IMP
Intermountain Province Subbasin Planning

404 W. 22nd Avenue
Spokane, WA 99203
(509) 747-5804

May 26, 2004

Judi Danielson, Chair
Northwest Power and Conservation Council
851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204-1348

Dear Ms. Danielson,

The Intermountain Province Oversight Committee is pleased to submit, and recommend for adoption, the enclosed subbasin plan for the Intermountain Province (IMP). The IMP is located in the northeast corner of Washington State and the northern Idaho panhandle and comprises six subbasins including the Coeur d'Alene, Pend Oreille, Spokane, Upper Columbia, San Poil, and Lake Rufus Woods.

This IMP Subbasin Plan is a response to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's (Council) request to develop locally derived subbasin plans for this region. This plan was developed in an open public process, which provided opportunities for participation by a wide range of state, federal, tribal and local managers, natural resource experts, landowners, local governments, and citizen stakeholders. The IMP Subbasin Plan is consistent with the substantive standards of the Power Act. The completed plan is also consistent with the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Water Act.

The IMP Subbasin Plan was developed to embrace both a provincial and subbasin perspective. The completed plan includes a provincial level overview of the IMP, summary of the IMP organizational structure, overall planning approach, and province scale discussion of aquatic and terrestrial resources. In addition, the plan was developed around a provincial hypothesis and includes both provincial and subbasin level biological objectives. Reviewers of the IMP Subbasin Plan should read all of the province level chapters in addition to the specific subbasin chapters in which they have direct interest.

Development of the IMP Subbasin Plan followed the recommended guidelines presented in the Council's, *Technical Guide for Subbasin Planners* to the extent appropriate to the ecological, cultural, social, and economic realities of the IMP - and consistent with the limitations of the available assessment tools, timeframe and budgets.

The completed IMP Subbasin Plan includes:

- assessments describing the current and historical condition of fish and wildlife habitat in the IMP and in the six IMP subbasins, including identification of relevant limiting factors;
- inventories summarizing recent and ongoing projects to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife in the IMP and in the six IMP subbasins, and an analysis of evident gaps; and
- management plans describing the vision, objectives, prioritized implementation strategies, and approaches to monitoring and evaluation in the six IMP subbasins.

This IMP Subbasin Plan reflects the dedication of substantial time and the best efforts of hundreds of individuals throughout the IMP. The contents of the subbasin management plans presented in this document were developed through a consensus process that included participation by relevant state, tribal and federal fish and wildlife agencies, and well as participation from a broad range of stakeholders including interested representatives of local government, industry, conservation districts, interest groups and citizens.

Subbasin planning participants in the IMP believe it is vital that subbasin plans be treated as living documents that are periodically updated. As a result of the many and diverse subbasin planning efforts occurring throughout the Columbia River Basin, substantial opportunities are available to learn from, and improve these documents in the future. Because no process is perfect – subbasin planners in the IMP have attached a document summarizing our reflections on the successes and failures of the subbasin planning process in the IMP along with some specific recommendations for improving the overall process in the next iteration. The IMP Oversight Committee also recommends that the Council establish a formal critique of the subbasin planning process and products in order to gain maximum benefit from the substantial efforts expended to date, and to help guide the next steps towards implementation and revision of the documents. For instance, a thoughtfully designed summit attended by key subbasin planning participants and coordinators, core members of the ISRP, and the Council in late October or early November could provide substantial benefit in rolling out the next steps. The IMP Oversight Committee is willing to volunteer efforts to assist the Council with this undertaking.

The subbasin planning participants in the IMP look forward to adoption of this IMP Subbasin Plan into the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program.

Sincerely,

James L. Caswell
Chair, Intermountain Province Oversight Committee

Cc: Frank Cassidy
Tom Karier
Jim Kempton
Doug Marker
Eric Merrill
John Ogan

Attachments: Review, Self-Assessment and Recommendations

IMP
Intermountain Province Subbasin Planning

404 W. 22nd Avenue
Spokane, WA 99203
(509) 747-5804

Review, Self-Assessment and Recommendations:
Intermountain Province Subbasin Plan and the Next Iteration of Subbasin Planning

Introduction

The following document describes the results of two days of meetings that occurred in the Intermountain Province (IMP) in early May 2004. The purpose of those meetings was to review and evaluate the subbasin planning process and product in the IMP, develop recommendations for future iterations of subbasin planning, and compare the IMP Subbasin Plan to the ISRP, ISAB and PRG review guidelines.

Subbasin planners in the IMP established a timeline and subbasin planning process specifically designed allow sufficient time for the IMP subbasin planning participants to take part in a province-wide review of the completed IMP Subbasin Plan. Although allowing adequate time to incorporate this review reduced the time available to make last-minute changes to the final document, and precluded inclusion of any late-arriving recommendations from the Council's staff, IMP subbasin planners agreed that it provided an important additional level of public involvement and accountability. Furthermore, IMP subbasin planners believe the expense and effort devoted to development of subbasin plans warrant a thoughtful review and analysis of the process and products. Towards this end, on May 5th and 6th 2004, IMP subbasin planners convened a final review and wrap-up meeting.

The purpose of the full-day May 5th provincial meeting was to review the completed IMP Subbasin Plan, confirm the final contents of the six subbasin management plans, appraise the overall process as well as the breadth of participation in the IMP, provide constructive critique of the planning guidelines and structure, and identify recommendations for the next iteration of subbasin planning. Invitations to attend the May 5th session were extended to the entire IMP mailing list of over 500 individuals and the meeting was open to anyone who cared to attend. Participants included members of the Subbasin Work Teams from each IMP subbasin, the Oversight Committee, members of the ad-hoc Technical Coordination Group, Council staff, the GEI technical and outreach teams, interested members of the public, and the IMP coordinator.

The purpose of the full-day May 6th meeting was a review by the Oversight Committee and the GEI technical team of the final IMP Subbasin Plan in comparison to the ISRP, ISAB and PRG review guidelines, and the Council's subbasin plan adoptability guidelines.

The following document is presented in two parts. The first part is a summary of key themes reflected in the comments and recommendations derived from the May 5th province-wide meeting; the second part includes the Oversight Committee and GEI team's responses to the specific questions posed in the ISRP, ISAB and PRG review form.

This information is provided to the Council and ISRP in order to:

1. provide additional levels of transparency regarding the how's and why's associated with development of the assessment, inventory and management plans in the IMP;
2. provide a constructive critique of the direction and guidance provided to subbasin planners and indicate how that direction and guidance influenced the development and content of the IMP Subbasin Plan ;
3. provide constructive suggestions from on-the-ground subbasin planners regarding ways to improve the subbasin planning process in future iterations.

Results of May 5th Meeting: Reflections on Guidelines, Process, and the Completed IMP Subbasin Plan

At the May 5th meeting IMP subbasin planning participants reviewed the completed province level portions of the IMP subbasin plan, the process used to develop the plans, and the contents of the specific subbasin management plans. Participants spent the morning in subbasin breakout groups reviewing the final management plans and confirming that the finished plans accurately reflected the work product of each team. Minor corrections were recorded and in two cases Subbasin Work Team members confirmed their requests to record dissenting opinions. Participants were also asked to provide written suggestions or comments regarding improvements to the next iteration of IMP subbasin planning. These comments were posted on a wall in association with each individual subbasin.

