aquatic life.
- In some basins it may be necessary for the program to fund projects that fill in some of the known gaps in water quality.

- If water quality conditions appear to be a problem within a basin, then the program should fund proposals that assess the influence of these conditions on fish health and survival.

For all three of the types of assessments above, it is important that all proposals integrate the influence of flow management practices on water quality.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with the recommendation. First, the program requires subbasin plans to include a subbasin assessment. The Council adopted as part of its Technical Appendix a subbasin assessment template developed by regional scientists that specifically includes a review of water quality information and data, as well as an analysis of key habitat parameters and a synthesis and interpretation that will relate attributes of the environment to the biological performance of species of interest and allow for comparisons among those attributes. Section V.A.3, Technical Appendix C. Where water quality issues and knowledge gaps that are relevant to fish and wildlife are apparent from the assessments, the subbasin management plans will need to address those issues.

Source: Washington Department of Ecology
Recommendation No. 6

Recommendation: The Department of Ecology recommended that the program require an assessment of ecosystem conditions by evaluating the changes to natural processes, since these result in the habitat characteristics currently present and define the potential for any restoration efforts.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with this recommendation. The vision, scientific principles, biological objectives and habitat strategies for the program as a whole, as well as the subbasin assessment template adopted as part of the Technical Appendix, strongly emphasize evaluating changes in natural processes as critical to understanding biological performance. See Sections III.A.1, A.2, B.2, C.2.b and Appendix D, D.3, V.A.3, Technical Appendix E.

Source: Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County
Recommendation No. 4

Recommendation: The Chelan PUD recommended that a requirement of a relatively fixed template or structure for subbasin plans does not facilitate negotiated plans. There should be a preference for supporting solutions negotiated by the parties affected by the plans. In order to achieve a negotiated package, those involved in the negotiations have to be creative in the manner in which they find common understandings. The fact that a negotiated solution does not create an entire subbasin plan, or is different from the vision for the basin, province, or subbasin, should not be a reason to reject a plan that otherwise has a strong level of support. The subbasin planning objectives may be too rigid, or the Council should be prepared to grant liberal exceptions for negotiated subbasin plans.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with at least one basic premise of this recommendation. The Council did not adopt a rigid subbasin planning template or structure for subbasin plans. The program generally describes the elements of the management plan portion of the subbasin plan, but it does not prescribe a fixed structure or substantive content for the plans. Moreover, the Council recognized that subbasin plans need a substantial amount of local support for successful implementation, and so the program emphasizes the need for significant local participation in the development process. The Council also recognized that precisely how to bring about this local

participation and support could be different in each subbasin, and so the Council will work with state, tribal, federal, and local parties to determine which approach is most likely to succeed in any particular subbasin and then help support that approach. Section V.A.2, A.6.

The Council did not accept that part of the recommendation that suggested, in the abstract, that the Council should accept into the program any subbasin plan created through a negotiated settlement among affected parties. First, the Power Act provides certain substantive and procedural requirements for subbasin plans to be adopted into the program. *See* Section V. The Council does not have the discretion to encourage the development of or to adopt plans into the program that do not meet the legal standards of Section 4(h) of the Power Act, even if negotiated between the parties affected.

In addition, the Council adopted at this time a vision and objectives and strategies for the basin as whole. The Council intends these to be sufficiently general to allow a great deal of flexibility at the local level in developing plans consistent with this program framework. That is not the same as saying that the Council will adopt any subbasin plan negotiated by the affected parties even if clearly inconsistent with the basinwide elements. The concept and effectiveness of the program framework relies upon plans at smaller spatial scales being consistent with the general vision, objectives and strategies adopted for the program as a whole. This is the approach that ensures that the varied and distinct efforts throughout the Columbia basin are coordinated and aggregate together to form a logical plan to protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife. The Council finds that requiring this sort of coordination and consistency throughout the program will be more effective in achieving the purposes of the Act. Further, the Act requires the Council to treat the Columbia River and its tributaries as a system. The recommendation to permit plans and proposals to be adopted without being coordinated with other objectives or standards established within the basin, province, or subbasin would not effectively provide this systematic planning.

5(b) Procedure for developing subbasin plans/participation

Source: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Recommendation No. 26

Recommendation: Oregon recommended that the Council adopt a three year schedule for completion of subbasin plans, including public review requirements. After this three year period, the plans will be submitted to the Council for adoption into the program. In the interim, existing management plans and the best subbasin information available should be used in implementing the fish and wildlife program. Although subbasin plans should be completed expeditiously, a one-year time frame is inadequate to complete the plans. The enormous breadth (53 subbasins) and scope (comprehensive subbasin and watershed assessments and plans for anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife) and coordination requirements (all of regional entities including the public and local stakeholders) of this planning effort simply cannot be completed in one year. Additional time will be needed to coordinate the Council's planning effort with planning efforts in Oregon, including natural production planning under HB 3609, water quality planning under Section 303(d) and SB 1010, and planning under the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds.

The Council should enlist the full participation of Columbia basin fish and wildlife managers in the development of subbasin plans; the Power Act directs the Council to give special consideration to the recommendations of tribal, state, and federal fish and wildlife managers when considering matters related to fish and wildlife in the Columbia Basin. The Council should also encourage and enable the participation in subbasin planning of water and land managers; they are needed if subbasin plans will not only serve the purposes of the Council under the Power Act, but also the purposes of fish and wildlife, water, and land managers under the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and other laws governing natural resource management.

The Council should recognize the major on-going efforts of state and local agencies in developing watershed assessments and plans. As such, subbasin planning teams should include state and local agencies, watershed councils, and others interested in participating in the process. To the fullest extent practicable and consistent with the Power Act, subbasin plans should build upon assessments and information already prepared by others as part of their on-going planning efforts.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions based on this recommendation. Sections V, VIII.4.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Source: | Spokane Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 28 |
| Source: | Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks |
| Recommendation No. | 31 |
| Source: | Colville Confederated Tribes |
| Recommendation No. | 33 |
| Source: | Burns-Paiute Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 34 |
| Source: | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes |
| Recommendation No. | 38 |
| Source: | Coeur d'Alene Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 42 |
| Source: | Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| Recommendation No. | 43 |
| Source: | Kalispel Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 48 |
| Source: | Kootenai Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 50 |

Recommendation: These fish and wildlife agencies and tribes all recommended some version of the following:

Decisionmaking regarding Bonneville fish and wildlife funding based on subbasin plans should take place in three linked stages. First, locally-based teams should develop draft subbasin plans. Next, the Council should review these plans in a rulemaking proceeding that amends the plans into the program. Finally, Bonneville should use the amended subbasin plans as the basis for funding fish and wildlife activities.

