



**COLUMBIA
BASIN
FISH & WILDLIFE
AUTHORITY**

May 2, 2002

TO: Resident Fish Committee

FROM: Joe Maroney, Chair

SUBJECT: DRAFT RFC Action Notes

RESIDENT FISH COMMITTEE

Monday, April 22, 2002

9:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

EWU/Spokane - Room 416

Spokane, WA

Draft Action Notes

If there are no objections to these action notes within five days from the date of this document, they will become final and will be posted to the CBFWA web site.

Attendees: Dave Ward (ODFW), Joe Maroney (KT), Ron Morinaka (BPA), Robert Walker (NWPPC), Dave Statler (NPT), Vinny Pero (SPT), Ron Peters (CDAT), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), John Arterburn (CCT) and Neil Ward (CBFWA)

By Phone: Clint Muhlfeld (MFWP)

Time Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process 0%

Allocation: Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries 95%

Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments 5%

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda

No new items were added to the agenda.

ITEM 2: Review RFC comments/recommendations for Blue Mountain and Mountain Snake Provinces

Participants discussed and modified the reviews that the RFC provided for proposals submitted in the Middle Snake River, Upper Snake River, Columbia Cascade, and Lower Columbia River provinces for funding consideration through the Rolling Provincial Review. For purposes of consistency, the reviewers performed the reviews by implementing the same criteria used by the Subbasin Review teams.

ACTION

Project ID: 29023**Title: Restoration/Protection of Kartar Creek In-stream, riparian, and Wetland Habitats**

The RFC suggests the project sponsor should include a detailed rationale or flow chart for selection/prioritization of project actions that will be developed in the feasibility study.

Project ID: 29041**Title: Evaluate Bull Trout Populations in the Columbia Cascade Province**

Proposal was well written.

Project ID: 31027**Title: Movements and Survival of Juvenile and Adult Bull Trout**

The RFC believes this is a potentially useful and interesting research project; however, it is unclear how results will be used in the management of bull trout. In addition, reviewers expressed concern about the size of the PIT tags relative to fish size. The RFC questions why this work should be funded by BPA?

Project ID: 32001**Title: Evaluate the Feasibility Artificial Production Facility DVIR**

The RFC recommended that Objective 1 (Tasks a-d) be categorized as “High Priority.” Although not included in the proposal, a cost benefit analysis will be performed. The RFC suggests that Objective 1 be extended for a three-year period at a total cost of \$450,000.

The RFC identified budgeting inconsistencies/concerns. For example, cultural department funding is \$10,000 in one area and \$15,000 in another. In addition, production costs are less than one dollar per pound of fish produced. The RFC suggests that these funds are likely insufficient to produce 170,000 lbs of trout during the initial production years when unexpected equipment needs (e.g., equipment) are likely to arise. In addition, the need for triploid fish may increase costs dramatically due to high mortality and the need for specialized equipment. The RFC believes these costs have not been addressed.

The RFC questions whether 170,000 lbs of annual production is appropriate for the DVIR? In addition, the RFC suggested that other options (e.g., net pen program, using shaker boxes, continued fish purchases, or developing a rearing facility) may be more cost effective.

Regardless of how the fish are obtained, the RFC recommends that monitoring and evaluation continue after stocking.

Project ID: 32002**Title: Implement BMP - Billingsley Creek Watershed**

Concerns expressed relative to Proposals 32012 and 33007 also apply to this project. In addition, the RFC found that some of the work would be performed in a State Park and question whether it should be a BPA responsibility. The RFC also found that there is a lack of coordination with the Tribes.

Project ID: 32003**Title: White Sturgeon Put, Grow, and Take Fishery Feasibility Assessment, Oxbow/Hells Canyon Reservoirs**

Although the RFC found the proposal to be technically sound, the proposal would benefit from the inclusion of additional information. For example, the RFC suggests that the proposal needs further documentation of the sample sizes needed

and analytical methods needed to determine survival and diet. To estimate survival, the RFC suggests the release of a larger number of fish. In addition, although the number of radio tags to be implanted seems reasonable, the RFC is unclear as to how the sample size was determined. The RFC suggests that estimation of abundance is key to describing the survival of these fish and recommend that investigators describe what precision they are targeting, how many fish they will need to capture and how many fish they will need to examine for marks.

