

Melinda S. Eden
Chair
Oregon

Joan M. Dukes
Oregon

Frank L. Cassidy Jr.
"Larry"
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington



Jim Kempton
Vice-Chair
Idaho

Judi Danielson
Idaho

Bruce A. Measure
Montana

Rhonda Whiting
Montana

June 7, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: Patty O'Toole, Program Implementation Manager
John Shurts, General Counsel

SUBJECT: Project review for FY06 -- list of issues

Introduction

One item on the agendas for both the Fish and Wildlife Committee and the Council at the June Council meeting is a discussion of the issues involved in recommending projects for funding by Bonneville in Fiscal Year 2006 to implement the Council's *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*. The purpose of this memorandum is to outline issues the staff has uncovered so far. The staff is not asking for a decision from the Council, only guidance from the members on whether the staff has captured the right issues and on possible treatments for each issue. We hope to have the Council decide on its FY06 funding recommendations to Bonneville at the July meeting.

The Council did not solicit for new project proposals for FY06 or organize a comprehensive new review of project proposals. This was not possible, or at least not practical to schedule and complete by July or August 2005. This is because a new project solicitation and full review for FY06 would have depended on having all the subbasin plans adopted into the program many months ago to allow time for the full review process -- and the Council has just been completing the adoption process this month -- and on having the proper complement of scientists on the Independent Scientific Review Panel ready to dive into the project review -- and the panel is just now in the process of replacing 7 of its 11 members after the ordeal of subbasin plan review. The program and the panel will be in shape to begin a comprehensive project review process in the second half of this year, and leading to recommendations for FY07 and beyond, a process including a wide solicitation, in-depth scientific and public review, and new multi-year Council

recommendations, all aimed at implementing the objectives, strategies and priorities in the subbasin plans.

In the interim, the approach to developing a start-of-year budget recommendation for FY06 is based on the following elements: The central principle used to organize and guide the review has been to remain consistent with the multi-year project recommendations that the Council developed during the provincial review a few years ago. It was in this provincial review process that the projects currently funded by Bonneville (at least most of them) received the full review by the Independent Scientific Review Panel, the public and the Council required by Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Act.

The Council asked the project sponsors of this ongoing work who sought continued funding in FY06 to submit a project response that explained the project and the budget request, described what the project had accomplished since the provincial review and what further the sponsor hoped to accomplish in FY06, and described how the sponsor understood the project to be consistent with the strategies and priorities of a subbasin plan, if relevant. The Council received 352 responses from sponsors requesting funding for around 300 projects, with the funding requests totaling just under \$160 million.

Members of the central and state staffs spent several days reviewing together the project responses for FY06, reading every response and in many cases also reading the original project proposals and the Council's original recommendations from the provincial review. Part of the purpose of the review was a threshold determination as to whether the project sponsors provided clear and persuasive explanations as to how their projects are consistent with the subbasin plans and of their past and expected accomplishments. The results of this part of the review are described later in this introduction.

The review also exposed a set of issues that need to be resolved on the road to recommending a particular set of projects and a total budget for FY06. These issues are outlined throughout the memorandum, along with possible ways to resolve the issues. The issues are organized such that issues 1 - 5 all have the potential to add to the base budget, issue 6 has the potential to reduce the budget and the remainder are primarily budget neutral issues.

Another principle arising out of the nature of the review process for FY06 has been not to solicit or recommend new projects (or new work in existing projects), deferring that to the next fiscal year and the solicitation and full scientific and public review of projects to implement subbasin plans. Projects proposed to implement the UPA represent an exception to that rule, as discussed below. The ISRP will be part of the review in FY06, to review these and any other new project proposals that have some reason to be considered for funding in FY06, and to handle a number of specific project reviews assigned for or in FY06.

Yet another governing principle of the review and articulation of the issues has been to focus our attention and group the issues into broad programmatic themes, staying out project detail and specific problems as much as possible. Our overriding recommendation to the Council, as it was last year, is to define these key issues, have the Council recommend a programmatic treatment

for each issue, and then turn to Bonneville and others to apply these treatments and resolve particular problems.

We are still working on the preliminary project and budget tables as packet deadline is upon us. We will send those separately to the Council in the next couple of days. Among other information, the tables will list all the projects, the budget requests from the sponsors, a tentative staff proposal for a start-of-year budget for the project which reflects in some way a proposed resolution of issues described later in this memorandum (if any apply to the project), a code that links the project to one of more of these issues (again, if any apply), and additional comments.

We are currently discussing the appropriate total budget-planning target for FY06. We expect to establish a budget planning target that is significantly above the accrual target for FY06, given how spending has lagged behind the planning budgets. For the moment, we are assuming a start-of-year planning budget of \$160 million (unrelated to the \$160 in requests mentioned above) in expense funds, a total that includes \$11 million in Bonneville program support (overhead). We estimate that this planning level will result in actual spending consistent with Bonneville's budget commitment. We will be working with Bonneville to confirm the appropriate planning target before the July meeting. We expect the capital budget accrual target to remain \$36 million.

- *Consistency with subbasin plans.* Consistency with the program's adopted subbasin plans is a critical requirement of project review and funding recommendations from here on. We asked the project sponsors for FY06 to describe whether and how their projects are consistent with the objectives, strategies and priorities in a relevant subbasin plan. The responses have been, for the most part, encouraging, and something that others interested in the program should see. We plan to organize the information we received for FY06 so the projects in each subbasin and mainstem reach will be grouped together along with the sponsors' explanations for how this body of on-going work relates to the priorities of the subbasin plan.

Sponsors of certain types of projects -- especially projects funding and monitoring and evaluation on existing work, and projects for the purpose of baseline and trend monitoring, assessment and evaluation of population or habitat conditions had a harder time showing the link to the subbasin plans and priorities, even if the work was occurring in a subbasin or relevant mainstem reach. This is not surprising, given the focus in the subbasin plans on the objectives and strategies to address factors identified as still limiting the productivity of key species, and given that the Council decided to address monitoring and evaluation issues from a regional and not a subbasin perspective.

The staff's review of these responses this year has not been deep, no more than reading the responses to determine if a project sponsor has been able to produce a relatively persuasive explanation, with citations, as to how the project is consistent with the relevant subbasin plan, and relying on the knowledge of the plans among central and state staff for a preliminary check. The full project review process that will begin later this year and lead to the funding recommendations in FY07 and beyond will be the place for a deep and critical review and reshaping of the projects in the light of the newly adopted subbasin plans. The staff did identify

a set of projects for which the explanations of subbasin plan consistency were lacking or not persuasive. Most of these are projects that raise other issues for funding in FY 2006 and are dealt with under the issues described below. The way in which the FY06 project descriptions illustrate the on-going work for each subbasin will play an important role in that review.

One caveat: Just because we have not singled out a project for a comment about the description of subbasin consistency does not mean that the staff, has in fact determined in some definitive way that the project is indeed consistent with the relevant subbasin plan.

- *Descriptions of past accomplishments and expected accomplishments in FY06.* The Council also asked the projects sponsors to summarize what their projects have accomplished since the last full review and provincial review recommendations, and what more they hope to accomplish in FY06. The results are eye-opening and again, for the most part, encouraging. We plan to organize and make available the descriptions of the projects and their accomplishments so more people will understand what the program has been all about for the past five years.

