

Henry Lorenzen
Chair
Oregon

Bill Bradbury
Oregon

Guy Norman
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington



Northwest Power and Conservation Council

W. Bill Booth
Vice Chair
Idaho

James Yost
Idaho

Jennifer Anders
Montana

Tim Baker
Montana

September 6, 2017

DECISION MEMORANDUM

TO: Fish and Wildlife Committee members

FROM: Lynn Palensky

SUBJECT: Wildlife Category Review: Staff recommendations on 29 wildlife projects and associated programmatic issues

PROPOSED ACTION: Fish and Wildlife Committee consider the staff recommendations on the wildlife category review

SIGNIFICANCE: Pursuant to Section 4(h)(10) (D) of the Northwest Power Act, the Council has engaged in a review of the wildlife projects that implement the Fish and Wildlife Program (Program). The wildlife projects were last reviewed and recommended in 2009.

BUDGETARY/ECONOMIC IMPACTS

The 29 projects included in this review represent those that are still receiving annual operation and maintenance funding. Annual funding for this set of reviewed wildlife projects has been ranged from \$12 million to \$13.4 million in expense program funding since FY 2016. The Start of Year budget for FY 2018 is \$12.2 million for this set of projects (see attached spreadsheet in Part 2). There is also associated capital funding for a subset of projects that are actively purchasing additional land.

BACKGROUND

The last wildlife project review took place in 2009/2010, with funding recommendations covering FY 2010-2014 for 34 projects. Wildlife projects are implemented over a long time period. Many are part of long-term agreements; and all have been reviewed

several times. Thus, the 2017 review has a somewhat different focus than previous wildlife project reviews. This review largely focused on evaluating results and adaptive management, management challenges, and maintenance. Rather than reviewing project *proposals*, the review relied on a project results summary, management plans and annual reports.

The 2017 Wildlife Category Review began in December 2016. The information packet shared with sponsors included background, schedule, and instructions for the review. Summary reports were due from sponsors on March 23, 2017 for ISRP and Council review. The Council held a two-day meeting with the Independent Scientific Review Panel and sponsors for project presentations and discussion of programmatic wildlife issues. The preliminary ISRP report ([ISRP document 2017-5](#)) was completed on May 10, and responses from 10 projects were requested. Public comment on the ISRP reports began May 11 at the completion of the Preliminary Report. The ISRP's Final Report ([ISRP document 2017-7](#)) was complete on June 28, and public comment closed July 27. Only one comment letter was received on the ISRP Report; it was related to Idaho Department of Fish and Game projects. All background information on the 2017 [review process details](#) (schedule, criteria, and process) can be found on the Council's website.

ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are divided into two Parts. [Part 1](#) covers the ISRP's programmatic issues and associated recommendations as well as two Program policy issues and recommendations for a path forward. [Part 2](#) covers project-specific recommendations for the individual projects. This includes a spreadsheet listing the 29 projects with a description of the form and duration of our recommendations. The Council expects Bonneville and the sponsors to apply final Council recommendations during contract development and implementation.

Part 1: ISRP Programmatics, Policy Issues, and Recommendations

Since the beginning of the category reviews in 2009/2010, reviewing individual projects illuminates a set of broader policy or programmatic issues that affect a collective set of the projects. Possible resolutions for the programmatic issues are provided for Council consideration. Some programmatic issues were raised by the ISRP while others were raised by Council staff.

In addition to the ISRP programmatic issues, staff have included analysis and recommendations on two major wildlife program issues that relate directly back to Program strategies. Those issues are crediting at 2:1 habitat units and assessing operational losses. These issues need resolution in the next program amendment process, but staff summarizes the issues in this document and suggest a possible path forward.

