

7. High priority actions

7(a) Criteria and procedures

Source: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Recommendation No. 43

Recommendation: Washington recommended that as subbasin planning continues, immediate actions may be necessary to forestall further declines in Columbia River basin fish and wildlife. Authority for these high priority, early actions comes as a part of the trust responsibilities of the federal government to the tribes and from responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act.

All high priority project applicants must ensure that assessments and planning (e.g. NEPA) work can be completed so the project can begin as soon as possible in 2001. The Council should then expedite the review process. Immediate action projects should be substantially completed within two years, and any actions on private land must depend on voluntary cooperation of landowners. In addition, projects must meet one or more of the following threshold criteria:

- Action is necessary to reduce imminent risk to state or federally listed species or their habitat.
- Action will secure high quality or critical habitat, or will provide connectivity between patches of high quality or critical habitat, and the habitat is at imminent risk of alteration.
- Action will result in immediate improvement in native resident fish, anadromous fish or wildlife survival. Actions that improve conditions for multiple stocks or populations should have greater urgency.

Finding: The Council adopted provisions substantially consistent with this recommendation. Section X. Based on other recommendations and comments, the Council limited the high priority initiative to addressing imminent risks to species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act.

Source: National Marine Fisheries Service
Recommendation No. 54

Recommendation: The Fisheries Service recommended:

- Implement immediate or high priority actions with a high likelihood of benefiting listed species in the short term, prior to the completion of subbasin assessments and plans. Immediate steps are needed to reduce risks to salmon and steelhead survival.
- Apply criteria to project selection that are available and understandable to project proponents. To assist with decision-making for high priority actions, NMFS recommended the following "immediate action criteria." NMFS also recommended ISRP review of the criteria before adoption. Projects that do not meet ISRP criteria should not be considered for funding.
- For a project to be considered for immediate action, all assessments and planning (e.g., NEPA) work should be completed so the action can begin before September 30, 2001. Exceptions to this requirement should be provided for proposals that are more programmatic in nature. Examples of programmatic actions include funding programs for water or land acquisitions. Such programs need to be established immediately, but need flexibility for implementation when acquisition opportunities arise and ripen.
- In addition, actions prior to subbasin assessment and planning should satisfy one or more of the following criteria:

1. The action restores or acquires potentially productive habitats that will be largely self-maintaining after the activities are complete.
2. The action addresses imminent risks to survival of one or more species.
3. The action results in substantial benefits to species survival in not more than 5 years after implementation, and these benefits are measurable.
4. The action is part of an action plan that is derived from science-based assessment.
5. The action addresses a habitat enforcement issue and results in the protection of aquatic habitats.

Finding: The Council adopted a high priority project initiative and a set of criteria substantially consistent with the recommendation. Section X. The Council did not have the opportunity to have the ISRP review the criteria before finalizing the program.

Source: Bonneville Power Administration
Recommendation No. 37

Recommendation: Bonneville recommended that the Council use its existing within-year project review process to consider immediate, high priority actions brought forward by the resource managers and others for implementation. Immediate action items benefiting critical need populations should fit a time frame for implementation by the end of 2001 and must have measurable, beneficial effects on these populations in the short term. Bonneville noted the importance of a process with clear criteria for early identification of critical actions in all program areas, especially hatcheries and habitat, that can help achieve progress towards recovery of salmon and steelhead stocks. Bonneville also noted the value of subbasin assessments and planning as valid tools for evaluating what has been accomplished to date in a geographic area, what biological gaps or needs still exist, and what strategies should be chosen to address these needs. And Bonneville made clear that it did not wish to circumvent the valuable ordinary process for rigorous evaluation of projects for funding. Bonneville intended its proposed high priority criteria to respect the importance and value of the watershed assessment and planning process, as well as the need for the involvement of local groups and landowners in the planning, evaluation, selection and implementation of whatever actions are recommended. Consequently, Bonneville expected only a focused number of projects to be agreed upon regionally as actions that require an expedited evaluation and consideration for immediate implementation.

