

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

April 5, 2005

## DECISION MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council Members

**FROM:** Mark Fritsch, Project Implementation Manager

**SUBJECT:** Council decision on funding recommendations for Updated Proposed Action (UPA) habitat proposals

### PROPOSED ACTION:

Council staff recommends that the Council approve the Chewuch Diversion, Fulton Diversion, Hottell Headgate, MacPherson Side Channel, Marrachi Diversion and MSRF Side Channel proposals as reviewed. The remaining two proposals should not be approved at this time (i.e., Entiat Wells and Whitehall Wells).

This affirmative recommendation is made with the following conditions: (1) that the relationship of how each project is consistent with the applicable subbasin plan, citing specifically the objectives, strategies, and limiting factors or key conclusions from the plans' assessments; (2) that specific questions raised by the ISRP are with a written response provided to both the Bonneville and Council staff. It is understood that Fiscal Year 2005 funds are not to exceed \$505,520 to implement the six projects.

### SIGNIFICANCE:

Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) and Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) implementation and funding of updated proposed action (UPA) habitat projects in the Wenatchee, Entiat and Methow subbasins (see attached letter, Summary of Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook and Steelhead UPA Actions, spreadsheet summarizing the 9 proposed projects, and 2005-2007 Implementation Plan for the Updated Proposed Action). Bonneville must initiate contracting this month to meet the implementation schedule of the revised Biological Opinion (BiOp).

While the ISRP review found the package of proposals "not fundable" as proposed, our review of the specific project findings leads us to conclude that the deficiencies are in the presentation and not the benefits of the work. That is, while the proposals, individually and as a package, are not

up to the presentation standards typical for this program, the project specific comments in the report indicate that the ISRP has confidence that the actual work in the proposals recommended for approval will benefit the targeted listed stocks. Where there are any questions about the benefit of that work, we will require that the ISRP's specific questions be addressed in writing, that stronger and explicit ties to subbasin plans be made in all instances, and that expected benefits to specific populations and life stages of fish be clearly stated.

## **BUDGETARY/ECONOMIC IMPACTS:**

Council staff recommends that \$505,520 in Fiscal year 2005 funds be approved for the six proposals. Bonneville had requested \$635,520 in Fiscal Year 2005 for the package of proposals. It is anticipated that the proposed projects will be completed during FY05. There will likely be additional projects implemented in FY06 in order to meet the Action Agencies' metric goals for these three subbasins. In addition, Bonneville expects to integrate the UPA habitat project implementation in Fiscal Year 2007 and beyond with the Council's Program as part of a future solicitation process.

## **BACKGROUND:**

### Origin of the UPA Proposals and General Background

Bonneville, Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), along with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, have developed an UPA on their joint operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS). The UPA includes a program to improve the quality of tributary habitat to help provide "off-sets" to the impacts of hydro operations on the survival of certain listed anadromous species (Evolutionarily Significant Units or ESUs). Together, the Action Agencies have agreed to address specific limiting factors on the survival of these ESUs in specified areas of their passage, spawning and rearing habitats. The effects of the November 24, 2004 Updated Proposed Action were evaluated in a revised BiOp on the FCRPS issued by NOAA Fisheries on November 30, 2004 pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

NOAA Fisheries analyses determined that habitat actions addressing limiting factors have the potential to increase the ESU populations. The updated NOAA Fisheries analyses for the Biological Opinion found that a qualitative estimate of improvement is needed for Upper Columbia River spring Chinook and steelhead. To fill part of that gap, Bonneville agreed to help achieve tributary habitat metric goals to improve overall survival for fish in these ESUs during their spawning and rearing life stages. The proposed action to meet these goals focuses on four limiting factors: fish entrainment, instream flow, channel morphology, and riparian protection/enhancement. These proposed projects will assist in achieving milestones set forth and described in the tributary habitat action section of the UPA at three and six year intervals.

The BOR has provided funds for the planning and design of these projects. Bonneville's strategic approach in FY05 is to provide cost-share funds for the habitat projects in the Columbia Cascade Province to enable the Action Agencies to achieve the specific metric goals identified in NOAA Fisheries' 2004 Biological Opinion and Updated Proposed Action (UPA).

On February 16, 2005 Bonneville presented to the Council a review of the anticipated implementation of the Updated Proposed Action (UPA) for the Biological Opinion for the Federal Columbia River Power System by the Action Agencies. At that presentation they requested that the proposed projects be reviewed by the ISRP and that a decision from the Council be made during your March meeting.

On March 8, 2005 Council staff received the habitat proposals from Bonneville. (see attached letter, Summary of Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook and Steelhead UPA Actions and spreadsheet summarizing the 9 proposed projects - also included with the submittal was individual project details for the ISRP).