In the afternoon, meeting participants split into discussion breakout groups structured around four topics. Each group circulated through each of the four discussion topics so that by the end of the day, every participant had contributed to the discussion of each topic. In each group participants were asked to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the IMP response to the topic and to develop constructive recommendations for how to make improvements in the future. The four topics were:

- Guidelines for subbasin planning and the task of developing the plan
- Development of a science-based management plan
- Participation in the subbasin planning process
- Quality and Usefulness of the IMP Subbasin Plan

The Oversight Committee and many of the participants in the IMP subbasin planning process note the uniqueness of the subbasin planning process. It is in all likelihood one of the only efforts of this scale taking place in the United States. The Council (and BPA) should be commended for undertaking such and ambitious, innovative, and groundbreaking effort. In this spirit of co-discovery, the IMP offers the following summary of the central critiques and recommendations developed by participants in the IMP May 5th breakout groups:

Critique:	**Recommendations:**
Lack of familiarity with Council, BPA and Fish and Wildlife Program: • A great deal of time was spent in the Subbasin Work Team meetings and early planning meetings educating stakeholders about the Council, BPA and the Fish and Wildlife Program. This effort significantly cut into time	• If members of the public are to be meaningfully involved in future iterations of subbasin planning the Council needs to help educate people about what the Council is, what the BPA's role is, and what the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program is and is not. • Increased participation in subbasin planning by

available to develop the management plan. • Participants were confused by the relationship of subbasin plans to state and local regulations such as Washington State's Growth Management Act. • Participants were unfamiliar with the Power Act and purpose of the Fish and Wildlife Program and in some cases this lack of familiarity caused unrealistic expectations about what could be gained through participation in the process.	Council staff (and when and where possible Council members) would be beneficial at the subbasin level – many stakeholders asked repeatedly why the Council staff or Council members were not involved more actively in the planning process.

Lack of timely, clear and consistent guidance or tools: • Subbasin planners in the IMP understood that the process of developing subbasin plans was of necessity an evolving process and required ongoing adaptation by all parties. However, the lack of consistent, timely guidelines and sideboards in some areas caused significant frustration for on-the-ground participants. • The lack of clarity as to the scope of subbasin planning in terms of FCRPS versus non-FCRPS caused confusion and frustration for subbasin planners. • While stakeholders were encouraged to be actively involved, the obligations of the Power Act assure special consideration to the co-managers. This caused frustration and some distrust for some stakeholders and limited the willingness of some stakeholders to become engaged – or to stay engaged. • Guidelines for subbasin planners and assessment tools provided by the Council were largely "fish based" and were anadromous fish oriented. For example, much of the Technical Guidelines and ISRP review guidelines are based on outputs from the EDT model. Those subbasins that are not able to use EDT (non-anadromous) or that choose not to use EDT are at some disadvantage. QHA (provided an alternate to EDT) does not have the same outputs as the EDT model. Additionally, QHA was not developed until after subbasin planning had started and was still being updated and changed during the time the IMP was trying to finalize the QHA outputs in order to provide timely information to the Subbasin Work Teams for use in developing the management plans. • Technical Guidelines were developed as	• Develop complete guidelines before the next iteration of subbasin planning process begins. At the outset of the planning process these guidelines should describe how the final plans will be reviewed and provide a clear template with evaluation criteria and facilitate development of succinct and simple subbasin plans • The substantial information that will be gathered through the Council and ISRP review of subbasin plans throughout the Columbia River Basin should be used to identify the "best" examples of effective approaches to public involvement, assessment, inventory and development of a management plan, and to develop revised guidelines. • The Council should consider hosting a "summit" for key subbasin planners, ISRP reviewers, Council members and staff to review successes and failures and gather input on how to best implement next steps. • If economic issues are to be included in future iterations, adequate guidelines to frame the scope and content need to be developed. • Planning guidelines and review processes need to better reflect available assessment tools and on-the-ground conditions for both fish and wildlife, and for both anadromous and resident fish. • The scope of subbasin planning (e.g., FCRPS versus non-FCRPS issues) needs to be clarified. • The expectations regarding participation by local governments, stakeholders and those not directly affected by the FCRPS or by the obligations of the Power Act need to be more explicitly addressed by the Council. • Subbasin planners understand that the Council may adopt only the management portion of

recommended guidelines, however ISRP/ISAB/PRG review is based directly on Technical Guidelines. • The review guidelines were not distributed and posted until April and May. It would have been particularly useful for planners to better understand the review criteria at the outset of planning.	subbasin plans into the Fish and Wildlife Program. Had planners known this from the outset – it might have led to development of a different approach to planning – or to recommendation of a different format for the document.

Lack of clarity regarding implementation, continuity, and commitment to development of future subbasin plan iterations: • Subbasin planning coordinators were not able to supply stakeholders and other participants with specifics regarding implementation of subbasin plans, or with specifics regarding how plans would be updated and revised over time. This resulted in a credibility gap for those coordinating subbasin planning activities. • Participants questioned the value of their commitments of time and effort because of the lack of clear commitment and methodology for updating the subbasin plans.	• Subbasin planners in the IMP agree that the plans must be living documents. • A schedule, timeline and method for implementation of subbasin plans should be established as soon as possible. • A schedule, timeline and method for updating and revising subbasin plans should be established as soon as possible. • In many subbasins important initial steps to develop working relationships between a broad range of stakeholders and co-managers have been developed. This was an important outcome of the process. However, these relationships may be weakened – and potentially compromised – if there is no clear commitment to maintain them or follow-through to the subbasin planning process.

Significant decisions made without consultation of local experts: • Prior to the initiation of subbasin planning, the subbasin boundaries were defined (and redefined) without consultation by local experts and citizens. This caused a great deal of frustration and confusion for local subbasin planners (e.g. subbasin borders did not follow watersheds in all cases, or in the case of Lake Rufus Woods – an entire subbasin was eliminated). • The Technical Guide for Subbasin Planners and the ISRP, ISAB, and PRG review guidelines were developed without consultation by local experts and citizens.	• Consult with locals to determine where to define subbasin boundaries consistent with ecological conditions in subbasins, and consistent with unique management conditions. • Consult with on-the-ground subbasin planners and local experts to refine and revise guidelines for development and updating of future iterations of subbasin plans. • Consult with on-the-ground subbasin planners and local experts to refine and revise assessment tools for use in subbasin assessment.

Developing the management plans with lay-people and scientists proved challenging: • The tight timeline made it difficult to include lay-people in the development of biological objectives and strategies. It was difficult to get	• Include adequate time to bring lay-people up to speed on assessment. • A commitment to an ongoing iterative process will help keep the individuals who took the time to be involved and learn interested in working

everyone up to speed, meet the deadlines, and at the same time provide adequate time for meaningful review and comment. • Process of including both lay-people and scientists resulted in disagreements over how specific to be in the objectives and strategies.	on future iterations so that subbasin planners don't have to educate a completely new group of stakeholders in next iteration. • The review guidelines need to recognize the challenges associated with developing biological objectives in groups that include non-scientists.

Results of May 6th Meeting: Oversight Committee and GEI Team Assessment of IMP Subbasin Plan in Comparison to the ISRP, ISAB and PRG Guidelines

The Council identified a list of seven issues on which it seeks advice from the ISRP, ISAB and PRG in determining the scientific soundness of recommendations proposed for adoption into the program:

1. Do the assessments appear to be thorough and substantially complete?
2. Are the subbasin goals, objectives, and strategies scientifically appropriate in light of the assessment and inventory of existing activities?
3. Does the plan demonstrate a linkage between the strategies, the biological objectives, the subbasin vision and the assessment?
4. Are the goals, objectives, and strategies consistent with those adopted in the program for the province and/or basin levels?
5. Do the plans demonstrate that alternate management responses have been adequately considered?
6. Does the proposed subbasin plan include a procedure for assessing how well subbasin objectives are being met over time?
7. Does the plan provide a scientifically supportable procedure for refining the biological objectives as new information becomes available about how fish, wildlife and the environment interact, and in relationship to how the plans are implemented over time?

