

## **Yakima Subbasin-Level Review of 2007-9 Requests for BPA Funding**

*Report to the Northwest Power Planning Council*

Prepared by the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2006

### **Overview of the Review Process**

On January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2006, the NPCC requested that the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board develop a local process to review proposals for BPA funding in the Yakima Basin. We convened a three-day meeting of the Board's Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to complete this review process. Members of the TAG are listed in Appendix A.

Proponents of all 30 proposed projects in the Yakima Basin were invited to present their proposals to the review team. Twenty-eight presentations were made to the review panel on June 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. Appendix C gives the presentation schedule. Proponents of two proposals (Projects 200711800 & 200703000) chose not to give presentations to the local review panel.

On June 7<sup>th</sup>, projects were scored based on a set of criteria developed by the Board drawing from the Council's request and the criteria used in other subbasins in the region (blank scoring worksheet shown in Appendix B). Review panel notes for each project are included in Appendix D. Each project was assigned to one of three categories, 1: Fund- High Priority, 2: Fund-Medium Priority, and 3: Do Not Fund based on reviewers assessments of the project quality and its links to specific priorities in the Yakima Subbasin Plan. TAG members with a direct affiliation with a specific project were directed to be available for questions, but not participate in decisions about that project. Table I breaks out proposals by funding recommendation.

### **General Topics Raised by the Review Team:**

During the course of our project review, we repeatedly returned to several general issues the team agreed should be communicated to BPA and the NPCC. These are listed below:

#### Voluntary Budget Reductions

During the review process, we asked project proponents if they were willing to reduce the amount of their request to BPA. Nine projects offered voluntary reductions in requested funding levels, as specified in Table II. We encourage BPA and NPCC staff to contact proponents of these projects directly to confirm the possibility of reducing these budget requests. These voluntary budget reductions come to a total of at least \$4,697,777, with a minimum of \$2,272,777 of savings from projects recommended for funding by the review team.

#### Capitalization

BPA policy allows for capitalization of the purchase or construction of assets with a life of 15 years or more, and a total cost of \$1 million or more. Currently, only two of the projects presented to us are being classified by BPA as Capital projects (200707000 Fish Passage Facility Final Design and Construction - Clear Lake Dam and 2003000100 Manastash Crk Passage & Screening). We concur with BPA's designation for these two projects. We recommend combining project 200702000 Manastash Instream Flow Enhancement with 2003000100 and including the pipeline and other infrastructure costs included in 200702000 in the capitalized portion of 2003000100.

Another four projects include funding for fish habitat acquisitions that clearly qualify for consideration as capital projects if BPA develops mitigation credits for fish habitat acquisitions. These are:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Title</b>
200711200	1	Teanaway Watershed Project (whole)
199705100	1	Yakima Basin Side Channels (whole)
199206200	1	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration (partial)
200711800	2	Protect and Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in Little Naches (whole)

We request that BPA accelerate efforts to develop a capitalization policy for fisheries habitat acquisitions so that these projects can be moved from the over-committed expense budget to the under-utilized capital budget.

Another four projects would be in one of the three groups above if they were not under the \$1 million minimum project size limit set by Bonneville. They could be considered for capitalization by combining related projects into larger qualifying projects, based on their being interdependent parts of the overall fisheries recovery strategies articulated in the Yakima Subbasin Plan and Salmon Recovery Plan. These projects are:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Title</b>
200201800	1	Tapteal Greenway Riparian Corridor-Phase II .
200719400	1	Oak Flats Acquisition and Habitat Enhancement
200711300	1	Cowiche Restoration and Protection
198811525	3	Ykfp - Design & Construction (Nelson Springs)

Two of these projects (200719400 and 200711300) are located in the Naches Watershed and proposed by WDFW and could easily be combined.

By appropriately adjusting how projects are classified, BPA can go a long way to funding the recommended suite of projects in the Yakima Basin. A very rough estimate of potential savings to the expense budget for the Yakima Basin is indicated near the bottom of Table I.

#### Combining Projects

Project 200300100 (Manastash Crk Passage & Screening) & Project 200702000 (Manastash Instream Flow Enhancement Project) should be combined as they are interdependent. This should result in administrative cost savings to both BPA and the project proponent. The project proponent is supportive of this idea.

Project 199503300 (O&M Yakima Basin Fish Screens) and Project 199200900 (Yakima Phase II/Huntsville Screen Operation & Maintenance) could be combined into a single project with separate contracts with each of the two project proponents if it would result in administrative cost savings. The project proponents are supportive of this idea.