ISRP Programmatic Issues

Below are the programmatic issues discussed by the ISRP in its [final report](#). This list is followed by a discussion of each issue in the order presented here:

- A. The need for time-specific, quantifiable objectives
- B. Research, monitoring, evaluation (RME)
 - a. Wildlife crediting
 - b. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and adaptive management
 - c. Results reporting: inconsistencies between project summaries and annual reports
 - d. Project effectiveness M&E: policy on funding
 - e. Prospects for regional RM&E
- C. Proposal for a workshop and pilot project
- D. The ecological consequences of fragmented acquisitions
- E. Treating wildlife mitigation as an integrated program
- F. Outreach activities
- G. Weed management
- H. The need for a broader and readily available supply of native seed and locally adapted nursery stock
- I. Lead shot use on wildlife mitigation properties
- J. Improving the review process

A. The need for time-specific, quantifiable objectives

Staff and Bonneville agree that sponsors should have measureable, task-based or biologically based objectives articulated within their management plans. And monitoring activities should tie directly back to these objectives in the management plan. The Council recognizes that management of wildlife lands varies from passive to active management and may or may not include specific actions intended to benefit focal species. The goals and objectives will vary from simple to more complex based on the conservation values and goals for the land and its management. For example, some parcels require very little and infrequent management actions, while others require more frequent, on-the-ground attention and possibly even restoration actions. The specific objectives should drive the level of monitoring necessary to understand how well objectives are being met.

Recommendations:

- 1) **If not already articulated in management plans, time-specific, quantifiable objectives and measurable goals should be incorporated in management plans for every parcel or group of parcels that have associated management plans during scheduled updates or as new management plans are developed.**
- 2) **Bonneville will work with managers to review and if necessary update the [management plan template](#) to reflect a place for clearly articulated measureable goals and objectives with time-based benchmarks by the end of Fiscal Year 2018. The Council can facilitate a webinar for sponsors on**

how to develop measurable objectives (task-based and/or biological objectives) as part of Bonneville's management plan template.

- 3) The Council can host a webinar/workshop to assist sponsors in developing objectives and a basic adaptive management framework.

B. Research, monitoring, evaluation (RME) a-e

a. *Wildlife crediting:*

The ISRP recommends that the Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) not be used for biological monitoring, and only be used for assigning credit for mitigation objectives. In a Council recommendation on November 17, 2015 the HEP project was closed out¹. The extensive volume of documents, photos, and reports compiled by the Regional HEP Team has been transferred to the StreamNet website (<http://www.streamnet.org/hep>)¹. These documents will remain available for future reference as needed (see Council [decision on HEP](#)).

Recommendation: The Council upholds the previous Council decision on HEP.

b,d, e (combined): Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and adaptive management; policy on funding and prospects for regional RM&E

The issues around monitoring and evaluating (M&E) wildlife species' response to habitat actions are not new. In the last two reviews, the ISRP viewed the limited amount of work being done on monitoring within the wildlife program as a deficiency. However, in the current review the ISRP notes that all 29 are engaged in some level of monitoring.

The 2014 Program's strategy for wildlife "encourages wildlife agencies and tribes to monitor and evaluate habitat and species responses to mitigation actions and develop a more standardized approach to wildlife monitoring." General Program requirements for adaptive management call for monitoring to assess if a project's objectives (biological or otherwise) are being achieved.

In the FY 2007-2009 project review recommendations, the Council and Bonneville recommended a 5-percent soft cap for project-specific monitoring. The ISRP notes that monitoring support is inconsistently applied and inefficient, and supports a more coordinated, regional approach. The funding level cap limits, and was intended to limit, monitoring to just compliance activities. Some projects use non-BPA funds to conduct M&E, but others have been unable to secure non-BPA resources. The outcome is large variability in the information available to evaluate progress and the likelihood that projects will be unable to fulfill the ISRP concern for habitat and species monitoring.

¹ HEP was adopted by the Council, as outlined, in the NPCC's 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program. The region found the process very helpful in establishing mitigation credits against the initial baseline losses indexed by habitat units (HUs) derived from HEP. As the Program has matured and the region has shifted to agreements to address wildlife mitigation efforts, the use of the regional HEP process has come to a useful end.

However, wildlife mitigation differs from other habitat mitigation in that land is purchased to replace the habitat once exposed and now inundated by the construction of the dams. Once that land is purchased the obligation is subject to operation and maintenance funding to support the continuance of those habitat units that were the basis for mitigation.