### Review and Implementation Expectations of the Council

It is evident from the ISRP's critique of this package, and discussion last month, that the Council's expectations for proposal quality and process integrity be reinforced. Of course we cannot go back and start this particular effort over again, but it is worth spending a moment here to state our standing expectations for unique or out-of-sequence proposal development and review processes. This is especially critical for UPA related proposals because they enjoy elevated preference in the within-year process. That preference comes with a concomitant need for rigorous proposal definition and review, and careful selection. We understand the Council's expectation for UPA proposals to be:

- Use of the current project proposal form consistently with the submission of projects in the last round of project selection.
- ISRP review and the Council review process should be completed before contracting. Bonneville and the Council may reserve funding in the annual budgeting process for UPA implementation before ISRP review is sought.
- Adequate lead time for ISRP and Council review.

### March Council Meeting

On March 15, 2005 Council staff presented and recommended that the Council conditionally approve allocating Fiscal Year 2005 funds, not to exceed \$635,520, for the Updated Proposed Action (UPA) habitat proposals as defined in the submittal received from Bonneville Power Administration on March 8, 2005. The condition of approval is a favorable ISRP review of the package of proposals. During deliberations the Council raised several issues regarding the submittal and the need to have the ISRP review prior to making a decision. Bonneville raised concerns regarding the need for a decision regarding two of the proposed projects (i.e. Fulton Diversion and Chewuch Diversion) that they felt needed to be contracted in the near future to ensure that the quantitative milestones are reached within the three-year interval for the defined limiting factors.

Based on the presentation and the discussion the Council conditionally recommended that the two projects that need a decision (i.e., Fulton Diversion and Chewuch Diversion) be allocated up to \$268,000 of the \$635,520 requested in Fiscal Year 2005 funds, subject to (1) ISRP review and (2) Council confirmation of its recommendation following the ISRP review. It was intended that

this scenario would expedite the Council review and final recommendation for those two projects. As part of this recommendation the other projects in the package, the Council asked the staff to send those to the ISRP for review on an expedited basis, too, followed by Council review and recommendation at the Council's April meeting.

#### Actions taken in Response to the Council's March Decision

On March 15, 2005 Council staff submitted the project proposals to the ISRP as per the Council recommendation made earlier in the day. It was determined that the review by the ISRP could be accomplished by March 29, 2005 and that would meet Bonneville's needs for contracted, therefore the project were submitted as a package to the ISRP.

On March 30, 2005 the Council received from the ISRP their review of the UPA habitat projects (ISRP Document 2005-09). The ISRP stated that some of the proposed projects have biological merit, but that the proposals were not technically justified and therefore, are "not fundable" as submitted. The ISRP was very critical of the unique process for the development of these proposals, and the out-of-sequence review. As it has found in the past with unique, out of sequence and expedited processes, it reported that the overall quality of the proposals was below standards relative to the regular project selection process. After its critique of the overall package and the process, the ISRP did also provide specific comments for each proposal. While the overall summary comments from the panel were extremely critical, the staff does believe that the proposal specific review comments suggest how to move forward with a portion of the proposals

#### **ANALYSIS:**

The majority of proposed projects can all be defined as water optimization projects (i.e., projects that address efficiencies regarding water usage and quantity in a particular basin) and should have early demonstrable benefits for fish.

The ISRP provided a "not fundable" recommendation for the package of projects. It is fair to say that the ISRP had concerns with three overall matters: (1) the out-of-sequence and expedited process. This has been discussed above; (2) inadequate relation of projects to subbasin plans; (3) sufficiency of monitoring and evaluation for each proposed project. There were particular questions or deficiencies for individual proposals, but these three matters seemed to substantially color the Panel's evaluation of this package. .

The staff agrees that more explicit links to the applicable subbasin plans should be made. That is, the proposals should be directly tied to objectives and strategies in the plans, and they should explain how they address limiting factors identified in the Plans' assessments. The proposals should be augmented to do this and returned to Council staff for an evaluation. If an adequate linkage to the subbasin plan is made, the staff will report this to Bonneville, and it would move to implementation. If that connection is not made, the staff will notify the Council, and it will need to determine how it wishes to advise Bonneville.

The second major and over-arching issue raised by the ISRP relates to the monitoring and evaluation component of each of the proposals. At this time, the staff does *not* recommend that additional monitoring and evaluation elements be added to the proposals. Rather, if the

proposals demonstrate that they are likely beneficial, they would move forward on that basis. The staff understands that the Council and others are concerned about the existing level of project-specific monitoring and evaluation activities within the program, and the region is currently engaged in an effort to streamline that work and lift it to a broader scale. It seems unwise to layer in more project-specific monitoring and evaluation work here on these proposals at this time. Therefore, the staff recommends that the critique of inadequate project-specific monitoring *not* be a basis for withholding support from these proposals.

Based on the above and the understanding that there are only 8 proposals that seek program funds (Peshastin Diversion Dam was not requesting funds and information was provided to the ISRP for only informational purpose) the proposals fall into three groupings when one studies the project specific comments made by the ISRP.

The first grouping of proposals is generally supported by the ISRP. This includes the Chewuch Diversion, Fulton Diversion, and Hottell Headgate.