### Allocating a Portion of Research Funding to System-wide Budgets

The review team agreed that research projects which occur in the Yakima Basin but address questions of regional import could be funded, at least in part, from system-wide funding allocations. The Yakama Basin has become one of the principal sites for evaluating the long-term effects of hatchery supplementation on native fish runs, and the lessons being learned from this research are directly applicable to supplementation efforts throughout the Columbia Basin. The four projects that the review team felt had benefits that clearly extended beyond the Yakima Basin are:

199506325 Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project: Monitoring & Evaluation

200203100 Growth Modulation in Salmon Supplementation

200733500 Migration & Homing Ecology of Supplemented & Wild Spring Chinook Salmon

200703000 Determination of Steelhead Smolt Production and Smoltification Genes in the Yakima River

### Overall Funding Recommendations

The total amount initially requested from BPA for Yakima proposals came to \$70,706,452. Based on our funding recommendations and the potential budget reductions proposed by project proponents, we have identified projects with a value of between \$54 million and \$60 million as fundable projects that meet subbasin plan priorities. This is significantly more than the under \$30 million funding level proposed by BPA for the Yakima Basin for the FY2007-9 period. We encourage BPA and the NPCC to follow up on additional potential budget reductions with project proponents. We also emphasize the need for BPA to make additional funding available to fully fund the fish & wildlife priorities identified in the Yakima Subbasin Plan and the recovery actions for Mid-Columbia Steelhead identified in the Yakima Subbasin Salmon Recovery Plan. Capitalizing fisheries habitat acquisitions would go a considerable way towards meeting this need within the constraints of the existing BPA fish & wildlife budget.

**TABLE I: Summary of Yakima Subbasin Review Funding Recommendations**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>High Priority</u>	<u>Med. Priority</u>	<u>Do Not Fund</u>
200707000	Fish Passage Facility Final Design and Construction - Clear Lake Dam (NF Tieton R.).	1	\$1,930,000		
199503300	O&M Yakima Basin Fish Screens	1	\$295,130		
199200900	Yakima Phase II/Huntsville Screen Operation & Maintenance	1	\$547,125		
200202501	Yakima Tributary Access & Habitat Program	1	\$3,167,800		
200300100	Manastash Crk Passage & Screening	1	\$2,118,700		
200702000	Manastash Instream Flow Enhancement	1	\$1,692,895		
199701325	Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance	1	\$8,687,944		
199506425	YKFP Policy/Plan/Technical	1	\$724,382		
198812025	Ykfp Management, Data, Habitat	1	\$4,789,862		
199506325	Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project - Monitoring And Evaluation	1	\$13,781,246		
200201400	Sunnyside Wildlife Mitigation	1	\$1,056,014		
200600400	Wenas Wildlife Area O&M	1	\$1,545,912		
200719400	Oak Flats Acquisition and Habitat Enhancement	1	\$652,070		
200711300	Cowiche Restoration and Protection Project (Easement/Fee Simple Acquisition)	1	\$300,000		
200711200	Teaway Watershed	1	\$2,044,000		
199705100	Yakima Basin Side Channels	1	\$3,150,000		
199603501	Yakama Reservation Watersheds Project	1	\$3,426,339		
199206200	Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration	1	\$4,872,318		
200203100	Growth modulation in salmon supplementation	1	\$1,121,672		
200201800	Tapteal Greenway Riparian Corridor Enhancement, Protection and Education Outreach--Phase II .	1	\$388,383		
199405900	Yakima Basin Environmental Education Program	1	\$531,000		
200711800	Protect and Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in Little Naches River Watershed.	2		\$5,315,000	
200710200	Subbasin Scale Monitoring and Plan Implementation Monitoring for the Yakima Subbasin Plan	2		\$565,000	
200725900	Wilson Creek Relocation and Rehabilitation	3			\$2,725,000
200707900	Salmon & Steelhead Habitat Restoration and Protection in the Yakima Basin	3			\$447,500
198811525	Ykfp - Design & Construction (Nelson Springs replacement facility)	3			\$628,701
200724100	Well modifications to improve aquatic habitat for Toppenish/Simcoe Creeks.	3			\$1,261,422
200733500	Migration and homing ecology of supplemented and wild spring Chinook salmon.	3			\$1,242,216
200703000	Determination of steelhead smolt production and smoltification genes in the Yakima River	3			\$594,070
200705900	Abiotic and Biotic Factors Affecting the Success of Reintroductions of Salmonids in Cle Elum Lake	3			\$1,104,751
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 56,822,792</b>	<b>\$ 5,880,000</b>	<b>\$ 8,003,660</b>
	MIMIMUM POTENTIAL VOLUNTARY BUDGET REDUCTIONS		\$ 1,947,777	\$ 325,000	\$ 2,425,000
	<i>Total after Minimum Voluntary Budget Reductions</i>		<b>\$ 54,875,015</b>	<b>\$ 5,555,000</b>	<b>\$ 5,578,660</b>
	CAPITALIZABLE with Fish Credits		\$7,630,159	\$5,315,000	
	<i>Total for Expense Budget after Budget Reductions &amp; Fish Credits</i>		\$47,244,856	\$240,000	
	CAPITALIZABLE in combination and with Fish Credits		\$1,146,262		
	<i>Total for Expense Budget after Budget Reductions, Fish Credits and combining potential small capital projects</i>		\$46,098,595	\$240,000	