The RFC suggests that diet objectives need to either be modified to allow lethal sampling of the fish using an unbiased gear (gill nets not set lines) or eliminated from the proposal. The RFC suggests that modified methods should include a description of sample size required and the methods that will be used to characterize the stomach contents (e.g., volume, weight, count, taxonomic order, preservation techniques, etc.). The RFC applauds the proposed coordination with ODFW and IDFG.

Project ID: 32004
Title: Effects of Culverts on Fish Population Persistence: Tools for Prioritizing Fish Passage Restoration Projects in the Middle Snake Province

The RFC found that the proposed work is potentially interesting; however, the RFC questions whether it is needed. The RFC found that the methods are more of a discussion and that specific methods for fieldwork and modeling are lacking. In addition, the RFC is uncertain if this approach would provide additional information beyond the WDFW protocol manual (i.e., Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual).

Project ID: 32007
Title: Bull Trout Habitat Restoration/Protection Program – Bruneau Subbasin

The objective of this project is to improve stream and riparian habitat conditions for the Jarbidge bull trout population. The RFC agrees with the sponsor's decision to consider only the Dave Creek project under the project request. The objectives are clearly defined and attainable in the stated time frame. The habitat analysis was comprehensive and nicely demonstrated the benefit of acquiring a Temporary Conservation Easement on critical bull trout spawning habitat to restrict livestock grazing and other streamside development and the need for habitat improvements. Although the proposal lacks an M&E plan, the plan is being developed with the BLM. The sponsors indicated that the BLM plan would be adopted when completed.

Project ID: 32009
Title: Squaw Creek Cooperative Fisheries Restoration Project

Due to the weakness of the proposed methods and the apparent lack of coordination with IDFG, the RFC suggests that this project should be reclassified as a "Recommended Action" until the following comments are answered in a satisfactory manner. Are all culvert replacement activities occurring on private lands? Are bull trout present in Squaw Creek above the mouth of Poison Creek? What is the current population status of the Squaw Creek bull trout population compared to other populations within the Subbasin? How will the sponsor "characterize channel condition" during downstream migration of post-spawning adults? In addition, the RFC expressed concern relative to the lack of information pertaining to the type of poison that would be used by the sponsors. The RFC suggests that until the status of the bull trout population is identified, poisoning activities should not be implemented.

Project ID: 32010

Title: Lookout Mountain Road Decommissioning

The sponsor indicates that the project proposal can help alleviate some of the limiting factors identified in the subbasin summaries. Loss of quality habitat and habitat degradation are among the overriding factors limiting fish and wildlife populations in the Burnt and Lower Middle Snake subbasins. In the Snake River tributaries, the limiting factor to tributary habitat is also degraded riparian habitat. Road related activities are contributory to on-going negative impacts to resident fish and their habitats.

The RFC suggest that decommissioning of roads along riparian areas with reclamation seems like a reasonable approach to improve habitat conditions for native resident fishes; however, the RFC questions prioritizing BPA funding for this type of work sponsored by the US BLM on BLM administered land to correct previous BLM sponsored actions. Potential actions to address native fish habitat needs are virtually endless. Where does the BPA responsibility to mitigation for hydrosystem impacts end and the responsibilities of others begin?

Project ID: 32012

Title: Implement Best Management Practices to Improve Riparian Habitat - Clover Creek

Although the proposed concept is valid, the RFC questions the priority status of this project since the perception is that the ongoing work will continue regardless of whether BPA funds are secured. The RFC found that most of the monitoring activities are being completed through various processes (e.g., TMDL) as well as general fish, wildlife and habitat monitoring by IDFG. The RFC questions the appropriateness of allocating BPA funds to this proposal.