The first stage, subbasin planning, should start with the convening of subbasin teams in each subbasin. The subbasin teams will be responsible for compiling the subbasin plans and ensuring that they receive public review. The membership of the teams (federal, state and tribal fish and wildlife managers; federal, state, and tribal land managers; federal, state and tribal water quality managers; private land and water owners; watershed councils; CBFWA staff, Council staff, conservationists, local officials) and the members' roles were outlined in a table that is part of the recommendation. The fish and wildlife agencies and tribes have legal authority to manage fish and wildlife resources based on treaty and statute. To the extent that the fish and wildlife managers have jurisdiction over land and water (e.g., wildlife refuges and tribal lands), they will serve as land and water managers as well. However, most public and private lands are managed by others, under separate authorities.

The subbasin teams will then develop the draft assessment, strategic plan and implementation plan. Two types of decisions are part of the process. The fish and wildlife managers must identify objectives and strategies for focal (or target) populations and their habitats. Second, the subbasin team must recommend actions, following the identified strategies, to meet the objectives in the fish and wildlife strategic plan.

The key set of decisions to be made in subbasin planning involve the fish and wildlife managers, in choosing production and harvest objectives and actions, and the land and water managers, recommending habitat actions in coordination with the fish and wildlife managers. The actions chosen will have to contribute to achieving the population or habitat objectives. The actions must also be consistent with the statutory standards, scientific principles and policies governing the subbasin program

amendment process. The choice of actions may be influenced by management considerations, such as management priority, appropriate sequence, or coordination with other activities.

Fish and wildlife managers will have the ultimate responsibility for development of the fish and wildlife management objectives for the subbasin plans and will be responsible for coordinating the development of these objectives during the Council's public process. Land managers, watershed councils, private land owners and any other interested parties will also have an opportunity to comment on the strategies and actions, within the side boards set by science.

The Council should establish a team of scientists familiar with fish and wildlife restoration and enhancement to be available to assist subbasin teams as needed. This science team may assist the subbasin teams to address questions regarding best available scientific information, the nature of limiting factors, and the assessment of risks and benefits of different strategies. Members of the science team could be involved with the subbasin teams as they develop the draft subbasin plans.

When the drafts have been assembled, the Council, fish and wildlife managers and CBFWA staff will take the lead in getting the draft plans reviewed by the public. Interested stakeholders must be involved at each step of the subbasin planning process. Although the fish and wildlife managers will have the ultimate responsibility for development of the fish and wildlife management objectives, they will be responsible for coordinating the development of these objectives in a public process. It is expected that land managers, watershed councils, private landowners and any other interested parties will also have an opportunity to participate in the development of strategies and actions. The subbasin team can incorporate any needed changes resulting from reviewer comments.

Finally, the core members of the subbasin team will try to reach agreement among themselves and with other stakeholders in the subbasin prior to when the draft subbasin plan is forwarded to CBFWA for dissemination and review. Following CBFWA review, the subbasin plans will then be sent to the Council with a request that the plan be amended into the program. If the subbasin team members have opinions not reflected in the draft plan, those opinions should be appended to the draft plan.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions into the program consistent with the substance of this recommendation, if more general. There are differences between the recommendations and the provisions adopted in Sections V regarding subbasin plan development, but the Council finds that the differences are more a matter of emphasis than fundamental substantive conflict, and that these differences do not represent a material departure from the substance of the recommendations, as follows:

The Council called for the development of locally-based subbasin plans, their recommendation to the Council for review and adoption into the program, and for Bonneville's annual fish and wildlife funding decisions then to be based upon subbasin plans. Sections V, VI.A.3, VIII.4.

Consistent with the recommendation, the Council also called for the subbasin plans to be developed through the broad participation of affected people in the subbasins, in "an open public process that provides ample opportunity for participation by a wide range of state, federal, tribal, and local managers, experts, landowners, local governments, and stakeholders." These recommendations focused heavily on the central role that the fish and wildlife managers should play in the subbasin planning process. Consistent with these recommendations, the subbasin management plan must include goals, objectives and strategies that are consistent with the activities, objectives and legal rights and obligations of the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes in that subbasin. Section V.A.5, A.6. The special considerations owed to fish and wildlife management entities are derived from the Power Act provisions, which the Council must follow to adopt subbasin plans into the program. Thus the fish and wildlife

managers will have to play an important role in the development of the subbasin plans, and the substance of the plans that result will need to reflect their particular contributions.

On the other hand, the Council did not adopt provisions specifically designating the fish and wildlife managers or anyone else to be the “lead entities” or exclusive decisionmakers for specific elements of the subbasin plans, based on authorities or jurisdiction or any other factor. There are at least two reasons for this. First, based on many consultations and comments it received during the amendment process, the Council concluded that the development of subbasin plans must be open and inclusive and largely locally driven if the plans are to be successfully implemented. In other words, subbasin plans will depend for their success in significant part on the support of people whose land and water activities will be affected in that subbasin, which is a group far larger than just the fish and wildlife managers. The Council finds that for the Council to designate certain entities at this stage as “in the lead” for specific elements of the plans could frustrate the goal of full and meaningful participation by all of those interested in plan development. That is why the Council recognized the special considerations due to the recommendations of the fish and wildlife managers under the Act in terms of the substantive content that the plans must ultimately reflect, rather than through assigning the managers the lead status in developing the plans. The Council believes that this is the more appropriate and effective level of emphasis to place on the role of fish and wildlife managers at this point. Second, in the case of the states, it is not clear that the state fish and wildlife agencies will in fact be the “lead” or primary entity that will coordinate subbasin plan development on behalf of the states. On the whole, the Council finds that it is likely to be more effective to gather the interested parties for subbasin planning, and let roles and responsibilities evolve within the process rather than prescribe them, while providing notice that subbasin plan content and development procedures must satisfy the Power Act’s standards in order for the Council to be able to adopt the plans into the program.

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Source: | Spokane Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 28 |
| Source: | Colville Confederated Tribes |
| Recommendation No. | 33 |
| Source: | Burns-Paiute Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 34 |
| Source: | Shoshone-Bannock Tribes |
| Recommendation No. | 38 |
| Source: | Coeur d’Alene Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 42 |
| Source: | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Recommendation No. | 46 |
| Source: | Kalispel Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 48 |
| Source: | Kootenai Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 50 |

Recommendation: These tribes and the Fish and Wildlife Service provided various versions of the following:

The Council should issue a second request for Phase II amendment recommendations as soon as possible, but no later than the adoption of these Phase I amendments. The Phase II amendments would include specific measures or actions to be carried out in the Columbia River basin and its tributary subbasins. The amendments should include specific systemwide measures and measures applicable to the configuration or operation of the federal hydropower system. The Phase II recommendations could be for

a single action or measure in a subbasin or for a partially-completed “subbasin plan.” More time will be needed to complete the scientific studies and stakeholder involvement required in a subbasin plan. Make the Phase II amendment recommendations due on or before April 1, 2001; complete the Phase II amendment process by July 31, 2001. Upon adoption of the Phase II amendments, the managers recommend that the Council review the ISRP provincial review schedule and request that Bonneville solicit projects to start new initiatives.