## YAKIMA BASIN BPA PROJECT REVIEW

TABLE III: POSSIBLE COST SAVINGS IDENTIFIED BY PROJECT SPONSORS

Project	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	TOTAL	Comments
200725900 original request	\$ 2,725,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,725,000	
200725900 revised request	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	Proponent proposed implementing only first phase of project
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>\$ 2,425,000</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ 2,425,000</i>	
200300100 original request	\$ 1,181,220	\$ 492,290	\$ 445,190	\$ 2,118,700	Total project cost on application included cost-share
200300100 revised request	\$ 293,220	\$ 492,290	\$ 445,190	\$ 1,230,700	
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>\$ 888,000</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ 888,000</i>	
200702000 original request	\$ 529,950	\$ 666,195	\$ 496,750	\$ 1,692,895	Total project cost on application included cost-share
200702000 revised request	\$148,062	\$454,937	\$290,312	\$ 893,311	Additional savings identified by project proponent.
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>\$ 381,888</i>	<i>\$ 211,258</i>	<i>\$ 206,438</i>	<i>\$ 799,584</i>	
200707900 original request	\$78,000	\$184,400	\$185,100	\$ 447,500	Proponent indicated that it might be possible to reduce the
200707900 revised request	Amounts not specified			\$ -	budget request based on increasing match funding
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>Amounts not specified</i>			<i>\$ -</i>	
200201400 original request	\$ 375,540	\$ 363,884	\$ 316,590	\$ 1,056,014	Proponent indicated that a 10% reduction is possible
200201400 revised request	\$ 337,986	\$ 327,496	\$ 284,931	\$ 950,413	
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>\$ 37,554</i>	<i>\$ 36,388</i>	<i>\$ 31,659</i>	<i>\$ 105,601</i>	
200600400 original request	\$ 482,857	\$ 529,755	\$ 533,300	\$ 1,545,912	Proponent indicated that a 10% budget reduction is possible
200600400 revised request	\$ 434,571	\$ 476,780	\$ 479,970	\$ 1,391,321	
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>\$ 48,286</i>	<i>\$ 52,976</i>	<i>\$ 53,330</i>	<i>\$ 154,591</i>	
200719400 original request	\$620,800	\$23,500	\$7,770	\$ 652,070	Proponent indicated that acquisition was the priority, and other
200719400 revised request	Amounts not specified				project elements could be deferred to future or other funding.
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>Amounts not specified</i>				
200201800 original request	\$300,813	\$43,785	\$43,785	\$ 388,383	Proponent indicated funding reduction may be possible
200201800 revised request	Amounts not specified			\$ -	
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>Amounts not specified</i>			<i>\$ -</i>	
200710200 original request	\$ 288,500	\$ 146,500	\$ 130,000	\$ 565,000	
200710200 revised request	\$ 90,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 240,000	
<i>Potential savings</i>	<i>\$ 198,500</i>	<i>\$ 71,500</i>	<i>\$ 55,000</i>	<i>\$ 325,000</i>	
<b>POSSIBLE SAVINGS</b>	<b>\$ 3,979,228</b>	<b>\$ 372,122</b>	<b>\$ 346,427</b>	<b>\$ 4,697,777</b>	This is a low estimate; more savings are possible but were not quantified by project proponents.

**APPENDIX A: LIST OF REVIEW PANEL PARTICIPANTS**

Richard Visser, Watershed Steward, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Alex Conley, Executive Director, Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board  
David Lind, Fisheries Biologist, Yakama Nation  
John Easterbrooks, Regional Fish Program Manager, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Ryan Roberts, Engineer, Kittitas County  
Paul LaRiviere, Instream Flow Biologist, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Yuki Reiss, Fisheries Biologist, Wenatchee National Forest  
Jeff Thomas, Fisheries Biologist, US Fish & Wildlife Service  
Scott Nicolai, Habitat Biologist, Yakama Nation  
Heath Mellottee, Engineer, City of West Richland  
Dale Bambrick, Branch Chief, NOAA Fisheries  
Joel Freudenthal, Fish & Wildlife Biologist, Yakima County  
Pat Monk, Fisheries Consultant  
Tom Ring, Biologist, Yakama Nation  
Anna Lael, Manager, Kittitas Conservation District