In general, the Program is moving in a direction of settlement agreements, many of which include long-term funding mechanisms for operations, maintenance and monitoring. In lieu of a settlement agreement, wildlife projects that still received annual O&M funding still need to meet general program requirements for monitoring to assess if objectives are being achieved. Wildlife projects sponsors should continue to use the allocated 5-percent of their budgets to track progress in accomplishing quantifiable objectives in management plans. Through Program funding, the Council expects wildlife sponsors to conduct compliance monitoring, at a minimum. Sponsors are not expected to conduct species-response monitoring (gather and evaluate data for assessing species response to their mitigation actions).

Since the 2009 review the Upper Columbia United Tribes have pooled resources to develop a standardized monitoring approach called the UCUT Wildlife Monitoring and Evaluation Program (UWMEP) with the help of Eastern Washington University. That project was highlighted during this 2017 review as an approach that could be applied to other areas of the basin. The Council supports efforts of the managers to pool resources to implement a regional RM&E framework for wildlife projects.

Recommendations: 1) Sponsors should conduct compliance monitoring, at a minimum, within the funded 5-percent budget dedicated to monitoring activities. Sponsors are not expected to conduct species-response monitoring (i.e. gather, and evaluate data for assessing species response to their mitigation actions monitoring plan) within the 5-percent monitoring budget. 2) The Council can host a webinar/workshop to explore opportunities to collaborate and coordinate monitoring activities, and even pool resources, in an effort to be more efficient at monitoring at a higher geographic scale.

- c. *Results reporting:* inconsistencies between project summaries and annual reports: The ISRP found inconsistencies between project summaries and annual reports and found that annual reports are more focused on project justifications, future benefits and current activities rather than results from monitoring.

Project summaries are created for each review, specifically to show the history of a project, its accomplishments, results, challenges, etc. This is one of the primary reports used by the ISRP to understand the context of each project. Used in conjunction with the annual progress reports and the management plan, the ISRP members round out their understanding of each project. The annual habitat

report template currently used by sponsors is linked [here](#). This template is used for all acquisition (wildlife and fish) projects.

Recommendations: Bonneville will update the annual habitat report template to include a place for how sponsors progressed each year toward meeting measurable goals and objectives stated in the management plan (see Recommendation A. above). Updates to the annual report template will be made by the end of Fiscal Year 2018.

C. Proposal for a workshop and pilot project

The ISRP recommended a workshop or series of workshops that would provide guidance for developing adaptive management programs for fish and wildlife projects, a specific adaptive management plan using an existing project, and assistance from ISRP to strengthen the wildlife program, overall.

Recommendation: See recommendation for A (the need for quantifiable objectives) and B (RM&E). To reduce travel costs and increase accessibility, the Council will plan an online webinar (described above in A and B) for all interested wildlife sponsors to attend.

D. The ecological consequences of fragmented acquisitions

The ISRP notes that one fundamental issue is that the original lands lost by inundation and operation of hydropower projects were, for the most part, continuous parcels of riparian wetlands, floodplains, and forests. The wildlife mitigation parcels, however, are fragmented and sometimes small (from an ecological perspective) raising concerns about the viability and long-term persistence of plant and animal communities with their unique collections of species. Staff agrees from a scientific standpoint that large conservation areas would likely benefit many of the target species for wildlife managers. However, in a program that has already completed significant portions of mitigation responsibilities and that relies to some degree on opportunism for acquiring mitigation parcels, it would be difficult to build the large contiguous network of wildlife habitats that the Panel envisions. Managers should always consider connecting mitigation parcels to other wildlife lands or publicly held properties that will increase connectivity for the benefit of target species. The ISRP identified a series of questions that could help manage isolated wildlife parcels, and the Council agrees that these are good questions to consider for wildlife land management.

Recommendation: Sponsors should consider the questions posed by the ISRP during mitigation project parcel prioritization and in management plan updates and development.