Finding: Consistent with these recommendations, the Council adopted provisions calling for subsequent phases of the program revision process, in which specific objectives and measures for the program will be adopted in integrated subbasin plans and in a coordinated plan for the mainstem hydropower system. *See* Section VIII.

The Council did not adopt the specific timelines recommended for these amendment processes, calling instead for the development of the mainstem plan in 2001 and the subbasin plan over a three-year period following the first phase. Comments received on the draft program, including in informal consultations and comments from these entities, called for a somewhat more deliberate process to complete the revision of the program, including more time to develop subbasin assessments prior to developing subbasin plans. Also, in addition to its program amendment responsibilities, the Council is administering project review and funding recommendations in the rolling provincial review process and conducting day-to-day business on several other initiatives, and it needed to establish a schedule that both the Council and others could manage. At the same time, the Council has committed to an approach to subbasin planning that should allow an early opportunity for consideration of subbasin plan recommendations in those areas that are ready. *See* Section VIII.4.

Source: Spokane Tribe
Recommendation No. 28

Recommendation: The Spokane Tribe recommended that subbasin planning be broadly inclusive of all governmental and non-governmental entities who have legitimate interests in the planning process. However, decisionmaking must be retained in the state, federal and tribal governments through their fish, wildlife, water, and land managers.

The Council should postpone all plans to initiate amendments to adopt subbasin plans until after the current phase 1 amendments have been adopted through a completed rulemaking process. The program should also include language providing that all measures in the existing (1994-95) fish and wildlife program continue to be funded for implementation until explicitly modified or replaced through a subbasin planning process in which all the fish and wildlife managers, including the tribes as sovereign tribal governments, have participated.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with this recommendation, as explained in response to recommendations above. Section V, VIII.4. The subbasin planning provisions adopted did not define rigid roles among subbasin planning participants. That is, regardless of what entity may have final “decisionmaking” authority in a particular case, the Council recognizes the need for broad agreement among managers and others if subbasin plans are to be effectively implemented. For example, it will mean little for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation, or enhancement if an agency with decisionmaking authority over fish and wildlife insists on unilaterally deciding on the objectives and strategies for fish or wildlife if that entity does not also have the funding, resources or authority to require on-the-ground actions affecting private lands and water rights to achieve the objective. In a habitat-based approach, decisionmaking authority as to what should be the fish and wildlife objectives is not often

combined with decisionmaking authority as to whether or not actions that meet the objectives can actually happen on the ground. For that reason, the Council did not emphasize or seek to specifically define the roles or jurisdictions of those who will assist in subbasin planning, while recognizing that there are certain standards in the Power Act, including those that give special considerations to the recommendations and activities of the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes, that must be reflected in a subbasin plan if the Council is going to be able to adopt the plan into the program.

Specific objectives and measures in the existing 1994-95 program continue in effect until superseded in the completion of the program amendment process. Section IX.

Source: Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Recommendation No. 42

Recommendation: The Coeur d'Alene Tribe recommended that subbasin planning be broadly inclusive of all governmental and non-governmental entities that have legitimate interests in the planning process. Decisionmaking, however, must be retained in the state, federal and tribal governments through their fish, wildlife, water and land managers. The tribe supported having fish and wildlife managers coordinate fish and wildlife needs with other resource managers and stakeholders. However, it is clear that the ultimate responsibility for these resources lies solely within the appropriate government agencies.

Finding: See the finding immediately above.

Source: Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Recommendation No. 31

Recommendation: Montana recommended that funding be provided to staff subbasin planning adequately to meet the ambitious schedule without affecting ongoing program measures and staff. Care should be taken to minimize impacts to on-the-ground actions. Montana anticipated that its portion of plan preparation and the public scoping and involvement process will cost roughly \$200,000, based on past experience with the state's mitigation planning effort. This expense cannot be borne by existing projects without sacrificing existing mitigation actions. Additional funding should be provided through the program.

Scientists familiar with fish and wildlife restoration should be consulted, as needed, during the subbasin planning process. Experts from various disciplines will be useful to assist the subbasin teams in addressing uncertainties (e.g. questions regarding best available scientific information, the nature of limiting factors, and the assessment of risks and benefits of different strategies). Do not convene a formal science team for this purpose; another team would be redundant.

Finding: The Council agrees that additional funding from Bonneville will need to supplement the current resources available for the development of subbasin plans. Specific funding recommendations are made by the Council pursuant to section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Act, rather than as a matter of program amendments. As recommended, the Council intends at this time to use existing scientific panels and advisory groups to help in subbasin planning and review subbasin plans, rather than create new or additional review groups.

Source:

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Recommendation No.

40

Recommendation: The Commission noted that the Council's discussion of subbasin planning in the Strawman lacked sufficient detail and effort necessary to guide the region into a future planning effort, giving too vague guidance as to how these plans will be developed, who will develop them, and what form they will follow. The Commission supported the coordinated effort through Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority to develop a subbasin planning template. However, the template being developed is a work in progress, and the Commission cannot accept an incomplete work product. Subbasin planning is an important function to ensure an appropriate use of Bonneville Power Administration funds. However, the Council must develop a new fish and wildlife program that is more action oriented to meet quantitative objectives and should not retreat to an elaborate planning process that delays actions or is otherwise counter-productive.

The Commission then recommended that the Council and Bonneville provide funding for subbasin planning efforts for each subbasin of the Columbia basin within each respective state, and that the Council ensure that in the subbasin planning effort:

- One agency or tribe should be designated as a lead coordinating body for the subbasin planning process.
- The lead agency or tribe should be responsible for making available to any cooperator all data, analysis, and summaries developed by them and cooperators in planning.
- Data collection, analysis, summary, and planning process should rely on the subbasin template as the minimum guidance for data needs
- Creation of the plan should be done with full participation and input from interested cooperators and the public.
- As part of the development process, compile all existing plans, programs, policies, laws and other appropriate authorities that relate to comprehensive watershed management in each watershed.
- Identify gaps and conflicts in the existing plans, programs, policies, laws and other appropriate authorities that hinder comprehensive watershed management in the watershed.
- Set out a path and procedures for filling gaps and addressing conflicts.
- Identify key factors limiting salmon and steelhead productivity.
- Identify priority on-the-ground actions to address key limiting factors.
- Identify all parties with an interest in the subbasin plan being created after other cooperators have compiled available data and conducted the technical watershed analysis. Set up procedures to ensure that all these parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the development and implementation of the subbasin plan on the basis of the best available data. Determine whether other useful sources of data are available from the public. Convene a watershed conference that includes all parties with an interest in the subbasin plan development.
- Compile a list of all human and fiscal resources that are potentially available for protection and improvement of habitat. Include on the list all potential federal, state, local government, and other public sources as well as private sources such as local businesses that rely on natural resources in those watersheds. Coordinate this activity on a regional and state level, as appropriate.
- Provide for the involvement of volunteers and educational institutions in the implementation of projects.