## APPENDIX B: SAMPLE SCORING SHEET WITH REVIEW CRITERIA

<b>Project Number &amp; Name</b>		
<b>Budget</b>	FYs 07-09	\$0
<b>New or Ongoing</b>		\$0
<b>Fish or Wildlife Focus</b>		\$0
<b>Project Changes</b>		
<b>Project Review Considerations</b>	<u>Yes or No</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Does another entity have a clear and legal obligation to remedy the projects objective		
Project proposes proven techniques or essential research		
Are objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes to accomplish the objectives		
Is project technically feasible and likely to meet the project's objectives		
Are the resources proposed appropriate to achieve the objectives		
Will the project complement other protection and restoration efforts		
Will the project enhance previous investments in priority activities		
Is this a BPA Contractual Responsibility		
Does project implement priority actions identified in the subbasin plan		
<b>Species Benefit (check as many as apply)</b>		
Will Benefit Steelhead		
Will Benefit Bull trout		
Will Benefit Fish Focal Species		
Will Benefit Wildlife Focal Species		
<b>Funding Recommendation</b>	<u>check one</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Plan Priority - High Priority for Funding		
Plan Priority - Medium Priority for Funding		
Not a Plan Priority		
<b>Scope of Benefit</b>	<u>check as apply</u>	terms of population, habitat, or knowledge
Yakima Basin		
Columbia Plateau		
Basin Wide/ Multi-Province		
<b>Project Category (check one)</b>	<u>check one</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Coordination & Support		
Research		
Monitoring & Evaluation		
On the ground actions - Protection/Restoration		
<b>Funding Source (check one)</b>	<u>check one</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Expense Fund		
Capital Fund		

## **APPENDIX C: SCHEDULE OF PRESENTATIONS**

### **Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Board BPA Project Review**

#### **June 5**

8:00 200707000 Fish Passage Facility Final Design and Construction - Clear Lake Dam (NF Tieton R.).  
Presenter – Jim Cummins

8:30 199503300 O&M Yakima Basin Fish Screens.  
Presenter – Scott Kline

9:00 199200900 Yakima Phase II/Huntsville Screen Operation & Maintenance.  
Presenter – Patrick Schille

9:30 200725900 Wilson Creek Relocation and Rehabilitation.  
Presenter – Bill VerTrees

10:00 200202501 Yakima Tributary Access & Habitat Program.  
Presenter – Carol Ready

10:30 200300100 Manastash Creek Passage & Screening.  
Presenter – Carol Ready & Anna Lael

11:00 200702000 Manastash Instream Flow Enhancement.  
Presenter – Carol Ready & Anna Lael

11:30 200707900 Salmon & Steelhead Habitat Restoration and Protection in the Yakima Basin.  
Presenter - Margaret Neuman

#### **Lunch**

1:00 198811525 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project- Design & Construction (Nelson Springs replacement facility). Presenter - YKFP Yakama Nation

1:30 199701325 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance.  
Presenter - YKFP Yakama Nation

2:00 199506425 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Policy/Plan/Technical. Presenter - WDFW

2:30 198812025 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Management, Data, Habitat.  
Presenter - YKFP, Yakama Nation

3:00 199506325 Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project - Monitoring And Evaluation.  
Presenter - YKFP, Yakama Nation & WDFW

3:30 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project as needed

4:00 200201400 Sunnyside Wildlife Mitigation. Presenter – Rocky Ross

4:30 200600400 Wenas Wildlife Area O&M. Presenter – Rocky Ross

**June 6**

8:00 200711800 Protect and Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in Little Naches River Watershed.  
**NO PRESENTATION GIVEN**

8:30 200719400 Oak Flats Acquisition and Habitat Enhancement.  
Presenter - John McGowan

9:00 200711300 Cowiche Restoration and Protection Project (Easement/Fee Simple Acquisition). Presenter – Richard Visser

9:30 200711200 Teanaway Watershed - Protect critical habitat from development, reduce water temperatures and increase instream flows, restore habitat forming processes in the floodplain. Presenter - David Gerth

10:00 199705100 Yakima Basin Side Channels.  
Presenter – Kelley Larimer-Clark

10:30 199603501 Yakama Reservation Watersheds Project.  
Presenter - Tim Resseguie

11:00 199206200 Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration.  
Presenter - Tracy Hames

11:30 200724100 Well modifications to improve aquatic habitat for Toppenish/Simcoe Creeks.  
Presenter - Robert Pimms