For the more focused purpose of the FY06 review and recommendations, a lack of a strong explanation of past or expected accomplishments at the least raises a question as to the continued viability of the project. Descriptions of accomplishments has been especially useful to the staff when considering whether to recommend renewal for projects already on the margin for some other reason, discussed below in the issues. Lack of a sufficient description of past or expected accomplishments may at the very least be a reason to seek further review of a project before recommending funding in FY06, or to recommend a conditional approval requiring a better description of past and/or expected accomplishments before going forward in FY06. As with questions about subbasin plan consistency, the staff's comments indicating a concern with a project's description of accomplishments (past and expected) have largely been folded in with comments and recommendations related to other issues.

Issues

1) Effects of Level Funding

The first set of issues present new or additional funding needs against what has been for years a tightly constrained budget. An issue repeating from the last two years, but perhaps the biggest problem the program now faces in FY06 is the adverse effect of years of level funding yet rising project costs. A large number of project sponsors stated in their FY06 response that they are experiencing significant increases in costs for personnel, benefits, supplies (especially fuel), overhead charges from parent agencies, and the like. If funding remains level, something has to give, they report, and so sponsors have identified project tasks that will be dropped or reduced or only partially completed if the project budgets are not increased. Some of these sponsors requested a specific funding increase to address this “cost of living or inflation” problem. Requests for increases in funding for this purpose total roughly \$5.7 million, from around 81 projects. The budget total is rough, as in some instances it has been difficult to precisely separate funding increase requests related to increased cost of living from requests for increases for other purposes. It is important to understand that this total is lower than the real size of problem. This is because some project sponsors, perhaps expecting no change from level funding, simply explained that rising costs would affect actual work and tasks, but did not request a specific increase. And we believe others are facing the same problem, but with the same expectation, said nothing but will suffer the same.

Staff will identify the projects explicitly raising this issue on the project tables, as well as the requests for funding increases compared to level funding. The problem is so serious that room may need to be found in the FY06 budget to address some of the more dire cases. How to decide which requests are more pressing than others will be difficult.

2) UPA projects

The FY06 projects and budget requests include a number of projects and placeholders intended to implement the federal action agencies’ final Updated Proposed Action. These projects fall into three types: (1) new projects or placeholders (new in 06 or in 05 as within-year requests), mostly identified by Bonneville; (2) existing projects for which the project sponsors are requesting significant increases in funding to build capacity or expand in scope so as to address needs identified in the UPA; and (3) existing projects for which the project sponsors have identified a link to the UPA, but there is no increase in tasks or capacity projected and no increase in funds requested (at least not linked to the UPA).

Requests for new or increased funding represented by the UPA projects total around \$9 million. We recognize the policy and legal purposes underlying the UPA, and also recognize that it is likely the Council will support the federal agencies in appropriate implementation of the UPA. That said, all should also recognize that to fund new UPA projects in a tight budget is tantamount to saying these projects are of a higher priority than the other deserving requests for new or increased funding, such as funding increases needed by the program’s existing body of

non-UPA habitat and production projects (many of them important to the 2000 BiOp RPA) simply to maintain the quality of the project as originally recommended in the face of rising costs, or important habitat acquisitions long recommended but stalled by budget and policy constraints.

One of our basic premises for FY06 is not to start new work, deferring to the solicitation and full review of projects to implement subbasin plans next year. The UPA projects involving new work is the only exception we have identified to that premise. The staff recommends that any new UPA work (whether in a new or an existing project) at a minimum needs ISRP and subsequent Council review. We also need to discuss further with Bonneville precisely how and why some of these are dictated by the UPA, and how to accommodate their cost. Other issues are noted in specific comments on projects. Finally, while the court's decision invalidating the 2004 Biological Opinion does not by itself change the status of the UPA, we need further discussions with Bonneville about the implications of that decision, if any, for the FY06 budget. The projects that fall under this issue are presented in Appendix A.

3) Issues relating to requests for additional funding, especially regarding land acquisition

We have a set of discrete issues for FY06 concerning costs, especially involving land acquisition :

- *Washington Wildlife Agreement land acquisition.* The Washington Wildlife Agreement committed funds to acquire lands for wildlife mitigation and a certain amount to pay the costs on those lands for a number of years. The funds made available to pay for this operation and maintenance work have been expended. So, the costs on these WWA wildlife properties are now showing up for the first time in the direct program expense budget as separate, additional expense obligations. The total impact will be around \$1.8 million. A list of these projects is presented in Appendix B.

Bonneville presumably has an obligation to maintain these properties to preserve the habitat credits. The question is whether and how the direct program should absorb these costs:

- *Requests for increases in land acquisition operation and maintenance funding that relate to more than the rising project costs that all projects are facing.* We have separated out a number of requests for increased operation and maintenance funding on land acquisitions as resulting from factors other than general "cost of living" issue discussed above. These fall into a couple of different categories (Appendix B). One set involves on-going wildlife land acquisition projects, mostly in the Intermountain province and the Willamette, which have seen substantial increases in the amount of land acquired, in one case nearly doubling from 23,000 to 43,000 acres yet the operation and maintenance budgets are being held level. This cannot be sustained. A second set of land acquisition projects, primarily in the John Day subbasin, began immediately following the acquisition with minimal operation and maintenance budgets to allow for the development of management plans, budgets that have not changed but which are now totally inadequate, as much as 1/3 of what is the likely appropriate amount -- now that the management plans are in place.

We have identified the projects and funding requests in the budget tables, and will continue working with Bonneville to appropriately address these projects.

One point that is obvious from the staff's review is the great disparity in the per-acre costs of wildlife land operation and maintenance, even when the types of work listed seem similar. The staff does not recommend addressing this broad issue in the FY06 project recommendations. But the staff does recommend that sometime in the next year, or in the upcoming comprehensive project review process (FY07), Bonneville or the Council ought to initiate a comprehensive review of wildlife land operation and maintenance costs, with an eye toward standardizing the amount the program will bear for land operation and maintenance. The wildlife managers developed program "Guidelines for Enhancement, Operation, and Maintenance Activities for Wildlife Mitigation Projects" back in 1998. It is unclear if these guidelines are sufficient or followed. We suggest that only basic operation and maintenance tasks be performed on newly acquired land and that enhancement work wait until management plans for each property is completed and approved.

- *Requests for increased funding for more than routine maintenance of production facilities.* We have issues similar to the one above related to operation and maintenance of production facilities. A few of the production projects have identified needs for substantial maintenance and rehabilitation of facilities. The costs of this type of maintenance appear to be well beyond the ordinary operation and maintenance budgets. Because project budgets have been level funded at base levels for some time, it has not been possible for production facilities to receive all of the maintenance funding they require. Sponsors of several of the older production facilities have communicated additional maintenance funding needs over the last few years.

Also, as with the funding of operation and maintenance on land acquisition, we see quite a disparity in the costs of production facility operation and maintenance. And again, we do not recommend addressing this issue in the FY 06 project recommendations, but the Council and Bonneville do need to address this issue during the full project review to follow.

