

Bill Bradbury  
Chair  
Oregon

Henry Lorenzen  
Oregon

W. Bill Booth  
Idaho

James A. Yost  
Idaho



Jennifer Anders  
Vice Chair  
Montana

Pat Smith  
Montana

Tom Karier  
Washington

Phil Rockefeller  
Washington

October 29, 2013

## DECISION MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council Members

**FROM:** Lynn Palensky

**SUBJECT:** Council decision on geographic project review and recommendations

**PROPOSED ACTION:** Council recommendation to Bonneville

**SIGNIFICANCE:** This is the final category review since they began in 2009. This group of 83 habitat projects represents a commitment of nearly \$80 million in expense funds and over \$6 million in capital funds in FY 2014.

### Introduction

Pursuant to Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Act, the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) has been engaged in a review of ongoing habitat projects being implemented in areas of the basin that are currently accessible to anadromous fish, referred to as geographic review. This document, when final, will contain and explain the Council's recommendations to the Bonneville Power Administration for funding and implementing these projects for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018.

This document contains three Parts. Part 1 provides the background on the projects, review process, and an explanation of the form and duration of recommendation. Part 2 will cover programmatic issues and recommendations. As has been true in the past, the review of the individual projects illuminates a set of broader policy or programmatic issues that affect the Council's review and recommendations for a collective set of the projects. Possible resolutions for the programmatic issues are provided for Council consideration. Part 3 covers project-specific recommendations for individual projects for the geographic review. This includes a spreadsheet listing the 83 projects with a description of the form and duration of our recommendations. The project recommendations are associated with Part 2 of the decision document, as many of the recommendations point to programmatic issues for full resolution.

Part 4 contains the formal explanations by the Council responsive to the specific requirements of Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Act. This includes the written explanations required of the Council in those few instances in which the Council's project funding recommendations do not follow the recommendations of the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP). The

Council will also explain how it complied with the requirements in Section 4(h)(10)(D) to “consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations” and “determine whether the projects employ cost-effective measures to achieve program objectives” when making project funding recommendations.

## **Part 1: Background -- Projects and Review Process**

Under Section 4(h) of the Northwest Power Act, the Council develops a program to “protect, mitigate and enhance” fish and wildlife affected by the hydroelectric facilities on the Columbia and its tributaries. Section 4(h)(10)(A) of the Northwest Power Act then calls on the Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) to use its funds and other authorities to protect, mitigate, and enhance these same fish and wildlife “in a manner consistent with” the Council’s fish and wildlife program. Bonneville spends hundreds of millions of dollars every year to fund mainstem and off-site mitigation projects that implement measures in the Council’s program, including this select group of habitat projects in areas of the basin currently accessible to anadromous fish.

Section 4h(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Act (Act) then directs the Council to review projects proposed for funding by Bonneville to implement the Council’s fish and wildlife program (Program). The Council engages in this review with the assistance of its ISRP. The Council also works with Bonneville to develop the information necessary to make this review process successful. Beginning in 2009, the Council and Bonneville, with advice from the ISRP, decided to review projects in functional categories (wildlife, monitoring, evaluation and research, artificial production, resident fish in the areas impassible for anadromous fish), to be followed by a review of habitat actions, organized by subbasin and province, commonly referred to as “geographic review”.

The central purpose of the category reviews is to highlight issues apparent by looking at similar projects collectively. Issues include relevance and priority, coordination, consistency of approach, methods and costs, and collective consistency with the subbasin plans, broad basinwide objectives and strategies in the Program and other regional plans. In this review, the projects are all habitat-based and organized geographically. As a result, the Council is able to identify and address these larger issues, as appropriate, at a similar scale.

The geographic review focused on existing commitments and these existing commitments are of many years’ standing and many have been the subject of numerous reviews in the past. So an important function of the reviews is to evaluate project results and how well the projects have adapted proposed future work based on those results, and how well the project sponsors have responded to the scientific and management issues identified in previous reviews. The scientific and administrative review for the projects allow the Council and Bonneville to make long-term funding decisions and establish appropriate longer-length review cycles for many of these projects.

The geographic review included six steps: planning; project sponsors’ reports and proposals, ISRP review; public review; staff review and recommendations, and final Council recommendation. Detailed information about the geographic review is found on the Council’s

website at <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/reviews/2014/geographic-review/>. The webpage describes the steps in the review process and includes a link to the list of the projects reviewed.

Project sponsors were asked in December 2012 to submit the necessary information for ISRP and Council review by the end of February 2013. The sponsors were asked to include project descriptions, work elements, a report on results, and proposed work for the next five fiscal years, and proposed budgets. Sponsors entered the information directly into the Taurus database (cbfish.org) in a set proposal format.

The ISRP began its review on March 1, 2013 beginning with submitted proposals, and site visits for most of the projects. As noted above, under Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Act, the Council is to conduct its review of projects with the assistance of an ISRP appointed by the Council. The ISRP is asked “to adequately ensure that the list of prioritized projects recommended is consistent with the program,” and to make project recommendations to the Council “based on a determination that projects: are based on sound scientific principles; benefit fish and wildlife; and have a clearly defined objective and outcome with provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results.”

The ISRP released its preliminary report in June 2013, and concluded that 13 proposals met scientific review criteria, 33 proposals met criteria with some qualifications, one proposal did not meet criteria, and three proposals were not amenable to scientific review. In addition, the ISRP requested responses (additional or clarifying information) on 33 proposals. Project sponsors for these 33 projects were given an opportunity to respond to ISRP concerns by July 9, before the ISRP submitted its final report to the Council on August 15, 2013. The preliminary report also outlined an initial list of programmatic recommendations. The Council invited public comment on the preliminary ISRP report (<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/reviews/2014/geographic-review/isrp2013-4/>) and that period remained open for over a month after the release of the final report, until September 20, 2013.

Project sponsors for the 33 proposal submitted responses to the ISRP on July 9, 2013. The ISRP then issued its final review report on August 15, 2013. See [www.nwcouncil.org/fw/isrp/isrp2013-11](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/isrp/isrp2013-11). In this final review for the 83 projects, the ISRP recommends that 20 proposals meet scientific review criteria (24%), 55 proposals meet criteria with some qualifications (66%), four proposals did not meet criteria (5%) and four proposals were not amenable to scientific review (5%).

In addition to individual project reviews, this report contains comments on issues that cut across projects and apply to the program in general. Topics covered include evaluation of results, regional monitoring and evaluation, strategic restoration frameworks, umbrella proposals, and long term operation and maintenance needs. See Part 2 of this document.

The Council staff, working in cooperation and consultation with Bonneville staff, began reviewing the project information, comments from the sponsors and others on the projects, the ISRP’s reports, public comment on the ISRP report, and other information to develop project recommendations and frame programmatic issues.

Under Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Act, the Council completes the review process by deciding on its project recommendations to Bonneville to implement the program. The Act specifies that in making these recommendations, the Council is to “fully consider” the recommendations of the

ISRP. If the Council decides not to accept a recommendation of the ISRP, the Council must explain in writing its reasons (in Part 4). The Council is also to “consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations” and “determine whether the projects employ cost-effective measures to achieve program objectives” when deciding on its project-funding recommendations. “The Council, after consideration of the recommendations of the ISRP and other appropriate entities, shall be responsible for making the final recommendations of projects to be funded through Bonneville’s annual fish and wildlife budget.”

Before turning to the substantive programmatic and project-specific issues and recommendations in Parts 2 and 3, this part concludes with an overarching issue concerning the form and duration of the project recommendations. The Council’s recommendations include the following set of general expectations regarding the duration and implementation of specific project recommendations:

### ***Duration and conditions of multi-year project recommendations***

The Council’s multi-year funding recommendations for projects begin FY2014 and may extend through FY2018. The duration of any particular project recommendation is specified in the project-specific recommendation on the attached spreadsheet. These vary from one to five years depending on the type of project, the project conditions, when the project is due to be completed, and if there is delivery of a product to review prior to a recommendation for additional years of funding. For example several projects have a short-term funding recommendation that is accompanied with a recommendation to deliver a plan or report for a secondary review and funding recommendation. As is the case in previous category reviews, the out-year funding recommendations are generally based on the ISRP and Council review of the plan or process.