The Commission's recommendation then included language on subbasin planning proposed in the Council's Strawman and then added these comments and recommendations:

- The Strawman states that subbasin plans should be coordinated with other regional subbasin planning efforts. It is unclear whether coordination will be mandated or left up to participant discretion. Further, it is unclear what will prevent planning efforts from being duplicated by other agencies. The inter-agency coordination efforts need to be more clearly spelled out so coordination is not up to the participant discretion. This paragraph says that “the Council aims to maximize coordination and cooperation and avoid duplication of these efforts” but does not suggest how this will be done.
- Proposed assessment method does not in any way explain how efforts will be coordinated with regulatory responsibilities. More direction is needed here as to how this will occur.
- The Strawman says that subbasin plans will be developed with participation of fish and wildlife managers in each subbasin. It does not specify who will develop these plans.
- Who will evaluate whether there has been enough participation by diverse interests in plan development? What consequences are there if groups who should be invited to participate are not?
- The program must more clearly describe who has the authority to submit the final subbasin plan, and who is responsible for doing so.

Finding: The Commission’s recommendation deals with four fundamental elements of subbasin planning: (1) planning versus immediate action; (2) minimum standards or base requirements; (3) coordination among participants and with other processes; and (4) the process for developing, submitting and reviewing plans for adoption. The Council adopted provisions that the Council concludes are consistent with the basic concepts and underlying substance of this recommendation, if more general.

First, the Council agreed that Bonneville funding for program activities should be on-going as subbasin planning is taking place, with the considerations and projects funded changing and adapting as assessments and plans are completed and plans adopted into the program. Also, the Council recognized that there may be some new “high priority” actions that could be funded immediately by Bonneville that do not require elaborate subbasin planning. Section X. The Council will expedite the scientific, public and Council review of these projects based on the criteria established in the program and make recommendations to Bonneville for funding. The Council finds these provisions consistent with the recommendation for important action on the ground to continue, under appropriate standards, in advance of longer-term planning.

Second, the Commission recommended minimum standards for subbasin plans. The Council established the minimum standards or base elements of a subbasin assessment and plan in provisions generally consistent with the recommendations. Sections V.A.1, A.3, A.4, A.5, Technical Appendix C. Many of the specific points recommended have been addressed in the subbasin assessment template developed by the Subbasin Assessment Template Science team (e.g. limiting factors, data requirements,) and in the discussion of what is to be included in the inventory of existing activities and the management plan sections of the subbasin plan. The Council sought to provide guidance on the standards and format for plans while remaining general enough to allow for the kind of flexibility and freedom necessary for participants to adapt the planning process to the varied circumstances they will encounter and to be able to accommodate what is learned through experience.

Third, the recommendation calls for coordination within the subbasin planning efforts and coordination with other similar or related efforts that are proceeding under other authorities. The Commission recommended that a “lead” entity be identified, and that the lead entity fulfill certain tasks. Several points speak to full participation by diverse groups interested in subbasin planning, and yet other points inquire as to who will determine if participation has been sufficiently broad. The Council included provisions in the program consistent with the recommendation that all interested parties be included, and

language recognizing the special consideration that the recommendations of the fish and wildlife agencies must be given for program recommendations. The Council concluded that “lead” entities can be identified on a case-by-case basis to fit best the particular dynamics of each subbasin, and that it was more important at this point for the Council to emphasize that it will be concerned with how state, tribal and federal input has been incorporated into subbasin plans as the Council reviews these plans pursuant to the standards in Section 4(h) of the Act.

With regard to the Commission’s concerns about who will determine if there has been sufficient participation in subbasin planning, the program’s answer is that ultimately the Council will make that determination. Again, subbasin plans will be developed and adopted into the program pursuant to the standards and procedures of Section 4(h) of the Act. As such, it is the Council that has the responsibility to decide whether or not to accept these subbasin level recommendations. Sections 4(h)(4) and 4(h)(5) individually and collectively require the Council to make broadly available, take comment on, and consult on recommendations to the program. Therefore, the Council will need to ensure that the public participation contemplated in those sections and in the program have been satisfied at some point in the planning process.

Source: Yakama Nation
Recommendation No. 24

Recommendation: The Yakama Nation recommended immediate funding of those projects deemed necessary by the Council to complete the ongoing assessment and planning process. This would include those elements of the Multi Species Framework project that need to be completed, additional EDT validation projects for tributary watersheds, the subbasin assessment project proposed by NMFS personnel, the habitat and ecological function project proposed by the Northwest Habitat Institute, and any other projects deemed necessary to put the perceived planning needs of this process to bed.

Finding: The Council agrees on the need for sufficient and timely funding of these tasks to bring the subbasin assessment and planning process to as early a conclusion as possible.

Source: National Marine Fisheries Service
Recommendation No. 54

Recommendation: The Fisheries Service recommended:

- It is crucial that subbasin assessment and subbasin planning occur rapidly. The Fisheries Service understands that a collaborative subbasin plan process could take a long time, yet also recognizes that there is a high risk of an ineffective plan if the entities that are key to implementation (local watershed groups, tribes, local land managers) do not participate in its development. Therefore, a facilitator and technical support should be provided for setting up subbasin plan teams. Specific time frames and default processes for developing recommendations should be determined and adhered to.
- Subbasin assessments and subbasin planning should be two efforts conducted by different (but closely related) groups.
- The Council should establish subbasin assessment teams that are comprised of specialists in biology, statistics and geographic information systems.