Project ID: 32013

Title: Fishery Restoration of the Gold Fork River, Idaho

The RFC suggests that this anadromous substitution project will benefit bull trout if brook trout can be successfully removed; however, the proposed methodology to eradicate brook trout is vague. The RFC suggests that Antimycin combined with selective electrofishing has the best track record for removing nuisance species from running water. Lakes can be successfully treated with rotenone during late fall, just prior to ice formation. The sequential strategy for removing brook trout in stages between temporary barriers has merit and should be funded and assessed for effectiveness before initiating Objective 2.

The narrative states that bull trout will not be stocked until brook trout are reduced to acceptable levels. Unfortunately, because the stream habitat has been degraded by excessive sedimentation, the RFC believes that brook trout are likely to rebound if not removed entirely. Instream habitat should be repaired to reduce the amount of fine sediments and protect riparian vegetation for thermal cover. Bull trout require cool water temperatures and clean substrates, whereas brook trout can tolerate degraded stream conditions. Barriers isolating the remnant population of bull trout should not be removed if brook trout can invade from elsewhere in the system.

The RFC questions the current population status of the Gold Fork population compared to other populations within the Subbasin. Funds are allocated in FY 2003 to relocate bull trout and native fish assemblages into renovated stream sections. After removing brook trout from selected stream reaches, what is the duration and sampling frequency that will conclude that all brook trout have been removed? It is mentioned in the abstract that "No stocking will occur until brook trout abundance is reduced to acceptable levels in treatment stream sections". Is this acceptable level zero? The proposal mentions that "lower river reaches are

frequently dewatered to satisfy irrigation demands”. Would the creation of passage facilities and more efficient water transfer to the irrigators guarantee water will be left instream?

The RFC proposes that the project should be funded in stages. Objective 1 should be completed first with the initiation of Object 2 dependent on the RFC review/approval of the results from Objective 1.

Project ID: 32015
Title: Deadwood River and Clear Creek Drainages Roads Analysis and Repair

The RFC believes that analyzing and correcting problems with roads, culverts and such seem to be reasonable approaches to improving conditions for bull trout; however, the RFC believes that BPA funds should not be used for this work which is sponsored by the US Forest Service on Forest Service administered land to correct previous Forest Service sponsored actions.

The potential actions to address listed bull trout needs is extensive. The RFC questions where BPA’s responsibility to mitigate for hydrosystem impacts end and the responsibilities of others begin.

Project ID: 32017
Title: Suppress Brook Trout Populations in the Upper Malheur Subbasin, Oregon

The RFC recommends that this proposal, in its current state, should not be funded. Although the overall goal of the project is important to bull trout recovery in the Upper Malheur Subbasin, the RFC believes the likelihood that the proposed suppression projects will be successful is minimal using the proposed strategies and under the existing ecological situation. The project proposal is well written and the project objectives are biologically appropriate. However, the proposal does not demonstrate that the project benefits (i.e., brook trout suppression) are likely to persist over the long term because they will be compromised by a source population of brook trout occupying the headwater lake and river system. Further, the effectiveness of the proposed suppression techniques (i.e., pheromone-based trapping, angling, and gillnetting) is questionable, especially given that the entire headwater lake (High Lake) and river (Lake Creek) system is inhabited exclusively by brook trout. Chemical eradication of the headwater lake source population of brook trout should be considered to ensure successful long-term brook trout suppression efforts.

Objective 1 will assess the basin-wide level of hybridization and sympatric populations of brook and bull trout. This objective is important to document the magnitude and location of hybridization between native bull trout and non-native brook trout for future suppression and eradication programs. The RFC suggests that the project proponents consider submitting this request as a separate project or include this objective in a modified proposal. Objective 1 is important; however, during the project review it was noted this objective is covered under another project.

Objective 2 concerns implementing brook trout suppression efforts in areas where bull trout spawning activity occurs. Pheromone-based trapping may be a promising technique to attract and remove spawning brook trout; however, the RFC believes the study area does not appear to be an ideal setting to conduct a quantitative study to test this methodology. Research currently underway by Mike Young (USFS) and David Schmetterling (MFWP) will assess the effectiveness of pheromone “bait” trapping in tributaries of the Blackfoot River drainage, Montana during 2002. Results of their study may provide insight in the effectiveness of the technique. Further, the success of angling and weir trapping to suppress brook trout will be minimal in this setting.