### ***Review considerations***

The Council’s recommendations are based on sound scientific principles, the reviews of the projects by the ISRP, review of the projects in the context of the program, and other considerations and information developed during the review process. Collectively, the body of work recommended is intended to support and address the program, as also integrated with the requirements of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) Biological Opinion and the commitments made by Bonneville with the parties to the Columbia Basin Fish Accords.

### ***Funding considerations and expectations***

The Council’s project recommendations do not include recommended project budgets or annual budgets. The spreadsheet shows contextual budget information to provide a general sense of annual project cost (e.g. Bonneville’s FY2014 start of year, and Sponsor’s FY2014 requested budgets). A multi-year funding recommendation that does not set a particular budget allows Bonneville and the sponsors’ flexibility in contracting and spending over the life of the project recommendation. The Council’s multi-year implementation recommendation includes the following expectations:

1. The ISRP’s science review of the projects is sufficient for the duration recommended for the project with two exceptions: 1) when the project recommendation is conditioned upon the ISRP reviewing a deliverable (such as a comprehensive management plan or report)

within or at the end of the funding period, or 2) when new components outside of the scope or intent of the project at the time of this review are proposed by the project sponsor or Bonneville during the funding period. In these cases, the delivered product or the new project components may be reviewed by the ISRP and/or Council, and a funding recommendation made by the Council based on this new or supplemental information.

2. Bonneville will provide start-of-year budgets annually, for this project portfolio prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, which should also include 1) how inflation and cost-of-living adjustments are to be applied, if any; 2) any significant modifications to scope negotiated with the project sponsor; and 3) report back to the Council in general how the Council recommendations were dealt with in contracting, and 4) Bonneville will work with the Council to track and follow-up on items or project conditions that require the sponsor to deliver products as part of the funding recommendations.
3. Bonneville will work with sponsors to address ISRP qualifications and other conditions during contracting when and as recommended by the Council.
4. Bonneville will provide adequate funding to maintain the integrity of the project as reviewed by the ISRP and recommended by the Council.
5. In the event that a project is defunded as an outcome of this review, Bonneville will notify the Council of the contract savings and redirect the funding from the closed project to operation and maintenance of existing fish screening facilities/structures. See programmatic issue C and recommendation.
6. The Council is in the process of amending the Fish and Wildlife Program and anticipated finalizing the program in the summer of 2014. Should there be significant changes in the existing program that would suggest or require changes in recommendations adopted by the Council; the Council may choose to revisit these recommendations through its normal public processes.

### ***Project funding package***

Collectively, for projects in this review, the start of year budget for FY 2014 totals more than \$75 million in expense funds and \$6.3 million in capital funds. While the sponsor's project budget requests can vary from year to year, the first year budget requests are provided in the spreadsheet for all 83 projects, as well as Bonneville's start of year budgets for FY2014 (expense and capital).

## Part 2: Programmatic Issues and Recommendations

Part 2 identifies a subset of four (A-D) overarching programmatic issues outlined by the ISRP, which are timely and important to address in this geographic review. While the ISRP identified 17 programmatic issues in its final report, many of the issues may be addressed through different processes or at a more appropriate time in the future. For example, several issues will likely be topics of discussion throughout the amendment process in 2014 such: as *refining the future review process*, *develop a strategic framework for restoration* and *considering pesticides and toxic chemicals* when implementing habitat projects. Other issues will be dealt with through project implementation as work, budget and adaptive management processes allow, such as: *efficient use of large wood*, and *efficient weed control practices*. Others such as streamlining the NEPA process and expanding the CREP are dealt with at the federal level. While these programmatic issues are important, we speak to, and make recommendations on, a subset of them through this process (A-D below).

The Council's recommendations on the programmatic issues are to be afforded the same weight as the project-specific recommendations (in Part 3). In many cases the Council's programmatic recommendations have become conditions or recommendations that accompany the relevant project recommendations, as explained further in Part 3 (project recommendation spreadsheet).

- A. Implement Monitoring, and Evaluation at a Regional Scale
- B. Evaluate and Improve Umbrella Projects
- C. Provide Long-term Maintenance of Fish Screens
- D. Columbia River Estuary – effectiveness monitoring

### **A. Implement Monitoring, and Evaluation at a Regional Scale**

As noted by the ISRP, the program has evolved in how it gathers, handles, and communicates information that is needed for the adaptive management of the program. During the Council's discussions and programmatic recommendations from its 2011 Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E) and Artificial Production category review process these needs were defined and an approach suggested ([www.nwcouncil.org/fw/reviews/2010/rmeap](http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/reviews/2010/rmeap)). In that recommendation, the Council suggests how the region and Bonneville need to improve implementation of research and monitoring through the program. In response, Bonneville has proposed to Council and begun implementation of several efforts to address these needs including development of a new program tributary habitat monitoring framework and supporting documents, improved reporting tools, refinement of approaches, and assessment of existing work to tighten up the information gathered and how these are used to inform management and policy decisions for the program and the FCRPS Biological Opinion. Some of these efforts are ongoing and others are in the pilot phase, including Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Program (ISEMP, Project #2003-017-00) and Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program (CHaMP, Project #2011-006-00) and Action Effectiveness Monitoring (AEM).

On January 10, 2013 the Council received a submittal that further addressed the above 2011 recommendation from Bonneville and NOAA Fisheries for ISRP review. Following the ISRP review of this submittal in June 2013, the Council provided specific recommendations for programmatic approaches, related to habitat status and trend and AEM. The Council included recommendations that would address the ISRP request for more certainty about this programmatic approach and how the information will be made accessible to all that can benefit from this information. Specifics about these recommendations are in the Council's decision letter to Bonneville, and dated June 17, 2013. Below we excerpt some of the pertinent recommendations:

- *The CHaMP and ISEMP projects and the AEM Approach as it is developed should be subject to continued oversight by Bonneville, the Council and the ISRP, including submission of reports for review on an annual basis for Projects #2003-017-00 (ISEMP) and #2011-006-00 (CHaMP) and an overall status update for the AEM Approach which will be implemented under a number of projects. Among other things, the review of these activities in 2014 should address the questions and comments provided by the ISRP in this year's review (ISRP document 2013-02). The project sponsors and Bonneville should submit the needed information for this review no later than March 2014.*
- *In addition, the document submitted for review in 2014 should explain how these tributary habitat monitoring and evaluation activities link to and integrate into the monitoring, evaluation, reporting and data management effort for the entire program, including for the tributaries (ISEMP, CHaMP and AEM), the estuary (CEERP), artificial production (such as the CHREET proposal); Bonneville's data management framework, the Coordinated Assessment (CA) data sharing effort, and other large scale aquatic monitoring programs occurring within the Basin that are funded by other agencies such as PIBO and AREMP.*
- *Subsequent ISRP and Council review and recommendations for the two existing Program projects (ISEMP and CHaMP) should follow the timeline and transition as described in the AEM Approach documents. That is, the submission and the review in 2015 should be used for a comprehensive consideration of whether and how to transition CHaMP out of the pilot phase; to confirm or alter the timeline for completion and end of the Program funded IMW studies and the evolution of the rest of the ISEMP project; to confirm and implement or alter the AEM Approach to project-level effectiveness; and to flesh out, explain and decide on the analytical framework for an overarching evaluation of the habitat monitoring and evaluation information. This submittal should be no later than March 2015.*

The ISRP requested to have clearer linkages between habitat work and each of the approaches to monitoring. They specifically wanted to know which projects were feeding data and information into the programs (CHaMP, ISEMP and the AEM). The ISRP also wanted to know how these three programs were feeding information back to the habitat action projects to improve methodology and design for project work. Bonneville provided an update in July 2013 to the ISRP/ISAB about the implementation of the AEM that was valuable to enhance this understanding.

Council believes the request for clearer linkages also should be applied to projects providing information for the VSP parameters under the programmatic guidance provided in the draft Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Strategy (ASMS).