**Lunch**

1:00 200733500 Migration and homing ecology of supplemented and wild spring Chinook salmon. Presenter - Andrew Dittman

1:30 200703000 Determination of steelhead smolt production and smoltification genes in the Yakima River.  
**NO PRESENTATION GIVEN**

2:00 200203100 Growth modulation in salmon supplementation.  
Presenter - Don Larsen

2:30 200705900 Abiotic and Biotic Factors Affecting the Success of Reintroductions of Anadromous Salmonids in Cle Elum Lake, Washington. Presenter – Katrina Simmons

3:00 200201800 Tapteal Greenway Riparian Corridor Enhancement, Protection and Education Outreach--Phase II (Tapteal Bend and Horn Rapids). Presenter – Darrel Sunday

3:30 200710200 Subbasin Scale Monitoring and Plan Implementation Monitoring for the Yakima Subbasin Plan. Presenter – Alex Conley

4:00 199405900 Yakima Basin Environmental Education Program.  
Presenter - Robert Tuck

## **APPENDIX D: INDIVIDUAL PROJECT REVIEW NOTES**

### **200707000 Fish Passage Facility Final Design and Construction - Clear Lake Dam (NF Tieton R)**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Bull trout

#### Summary Comments

This project would implement a priority action identified in the Subbasin Plan. It will benefit spatial diversity for bull trout. There is some uncertainty about the proposed temperature curtain technique due to lack of available information. Proponents did not consider the option of dam breaching because recreational benefits from the reservoir would be lost. Bull trout/ brook trout interaction not are not considered to be a major concern by local bull trout biologist based on past genetic analysis in the Tieton that showed no evidence of hybridization. However, interactions will need to be monitored and should be coordinated with brook trout management actions that are being considered for the basin.

#### Funding and Budget Comments

Project proponents were encouraged to seek a greater contribution from BOR and seek additional match (USFWS was proposed as a source). If preservation of recreational opportunities limits the restoration options that were considered then other funding sources should help fund this project (since otherwise breaching the dam may be a less expensive option). This project meets the criteria for capital funding.

### **199503300 O&M Yakima Basin Fish Screens**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – steelhead, bull trout, spring chinook, (possible lamprey & sockeye in the future)

#### Summary Comments

Water users have a responsibility to maintain screens unless BPA has contractually agreed to provide support when screens were installed. This project should be merged with 199200900 if it would save administrative costs.

#### Funding and Budget Comments

Project proponent noted that there was no opportunity for budget reductions.

### **199200900 Yakima Phase II/Huntsville Screen Operation & Maintenance**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – steelhead, bull trout, spring chinook, (possible lamprey & sockeye in the future)

#### Summary Comments

Water users have a responsibility to maintain screens unless BPA has contractually agreed to provide support when screens were installed. This project should be merged with 199503300 if it would save administrative costs.

#### Funding and Budget Comments

Project proponent noted that there was no opportunity for budget reductions, and that funding had been flat for 6 years despite increase in costs and number of sites maintained.

**200725900 Wilson Creek Relocation and Rehabilitation**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – steelhead, bull trout, spring chinook, (possible lamprey & sockeye in the future)

**Summary Comments**

This project will not help any focal species until numerous downstream passage barriers are fixed. It will provide much needed restoration and will provide tremendous education opportunities and open space values. However, the cost is high with limited benefits and the project is not currently a priority project based on the Subbasin Plan.

**Funding and Budget Comments**

Presenter noted that the project was amenable to being done in independent sections, and that \$300,000 from BPA would allow the first (northern) phase to be completed.

**200202501 Yakima Tributary Access & Habitat Program**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit –

**Summary Comments**

YTHAP does not establish annual goals as the program is voluntarily driven. However, YTHAP's objective is to make incremental progress toward the clearly stated subbasin goals of restoring passage to priority Yakima Subbasin tributaries. YTHAP is addressing high priority actions identified in the Subbasin plan by providing passage and screening for water diversions. There are ongoing responsibilities for water users to provide screening and passage. However, there is a long tradition of funding these types of projects in the form of cooperative compliance and other programs. It would be beneficial to improve monitoring effort and reporting.

**Funding and Budget Comments**

YTAHP project managers have been very successful at leveraging BPA funds with other grants and resources. This program should be funded with capital funds.