4) Funding issues relating to the capital budget

Again in FY06 we have funding issues that derive from the difference between the assumptions about Bonneville's capital budget that informed the Council's original provincial review recommendations and the way Bonneville has shaped its capital policy since that time. The Council recommended a number of projects for funding out of the capital budget that Bonneville has balked at capitalizing, or at the least have difficulties that we are still working to resolve. One effect of this situation is the need or desire to turn to the expense side of the budget to fund these projects, yet the expense budget is tight in ways the capital budget is not. The types of issues include:

- *Land acquisitions to expense.* As with last year, a number of projects to acquire land for wildlife and fish habitat that the Council recommended for funding out of the capital budget are

held up because of policy issues about the use of capital. We are not detailing the capital issues here, as they are well known. Over the last year Bonneville has worked to resolve these issues in specific instances and moved forward to acquire properties with capital funds. But a number of projects are still in limbo without any expectation of resolution. One result has been an increasing number of requests in the FY06 responses to fund these acquisitions even if the funds are to come out of the expense budget. The problem is that the expense budget appears too tight to accommodate the projects, as worthy as they might be. Unless room can be found in the budget, the staff recommends against moving these projects to expense, and instead to continue working with Bonneville either to resolve the capital issues in a way that makes it possible to capitalize these projects or to add money to the expense budget to accommodate these projects. If there is a cushion in the total expense budget at the end of the FY06 review, the Council will have to grapple with the issue of whether funding some of these land acquisitions from expense is the priority use of this money, or to meet cost increases noted in the first issue, or some other priority.

- *Production planning to expense.* A similar issue, and again one the Council identified last year as well. The Council made its provincial review recommendations under the understanding at the time that the planning expenses for major capital projects (such as building a hatchery) could be capitalized as well. Bonneville now interprets the accounting rules to require that most or all planning expenditures be expensed and not capitalized, even for major capital projects until there is certainty that the facility will be constructed. Project sponsors are seeking funds for planning if that is what the policy must be, again putting burdens on a tight expense budget. The staff will display these costs in the expense side of the budget, but also recommends the Council continue to work with Bonneville to include these types of costs with the capital construction costs if at all possible.

- *Miscellaneous issues.* Three other issues involving the capital budget, two recommending moving cost to capital from expense:

The sponsor requests \$1,000,000 in FY06 for the on-going Idaho fish screening project. This project has been funded out of the expense budget. It is unclear why, as similar large-scale screening efforts in other parts of the basin are funded out of capital. The staff recommends that the Council recommend to Bonneville moving this project to the capital budget. The project is 1994-015-00 Idaho Fish Screening Improvement (Mountain Snake -- Salmon).

Another project that is in the expense side but which would seem to belong, at least in large part, in the capital budget funds improvements at the Bonneville Dam corner collector. (It is also unclear why the Corps of Engineers is not funding this work, but if it was, it seems certain to be able to be a capital improvement.) The project sponsor is seeking a large increase in funding for this project -- from a projected \$500,000 to \$1.275 million -- to deal with cost overruns and the effects of delays. The project is 1983-319-00 New Marking & Monitoring Tech (Systemwide) .

5) Additional monitoring costs from the Habitat Improvement Program Biological Opinion/cultural resource monitors

The programmatic biological opinion covering the habitat work that Bonneville funds in areas with listed species (the Habitat Improvement Program Biological Opinion, or HIP BiOp) requires monitoring of mitigation measures, such as five years of monitoring of vegetation planting and monitoring use of herbicides. Bonneville noted that these costs have not been part of the program budget, but that “now is the time” to add in these costs. Bonneville has also identified a need to improve the agency’s compliance with cultural resource requirements; especially including cultural resource monitors at all projects in tribal ceded areas, and that this will be another additional program cost. Bonneville has suggested adding a \$150,000 placeholder to the budget for these purposes. Staff suggests more discussion with Bonneville on this topic before we add it to the FY 2006 budget.

6) Projects involving research or basic monitoring, assessment and evaluation of population status or watershed conditions

This issue differs from those discussed above in that resolution may lead to a reduction of funding needed for this work. Any funding made available through reductions in monitoring and evaluation funding could be reprogrammed to address needs in other areas of the program. The program includes a number of research projects and a much greater number of projects that involve baseline monitoring, assessment and evaluation of population and watershed conditions, and trends in those conditions. For the purpose of the FY06 review, we divided these into two categories:

- *Discrete assessment or research projects that may be complete.* The staff has identified a small number of projects of this type that should be considered complete by the end of FY05, and thus not appropriate for funding in FY06, even if in some of these cases the project sponsors seek additional funding. We have identified these projects for closer Council scrutiny, with a staff presumptive recommendation **not** to include in the FY06 start-of-year budget. Requests for funding for this list of projects totals approximately \$ 3.9 million. We have organized the list into two parts. First are those projects that staff identified last year that should wrap up in FY 2005 or that need to provide deliverables before receiving additional funding. Second are projects that we question recommending for funding given the completion of subbasin planning and that these projects have received a full three years of funding.
- *On-going monitoring, assessment, evaluation and research work.* Of more long-term interest, the staff review identified the program’s large number and wide variety of on-going, often long standing, often expensive projects involved (wholly or in large part) in research or in monitoring, assessment or evaluation of baselines and trends in population status and watershed conditions. Included below is list of these projects.

The point of the list is *not* to call into question funding for these projects in FY06; the staff recommends continued funding for these projects this year. Instead, the point is simply to

capture the magnitude of the program's commitment to this type of work, in preparation for a serious regional review of that commitment for FY07 and beyond. It is clearly important to be engaged in monitoring and assessment of baseline population and watershed conditions, and in trends in those conditions, as it is important to be engaged in research on key uncertainties. But what is most unclear is if *all* of these projects are required to that end. This is the nature of the review task ahead of the Council and Bonneville, in combination with the significant project-specific effectiveness monitoring and evaluation that the program also funds, if the Council and Bonneville and its partners are to be successful in developing a more coherent and cost-effective regional approach to population monitoring and evaluation and in reducing program spending on this type of work to no more than 25% of the total budget.

The list is obviously imperfect. For the most part it is easy to distinguish the projects involved in basic population and watershed monitoring from the projects involved in project-specific monitoring and evaluation. And we were trying at this point just to gather and display the former. But there are places where the two types of monitoring obviously overlap. We also distinguished between the research aspect of the active supplementation and captive broodstock programs and all other types of research (including research on supplementation questions distinct from the production programs themselves), and again the two types overlap at the edges. Also, habitat projects often combine habitat restoration work with monitoring and assessment work. These were not included except for a few that seem almost entirely devoted to the monitoring and assessment function. Finally, of course, to the extent that any of the projects identified above as candidates for no more funding in 06 do receive continued funding, they could be added to this list. But for the purposes of displaying the nature of this issue, the list is fine:

Staff recognizes that monitoring and evaluation associated with artificial production is also a significant part of the Fish and Wildlife program costs and need to be addressed as well. The ISRP and Council often impose the monitoring and evaluation requirements associated with production projects on a case by case basis. A programmatic review of production monitoring and evaluation is needed to establish priorities and look for efficiencies. We suggest that the programmatic review occur in the project review leading to new funding recommendations for FY 2007 and beyond.