- Initiate Phase 2 of the amendment process (developing specific objectives and measures at the subbasin level) when subbasin assessments are complete. Recommendations for Phase 2 subbasin plan measures should be developed by entities based on findings from the subbasin assessment. The Fisheries Service's primary concern with early proposals by the Council for the subbasin plan process is that subbasin plans should be developed only after the findings of subbasin assessment have been communicated.
- The Council should facilitate the establishment of subbasin plan teams and recommendations. Representation on subbasin plan teams should vary, depending on the subbasin. Members should include representatives from the federal land management agencies, tribes, state agencies (including fish and wildlife, water quality, land use and water use agencies) and local watershed councils. The Council cannot assume or expect that the people and entities have the resources to facilitate and set up their own subbasin plans. Teams should be established and these teams should be supported and enabled to do the job. This enabling will require facilitation, technical resources and support, and outreach.
- Subbasin planning should include entities who are able to coordinate and understand both the subbasin and watershed scales and also entities with the ability to implement measures affecting non-federal land and water. ESA listings and the varied nature of efforts to stem these species' decline require a re-structuring of how the program is implemented. The federal, state and tribal fish and wildlife management entities have the expertise to advise on population and production objectives and production and harvest measures for the subbasins. However, for habitat actions, the fishery management entities are not necessarily the primary or appropriate entities to decide management actions to achieve those objectives. The fishery management entities are important participants in and technical resources for these decisions, but participation should also include local land and water management entities, and state and local governments and stakeholders. The re-structuring NMFS suggests is one that provides a principal role for these entities, in addition to a specific role for the fishery management entities.
- The first step of subbasin planning should be the transfer of subbasin assessment information, syntheses, and technology to the subbasin plan teams. Develop an explicit strategy for transferring syntheses and results of subbasin assessment to the subbasin planning teams and other interested entities. The transfer of findings from the subbasin assessments should be the first step not only to communicating science to managers and planners but also to outreach and understanding with the stakeholders in a subbasin. There should really be two efforts, one is technology transfer to subbasin planners, the other is outreach and information sharing to affected stakeholders.
- Subbasin plan teams will then develop specific recommendations for objectives and measures at the subbasin level. Responsibility for completing and transmitting subbasin plans should rest largely with the states and tribes with input from federal land management and regulatory agencies.
- Disputes are inevitable when so many interests are at stake. The Council should attempt to provide dispute resolution, but ultimately will have to decide on the final subbasin plan components.
- Fund the states and tribes for participating in developing, completing and implementing subbasin plans. Develop and fund an outreach strategy to inform, educate, involve and collaborate with affected stakeholders. A concerted effort to work with local governments, local communities and stakeholders can strongly influence the will of nonfederal land and water users to participate in the conservation effort.
- The Council should establish a subbasin planning and budgeting process that fully recognizes the coordination, monitoring and evaluation, and operation and maintenance need associated with effective implementation. Some subbasins might require the services of an "in-basin" coordinator to interface with local stakeholders and other state or federal programs. Some habitat

projects will require ongoing monitoring and evaluation activities to determine whether the expected benefits of the investment are being secured. Many habitat projects carry with them an ongoing operation and maintenance responsibility in order to continue to provide the intended benefits. All of these elements potentially have costs associated with them that must be considered in planning for and implementing projects within each watershed or subbasin.

- The Habitat Appendix to the All H paper developed by the Federal Caucus, outlined categories of costs associated with planning and implementation of habitat activities. There were six categories; 1) watershed planning and assessment, 2) subbasin planning and assessment, 3) subbasin and regional coordination, 4) implementation, 5) accountability (M&E) and, 6) operation and maintenance. Two scenarios of the potential annual and 15-year costs of a regional habitat program were estimated (the costs indicated were for a total habitat program irrespective of funding source). In initiating the subbasin planning process and in subsequently adopting subbasin plans into the fish and wildlife program, the Council should consider these categories and the funding implications they portend. NMFS recommends the Council allocate sufficient funding during Phase 1 of the subbasin planning process to fully fund the development of watershed and subbasin assessments.

Finding: The recommendation focuses on two issues: (1) the function and timing of subbasin assessments within the subbasin planning effort and (2) Council facilitation of subbasin planning efforts that allow for broad participation by affected entities. The Council adopted provisions consistent with the recommendation, if more general. Section V.

Regarding assessments, the program agrees that a fundamental part of any subbasin plan must be a technical, science-based subbasin assessment. That assessment should inform the objectives and strategies that are developed for the management plan and implementation sections of the subbasin plan. Section V.A.3, A.5. The Council adopted the subbasin assessment template developed by the Subbasin Assessment Science team as part of its Technical Appendix to the program. The provisions adopted in the program for the timing of subsequent phases of the program amendment process were crafted to allow for assessments to be completed prior to developing the management plan elements of subbasin plans, as is recommended. Sections V.A.1, A.3, A.5, VIII.4, Technical Appendix C.

The Council also adopted provisions calling for broad participation in the development of plans, with the expectation that people and entities with broad expertise and perspectives will choose to participate. The Council believes that the recommendation can be self-fulfilling in a significant way if the Fisheries Service and other agencies implementing the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act participate in subbasin planning in a meaningful way. Section V.A.3, A.5, A.6. The Council cannot *mandate* participation by specific entities in the subbasin planning process and it did not attempt to do so in the program. Rather, it can only evaluate whether the plans presented to it for adoption meet the Power Act's standards for public participation and substance, noting the special role that the region's state, tribal and federal fish and wildlife managers have in program development.

Finally, the Council adopted provisions indicating it will seek to make resources available for assessment information transfer as well as subbasin planning coordination and facilitation consistent with the recommendation. The Council is continuing its discussions with state, tribal, local, and federal entities to determine what the facilitation and coordination needs are, and what methods may work best in the varied jurisdictions.

Source: Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Recommendation No. 36

Recommendation: Idaho noted that a schedule for subbasin planning that would have assessments completed by December 31, 2000, and plans submitted by April 1, 2001, was incredibly rigorous and that Idaho had inadequate resources to meet that schedule. As a solution, Idaho recommended hiring Subbasin Planning Coordinators. A coordinator for each subbasin would be hired as a temporary employee with either the relevant state fish and wildlife agency or an appropriate tribe, to increase managerial oversight, final product accountability, and overhead support. The coordinator should have a technical background in fish and wildlife management and have significant professional experience in planning, public involvement, and coordination. In more detail:

Scope of work/tasks: Subbasin Planning Coordinator

Each province will have a Coordinator who will be responsible for facilitating the subbasin planning effort through its entirety, including public involvement. The Coordinator's task will be to facilitate the planning and public involvement process, not represent one interest over the other. In Idaho, the Coordinator will equally represent the IDFG and all tribes involved in the subbasin.