E. Treating wildlife mitigation as an integrated program

The ISRP suggests that the *program requires a working scientific basis for restoring and maintaining parcels that will assure ecological viability in perpetuity. The goal of*

a scientific basis for restoration and maintenance should be to improve the existing mitigation program for overall accountability. The ISRP recommends that the Council and Bonneville organize and lead an information-gathering process that can be used to create analyses and summaries of the overall effects of Bonneville's wildlife mitigation efforts. Summary data on the ecological characteristics, restoration actions, human modifications to the parcels, and partnerships with other agencies/groups across the parcels or projects are needed for an effective mitigation program. The Program would be improved by further collection and analyses of these data with the goal to implement and evaluate projects and to document the overall responses of focal wildlife species. In terms of Bonneville organizing and leading an information-gathering process that can be used to create analyses and summaries of the overall effects of Bonneville's wildlife mitigation efforts, this is something that should be done at sub-regional scale as it is not feasible at a basinwide scale because of geography, conditions, accessibility, purposes and objectives, and target species.

Recommendations: 1) The Council will support the development of a wildlife advisory group or similar venue for information sharing between Bonneville-funded projects so long as the wildlife managers see the value in this and want to participate. The Council can help convene as requested by the group in the form of meeting space, A/V and or facilitation. A first meeting could be scheduled as early as 2018 to discuss the many issues identified in these recommendations. 2) Bonneville will continue to gather summary information at a sub-regional scale and through the parcel assessment a mapping/inventory process (i.e., Phase I and II associated with the O&M Strategic Plan).

F. Outreach activities:

The ISRP encourages sponsors to engage in more outreach activities directed at the public. Reporting on activities to the public and to other managers could increase the effectiveness and impact of habitat management. Bonneville's focus is on-the-ground work, but it does pay for limited public engagement. The ISRP also suggests development of a registry to share information between managers that could be enhanced through linkages to university extension services. The wildlife managers, through these reviews, learn from each other and share information. But they've also expressed a desire to maintain a wildlife manager group similar to past management advisory groups. In terms of a Program-based wildlife advisory group or similar venue for information sharing between Bonneville-funded projects, the Council supports that, and can help convene as requested by the group in the form of meeting space, A/V, and or facilitation.

Recommendation: The Council encourages continued engagement in no-to low-cost outreach activities, aimed at increased public awareness/engagement and more efficient and effective management activities to the extent that it is of benefit. These include use of partnerships and cost-share opportunities (events, volunteer days, schools, signage, interpretive signs, and festivals). The Council will

provide space, A/V, and or facilitation support as needed for a Program-based wildlife advisory group or similar venue for information sharing between Bonneville-funded projects in the form of meetings.

G. Weed management

The ISRP noted that much progress has taken place since the last review with regard to using integrated pest management techniques. The ISRP continues to be concerned about resilience of pervasive weeds and the long term effects of herbicide use, and how to improve degraded soils to give native plants an edge over weeds. The recommendations from the ISRP include the following actions take place if they have not yet occurred:

- Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and develop and regularly update a formal weed management plan for project lands;
- Reinstitute regular meetings among wildlife mitigation proponents;
- Conduct annual or regularly scheduled surveys for weeds and use GPS and GIS tools to identify weed locations and size of weed infestations;
- Implement “clean” practices whenever possible to reduce the inadvertent spread of weed species on mitigation lands;
- Work cooperatively with adjacent landowners and local weed control boards to develop regionwide weed control plans; and
- Investigate the possibility of using project lands as research sites for:
 - the long-term effects of herbicide applications and
 - testing the use of soil and microorganism inocula as tools for soil restoration.

The Council agrees with these actions as general principles for sponsors to consider and implement to the extent practical. Also see recommendations E, F, and J.

Recommendation: Sponsors should consider the ISRP’s principles for implementation of weed management plans.

H. The need for a broader and readily available supply of native seed and locally adapted nursery stock

Many project proponents expressed the need for more readily available supplies of locally adapted seed and/or nursery stock for wildlife lands. The timing and availability can be difficult. A couple of the projects have developed their own nurseries. The ISRP suggests that measures be explored to address this issue. The Council encourages the project sponsors who need or utilize local seed stock to collaborate on ways to make seed stock more accessible, including new suppliers, expansion of existing suppliers (funded by the Program), or working with local nurseries or seed suppliers. For efficiency, a thought worth considering is developing a central nursery or nurseries to supply stock, so long as it reduces the costs involved with sourcing stock on an ad-hoc and individual project basis.