The ISRP, ISAB and PRG review guidelines were developed to help provide this guidance and ensure timely, and consistent reviews across the Columbia River Basin. The initial review guidelines were dated March 19, 2004. Revised guidelines were posted on the Council's website posted April 6, 2004. The preamble to the review guidelines states that the guidelines were derived directly from the Council's Subbasin Planning Technical Guide.

On May 6th 2004, the IMP Oversight Committee and GEI's technical staff met for a full day to review the IMP Subbasin Plan in comparison to the ISRP, ISAB and PRG review guidelines. The following section contains a summary of the responses developed at the May 6th meeting to the specific questions posed in the ISRP, ISAB and PRG review guideline template.

In the self-review process Oversight Committee members and GEI's team agreed that development and distribution of these guidelines in tandem with the Technical Guide for Subbasin Planners, and prior to the initiation of subbasin planning activities would have been very helpful. The Oversight Committee also noted that the use of the numeric score to compare subbasins against other subbasins would be

problematic since the review template is so heavily based on the anadromous fish oriented recommended *Guidelines for Technical Planners.*

I. The Subbasin Assessment

(See generally pages 4-6, 9-10 of the Technical Guide; the checklist is derived from 18-24 of the Technical Guide.) Reviewers should consider the soundness, completeness, analytical approach, and transparency (documentation of methods and decision-making process) of the following components of a subbasin assessment:

I. A. Subbasin Overview

General Question to be addressed: Does the assessment provide the geographical, demographical, and environmental context for fish and wildlife resources in this subbasin? The Council specifically asked that the independent scientific review evaluate whether the subbasin assessment was thorough and substantially complete. The following checklist is to aid reviewers in that determination.

I. A.1. General Description		*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
I.A.1.1	*Does the assessment provide a general orientation to the subbasin (location, size, distinguishing natural and cultural features, land use, land ownership) and an overview of jurisdictional authorities (state, county, federal lands, tribal lands and fishing rights)?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, the general orientation to the subbasin is addressed in the province-level portions of the document particularly sections 3 and 4 with some additional information provided at the subbasin level. Jurisdictional authority is summarized at a province level for federal, state and sometimes tribal authorities. Local government or other local authorities are discussed in the subbasin chapters.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.A.1.2	*Does the assessment provide a general description of the subbasin's macro-environment (geology, climate and weather, land cover, vegetation) and of the subbasin's water resources (hydrography and watersheds, hydrologic regimes, water quality, riparian and wetland resources), water uses, and modifications to water resources (hydropower projects and operations, water diversions, channel modifications)?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, a general description of the macro-environment is included at the province level as well as for each of the six subbasins. Water resources are described primarily at the subbasin level. The discussion of water quality is primarily limited to major water quality concerns since more extensive and detailed information on water quality is available from other sources (e.g. Washington Department of Ecology, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality). The list of water diversions in the IMP is not complete due to a lack of information. Mechanisms to acquire this information in the future are identified in specific subbasin strategies.**	**P**	**N/A**
I.A.1.3	*Does the assessment provide a general description of anthropogenic disturbances to the aquatic and terrestrial environment, organized by the source of disturbance (urbanization, agriculture, forest practices, water development, mining, transportation, and other)?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, anthropogenic disturbances and their sources are described primarily in the provincial chapters with some additional local detail provided where appropriate in distinct subbasin chapters. These are**	**Y**	**N/A**

	generally described by source of disturbance.		
I.A.1.4	*Does the assessment provide a list of native and non-native fish and wildlife species present in this subbasin including those species that:* *a. have been designated as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act or state equivalents,* *b. have been recognized by applicable federal, state, or local resource management agencies, or by the Nature Conservancy or state heritage program, as being especially rare or significant in the local area,* *c. have special ecological importance within the subbasin,* *d. are recognized by Native American tribes as having special cultural or spiritual significance, or* *e. are not native to this subbasin?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, for the most part. The IMP subbasin plan includes a list(s) of native and non-native fish and wildlife species of special interest or concern in the province as a whole, as well as species of particular concern in various subbasins. However, the list is not comprehensive (e.g. does not include full list of species recognized by Native American tribes as having special cultural or spiritual significance, does not include full list of species identified by Washington or Idaho, does not include extensive lists of all non-native species). The list(s) does include threatened or endangered species, species that are important indicator species, or species that represent unique circumstances in the IMP. Subbasin planners in the IMP sought to balance the desire to build a thoroughly comprehensive assessment with realities of time and funding – and a desire to create a relatively compact, succinct document.**	**P**	**N/A**
I.A.1.5	*Does the assessment identify plants that have been designated as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act or state equivalents, and/or that are recognized by Native American tribes as having special cultural or spiritual significance, or (optional) that have special ecological importance within the subbasin?*		
ANSWER	**The subbasin plan contains a partial response to this recommended guideline. Federally listed plants were included in the plan. However, neither equivalent state lists nor lists of plants with significance to Native American tribes were included. See comment in previous question. However, this relatively minor omission can be addressed in future iterations of the plan if the information is deemed critical.**	**P**	**N/A**
I.A.2. Subbasin in the Regional Context		*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
I.A.2.1	*Does the assessment adequately describe how this subbasin fits within its regional context (size in relation to the total Columbia Basin, placement within the ecological province and relationship to other subbasins in this province, qualities that distinguish this subbasin from others in the province)?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, in the opinion of subbasin planners in the IMP, the assessment adequately describes both the province and the subbasins within their regional and basinwide context. The IMP and the subbasins within it are described in relation to qualities that make them unique from other regions, and in terms of geographic location and size. This information is located primarily in the provincial overview Chapters but subbasin specific information is also located in each subbasin chapter.**	**Y**	**N/A**

I.A.2.2	*Does the assessment adequately describe this subbasin's relationship to Endangered Species Act planning units (NOAA Fisheries-designated evolutionarily significant units (ESU) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-designated bull trout planning units. where this information was available during the planning process?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, the assessment describes the relationship of the relevant subbasins to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – designated bull trout planning units. Anadromous fish are extirpated from the IMP so NOAA Fisheries ESU's are not relevant. Because the bull trout recovery plans are still being developed and finalized, the IMP plan includes a web link to the recovery plans so that the most up to date information will be associated with the assessment and management plan.** **Note: the assessment information from which the bull trout recovery plans are derived from are deemed controversial among some stakeholders who participated in the Subbasin Work Teams. For this reason, there was extensive discussion among some of the work teams regarding whether elements of the recovery plans should be included among strategies developed by the Subbasin Work Teams. Nevertheless, the bull trout recovery plans were taken into account by the Subbasin Work Teams and are reflected in the management plan objectives and strategies.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.A.2.3	*Does the assessment adequately summarize external environmental conditions that might have an effect on fish and/or wildlife in this subbasin (the ocean, the estuary, the mainstem downstream from the subbasin, and, as relevant, upstream areas and adjacent subbasins)?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, out-of-subbasin factors are acknowledged in the plan, particularly in the provincial overview chapters. Estuary and mainstem issues are of relatively minor importance to the IMP given the extirpation of anadromous fish; while operations of the FCRPS for power, flood control, irrigation and spill have profound effects on the aquatic, and to a lesser extent, terrestrial resources in the IMP. The effects of upstream hydropower projects are also acknowledged. Planners in the IMP believe that larger issues like global warming which may supercede a host of local and regional issues are simply too big to deal with at this scale of planning. The question of adequacy is subjective, but IMP subbasin planners do believe these issues are adequately dealt with in the plan.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.A.2.4	*Does the assessment adequately identify macroclimate and human occupation and use trends that may affect hydrological or ecological processes in this subbasin over the long-term (50 years into the future and beyond)?*		
ANSWER	**No, the identified planning horizon was 10 to 15 years and subbasin planners in the IMP didn't feel they could identify macroclimate and human occupation and use trends extending into 50 years and beyond with any degree of accuracy. IMP subbasin planners chose not to address this recommendation.**	**N**	**N/A**