Specific tasks may include the following:

- Compile existing information to write the subbasin assessment. The assessment will include information on focal fish and wildlife species and populations, habitat, and limiting factors.
- Use the subbasin assessment to coordinate and write the subbasin strategic plan. This plan will include long- and short-term priorities for fish and wildlife populations and habitats, strategies, and evaluation.
- Develop a three-year implementation plan. The implementation plan will include actions for populations and habitat, a monitoring and evaluation plan, and a budget.
- Throughout the process, coordinate state, tribal, and federal fish and wildlife managers.
- Throughout the process, coordinate land and water managers.
- Throughout the process, coordinate with stakeholders (public involvement).

Although each subbasin will have a plan, the planning process for all subbasins within a province will be concurrent. This approach makes sense in that subbasins are connected ecologically as well as ensuring that all subbasins will be finished for the rolling provincial review as a unit. It also is more efficient from a coordination perspective.

Finding: The schedule contemplated in the program for both assessments and subbasin planning is more deliberate than in earlier proposals to which this recommendation responded. See Sections V, VIII.4. The Council in general recognized the need for facilitation and other assistance in developing the subbasin plans. The Council did not adopt specific provisions for who to fund and how funding should be arranged for this purpose. These are specific funding items to work out with participants as the subbasin planning process is further developed and implemented.

Source: Bonneville Power Administration
Recommendation No. 37

Recommendation: Bonneville supported the Council's plan to support the fish and wildlife program with a set of standardized subbasin assessments and plans. Bonneville recommended:

- The process for subbasin assessments, plans and subsequent provincial project reviews should be coordinated with the federal plans for implementation of the off-site mitigation provisions of the recent hydrosystem biological opinions and recovery planning under the ESA.
- Planning across the basin must be done with a high level of uniformity. The assessment template needs to be developed and approved by all major state, federal, or tribal entities with a role in subbasin assessment.
- The subbasin assessment and planning process should remain dynamic and change as new information is developed that may lead to fresh approaches.
- Use existing subbasin plans where possible.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with the recommendation, calling for subbasin plans to be developed as expeditiously as is practical while ensuring a quality product, to build from existing assessment and plans where possible, to be responsive to changing circumstances and information, and to coordinate with and even integrate where possible ESA-based planning and implementation requirements from the hydrosystem biological opinions. Sections V.A.2-A.5, VIII.4.

The Council also adopted provisions consistent with this recommendation for a common assessment template to provide a significant level of uniformity and support for the assessments and to ensure that the management plan components of subbasin plans have a solid technical and scientific foundation. The Council did include in the Technical Appendix an assessment template developed and agreed to by major state, federal, and tribal entities. Sections V.A.3, A.5, Technical Appendix C..

Source: Washington Department of Ecology
Recommendation No. 6

Recommendation: The Department of Ecology recommended that to better coordinate subbasin planning with other efforts, the program should provide a financial incentive to proponents that coordinate with any already occurring local planning and data collecting efforts. Also, the Council should allow potentially important stakeholders beyond fish and wildlife managers to participate and be eligible to apply for funding for projects that affect water quantity and water quality when they demonstrate that these projects will have a positive impact on habitat.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with the substance of this recommendation. Sections V.A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, VI.A. The Council did not adopt a specific “financial incentives” package as part of the program, but the Council did recognize the need to direct resources of various sorts to the subbasins to assist in the development of subbasin plans. The Council also included provisions calling for broad participation in the development of subbasin plans. People and entities other than the fish and wildlife managers are already eligible for project funding under the program for habitat and other projects that contribute to achieving the objectives of the program. The program further emphasizes this fact, in Section VI.A.1-3. The nature of the subbasin plans and of the subbasin planning development process could markedly increase the number of people who can more fully participate in the implementation of the fish and wildlife program.

Source: Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County
Recommendation No. 4

Recommendation: The Chelan PUD recommended that the program identify who is responsible for the development of the subbasin plans, who must agree to each subbasin plan, what happens to a subbasin plan in the event an agreement cannot be reached, when the development of the subbasin plan must be completed, and the consequence for failing to prepare a subbasin plan.

Subbasin plans should also provide an opportunity for the integration and coordination of projects and programs funded by others than Bonneville whenever feasible. And along with recognition of the ongoing efforts of state and local agencies in the development of watershed assessments and plans, the program should recognize and coordinate with relevant settlement agreements, habitat conservation plans, and biological opinions.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions partially consistent with this recommendation. Sections V, VI. First, subbasin plans are to be developed collectively by interested persons and entities in each subbasin. The Council declined to name a single entity to “lead” each subbasin plan development. Because subbasin plans will be adopted into the program, what most concerns the Council is making sure the subbasin plans reflect the Power Act’s standards for program development and for broad public participation. Sections V.A.5, A.6. But the Power Act’s program amendment process, which will be used to consider and adopt subbasin plans, is voluntary -- the Council cannot compel any party or entity to participate. Any attempt to “designate” entities to lead in the development of subbasin plans would be beyond the Council’s authority.

Second, the Council did not specify who must “agree” on a subbasin plan for it be adopted into the program. The Council will make the final decision based on the standards in the Power Act. The Council encouraged broad participation in the development of the plan, recognizing that subbasin plans will depend for their success in significant part on the support of people whose land and water activities will be affected in each subbasin. One of criteria the Council will consider in the public review of any recommended subbasin plan will be the degree of participation and support in the subbasin for the recommended plan. Rather than designating who must “agree” to a subbasin plan, the Council believes it is more effective to identify those who should participate; scrutinize recommended plans for evidence of broad participation and support; and make clear to planners that failure to produce a broadly supported plan for adoption could mean difficulty in securing Bonneville funding for activities in the subbasin.

The recommendation to coordinate Bonneville funded efforts with other fish and wildlife activities in subbasin plans was made in many recommendations, and was adopted by the Council. The program calls for the subbasin plan to identify, explain and in some fashion coordinate all activities implemented and funded in the subbasin. Section V.A.4, A.5. The Council has been advised by many entities providing recommendations and comments that all fish and wildlife activities in a subbasin need to be considered together to avoid conflicting goals and strategies.

5(c) Review of subbasin plans

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Source: | Spokane Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 28 |
| Source: | Colville Confederated Tribes |
| Recommendation No. | 33 |
| Source: | Burns-Paiute Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 34 |
| Source: | Coeur d'Alene Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 42 |
| Source: | Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| Recommendation No. | 43 |
| Source: | Kalispel Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 48 |
| Source: | Kootenai Tribe |
| Recommendation No. | 50 |

Recommendation: These fish and wildlife agencies and tribes recommend versions of the following:

The Council's review procedures and standards are defined by the Power Act. As the plans for subbasins are completed, the Council should enter into a formal program amendment process to amend the plans into the fish and wildlife program.

