



Independent Scientific Review Panel
for the Northwest Power & Conservation Council
851 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204
www.nwccouncil.org/fw/isrp

September 24, 2009

MEMORANDUM

To: Fish and Wildlife Committee Members, Northwest Power and Conservation Council

From: Eric Loudenslager, ISRP Chair, and Erik Merrill, ISRP Coordinator

Subject: Future ISRP Retrospective Reviews

Discussion Request

The ISRP requests the Council's Fish and Wildlife Committee's feedback on topics for the ISRP's next retrospective report.

The Retrospective Review Charge

In addition to reviews of proposed projects, the 1996 amendment directs the ISRP, with assistance from the Scientific Peer Review Groups, to review annually the results of prior-year expenditures based on the ISRP's project review criteria and submit its findings to the Council. As stated in the Council's 2009 Fish and Wildlife Program "the retrospective review should focus on the measurable benefits to fish and wildlife made through projects funded by Bonneville and previously reviewed. The ISRP's findings should provide biological information for the Council's ongoing accounting and evaluation of Bonneville's expenditures and the level of success in meeting the objectives of the 2009 Program, as described in the monitoring and evaluation section. Also as part of the ISRP's annual retrospective report, the ISRP should summarize major basinwide programmatic issues identified during project reviews."

Past ISRP Retrospective Reviews

A major element of the ISRP's reviews of ongoing projects, such as for the recently completed wildlife category review, is an examination of the reporting of past results consistent with the retrospective review charge. The general sufficiency of results reporting and incorporation of project accomplishments into future planning is summarized by the ISRP in the programmatic section of category and geographic reviews. In addition to this project-specific review function associated with Fish and Wildlife Program solicitations, the ISRP has released three major retrospective reports. In August 2005, the ISRP completed its first retrospective report, which focused on programmatic issues and observations identified in ISRP reviews dating back to the ISRP's first report in 1997 ([ISRP 2005-14](#), August 31, 2005). In FY 2006, the ISRP's review of FY 2007-09 proposals included an examination of the results reported by ongoing projects. The

ISRP reported the results of that analysis in its 2006 Retrospective Report ([ISRP 2007-1](#), March 1, 2007). The ISRP's 2007 Retrospective Report ([ISRP 2008-4](#), April 11, 2008) focused on how projects are changing their objectives, strategies, and methods based on learning from the results of their actions. The ISRP accomplished this by looking at themes that emerged in previous ISRP retrospectives, examining a subset of projects that were reviewed in Fiscal Year 2007, and investigating how proponents applied the results of their past projects to proposed future actions and monitoring.

Potential Topics for 2010 and Future Retrospective Reports

The ISRP's FY 2010 Statement of Work identifies the need for the ISRP to consult with the Council to scope topics and approaches for a potential 2010 retrospective report. The ISRP recognizes that retrospective reports need to be conducted in the context and use other concurrent efforts that track results of the Fish and Wildlife Program. Specifically, the Council is developing its own annual report to Congress and the four Basin state governors on the Program's progress toward fish and wildlife mitigation and recovery using high level indicators. In addition, the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) issues an annual report of the status of the resource, and the Bonneville Power Administration has made progress on project tracking through Pisces and Taurus.

The ISRP also understands that retrospective reports should be scoped to best inform Council decisions such as project reviews or program amendments. The ISRP suggests the next retrospective employ results from projects reviewed in the upcoming Artificial Production and Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Category Reviews.

To prompt discussion, the ISRP poses a few potential topics for a 2010 retrospective review:

- A review of the extent that Ad Hoc Supplementation Work Group recommendations, Hatchery Science Review Group findings, and the anticipated NOAA consultation on artificial production programs are reflected in the project proposals in the upcoming Artificial Production Category Review. The review would specifically focus on how project proponents' analyses of their project results have considered the findings and observations from these regional efforts to improve project integration with the natural production goals in subbasin and recovery plans, and the Fish and Wildlife Program.
- Bonneville, the Council, and CBFWA are currently examining anadromous salmon research, monitoring, and evaluation to identify whether existing projects adequately address Biological Opinion and Fish and Wildlife Program monitoring needs. The ISRP could review how project proponents' analyses of their project results have considered the findings and observations from this regional effort to improve project integration with the needs of the Program and subbasin and recovery plans.
- A program level review of the results of estuary restoration and research projects in the context of key points identified during the 2009 Estuary Science-Policy Exchange and the 2007 Science-Policy Exchange.
- A review of the results of tagging projects in the context of key points identified in the ISRP/ISAB tagging report.

- A focused review of a small subset of research or hatchery projects' results as part of the category reviews. The results could be briefly described in the Council's report to Congress and the governors.