Criteria for Bonneville Funding of Immediate Actions

Objective. The policy objective is to provide guidance to enable Bonneville to choose what immediate actions to fund through the direct program during FY 2000-2001 to benefit ESA listed species, tribal trust or treaty resources, or prevent the listing of additional species. In addition, if the Council keeps an immediate action format once this amendment cycle is complete, these criteria may also serve for those determinations as well. For immediate habitat actions, the biological objectives are to prevent further degradation of tributary, estuary and mainstem habitat conditions and water quality, protect existing high quality habitats, and restore degraded habitats on a priority basis.

Summary. Immediate actions will be considered for the estuary, mainstem, and high priority tributaries. Bonneville will favor cost-share actions. Actions likely to receive funding must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Addresses imminent risks to survival of one or more species.
- Immediately results in substantial benefits to species and these benefits are measurable.

- Or, habitat actions may also secure existing high-quality habitats that include currently productive habitats (fully seeded) or important habitats (currently underseeded) that could be productive with increased fish returns.

In addition, all actions should meet the following criteria:

- Can be done with existing NEPA compliance documents or categorical exclusions.
- Is part of an action plan derived from science-based assessment.
- Implementation can be started before September 30, 2001.
- Is in a priority watershed. Bonneville suggests the scientific data and regional needs point to the following watersheds as important priorities: John Day, Deschutes, Grande Ronde, White Salmon, Upper Salmon, Methow, and Okanogan rivers.
- Supports credit to hydrosystem for actions made possible by Bonneville.

Habit actions should also meet these criteria:

- Is largely self-sustaining habitat after necessary habitat improvements are completed.
- Restores habitat out from core critical habitat area, rebuilding connected habitats that support spawning and rearing.

Criteria for high priority actions should receive ISRP review. All actions would proceed through the Council's prioritization process, including ISRP review and Council recommendation. Bonneville would make a funding decision on a proposal only after completion of this process and any ESA consultation or NEPA work that is required. Council is encouraged to use its existing process for review and recommendation of within-year emergency/high priority actions to Bonneville for funding.

All immediate actions Bonneville implements shall be credited to Bonneville's fulfillment of the hydrosystem biological opinion(s) and Council's program as applicable.

Finding: The Council adopted a high priority project initiative and a set of criteria substantially consistent with the recommendation. The Council intends to use its existing within-year project review processes and ISRP review to solicit, review and recommend high priority projects for funding. Section X. The criteria the Council adopted did not include that the project must be in a "priority watershed." The Council concluded that a project, wherever it is in the basin, that can be shown to address an imminent risk to a listed species, is ready to implement, and is a time-limited opportunity and/or is broadly recognized as achieving direct fish and wildlife benefits should receive consideration for possible funding.

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:	Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
Recommendation No.	40
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 fish and wildlife agencies and tribes recommended various versions of the same or similar criteria, summarized here with differences noted:

The federal agencies have suggested that as planning and studies continue, immediate actions may be necessary to forestall further declines in Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife. Authority for these high priority, early actions comes as a part of the trust responsibilities of the federal government to the tribes and from responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act. (The CRITFC recommendation did not include this paragraph. The Fish and Wildlife Service added: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will recommend early implementation actions through the Biological Opinions. There will be possible recommendations for other actions for anadromous and resident fish and wildlife.)

For a project to be considered for immediate action, all assessments and planning (e.g., NEPA) work should be completed, so the project can begin before September 30, 2001. In addition, projects must satisfy one or more of the following categories:

Category A: Tribal Trust Responsibilities -- meet the following criteria, subject to agreement between the tribe and the federal government: (The CRITFC recommendation said meet "all" the criteria)

- Action represents a high-priority project approved by a tribal government.
- A tribal plan identifies the action as necessary to protect and rebuild fish and/or wildlife in the Columbia River Basin. (For the words "tribal plan," the Colville Tribes substituted "plan/program or existing measure.")

Category B: Biological Needs (ESA, Unfunded Current Projects, FCRPS, Tier II Projects, etc.) -- meet one of the following criteria: (The CRITFC recommendation said "at least" one.)

- The action restores or acquires potentially productive habitats that will be largely self-maintaining after the activities are complete.
- The action addresses imminent risks to survival of one or more species.