I.B. Species Characterization and Status *General question: Does the assessment adequately describe the current status of fish and wildlife focal species?* *Note to reviewers: for this section of the review, the checklist should be applied to each focal species. Once the plans are received, assignments will be made to cover an individual species or a series of focal species.*		*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
I.B.1. Does the assessment adequately identify a series of focal species that will be used to characterize the status of fish and wildlife species within the subbasin? These should include one or more wildlife, resident fish, and, where present, anadromous fish species. Anadromous fish may also be included in subbasins where they were historically present and where there is a reasonable probability that these fish could be restored to sustainable levels. Criteria suggested for selecting focal species include a) designation as Federal endangered or threatened species, b) local ecological significance, and c) cultural significance.			
ANSWER	**Note: in responding to this question the IMP reviewers did not look at each species individually. They only looked at the overall quality of response for all focal species. All of the focal species in the IMP were dealt with in the same manner.** **Yes, focal species were selected that represent wildlife, resident fish, and species with ecological, cultural or economic significance. The criteria used in selecting the focal species are clearly identified in the associated discussion in the subbasin plan. The IMP subbasin planners also took to heart the ISRP recommendations presented in the Clearwater review to limit the number of focal species. However, IMP planners note that the selection of focal species is most appropriate to fish species and that in evaluating wildlife, focal species were selected which represented a range of key habitat types which in turn resulted in selection of a much larger quantity of wildlife focal species.** **IMP planners also note that non-native fish were in some cases selected as focal species in the IMP. This is directly related to the unique anthropogenic disturbances (e.g. construction of Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph dams and operation of the FCRPS) in the IMP which have resulted in the extirpation of native anadromous fish and of numerous native resident fish. In addition current habitat conditions including hydropower operations of reservoirs, and cultural preferences limit and dictate the selection of appropriate and potential mitigation species.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.B.2. Does the assessment adequately identify and characterize focal species populations; i.e. delineate unique population units and, as applicable and where information is available, meta-populations, subpopulations and/or other genetic/behavioral groupings used by scientists or managers?			
ANSWER	**Yes, the assessment identifies and characterizes focal species populations to the extent possible using existing available data. However, subbasin planners in the IMP acknowledge there are significant data gaps in the IMP and subbasin planning was not intended as a mechanism to collect new data. Specific information needs and mechanisms to meet those needs are identified in the subbasin biological objectives and strategies.** **Note: many of the questions in this section of the review template (and in**	**Y**	**N/A**

	the *Technical Guide for Subbasin Planners* from which it is derived) are based directly on the input and outputs associated with the EDT model. Beginning in 2002 (and in meetings prior to the initiation of subbasin planning) subbasin planners in the IMP met with Council staff and contractors to discuss the use of EDT in the IMP. Subbasin planners were repeatedly assured in these early meetings that EDT tools would be adapted for use with resident fish in lakes and reservoirs in time to fulfill the assessment needs associated with subbasin planning. To facilitate timely adaptation of these tools the Colville Tribes agreed to work with Council staff and consultants from Mobrand Biometrics to test new rules for resident fish in one small subbasin – the San Poil. The Colville Tribes dedicated significant time and resources to this effort and the model was populated with data – but to date – no results have been forthcoming. Ultimately, subbasin planners in the IMP, for lack of suitable alternate tools chose to use the QHA model that was developed in 2002. This model was still being finalized and refined at the time IMP planners were using it to develop the assessment. The conditions, inputs, and outputs of the QHA model do not cleanly align with some of the review criteria identified in this section. Additionally, these criteria are in many cases more specific to fish than wildlife. However, the QHA model did provide additional useful information to the IMP subbasin planning process.		
I.B.3. Does the assessment describe the current and historic status of each focal species population and summarize available population data (abundance, productivity, etc., with particular emphasis on trend data)?			
ANSWER	**Yes to the extent possible using existing available data. See note above regarding availability of information and existing data gaps.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.B.4. Does the assessment adequately describe the population's life history, including identifying distinct life stages?			
ANSWER	**Yes to the extent possible using existing available data. See note above regarding availability of information and existing data gaps.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.B.5. Does the assessment adequately characterize the genetic constitution of the population, especially regarding possible effects of artificial production? Specifically does the assessment describe the historic and current status of introductions, artificial production, or captive breeding programs in this subbasin or affecting the subbasin through straying or other means, and describe the relationship between the artificial and naturally produced populations?			
ANSWER	**Yes, for the most part. In particular bull trout are specifically addressed. Links are provided to HGMPs for relevant artificial production programs, however the actual HGMPs were not attached to the document in the interests of keeping the document size manageable.** **A side note regarding the HGMPs – as part of the Council's APRE review process HGMPs were developed throughout the Columbia River Basin. In areas with anadromous fish the HGMPs are proceeding to Phase II and Phase III of a three-phase process. In IMP none of the Phase I HGMPs have been forwarded on to Phase II or III.**	**P**	**N/A**
I.B.6. Does the assessment adequately describe historic and current harvest, including both in-subbasin harvest and downstream or ocean harvest affecting the focal species?			
ANSWER	**Historical and current harvest is addressed for bull trout. Extensive**	**P**	**N/A**

	information regarding historical and current harvest of other species is not included. If this is deemed critical this omission can be addressed in future iterations of the plan. Downstream and ocean harvest is not addressed since there are no anadromous fish in the IMP.		

I.C. Environmental Conditions *General question to be addressed: Does the assessment adequately describe the effect of the environment on fish and wildlife populations?*			
I.C.1. Environmental Conditions within the Subbasin		*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
I.C.1.1	*Does the assessment adequately describe the current condition of the environment in this subbasin, and characterize the condition of the environment under the following reference conditions: a) historic, b) potential, c) future/no new action, and the potential condition of aquatic and terrestrial habitats within the subbasin? Does the assessment include a determination of the difference between current conditions and the various reference conditions?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, the current condition of the environment in the subbasin is described for both aquatic and terrestrial species. To the extent possible historical conditions are also described. Potential conditions are addressed through the provincial and subbasin vision as well as to a limited extent, described in the assessment. However, unlike the EDT model QHA does not address future conditions or population. Future/no new action and potential conditions are not explicitly addressed in the assessment.** **Future conditions relative to wildlife were addressed as part pf the HEP analysis.**	**P**	**N/A**
I.C.1.2	*Does the assessment adequately classify 6th field HUCs within the subbasin according to the degree to which each area has been modified and the potential for restoration?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, as applicable for IMP. IMP planners did look at 6th HUC scale to the extent practicable and applicable with QHA tool we had at our disposal. In the IMP in some cases planners chose to look at degree of modification and potential for restoration at different scales. These decisions were made by the ad hoc technical teams at a subbasin level and were based on availability of data, management units, etc. The use of 6th field HUCs is associated particularly with the EDT model.**	**Y**	**N/A**
I.C.2. Out-of-Subbasin Effects and Assumptions			
I.C.2.1	*Does the assessment identify factors outside of the subbasin that have a significant effect on each focal species, with particular attention to bottlenecks? These might include effects associated with upstream conditions, downstream conditions, and, in the case of migratory wildlife, conditions in adjacent subbasins. Outside effects are particularly relevant for anadromous fish and may include mainstem passage and habitat, estuary conditions, ocean conditions, and harvest.*		
ANSWER	**This discussion is fairly limited and occurs primarily at the province level in terms of larger scale out-of-subbasin effects. In particular, the operation of the hydropower system for: power, flood control, irrigation, and downstream flows have very significant effects on focal species (and**	**P**	**N/A**

	the selection of mitigation species) and ecological conditions in the IMP.		
I.C.2.2	*For each focal species, does the assessment establish assumptions for each external effect that can be used to calculate the effects of external conditions on the productivity and sustainability of fish and wildlife within this subbasin?*		
ANSWER	**No, not explicitly. If this is deemed critical subbasin planners can do their best to update the assessment in future iterations. Planners were limited by time and available data in fulfilling this recommendation.**	**N**	**N/A**