7) Habitat work

The staff began its review with the hypothesis that we would find a set of habitat projects that seemed similarly discrete and complete as the monitoring and evaluation projects. That has not been the case. The great majority of habitat protection and restoration projects in the program for FY06 are simply part of long-standing, on-going, progressive watershed restoration programs. The project descriptions for those of more recent origin were also largely compelling in explaining how they relate to the on-going work and to strategies and priority areas in the subbasin plans.

All of the habitat projects will need close scrutiny in next year's full review process to determine what habitat work is most consistent with the priorities identified in the subbasin plans for watershed protection and restoration. Just a couple of the habitat raise clear issues about completion and the validity of continued funding; those are discussed elsewhere as they also fit into other issue categories.

8) Projects requiring Step review or similar review or responding to a review

There are a number of projects (Appendix E) that require or are in the middle of some form of review, that are proposing tasks or funds relating to a review that has just completed or will soon complete, or that are proposing or engaged in tasks that may not be appropriate without a review -- either one stage of the Step review of production investments or some other particular review arising out of the logic of the project. In a few cases, the staff has identified actions that need to take place prior to or during FY06 (either reviews or responses to reviews), to address certain obvious conditions for FY06 funding. The most obvious example is the UPA projects that propose new work; these need ISRP review and have been addressed separately above. The other situations are noted in the comments on specific projects below. Otherwise, given how close we are to the full review that will begin for FY07, the staff is considering a recommendation as a general matter in 06 of not moving projects in the review process to a different phase of implementation, or starting new work based on a Step or similar review, or scheduling a major new Step review -- with the few exceptions noted below, hold proposed plans, changes and tasks for review in context with other proposals in the next round of project review.

9) Possible scope expansion

A key premise for the FY06 renewals is to hold projects to the scope of work reviewed and recommended in the provincial review. A few of the project descriptions indicate possible expansions or changes in the scope of the projects beyond what was recommended (Appendix F). These have been marked for further review to confirm. If confirmed, the staff recommends that 06 funding be limited so as not to allow these changes. We suggest that Bonneville review the project accomplishments, goals for FY 2006, statement of work and the Councils provincial recommendation and provide assurance to the Council and these projects are contracted consistent with Council recommendations.

10) Projects recommended in Idaho above Hells Canyon that Bonneville never implemented because of issues about FCRPS responsibility

This issue (also called out last year) concerns a set of projects involving resident fish mitigation in the Snake and its tributaries above Hells Canyon Dam. The Council recommended funding for these projects during the provincial review. Bonneville has objected to funding or placed on a low priority list largely on the grounds that the Federal Columbia River Power

System (FCRPS) had little or no responsibility for the decline of these populations. (These projects are sometimes known as “Phase 3” projects, the remnants of a larger low-priority list Bonneville created a few years ago.) Some of these issues have been resolved, but the three projects listed below have never started in on even their first year of the multi-year provincial review recommendation. The FCRPS responsibility issues are significant. The Council does not agree with Bonneville that the projects on this list cannot be funded as an FCRPS responsibility. At the same time, it is highly unlikely Bonneville will fund these projects in FY06, while the likely time and place to address the larger policy issue will come in the next round of provincial review and the implementation of subbasin plans. For now, and until further guidance from the Council, the staff continues to show these projects in the start-of-year tables, but with no budgets attached (Appendix G).

11) Miscellaneous Issues

A handful of projects present issues that are more than minimal but unique to that project:

Two “**placeholder**” projects:

2002-013-01 Columbia Basin Water Transactions Program (Systemwide) [FY05 budget was \$4 million for water; \$1 million for pilot project in acquiring conservation easements; request was for same amount in 06, but sponsor’s response for 06 speaks only to water; staff recommends same arrangement and funding as last year]

200304700 Data Management Placeholder (Systemwide) [\$350K for data management work and \$200K for GIS work for data associated with subbasin plans. Includes NED. This work would require specific Council approval before implementation]

Others:

1988-115-25 YKFP - Design & Construction (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima) [three different project responses that are not reconcilable on their face; need help from Bonneville to sort out; hold at \$25,000 until cleared up]

1994-059-00 Yakima Basin Environmental Education (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima) [staff review raised a comment about appropriateness of funding a completely separate educational program; staff recommendation, however, is to hold review of priority to 07 process]

1989-027-00 Power Repay Umatilla Basin Pro (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [Bonneville projects \$1,000,000 as the right budget placeholder for this project; from past spending patterns, \$500,000 seems a more likely placeholder target]

1990-018-00 Rainbow Trout Hab/Pass Impr Prog (Intermountain -- San Poil) [Council’s past recommendations indicate this passage improvement project should be complete in 05; yet sponsor requests additional funds]

2001-031-00 Resident Fish Symposium (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem) [issue similar to Yakima education project above]

2000-034-00 Protect N Lochsa Face Analysis (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [project never started; held up by appeals; project sponsor requests 06 funding, but not a persuasive explanation that it will begin; leave in the tables, but at zero budget]
1995-057-00 and -01 S Idaho Wildlife Mitigation (Middle Snake and Upper Snake) [IDFG proposes to shift funding from its Middle Snake portion of this project to the Upper Snake portion of its project; Bonneville should ensure shift does indeed make sense *and* does not disadvantage the tribal participants in this project]

APPENDICES: Project lists

Appendix A. Projects associated with issue 2.

The UPA projects, organized into the three types noted under issue 2 are listed below. The project titles are presented in a truncated form as they were gathered from the Bonneville project database.

- New projects/placeholder:

xxxx-xxx-xx Columbia Cascade UPA habitat measures (Columbia Cascade) [\$2.4 million placeholder requested -- new work other than projects begun in 05 and recently reviewed by ISRP will need ISRP review. Need to investigate FY 2006 funding needs for projects initiated in FY 2005. Not clear if these need additional funding past FY 2005]

2005-002-00 Lower Granite Adult Trap Modification and Operation and Maintenance of Trap (Systemwide) [undergoing ISRP review; why not funded by Corps of Engineers?]

2005-xxx-x2 Snake River Sockeye Smolt Program at Oxbow Hatchery (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [hatchery modifications to increase sockeye production as called for in UPA; needs ISRP/Step review]

2005-001-00 Estuary RME Pilot (Columbia Estuary or Lower Columbia -- Sandy River delta) [needs ISRP review]

2006-002-00 Implementation of the Caspian Tern Management EIS (Columbia River Estuary) [not sure why this is Bonneville and not Corps funding? needs ISRP review]

2005-xxx-x3 Selective Fishery Research RFP (Systemwide) [\$400,000 placeholder from Bonneville; little description in project response; would need ISRP review]

2005-xxx-x1 Data Management Pilot Work (Systemwide) [unclear if this is really alive in 06 budget; no 06 response filed; apparently a \$500,000 placeholder for data mgmt work communicated earlier from Bonneville; not clear how it might relate to already existing data mgmt placeholder]

2005-xxx-x4 Supplementation Research Review (Systemwide) [same issue as above; unclear if this is really alive in 06 budget; no 06 response filed; apparently a \$150,000 placeholder for supplementation research review communicated earlier from Bonneville]

2006-001-00 McIntyre Dam Feasibility Study (Columbia Cascade -- Okanagon) [Will need ISRP review]

- Existing projects with an adjustment requested for budget/scope:

1990-077-00 Dev Of Systemwide Predator Control (Systemwide) [pike minnow control project largely; after reducing funding for this project on cost-efficiency grounds a number of years ago, project funding is now increasing to \$3.7 million in 06!]