**200300100 Manastash Crk Passage & Screening**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead

**Summary Comments**

There is strong support for this project's goal of provide passage on Manastach Creek to quality upstream habitat for steelhead. However, this project only addresses physical passage and screening but not flow. Without flow improvements the project may have limited effectiveness, and could attract fish to areas subsequently dewatered. Therefore, this project should be combined with project 200702000. The review team is also concerned about the diversion infrastructure being built larger than needed in hopes that consolidation and flow benefits can be achieved over time. Flow issues should be addressed concurrently with passage and screening or agreements to address flow issues should be in place before project implementation. A minority opinion suggested that a better approach may be to work from the bottom to the top of the watershed due to community acceptance of this approach. There are ongoing responsibilities for water users to provide screening and passage. However, there is a long tradition of funding these types of projects in the form of cooperative compliance and other programs.

**Funding and Budget Comments**

The review team is concerned with diversion and screening sizing and the cost of adding additional capacity (screen and piping). Money will be wasted if infrastructure is not used as designed.

The presenter indicated that the project amount indicated on the application included cost share, and that the actual request from Bonneville would be significantly lower than listed (revised request proposed by proponent is \$293,220 for FY 2007, \$492,290 for FY 2008, \$445,190 for FY 2009, for a total of \$1,230,700 from BPA). This project meets the criteria to be funded with capital funds.

**200702000 Manastash Instream Flow Enhancement**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead

Summary Comments

See comments for project 200300100. There are also concerns about there being no defined amount of flow benefit, uncertainties about firm commitments from landowners, and about hydrological responses to increased pulsed flow. Water user and landowner agreements need to be obtained before implementation.

Funding and Budget Comments

There is a concern that without upfront agreements that some water right holder may expect funding for infrastructure to preserve water and then expect compensation for providing water for instream use. A clear understanding of water rights and management options is needed. Other sources of funding for water acquisition should be pursued. Consider capitalizing parts of project, especially if combined with passage/screening work in 200300100. The presenter indicated that the project amount indicated on the application included cost share, and that the actual request from Bonneville would be significantly lower than listed (revised request proposed by proponent is \$148,062 for FY 2007, \$454,937 for FY 2008, \$290,312 for FY 2009, for a total of \$893,311 from BPA).

**200707900 Salmon & Steelhead Habitat Restoration and Protection in the Yakima Basin**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – Coordination and Support

On the ground actions (Restoration) in 2008-2009

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – steelhead, spring chinook, (possible lamprey)

Summary Comments

Part of this proposal overlaps with other habitat improvement and coordination efforts. The RFEG and the YBFWRB will work together to better define coordination and support needs (see project 200710200). The RFEGs history of effectively leveraging diverse funding sources was highlighted. There are no defined projects for the requested restoration funds, and only general outcomes were described.

Funding and Budget Comments

Presenter indicated that it might be possible to reduce the budget request based on increasing match and volunteer contributions.

**198811525 YKFP - Design & Construction (Nelson Springs replacement facility)**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – Coordination and Support

On the ground actions (Restoration) in 2008-2009

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – steelhead, spring chinook, (possible lamprey)

Summary Comments

The review panel recognizes the need for upgraded office space and that the general location is favorable, but noted that the Nelson Springs office was established in association with a planned hatchery that was never built. Having

office space at Nelson Springs itself is not necessary and the plan does not set this as a priority action (it should be noted that the office space would support work that include priority actions). A full range of options should be considered including leasing and/or selling of land and other assets to support a lease. Expending this money upfront and taking up to 15 years for it to pay for itself creates opportunity cost questions. The panel was unsure if there is a contractual responsibility that BPA has committed to in the past.

#### Funding and Budget Comments

This project is ideally a capital expense but under 1 million dollar minimum.

#### **199701325 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Spring and fall chinook and steelhead

#### **199506425 YKFP Policy/Plan/Technical**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – Coordination and Support

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Spring and fall chinook and steelhead

#### **198812025 YKFP Management, Data, Habitat**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – Coordination & Support, On the ground actions (protection, restoration, maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Columbia Basin Wide

Focal Species Benefit – Spring and fall chinook and steelhead (other focal species out of basin)

#### **199506325 Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project - Monitoring & Evaluation**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – Research, Monitoring & Evaluation

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Columbia Basin Wide Benefits

Focal Species Benefit – Spring and fall chinook and steelhead (other focal species out of basin)

#### Summary Comments

This suite of YKFP projects project includes many actions identified as priority actions in the Subbasin plan and the review panel support for this project. We are unsure if there are contractual agreements to support this project. The YKFP is very important to the Yakima basin and it also has value for the Columbia basin as a whole. This project also benefits recovery efforts for Mid Columbia steelhead. Some panel members raised the concern that if funded in full, this project alone will expend BPA's currently proposed budget for the Yakima basin and emphasized the need for BPA to increase that allocation to encompass other valuable work as well.

#### Funding and Budget Comments

The review panel expressed that it is not in a position to judge the budgets for these projects. It was noted that portions of 199506325 and 198812025 should be funded with system-wide funds as they provide key research findings applicable throughout the Columbia Basin.