I.C.3. Environment / Population Relationships

For each focal species, does the assessment adequately identify, for each life stage, environmental factors that are particularly important for the species' survival and determine the characteristics that constitute optimal conditions for species health? Does the assessment adequately describe and make a finding regarding the environment's ability to provide such optimal conditions, or conditions that support the long-term viability of these populations.

ANSWER	**Yes, overall. Some species are presented more thoroughly than others. In addressing this recommendation the assessment also includes information about the unique mitigation opportunities and limitations posed by ecological conditions in the blocked areas.**	**Y**	**N/A**

I.D. Ecological Relationships *Question to be addressed: Does the assessment describe the key inter-species relationships and the key functional relationships?*	*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*

I.D.1. Inter-species Relationships

Does the assessment adequately identify important inter-species relationships or interactions, both positive and negative, with specific attention to relationships between anadromous fish and wildlife and specifically identify: 1) wildlife species and habitats that may be influenced, positively or negatively through direct effects of changes in fish abundance or fish community composition; 2) fish species and habitats that may be influenced, positively or negatively, through direct effects of changes in wildlife abundance or wildlife community composition; and 3) key species relationships within this subbasin based on the above?

ANSWER	**Yes, to the extent practical given limitations of time and scope. If additional information is deemed critical this section could be expanded in future iterations.**	**Y**	**N/A**

I.D.2. Processes and Functions

Does the assessment adequately identify key ecological functions for species within this subbasin and assess the current status of ecological processes and functions in the subbasin?

ANSWER	**Yes, to the extent practical given limitations of time and scope. If additional information is deemed critical this section could be expanded in future iterations. This assessment occurs at both the provincial and subbasin levels.**	**Y**	**N/A**

I.E. Interpretation and Synthesis / Limiting Factors and Conditions

I.E.1. Limiting Factors and Conditions

Does the assessment adequately describe:
1) Historic factors or conditions *that led to the decline of each focal species and of ecological functions and processes?*

2) Current key factors or conditions *within and without the subbasin that inhibit populations and ecological processes and functions relative to their potential.*

ANSWER	**Yes, for the most part, historical factors leading to decline of the focal species are addressed at a broader scale in the province level chapters as well as in the subbasin chapters.** **Current factors and conditions are also addressed at both the subbasin and province level. The QHA analysis provides a snapshot of subbasin scale habitat conditions. However, it is important to note that the snapshot of conditions provided by the QHA model do not take into account other factors that fish and wildlife managers must consider when developing and implementing specific mitigation, enhancement or protection projects. These factors include political realities, willingness of private landowners to participate, economic limitations (e.g. cost of one parcel of land versus another), and cultural preferences. Subbasin planners tried to capture these additional factors in developing strategies in each subbasin. However, the current subbasin plan does not fully reflect the levels of detailed discussion and potential decision trees that would be necessary to make these various considerations entirely transparent. Moreover, subbasin planners in the IMP are not convinced it would be possible to do so in more than a general way.**	**Y**	**N/A**

I.E.2. Key Findings

Is the knowledge gained through the assessment adequately synthesized in regard to: 1) the status of species, 2) the status of the subbasin environment, 3) the biological performance of focal species in relationship to the environment, 4) the health of the overall ecosystem, 5) potential conflicts and compatibilities between individual species and ecological processes, 6) a determination of the key factors that impede this subbasin from reaching optimal ecological functioning and biological performance?

ANSWER	**Yes, the IMP assessment is synthesized in regard to the six topics above. For aquatic species a synthesis is provided relative to the QHA analysis and to the identified limiting factors, and to other known factors. For wildlife species, given the large number of focal species this was more difficult and discussion focuses more on habitat types.** **IMP subbasin planners believe the overall assessment synthesis presented in this present plan is adequate, but that in the next iteration of the subbasin plan additional depth can, and should, be developed.**	**Y**	**N/A**

I.E.3. Subbasin-wide Key Assumptions/Uncertainties ("Working Hypothesis")

Does the assessment describe the key assumptions (including uncertainties) that have been made in the "Key Findings" above, and document the data sources and/or analytical tools relied upon?

ANSWER	**Yes, however the IMP took a slightly different approach to the working hypothesis than would be anticipated in subbasins relying on EDT for**	**Y**	**N/A**

	their primary assessment tool. In the EDT model the working hypothesis are input directly into the model. In the IMP a province-wide working hypothesis was developed which frames the entire provincial plan and individual subbasin plans. The key assumptions are describes in the working hypothesis. The data sources and analytical tools used in development of the assessment are also described.		

II. The Inventory

(This checklist section was developed from pages 11-12 of the Technical Guide.)
Reviewers should consider the soundness, completeness, analytical approach, and transparency (documentation of methods and decision-making process) of the following components of a subbasin inventory, specifically whether the inventory includes an assessment of the adequacy of current legal protections, plans, and projects to protect and restore fish, wildlife, and ecosystem resources. Does the inventory adequately synthesize past activities and their biological achievements? Planners were requested to, as applicable, describe the extent to which these programs and activities extend beyond the subbasin to a larger scale (provincial and basin-wide).

II.A. Existing Protection		*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
II.A.1	*Does the inventory adequately identify areas with protections through stream buffers, municipal or county ordinances, conservation designations, or water resources protection?*		
ANSWER	**This is partially done and IMP subbasin planners believe the information provided is adequate for this initial iteration of subbasin plans. Additional information will need to be developed in future iterations of the plan.** **Note regarding the Inventory as a whole: subbasin planners in the IMP believe the Inventory section of the IMP Subbasin Plan is probably the single area could most be improved in the next iteration of subbasin planning. IMP subbasin planners recognize the value and importance of a thoughtful and critical analysis of existing protections, existing plans, and past and current protection, mitigation and enhancement activities. IMP subbasin planners relied primarily on the ad hoc Technical Coordination Group to help develop the content of the Inventory. However, IMP subbasin planners acknowledge that adequate time and effort was not delegated to this task. Both the ad hoc Technical Coordination Group and the Subbasin Work Teams spent significant time developing and refining biological objectives based on the assessment, and based on an informal awareness – rather than formal synthesis of the relative success or failures of prior and ongoing projects. Additional specific notes are included in the responses to the following questions.**	**P**	**N/A**
II.A.2	*Does the inventory assess the adequacy of protections for fish, wildlife, and ecosystem resources?*		
ANSWER	**The existing inventory contains a very limited assessment of the adequacy of existing protections. This could be improved in future interations.**	**P**	**N/A**
II.B. Existing Plans			