The project proponents are strongly urged to use chemical eradication techniques (antimycin and rotenone) to eradicate the existing population of brook trout in High Lake and Lake Creek. Case histories of related projects have shown that gillnetting and spot electrofishing have a low probability of success in achieving the desired goal of the project. Further, the proposed suppression efforts throughout the system will have minimal success if this source population is not removed.

The RFC believes that monitoring brook trout and bull trout population trends (Objective 4) and coordinating with state, federal, tribal and private landowners (Objective 5) are important elements of this project and should be considered for funding if the scope of the proposal is modified as suggested. A change in techniques and methods could make this project a high priority. The RFC proposes that the sponsors eradicate the source population (i.e., headwater (lake) and stream). Following verification of effectiveness through M&E efforts, the RFC proposes the sponsors could consider restocking the lake/stream with native redband trout pending approval of other cooperating fish and wildlife managers. The proposed Phase 2 of this project should not be initiated without RFC review/approval.

Project ID: 32020
Title: Inventory and Assessment of Stream/Riparian Resources, Upper Boise and Upper Payette River Subbasins, Idaho

The RFC found that the proposed work is similar to the mapping effort submitted by the Northwest Habitat Institute in previous provinces. This may be useful when subbasin planning begins in this province and needs to be coordinated with EDT. The RFC questions the specific need for this project and suggests the benefits to fish and wildlife are low. The proposal states the “proposed inventory and assessment can be used to enhance both completed and ongoing TMDL efforts, and as a basis for remediation to achieve TMDLs.” The RFC expressed concern regarding the appropriateness of funding TMDL’s through the NWPPC Program.

Project ID: 32021
Title: Lower Boise River Wetlands Restoration Project

The RFC found that this proposal does not provide enough detail to determine if the construction phase should be funded and suggest that the proposal be reviewed after the design phase is completed. Wildlife would likely benefit from the wetland creation, but dredging and removal of vegetation to remove accumulated silts and nutrients would cause disturbances approximately every five years. It is unclear if fisheries benefits would result. In fact, the RFC suggests that thermal heating in the settling cells and wetlands could lead to elevated water temperatures downstream. The RFC suggests that the proposed project is primarily a water quality project, with potential side benefits to wildlife. Monitoring and evaluation for water quality was included in the original proposal, but monitoring and evaluation for wildlife resources was not. A wildlife monitoring and evaluation plan still is yet to be developed.

The project would benefit from cost-share arrangements for funding from other sources. All listed cooperators are shown to contribute “in-kind” services or funds. Although the benefit of this project, combined with others throughout the basin, could have lasting benefits, impacts addressed are not entirely attributable to the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS). The RFC was unclear as to how this project qualifies as offsite mitigation for impacts caused by the FCRPS. Due to the relatively minor impacts associated with power operations, it seems the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, State of Idaho and the counties would have greater responsibilities to provide funding to mitigate for

these impacts, rather than BPA.

The proposed conservation easements or land acquisitions appear to be very high cost at \$5000/acre and \$10,000/acre, respectively. The proposal does not describe how wildlife benefits will be calculated and credited.

The RFC found that coordination with BPA and the fish and wildlife managers appears to have been inadequate.

Project ID: 33001

Title: Assessment of Genetic Population Structure and Risk of Introgression and Hybridization to Native Trout in the Middle and Upper Snake River Provinces

Although the RFC believes the proposed work should be categorized as a “High Priority” since management efforts would benefit from the activities, the RFC identified four issues that need to be addressed. First, although the proposed genetic techniques are technically valid, the RFC suggests that using existing fin clip samples to determine population structure can be problematic due to collection design (e.g., samples need to be collected over a large area of stream and samples need to represent various age classes). Typically no more than 10 fish per 100m section of stream should be collected. In addition, lengths and sometime weights need to be collected as well. This is to ensure that adults make up the majority of samples. If only juveniles are collected from a short section of stream, in essence siblings could make up the entire sample, thus providing inaccurate population structure makeup. Samples and sample locations need to be geo-referenced. In addition, samples need to be archived for future use. This and other resident fish genetic projects need to be coordinated among all labs to determine which loci are used and to ensure that methods and techniques are the same.