#### **200201400 Sunnyside Wildlife Mitigation**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Habitat Benefit – Eastside riparian wetlands, interior grasslands, and shrub steppe.

#### Summary Comments

The review panel understands that there is a contractual agreement to fund maintenance of wildlife credits.

Funding and Budget Comments

There appears to be a contractual obligation by BPA and the review panel is not in the position to judge this budget request. Project proponent indicated that a 10% reduction in the budget may be possible if saved funding will fund another priority project.

**200600400 Wenas Wildlife Area O&M**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Habitat Benefit – Interior grassland, shrub steppe, and riparian wetlands.

Summary Comments

The review panel understands that there is a contractual agreement to fund to maintain wildlife credits obtained with the initial funding of this project.

Funding and Budget Comments

There appears to be a contractual obligation by BPA and the review panel is not in the position to judge this budget request. Project proponent indicated that a 10% reduction in the budget may be possible if saved funding will fund another priority project.

**200711800 Protect and Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in Little Naches River Watershed**

Funding Priority – 2

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Bull trout and spring chinook

Focal Habitat Benefit – Riparian wetlands and montane coniferous wetlands

Summary Comments

This application is incomplete and we did not receive a presentation by project sponsors, so it was impossible for us to fully evaluate. However the panel recognizes the importance of the identified area for bull trout and spring chinook, understands the possible threats to the habitat and fish (private land development), and recommends that this project be considered for future funding if more info is provided.

Funding and Budget Comments

Should be eligible for capital funding.

**200719400 Oak Flats Acquisition and Habitat Enhancement**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead, bull trout, and spring chinook

Focal Habitat Benefit – Riparian wetlands and shrub steppe

Summary Comments

This is a priority action and the panel supports this project with proposed changes. The project proponent has scaled back the proposed project to acquisition only in this phase of the project. The site is at high risk of development, there is a willing seller, and the site has strong values for bull trout and wildlife. This reach will support some anadromous use but it has experienced degradation during floods in the 90's but will aggrade and become a functional floodplain overtime.

Funding and Budget Comments

The proposed budget can be adjusted to fund only acquisition and minor maintenance for this phase. Contact project sponsors.

**200711300 Cowiche Restoration and Protection Project (Easement/Fee Simple Acquisition)**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead

Focal Habitat Benefit – Riparian wetlands, Ponderosa Pine/Oregon White Oak, interior grassland and shrub steppe

Summary Comments

This is a priority action and the review panel supports this project. The site is at high risk of development, there is a willing seller, and the site has strong values for steelhead and wildlife. This project will also enhance a number of other projects that will ultimately restore a watershed for anadromous use (steelhead & coho)

Funding and Budget Comments

This project has a high match and will leverage BPA funds well. This project is ideally a capital expense but under 1 million dollar minimum if match is not considered.

**200711200 Teanaway Watershed - Protect habitat, reduce water temperatures, increase instream flows, restore habitat**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead, bull trout, and spring chinook

Focal Habitat Benefit – Riparian wetlands, Ponderosa Pine, and montane coniferous wetlands

Summary Comments

This is a priority action and the review panel supports this project. The site is at high risk of development, there is a likely willing seller, and the site has strong values for steelhead, chinook, bull trout and wildlife. This is a third phase, with phases one and two as yet incomplete. Funding should be contingent on completion of phase I & II.

Funding and Budget Comments

The applicant is willing to move the 2007 \$ request into 2008. This project should be considered for capital funds.

**199705100 Yakima Basin Side Channels**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Fish = steelhead, bulltrout, spring chinook, (possible lamprey & sockeye)

Focal Habitat Benefit – Eastside Riparian Wetland & Montane Coniferous Wetlands

Summary Comments

This is a priority action and the review panel supports this project. The sites described are at high risk of development, and have strong values for steelhead, chinook, bull trout and wildlife. Review panel members noted the project's strong track record.

Funding and Budget Comments

This project should be considered as a capital project.

**199603501 Yakama Reservation Watersheds Project**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Monitoring &amp; Evaluation

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Fish = steelhead, bulltrout

**Summary Comments**

Project is difficult to judge without more identified tasks and overall strategies. However progress to date is laudable and concurrent monitoring has been crucial for successful restoration efforts within the project area. Panel members encouraged development of a watershed assessment to prioritize future actions.

**Funding and Budget Comments**

The review panel is not in a position to judge the budget request without its being tied to specific tasks. However, past work and monitoring has been successful and similar actions should receive funding.