Council believes that for the programmatic approach to action effectiveness monitoring (AEM) to be successful, there needs to be assurance that there is an adequate level of communication between the programmatic work gathering the monitoring information and the habitat projects that rely on this information to guide their habitat work. Bonneville's "AEM Matrix" that identifies which habitat projects directly provide information to the programmatic work, as opposed to relying on information generated from the programmatic work, is a good start and will include the habitat projects reviewed as part of this category. In addition, there should be linkages made between the VSP projects and the habitat projects to respond to the ISRP's request for clarity on how the data gather by monitoring of the status of fish and habitat are used to assess the effectiveness of habitat actions.

Council recommendation:

The Council recommends, consistent with Council's 2011 and 2013 recommendations, that Bonneville:

1. By mid 2014, use a Bonneville, publicly available project tracking database for program funded projects to identify:
  - the Programmatic approaches being implemented for fish (VSP, ASMS), habitat (CHaMP, ISEMP), and action effectiveness (ISEMP, AEM, AEMR - see section D for details about AEMR);
  - which projects contribute information to these efforts
  - which projects rely on information provided by these efforts
2. By March 2015, describe the entire process from data gathering to making findings available for adaptive management of projects and the program, how these programmatic findings are made available:
  - to habitat and fish restoration efforts to guide their work
  - for reporting on the program progress.
3. On an ongoing basis, work with existing (e.g. Colville Confederated Tribes'), in-development (e.g., Nez Perce Tribe's), and other future subregional approaches to assessing action effectiveness, to ensure they complement and address the programmatic approach and recommendations described above by the Council.

## **B. Evaluate and Improve Umbrella Projects**

As part of this review, the ISRP and Council reviewed a subset of larger habitat projects that identify, rank, select, and fund habitat project implementation in specific geographic areas. An even smaller subset of these (listed below) take a more formal approach to this and offer a solicitation for funding much like a mini-grant program for the area. For this review, we refer to the more formal approach as *umbrella projects*. The process is somewhat different for each group in the number of solicitations offered per year, the amount of funding available, how projects are scored and selected and who may apply for funding. There is one other umbrella program funded under the fish and wildlife program in which an administrative entity, serving as the coordination, administration, and reporting arm of the program and in essence functions much the same way as a granting organization -- the Columbia Basin Water Transaction Program. This program was reviewed in the RM&E category review, but can serve as a model for process, accountability and transparency for the umbrella projects reviewed in this category.



Umbrella Projects included in this review:

1. Project #1992-026-01: Grande Ronde Model Watershed
2. Project #2010-077-00: Tucannon River Programmatic Habitat
3. Project #2010-001-00: Upper Columbia Programmatic Habitat
4. Project #2003-011-00: Columbia River Estuary Habitat Restoration
5. Project #2009-012-00: Willamette Bi-Op Habitat Restoration
6. Project # 2009-397-00: John Day Habitat Flow and Habitat Enhancement<sup>1</sup>

In the case of the Columbia Basin Water Transaction Program, the administration and implementation is clear, transparent, and accountable. The program employs a standard and predictable process for identifying, ranking, and selecting projects and the ranking scoring criteria -- both the ranking sheets and the checklists - have been reviewed and approved by the Council's ISRP. The program has one more screen with the Council, and that is an "objection" process by which Council members can raise concerns or objections to any proposal on the current slate prior to it moving forward for contracting. This allows the Council to see the outcome of the process and what the anticipated benefits for each project.

While the umbrella programs were created at different times, for different purposes, and have evolved over time, it is important to look at the value that each currently adds to the program. Since the sponsoring organizations are entrusted to administer a process involving rate-payer dollars, reducing conflicts of interest, or the appearance of a conflict, becomes important at all levels. They each play a coordination role and therefore social dynamics come into play to a large degree. At a minimum, the Council wants to see consistency in how processes are implemented among these umbrella projects. In reviewing these multi-million dollar umbrella programs, the Council is taking a closer look at the effectiveness and value of umbrella projects.

In terms of the scientific criteria used at this subregional level to evaluate and rank projects, the umbrella projects should all be using ISRP-reviewed criteria. Council staff developed specific questions for the proposal form that would provide the Council with information on the process from beginning to end -- solicitation to project reporting. The ISRP reviewed the projects and heard from sponsors and partners during site visits and presentations. While the ISRP makes some good observations and suggestions for future review, the Council and Bonneville have an obligation to consider the value added for each umbrella project and where it makes sense to continue or discontinue with that approach.

The Council, Bonneville and ISRP all see benefits of this approach for project implementation in a subregional area with several partners. As stated by the ISRP: *opportunity afforded by this approach to consolidate habitat restoration actions under an overarching project offers administrative efficiency and a landscape-based strategy that could benefit the region.* This approach can be efficient, and can lead to more orderly and effective implementation in a particular subregion. However, for this approach to be successful, it needs to be equitable and

---

<sup>1</sup> The John Day Habitat Flow and Habitat Enhancement Project appears to be an umbrella project as described in the proposal. Project recommendation is conditioned on review of the implementation strategy, which should also further describe their approach for implementation. If after review of the implementation strategy, the approach remains as the Council describes as an umbrella project, then Council and Bonneville will work together on how the principles for umbrella projects will apply to this project.

transparent. Moving forward in 2014, certain principles should apply to all umbrella projects that will help ensure the expectations outlined above are met for umbrella project administration.

Council Recommendation:

To achieve the above expectations about administrative streamlining, project selection efficiency, action effectiveness and transparency, the Council, working with Bonneville, developed the following list of principles that should be applied by Bonneville to the umbrella contracts' management and in sponsors' implementation. The umbrella projects under this recommendation are largely defined by their approach to: 1) serve as a coordinating entity among sponsors in a particular subregion to identify, review, and select projects; 2) use a formal project solicitation process; and 3) allocate and administer Bonneville funds to other entities for implementation.

1. Umbrella project sponsors will develop and use an implementation strategy to identify, prioritize and select restoration projects based on limiting factors and biological benefits as described in the program and the Willamette and FCRPS Biological Opinions. This strategy should be: science-based, inclusive, impartial, and transparent. Selection, ranking and scoring criteria should be reviewed by the ISRP.
2. To avoid any conflict of interest or the appearance thereof, umbrella project sponsors should not implement habitat actions under a solicitation program that they administer. If the administering entity does engage in habitat implementation, that work should be implemented under a separate contract and the proposed work may be subject to review under the Council's scientific review process.
3. The implementation strategy should integrate the best available science and on-the-ground circumstances/conditions. In addition, when feasible, the sponsor will incorporate project cost and readiness into the implementation strategy.
4. The biological benefits of proposed habitat actions should be reviewed by technical experts.
5. If Bonneville funds for technical assistance (e.g., engineering and preliminary design) are available through the umbrella organization, those funds will be equally available to all partners developing and implementing projects.
6. On an informational basis, umbrella project sponsors will inform the Council at the end of each calendar year regarding, umbrella sponsor's administrative costs and provide a summary of projects implemented under the umbrella solicitations<sup>2</sup>.
7. Umbrella projects will be implemented through FY2016. Funding recommendation beyond 2016 would be based on outcome of and participation in a Council-facilitated performance/effectiveness review every two-four years using the tailored questions from the proposal form for umbrella projects. The review also will likely include a workshop with presentations for sponsors and partners. The first review will take place early-mid 2016.

---

<sup>2</sup> Provide an Annual Summary of project actions to date. Sponsor, project cost, project title, location and short project summary, including anticipated benefits to fish and wildlife, and implementation timeline.

### **C. Provide Long-term Maintenance of Fish Screens**

The geographic review focused on existing commitments for habitat projects, most have which have been ongoing for many years and have been the subject of numerous reviews in the past. Effectiveness and results, in many cases, depend on properly-functioning infrastructure and ongoing maintenance of capital structures. Continued support for the initial investment and ongoing effectiveness of the structure is critical to ensure benefits to fish and wildlife. Because the Council and Bonneville have legal obligations to achieve fish and wildlife protection, mitigation, and enhancement, and those obligations extend over time, the fish and wildlife program needs to maintain the financial support for long-term operations and maintenance.