1991-072-00 Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Ca (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [ongoing sockeye project is now UPA related; seeks significant increase in funding in part to increase production significantly]

1992-040-00 Redfish Lake Sockeye Broodstock (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [companion project to above]

1997-024-00 Avian Predation On Juvenile Salmonids (Columbia River Estuary) [on-going tern work that pre-dates UPA; UPA `connected now; -- not originally recommended by Council in Mainstem/Systemwide review, on the grounds that this is more appropriate for Corps funding; Bonneville chose to fund anyway -- may be expanding now in scope and amount of tasks to fund in association with tern EIS, which is all the more reason for Corps funding]

2000-001-00 Anadromous Fish Habitat & Passage (Columbia Cascade -- Okanagon) [Increase requested over previous funding level for UPA work]

2003-017-00 Integrated Status/Effect Progr (Systemwide) [huge NOAA project for monitoring of status and trends in populations and habitat and project effectiveness; now linked to UPA; seeks increase from \$1.5 million to \$2.8 million!]

- Existing projects that link to UPA, no adjustment in budget/scope request:

1997-001-00 Idaho Chinook Salmon Captive R (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [on-going Snake spring/summer chinook captive rearing project, now carries UPA link; description of subbasin consistency weak]

1999-025-00 Sandy River Delta Habitat (Lower Columbia -- Sandy) [central to provincial review recommendation for this project was dike removal, budget reserved nearly \$1 million for that purpose; dike still has not been removed, and is not recommended for removal in 06]

2000-012-00 Eval Factors Limiting Col R Chum (Lower Columbia -- Lower Columbia Mainstem) [sponsor links to UPA; weak description of past/expected accomplishments]

2003-008-00 Pres/Restore Col R/Est Willapa (Columbia River Estuary) [Crimms Island work -- not sure if UPA connected; project description says nothing about UPA, yet UPA refers to habitat work in the Crimms Island area of the estuary -- also unclear is whether current project scope is consistent with original scope, as this project is an unusual mixture of wildlife land (its original purpose) and fish habitat restoration]

1991-029-00 Post-Release Survival Of Fall Chinook (Systemwide) [sponsor links to UPA]

1993-029-00 Survival Est For Passage (Systemwide) [sponsor links to UPA]

2002-032-00 Fall Chin Passage Lower Granite (Systemwide) [sponsor links to UPA]

Appendix B. Projects associated with issue 3.

- Projects associated with the Washington Wildlife Agreement discussed under issue 3:

2006-005-00 Asotin Creek Wildlife Area (Blue Mountain -- Asotin)

1994-044-00 Sagebrush Flat Wildlife Mitigation (Columbia Plateau -- Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem)

1991-061-00 Swanson Lake Wildlife Mitigation (Columbia Plateau -- Crab Creek)

2006-003-00 Desert Wildlife Area (Columbia Plateau -- Crab Creek)

2000-026-00 Rainwater Wildlife Area (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla)

2002-014-00 Sunnyside Wildlife Mitigation (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima)

2006-004-00 Wenas Wildlife Area (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima)

- Other projects discussed under issue 3:

1998-022-00 Pine Creek/Wagner Management (Columbia Plateau -- John Day)

2000-015-00 Oxbow Ranch Management (Columbia Plateau -- John Day)

2001-041-01 Forrest Ranch Management (Columbia Plateau -- John Day)

1992-061-00 Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation (Intermountain -- Pend Oreille) [increase in sought to \$1.6 million due to increased acreage -- on the other hand, funding is already huge in absolute terms and compared to per acre price of other wildlife land ; description of what has been and will be done with that money is missing]

1992-048-00 Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range (Intermountain -- San Poil)

2001-033-00 Coeur d'Alene - Hangman Watershed (Intermountain -- Coeur d'Alene)

1992-059-00 Amazon Basin/Eugene Wetlands (Lower Columbia -- Willamette)

1992-068-00 Willamette Basin Mitigation (Lower Columbia -- Willamette)

- We identified one project in particular (example) that submitted a request for additional funding to cover basic operation and maintenance needs as well as for operational costs.

1991-046-00 Spokane Tribal (Galbr Sprgs) Hatchery (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem).

Appendix C. Project associated with issue 4.

- Projects associated with issue 3 “capital to expense” - Land Acquisitions:

2002-025-01 Yakima Tributary Access & Habitat (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima)

1997-051-00 Yakima Basin Side Channels (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima)

2002-045-00 Coeur d’Alene Fish Habitat (Intermountain -- Coeur D’Alene)

1995-067-00 Colville Confederated Tribes (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem)

1991-062-00 Blue Creek Winter Range (Intermountain) [project sponsor seeking \$3,000,000 out of capital for acquisitions; not clear if this is held up by capital policy issues; Bonneville COTR filed separate request for pre-acquisition cost funding, seeking big jump in such funding from \$10,000 to \$100,000]

2003-018-00 Nez Perce Terrestrial (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [project response is minimal, so not fully clear about status, subbasin plan consistency, etc.]

2003-030-00 Lower Clearwater Hab Enhance (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [project response is minimal, so not fully clear about status, subbasin plan consistency, etc.]

2003-031-00 Precious Lands Wildlife Habitat (Blue Mountain)

1997-059-00 Oregon Wildlife Plan (Systemwide) [not sure the status of this project]

- Projects associated with issue 3 “capital to expense” - Production planning to expense:

1988-115-35 YKFP - Klickitat Design & Construction (Columbia Gorge -- Klickitat)

1988-053-XX Hood River Production Facilities Modifications/New Construction (Columbia Gorge -- Hood) [no proposal from project sponsor, but Bonneville COTR included a placeholder for planning and EIS work]

1988-115-25 YKFP - Design & Construction (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima) [not entirely sure what is going on here -- see miscellaneous issues]

2000-038-00 NE Oregon Walla Walla Hatchery Design and Construct (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla)

2003-023-00 Chief Joseph Dam Hatchery Columbia (Columbia Cascade -- Okanogan)

1996-040-00 Coho Restoration Mid-Columbia (Columbia Cascade -- Wenatchee)

1988-053-05 NE Oregon Outplanting Facilities Mst (Blue Mountain -- Grande Ronde) [project response is weak in describing subbasin plan consistency]

1988-053-01 NE Oregon Hatchery Master Plan (Blue Mountain -- Imnaha)

Appendix D. Projects related to issue 6.