Second, regarding management applications of resultant genetic data, notably lacking from the discussion is the need or potential to replace the stocking of nonnative rainbow trout with progeny from broodstock developed from pure populations of Yellowstone cutthroat trout or redband. In previous reviews the ISRP has indicated that, if a management decision is made to continue stocking fish to augment fisheries in waters inhabitable to native fishes, the brood stock source for such stocking should be from the native fishes. The proposal suggests that Idaho’s stocking database may be useful in predicting hybridization and introgression levels and therefore a good predictor of genetic risks to resident trout populations from historical rainbow trout stocking. Using an historical stocking model as a guide to suggest where it may be “safe” to stock non-native rainbow trout, especially where unimpeded access (connectivity) is involved, appears to be playing with fire. Changing environmental conditions could render historic stocking/introgression risk assumptions/relationships invalid. A more comprehensive policy of using progeny from native broodstock for stocking purposes would be less risky.

Third, per the ISRP’s comments, the sponsors have modified, through the “fix-it loop”, their proposal to include the analysis of redband trout from Oregon waters. Although the proposal sponsors include a personal communication reference (BPT personnel) with respect to the allocation of samples from Malheur Subbasin waters, the RFC has identified an oversight. The Statement of Work that the BPT has submitted to BPA for Project 199701900 provides for the collection of samples (i.e., fin samples) and genetic analysis of salmonid species, which includes redband trout, from the locations identified in the revised Proposal 33001. The RFC suggests that the BPT should make available, if requested by the sponsors of Proposal 33001, the results from the genetic analyses (techniques used in Project 199701900 are the same as those proposed in 33001) that have and will be obtained through Project 199701900. The RFC believes the allocation of funds

to Proposal 33001 for the analysis of samples from Oregon would result in unnecessary duplicative efforts in a province where only \$500,000 is available for new work. The RFC suggests that funding the Oregon portion of the proposed work would create a duplication of effort and entail an inefficient use of resources. In addition, the RFC expressed concern relative to the lack of coordination with the ODFW's geneticist.

The RFC believes an independent scientific review of this proposal may not have occurred. The RFC request that the MMG discuss the potential impropriety that may have resulted due to a perceived conflict of interest relative to one of the reviewers. The RFC request that an additional review be performed by an independent reviewer prior to an NWPPC decision/recommendation.

Project ID: 33007

Title: Implement BMP - Medicine Lodge watershed

Although the proposal calls for instream work (e.g., rock weirs, in stream barbs, etc.), the RFC questions whether passive restoration techniques have been considered. The RFC found that local fish and wildlife managers view the proposed work as a good idea but question the priority of the project. The proposed work would implement BMPs, which should already be in place in the subbasin. In addition, the RFC identified a lack of coordination with the Tribes.

Project ID: 33008

Title: Assessing Effects of Columbia River Basin Anadromous Fish Flow Management on the Aquatic Ecology of the Henry's Fork Watershed

The RFC believes that the proposal does not address how it mitigates for losses created by the Federal Hydrosystem. The hydrologic problems in the Henry's Fork watershed are a result of over allocating water for irrigation needs and not the operations of the Federal Hydroelectric Dams. Additional monitoring will likely confirm that over-winter survival is the limiting factor, but this is already well established. Past attempts to reduce this limiting factor have had minimal success, so how will information collected result in new and innovative management alternatives? Responses to ISRP concerns link this data to reservoir operations but a long history both in the Missouri River and Columbia River basins where reservoir operators are not inclined to modify water flows for fish and wildlife unless mandated, makes this an unlikely outcome.

The Henry's Fork watershed has a wealth of information while other watersheds have far less information to work with. The amount of work done within this watershed has clearly identified the limiting factor as over winter juvenile survival; however, the fishery continues to support heavy use so the limiting factors maybe a normal condition. Areas that are highly impacted and are poorly studied would likely result in greater benefits to fish, fisheries, ecology of the area, and the watershed.