The second group includes the MacPherson Side Channel, Marrachi Diversion and MSRF Side Channel proposals. The ISRP provide specific questions that should be addressed or clarified prior to implementation to ensure that the projects have the biological merit that are intended to address. It is interesting to note that the Marrachi Diversion proposal was an element of a project that was reviewed and prioritized as part of the solicitation associated with the Columbia Cascade Province (i.e., Proposal #29010, *Restore passage on Private lands in Beaver Creek Drainage to Benefit Spring Chinook, Steelhead and Bull Trout*, as outlined in “Part 2” of the fish and wildlife managers prioritized second block of projects). The staff recommends that the sponsors address each question presented by the ISRP for each of these proposals and return that information to the Council staff. If the Council staff believes that the response is adequate, it will notify Bonneville and it will proceed to funding. If the responses are found lacking by staff, it will notify the Council and it will need to determine what recommendation to make to Bonneville.

The remaining two projects (i.e., Entiat Wells and Whitehall Wells) make up the third category that received the least favorable review by the ISRP due to the insufficient details provided. For this reason the ISRP could not provide a review. A favorable recommendation associated with these two projects will be dependent of a future submittal to the Council and ISRP, and a favorable review and recommendation by the Council.

Therefore, Council staff recommends that the Council approve the Chewuch Diversion, Fulton Diversion, Hottell Headgate, MacPherson Side Channel, Marrachi Diversion and MSRF Side Channel proposals as reviewed. The remaining two proposals should not be approved at this time (i.e., Entiat Wells and Whitehall Wells). This recommendation is conditioned on the understanding that the subbasin linkage is provided for each proposal and the proposal-specific questions raised by the ISRP are fully addressed to the satisfaction of Council and Bonneville staff. By this recommendation it is understood that Fiscal Year 2005 funds not to exceed \$505,520 is needed to implement the six projects.

## **ALTERNATIVES:**

### **I.      Defer Action to a Future Project Solicitation**

The Council could choose to not take action on the request from Bonneville and suggest that the actions be addressed as part of a future project solicitation process. Bonneville and BOR have presented these proposed UPA habitat projects in the Wenatchee, Entiat and Methow Subbasins in an attempt to ensure that the quantitative milestones are reached within the three and six year intervals for the defined limiting factors. Aligning the UPA measures to the next project solicitation would most likely prevent meeting the UPA implementation schedule. Therefore staff does not recommend this alternative.

Attachment: Letter received from Bonneville Power Administration, on March 8, 2005, regarding the UPA habitat projects for Bi-Op Implementation.



## Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

ENVIRONMENT, FISH AND WILDLIFE

In reply refer to:

Mr. Doug Marker  
Fish & Wildlife Director  
Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Mr. Marker:

In coordination with the Northwest Power Council (Council), the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) seeks Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) review of a suite of Columbia Cascade Province offsite anadromous fish mitigation projects for consistency with the Fish and Wildlife Program prior to the Council meeting in March. Implementation of these projects, detailed on the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) website at [www.cbfwa.org](http://www.cbfwa.org) ([www.cbfwa.org/mods/components/forms/DisplayWYOngoing.cfm?ModID=210&action=final](http://www.cbfwa.org/mods/components/forms/DisplayWYOngoing.cfm?ModID=210&action=final)), is planned to help achieve Biological Opinion tributary habitat metric goals for Upper Columbia Spring chinook and steelhead. We are hopeful that the information provided here and in the attachments meets the expectations of our most recent discussions on this topic. (Project descriptions, maps and spreadsheet with further details are also attached).

NOAA Fisheries analyses determined that habitat actions addressing primary anthropogenic limiting factors have the potential to increase the ESU populations. The updated NOAA Fisheries analyses for the Biological Opinion found that a qualitative estimate of "medium" (from 2 to 24 percent) improvements is needed for Upper Columbia River spring Chinook and steelhead. To fill part of that gap, BPA agreed to help achieve tributary habitat metric goals to improve overall survival for these ESUs during their spawning and rearing life stages. The proposed action to meet these goals focuses on four limiting factors: fish entrainment, instream flow, channel morphology, and riparian protection/enhancement; with quantitative milestone goals at three and six year intervals. The suite of projects currently scheduled for implementation in fiscal year 2005 will help achieve milestones set forth and described in the tributary habitat action section of the Updated Proposed Action (UPA). The three-year metric goals to which these projects will apply are 5 irrigation diversion screens addressed, 12 cfs of water protected for instream flow, 60 miles of access restored to anadromous fish and 5 miles of

habitat complexity restored. Please refer to the draft enclosure pertaining to the implementation plan for the UPA.

Staffs from BPA, Council, have coordinated among each other and obtained additional information from entities and sub-basin planners familiar with the projects involved. Council staff from Washington reviewed the project plans and found them consistent with the sub-basin plans. We anticipate this suite of habitat projects scheduled for implementation will be consistent with the Fish and Wildlife Program. Planning and design of several of these projects is already underway through other funding sources, although BPA funding is necessary for projects to move forward with construction. The estimated FY05 amount of BPA funding required for these projects is \$635,520. However, if unforeseen construction or contractual issues arise causing budget increases, BPA will coordinate with the Council.