Recommendation: Based on interest level, the Council may host a half-day webinar to discuss options for sourcing, purchasing, and delivery of seed and nursery stock needs before the end of 2018.

I. Lead shot use on wildlife mitigation properties

The ISRP discussed the use of lead in ammunition used by hunters and target shooters, which is recognized as a hazard to wildlife, ecosystems, and humans. The ISRP encourages banning the use of lead shot and bullets on Fish and Wildlife Program wildlife lands. The Program calls for maintaining the values and characteristics of the habitat, and use of lead bullets or shot would degrade those values. The Council agrees with the ISRP on the banning of lead shot use consistent with state and federal laws and expects that to be reflected in the public use section of the management plans.

Recommendation: The Council expects sponsors to take a conservative approach when it comes to the use of lead shot on Fish and Wildlife Program wildlife properties consistent with state and federal laws. (Also see issue F on public outreach recommendations.) A public access and use plan should be articulated in the management plan, consistent with the conservation values and objectives of the habitat.

J. Improving the review process

To improve the review process, the ISRP suggests: 1. Streamlining reporting and review; 2. Continuing presentations and programmatic discussions; 3. Reinstating site visits; and 4. Integrating Program-level analyses.

The Council agrees that the project review process can be improved and streamlined; particularly with this set of long-term, ongoing projects. This set of projects represents those that still receive annual funding for operation, maintenance, and some with monitoring and restoration. There is value in bringing these projects together to learn from each other on methodologies, adaptive management, efficiencies, and lessons learned. Recommendations herein reflect the Council's effort to have clearly articulated project objectives and are intended in part to help projects be as cost-effective as possible. The Council agrees that presentations in lieu of site visits or in addition to site visits on a subset of wildlife lands is a valuable part of any future review.

The Council streamlined the process from 2010 to 2017 and will continue to do so, particularly if the Council and Bonneville can implement the recommendations above, particularly once the key issues are resolved, the reporting and management plan template improvements are made, and we create a list-serve or similar communication tool and hold workshops. In addition, the O&M Subcommittee is working to inventory the Program's wildlife lands, as part of the O&M Strategic Plan effort. The wildlife projects are currently in the Phase I (inventory) and II (Condition Assessment) of the four-phase asset management strategy. It is anticipated that as part of the final strategic plan the wildlife projects will include a mechanism to refresh

and review results and define needs to ensure these investments maintain their inherent benefits.

Fish and Wildlife Program Issues

The two Fish and Wildlife Program policy issues below are both related to crediting. While these issues don't directly affect the review recommendations at hand, they are related in a larger context. These issues should be resolved in the next Program amendment process.

1. Complete loss mitigation agreements for remaining construction and inundation (C&I) losses by 2016 at 2:1.

The 2014 Program language calls for:

- *Bonneville and the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes will complete wildlife loss mitigation agreements for at least the remaining construction and inundation losses by 2016. In addition, for each wildlife agreement that does not already provide for long-term maintenance of the habitat, Bonneville and the applicable management agency shall propose a management plan adequate to sustain the minimum credited habitat values for the life of the project.*
- *Whenever possible, Bonneville shall work with the agencies and tribes to ensure that wildlife mitigation shall take place through long-term agreements that have clear objectives, a plan for action over time, a committed level of funding that provides a substantial likelihood of achieving and sustaining the stated wildlife mitigation objectives, and provisions to ensure effective implementation with periodic monitoring and evaluation.*

Staff is working on a compiling a list of the most current and comprehensive accounting of wildlife losses and crediting. The information for both construction and inundation and operational losses was compiled from existing sources, most of which are on cbfish.org. The list will identify the current mitigation status for each dam. Staff will work with Bonneville to verify information, at which point Bonneville will present to the Council its summary of wildlife losses and crediting. This will occur after the Council makes its final wildlife project recommendations. However, as mentioned above, the C&I losses issue will be not be resolved through this review, but rather in the Program amendment process.

Since the 2014 Program adoption, Bonneville has been negotiating with several sponsors but no additional settlements have occurred. Based on those discussions and the progress being made on what remains in Southern and Northern Idaho (Albeni Falls), and Grand Coulee Dam, the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes will continue to work on agreements to fully mitigate for construction and inundation losses.