Projects involving research or basic monitoring, assessment and evaluation of population status or watershed conditions

- *Discrete assessment or research projects that may be complete*
Projects that were identified to wrap up in FY 2005:

1999-024-00 Bull Trout Assessment (Columbia Gorge -- Klickitat) [complete; no request from project sponsor]

2001-025-00 Rattlesnake Cr Salmonid Prod (Columbia Gorge -- Big White Salmon)

2002-027-00 Hydrodynamics and Water Quality (Columbia Plateau -- Lower Snake Mainstem)

[appears to staff to be complete, altho sponsor requests more funding; weak on describing consistency with subbasin plan and accomplishments and expected accomplishments; sponsor tries to tie to ISAB proposal for load following experiment, but this project is just an evaluation, not a manipulative experiment as ISAB seeks]

2002-031-00 Spring Chinook Growth Modulation (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima) [sponsor wants another year, but last year the recommendation was to complete in 05, and description now is not compelling as to why this should continue into 06]

1996-042-00 Restore Salmon Creek (Columbia Cascade -- Okanogan) [also weak in describing subbasin plan consistency and accomplishments]

2001-030-00 Sharp Tailed Grouse Habitat (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem) [project sponsor requests continued funding, but recommendation for 05 was to complete in 05; description is not persuasive as to reason to continue]

1999-020-00 Analyze Persistence/Dynamics S (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [for this and the next project, expectation has been to complete in 05; project sponsors seek additional funding in 06, but explanation not persuasive as to why projects should not be completed in 05 as expected]

2002-049-00 Eval Precision Bias Chinook (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [see note above]

1997-009-00 Eval Sturgeon Pop - Snake R (Blue Mountain -- Snake Hells Canyon) [zeroed out in the budget and no response from project sponsor, but with COTR comment that sponsor may separately come to Council if it decides it wants to pursue continuing activities]

- Other projects that *could* complete in FY 2005:

1994-069-00 Spawning Habitat Model - Snake (Columbia Plateau -- Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem) [sponsor requests more money and time, but last year's recommendation was to wrap up in 05; accomplishments problematic because of difficulties]

1995-028-00 Assessment Of Fishery Improvements (Columbia Plateau -- Crab Creek) [project of long standing, but not seeming to come to or drive to any particular point or reason to continue other than simply because it exists]

2002-030-00 Salmonid Progeny Markers (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [project description leaves it unclear what this is aiming at or why it would continue after completing the years of the provincial review recommendation]

2002-037-00 Freshwater Mussels In River (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [seems to be complete in what it originally set out to do, and now wants to phase to developing a recovery plan and

to expanding assessment scope to rivers other than original project proposal, such as Walla Walla -- scope issue that should probably wait for next review]

1997-004-00 Resident Fish Above Chief Joe (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem) [assessment that appears to be or should be complete; description is weak on describing both consistency with subbasin plan and expected work in FY06 as reason to continue]

2001-034-00 Forage & Mule Deer Conditions (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem) [from past recommendations, project should either be complete in 05, or complete as far as data collection and all else except for minimal amount of report writing, needing a reduced budget; sponsor instead seeks continued funding for data collection; description of why and description of link to subbasin plan are weak]

1995-011-00 Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement (Intermountain -- Spokane) [see note under issue about projects requiring review]

2000-004-00 Protect Wigwam R Bull Trout (Mountain Columbia -- Kootenai) [project sponsor requests additional funding, but indications are that this should be complete -- project response is weak in describing consistency with subbasin plan and expected accomplishments in FY06 from additional funding]

1987-099-00 Dworshak Dam Impacts Assess (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [evaluation is to complete in 05; further funding dependent on review of evaluation; hold that to next round?]

2002-061-00 Restore Potlatch R Watershed (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [project is an inter-agency watershed assessment in four subwatersheds; recommendation from last year indicates planning is to be completed in 05, and any implementation to wait until next full review; project sponsors seeks funds in 06 to continue planning; relatively weak in describing accomplishments]

2002-068-00 Evaluate Nez Pt Stream Habitat (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [project sponsor received only 12 months of funding since 2002 for watershed monitoring work; Bonneville has declined to fund additional monitoring work; does not appear likely impasse can be resolved in or for 06; so, assumption is no funding in 06, and revisit issue in future full review]

2002-053-00 Assess Salmonids Asotin Cr (Blue Mountain -- Asotin) [also issue of subbasin plan consistency]

2002-073-00 Wallowa Culvert Inventory (Blue Mountain -- Grande Ronde) [culvert inventory that should be complete]

1986-050-00 Evaluate Sturgeon Physical Hab (Systemwide) [one task -- 3b -- clearly called by Council to be complete in 05]

2003-013-00 Grays River Watershed Assess (Columbia River Estuary) [sponsor requests funding in 06, and it would be third year of funding following provincial review recommendation, but it is unclear why this should continue now that subbasin plan and draft recovery plan are finished, as this seems a basic subbasin assessment -- description of consistency with subbasin plan and of past and expected accomplishments is not strong, adding to the concern]

2001-055-00 Salmonid Response To Fertilization (Systemwide) [project from “innovative project” list; money in 05 is to close out project; COTR submitted request for 06 funding to write reports and close out, but that is to be complete in 05]

2003-038-00 Eval Restoration Of Snake R Chinook (Systemwide) [never recommended by Council; Bonneville funded, but indications are Bonneville only assigned two years of funding to study, to complete in 05]

- *On-going monitoring, assessment, evaluation and research work:*
 - 2003-065-00 Bull Trout In Bonneville Reservoir (Columbia Gorge -- Columbia Gorge)
 - 1994-054-00 Bull Trout Life History Project (Columbia Plateau)
 - 2002-016-00 Lamprey Abundance (Columbia Plateau -- Deschutes)
 - 1998-016-00 Escapement/Productivity Spring Chinook (Columbia Plateau -- John Day)
 - 2002-033-00 John Day Recovery Monitoring (Columbia Plateau -- John Day) [weak response, especially as to past and proposed accomplishments]
 - 2002-006-00 Bull Trout Movement: Tucannon (Columbia Plateau -- Tucannon) [not recommended by Council -- a Bonneville decision to fund; weak in description of subbasin plan consistency]
 - 1989-024-01 Eval Um Juvenile Sal Out Migra (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [description is weak as to how and why this separate effort is needed and useful when there are other two other projects that seem to be doing the same thing, especially the Umatilla Tribes' Natural Production Monitoring Project, next]
 - 1990-005-01 Umatilla Basin Nat Prod D Monitoring and Evaluation (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla)
 - 1994-026-00 Pacific Lamprey Population Status (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [aspect of project that involves research and population monitoring and assessment]
 - 1998-020-00 Walla Walla R. Habitat Assess (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla)
 - 2000-039-00 Walla Walla River Basin Monitoring (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla)
 - 2003-022-00 Monitor/Eval Okanogan Basin Pr (Columbia Cascade -- Okanogan) [also an issue as to the right budget for FY06 on what was a delayed project]
 - 2003-039-00 Monitor Repro In Wenat/Tuc/Kal (Columbia Cascade -- Wenatchee) [a project originally in the Systemwide group; not recommended by Council -- a Bonneville decision to fund]
 - 1994-043-00 Lake Roosevelt Data Collection (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem) [description of expected accomplishments in FY06 could be stronger, especially in giving a sense of what is the ultimate point of the project]
 - 2001-028-00 Banks Lake Fishery Evaluation (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem)
 - 1994-047-00 Lake Pend Oreille Kokanee Mitigation (Intermountain -- Pend Oreille) [
 - 2001-032-00 Coeur d'Alene Fisheries Enhancement (Intermountain -- Spokane) [some enhancement work occurring, but appears to be mostly monitoring and assessment of water quality and other baseline conditions]
 - 1991-019-01 Hungry Horse Mitigation (Mountain Columbia -- Flathead) [baseline monitoring of population and habitat characteristics]
 - 1988-065-00 Kootenai R White Sturgeon Inve (Mountain Columbia -- Kootenai)
 - 1994-049-00 Kootenai River Resident Fish A (Mountain Columbia -- Kootenai)
 - 2002-002-00 Enhance White Sturgeon Habitat (Mountain Columbia -- Kootenai) [project has been monitoring and modeling flow/lake level/sediment transport matters affecting sturgeon - - now proposing to move to a "Phase II implementation" stage, involving a rock fill pilot project and evaluation of various treatment alternatives, but also continued basic assessment work of these conditions]