### **Additional Information to address Guidance for Documentation from the ISRP**

#### **Technical and scientific background -**

Several investigations have been performed to identify the habitat limiting factors in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow subbasins and to assess the opportunities for improvement (most notably the Washington State Conservation Commission's Limiting Factors Analyses for the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow subbasins). The suite of projects is designed to address limiting factors in these subbasins. NOAA's recent analysis of potential habitat improvement measures and practical constraints in all three sub-basins (Kratz et al. 2004) was also considered in developing the metric goals that this suite of projects will help achieve. Specific limiting factors were matched with sub-basin opportunities, e.g., willing landowners, to focus efforts on specific strategies that could be addressed by agency funding. Projects have been planned and designed to implement these strategies.

(See attached document of Updated from Proposed Action for tributary actions for the Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook and Steelhead; see also detailed project information from [www.cbfwa.org/mods/components/forms/DisplayWYOngoing.cfm?ModID=210&action=final](http://www.cbfwa.org/mods/components/forms/DisplayWYOngoing.cfm?ModID=210&action=final) ).

#### **Subbasin Plans –**

Each project description briefly addresses objectives and limiting factors.

Considerable investigations have been performed to identify the habitat limiting factors in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow sub-basins and to assess the opportunities for habitat improvement through the subbasin planning efforts. The Upper Columbia Subbasin Planners are essentially "The Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board" which includes entities throughout the subbasins including the Yakama Nation, the Colville Confederated tribes, Chelan County, and Douglas County. These entities are working with the State and Federal agencies and others to develop salmon recovery plans for the Upper Columbia River tributaries. This group also revised the subbasin plans to address the ISRP comments specifically inadequacies in the Management Plans and Limiting Factors. Part of the overall coordination effort of this group was to develop a list of projects that would address the UPA metric goals and also be consistent with the subbasin plans. Technical evaluation at the local level for these projects was conducted by the Regional Technical Team (RTT), which is composed of biologists and other scientists from a wide variety of state, local, tribal, PUD and federal agencies. Attached is a list of these projects by subbasin, proposed for implementation in FY 05.

#### **Objective, Tasks and Methods-**



BPA has sought the initial project selection and prioritization process for the suite of projects to be addressed as part of the Updated Proposed Action and coordination efforts. We also note that none of the projects proposed are in the Methow River reach that goes subsurface (e.g., the Arrowleaf Reach). Maps are provided with each project description.

**Active Restoration-**

All of the projects are “active” in the sense that an action will be taken to mitigate an entrainment or barrier problem associated with an irrigation diversion or will restore channel complexity in locations behind dikes that will not be removed because they are protecting private property. Passive restoration of natural functions is simply not an option in all locations because of legal and social constraints. Opportunities for passive restoration, such as riparian protection and stream flow improvements, are still being pursued.

**Monitoring and Evaluation-**

Each of these projects that has already been submitted to a grant funding review has a monitoring component in the original project proposal. In the case of those projects 100% funded by BPA, each of these projects is also using the Habitat Improvement Program BiOp format for consultation with NOAA Fisheries. Those familiar with this process know that it contains a strong “built-in” construction and site restoration-monitoring requirement including annual reporting and photo-documentation. Either the project sponsor or the Bureau of Reclamation will perform this photo-documentation subsequent to construction in each case.

The US Forest Service, WDFW, USFWS, Yakama Indian Nation, Colville Confederated Tribes, USGS, University of Idaho, Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers are all conducting some form of biological or habitat monitoring related to listed salmonids in the Methow Subbasin. There activities are being coordinated through the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board’s Regional Technical Team (RTT), which is in turn linked to provincial –level efforts to standardize methods and protocols across the Columbia Basin. Because the level of monitoring in the subbasin is so extensive, some form of information useful for long -term effectiveness monitoring is presently being collected in a manner consistent with regional protocols in every reach where a 2005 project is proposed. For example, reach specific information for the Marrachi the USGS and the University of Idaho are presently collecting project as part of a larger Beaver Creek colonization and sediment transport study associated with Reclamation’s barrier removal program in the Beaver Creek watershed. Similarly, fish usage is presently being monitored by trapping and pit tagging at the MSRF Side Channel project and this monitoring will continue.

A finding from the ISRP that these projects are consistent with the Fish and Wildlife Program will help facilitate implementation of these projects as part of the current budget process. We thank you for the expedited review of this suite of projects.

Sincerely,

William C. Maslen  
Director for Fish and Wildlife

## Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook and Steelhead UPA Actions

### ***Tributary Habitat Actions***

The updated NOAA Fisheries analyses found that a qualitative estimate of “medium” (from 2 to 24 percent) improvements are needed for Upper Columbia River spring Chinook and steelhead. The Action Agencies consider this survival change to be in the lower range of medium. To fill that gap, the BPA and Reclamation propose a tributary habitat program to improve overall survival for the ESU during its spawning and rearing life stages.