Recommendation:

- 1) Bonneville will provide an update to the Council toward the end of each calendar year on the status of what remains for construction and inundation losses and agreement status.**

- 2) If outstanding issues are identified through the update process, Bonneville will work with the Council and fish and wildlife managers to resolve outstanding crediting issues (e.g. Grand Coulee, Southern Idaho, and the distribution of crediting across the lower Columbia dams).**

2. Complete operational loss assessments

The 2014 Program and past programs called for wildlife mitigation from the continued operation of the dams; particularly through negotiated agreements (see Program language below). This is different from construction and inundation losses and harder to assess. For many years wildlife managers have been divided on the level and nature of technical analysis needed to adequately characterize wildlife impacts resulting from the operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System, but agree that these impacts vary widely from hydropower project to hydropower project in both nature and extent. The upper Columbia storage projects are widely believed to suffer the greatest unmitigated losses due in part to the wide range of operating levels and immediate downriver and floodplain impacts not found in the lower “run of the river” projects. However, the effects of hydropower system operations extend throughout the river, even to the estuary. The complex nature of operational and secondary impacts to wildlife makes their full quantification and characterization challenging.

The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho and Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks have developed a framework for assessing operational losses for Libby Dam. That work has improved our understanding of the nature of operational impacts, and consequences to wildlife habitats and populations and has been used as a tool in that area of the basin for their habitat efforts. The Kootenai Operational Loss Assessment has been tested on the Flathead, and according to sponsors it worked equally well on that system. The applicability to other hydropower facilities has not been designed and tested yet, but sponsors feel the model used in the Kootenai and the Flathead could be a functional tool for quantifying downstream impacts in upper Columbia River Basin storage projects. Given the high and the challenges involved in modeling assumptions, Bonneville has expressed little interest in funding further assessments at this time.

The 2014 Program calls for:

- *Where appropriate prioritization exists and agreements exist on the methodology, complete wildlife loss assessments for losses caused by operation of the hydropower projects*
- *Develop and implement habitat acquisition and enhancement projects to fully mitigate for identified losses.*
- *The need for new methods to assess operational losses that incorporate the results of ongoing pilot projects. This could include technical testing and evaluation of operational loss models and methodologies, or other alternative habitat evaluation methods.*

Operational losses may be addressed through settlement agreements. A methodology to assess the impacts of operational losses was developed and could be tested for applicability to other areas of the Program if the need arises. The

Council, Bonneville, and the managers should continue working toward settlement agreements for operational losses, or an agreed upon method of assessing operational losses, and prioritize mitigation opportunities that are in place and in kind. In addition, the Columbia River Systems Operations Environmental Impact Statement (CRSO EIS) process will assess the impacts of system operations on wildlife and may be a useful vehicle for resolving any outstanding issues about operational losses.

Recommendation:

- 1) The Council will work on a process that will lead to an assessment of operational losses in areas that do not have settlement agreements in place ahead of Program amendments. In addition, the CRSO EIS process may be a useful vehicle for resolving any outstanding issues about operational losses.**
- 2) Bonneville should continue to work on agreements to settle operational losses for projects that do not have operational loss settlement agreements. In those agreements, Bonneville should prioritize opportunities for in place/in kind restoration from dam impacts and include these in settlement agreements as possible.**

Part 2: Individual Project Recommendations

The attached spreadsheet contains Council recommendations on individual projects in this review. See Bonneville's Start of Year 2018 budgets in the attached spreadsheet. The Council's recommendations on projects extend for at least six years (2023), at which point the Council will conduct a performance/effectiveness check-in on progress, and follow up on ISRP qualifications, challenges, and programmatic issues from this review. The check-in will require a progress report from the sponsors and will involve a workshop with presentations for sponsors and partners. In the interim, a check-in on operation and maintenance needs may occur through the Operation and Maintenance Subcommittee of the Council. The wildlife projects are currently in the Phase I (inventory) and II (Condition Assessment) of the four-phase asset management strategy. It is anticipated that as part of the final strategic plan the wildlife projects will include a mechanism to refresh and review results and define needs to ensure these investments and benefits are maintained.