2002-008-00 Reconnect Floodplain Kootenai R (Mountain Columbia -- Kootenai) [this project and the next are both engaged in assessing floodplain conditions and connectivity possibilities; not clear the difference or why need both]

2002-011-00 L. Kootenai Floodplain Assess. (Mountain Columbia -- Kootenai)

1990-055-00 Id Steelhead Monitoring and Evaluation (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater)

2000-028-00 Eval Pacific Lamprey In Clearwater (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [note from prior budget review to complete in 06; relatively weak in description of subbasin plan consistency]

1989-098-00 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Salmon)

1989-098-01 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater)

1989-098-02 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Salmon)

1989-098-03 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Salmon)

1991-028-00 Pit Tagging Wild Chinook (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [seeking significant increase in funding in 06 to expand tagging and monitoring to different creek; not sure if this is expansion in scope or just result of too low estimate of cost of work within expected scope]

1991-073-00 Idaho Natural Production Monitoring (Mountain Snake -- Salmon)

1994-050-00 Salmon River Habitat Enhance (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [a habitat project, too, but accomplishments description indicates heavy emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of watershed conditions; little on-the-ground enhancement work]

1997-030-00 Listed Stock Adult Escapement (Mountain Snake -- Salmon)

1992-026-04 Life Studies Of Spring Chinook (Blue Mountain -- Grande Ronde)

1997-015-01 Imnaha R Smolt Monitoring (Blue Mountain -- Imnaha)

1998-010-03 Spawning distribution of Snake River Fall Chinook (Blue Mountain -- Snake Hells Canyon) [description weak in summarizing accomplishments and what expected in FY06]

1997-019-00 Stinking Water Salmonid Project (Middle Snake -- Malheur)

1998-002-00 Snake River Native Salmonid As (Middle Snake -- Upper Mid-Snake Mainstem)

2000-012-00 Eval Factors Limiting Col R Chum (Lower Columbia -- Lower Columbia Mainstem)

2000-014-00 Evaluate Lamprey Habitat/Popul (Lower Columbia -- Lewis)

2005-001-00 Estuary RME Pilot (Columbia Estuary or Lower Columbia -- Sandy River delta)

1997-024-00 Avian Predation On Juvenile Salmonids (Columbia River Estuary)

1998-014-00 Ocean Survival of Salmonids (Columbia River Estuary) [all the estuary research and assessment projects will be in their third year of provincial review recommendations]

2003-006-00 Effect Monitor Chinook (Columbia River Estuary)

2003-007-00 Lower Col River/Est Eco Monitor (Columbia River Estuary)

2003-010-00 Historic Hab Food Web Link Sal (Columbia River Estuary)

1982-013-01 Coded Wire Tag -- PSMFC (Systemwide)

1982-013-02 Coded Wire Tag - ODFW (Systemwide)

1982-013-03 Coded Wire Tag - USFWS (Systemwide)

1982-013-04 Coded Wire Tag - WDFW (Systemwide)

1983-319-00 New Marking & Monitoring Tech (Systemwide)

1986-050-00 Evaluate Sturgeon Physical Hab (Systemwide) [except for one task; see above]

1987-127-00 Smolt Monitoring (Systemwide)

1989-096-00 Genetic MONITORING AND EVALUATION Prog For Sal/Steel (Systemwide)

1989-107-00 Statistical Support For Salmon (Systemwide)

1990-080-00 Columbia Basin Pit-Tag Information (Systemwide)
1990-093-00 Genetic Analyses Of Oncorhynchus (Systemwide)
1991-029-00 Post-Release Survival Of Fall Chinook (Systemwide)
1991-051-00 MONITORING AND EVALUATION Statistical Support (Systemwide)
1993-029-00 Survival Est For Passage (Systemwide)
1994-033-00 Fish Passage Center (Systemwide)
1996-019-00 Second Tier Database (DART) (Systemwide)
1996-020-00 Pit Tagging Spring/Summer Chin (Systemwide)
1996-020-00 Pit Tagging Spring/Summer Chin (Systemwide)
1996-021-00 Gas Bubble Disease Monitoring & Research (Systemwide)
1999-003-01 Salmon Spawning Below Lower Co (Systemwide)
2000-017-00 Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts (Systemwide)
2001-003-00 Adult Pit Detector Installation (Systemwide)
2002-032-00 Fall Chin Passage Lower Granite (Systemwide)
2003-009-00 Canada USA Shelf Salmon Survival (Systemwide)
2003-017-00 Integrated Status/Effect Progr (Systemwide)
2003-041-00 Eval Salmon Thru Snake R Dams (Systemwide) [unclear of the need for a number of projects that all seem to be evaluated passage thru Snake River dams]
2003-050-00 Eval Of Reprod Of Steelhead (Systemwide)
2003-054-00 Repro of Steelhead in Hood River (Systemwide)
2003-060-00 Eval Repro Success Snake Rvr C (Systemwide)
2003-062-00 Eval Repro Success Kelt Steel (Systemwide)
2003-063-00 Repro Success Abernathy Creek (Systemwide)
2003-114-00 Acoustic Tracking For Survival (Systemwide) [see issue under scope expansion]
2004-002-00 PNAMP (Systemwide)
2005-xxx-x3 Selective Fishery Research RFP (Systemwide) [\$400,000 placeholder from Bonneville; little description in project response]

Appendix E. Projects associated with issue 8.

- Projects requiring Step review or similar review or responding to a review.

1988-053-XX Hood River Production Facilities Modifications/New Construction (Columbia Gorge -- Hood) [no proposal from project sponsor, but Bonneville COTR has included a placeholder for planning and EIS work; probably not until 07]

1988-115-35 YKFP - Klickitat Design & Construction and 1995-063-35 Klickitat Fishery YKFP M & E (Columbia Gorge -- Klickitat) [middle of Step review]

1988-115-25 YKFP - Yakima Design & Construction (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima) [not entirely clear what is going on here -- see miscellaneous issues -- but new production activities are part of planning/Step review process]

2000-038-00 NE Oregon Walla Walla Hatchery Design and Construct (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla) [part of planning/Step review process; nothing new expected in 06?]

1983-435-00 Umatilla Hatchery - CTUIR (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) and 2000-033-00 Walla Walla River Fish Passage (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla) [one part of project description for both projects refers to holding and outplanting spring chinook adults in Walla Walla -- as far as staff can tell, this was allowed on a one-time basis many years ago, but was not to be repeated without a master plan and Step review; should funding in 06 be conditioned on not engaging in any further outplanting until review?]

1994-026-00 Pacific Lamprey Population Status (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [has the part of project that involves outplanting has been properly reviewed?]