II.B.1	*Does the inventory identify and review applicable local, state, tribal, and/or federal fish and/or wildlife management plans and water resource management plans that affect fish and wildlife?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, this information is located in the provincial chapters for state, tribal and federal entities, and at the subbasin level for local entities. The information provided is generally adequate although it is incomplete in some subbasins.**	**Y**	**N/A**
II.B.2	*Does the inventory assess the extent to which existing plans are consistent with the subbasin assessment and their adequacy in protecting and restoring fish, wildlife, and ecosystem resources? (It is possible that this analysis is done in another section of the plan, e.g. in the management plan.)*		
ANSWER	**There is minimal discussion of the consistency of existing plans with the subbasin assessment.** **However, in regards to the explicitly assessing the adequacy of existing plans to protect and restore fish, wildlife and ecosystem resources, IMP subbasin planners did not wish to accede to this recommendation. Subbasin Work Teams represented potentially fragile political compromises in some cases. Participants did not believe it was appropriate, or realistic, for subbasin planners to assess the adequacy of existing management plans in the context of subbasin planning.** **Additionally, planners believe it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of actions in the near-term. The Inventory addresses actions taken in the last five years, and many of the projects identified in the Inventory occurred in the last year or two - the results of many of these actions (e.g. reduction of stream temperature due to riparian restoration, etc.) may not be evident for five or ten years, or more.** **To a large extent, the adequacy of existing plans to meet the biological objectives identified in each subbasin and at the province level, is addressed implicitly through the strategies developed in the management plans.**	**P**	**N/A**
II.C. Management Programs / Restoration and Coordination Projects *Does the inventory identify management programs implemented through on-the-ground restoration and conservation projects that target fish and wildlife or otherwise provide substantial benefit to fish and wildlife? These include, at a minimum, those implemented within the past five years regardless of funding source.*			
II.C.1	*Does the inventory identify ongoing or planned public and private management programs or initiatives that have a significant effect on fish, wildlife, water resources, riparian areas, and/or upland areas?*		
ANSWER	**Yes.**	**Y**	**N/A**
II.C.2	*For each management program (or project where not clearly part of an overarching management program), does the inventory describe the program, project or activity; identify the management or lead entity; identify how the program/project was authorized and who is responsible for implementation; identify the funding source; and identify the relationship to other activities in the subbasin?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, subbasin planners did their best to provide this information and for the most part it is complete. Missing information will be updated in future iterations of the plan.**	**P**	**N/A**

II.C.3	*For each management program (or project where not clearly part of an overarching management program), does the inventory identify limiting factors or ecological processes the activity is designed to address?*		
ANSWER	**Yes, the ad hoc Technical Coordination Group and project proponents developed a summary of categories of limiting factors and categories of strategies to use in identifying the limiting factors or ecological process the various activities were designed to address. In developing the inventory, the ad hoc Coordination Group worked in teams to review the projects one-by-one and identify the limiting factors and strategies each project was designed to address. This information is summarized in pie charts in the subbasin plan.**	**Y**	**N/A**
II.C.4	*For each management program (or project where not clearly part of an overarching management program), does the inventory summarize accomplishments/failures of activity*		
ANSWER	**No, the Inventory does not clearly summarize accomplishments or failures. The ad hoc Coordination Group and project sponsors discussed this but did not make much headway in developing an effective summary of accomplishment/failures – or a mechanism through which to accomplish this goal.** **Additionally, there was resistance to this recommendation. Participants found it difficult to measure or quantify the relative success or failure of each project. In addition, some projects do not currently contain clear performance standards or indicators, which tends to make evaluation of success or failure rather subjective. Furthermore, as noted previously, many projects wont show results for some years to come. Finally, the IMP subbasin planners acknowledge inherent difficulties in asking project sponsors, who are the people most familiar with the goals, objectives, and challenges of their projects, to assess the success or failure of projects in which they have a vested interest.** **IMP subbasin planners agree that this is a necessary step in building an effective adaptive management loop. Development of more standardized performance measures and indicators as part of local, regional and basinwide monitoring and evaluation activities may help more effectively address this recommendation in the future.**	**N**	**N/A**
II.C.5	*Does the inventory adequately relate the assessment to the existing activities and identify the gaps between actions that have already been taken or are underway and additional actions that are needed to address the limiting factors and meet recovery and other goals, and identify inadequacies in both design and implementation?*		
ANSWER	**Yes and no. In developing the inventory, the ad hoc Coordination Group reviewed the list of projects against the identified limiting factors (provincial and subbasin) and strategies the projects were intended to implement and sought to identify gaps. This worked better in the context of some subbasins then others, and adequate time was not available to follow-up in the subbasins where additional discussion and review was necessary. This is something that could, and should, be improved in future iterations of the subbasin plan.**	**P**	**N/A**

III. The Management Plan

(Derived from pages 12-16 of the Technical Guide.)
Reviewers should consider the soundness, completeness, analytical approach, and transparency (documentation of methods and decision-making process) of the following components of a subbasin management plan.

These checklist tables incorporate Council Question 4, Consistency with the Provincial- and Basin-level Program: Are the vision, objectives, and strategies proposed in the subbasin management plan consistent with those adopted in the program for the province and/or basin levels? This is a three-part question and reviewers must be familiar with the vision, objectives, and strategies described in the 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program (pp. 13-33) and, for mainstem subbasin plans, the Mainstem Amendments (pp.11-28).

III.A. The Vision for the Subbasin *Does the Vision Section of the Management Plan adequately 1) describe the desired future condition for the subbasin; 2) describe a vision that will drive development of the biological objectives and thereby the strategies that are incorporated to change conditions within the subbasin; and 3) incorporate the conditions, values and priorities of the subbasin in a manner that is consistent with the Vision described in the Council's 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program? (Council Question 4 to the ISRP):*		*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
ANSWER	**Yes, in developing the vision for the province and for each subbasin, IMP subbasin planners took into account the Council's vision for the 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program as well as the scientific principles the program is based on.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.B. Biological Objectives

Does the Biological Objectives Section of the Management Plan adequately describe physical and biological changes within the subbasin needed to achieve the vision?

ANSWER	**Yes, within the context of the range of possible protection and mitigation actions available to the IMP.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.B.1. Are the biological objectives consistent with basin-level visions, objectives, and strategies adopted in the program? (Council Question 4) The 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program, pages 16-18, provides general descriptions for basin-level goals, objectives, and strategies. The Mainstem Amendments provide additional biological objectives as well on pages 11-14.

ANSWER	**Yes, they are directly tiered to them. The province overview chapters of the IMP Subbasin Plan explain the linkages between the Council's scientific principles, biological objectives and strategies, and the IMP provincial objectives.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.B.2. Are the biological objectives based on the subbasin assessment? (This question relates to the Logic Path in the subbasin plan. Question III.C.1 is a similar question for the Strategies Section.)

ANSWER	**Yes, in developing the biological objectives Subbasin Work Teams were presented with summaries of information derived from the assessment. In addition, members of the ad hoc Technical Coordination who helped develop, review, and refine the biological objectives also helped collect information and review information presented in the assessment.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.B.3.Where possible, are the biological objectives empirically measurable and based on an explicit scientific rationale; i.e., quantitative with measurable outcomes?