As required under the Power Act, the Council must allow public comments on ISRP reports. Public comment on the ISRP reports began May 11, at the completion of the Preliminary Report. The ISRP Final Report was complete on June 28, and public comment closed July 27. The Council received one comment for consideration in the individual project recommendations on the Idaho Department of Fish and Game projects².

² Project #1992-061-03, *Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation-Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG)*, and Project #1995-057-00, *Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation*.

Section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Power Act requires the Council to “fully consider the recommendations of the Panel when making its final recommendations of projects to be funded through Bonneville’s annual fish and wildlife budget.

Three projects need detailed discussion, supporting the staff recommendation.

Project Numbers: 1995-057-00 Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation and 1992-061-03: Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation IDFG

On August 22, 2017, IDFG submitted a response to the Council addressing the ISRP issues. On August 31, 2017, the Council received the ISRP’s Final review of these projects in report number 2017-9. The ISRP [final review](#) found the IDFG projects to meet scientific review criteria (Qualified). The ISRP recommended consideration of further improvements and asked that the sponsor address the identified issues before the next ISRP review. The Council staff concurs with the ISRP recommendations and recommendations that the sponsor address the issues to the extent that they are consistent with the programmatic recommendations.

Recommendation: Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in the follow-up ISRP review (Aug 31, 2017) prior to the next review, and per programmatic issue recommendations in this this Decision Document (Part 1).

Project Number 2002-011-00: Kootenai River Operational Loss Assessment

Through this project, the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (KTOI), in partnership with Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (MFWP), developed a framework for assessing operational losses for Libby Dam. That work has improved our understanding of the nature of operational impacts, and consequences to wildlife habitats and populations and has been used as a tool in that area of the basin for habitat efforts. The Kootenai Operational Loss Assessment has been tested on the Flathead, but the applicability to other hydropower facilities has not been tested yet. This project began as a pilot project, and the original objectives to develop this framework have been met. Council staff recommends continued use of this methodology in the Kootenai and Flathead River subbasins as part of the KTOI and MFWP’s comprehensive efforts to improve and understand habitat in those subbasins. In conclusion, Council recommends a transition project from pilot phase -- methodology development of the operational loss assessment -- to habitat action implementation because the assessment phase is now complete. Future work should be directly focused on habitat restoration possibly through one of the Kootenai Tribe’s ongoing habitat projects.

Recommendation: Transition project from pilot phase --methodology development of the operational loss assessment -- to habitat action implementation (e.g. consider combining with the Kootenai Tribe's Reconnect Kootenai River with Historic Floodplain, Project #2002-008-00).

**2017 Wildlife Category Review
Staff Recommendations
September 2017**

Project Number	Title	Sponsor	FY 2016 EXP Budget	FY 2017 EXP Budget	SOY FY 2018 EXP Budget	ISRP review of science criteria	Staff Recommendation
1990-092-00	Wanaket Wildlife Area	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	\$344,838	\$436,517	\$304,601	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-3 in updated management plan and 2018 annual report (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1991-061-00	Swanson Lake Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$413,744	\$236,425	\$252,672	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in updated management plan and 2018 annual report (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1992-048-00	Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range	Colville Confederated Tribes	\$1,733,671	\$1,791,833	\$1,794,707	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-4 in 2018 annual reports and updated management plan (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1992-061-02	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation-Kalispel Tribe	Kalispel Tribe	\$984,952	\$1,118,640	\$1,032,857	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualification by developing an UWMEP framework and submit to ISRP for review by the end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1992-061-03	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation-Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG)	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	\$708,041	\$708,041	\$707,741	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in the follow-up ISRP review (Aug 31, 2017) prior to the next review, and per programmatic issue recommendations in this this Decision Document (Part 1).
1992-061-05	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation-Kootenai Tribe	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	\$401,178	\$401,178	\$399,778	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualification by developing an adaptive management framework and submit to ISRP for review by the end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1992-061-06	Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation-Coeur D'Alene Tribe	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	\$450,364	\$450,364	\$450,364	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualification by developing an adaptive management framework and submit to ISRP for review by the end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1994-044-00	Sagebrush Flat Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$527,556	\$275,247	\$294,161	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in updated management plan and 2018 annual report (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1995-057-00	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	\$419,884	\$400,000	\$400,000	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in the follow-up ISRP review (Aug 31, 2017) prior to the next review, and per programmatic issue recommendations in this this Decision Document Part 1).
1995-057-02	Shoshone-Bannock Wildlife Mitigation Projects	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	\$1,402,320	\$529,018	\$794,360	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in updated management plan in 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1) for ISRP review.