The geographic review allowed the ISRP and staff to see and hear first-hand about maintenance needs for many screen structures. Screens needs to be consolidated, replaced, and/or resurfaced/upgraded. In the past, the Council has weighed in on keeping up with maintenance actions, funding priorities are directed elsewhere. Priorities for funding seem to be currently directed at the BiOp and the Accords. At some point past investments need to be addressed as a priority to ensure we protect the integrity of the fish and wildlife program.

This issue is not only related to the investments reviewed as part of the geographic review (e.g., fish screens), but was also discussed in other reviews (e.g., wildlife - fences) and was a programmatic issue in the FY 2007-2009 review process.

#### Council Recommendation:

1. Bonneville should provide adequate funding to maintain the integrity of fish screening facilities that they are responsible to maintain.
2. Bonneville to direct funds from projects closed as an outcome of this review, to priority maintenance work (i.e. fish screening facilities). Council and Bonneville to work through established processes to prioritize work.
3. The Council is in the early stages of a process to amend the fish and wildlife program, and in that process the Bonneville and the Council should give careful consideration on how to address the more global issue of maintaining past investments in the program.

### **D. Columbia River Estuary – effectiveness monitoring**

The ISRP identified a series of issues concerning projects in the Columbia estuary dating from the Research Monitoring and Evaluation Programmatic Review. At the time of the RM&E Categorical Review, Bonneville was developing an overarching Estuary Strategy and Monitoring Plan to address its under the FCRPS Biological Opinion.

As part of the RM&E Review, the Council recommended that the responsible entities, primarily Bonneville and the Corps of Engineers (COE), complete their synthesis of estuary actions and results and continue to develop the overarching Estuary Plan and monitoring strategy (RM&E/AP Programmatic Issue #3). The Council reasoned that the development of these documents, and their subsequent review by an Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB)

would ensure that the projects implementing habitat actions and monitoring the results of those actions would have the necessary framework to be scientifically justified.

Prior to the Geographic Review, Bonneville and the Corps of Engineers completed the Columbia Estuary Ecosystem Restoration Program (CEERP). The CEERP was reviewed in 2012 by the ISAB. During the Geographic Review the ISRP had the benefit of a presentation from Bonneville about the CEERP and its plans for developing an AEM strategy for the estuary.

In the ISRP's Geographic Review Final Report, the panel identified a number of programmatic estuary issues that continued to concern them. Those issues revolved largely around the breadth of the CEERP strategy and whether it would cover issues such as toxics, upslope processes and water temperature. The ISRP also were unclear of the prioritization scheme and whether it occurred at a fine enough scale. Their review identified concerns about the lack of an overall strategic plan to guide the estuary effort.

The panel also considered the continuing development of the AEM and Research (AEMR) effort in the estuary. Although the effort follows the AEM strategy in the tributaries of the Columbia, the estuary effort is a separate strategy and thus it will be difficult to rely on just the freshwater AEM to help define action effectiveness in the estuary itself.

Finally, the ISRP recognized that its review role had changed over time in the estuary and that Bonneville and the Corps were placing increased emphasis on reviews of proposed habitat work in the estuary by the Expert Regional Technical Group (ERTG<sup>3</sup>). Thus the ISRP felt its review of the estuary program could scale back to a check-in type review every five years.

#### Council Recommendation:

Implementation of the Estuary aspect of the Council's program has always had a Biological Opinion focus. The program funded only a few projects below Bonneville Dam prior to the 2000 Biological Opinion, which placed an increased emphasis on the Estuary's role in the salmonid life-cycle. Though the work had a Biological Opinion focus, it was largely locally-driven. Over time, that local focus transformed to a program that is increasingly managed and directed by the Action Agencies, with locals implementing the projects, but with the Action Agencies prioritizing and selecting the work and attempting to develop the strategic plan for the estuary and its associated monitoring strategy.

Although the projects that implement the program receive ISRP review and comment, the responsible parties for developing the products to satisfy the ISRP's programmatic issues are Bonneville and the Corps of Engineers. Bonneville and the Corps continue to work on refining the CEERP and its attendant AEMR strategy. The AEMR should receive ISRP review upon its completion by the Action Agencies by early February 2014. The AEMR and its ISRP review should be presented to the Council. Additional review of the CEERP by the Council and the ISRP should occur initially after two years, then again after every five years. Similar to the Council recommendation for action effectiveness monitoring in the tributaries (Programmatic

---

<sup>3</sup> ISAB recommendation: More information about the method of estimating survival benefit units (SBU) to evaluate potential effectiveness of habitat restoration work is needed before the scientific merit of the overall approach can be fully evaluated. An independent scientific review of the method and process is recommended (ISAB 2012-6, September 10, 2012). The Council plans to begin ISAB/RP review of the ERTG method in 2013.

Issue A), Council recommends that Bonneville use a publicly-available tracking database to identify which projects contribute information to the AEMR and which projects rely on information provided by the AEMR.

## Part 3: Individual Project Recommendations

### 1. See the attached spreadsheet for recommendations on individual projects in this review.

The attached spreadsheet lists the projects reviewed in the geographic review, with Bonneville's current FY 2013 budgets, the 2014 Start of Year budgets, sponsors' budget request for 2014 and the Council recommendation for each project addressing conditions or comments to be considered a part of the recommendation.

2. As required under the Power Act, the Council must allow public comments on ISRP reports. The Council invited public comment on the preliminary ISRP report, and that period remained open for over a month after the release of the final report, until September 20, 2013. The Council considered the comments and the recommendations are reflected in the individual project recommendations.

Project #2007-393-00, *Protect and Restore Northeast Oregon*

- July 30, 2013, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest
- August, 1, 2013, Grande Ronde Model Watershed
- September 11, 2013, Nez Perce Tribe
- September 11, 2013, Snake River Recovery Board

Project #2007-398-00, *Yakima Basinwide Tributary Passage and Flow*

- May 6, 2013, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
- May 6, 2013, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- June 5, 2013, Yakima Basin Joint Board
- July 8, 2013, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board
- September 17, 2013, Kittita County, Board of County Commissioners

Project #1992-009-00, *Yakima Phase II Fish Screens Operations and Maintenance (O&M) with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)*

- May 6, 2013, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- May 15, 2013, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- May 20, 2013, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
- June 5, 2013, Yakima Basin Joint Board
- July 8, 2013, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board
- September 10, 2013, Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group

## **Part 4: Council explanations addressing the formal requirements of Section 4h(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Act**

Part 4 contains the formal explanations by the Council responsive to certain specific requirements of Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Act. This includes the written explanations required of the Council in those few instances in which the Council's project funding recommendations do not follow the recommendations of the Independent Scientific Review Panel. The Council also explains how it complied with the requirements in Section 4(h)(10)(D) to "consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations" and "determine whether the projects employ cost-effective measures to achieve program objectives" when making project-funding recommendations.

### **Explanations as to how the Council responded to the recommendations of the Independent Scientific Review Panel**

Section 4(h)(10)(D) requires the Council to "fully consider the recommendations of the Panel when making its final recommendations of projects to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget." If the Council "does not incorporate a recommendation of the Panel, the Council shall explain in writing its reasons for not accepting Panel recommendations." Finally, "[t]he Council, after consideration of the recommendations of the Panel and other appropriate entities, shall be responsible for making the final recommendations of projects to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget." The Council has carefully and fully considered the project review reports of the ISRP, and with the few exceptions noted below, the Council has followed the panel's recommendations in formulating the Council's project funding recommendations.

Umatilla Fish Passage Operations (Project #1988-022-00). The ISRP concluded that this project meets scientific review criteria with two qualifications that "should be addressed in contracting and in future reviews." The first qualification, concerning monitoring and progress reports, the Council did include as a condition on the recommendation for funding. The ISRP's second qualification was that "[c]ollection of adult salmon and steelhead selected for use as broodstock should continue to follow the Hatchery Scientific Review Group's (HSRG) guidelines for the Umatilla and Walla Walla subbasins." (To explain, the project not only provides for coordination and operation of passage facilities and other measures to provide adequate passage conditions, it also "is responsible for collecting broodstock for the Umatilla production program and adult return data for the Umatilla River.") The project sponsor currently operates consistent with the HSRG guidelines. The Council has no reason to believe that it will not continue to do so, and the ISRP is free to inquire about it in future reviews. But the Council decided not to impose this qualification as a requirement in contracting. The issue of the HSRG guidelines as imposed requirements versus best practices guidelines is an issue at play in the process to amend the Council's program that is in progress (as of October 2013).