NOAA Fisheries evaluated the likelihood of improving species survival through habitat improvements through an analytical approach that included the four VSP criteria of:

- abundance,
- productivity,
- diversity, and
- distribution.

NOAA performed a qualitative evaluation of trends in population status and associated tributary habitat condition and considered the potential to address identified habitat limitations sufficiently to elicit a response in population status. Qualitative rankings of high, medium, or low were assigned to population and habitat parameters based on the magnitude of the observed or potential change.

For Upper Columbia spring Chinook, NOAA concluded that there is a *medium potential* to improve spawning and rearing habitat in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow subbasins. For Upper Columbia steelhead, NOAA Fisheries concluded that there is a medium level of intrinsic potential to improve spawning and rearing habitat in the Wenatchee and Methow Rivers subbasins and a low to medium level of intrinsic potential in the Entiat. A summary of NOAA’s analysis of the potential to increase populations, identification of anthropogenic limiting factors, identification of the ecological improvement potential, and adjusted improvement potential based on practical constraints is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. NOAA Summary of Upper Columbia Spring Chinook (Yearlings)**

<b>Population</b>	<b>Index of Potential to Increase Population<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Primary Anthropogenic Limiting Factors<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Ecological Intrinsic Potential<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Intrinsic Potential Summary (practical constraints)<sup>4</sup></b>
Wenatchee	Very High	Medium—Channel morphology, flood plain connectivity, flows	Medium	Medium
Entiat	Very High	High—Channel morphology	Medium	Medium
Methow	Very High	Medium—Flows, entrainment, channel morphology, water	Medium	Medium

<sup>1</sup> Based upon an analysis of base period (historic) average annual redd counts and recent average annual redd counts.

<sup>2</sup> Anthropogenic limiting factors include instream flows, channel morphology (barriers, connectivity, condition of bed, sedimentation, etc.), entrainment (lack of fish screens), riparian condition, water quality including water temperature, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Ecological Improvement Potential is the anticipated qualitative response to improve population status by addressing limiting factors that resulted from anthropogenic management actions.

<sup>4</sup> An adjustment of the Ecological Improvement Potential based upon practical constraints which may limit the ability to address limiting factors including legal, social, political, or economic constraints.

Population	Index of Potential to Increase Population <sup>1</sup>	Primary Anthropogenic Limiting Factors <sup>2</sup>	Ecological Intrinsic Potential <sup>3</sup>	Intrinsic Potential Summary (practical constraints) <sup>4</sup>
		temperatures		

**Table 2.** Upper Columbia River Steelhead (Yearlings)

Population	Index of Potential to Increase Population <sup>5</sup>	Primary Anthropogenic Limiting Factors <sup>6</sup>	Ecological Intrinsic Potential <sup>7</sup>	Intrinsic Potential Summary (practical constraints) <sup>8</sup>
Wenatchee	Medium to High	Medium-High—Barriers, channel morphology including flood plain connectivity, flows	Medium	Medium
Entiat	Low to Medium	Medium—Channel morphology, flows	Medium	Low to Medium
Methow	High	Medium—Irrigation, sedimentation, barriers, large woody debris, riparian vegetation, and flows	Medium	Medium

Upper Columbia spring Chinook and steelhead spawn and rear in a limited number of tributaries to the upper Columbia River below Chief Joseph Dam. These tributaries rise along the eastern slope of the Cascade Range and include populations of the ESUs in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow. The Okanogan subbasin also includes populations of Upper Columbia River steelhead. Actions to improve spawning and rearing habitat in Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow, and Okanogan subbasins are proposed in the UPA.

Considerable investigations have been performed to identify the habitat limiting factors in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow subbasins and to assess the opportunities for improvement. We do not reiterate those findings here. However, NOAA's recent analysis of potential habitat improvement measures and practical constraints in all three subbasins (Kratz et al. 2004) was considered in developing the UPA. In addition, we verified opportunities by contacting local knowledgeable individuals and organizations, reviewing the considerable information made available by the Council's drafted subbasin plans, and consulting other state and local documents.

**Wenatchee Subbasin.** NOAA Fisheries' analysis showed that channel morphology, including flood plain connectivity and flows are the primary anthropogenic limiting factors in the Wenatchee subbasin. We include a significant increase of habitat condition associated with channel morphology. However, the flow improvement potential identified by NOAA Fisheries

<sup>5</sup> Based upon an analysis of base period (historic) average annual redd counts and recent average annual redd counts.

<sup>6</sup> Anthropogenic limiting factors include instream flows, channel morphology (barriers, connectivity, condition of bed, sedimentation, etc.), entrainment (lack of fish screens), riparian condition, water quality including water temperature, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Ecological Improvement Potential is the anticipated qualitative response to improve population status by addressing limiting factors that resulted from anthropogenic management actions.