The Council should seek comment on the draft subbasin plans from the public through hearings in each of the four states and through formal consultations between the Council and the affected tribes. The Council should then develop draft findings regarding whether or not the draft subbasin plans are consistent with the standards of the Power Act in Sections 4(h)(5) and (6). The Council should provide its findings in draft for public comment before amending the subbasin plans into the program. The subbasin teams should be given the opportunity to make revisions in the draft subbasin plans, as necessary, to respond to public or scientific comments, results of tribal consultations, and initial Council findings. If the Council finds that recommended plans fail to meet the Power Act standards, the Council must describe the inconsistencies in writing. Otherwise, the Council must amend the subbasin plans into the program.

To provide guidance in making its findings, the Council should adopt, as part of the program in this first phase, the regional goals and objectives, scientific principles and policies to define the Council's interpretation of the statutory standards of the Power Act. In particular, the Council must ensure that their rulemaking effort complements the existing and future activities of the federal and the region's state fish and wildlife agencies and appropriate tribes and that they remain consistent with the legal rights of appropriate Indian tribes in the region (Section 4(h)(6)).

Finding: In essence the recommendation is that the Council follow the substance and procedures in the Power Act for program amendments to evaluate and adopt subbasin plans. The Council will use the Power Act amendment process to call for, consider and adopt subbasin plans, as generally outlined in the program. Section V.A.1, A.6.

Many of the recommendations and the comments on the draft program called for the Council to engage in additional consultations with state, tribal, federal and private entities about the specifics of the process for subbasin plan development and adoption. The Council agrees that continued discussions on

these specifics should take place, and therefore, it chose not to adopt either the specific procedures recommended or any other. The Council will continue its discussions around the region to identify collaboratively the processes that will lead most effectively to the development and adoption of subbasin plans that meet the standards of the Power Act and the program.

Source: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Recommendation No. 26

Recommendation: Oregon recommended that the Council work with the fish and wildlife managers and others to design an independent peer review of draft subbasin plans to ensure that biological objectives and strategies are clearly stated and easily understood, are based on sound scientific principles, and are consistent with the policy and scientific framework. Draft subbasin plans should then be revised, as appropriate, based on the peer review.

Conduct a public review of subbasin plans after each has been peer reviewed and revised. If there are irreconcilable differences between the subbasin planners and the peer reviewers, the plan and peer review should be distributed for public review. The Council should adopt subbasin plans into the program under terms that will allow for updating the plans, as necessary, to reflect new knowledge.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions consistent with the recommendation, although it did not include the level of detail recommended. The program provides that subbasin plans proposed for adoption should be reviewed by independent scientists along the lines recommended. Section V.A.7. The Council anticipates consulting with state, tribal and federal fish and wildlife managers as well as others about the scope and process for that review, and about what process should be followed to respond to the review reports of the scientists. The program also provides for public review of subbasin plans proposed for adoption as recommended. Subbasin plans will be brought into the program through the amendment process of the Power Act, which includes substantial public notice and review provisions. Finally, the program provides for periodic review and revision of the plans to reflect new information and understanding. Section V.A.6.

Source: Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Recommendation No. 31

Recommendation: Montana recommended that the Council take the lead in public review of the draft plans.

Finding: The Council adopted this recommendation. Subbasin plans are the embodiment of “recommendations” for “measures” and “objectives” for the subbasin level of the program. They will come to the Council through a formal program amendment process under the Power Act, including substantial public review, with a final decision about adoption into the program by the Council consistent with the substantive and procedural requirements of the Act.

Source: National Marine Fisheries Service
Recommendation No. 54

Recommendation: The Fisheries Service recommended that as part of the review of the subbasin plans, the Council should analyze whether the plan includes performance standards, performance measures and a monitoring strategy to measure progress toward those standards. The program should implement a tiered or nested approach to the development of performance measures, performance standards and monitoring. A monitoring strategy at the subbasin level and an explanation of the subbasin's role in basin-level monitoring should be provided.

Finding: The Council adopted this recommendation, using different terminology for some of the elements. The program requires each subbasin to contain objectives and a monitoring and evaluation plan that will assess progress towards meeting subbasin objectives. Sections III.D.9, V.A.5. Subbasin objectives are understood to include what NMFS has termed performance standards and performance measures.

As recommended, the program requires that both the objectives and an associated monitoring and evaluation program be part of a tiered approach from the individual project level to the subbasin and province/basin levels. Section III.C.2, C.4, D.9. V.5. The program emphasizes that monitoring and evaluation efforts at the broader scales are intended to ensure that actions being taken at the subbasin scale are achieving province- and basin scale objectives, an issue highlighted in the recommendation. The program recognizes that additional work is needed to establish a functioning basin-level monitoring and evaluation plan, and it calls on the assistance of other parties in the basin, certainly including the Fisheries Service, to help develop this plan.

Source: Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County
Recommendation No. 4

Recommendation: The Chelan PUD recommended that Council review of subbasin plans by an independent science panel should remain a discretionary requirement to avoid redundant scientific reviews.

Finding: The Council provided that it will use the expertise of independent scientists to review subbasin plans. Section V.A.7. Within that general guidance, there is the flexibility to ensure that the scientific reviews do not become an exercise in redundancy.

5(d) Specific subbasin plans/subbasin objectives/specific measures and actions

Source: Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
Recommendation No. 40

Recommendation: The Commission submitted as an attachment to its main recommendations a set of subbasin goals and objectives for Columbia River Basin salmon and steelhead populations. Those goals and objectives were presented in a matrix, and consisted of a mixture of harvest, escapement, and production goals for each anadromous stock on a subbasin by subbasin basis. Goals and objectives drawn from the Tribal Recovery Plan, from existing subbasin plans, and from the work of Oregon and the Fisheries Service were presented as well. The Commission noted that in some subbasins, the goals and objectives identified by various entities are the same or very similar, but in many of the subbasins, the goals and objectives are inconsistent and/or incomplete. Consistent, complete goals and objectives need to be developed and agreed to for every salmon and steelhead population in every subbasin.

The Commission recommended that the inconsistencies and incomplete nature of subbasin goals and objectives be addressed in any process to update subbasin plans. Updating these goals and objectives will need to be coordinated at the basin-wide level to ensure consistency between subbasins. This coordination might occur in the *U.S. v Oregon* forum for anadromous fish as well as other appropriate forums for these and other species. In addition, it appears that in some instances the goals and objectives may not be achievable because of factors that occur outside of the subbasins, such as harvest, mainstem passage, and estuary/ocean survival. In these instances it might be useful to consider developing interim goals and objectives until factors outside the subbasins are appropriately addressed.

To assist in developing coordinated, complete goals and objectives the Commission recommended that a standard format be identified. This format should include objectives for production broodstock (natural and artificial production), tribal harvest, and non-tribal harvest. This format needs additional discussion and needs to be agreed to for all populations produced in all the subbasins basin-wide.