Yakima Phase II Fish Screens Operations and Maintenance (Project #1992-009-00). The ISRP concluded that this project meets scientific review criteria in part, the qualifications relating to the portion of the proposal to update the Glead and Nelson screens as "not justified biologically,

based on the information provided.” The ISRP concluded that more information was needed, “[f]or instance, if the sponsors are targeting a screen for re-constructing or re-furbishing, they should monitor the existing screen to demonstrate biological data (primarily fish) associated with problems at the screen location.” The Council incorporated this condition into its recommendation for the Nelson screen, a consolidation of a number of screens that clearly depends for further implementation on additional biological justification. The Council decided not to include this condition on its recommendation to implement the improvements at the Glead screen. The inadequacies with the Glead screen -- working within biological criteria under certain conditions and out of criteria in others -- that need to be solved through an upgrade are well documented, and have been the subject of Council review and recommendations to make the same upgrade twice in the recent past, in August 2010 and November 2011.

Forrest Ranch Conservation Area (Project #2001-041-01). The ISRP concluded that this project meets scientific review with a qualification. The project is primarily about managing the Forrest Ranch acquisition in the John Day River basin to protect, manage and enhance Chinook and steelhead habitat. But the project sponsor -- the Warm Springs Tribe -- also sees social value in using the conservation area activities to engage its people and especially its youth in the work and purpose of salmon recovery. The ISRP made the social engagement purpose of the project the subject of its qualification, recommending “that the project sponsor develop a long term plan for public engagement and submit it for ISRP review early in 2014.” The Council has included in its recommendation that the project sponsor consider the ISRP’s qualification concerning the public engagement plan. But the Council decided not to require this as a condition of continued implementation. The Council agrees with the ISRP that the public engagement aspects of the project are strong and notable but lacking definition, and if the project ever becomes dependent on these social elements for continued implementation, more of a coherent plan is needed. But the project’s value for the program is dependent on maintaining and enhancing the conservation value of the land and waters, and the Council is comfortable that the proposal is adequate to justify that value.

Omak Creek Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage (Project #2000-001-00). The ISRP concluded that this project proposal did not meet scientific review criteria. Consistent with the ISRP’s views, the Council recommends that the sponsor provide a revised proposal for ISRP review by May 1, 2014. Implementation beyond FY 2014 is conditioned on that review and then a favorable Council recommendation. We are including this explanation only because the Council is continuing the project, albeit on this contingent condition.

Protect and Restore Northeast Oregon (Project #2007-393-00). The ISRP concluded that this project proposal also did not meet scientific review criteria. The project’s concept appears to be sound: The goal of the Nez Perce Tribe for this project is to assist in the restoration of aquatic habitat within Oregon and southeast Washington to improve conditions for populations of anadromous and resident fish. The main objective of the project, at least in the short term, appears to be to coordinate with the two umbrella projects in the area -- the Grande Ronde Model Watershed and the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board -- on project development and project implementation. The longer term objective for this project is to shift to more on-the-ground habitat improvements. The Tribe will also coordinate with the US Forest Service and apply for non-Bonneville funding from other sources for implementation. The ISRP concluded the proposal lacks both precision and necessary detail; the original proposal is confusing in part as carries some umbrella project elements in the description when it is not an umbrella project. The

Council's recommendation is that the sponsor submit a revised proposal by the end of calendar year 2013 for ISRP and Council review. Implementation beyond February 2014 is conditioned on that ISRP review and then a favorable Council recommendation.

### **Consideration of ocean conditions**

Section 4(h)(10)(D) provides that "in making its recommendations" to Bonneville, the Council is to "consider the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations." Congress provided no other guidance as to the meaning of this consideration. The Council's initial policy response to this charge came in an issue paper titled *Consideration of ocean conditions in the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program* (Council Document No. 97-6; <http://www.nwppc.org/library/1997/97-6.htm>). This paper continues to guide how the Council responds to the direction to consider ocean conditions in its project funding recommendations.

Our regional understanding as to how ocean conditions affect Columbia River salmon and other anadromous fish populations continues to increase, even while much uncertainty remains both about how ocean conditions affect Columbia populations and about the management implications of that information. Increasing knowledge includes greater appreciation for the impact of the ocean on salmon productivity and abundance and the degree of variation in the marine environment. The key scientific principle guiding the Council's consideration is that salmon and steelhead handle environmental variation throughout their life cycle and over time, including within the ocean portion of their lives, by having a broad array of biological characteristics within and between populations.

In addition, while the fish and wildlife program and projects cannot influence the ocean environment, actions can be taken to improve water quality and habitat in the estuary and near-shore environments. These transition zones are critical to the survival of young salmon.

Consequently, the Council's program describes the ocean environment as an integral component of the Columbia River ecosystem. The primary strategy called for in the program is to "identify the effects of ocean conditions on anadromous fish survival and use this information to evaluate and adjust inland actions." The program sets forth two strategies to guide the program's activities with regard to the freshwater plume, the near-shore ocean, and the high seas:

#### ***1. Manage for Variability***

Management actions should strive to help anadromous fish and other species accommodate a variety of ocean conditions by providing a wide range of life history strategies. Continue monitoring and evaluation of the Columbia River plume and ocean conditions for impacts on salmonid survival. Monitor salmon returns and climate-change impacts on ocean conditions in order to identify factors affecting survival in the ocean and plume.

#### ***2. Distinguish Ocean Effects from Other Effects***

Monitoring and evaluation actions should recognize and take into account the effect of varying ocean conditions and, to the extent feasible, separate the effects of ocean related mortality from that caused in the freshwater part of the life cycle.



The Fish and Wildlife Program's biological objectives for population and environmental characteristics and its strategies for the mainstem, estuary, habitat, and artificial production add further consideration of relevance. Taken together, the three primary ways the Council acting under the program can take into account ocean conditions in general and influence salmon survival in the ocean are to evaluate proposals and recommending funding for projects that: (1) further improve our understanding of the effects of ocean conditions on salmon populations; (2) improve productivity and preserve and extend life-history diversity in salmon populations; and (3) improve estuarine and near-shore conditions.

Turning to this particular review, however, the relevance of the obligation to consider ocean conditions is minimal in any direct sense. There is nothing in our knowledge about ocean conditions that directly changes the particular dynamics of reviewing and recommending tributary habitat projects. The one key lesson -- the need to help anadromous fish and other species accommodate a variety of ocean conditions by providing a wide range of life history strategies -- is furthered here by recommending projects to improve habitat for a range of salmon and steelhead life histories. And as our understanding of the value of estuary conditions for salmon and steelhead of all types has grown over the years, so has the importance of increasing the amount and quality of habitat work we do in the estuary, another aspect of this review.

The Council is currently in the middle of a process to amend its program, including the ocean, near-shore and estuary elements of the program. Even as the Council will update these portions of the program with the latest understandings of ocean conditions and their implications for salmon and steelhead survival and management, there is nothing in the recommended amendments that would directly affect these review conclusions.

### **Cost-effective measures**

Section 4(h)(10)(D) further provides that in making the project funding recommendations, the Council is to "determine whether the projects employ cost-effective measures to achieve program objectives." As with the command to "consider ocean conditions," Congress did not provide any further explanation or guidance as to the meaning of this provision. The legislation did not specify any particular approach to cost-effectiveness analysis or define in any particular what is meant by a "cost-effective measure." The provision does not require, for example, the use of a single measure of biological effectiveness as a basis for comparison among projects, nor the use of strictly quantitative analysis. And while the logic of the Council's program might focus most of the cost effectiveness analysis among and between project proposals, the literal wording calls for a cost-effectiveness analysis only *within* projects, that is, whether any particular project employs the best of possible alternative methods to meet its objectives.