- The action results in substantial benefits to species survival in not less than 10 years after implementation, and these benefits are measurable. (The CRITFC recommendation called for “results in tangible benefits to fish habitat conditions or otherwise benefits species survival within five years.”)
- The action is part of an action plan that is derived from science-based assessment.
- The action addresses a habitat enforcement issue and results in the protection of aquatic habitats. (The CRITFC recommendation called for “results in the protection of habitats throughout the geographic range of anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife.”)
- The action secures a high priority habitat area that contributes to the fulfillment of a critical life requisite(s) for terrestrial wildlife species.
- The Colville Tribes added: Actions which address conservation mitigation as a result of Biological Opinions and FCRPS operations.

Category C : Fish and Wildlife Management Coordination Needs

- Early action funding process should be used to provide funding for the managers to develop subbasin recommendations since work must begin immediately to meet the schedule currently being considered. (Provided in this form by Montana, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes only. But many of the other agencies and tribes recommended funding for subbasin planning and for subbasin planning coordinators as part of the high priority initiative.)

The Spokane, Coeur d’Alene, Kootenai and Kalispel Tribes recommended some additional language:

All “high priority projects” (also called “early implementation actions” and other similar terms) should meet one or more of the following criteria:

- fully implements the Council's current (1994-95) program;
- addresses the longstanding inequitable distribution of the basin’s funds (the focus on mainstem anadromous runs should be offset by greater funding for upriver/storage reservoir priorities),
- is necessary to implement and mitigate for the NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions;
- protects/enhances existing mitigation efforts and projects;
- is in compliance with the hatchery reform recommendations of the APR,
- is required by law and/or by treaty and trust responsibilities to the tribes.
- High priority/immediate funding in full should be given to all projects in the current (1994-95) program that have been approved through CBFWA consensus and ISRP review but have not been funded only because the budget was inadequate. These tribes identified sub-sections, measures and projects in and related to Sections 10 (Resident Fish) and 11 (Wildlife) of the existing program as high priority actions.

Finding: The Council adopted a high priority project initiative and review criteria substantially consistent with these recommendations. Section X. The one major difference is that the Council’s criteria require that all high priority projects address imminent risks to species listed under the Endangered Species Act. The recommendations would allow for high priority projects through alternative categories (tribal high priority projects generally, subbasin planning, management coordination needs, or projects in the current program that have not yet been funded) that do not address imminent risk to listed species. As noted in the recommendations and comments of the National Marine Fisheries Service and Bonneville, the genesis of this high priority project initiative is the need to begin immediately certain work identified in the biological opinions on the hydrosystem that could not wait for subbasin planning or the ordinary project review cycle. For that reason, the Council decided to limit the criteria for the review to focus only on addressing the problems of listed species.

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

Recommendation: Oregon recommended the following procedure for a high priority project selection process:

- the Council adopts criteria for evaluating the management priority and technical merit of projects proposed for funding as high-priority actions;
- the Council solicits proposals for high-priority projects;
- the Council provides notice to the public that the fish and wildlife managers and ISRP will review the proposals for management priority and technical merit;
- the fish and wildlife managers evaluate the management priority and technical merit of proposed projects using criteria adopted by the Council and submit their recommendations to the Council for projects to be funded by Bonneville;
- the ISRP evaluates the technical merit of proposed projects using criteria adopted by the Council and submit their evaluation to the Council;
- the Council conducts a public review of the fish and wildlife managers' recommendations and the ISRP's technical evaluations;
- the Council develops its draft recommendations for projects to be funded by Bonneville as high-priority actions;
- the Council conducts a public review of its recommendations;
- the Council submits its final recommendations to Bonneville.

Oregon recommended that the Council use the following criteria to evaluate the management priority and technical merit of projects proposed for funding on an expedited basis under the program:

Management Priority

- Does the project address objectives, problems, limiting factors, and/or critical information needs, and/or does it support strategies described in an existing assessment or plan (e.g. watershed assessment or a strategic, species, or subbasin plan) or identified in the program, the Endangered Species Act or the Clean Water Act?
- Does the project clearly describe the risks to fish and wildlife and their habitats if the project is not funded, and does it explain why those risks are significant and unacceptable?
- Does the project have demonstrated support from fish and wildlife, water, and land managers and from others whose cooperation and involvement is needed for its success?
- Does the project promote normative ecosystem processes, connectivity of habitats, community diversity, species richness or other scientific principles critical to the protection, mitigation, and enhancement of fish and wildlife and their habitats?
- Does the project complement or support ongoing projects or activities, and is it critical to the success of these other projects or activities?
- Does the project stand on its own or is it dependent on other activities that, if unfunded, threaten its success (e.g. long-term operations and maintenance contracts)?
- Does the project describe how its progress and success will be monitored and evaluated?
- Does the project distinguish itself from other alternatives to achieve its objectives?
- Have project costs been minimized, i.e. is there a cost-share, does it build on existing infrastructure, etc.?

Technical Merit

- Does the project define its objectives, deliverables, and schedule?
- Does the project explicitly relate its deliverables to its objectives?
- Does the project explain how its approach and techniques ensure it will achieve its objectives and deliver the products it promises according to the schedule it proposes? Is success likely, given the explanation?
- Does the project explain whether its approach and techniques pose risks to the success of other projects or to non-target natural resources? Are those risks acceptable, given the explanation?
- Does the project explain whether its approach and techniques are scientifically proven and sound?
- Does the project distinguish its approach and techniques from commonly used and applicable alternatives?
- Does the project explain how it will monitor and evaluate its progress toward and success in achieving its objectives?
- Does the project explain why the resources it requests (staff, equipment, materials, etc.) are necessary and reasonable to implement its work plan?

Finding: The Council adopted a high priority project initiative and criteria consistent with the substance of this recommendation, if not as detailed. Section X. The Council's intent is to use an expedited version of its regular project review process for the high priority project review, including review by the Independent Scientific Review Panel, a process generally consistent with the procedures recommended here. The Council also adopted high priority project criteria that, while worded quite differently and not as detailed as here, are consistent in basic substance with the recommended standards. Some of the detailed standards recommended reflect or parallel the scientific review standards assigned to the ISRP in Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Power Act. The Council did not see the need to repeat those criteria in the program.

The one substantive difference between what Oregon recommended and what the Council adopted is that the Council required all high priority projects to address imminent risks to species listed under the Endangered Species Act. Oregon's recommendation could be interpreted to allow for projects that addressed objectives identified in the program or in Clean Water Act for the benefit of fish or wildlife that are not listed. As noted in the recommendations and comments of the National Marine Fisheries Service and Bonneville, the genesis of this high priority project initiative is the need to begin immediately certain off-site mitigation work identified in the biological opinions that could not wait for subbasin planning or the ordinary project review cycle. For that reason, the Council decided to limit the criteria for the review to focus only on addressing the problems of listed species.

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

Recommendation: The Commission recommended a procedure for identifying and implementing emergency production and habitat actions:

- The fishery managers should develop project-specific action plans for production and habitat measures for prompt implementation in Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002. Because of the dire status of Snake River chinook, as well as some other populations in the basin, these implementation action plans should contain measures that will provide immediate increases in natural production and survival for adults returning in 2001 and 2002 and for their progeny. In identifying actions, use Table 1, Table 2 and Appendix A of the Columbia Basin Tribal Restoration Plan submitted to

the Council on August 15, 1994, the Integrated System Plan and other appropriate information. Submit action plans to the Council by June 1, 2000.

- The Council should review the action plans for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 by the end of May 2001.
- Absent Council disapproval, fund, or share in funding, projects called for in the action plans as a high priority in the fiscal year identified by the fishery managers.

Finding: The Council adopted criteria for high priority projects that while very different in wording from this recommendation, are based in the same basic substantive requirement to address the dire state of (imminent risk to) species listed as threatened or endangered through projects that clearly can provide direct benefits to these species in 2001-02. Based on the recommendations and comments of others, the criteria emphasize habitat considerations, in part because people are more likely to be able to implement discrete, beneficial habitat projects immediately with little planning and permitting when compared to production activities. But, production activities are not absolutely excluded by the criteria or from consideration during FY 2001 project review processes for emergency funding.

The Council is planning to use an expedited version of its regular project review process for the high priority project review, based in section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Act, and so did not adopt the procedures recommended here.