<sup>8</sup> An adjustment of the Ecological Improvement Potential based upon practical constraints which may limit the ability to address limiting factors including legal, social, political, or economic constraints.

focuses on large streamflow increases in the lower Wenatchee River. Although low flows in this area limit some of the habitat potential, they do not form a migration barrier to other areas of the subbasin. Based upon practical constraints, there is little likelihood that flows could be significantly enhanced in that reach. Most upstream areas appear to have sufficient fish flows; but additional flow needs, if any, need to be confirmed by IFIM studies. Those studies are currently ongoing. Also, to provide greater assurance that the appropriate level of survival improvements accrue in the Wenatchee subbasin, BPA and Reclamation propose a habitat improvement action to address two additional limiting factors, 1) entrainment, and 2) riparian enhancement and protection. NOAA did not identify these primary anthropogenic limiting factors, but the Action Agencies believe they would yield survival improvements. Based on the Action Agencies' analysis, the total proposed habitat improvements in the Wenatchee subbasin would meet the level of intrinsic potential needed to improve habitat conditions and juvenile survival.

**Entiat Subbasin.** NOAA identified channel morphology to be a primary anthropogenic limiting factor in the Entiat subbasin and considered the lower, channelized, section of the Entiat River to be of particular importance. Therefore, the UPA includes several morphology projects in the lower reach of the river including some opportunities to improve stream complexity and channel connectivity. We also anticipate that other channel morphology improvement projects will be implemented in other reaches of the subbasin.

**Methow Subbasin.** NOAA identified the primary anthropogenic limiting factors in the Methow as flows, entrainment, channel morphology, and water temperatures. The UPA considers those habitat limiting factors and NOAA's opportunity analyses to identify tributary habitat improvements for the Methow subbasin. Virtually all diversions in the Methow basin have been screened; consequently, our UPA focuses on implementing channel morphology projects. We also propose to implement some limited streamflow improvements and riparian protection and enhancement opportunities actions.

#### **UPA performance metrics**

To confirm that the survival improvement goals are achieved, the Action Agencies will implement a habitat effectiveness monitoring program in the Methow subbasin. The program will inform the Action Agencies and NOAA about the survival effects of habitat improvement projects for these ESUs. As our knowledge and understanding increases, we may modify the habitat goals associated with each limiting factor if a different mix of limiting factor goals would improve results.

Specific performance metrics and associated targets for improving Upper Columbia spring Chinook and steelhead juvenile survival production in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow subbasins are shown in Table 3. Metrics measurements and goals are established for 3 years (by 2007) after this UPA is adopted and cumulative goals for 6 years (by 2010) after adoption.

**Table 3. UPA Performance goals for Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow Subbasin**

Limiting Factor	Metric Measurement	Metric Goal in three years	Cumulative Metric Goal in six years
<u>Entrainment</u> <sup>9</sup>	a. Number of screens addressed	5	10
<u>Instream flow projects</u> <sup>10</sup>	a. Cubic Feet per Second (cfs) of water protected for instream flows	12 cfs	40 cfs
<u>Channel Morphology</u> <sup>11</sup>	a. Miles of access restored	60 miles	105 miles
	b. Miles complexity restored	5 miles	10 miles
<u>Riparian Protection/Enhancement</u> <sup>12</sup>	a. Number of miles protected	4 miles	12 miles
	b. Number of miles enhanced.	6 miles	12 miles

***Okanogan Subbasin Conservation Measure for Upper Columbia River steelhead***

For Upper Columbia River Steelhead, NOAA concluded that there is a high level of “intrinsic potential” to improve spawning and rearing habitat in Okanogan is possible when practical constraints are not considered. BPA considered the primary limiting factors identified by NOAA Fisheries for the subbasin that include temperature, barriers, flow, and sediment. Since Reclamation does not have authority to fund habitat actions in the Okanogan, BPA evaluated potential options for improving habitat in the subbasin. BPA proposes to implement some habitat activities to address limiting factors, such as enhancing riparian habitat and improving flows through instream water transactions. BPA may pursue these habitat actions in the Okanogan subbasin through the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program.

<sup>9</sup> Fish entrainment at screens may be addressed through adding new screens, modifying existing screens to meet current criteria, or eliminating the diversion through replacement wells or other means.

<sup>10</sup> Instream flow projects include lease or purchase of streamflow, water conservation projects which yield actual “wet water” instream which may be secured through state water law. Not counted in this metric are gaging stations or other water measurement initiatives or investigations which may be necessary to support the evaluation and protection of instream flows for fish.

<sup>11</sup> Channel morphology projects include Access projects which provide fish passage at structures or conditions that create migration barriers including diversion dams, culverts, low flow channels, etc. Stream Complexity Restoration projects include side channel connectivity, flood plain connectivity, channel reconfiguration, large woody debris placement, etc.