The Commission also recommended extensive, specific subbasin level measures and actions, including, but not limited to, Tables 1.C.1.1 (harvest measures); 1.C.2.2 (five dam drawdown actions); 1.C.3.1 (production measures); 1.C.4.1 (habitat measures); 1.C.5.1 (coordination, research, monitoring and evaluation measures).

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject these recommendations. This phase of the amendment process was limited to recommendations for the basin and possibly province levels of the program. In its January 12, 2000 "Notice of Request for Recommendations to the Northwest Power Planning Council's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program," the Council detailed the scope of this first phase of a comprehensive program amendment process as follows:

The Council is requesting recommendations for program amendments at the basin and province levels. The Council is therefore not requesting recommendations at this time for specific measures to be implemented in a particular subbasin. Following this reorganization of the program the Council intends to call for the region's Indian tribes and fish and wildlife agencies, and other interested parties, to recommend specific fish and wildlife plans for each of the subbasins for adoption into the fish and wildlife program. The Council anticipates that these plans will be prepared and adopted over a period of several years. In the current amendment proceedings, the Council will establish the general criteria for these plans. Any recommendations for measures or subbasin objectives received as part of the current amendment

process will be held over until the appropriate subbasin plan is considered for adoption into the fish and wildlife program, and will be taken up at that time. (See Council document 2000-1).

Thus as stated in the notice initiating this phase of the amendment proceeding, specific recommendations for subbasin goals, objectives and measures have been deferred to a subsequent amendment proceeding that will seek recommendations for specific, subbasin-level measures and objectives, to be adopted into the program as integrated subbasin plans. Sections V, VIII.4. The Council agrees with the Commission that the subbasin plans need to include complete and consistent goals and objectives.

Source: Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
Recommendation No. 21

Recommendation: The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation submitted the following specific program measures as part of their recommendation:

- Continue the Hood River Production Program (existing measure in program: 7.4L.2) and the corresponding Pelton Dam Fish Ladder production.
- Determine life distribution, abundance, life history patterns, cultural use patterns of Pacific Lamprey in the Deschutes and other subbasins within the CTWSRO ceded area.
- Continue water conservation/optimization projects in the John Day River Basin (existing measure in program: 7.8H.2) [labeled a high priority action “due to lethal water quality and quantity issues, listed stocks”]
- Habitat restoration on the Warm Springs Reservation, including road eradication, culvert improvement and replacement, riparian fencing and off- stream water developments for livestock, and riparian plantings.
- White River Terminal Fisheries Project: Develop and implement a terminal fisheries project for the Deschutes subbasin.
- Deschutes River Fall chinook salmon population estimation and monitoring.
- Bull trout life history evaluation (existing measure in program: 10.5A.2).
- Big Horn Sheep Reintroduction into historic habitat in the Mutton Mountains, near the northeastern corner of the Warm Springs Reservation.
- Other wildlife reintroductions: Evaluate the feasibility of reintroducing native wildlife species such as pronghorn and mountain quail into historic habitat on the Warm Springs Reservation. If feasible, develop and implement reintroduction programs.
- Land acquisitions: Identify and acquire key parcels of land for conservation purposes in the John Day subbasin, including spawning and rearing areas for spring chinook salmon, summer steelhead, bull trout, Pacific lamprey and other species including wildlife.

Finding: These specific recommendations for subbasin measures are deferred until the amendment proceedings for specific subbasin-level objectives and measures. See the findings above responding to the Commission’s recommendations.

Some of these recommendations relate to proposals for “High Priority” projects, as those types of projects were described in the Council’s letter of April 11, 2000, clarifying its original notice of request for recommendations (Council document 2000-1). Section X of the program adopted criteria and a procedure for a “High Priority” project initiative. That high priority project solicitation and review process, initiated in November 2000, will ultimately conclude in funding recommendations for specific

projects in specific subbasins, but those project funding recommendations will not be a part of the program revision process itself.

Source: Yakama Nation
Recommendation No. 24

Recommendation: The Yakama Nation recommended subbasin plans for:

- Okanogan River
- Methow River
- Entiat River
- Wenatchee River
- Yakima River
- Klickitat River
- Big White Salmon
- Little White Salmon
- Wind River

Finding: These subbasin plan recommendations are deferred until the amendment proceedings for specific subbasin-level objectives and measures, to be adopted then as integrated subbasin plans. See the findings above responding to the Commission's recommendations.

Source: Burns-Paiute Tribe
Recommendation No. 34

Recommendation: The Burns-Paiute Tribe recommended a subbasin plan for the Malheur River Basin, including a description of the subbasin, an overview of the fish, wildlife and habitat status; resident fish and wildlife policies, and goals and strategies.

Finding: These subbasin plan recommendations are deferred until the amendment proceedings for specific subbasin-level objectives and measures, to be adopted then as integrated subbasin plans. See the findings above responding to the Commission's recommendations.

Source: Kootenai Tribe
Recommendation No. 50

Recommendation: The Kootenai Tribe recommended a Kootenai subbasin plan, including a vision for the subbasin, a management framework, and a summary of goals, objectives, and present and future actions to be funded by Bonneville according to its trust responsibilities.

Finding: These subbasin plan recommendations are deferred until the amendment proceedings for specific subbasin-level objectives and measures, to be adopted then as integrated subbasin plans. See the findings above responding to the Commission's recommendations.

Source: Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
Recommendation No. 23

Recommendation: The Shoshone-Paiute Tribes recommended a subbasin plan for the Owyhee River and Bruneau River basins, including the management plan of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes. The Council should ensure the Duck Valley Indian Reservation receives settlement for primary wildlife losses, as do eleven other tribes in the Columbia basin.

Finding: These subbasin plan recommendations are deferred until the amendment proceedings for specific subbasin-level objectives and measures, to be adopted then as integrated subbasin plans. See the findings above responding to the Commission's recommendations.

Source: U.S. Geological Survey and Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Recommendation No. 22

Recommendation: The Survey and Colville Tribes recommended that it is imperative that restoration activities in the Okanogan River basin include a solid understanding of the potential toxic effects of contaminants on anadromous salmonids and other components of the ecosystem that salmonids rely on.

Finding: This is a subbasin-specific recommendation, and is deferred until later phases of program amendment as discussed in findings above responsive to the Commission's recommendations. As is detailed in Section V.3, subbasin plans are required to contain a science-based subbasin assessment that will guide the development of objectives and strategies in each subbasin. If toxicity is a particular problem in the Okanogan subbasin, this should be identified in the subbasin assessment portion of the Okanogan subbasin plan.