Source: Yakama Nation
Recommendation No. 24

Recommendation: The Yakama Nation recommended that if this amendment process can be concluded on schedule, i.e. by the end of August, 2000, additional Bonneville funds could be made available in Fiscal Year 2001 to address immediate action items. Habitat initiatives in particular should be implemented as immediate action items in the 2001 budget, and teams should develop the requisite standards, criteria, and evaluation protocols immediately. Habitat projects take at least two- to three-years to demonstrate a positive salmonid response. If we implement this approach immediately, we will have positive results within the 5-year amendment period. In terms of habitat restoration activities, we should be thinking of at least a \$50,000,000 per year effort over the next 5 years.

Finding: The Council adopted a high priority initiative and set of review criteria consistent with this recommendation, focused especially on habitat projects. The Council did not have information at the phase of the program amendment process that would justify setting a specific implementation budget in the program for the high priority projects.

Source: Kootenai Tribe
Recommendation No. 50

Recommendation: The Kootenai Tribe recommended that “high priority /early action” projects must be consistent with the tribal trust responsibility.

Finding: Bonneville will be the source of funding for high priority projects. Bonneville’s actions must be consistent with the federal government’s tribal trust responsibility.

Source: City of Portland
Recommendation No. 45

Recommendation: The City of Portland recommended that the criteria for selecting early action or high projects include:

- Priority should be given to early action projects that meet not only the obligations of the Northwest Power Act but also the obligations of the federal Endangered Species Act, and other federal laws and regulations as well. Those laws and regulations include, but are not limited to: NPDES, TMDL and other Clean Water Act obligations, Superfund, NEPA, etc. The Council should put highest priority on those early action items that satisfy or assist in satisfying multiple obligations. In other words, once a project is proved consistent with the Power Act, it would be scored against its ability to satisfy other statutes as well. Projects satisfying more statutes would be considered higher priority.
- Some portion of the budget for high priority projects should be reserved for urban areas. Urban areas historically have not received priority under the Power Act or in Council outreach and involvement activities. Nonetheless, urban areas often are located in critical migration corridors. The effects of urban development on fish migration and survival are largely unknown, as are the effects of urban bank development on fish behavior and survival. Given the scope of recent ESA listings and the limiting factors urban areas may create for fish originating in relatively pristine watersheds and subbasins, the city recommended that some early action dollars be dedicating to assessing urban areas' contribution to limiting factors.

Finding: Consistent with the substance of the first recommendation, the Council adopted criteria that, while focused on the need to address imminent risks to species listed under the Endangered Species Act, also required that the projects meet the requirements of the Power Act and added weight to those projects that also improve conditions for streams determined to be water-quality limited under the Clean Water Act.

The Council did not adopt the second recommendation to reserve some portion of the budget for high priority actions in urban areas. Instead, projects in urban areas that address imminent risks to a listed species and meet the other criteria will have the same priority as projects outside of urban areas.

7(b) Possible actions

Source: National Marine Fisheries Service
Recommendation No. 54

Recommendation: The Fisheries Service recommended that projects funded through this process include water diversion screening programs, initiatives to protect high-value riparian areas, initiatives to improve water quality and initiatives to improve tributary stream flows.

Finding: The Council agreed that these are types of projects likely to fit the criteria for high priority projects. See the list of examples in Section X.

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

Recommendation: Oregon recommended a set of project proposals for consideration for funding as high-priority actions. Each proposal will be expanded into a detailed statement of work once the Council adopts criteria and a process for proposal evaluation. A list of project titles follows:

1. Implement Oregon Plan Monitoring Program in the Columbia Basin
2. Watershed Assessments
3. Riparian Condition Assessment Through Spectrometric Imaging Of Riparian Vegetation
4. Establish a water bank to promote voluntary actions to enhance instream flows in key stream reaches on Oregon tributaries to the Columbia River
5. Critical Habitat Inventory of the Lower Columbia River and Estuary, Phase Two
6. Apply for Additional Instream Water Rights
7. Bull Trout Recovery Critical Needs
8. Create/Enhance Components of ODFW's Natural Resource Data Management System
9. Deschutes River Eastside Tributary Summer Steelhead Study
10. Assist in Locating and Purchasing Existing Water Rights for Instream Use
11. Fifteenmile Creek Subbasin Stream Habitat Restoration
12. Fifteenmile Creek Physical Stream Surveys / Habitat Inventories
13. Install An Adult Salmonid Trapping Facility Near the Mouth of Fifteenmile Creek
14. Add Additional Stream Gauging Stations
15. Improve Columbia Basin Hatchery Facilities for Salmon and Steelhead Production Identified in ODFW's Assessment Beyond the IHOT Audit
16. Implement Remedial Actions Recommended in the 1995 Integrated Hatchery Operations Team (IHOT) Hatchery Audits
17. Hood River Fish Screen Construction Farmers Irrigation District
18. Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon, Horn Butte
19. Completion of Pine Creek Ranch Acquisition
20. Punch Bowl Falls Fishway and Fishway Access (stairway) Repair
21. ODFW Columbia Basin Subbasin Planning Coordination
22. Encourage Water Conservation to Return Conserved Water to Instream Flows
23. Securing Wildlife Mitigation Sites - Oregon
24. Willamette River Falls Fishway; Phase IV and V Reconstruction
25. Provide Upstream and Downstream Passage at Willamette Subbasin Dams
26. Restore Riverine and Floodplain Habitat by Purchasing Willamette River and Tributary Revetment

27. Oregon Wildlife Mitigation Trust Fund
28. Ochoco National Forest Fish and Wildlife Improvements
29. Status, Life History, and Genetic Characterization of Summer Steelhead in NE Oregon
30. Audit of Bonneville Wildlife Mitigation Implemented to Date; Assessment of Direct Operational Impacts to Wildlife from the Federal Hydropower System in the Columbia Basin
31. Columbia Basin Technical Participation in Analytical Assessment of Provincial and Subbasin Plans

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Recommendation No. 43

Recommendation: Washington recommended 25 immediate action projects that it believes meet the criteria it recommended.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

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

Recommendation: The Commission provided 30 pages of tables with actions recommended for consideration under the high priority action category -- 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 recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Yakama Nation
Recommendation No. 24

Recommendation: The Yakama Nation recommended lists of habitat and production actions that needed funding. Habitat initiatives should be implemented as immediate action items in the 2001 budget, and teams should develop the requisite standards, criteria, and evaluation protocols immediately.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

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

Recommendation: The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation recommended two measures that the tribe labeled “high priority” actions:

- 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.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Colville Confederated Tribes
Recommendation No. 33

Recommendation: The Colville Tribes recommended:

- Fund the development and implementation of a pilot strobe light, fish entrainment deterrent system at Grand Coulee Dam as detailed in Bonneville Project # 9001800.
- Fund the design and construction of additional incubation and rearing capacity at the Colville Tribal Fish Hatchery to reduce densities of rainbow trout.
- Fund Okanogan River summer steelhead acclimation facilities.
- Fund the reintroduction of Okanogan River spring chinook.
- Fund a Columbia River summer/fall chinook hatchery program at Chief Joseph Dam.
- Fund an Okanogan River sockeye salmon supplementation hatchery program.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project

satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Spokane Tribe
Recommendation No. 28

Recommendation: The Spokane Tribe recommended implementation of the following measures as meeting the criteria for high priority funding:

- fund engineering, feasibility and other associated studies to find ways to prevent entrainment of fish at Grand Coulee Dam;
- provide security for long-term operations and maintenance expenses for habitat and mitigation investments made under the current and past Fish and Wildlife programs;
- additional measures identified in the UCUT Upper Columbia River Blocked Area Provincial Amendment (summarized in various parts, shown as recommendations by the Spokane, Coeur d'Alene, Kalispel and Kootenai Tribes).