<sup>12</sup> Riparian protection projects include acquisition of riparian easements or purchases. Riparian enhancement projects include streambank stabilization and riparian treatments such as fencing or reconstruction.

COLUMBIA CASCADE HABITAT ACTIONS IN THE ENTIAI, METHOW AND WENATCHEE SUBBASINS											
Limiting Factor	Metric Measurement	Metric Goal in three years (by 10/1/07)	Project	Brief Project Description/Comment	Projected Metric	Total Metrics Planned for 05	Estimated BPA Contract Start Date in 2005	Total Project Cost Estimate	BPA Cost-Share Estimate in FY05 (underlined figures are NOT in current FY05 SOY budget)	Construction Funding Partners	Project Sponsor
Entrainment	a. Number of screens addressed	5 screens	Entiat 4 Mile	Replace diversion with well(s).	1		April	\$ 80,000	<u>\$40,000</u>		
			Whitehall Wells	Replace 4 unscreened diversions with well(s).	4		April	\$ 50,000	<u>\$40,000</u>		
			Hottell	Existing screen would be protected by new intake gate.	1		May	\$ 53,000	<u>\$11,520</u>		Okanogan Conservation District
						6 screens					
Instream flow	a. Cubic Feet per Second (cfs) of water protected for instream flows	12 cfs	Marrachi Diversion	Irrigation diversion replaced with a rock v-weir and piped to increase instream flows.	1 cfs		July	\$ 134,600	<u>\$105,000</u>	WDFW (\$5000)	Okanogan Conservation District
						1 cfs					
Channel Morphology	a. Miles of access restored	60 miles	Peshastin Irr. District	Provide passage through an existing diversion dam on Peshastin Creek	11 miles		N/A	\$ 200,000	No BPA Funds Needed	SRFB will fund the construction of this project.	
			Fulton Diversion	Present passage impediment will be replaced with a roughened channel and rock v-weir.	8.2 miles		May	\$ 600,223	<u>\$146,000</u>	SRFB (~80%)	Chewuch Basin Council
			Chewuch Diversion	Present passage impediment will be replaced with a roughened channel and dam repaired.	23 miles		May	\$ 393,091	<u>\$122,000</u>	SRFB (~80%), Douglas Co. PUD (25% of dam repair)	Chewuch Basin Council
						42.2 miles					
	b. Miles complexity restored	5 miles	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation Side Channel Enhancement	Side channel reconnected using headgate through existing rock levee	0.75		March	\$ 75,000	<u>\$65,000</u>	MSRF (15% in kind)	MSRF
			MacPherson Side Channel Restoration	Side channel reconnected using headgate through existing rock levee	0.3		March	\$ 123,855	<u>\$106,000</u>	WDFW (10%)	MSRF
						.78 miles		\$ 1,709,769	<u>\$ 635,520</u>		

***Draft***  
***2005 – 2007 Implementation Plan***  
***for the***  
***Updated Proposed Action***

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Bonneville Power Administration  
*March 2, 2005*

**Draft 2005 — 2007 Implementation Plan**

**Table of Contents**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Public Review and Comment .....	2
<b>II. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS BY ESU .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. GENERAL APPROACH.....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Adaptive Management.....	4
B. Performance Measures and Progress Reporting .....	4
<i>Annual Progress Reports .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Comprehensive Performance Evaluations: .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>IV. ACTIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY CATEGORY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. Hydrosystem Actions.....	6
<i>Configure Dam Facilities to Improve Juvenile and Adult Fish Passage Survival.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Manage Water to Improve Juvenile and Adult Fish Survival .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Operate and Maintain (O&amp;M) Fish Passage Facilities to Improve Fish Survival.....</i>	<i>17</i>
B. Predator Control Actions .....	19
<i>Redistribute Avian Predators.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Reduce Fish Predation.....</i>	<i>22</i>
C. Estuary Habitat Protection and Improvement.....	23
<i>Protect Estuary Habitat .....</i>	<i>24</i>
D. Tributary Habitat Protection and Improvement Actions.....	25
<i>Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook and Upper Columbia River Steelhead.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Conservation Measures .....</i>	<i>26</i>
E. Hatchery Actions .....	28
<i>Implement a Safety-Net Program as an Interim Measure to Avoid Extinction.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Reduce Potentially Harmful Effects of Artificial Production and Implement Hatchery Actions to Aid Recovery .....</i>	<i>31</i>
<b>V. RESEARCH, MONITORING AND EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>33</b>
A. Hydrosystem RM&E Actions.....	33
<i>Hydrosystem Corridor Status Monitoring .....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Hydrosystem Action Effectiveness Research.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Hydrosystem System Studies .....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Hydrosystem Uncertainties Research .....</i>	<i>41</i>
B. Estuary RM&E Actions.....	44
<i>Estuary/Plume Status Monitoring.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Estuary Action Effectiveness Monitoring Research.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Estuary Uncertainties Research .....</i>	<i>45</i>
C. Tributary RM&E Actions .....	46
<i>Tributary Status Monitoring .....</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Tributary Habitat Action Effectiveness Research.....</i>	<i>47</i>
D. Hatchery RM&E Actions.....	50
<i>Hatchery Status Monitoring.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Hatchery Action Effectiveness Research.....</i>	<i>50</i>
E. Predator Control RM&E Actions .....	51