**199206200 Yakama Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Monitoring &amp; Evaluation

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead and chinook

Focal Habitat Benefit – Riparian wetlands, interior grassland and shrub steppe

**Summary Comments**

This is a priority action and the review panel supports this project. Past project efforts have been very successful and cost effective.

**Funding and Budget Comments**

Some of the project costs are O & M for projects originally done for wildlife credit and BPA may have contractual responsibility to maintain past wildlife mitigation. Acquisition component should be considered for capital funding.

**200724100 Well modifications to improve aquatic habitat for Toppenish/Simcoe Creeks.**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Species Benefit – Steelhead

**Summary Comments**

The panel is unsure about the technique and the level of potential improvement in instream flow and riparian restoration using this technique. Review team would like to see effort to assess water losses in lower Toppenish and attribute it to sources. If well issues are confirmed as a key issue, it could be a valuable project.

**Funding and Budget Comments**

Proponents encourage to seek additional sources of funding.

**200733500 Migration and homing ecology of supplemented and wild spring Chinook salmon.**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – Research

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Columbia Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Spring chinook

Summary Comments

Past research efforts have been productive but more in depth research is not a priority at this time and costs seem to be high. Agreement by review team that basic spawning survey work could be accomplished through YKFP. Suggested proponents approach BOR for funding for portion of study linked to evaluation of flip-flop.

Funding and Budget Comments

Proponent expressed that there was no room for budget adjustments without eliminating key components.

**200703000 Determination of steelhead smolt production and smoltification genes in the Yakima River**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – Research

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Columbia Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead

Summary Comments

No presentation was given for this project. The population characterization aspect of this project overlaps with YKFP steelhead genetics characteristics currently being conducted in the basin. Review panel was split on merits of research into smoltification cause, but did agree that if funded, it should be allocated to systemwide funding, as it was basic research with broad application. Review team determined that it was not a priority for funding at this time.

Funding and Budget Comments

See above re allocating to systemwide research.

**200203100 Growth modulation in salmon supplementation**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – Research

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Columbia Basin Wide

Focal Species Benefit – Spring chinook (possibly other hatchery produced species)

Summary Comments

This is a key study for the success of YKFP and other supplementation efforts that leads to implementable actions and will help address the Council's goals for supplementation.

Funding and Budget Comments

Review team noted it could be allocated to systemwide funding, as it is basic research with broad application throughout the region. Project proponent noted that reducing the budget would significantly lower the scope of what could be done.

**200705900 Abiotic & Biotic Factors Affecting Success of Reintroductions of Salmonids in Cle Elum**

Funding Priority – 3

Project Category – Research

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Steelhead and sockeye with future passage at Cle Elum dam.

Summary Comments

Coordination with other efforts focused on reintroducing anadromous fish in Lake Cle Elum was not evident. BOR may have conducted related research, and may have a role to play in funding such work. Agreement that basic limnological research was valuable, but that the feasibility of getting smolts to migrate out of the lake should be completed first. This is not a priority at this time for BPA funding.

Funding and Budget Comments

The team felt that the budget request appears to be high for the work accomplished. The possibility of increasing cost-share and decreasing BPA budget request was noted by presenters.

**200201800 Taptal Riparian Corridor Enhancement, Protection and Education Outreach--Phase II**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – On the ground actions (protection, restoration, or maintenance)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – Fall chinook (possible steelhead winter migration)

Summary Comments

This project type is identified as a priority action. The project site is at risk for development and the associated loss of currently limited quality habitat in the lower Yakima River. This project will also provide education and public benefits.

Funding and Budget Comments

Project proponent noted that budget reductions are possible, but would require eliminating the education component of the project.

**200710200 Subbasin Scale Monitoring and Plan Implementation Monitoring for the Yakima Subbasin Plan**

Funding Priority – 2

Project Category – Coordination & Support

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – All focal species and habitats

Summary Comments

More work on this proposal is needed to coordinate with other similar efforts in the basin (see project 200707900). The review panel believes that BPA should continue to support Subbasin Planning maintenance with coordination and planning funds.

Funding and Budget Comments

Project proponent expressed that removing the more intensive data management proposal would allow reducing the budget request to \$90,000 in 2007, and \$75,000 each in 2008 and 2009.

**199405900 Yakima Basin Environmental Education Program**

Funding Priority – 1

Project Category – Coordination & Support (Education)

Geographic Scope of Benefit – Yakima Basin

Focal Species Benefit – All focal species and habitats

Summary Comments

Education is very important, valuable, and is a priority to recovery efforts. This project has wide support.

Funding and Budget Comments

Some panel members raised concerns that the budget was large for the amount of work actually conducted; panel expressed a desire for more specific tasks/outcomes tied to the budget.