Project ID: 33010

Title: Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fish Production Program

The RFC found that it was difficult to decipher what was being proposed. Bringing a group of experts together chosen from all competing entities within a specific geographical area would provide direction for resident fish resources in the upper Snake River province; however, specific rules for who and how they will be selected, and safeguards that would ensure independence of the board are not supplied. Once established, would this group continue? If so, why were no funds allocated to out-year budgets? The RFC believes that the general concept is good but unless the proponent provides additional detail, the current proposal is inadequate. Responses to ISRP concerns still do not provide specifics about this

process. The RFC proposes that the sponsors consult with the CDAT to develop procedures to appoint board members.

Project ID: 198815600
Title: Implement Fishery Stocking Program Consistent with Native Fish Restoration

The RFC recommends that the sponsor should consider combining this project with Project 199501500 since they are essentially the same but occur in different lakes. If this project was combined with Project 199501500 administrative, M&E, and O&M costs could be reduced without reducing the quality and deliverables of these projects.

Stocking rates for these waters seem excessive considering that temperature and oxygen profiles indicate they are marginal for trout. The RFC questions how they are determined and adjusted annually? During the next 2 years the project costs will increase from \$110,000 to \$420,000. The RFC questions why are project costs increasing so much over prior years?

If the goal of the project is to produce more and bigger fish for anglers, The suggests the proponent should consider using net-pens or rearing ponds to reduce transportation and fish costs. Equipment maintenance seems excessive for what is needed to do this project, most of the equipment is owned by sub-contractors. See project 199501500 for additional issues that also relate to this project.

Project ID: 199201000
Title: Habitat Restoration / Enhancement Fort Hall Reservation

The RFC questions the rationale used to select and prioritize the various enhancement projects. It was clear that monitoring and evaluation of projects is occurring; however, it was not clear how disturbances elsewhere in the subbasin are affecting the completed habitat projects and what strategies are being used to protect past and future investments.

Project ID: 199405300
Title: Middle Fork Willamette bull trout re-introduction and basin wide monitoring

The proposed project will investigate strategies for reintroduction of bull trout and status and trends of bull trout in the Upper Willamette basin; however, the RFC believes that the proposed experimental design and data analysis need to be explained in greater detail. Specifically, project sponsors should provide justification for number of release sites chosen and numbers and timing of fish transferred and released

For Objective 2, the RFC suggests that the sponsors need to identify why only two introduction sites (one site per experimental group) were selected on one stream. The RFC suggests the researchers need to replicate each experimental group within each stream to increase the statistical power of the analysis. Further, the project sponsors plan to immediately transfer 10-20% of the captured fry to the re-introduction sites and fish held in a hatchery facility for a year will be transferred in four groups at four times between February and June. The experiment needs to account for temporal effects of the treatment groups. Perhaps the sponsors should transfer equal numbers of fry and fingerlings at similar time periods to account for temporal variation. Density dependent and independent factors that may influence results of the reintroductions should be evaluated during the study. The project sponsors should address this in the experimental design.

The RFC suggests that growth rates may not be visually estimated by approximating individual lengths underwater and conducting a cohort analysis. This comparison is only valid if there is a significant relationship in the observed

versus expected values. Further, bull trout abundance will be estimated from numbers obtained by snorkeling, calibrated by electrofishing. Again, this relationship should be evaluated prior to being used as a population estimator. Snorkeling may not work for age 1-3 bull trout because they are concealed in cobble substrate during the day and may not emerge from concealment cover at night during summer months. The RFC recommends that the methods and statistical analyses for Objective 3 need to be defined in greater detail.

Project sponsor's comments were not available.