1996-040-00 Coho Restoration Mid-Columbia (Columbia Cascade -- Wenatchee) [part of planning/Step review process]

2003-023-00 Chief Joseph Dam Hatchery (Columbia Cascade -- Okanogan) [part of planning/Step review process]

1995-027-00 Lake Roosevelt Sturgeon (Intermountain -- Upper Columbia Mainstem) [should sturgeon releases in this area go through Step review?]

1995-011-00 Chief Joseph Kokanee Enhancement (Intermountain -- Spokane) [recent information indicates serious questions about both the reality or seriousness of the problem being studied (entrainment of kokanee at Chief Joseph) and the validity of the method being researched to address it (use of strobe lights); expensive project (\$1.3 million); staff recommends this project not go further without review of study design first]

1991-019-03 Hungry Horse Mitigation/Habitat (Mountain Columbia -- Flathead) [Sekokini Springs] [part of planning/Step review process]

1983-350-00 Nez Perce Tribal Hatchery -- coho (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [project response does not mention coho part of project, so is funding sought in 06 related to this purpose?; part of planning/Step review process]

1987-099-00 Dworshak Dam Impacts Assess (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [evaluation to complete in 05; further funding in 06 is dependent on review of evaluation]

1989-098-00 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [this and next three projects raise the same issue; a condition of approval after ISRP review some time ago was submission to ISRP and Council of a revised study design; staff recommends conditions 06 funding on submission of satisfactory revised study design]

1989-098-01 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [see above]

1989-098-02 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [see above]
1989-098-03 Salmon Studies Id Rvrs (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [see above]
1991-072-00 Redfish Lake Sockeye Salmon Ca (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [ongoing sockeye project is now UPA related; seeks significant increase in funding in part to increase production significantly; review before increased production]
1992-040-00 Redfish Lake Sockeye Broodstock (Mountain Snake -- Salmon)] [companion project to above]
2005-xxx-x2 Snake River Sockeye Smolt Program at Oxbow Hatchery (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [see above; hatchery modifications to increase sockeye production as called for in UPA]
1996-043-00 Johnson Creek Artificial Propa (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [new production part of planning/Step review process]
2002-069-00 Protect & Restore Little Salmon (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [Bonneville has not funded watershed work due to concern that passage into area is not feasible; justification of feasibility with satisfactory review of feasibility would be needed before funds approved; preferable to wait for full review process beginning for 07 than try to achieve review and initiation in 06]
1988-053-01 NE Oregon Hatchery Master Plan (Blue Mountain -- Imnaha) [part of planning/Step review process]
1998-010-05 Pittsburg Landing Fall Chinook (Blue Mountain -- Snake Hells Canyon) [project is outplanting surplus hatchery spring chinook and steelhead adults in under-seeded area streams for natural spawning; is this outplanting and the specific streams involved within the original scope? if not, raises issue of both project scope and Step review of new production activities]
1993-060-00 Select Area Fishery Evaluation (Lower Columbia -- Lower Columbia Mainstem) [need a response to ISRP and IEAB reviews for 06 funding]
2001-053-00 Reintro Of Chum In Duncan Cr (Lower Columbia -- Lower Columbia Mainstem) [first funding year following Step review; sponsor sought increase of \$50,000 to address improvements to monitoring and evaluation plan recommended by ISRP; Council recommendation is to wait until 07 review]

Appendix F. Projects associated with issue 9.

- Possible scope expansion

2003-005-00 Hatchery & Genetics Mgmt Plan (Systemwide) [this project to assist in preparation of HGMPs for hatcheries should have been complete in 05; held up by certain issues at NOAA; at best needs about \$100K or so to finish this task -- Bonneville COTR submitted request for \$3 million! in expense placeholder for hatchery upgrades; staff recommends Council not include in 06 recommendations]

1998-018-00 John Day Watershed Restoration (Columbia Plateau -- John Day) [native seed plots?]

1983-435-00 Umatilla Hatchery - CTUIR (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) and 2000-033-00 Walla Walla River Fish Passage (Columbia Plateau -- Walla Walla) [see discussion of outplanting under Step review issue above]

2002-037-00 Freshwater Mussels In River (Columbia Plateau -- Umatilla) [project seems to be complete in what it originally set out to do; sponsor now wants to phase to developing a recovery plan and to expanding assessment scope to rivers, such as Walla Walla, other than in original project proposal; these steps should wait until next review]

1985-062-00 Yakima Screen Evaluation (Columbia Plateau -- Yakima) [proposes to move from passive physical evaluation of screen status to biological evaluations]

2000-001-00 Anadromous Fish Habitat & Passage (Columbia Cascade -- Okanogan) [habitat/passage project, yet the project description also anticipates monitoring steelhead adult returns and evaluating hatchery populations and crosses; hold that work until later review]

2000-036-00 Protect And Restore Mill Creek (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [scope issue unclear -- seeking to double funding to implement culvert replacements after inventory, with note that budget set in 2001 did not anticipate culvert replacement -- perhaps scope of work did not either, and this new level of effort should wait until 07 review?]

2002-060-00 Nez Perce Harvest Monitoring (Mountain Snake -- Clearwater) [scope issue again unclear -- project sponsor response describes project work related to Zone 6 fishery; not sure that is within scope of project otherwise focused on monitoring harvest within the mainstem Snake Salmon and Clearwater; relatively weak in description of subbasin plan consistency and of past and projected accomplishments]

1991-028-00 Pit Tagging Wild Chinook (Mountain Snake -- Salmon) [seeking significant increase in funding in 06 to expand tagging and monitoring to different creek; not sure if this is expansion in scope or just result of too low estimate of cost of work within expected scope]

1998-010-05 Pittsburg Landing Fall Chinook (Blue Mountain -- Snake Hells Canyon) [see discussion of outplanting under Step review issue]

2000-016-00 Tualatin River National Wildlife (Lower Columbia -- Willamette) [wildlife land project, but requesting an additional \$100,000 for work to solve a fish entrapment problem; for next review]

1997-024-00 Avian Predation On Juvenile Salmonids (Columbia River Estuary) [see discussion under UPA issue; appears to expanding now in scope and amount to fund tasks in association with tern EIS; all the more reason for Corps funding]

2003-008-00 Pres/Restore Col R/Est Willapa (Columbia River Estuary) [Crimms Island work -- unclear whether current project scope is consistent with original scope, as this project is an unusual mixture of wildlife land (its original purpose) and fish habitat restoration -- need to sort out purpose for this project]

2003-114-00 Acoustic Tracking For Survival (Systemwide) [pilot study for ocean research; project sponsor seeks increase from \$200,000 to \$1.5 million to construct “continental scale tracking array for the west coast of North America”; hold until 07 full review]

Appendix G . Projects associated with issue 10 .

2003-029-00 Assess Upper Malheur Above Beu (Middle Snake -- Malheur)

2003-026-00 Inven/Eval Duck Valley Reserva (Middle Snake -- Owyhee)

1999-032-00 Consumptive Sturgeon-Hells Can (Middle Snake -- Upper Mid-Snake Mainstem)

[this project has additional history and issues associated with it; Bonneville has closed it out]

w:\po\ww\2006\fy06 issues june 20052porev.doc