**2017 Wildlife Category Review
Staff Recommendations
September 2017**

1995-057-03	Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation--Shoshone-Paiute Tribes	Shoshone-Paiute Tribes	\$288,987	\$288,987	\$288,987	Meets criteria	No issues. Implement as proposed
1995-060-01	Isq ^o ultpe Watershed Project	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	\$280,241	\$283,943	\$243,681	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-3 in updated management plan by end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1996-080-00	Northeast Oregon Wildlife Project	Nez Perce Tribe	\$459,186	\$459,186	\$458,686	Meets criteria	No issues. Implement as proposed
1996-094-01	Scotch Creek Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$399,933	\$399,933	\$427,416	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualification in revised management plan (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1998-003-00	Wildlife Mitigation/Operations and Maintenance (O&M) for Spokane Tribe Land Acquisitions	Spokane Tribe	\$481,369	\$439,896	\$439,896	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualification by developing an adaptive management framework and submit to ISRP for review by the end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
1998-022-00	Pine Creek Conservation Area	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	\$461,351	\$720,572	\$441,259	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-3 in updated management plan by end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2000-009-00	Logan Valley Wildlife Mitigation	Burns-Paiute Tribe	\$182,674	\$162,084	\$161,434	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-3 in 2018 annual report and future management plan (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1)
2000-016-00	Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Additions	US Fish and Wildlife Service	\$103,283	\$103,283	\$103,283	Meets criteria	No issues. Implement as proposed
2000-021-00	Ladd Marsh Wildlife Mitigation	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$79,199	\$79,199	\$79,199	Qualified	See programmatic Issue B. Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-3 in 2018 annual report and final management plan (currently in draft).
2000-026-00	Rainwater Wildlife Area Operations	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	\$381,713	\$375,629	\$365,521	Meets	No issues. Implement as proposed
2000-027-00	Malheur River Wildlife Mitigation	Burns-Paiute Tribe	\$378,895	\$358,305	\$357,505	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in next update to management plan (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2002-011-00	Kootenai River Operational Loss Assessment	Kootenai Tribe	\$735,462	\$735,462	\$734,712	Meets criteria	Transition project from pilot phase --methodology development of the operational loss assessment -- to habitat action implementation (e.g. consider combining with the Kootenai Tribe's Reconnect Kootenai River with Historic Floodplain, Project #2002-008-00).
2002-014-00	Sunnyside Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$259,126	\$259,126	\$276,933	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in updated management plan by end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2003-012-00	Shillapoo Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$279,739	\$279,739	\$298,962	Meets criteria	No issues. Implement as proposed

**2017 Wildlife Category Review
Staff Recommendations
September 2017**

2006-003-00	Desert Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$146,771	\$146,771	\$156,857	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in next scheduled annual report and submit for ISRP review (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2006-004-00	Wenas Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$414,174	\$414,174	\$442,635	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications 1-2 in next scheduled annual report and submit for ISRP review (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2006-005-00	Asotin Creek Wildlife Mitigation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$171,412	\$171,412	\$183,191	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in updated management plan by end of 2018 (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2008-007-00	Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Program	Upper Columbia United Tribes	\$231,273	\$231,273	\$231,273	Qualified	Submit a report for review in 2018 that addresses the ISRP qualifications (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
2011-003-00	Willamette Wildlife Fund	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$272,602	\$91,446	\$70,610	Qualified	Sponsor to address ISRP qualifications in next scheduled annual report and submit for ISRP review (per programmatic issue recommendations in this Decision Document Part 1).
		Annual Totals	\$13,393,938	\$12,347,683	\$12,193,281		