

JUDI DANIELSON
CHAIR
Idaho

Jim Kempton
Idaho

Frank L. Cassidy Jr.
"Larry"
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington

Steve Crow
Executive Director



MELINDA S. EDEN
VICE-CHAIR
Oregon

Gene Derfler
Oregon

Ed Bartlett
Montana

John Hines
Montana

March 1, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: Lynn Palensky and John Ogan

SUBJECT: Subbasin Planning Update

Independent Scientific Review of Subbasin Plans: Schedule and Approach

The summer schedule for the independent scientific review of subbasin plans has been developed (attached) and shared with state coordinators and the Regional Coordination Group. For a majority of the 58 subbasin plans, the ISRP/ISAB review process will begin immediately following the May 28 deadline and conclude with submittal of final reports to the Council by August 12, 2004 -- a total review timeline of two and a half months. To complete the review, about ten review teams and one basinwide umbrella committee have been established. The review teams are organized to review sets of subbasin plans grouped by province. Each team consists of six or more reviewers and includes a mix of ISRP, ISAB, and Peer Review Group members. The umbrella group will help ensure a consistent level of review scrutiny and comment quality.

ISRP Plan Evaluation Checklist and Comment Template

A review checklist and comment template is being developed for the ISRP/ISAB review of subbasin plans that will be derived directly from the Council's Subbasin Planning Technical Guide and will include the Council's review questions. The review questions take a two-pronged approach -- reviewers must evaluate: 1) whether the subbasin plans are complete, scientifically sound, and internally consistent following a transparent and defensible logic path; and 2) whether the subbasin plans are externally consistent with the vision, principles, objectives, and strategies contained in the Council's 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program and Mainstem Amendments. The checklist asks reviewers to evaluate whether the plan satisfactorily provides the assessment, inventory and management elements requested by the Council and, to recommend the level of need to further treat a specific element of the subbasin plan before the plan meets the criteria of completeness, scientific soundness, and transparency. A sample of the checklist and template is attached and the final will be available in March.

Subbasin Plan Adoptability Framework

The Council's Legal Division is organizing a framework that the Council members and may use to make the determinations required by the Power Act relative to subbasin plan amendment recommendations. The framework is essentially a way of organizing our review around the Act's standards that apply to program amendments for the Fish and Wildlife Program measures found in section 4(h), and the standards set in the 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program in the unique context of subbasin plans. The framework will be discussed with Council members in the near future.

ISRP Review Schedule

Dates	Day	Place	Item
4-Jun	Friday		Subbasin Plans Available for Review
WEEK 2: Yakima and Columbia Cascade			
14-Jun	Monday 1 PM to 5 PM	Yakima	Presentations: Yakima, Crab Creek, Palouse
15-Jun	Tuesday	Yakima	Finish Presentations and Reviewer Meeting
16-Jun	Wednesday	Wenatchee	Presentations: Entiat, Lake Chelan, Methow, Okanogan, Upper Mid-Columbia Mainstem, Wenatchee
17-Jun	Thursday	Wenatchee	Reviewer Meeting
18-Jun	Friday		
WEEK 3: Inter-Mountain			
21-Jun	Monday		
22-Jun	Tuesday		
23-Jun	Wednesday	Spokane	Presentations: Coeur d'Alene, Pend Oreille, San Poil, Spokane, Upper Columbia Mainstem
24-Jun	Thursday; 8 AM to Noon	Spokane	Reviewer Meeting
25-Jun	Friday		
WEEK 4: Salmon and Middle and Upper Snake			
28-Jun	Monday		
29-Jun	Tuesday	Boise	Presentations: Salmon, Boise, Bruneau, Burnt, Lower Mid-Snake Mainstem, Malheur, Owyhee, Payette, Powder, Upper Mid-Snake Mainstem, Weiser, Snake Headwaters, Upper Closed Basin, Upper Snake
30-Jun	Wednesday	Boise	Presentations continued and Reviewer Meeting
1-Jul	Thursday	Boise	Reviewer Meeting
2-Jul	Friday		
WEEK 5: Lower Columbia and Gorge			
6-Jul	Tuesday	Portland	Presentations: Big White Salmon, Klickitat, Lower Mid-Columbia Mainstem, Columbia Gorge, Fifteenmile Creek, Hood
7-Jul	Wednesday	Portland	Reviewer Meeting
8-Jul	Thursday	Portland	Presentations: Willamette; LCFRB: Columbia Estuary, Elochoman, Grays, Cowlitz, Kalama, Lewis, Lower Columbia River Mainstem, Wind
9-Jul	Friday	Portland	Reviewer Meeting
WEEK 6: OFF			
12-Jul	Monday		
13-Jul	Tuesday		No Meetings
14-Jul	Wednesday		No Meetings
15-Jul	Thursday		No Meetings
16-Jul	Friday		