ANSWER	**Yes, where possible, per guidelines and per agreement of Subbasin Work Team members. The biological objectives were developed in an iterative process, which included a back-and-forth dialog between the ad hoc Technical Coordination Group and the Subbasin Work Teams. Ultimately, the biological objectives were developed and agreed to by the Subbasin Work Teams, which included both scientists and lay-people.**	**Y**	**N/A**

	There was substantial disagreement within all of the Subbasin Work Teams (and among ad hoc Technical Coordination Group members) as to the degree of specificity that should be identified in the biological objectives. The agreed upon objectives in many cases represent a compromise between the differing views of participants.		
III.B.4. Are biological objectives identified for both the short and long-term?			
ANSWER	**Yes and no. The *Technical Guide for Subbasin Planners* does not specifically define short- and long-term. In the IMP some activities occur over a longer time frame and some over a shorter time frame. Some objectives specify specific time frames others do not. All objectives and strategies were developed within the context of the Council's identified 10-15 year management window.**	**P**	**N/A**
III.B.5. Are the biological objectives complementary to programs of tribal, state and federal land or water quality management agencies in the subbasin?			
ANSWER	**Yes, at the outset of IMP planning activities provincial level guidelines were developed to assure that all biological objectives would be complementary to tribal, state and federal land or water quality programs. These guidelines provided the framework within which the subbasin and province level objectives were developed. Representatives of tribal, state and federal agencies also participated on the Subbasin Work Team where the biological objectives and strategies were agreed to in a consensus process.**	**Y**	**N/A**
III.B.6. Clean Water Act: Does the management plan adequately describe how the objectives and strategies are reflective of and integrated with the water quality management plan and Total Maximum Daily Load schedule within that particular state? I.e., does this subsection of the management plan adequately assess and describe the consistency-coordination-findings of the Water Quality Plan with the subbasin plan?			
ANSWER	**Yes, the management plan compliments and acknowledges existing water quality management activities, plans, and TMDL schedules in both Idaho and Washington. The management plan does not replace any of these State or County efforts.**	**Y**	**N/A**
III.B.7. Endangered Species Act: The USFWS and NOAA Fisheries are developing recovery plans for listed species (bull trout, white sturgeon, salmon). Recognizing that those ESA-based efforts are in various states of completion across the Columbia basin (some efforts are well underway, others just beginning), does the management plan adequately describe how the objectives of the subbasin management plan are reflective of and integrated with the ESA-based goals for listed species within the subbasin?			
ANSWER	**Yes, the relevant bull trout recovery plans are referenced and taken into account in the subbasins where Bull Trout are present. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Representatives also participated on both the Oversight Committee and the Subbasin Work Teams. In addition, recovery plans for non-fish species are also taken into account where applicable.**	**Y**	**N/A**
III.B.8. If there are disagreements among co-managers that translate into differing biological objectives, are the differences and the alternative biological objectives fully presented? (The Council's review will examine whether the plan is consistent with legal rights and obligations of fish and wildlife agencies and tribes with jurisdiction over fish and wildlife in the subbasin, and agreed upon by co-managers in the subbasin.)			
ANSWER	**There were no disagreements between co-managers (although WDFW included a "no position" statement on reintroduction of anadromous fish in the IMP subbasin plan). Disagreements do exist between stakeholder Subbasin Work Team members and co-managers. These disagreements**	**Y**	**N/A**

	are reflected in two minority opinions - one in Lake Rufus Woods, and one in the Pend Oreille subbasin.		

III. C. Strategies

III.C.1. ***Internal Consistency of the Plan.*** *Does the Strategies Section of the Management Plan explain the linkage of the strategies to the subbasin biological objectives, vision and the subbasin assessment? (Council Questions 2 and 3)*

ANSWER	**Yes, this relationship is described in the provincial overview and is highlighted throughout each section of the assessment, inventory and management plan.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.C.2. ***Consistency with the Fish and Wildlife Program.*** *Are the Strategies proposed in the subbasin management plan consistent with those adopted in the program? (Council Question 4)*

ANSWER	**Yes, the biological objectives and strategies were tiered directly to the biological objectives identified in the Council's Program.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.C.3. ***Consideration of Alternative Management Responses.*** *Does the Strategies Section explain how and why the strategies presented were selected over other alternative strategies (e.g. passive restoration strategies v. intervention strategies)? (Council Question 5)*

ANSWER	**In general, yes. The provincial hypothesis explains why many of the strategies are selected (e.g. very limited range of mitigation options). In order to accommodate the limited amount of time available to develop biological objectives and strategies in the Subbasin Work Teams, the teams started from a set of biological objectives derived from the subbasin summaries, these were reviewed in the context of the limiting factors, by the ad hoc Technical Teams and the Subbasin Work Teams and revised, augmented or deleted. Some of the discussion behind the selection of specific strategies is identified in the Subbasin Work Team meeting notes. In other cases it is not as well documented. Additionally, a set of prioritization criteria were established for prioritization of the biological objectives and strategies in the IMP – these criteria are identified in the subbasin plan and divergence from these criteria is also addressed.**	**P**	**N/A**

III.C.4. ***Prioritization.*** *Does the Strategies Section describe a proposed sequence and prioritization of strategies?*

ANSWER	**Yes, both biological objectives and strategies were prioritized at the subbasin level. Biological objectives were prioritized sequentially and their related tiered strategies were prioritized as high, medium, or low.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.C.5. ***Additional Assessment Needs.*** *Does the Strategies Section describe, if necessary, additional steps required to compile more complete or detailed assessment?*

ANSWER	**Yes, a number of the strategies in the subbasin plan identify specific sequential steps necessary to acquire more detailed or complete assessment information.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.C.6. ***Clean Water Act:*** *Does the management plan adequately describe how the strategies are reflective of and integrated with the water quality management plan and Total Maximum Daily Load schedule within that particular state?*

ANSWER	**Yes, the objectives and strategies identified in the management plan are consistent with and reflect the most current water quality management and TMDL's schedules in both Washington and Idaho. Subbasin planners in the IMP recognize that many of these parallel water quality efforts are ongoing and that the results are not final.**	**Y**	**N/A**
III.C.7. ***Endangered Species Act:*** *Recognizing that ESA-based efforts are in various states of completion across the Columbia basin, does the management plan adequately describe how the strategies of the subbasin management plan are reflective of and integrated with the ESA-based goals for listed species within the subbasin?*			
ANSWER	**Yes, the strategies specifically address ESA-based goals for listed species.**	**Y**	**N/A**

III.D. Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation

This RME Checklist Section provides the review elements necessary for the ISRP/ISAB to answer Council Question 6. Plan for Assessing Progress toward Subbasin Goals. The ISRP/ISAB is asked to determine whether a subbasin plan includes a procedure for assessing how well subbasin objectives are being met over time. This question focuses on accountability and self-assessment, and reflects on the adequacy of the Management Plan's research, monitoring and evaluation component. This RME component needs to be closely connected to a limiting factors analysis and the biological and environmental objectives. A prioritized RME agenda reflecting the critical uncertainties and limiting factors should be developed and presented with the detail requested below (Technical Guide pp. 14-16). NOTE: The focus of the RME component should be on the strategy level rather than individual project level.

Explanatory note regarding the following general guidance: As of March 19th, 2004, the Council and Regional Coordinating Group are engaged in a dialogue about the potential to coordinate subbasin level RME efforts with those being defined at a regional scale. The following guidance language assumes that this dialogue will lead to a coordinated and related effort. If this proves to not be the case, the general guidance in the following paragraph may not apply. However, the specific questions that follow, derived from the 2000 Program and Technical Guide will continue to apply.

Subbasin planners were encouraged to incorporate, or link their RME framework and strategies with the "regional" RM&E strategies being developed by the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership and the Columbia Basin-Wide Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E) Program, a coordinated effort developed by State, Federal, and Tribal entities in response to the Basin-wide Salmon Recovery Strategy 2000 and the FCRPS 2000 Biological Opinion. Products from these regional RME efforts could be used to meet elements of a subbasin plan's RME section (Technical Guide pp. 14-16), particularly in the areas of monitoring protocols and methodologies. The subbasin plan should also explain how they incorporated existing monitoring guidance from state programs.