***Draft 2005 — 2007 Implementation Plan***

<i>Predator Control Action Effectiveness Research</i> .....	51
F. Harvest RM&E Actions.....	51
G. Project Implementation Monitoring.....	51
H. Data Management System.....	52
I. Regional Coordination .....	52
<b>VI. OTHER RECLAMATION ACTIONS</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>VII. ADDITIONAL ACTIONS FROM THE NOAA BIOP</b> .....	<b>53</b>
A. Conservation Recommendations .....	53
<i>Subbasin Planning Infrastructure</i> .....	53
<i>Snake River Sockeye Salmon</i> .....	54
B. Incidental Take .....	54
<i>Reasonable and Prudent Measures</i> .....	54
<i>Improving Juvenile and Adult Passage Survival</i> .....	55

#### **D. Tributary Habitat Protection and Improvement Actions**

Tributary habitat protection and improvement actions were included in the UPA to augment hydrosystem, predator control, and estuary habitat actions for Upper Columbia River spring Chinook and Upper Columbia River steelhead ESUs. Additional conservation measures were included in the UPA to improve survival, but are not required to avoid jeopardy. Conservation measures for Upper Columbia steelhead in the Okanogan subbasin were included by BPA. Conservation measures for Mid-Columbia steelhead in the Upper John Day, Middle Fork John Day, and North Fork John Day; and for Snake River spring/summer Chinook and Snake River steelhead in the Lemhi, Upper Salmon, and Little Salmon subbasins were included by Reclamation.

The following tables identify metrics for lists of known projects and summarize metrics for additional anticipated projects to meet or exceed the near-term (2007) priorities. Habitat projects are conducted in cooperation with private landowners and often require additional coordination among a wide array of State, Federal, and local agencies. The list of known projects indicates that construction funding has been secured, and all participants have agreed to complete the project. Preliminary work has been initiated on additional anticipated projects for the ESUs listed below, but specific identification of projects at this time could impair project completion. Consequently, only summary metrics are reported for additional anticipated projects.

#### **Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook and Upper Columbia River Steelhead**

##### ***Streamflow, Entrainment, Channel Morphology, and Riparian Protection and Enhancement Actions***

**Near-term priority (2007):** In the Wenatchee Entiat, and Methow subbasins, lease, purchase, and/or conserve 12 cfs of water; resolve 5 irrigation diversion screen problems; restore 60 miles of tributary access; restore 5 miles of complexity; protect 4 miles of riparian habitat, and enhance 6 miles of riparian habitat through 13 known and 26 additional anticipated projects.

**Long-term priority (2010):** In the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow subbasins, lease, purchase, and/or conserve 40 cfs of water; resolve 10 irrigation diversion screen problems; restore 105 miles of tributary access; restore 10 miles of complexity; protect 12 miles of riparian habitat, and enhance 12 miles of riparian habitat.

**Table 11 Habitat Metrics for List of Known Projects and Estimates for Anticipated Projects for Upper Columbia ESUs**

Project Name	Agency	CFS to acquire	# of screens	Miles of access	Miles of complexity	Miles protected	Miles enhanced
MVID East Canal Fish Screens	BPA/USBR		1.0				
Hottell Fish Screen	BPA/USBR		1.0				
Marmacoi Diversion Reconstruction	BPA/USBR			21.8			
Fulton Diversion Structure	BPA/USBR			30.1			
Chewuch Ditch Diversion Structure	BPA/USBR			22.8			
Rockview Channel Reconnect	USBR				0.7		
MSRF Twisp Ponds Reconnection	BPA/USBR				0.8		
McPherson Channel Reconnection	BPA/USBR				1.0		
Whitehall Unscreened Surface Pump Elimination	BPA/USBR		1.0				
Entiat 4 Mile Push-up Dam Replacement and Screen	BPA/USBR		1.0				
Water Entity Project (CBWTP and Riparian Easement)	BPA	5.0				5.0	
Jones Shotwell Ditch	USBR		1.0		0.2		
Peshastin Irrigation District Lower Diversion	USBR			2.4			
<b>Metrics Total for Contracted Projects</b>		<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>77.1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Metrics Totals for Anticipated Additional Projects for Completion by 2007</b>		<b>13.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>7.6</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>18.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>177.1</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>7.6</b>
<b>Near-term Metric Goal by 2007</b>		<b>12.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
<b>Long-term Metric Goal by 2010</b>		<b>40.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>105.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>

Council decision on habitat projects for Bi-Op Implementation. NPCC, March 2005.

---

w:\mf\ww\biop2004\upa\upasubmittal030705\040505upahabitatdecisionisrpinut.doc