Given this context, the Council has worked over the years to understand the state of the art in natural resource economics and cost-effectiveness analyses to help guide the Council in making the determination required. Soon after Congress adopted this amendment to the Power Act in 1997, the Council, with the help of its staff economists and its newly-formed Independent Economic Analysis Board (IEAB), developed an approach to the cost-effectiveness analysis in a document titled *Methods of Economic Analysis for Salmon Recovery Programs*, Council Document No. 97-12 (July 1997) ("methods analysis"). The Council first used this methods

analysis to initiate the cost-effectiveness determination in the project review process for Fiscal Year 1998. It remains the basis today for the analysis and determination.

The methods analysis concluded that several problems make it difficult for the Council to undertake a quantitative cost-effectiveness comparison between Columbia River fish and wildlife projects using a single, quantified measure of benefits to determine which projects produce the greatest benefits per dollar. The problems include the lack of agreement on measures of biological effectiveness; the fact that the complex life-cycle of anadromous and resident fish makes it difficult to isolate the biological effects of particular activities or to compare different biological effects of different kinds of projects; and the fact that in the project review process, different project sponsors propose vastly different types of activities, and thus different kinds of cost and economic information, which makes cost comparisons difficult.

These observations remain valid. There are sound reasons to believe projects produce benefits to fish and wildlife, as explained below, but not in a directly predictable single quantity. A quantitative cost-effectiveness analysis of the alternative method's available to a project still requires a greater understanding of the direct biological effectiveness of individual actions and methods than we have now.

The IEAB's methods analysis noted, however, that there is much more to cost effectiveness than a quantitative comparison of the costs of alternative ways to achieve a single biological objective. Much can be done to review the efficiency of projects, to improve the likelihood that the projects selected will be the most cost effective, and to improve project management. Cost-effectiveness review drives toward procedures for project review, selection, and management that emphasize efficiency and accountability.

Based on these considerations, the methods analysis recommended four strategies to improve the likelihood that the projects recommended for funding are those that employ cost-effective measures to the greatest degree:

- Strategy 1: The best assessment of the effectiveness of fish and wildlife projects comes from the review by the ISRP.
- Strategy 2: Improve the amount, quality, and comparability of project cost information.
- Strategy 3: Evaluate the record of existing projects over time. Projects that have been ongoing for some time should have yielded some measurable effects or have contributed some concrete addition to the region's knowledge about fish and wildlife problems.
- Strategy 4: Introduce selective audits on projects, oriented toward determining whether the contracting process contains the procedures necessary to manage the project's cost and effectiveness.

The Council's experience over the years has added to or elaborated on this set with three further strategies: (1) clarify, specify, and quantify program objectives as much as possible; (2) develop other elements of project review besides ISRP review that also provide accountability benefits; and (3) flag certain projects and programs for more in-depth review of benefits and costs.

The Council acted consistent with these strategies in the just-completed review of the tributary and estuary habitat projects. In particular, the Council relied heavily on the views of the

independent science panel in shaping its recommendations, selected certain program areas for further synthesis and review in order to evaluate just how effective key program areas are, and used this review both to evaluate projects and to continue to call for improvements in monitoring and reporting in order to have a better basis for evaluating projects over time. Many of these projects and umbrella initiatives have been reviewed and refined many times now, including the results of prior implementation, and the quality and effectiveness of the ongoing projects appears to be high. The Council, Bonneville, the ISRP and others working together have also made dramatic improvements in the last few years in the coordinated and comprehensive effort to monitor, evaluate and report on habitat action effectiveness.

---

w:\projectreviews 2009-2013\geographic\programmatic comments9-27.docx

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
1	<a href="#">198343600</a>	Umatilla Passage Operations and Maintenance	Westland Irrigation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$521,989	\$524,000	\$521,989		Implement with conditions through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in contracting and in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation C for long term maintenance.
2	<a href="#">198402100</a>	John Day Habitat Enhancement	Oregon Department Of Fish and Wildlife	Yes (Qualified)		\$534,944	\$572,500	\$567,944		Implement with conditions through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualification #2 regarding site selection in contracting. For ISRP qualification #1, see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring. For ISRP qualification #3, sponsor to work with CTWSRO on developing the Implementation Strategy (see the recommendation for project # 2007-397-00).
3	<a href="#">198402500</a>	Blue Mountain Fish Habitat Improvement	Oregon Department Of Fish and Wildlife	Yes (Qualified)		\$376,929	\$447,177	\$351,929		Implement through FY 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in future reviews. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
4	<a href="#">198710001</a>	Umatilla Anadromous Fish Habitat-Umatilla Tribe	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$2,472,464	\$1,023,878	\$800,038		Implement through FY 2018. ISRP qualifications will be addressed in Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
5	<a href="#">198710002</a>	Umatilla Anadromous Fish Habitat-Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Oregon Department Of Fish and Wildlife	Yes		\$282,103	\$297,103	\$297,103		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
6	<a href="#">198802200</a>	Umatilla Fish Passage Operations	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$574,101	\$526,122	\$533,032		Implement with condition through FY 2018: Bonneville and sponsor to address ISRP qualification regarding progress reports in contracting and in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation And Recommendation C for long term maintenance.
7	<a href="#">198812025</a>	Yakima River Management, Data and Habitat-Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project	Yakama Confederated Tribes	N/A	X	\$2,179,177	\$1,456,607	\$1,456,607		Implement through FY 2018.
8	<a href="#">198902700</a>	Umatilla Basin Power Repay	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	N/A	X	\$1,321,341	\$1,353,075	\$1,353,075		Implement through FY 2018.
9	<a href="#">199200900</a>	Yakima Phase II Fish Screens Operations and Maintenance with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	In Part		\$180,213	\$865,390	\$291,391		Recommendation in three parts: 1) Ongoing screen operations and maintenance: implement through 2018; 2) Glead Screen: Implement through completion per Council decisions on August 18, 2010 and November 9, 2011; 3) Proposed Nelson Dam Facilities Consolidation work will depend on biological justification (ISRP qualification) and review by the ISRP and Council when submitted by the sponsor. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation C for long term maintenance.