WEEK 7: Columbia Plateau - Oregon

19-Jul Monday	La Grande	Presentations: Grande Ronde, Imnaha, Snake Hells Canyon
20-Jul Tuesday	La Grande	Reviewer Meeting
21-Jul Wednesday	Pendleton	Presentations: Deschutes, John Day, Umatilla, Lower Snake Mainstem, Tucannon, Walla Walla, Asotin
22-Jul Thursday	Pendleton	Presentations continued through noon; Reviewer Meeting follows
23-Jul Friday 8 AM to Noon	Pendleton	Reviewer Meeting

WEEK 8 Wrap-up Meeting for ISRP/ISAB/PRG Only

26-Jul Monday		
27-Jul Tuesday	Portland	Wrap-up Meeting
28-Jul Wednesday	Portland	Wrap-up Meeting
29-Jul Thursday; 8 AM to Noon	Portland	Wrap-up Meeting
30-Jul Friday		

WEEK 9: Final Report Compilation and Drafting

2-Aug Monday
3-Aug Tuesday
4-Aug Wednesday
5-Aug Thursday
6-Aug Friday

WEEK 10: Final Editing

9-Aug Monday	
10-Aug Tuesday	
11-Aug Wednesday	
12-Aug Thursday	Final Report Due

Excerpts from the ISRP/ISAB/PRG Review Checklist and Comment Template

Need for Additional Treatment Evaluation Scale

0 - none. For example, the subbasin plan's treatment of this issue was complete, transparent and scientifically sound, and should lead to informed management of fish and wildlife resources in the subbasin.

1 - little to none. For example, the treatment of the issue is adequate:

a) because the plan justifies, in a transparent manner, a limited treatment of the issue due to the state of data and analysis in the subbasin and further justifies a scientifically sound approach to treat the issue in the future;

b) given the relative importance of the issue to scientifically sound management in the basin; or

c) in the context of the overall treatment of related issues in the plan.

2 - moderate. For example, the plan's approach to this issue was scientifically sound given the time, data, and analytical/decision support tools available, but the plan should better describe further treatment of this issue in the future. Alternatively, the approach and conclusion look sound but the process and decision-making behind the treatment of this issue needs to be better described (transparency).

3 - significant. For example, the plan did not adequately address this issue given the data and analytical/decision support tools available, but further effort on this plan, consistent with the approach taken in the plan, is needed before the plan can be deemed scientifically sound by the ISRP/ISAB/PRG.

4 - critical. For example, the plan did not address this issue in a scientifically sound manner. Significant remedial work and perhaps a new approach or methodology needs to be applied to the issue before this element of the plan can be deemed scientifically sound.

NA - not applicable.

Example from the Assessment Section of the Checklist:

I.E. Limiting Factors and Conditions <i>Does the assessment adequately:</i>		(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o	Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)
I.E.2	Describe key factors or conditions within and without the subbasin that currently inhibit populations and ecological processes and functions relative to their potential. Identify the root causes of these disturbances?		
I.E.3	Distinguish between those factors or conditions that can be corrected or influenced by human intervention from those where human intervention would have little if any effect?		

Provide your comments on the Limiting Factors and Conditions Subsection here. As needed elaborate on your evaluation of the various elements enumerated above. *Question: Does the assessment adequately describe factors or conditions that have been most responsible for fish and wildlife declines in this subbasin?* [Your Comments]