Project ID: 199405400
Title: Tools for Managing Bull Trout Populations Influenced by Nonnative Brook Trout Invasions in the Middle Snake Province

The original proposal for project 1994-054-00 in the Middle Snake Province called for four objectives, including EMAP, totaling \$555,981. After the ISRP review, the EMAP portion was removed, resulting in three remaining objectives with a budget of \$329,581, \$293,482, and \$106,425 for FY03, FY04, and FY05, respectively. Objectives 1 and 2 could be considered ongoing because they are directly related to previous work in the Malheur and Powder subbasins; however, ongoing work already approved for the Plateau and Blue Mountain provinces totals \$456,767, and exceeds the FY2001 budget plus 3.4% (\$387,182 + \$13,164, respectively) by \$56,421 (12% increase). *See Table 1 for proposed budget.*

Project ID: 199501500
Title: Lake Billy Shaw Operations and Maintenance and Evaluation

This is a fundable project; however, the RFC suggests that the following concerns should be addressed. Although many tasks (e.g., planting projects, fencing, signage, and public relations) have been in progress for multiple years, when will they be finished? Much of the work seems repetitive and once baseline data has been established, implementing select tasks (e.g., water quality monitoring) on a yearly basis may have limited value. Monitoring could be conducted on a rotating basis with other lakes from Project 198815600. The RFC suggests that data for each lake could be updated every three years and this would provide adequate information for assessing changes over time. In addition, monitoring riparian plants should be conducted one year after planting and then every five to ten years. Furthermore, the RFC believes that hook and line sampling is redundant if creel surveys are conducted. The recommends that the sponsors consider combining this project with Project 198815600 resulting in an annual budget of \$250,000.

Project ID: 200007900
Title: Assess Resident Fish Stocks Of The Owyhee/Bruneau Basin, D.V.I.R.

The RFC recommends that this project should be closely coordinated with Project 199800200 "Snake River Native Salmonid Assessment". The RFC was unable to determine if much coordination is taking place. The RFC believes that this project is a high priority and should be completed as soon as possible as results of this project are needed for other projects.

ITEM 3: Within-year Guideline Modifications

During the April 11, 2002, Members Management Group (MMG) Meeting, the RFC proposed that the MMG consider an approach to create standardization that could prevent future discrepancies among committee reviews of within-year requests. Although the Resident Fish Committee (RFC) believes the Within-year

Budget Modification Process guidelines

(<http://www.cbfwa.org/files/province/budgetmods>) provide a foundation to initiate the review of within-year requests, the RFC believes portions of the guidelines are vague. Due to this vagueness, discrepancies among the committees regarding interpretation of the language and the actual review of a request likely varies among the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Committees *as evidenced by* the RFC's recent decision on the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's within-year request for Project 199902400 titled "Columbia Gorge Bull Trout Investigations."

In an attempt to provide clarification and subsequent standardization, the MMG approved the RFC's request MMG. Joe Maroney and Dave Statler as well as Anadromous Fish and Wildlife committee representatives volunteered to participate in the standardization exercise that will be facilitated by Neil Ward.

Due to time limitations, the RFC was unable to discuss thoroughly discuss this item; however, the RFC participants did indicate that they prefer that Dave Statler and Joe Maroney ensure that the modified within-year guidelines be conservative.

Table 1. Revised budget summary for project 199405400. Amounts for FY02-04 in the Columbia Plateau and Blue Mountain provinces are recommended by CBFWA as per their website. Amounts for FY05-06 in the Columbia Plateau are estimated out-year costs for EMAP and activities conducted by CTWSRO.

Title	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Tools for Managing Bull Trout Populations Influenced by Nonnative Brook Trout Invasions; Monitoring Abundance and Habitat of Bull Trout and Other Salmonids in the Middle Snake Province	\$0	\$329,581	\$293,482	\$106,425	\$0
Characterize the Migratory Patterns, Population Structure, Food Habits, Abundance of Bull Trout from subbasins in the Blue Mountain	\$402,611	\$388,764	\$374,968	\$0	\$0
Migratory Patterns, Structure, Abundance, and Status of Bull Trout Populations from subbasins in the Columbia Plateau	\$488,027	\$489,174	\$500,558	\$295,668	\$304,601
Total	\$890,638	\$1,207,519	\$1,169,008	\$402,093	\$304,601