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Kootenai Tribe
Recommendation No. 50

Recommendation: The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho recommended the following for high priority/early action funding:

- Habitat acquisition for protection of sensitive fish and wildlife species
- Long term funding for the Kootenai Tribal Hatchery operations and maintenance
- Long term funding for land acquisition operations and maintenance
- Long term funding commitment for ongoing artificial nitrification of Kootenay and Arrow Lakes as long as flow augmentation occurs for U.S. salmon recovery efforts
- Support for Key Ecological Functions analysis (including plants) in the Kootenai drainage

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Recommendation No. 42
Source: Kalispel Tribe
Recommendation No. 48

Recommendation: The two tribes recommended the following high priority action:

Wildlife Habitat Acquisition Fund

Implementation of an early action item in the form of an interim funding agreement with the core members of the Albeni Falls Interagency Workgroup. These interim funds are necessary for continuing land protection efforts for wildlife that specifically target the remaining construction and inundation losses for the facility (94% still remain). This agreement should cover a minimum period of five-years and should be implemented under the auspices of the Albeni Falls Interagency Work Group. Make the following part of the agreement:

- Agreement period is defined as October 2000 to September 2005;
- Annual funding of \$6 million (total of \$30 million over 5 years) will be made available to the core members of the Albeni Falls Interagency Work Group;
- Funds shall be spent on habitat protection and enhancement only;
- Projects must mitigate for wildlife habitat losses due to either the construction and inundation or operations of Albeni Falls Dam;
- Bonneville will make the funds available (including acquired interest) when the funds are actually needed for purchase (i.e., contractors won't accumulate interest on funds);
- Contractors shall have flexibility to carry forward annual allocation;
- Bonneville will retain any funds not spent by September 2005;
- Bonneville will provide adequate annual O&M funding for all past and new wildlife habitat projects above the \$6 million acquisition funding.
- Bonneville will receive credits in the form of habitat units for all protection and enhancement actions to be counted against the loss ledger for Albeni Falls Dam.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

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

Recommendation: Idaho recommended the following early actions:

- Immediately fund project 20148 – Evaluate bull trout population status /N.F. Clearwater. Although bull trout have been observed and collected throughout the basin, little information is available on their life history or distribution. Prior to construction of Dworshak Dam, bull trout had the opportunity to interchange with other bull trout populations in the Clearwater River drainage. The maintenance of adequate migratory corridors throughout the Clearwater River drainage may be an important feature to ensure the genetic interchange suggested. With construction of Dworshak Dam near the mouth of the North Fork Clearwater River, movement of bull trout is limited to downstream passage only as there is no avenue by which bull trout can move upstream past Dworshak Dam. Similarly, bull trout that move downstream of the dam can

no longer return to the North Fork Clearwater River. The impact of severing the migratory corridor up the North Fork Clearwater River could be critical in sustaining bull trout upstream of Dworshak Dam. Without more information the disruption of this migratory corridor can only be viewed as a threat to the persistence of the North Fork Clearwater River bull trout population.

- Work with local Watershed Councils and governments, landowners, state and federal land managers and concerned citizens to:
Identify critical needs and associated costs for habitat actions to accommodate the needs of the federal biological opinions effecting anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife.
Develop strategies for creating trust funds for selected high priority drainages to insure continuity of actions.
- Initiate immediately discussions among the affected parties on a long-term strategy for managing the elevation of Lake Pend Oreille.
- To ensure that wildlife mitigation proceeds expeditiously in the Mountain Columbia Province, Idaho proposes a Five-Year Wildlife Habitat Acquisition Fund to be implemented by the Albeni Falls Interagency Work Group.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: City of Portland
Recommendation No. 45

Recommendation: The City of Portland recommended the following early action projects:

- Kelley Creek Culvert Replacement
- Willamette Fish Study: Effects of Bank Treatment and Near Shore Development On Anadromous and Resident Fish in the Lower Willamette River
- Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) Analysis for the Sandy Basin, Lower Columbia River Basin, State of Oregon
- Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Reconnection

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.

Source: Columbia River Alliance
Recommendation No. 39

Recommendation: The Columbia River Alliance recommended the following high priority actions:

- Introduce mammalian predators to control bird populations on Rice Island and elsewhere.
- Allow limited hunting for marine mammals to control populations; turn over percentage of license revenues to habitat restoration projects.

Finding: The Council did not adopt or reject recommendations for specific high priority actions or projects. The Council assumed that all of the projects recommended might merit high priority funding. The key in this one-time-only project selection process will be the extent to which any proposed project satisfies the high priority criteria for a funding recommendation, an evaluation that will be made in the project review process by the ISRP, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the other fish and wildlife managers, Bonneville and the Council.