

**JUDI DANIELSON**  
CHAIR  
Idaho  
  
**Jim Kempton**  
Idaho  
  
**Gene Derfler**  
Oregon  
  
**Melinda S. Eden**  
Oregon  
  
**Steve Crow**  
Executive Director



**TOM KARIER**  
VICE-CHAIR  
Washington  
  
**Frank L. Cassidy Jr.**  
"Larry"  
Washington  
  
**Ed Bartlett**  
Montana  
  
**John Hines**  
Montana

September 2, 2003

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Fish and Wildlife Committee Members

**FROM:** Mark Fritsch

**SUBJECT:** Presentation of *Northeast Oregon Hatchery Spring Chinook Master Plan*, Project #1988-053-01

### Action

The Nez Perce Tribe will make a presentation (see Attachment 1) regarding the *Northeast Oregon Hatchery Spring Chinook Master Plan*, Project #1988-053-01 at your meeting on September 9<sup>th</sup>. This presentation is intended to be informational and provide an update to the Fish and Wildlife Committee on the current status of the project.

It is anticipated that Council staff will present a recommendation to the Committee at your October meeting regarding the step two review of this project.

### Background

The Nez Perce Tribe, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and BPA initiated the Northeast Oregon Hatchery project in 1988. Initially designed to address spring chinook, steelhead, coho, sockeye and fall Chinook, NEOH has evolved over time. The master planning development refocused on phasing in rebuilding goals. The Master Plan focused on addressing current levels of production under the Lower Snake River Compensation Program using new and improved techniques for artificial production. The reason for this refocus on current production levels was driven primarily by ESA requirements and constraints for hatchery production, and facility limitations that were compromising the ability to achieve the production that had already been agreed to by the managers and permitted by NMFS. On September 20, 2000 the Council provided a conditional approval of the Step One submittal (the Spring Chinook Master Plan). The Council also established its expectations for the Step Two submittal.

On September 4, 2001 the NPT submitted the Step Two documents. When the Nez Perce made that submission it was believed that NEPA requirements would be satisfied with a simpler

Environmental Assessment (EA) document. It was anticipated that this EA would be completed by the time Council made decisions on the Mountain Snake and Blue Mountain Provinces. Council staff wanted to align the review of the Step Two documents by the ISRP to the provincial review for efficiency purposes. However, soon after the step two submittal was received, BPA made a determination that that a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) document would be needed instead of the previously anticipated, and much simpler, Environmental Assessment. This new decision by BPA about its NEPA requirements prevented the Council from making a Step Two decision during the provincial review. At that time it was anticipated that the draft EIS will be completed this fall of 2002.

In light of this more extensive environmental review process, the comments made by the ISRP in their preliminary review of the Step Two documents (ISRP document 2001- 12C) and the need to complete important elements of the step two submittal (e.g. monitoring plan, MOU and etc.) the completed step two submittal was rescheduled so that it tracked with the EIS development.

On May 22, 2003 the Nez Perce Tribe submitted the step two documents intended to address the above conditions that were placed on the project as part of the step one review. The draft EIS, submitted with the step documents, was completed in May 2003 and the final EIS is anticipated to be complete in the near future.

On August 12, 2003 the ISRP completed the review of the step submittal (ISRP document 2003-12). The ISRP continues to have concerns with four of the previously identified issues<sup>1</sup>. A primary issue of concern regards the current detail of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Overall, this response is much improved over the previous response; however the ISRP has continued concerns for ISRP issue 3 (Genetic breeding plans), issue 5 (forecasting and escapement goals), and with the lack of detail presented in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Appendix A). In addition, parts of the response suggest that integration with habitat issues is not a priority goal” (ISRP 2003-12).

**Attachment 1. Outline of *Northeast Oregon Hatchery Spring Chinook Master Plan* presentation the Nez Perce Tribe will make to the Fish and Wildlife Committee on September 9, 2003.**

Grande Ronde and Imnaha Spring Chinook  
Northeast Oregon Hatchery Project  
Step 2 Presentation to NPCC – September 9, 2003, Spokane, WA

---

**Purpose:**

- To update and review project with NPCC – provide summary of proposed facilities and cost estimates.
- To provide background as a reminder for what this project is and why it's necessary.
- To prepare NPCC for decision to move to Step 3 (Final Design) in October, 2003.

---

**I. Introduction**

NEOH Core team members –  
NPT, ODFW, CTUIR – BPA, FWS, NOAA

**II. Status of Project in Council 3-Step Review Process**

**Step 1 – Master Plan**

- Master Plan submittal, April 2000
- ISRP Review I, July 2000
- NPPC acceptance and authorization for Step 2, September 2000

**Step 2 – Preliminary Design and NEPA**

- Preliminary Design and response to ISRP comments submittal- coordinated with Blue Mt. Provincial Review, August 2001
- NEPA change from EA to EIS, November 2001
- ISRP Review II, December 2001
- Draft EIS and response to ISRP II comments submittal, May 2003
- ISRP Review III, August 2003

**III. Background**

Review of project –

Lower Snake River Compensation Plan link –

Imnaha and Grande Ronde spring chinook stocks involved –

Transition artificial production from mitigation to conservation –

Implementation of captive broodstock program – segregation of stocks and fish health –

Resultant Lookingglass Hatchery breakdown –

Current production scenario – Oxbow Hatchery, Irrigon Hatchery, reduction in program numbers, risk to ESA listed stocks –

#### IV. Summary of Proposed Facilities and Costs

##### Description of proposed program

- Lookingglass Hatchery - modifications for Upper Grande Ronde, Catherine Creek, Lookingglass Creek and Imnaha stocks.
- Imnaha satellite facility -modifications for Imnaha stock
- Imnaha River – proposed new final rearing facility @ Marks Ranch site
- Lostine River – proposed new incubation and rearing facility @ Lundquist site
- Lostine River –proposed new adult weir/trap site

#### V. Project Links to:

- APR/APRE
- FCRPS BiOp
- HGMP's
- LSRCP/COE/WRDA

#### VI. Project completion schedule

Proceed with Final Design, October 2003

Submit Final Design, July 2004

Proceed with Construction, October 2004

Construction phased over 3 years