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
10	<a href="#">199202601</a>	Grande Ronde Model Watershed	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Foundation	Yes (Qualified)		\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000		Implement with conditions through 2016. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications #1 and #2 in future reviews (also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring). Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification #3 in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation B for umbrella projects.
11	<a href="#">199206200</a>	Lower Yakima Valley Riparian Wetlands Restoration	Yakama Confederated Tribes	Yes	X	\$1,871,935	\$1,861,935	\$1,727,895		Implement through FY 2018. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
12	<a href="#">199304000</a>	Fifteenmile Creek Habitat Improvement	Oregon Department Of Fish and Wildlife	Yes		\$418,835	\$382,633	\$323,610		Implement through FY 2018. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
13	<a href="#">199306600</a>	Oregon Fish Screens Project	Oregon Department Of Fish and Wildlife	Yes (Qualified)		\$54,601	\$1,063,719	\$59,601	\$1,063,791	Implement with conditions through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP suggestions in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation C for long term maintenance. Also see recommendation for project # 2007-397-00.
14	<a href="#">199401500</a>	Idaho Fish Screening Improvement	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Yes		\$424,032	\$490,300	\$424,032		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation C for long term maintenance.
15	<a href="#">199401805</a>	Asotin Creek Enhancement and Restoration	Asotin County Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$350,647	\$288,933	\$280,517		Implement with conditions through FY 2015. Recommendation to combine scope and appropriate funding with Project #2002-050-00. ISRP qualifications #1 and #2 to be dealt with in contracting to better align with subbasin and regional planning efforts with project implementation priorities. ISRP qualification #3 (progress report) to be submitted to the ISRP for review by April 1, 2015. Funding recommendation beyond the start of FY 2016 dependent on favorable ISRP review. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #4).
16	<a href="#">199401806</a>	Tucannon Stream and Riparian Restoration	Columbia Conservation District	Yes		\$351,239	\$351,239	\$351,239		Implement through FY 2018. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
17	<a href="#">199401807</a>	Garfield County Fall Chinook and Steelhead Habitat Improvement	Pomeroy Conservation District	No		\$60,516	\$60,000	\$58,016		Close out due to non-performance.
18	<a href="#">199404200</a>	Trout Creek Operations and Maintenance (maintenance)	Oregon Department Of Fish and Wildlife	Yes (Qualified)		\$384,013	\$540,800	\$386,713		Implement with conditions through FY 2018: Sponsor to work with Jefferson County through project #1998-028-00 to develop a joint strategic plan for implementation and submit to BPA by FY 2015. Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualifications in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
19	<a href="#">199405000</a>	Salmon River Habitat Enhancement	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$238,799	\$244,769	\$262,206		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
20	<a href="#">199603501</a>	Yakama Reservation Watershed Project	Yakama Confederated Tribes	Yes	X	\$1,457,946	\$1,075,400	\$1,417,760		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
21	<a href="#">199604200</a>	Restore Salmon Creek Anadromous Fish	Colville Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$329,511	\$381,000	\$438,217		Implement with condition through FY 2018: Sponsor to develop an adaptive management process to be submitted to the ISRP for review by end of FY 2016. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
22	<a href="#">199604601</a>	Walla Walla River Basin Fish Habitat Enhancement	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$956,880	\$1,200,000	\$952,799		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification #2 in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #1).
23	<a href="#">199607702</a>	Lolo Creek Watershed Restoration	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$514,000	\$514,000	\$514,000		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications #2 and #3 in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #1).
24	<a href="#">199608300</a>	Grand Ronde Watershed Restoration	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$945,815	\$650,689	\$645,289		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in future reviews. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
25	<a href="#">199608600</a>	Clearwater Focus Program	Idaho Office of Species Conservation	N/A		\$102,961	\$102,958	\$102,961		Implement through FY 2018.
26	<a href="#">199705100</a>	Yakima Basin Side Channels Land Acquisition	Yakama Confederated Tribes	Yes	X	\$334,158	\$1,233,750	\$932,860		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
27	<a href="#">199705600</a>	Klickitat Watershed Enhancement	Yakama Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$715,931	\$633,216	\$696,216		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
28	<a href="#">199706000</a>	Clearwater Focus Watershed Restoration Coordination	Nez Perce Tribe	N/A		\$147,088	\$147,088	\$147,088		Implement through FY 2018.
29	<a href="#">199801900</a>	Wind River Watershed	Underwood CD, USFS, USGS, WDFW	Yes		\$508,523	\$501,218	\$508,523		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
30	<a href="#">199802100</a>	Hood River Fish Habitat	Confederated Tribes Of Warm Springs	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$477,685	\$583,717	\$671,044		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification #1 in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #2).

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
31	<a href="#">199802800</a>	Trout Creek Watershed Restoration	Jefferson County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$149,913	\$200,000	\$149,913		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to work with ODFW through project #1994-04-200 to develop a joint strategic plan for implementation and submit to BPA by FY 2015. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
32	<a href="#">199901700</a>	Protect and Restore Lapwai Creek Watershed	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$413,182	\$413,182	\$413,182		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualification related to implementation planning in contracting. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
33	<a href="#">200000100</a>	Omak Creek Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage	Colville Confederated Tribes	No	X	\$577,224	\$622,000	\$207,916		Implement with condition through FY 2014: Sponsor to provide a revised proposal for ISRP review by May 1, 2014. Implementation beyond FY 2014 is conditioned on ISRP review and Council recommendation.
34	<a href="#">200001500</a>	Oxbow Conservation Area	Confederated Tribes Of Warm Springs	Yes	X	\$295,026	\$1,930,000	\$450,791		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
35	<a href="#">200003100</a>	Enhance Habitat in the North Fork John Day River	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$706,556	\$495,400	\$558,757		Implement with condition through FY 2014: Sponsor to provide a revised proposal addressing ISRP qualifications, for ISRP review by May 1, 2014. Implementation beyond FY 2014 is conditioned on ISRP review and Council recommendation.
36	<a href="#">200003500</a>	Newsome Creek Watershed Restoration	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$671,427	\$671,426	\$651,677		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification #2 in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #1).
37	<a href="#">200102100</a>	15 Mile Creek Riparian Buffers	Wasco County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$91,345	\$84,000	\$91,345		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
38	<a href="#">200104101</a>	Forrest Ranch Conservation Area	Confederated Tribes Of Warm Springs	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$665,245	\$785,000	\$556,926		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification to develop a long term public engagement plan given the substantial social components of the project.
39	<a href="#">200201500</a>	Coordination and Technical Assistance to Watershed Councils and Individuals in Sherman County, Oregon	Sherman Soil and Water Conservation District	No		\$72,442	\$73,205	\$72,442		Close out due to non-performance.
40	<a href="#">200201900</a>	Develop Riparian Buffer Systems in Lower Wasco County	Wasco County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$45,000	\$74,300	\$74,375		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendations for CREP projects. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
41	<a href="#">200203400</a>	Riparian Buffers in Wheeler County	Wheeler County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$79,798	\$82,722	\$79,798		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendations for CREP projects. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
42	<a href="#">200203500</a>	Riparian Buffers in Gilliam County	Gilliam County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$77,886	\$81,155	\$77,886		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendations for CREP projects. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
43	<a href="#">200205000</a>	Riparian Buffers on Couse and Tenmile Creeks in Asotin County	Asotin County Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$306,432	\$252,499	\$245,145		Close out project and combine appropriate funding and implementation priorities with Project #1994-018-05. ISRP qualifications #1, #2 and #3 can be dealt with in contracting during transition.
44	<a href="#">200205900</a>	Yankee Fork Salmon River Restoration	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Yes	X	\$721,506	\$528,993	\$573,370		Implement through FY 2018 per August 2013 Council recommendation.
45	<a href="#">200206100</a>	Potlatch River Watershed Restoration	Latah Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (qualified)		\$400,000	\$421,367	\$400,000		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in contracting and for future reviews. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
46	<a href="#">200207000</a>	Lapwai Creek Anadromous Habitat	Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$261,759	\$261,760	\$261,759		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification #2 in future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #1).
47	<a href="#">200207200</a>	Red River Watershed Restoration	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$621,778	\$621,780	\$560,778		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualification #2 for future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #1).
48	<a href="#">200301100</a>	Columbia River Estuary Habitat Restoration	Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership	Yes (Qualified)		\$2,600,000	\$3,194,012	\$3,000,000		Implement with conditions through 2016. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation D for monitoring in the estuary. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation B for umbrella projects.
49	<a href="#">200706400</a>	Slate Creek Watershed Restoration	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes		\$168,490	\$168,493	\$160,092		Implement through FY 2018.
50	<a href="#">200709200</a>	Restore Selway River Watershed	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$198,451	\$200,000	\$197,000		Implement with conditions through 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in contracting and for future reviews. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
51	<a href="#">200712700</a>	East Fork of South Fork Salmon River Passage Restoration	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes		\$733,830	\$789,110	\$789,109		Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.



Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
52	<a href="#">200715600</a>	Rock Creek Fish and Habitat Assessment	Yakama Confederated Tribes	In Part (Qualified)	X	\$343,683	\$329,587	\$329,587		Implement with conditions through June 2014. Sponsor to submit geomorphology and salmonid assessment report to the ISRP when completed by March 1, 2014. Funding recommendation beyond June 2014 dependent on favorable ISRP review and Council recommendation.
53	<a href="#">200721700</a>	Walla Walla River Passage Operations and Maintenance	Gardena Farms Irrigation District #13	Yes		\$161,975	\$160,000	\$161,975		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendations for long term maintenance.
54	<a href="#">200722400</a>	Okanogan Subbasin Habitat Implementation Program (OSHIP)	Colville Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$2,319,017	\$8,000,000	\$1,625,727		Implement with condition through FY 2018: Sponsor to submit report regarding flows (ISRP qualification), by June 1, 2014 for ISRP review.
55	<a href="#">200726800</a>	Idaho Watershed Habitat Restoration-Custer District	Custer Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes (Qualified)		\$295,000	\$350,000	\$295,000		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications #1 and #2 in future reviews. Sponsor to address ISRP qualification #3 in contracting. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #4).
56	<a href="#">200739300</a>	Protect and Restore Northeast Oregon	Nez Perce Tribe	No		\$82,868	\$185,436	\$82,000		Sponsor should submit revised proposal by the end of calendar year 2013 for Council review. Funding recommendation beyond February 2014 dependent on favorable outcome of this subsequent review (see explanation in decision document Part 3)
57	<a href="#">200739400</a>	Idaho Watershed Habitat Restoration-Lemhi	Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Yes	X	\$445,233	\$433,051	\$445,233		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring. Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP's comments in future reviews.
58	<a href="#">200739500</a>	Protect and Restore Lochsa Watershed	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$1,384,775	\$1,419,395	\$1,211,775		Implement through FY 2018: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in future reviews. Sponsor to address ISRP qualification #3 in contracting. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #4)
59	<a href="#">200739600</a>	Walla Walla Basinwide Tributary Passage and Flow	Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council	Yes		\$58,803	\$1,031,600	\$33,803	\$940,659	Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
60	<a href="#">200739700</a>	John Day Passage, Flow and Habitat Enhancement	Confederated Tribes Of Warm Springs	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$438,672	\$2,937,500	\$425,758	\$1,676,428	Implement with conditions through 2014. Sponsor to submit to Council and ISRP for review the final Implementation Strategy (ISRP qualification). Sponsor to coordinate with projects #1984-021-00 and #1993-066-00 and appropriate local governments in the development of the Implementation Strategy (see recommendations for projects #1984-021-00 and #1993-066-00). See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation B for umbrella projects.

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
61	<a href="#">200739800</a>	Yakima Basinwide Tributary Passage and Flow	South Central Washington Resource Conservation and Development	Yes		\$127,605	\$1,131,618	\$127,605	\$777,321	Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
62	<a href="#">200739900</a>	Upper Salmon Screen Tributary Passage	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Yes		\$0	\$1,025,169	\$0	\$1,000,000	Implement through FY 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation C for long term maintenance.
63	<a href="#">200820200</a>	Protect and Restore Tucannon Watershed	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$387,407	\$225,000	\$218,928		Implement with condition through FY 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualification in contracting. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
64	<a href="#">200820600</a>	Instream Flow Restoration	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$1,067,939	\$225,000	\$1,094,637		Implement through FY 2018 with condition. Sponsor to revise proposal as suggested by ISRP (qualifications #1-4), through contracting. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (ISRP qualification #5). This project coordinates with the CBWTP and utilizes the process and criteria developed by CBWTP to review and prioritize transactions; see Council recommendations for project # 2002-013-01 of June 2011.
65	<a href="#">200820700</a>	Umatilla Tribe Ceded Area Stream Corridor Conservation & Protection	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$2,500,000	\$1,010,818	\$2,500,000		Implement with conditions through FY 2018 as described in the January 2012 Council recommendation. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
66	<a href="#">200830100</a>	Habitat Restoration Planning/Design/Implementation within boundaries of Warm Springs Reservation, lower Deschutes River, Oregon	Confederated Tribes Of Warm Springs	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$352,720	\$736,216	\$670,323		Implement through FY 2018 per February 12, 2012 Council recommendation for Beaver Creek and Mill Creek. Additional proposed activities for Warm Springs River wood placement requires further response and review. Implementation recommendation of wood placement dependent on favorable ISRP review. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
67	<a href="#">200860300</a>	Pahsimeroi River Habitat	Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$1,061,806	\$1,161,250	\$1,161,249		Implement with condition through FY 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications related to the hatchery-habitat relationship, during contracting. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
68	<a href="#">200860400</a>	Lower Clearwater and Potlatch Watersheds Habitat Improvements	Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$644,543	\$866,802	\$866,802		Implement with condition through FY 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in contracting and for future reviews. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
69	<a href="#">200860800</a>	Idaho MOA/Fish Accord Water Transactions	Idaho Department of Water Resources, Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$461,957	\$1,368,203	\$1,368,203		Implement with condition through FY 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualification related to the compliance monitoring protocols. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring. This project coordinates with the CBWTP and utilizes the process and criteria developed by CBWTP to review and prioritize transactions; see Council recommendations for project # 2002-013-01 of June 2011.
70	<a href="#">200890300</a>	ESA Habitat Restoration	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$546,711	\$487,098	\$487,098		Implement through FY 2015 with conditions. Sponsor to submit limiting factors and project prioritization report to the ISRP by June 1, 2015. Funding recommendation beyond FY 2015 dependent upon favorable ISRP review and Council recommendation.
71	<a href="#">200900300</a>	Upper Columbia Habitat Restoration	Yakama Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$8,915,056	\$4,485,997	\$7,817,839		Implement with conditions through FY 2014: 1) Sponsor to submit monitoring progress report for ISRP review by March 1, 2014 (also see recommendation for project # 2010-001-00). Recommendation to implement for FY 2015 and beyond, depending on favorable review of the monitoring progress report. 2) See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
72	<a href="#">200901200</a>	Willamette Bi-Op Habitat Restoration	Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board	Yes		\$500,000	\$800,000	\$800,000		Implement with conditions through 2016. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation B for umbrella projects.
73	<a href="#">200902600</a>	Walla Walla Juvenile and Adult Passage Improvements	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$21,404	\$776,000	\$20,000	\$855,148	Implement through 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
74	<a href="#">201000100</a>	Upper Columbia Programmatic Habitat	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board	Yes (Qualified)		\$3,642,862	\$200,500	\$3,751,000		Implement with conditions through FY 2014: 1) Sponsor to submit monitoring progress report for ISRP review by March 1, 2014. Funding recommendation for FY2015 and beyond, depending on favorable review of the monitoring progress report; 2) Bonneville and sponsor to administer project based on principles described in Programmatic Issue and Recommendation B for umbrella projects; 3) See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
75	<a href="#">201000300</a>	Lower South Fork Clearwater River Watershed Restoration	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$799,000	\$873,341	\$856,341		Implement with condition through FY 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualification to submit additional information on Leggett Creek in contracting. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
76	<a href="#">201000400</a>	CREST Estuary Habitat Restoration	Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce (CREST)	Yes (Qualified)		\$2,795,657	\$3,060,000	\$3,357,749		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation D for monitoring in the estuary.

Ln	ID	Title	Sponsor	Meets scientific criteria?	Accord	FY13 Working Budget	2014 Sponsor Budget Request	FY14 BPA SOY Budget	Capital FY14	Council Recommendation
77	<a href="#">201007000</a>	WA Estuary MOA Project Scoping & Implementation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Yes (Qualified)	X	\$2,326,083	\$1,800,000	\$2,273,207		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation D for monitoring in the estuary.
78	<a href="#">201007200</a>	Lemhi River Restoration	Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Yes	X	\$500,263	\$1,115,072	\$484,670		Implement through FY 2018. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
79	<a href="#">201007300</a>	Columbia Land Trust Estuarine Restoration	Columbia Land Trust	Yes (Qualified)		\$3,739,161	\$739,999	\$2,933,578		Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation D for monitoring in the estuary.
80	<a href="#">201007700</a>	Tucannon River Programmatic Habitat Project	Snake River Salmon Recovery Board	Yes (Qualified)		\$1,268,560	\$1,343,849	\$1,268,560		Implement with conditions through 2016. Sponsor should consider addressing ISRP qualifications #1 and #4 in future reviews. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring (Qualifications #2 and #3). See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation B for umbrella projects.
81	<a href="#">201008600</a>	Protect and Restore the Crooked and American River Watersheds	Nez Perce Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$756,900	\$750,900	\$680,000		Implement with conditions through 2018. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in contracting. Also see Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring.
82	<a href="#">201008800</a>	Upper and Lower Lemhi Acquisition/Easements	Idaho Office of Species Conservation	Yes	X	\$74,653	\$5,013,610	\$10,479,655		Implement through 2018.
83	<a href="#">201201500</a>	Cowlitz Indian Tribe Estuary Restoration Program	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Yes (Qualified)		\$2,833,942	\$1,813,762	\$446,888		New BiOp project. Implement with conditions through 2018: See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation D for monitoring in the estuary.
						<b>\$72,399,921</b>	<b>\$79,780,393</b>	<b>\$77,521,145</b>	<b>\$6,313,347</b>	