III.D.1	***Research:*** *Does the RME section of the plan describe a research agenda with specific conditions and situations identified in the subbasin that will require specific research studies to help resolve management uncertainties? Is the research agenda framed around the relationships between the assessment data and the stated vision, biological objectives, and strategies in describing uncertainties? Does the RME section prioritize research topics that are of critical importance to the subbasin?*	*(Y)es, (P)artial, (N)o*	*Need for Additional Treatment (0-4)*
ANSWER	**The IMP RM&E section identifies specific research needs for each of the IMP subbasins. These research needs were derived from the assessment. Research needs are not explicitly prioritized, however many of the research needs are connected to prioritized biological objectives. Planners in the IMP identified significant needs for basic baseline information which, given limitations of available funding, supercede**	**P**	**N/A**

	more ambitious research desires. **Note: the PNAMP products identified above are specifically designed for anadromous fish while some elements may adapt well, they will not effectively address larger RM&E needs in blocked areas like the IMP.**		
III.D.2	***Monitoring Objectives:*** *Does the RME subsection identify what kind of information needs to be collected in order to determine if the plan's vision and objectives are being met? I.e., what indicator variables will be monitored?*		
ANSWER	**IMP subbasin planners in the IMP found the recommendations to subbasin planners in the RM&E section of the *Technical Guide for Subbasin Planners* to be far too detailed (project level recommendations) to comply with within the constraints of the current subbasin planning effort. In response, rather than develop a single specific set of monitoring standards and indicators, the IMP surveyed the existing range of M&E tools and identified a "tool box" of M&E guidelines and variables. In the IMP approach to M&E, specific strategies are linked to M&E actions, which are in turn linked to an appropriate tool or range of tools in the M&E tool box.**	**Y**	**N/A**
III.D.3	***Monitoring Indicators:*** *Does the RME subsection identify measurable indicators of physical, chemical, biological, or socioeconomic conditions that may act as environmental signposts by which progress towards achieving the stated vision can be evaluated? E.g., does the RME subsection describe performance standards or quantitative benchmarks for reference conditions against which observations can be compared? Does the plan prioritize which indicators are most needed to answer management questions (include a short list)?*		
ANSWER	**Yes and no. The RM&E provides a tool box which identifies a suite of measurable indicators that would be selected based on the type of strategy being implemented. The RM&E strategies are linked directly to prioritized objectives identified at the provincial and subbasin scale and well as prioritized subbasin strategies. However, the approach taken in the IMP does not include explicit identification of a single set of measurable indicators.**	**P**	**N/A**
III.D.4	***Data and Information Archive:*** *Does the RME subsection describe an infrastructure to archive relevant data and meta data generated through monitoring efforts in existence for the subbasin (e.g., locally or at a regional Fish and Wildlife Program funded database such as StreamNet, the Fish Passage Center, or DART)? Specifically, does the RME subsection include discussion of quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC), data management and analysis, and data reporting?*		
ANSWER	**No, the IMP subbasin plan does not describe this infrastructure. This is a need in some areas of IMP. Data is currently collected on a smaller scale for specific projects but is not coordinated for all of IMP (the Joint Stock Assessment Program is a partial exception). Subbasin planners in the IMP thought this represented an important potential project proposal – but that it was not possible, nor appropriate for this stage and scale of subbasin planning.** **An aside relative to this point, and related to the ongoing inequity between resources directed to anadromous fish and those directed toward blocked areas, is the relative lack of coordinated resources available to the IMP in terms of basin-wide data archiving (e.g. until only a year ago Stream Net did not collect this resident fish data).**	**N**	**N/A**

III.D.5	***Coordination and Implementation:*** *Does the RME subsection describe who will collect the information and data collection methods whether collection is done by a subbasin, provincial, state, or a regional entity, or a combination of entities? This should include a description of coordination with regional RME efforts in the basin (Regional Partnership, Action Agencies Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plan, etc) with standardization of data methods. It should also include estimates of how much the proposed M and E will cost.*		
ANSWER	**No, subbasin planners in the IMP did not believe it was possible, or appropriate to identify who would collect data, how data would be collected, or the associated costs at this stage of subbasin planning. This seemed like a project scale requirement and subbasin planners would anticipate providing this level of detail as part of specific projects – or as part of a province scale proposal for RM&E.**	**N**	**N/A**
III.D.6	***Summary Question. RME Logic Path (Evaluation and Adaptive Management):*** *Does the subbasin plan provide a scientifically supportable procedure for refining the biological objectives as new information becomes available about how fish, wildlife, and the environment interact, and in relationship to how the plans are implemented over time? (Council Question 7) Specifically, does the RME subsection describe a scientifically sound logic path for how to test if the subbasin plan's strategies are helping to reach the stated vision and objectives? I.e., Is the RME agenda adequately framed around the relationships between the assessment data and the stated vision, biological objectives, and strategies in describing uncertainties?*		
	Yes and no. The IMP RM&E pieces were derived directly from subbasin objectives and strategies which were in turn derived from the assessment. The IMP plan does not at this time identify a specific feedback loop – in part IMP subbasin planners believe this needs to be addressed through a commitment to making the subbasin plans living documents. **Planning participants in the IMP readily acknowledge the need for, and value of, broader RM&E coordination at a province scale, but don't believe the subbasin planning process affords adequate time, nor is it the right stage within which to develop such a detailed plan. The guidelines provided by the Council at a regional level, PNAMP, are specific to anadromous fish. Wildlife guidelines from the Council were distributed in mid-May, too late in the process for inclusion in the IMP subbasin plan. Subbasin planners in the IMP believe the approach taken in the IMP represents an innovative and flexible approach to meeting the subbasin planning requirements. Subbasin planners in the IMP view this as a preliminary step towards development (and hopefully funding for) a more extensive, integrated RM&E program. Planners would be interested in talking with the ISRP about development of province scale RM&E strategies that would address the unique ecological circumstances, mitigation opportunities and limitations, and significant unknowns in the IMP.**	**P**	

General Council Question. Consistency with the Fish and Wildlife Program and its Scientific Foundation

The Council asks the ISRP to evaluate a subbasin plan for its consistency with the Scientific Foundation adopted as part of the Program and with the requirements for "biological objectives" as described in the program. The core of the Council's Scientific Foundation is a set of eight Scientific Principles:

1. The abundance, productivity, and diversity of organisms are integrally linked to the characteristics of their ecosystem.
2. Ecosystems are dynamic, resilient and develop over time.
3. Biological systems operate on various spatial and time scales that can be organized hierarchically.
4. Habitats develop, and are maintained, by physical and biological processes.
5. Species play key roles in developing and maintaining ecological conditions.
6. Biological diversity allows ecosystems to persist in the face of environmental variation.
7. Ecological management is adaptive and experimental.
8. Ecosystem function, habitat structure and biological performance are affected by human actions.

See 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program, pages 14-15 for full detail.

Questions on consistency with the objectives and strategies section of the Fish and Wildlife Program are incorporated in the table above. Consistency with the Program's scientific foundation is interwoven throughout the checklist, and this comment table provides reviewers a place to specifically summarize and identity how well the eight principles were addressed.

Answer	**Yes, the IMP province level and subbasin level biological objectives were tiered directly from biological objectives identified in the Council's 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program, which are in turn, tied to the Council's scientific foundation.**	**Y**	