



# MEMORANDUM

Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Intra-Department

**Date:** February 12, 2001  
**To:** Ron Boyce  
**From:** Steve Mamoyac  
**Subject:** ISRP Review of Calapooia Project proposal

**Project #:** 23071

**Project Title:** Calapooia River Flow Acquisition and Fish Passage Assessment

**Sponsor:** ODFW

**ISRP Comments (verbatim):** *This proposal to temporarily reimburse Thompson Mills not to divert flows for power on the Calapooia River did not offer long term, on-the-ground benefits with one-time funding. This proposal would provide benefits for one year, but to secure long-term benefits it would require funding every year or permanent actions on the dam. A proposal for permanent action on the dam would have better met the high priority criteria.*

**Response and Recommendations:**

We believe that the expenditure of the requested funds, even if confined to a single year, would provide significant long term, on the ground benefits to ESA-listed spring chinook and winter steelhead (Tier 1 criteria).

Improved passage for listed species, even if only provided for a single season, will generate long term benefits in the form of increased adult escapements several years hence. We are optimistic that those returning adults will encounter much improved passage conditions at that time. Since the ad-hoc working group described in the original high priority project proposal is committed to seeking long term resolution to the existing passage problems, it is assumed that a permanent solution to the problem will take several years but that it will indeed happen in the not-too-distant future. It should also be noted that flows this season are likely to be particularly problematic from a fish passage standpoint given current hydrological indications. If conditions do not improve dramatically, it is highly probable that passage at the Mill will be significantly worse than usual this season. The ramifications of not taking action this season, particularly given the anticipated severity of the problem, could very well prove to be extremely significant from a fish conservation standpoint. Implementation of the proposal will also serve to benefit survival of

ESA-listed *juvenile* salmonids that would otherwise be lost under status quo operations at the site. Increased survival of fish at this life stage will also benefit the species in the long term for the same reasons previously articulated.

We believe that implementation of the assessment component of the proposal is crucial to the short and *long term* success of any passage “fixes” at the site. Presently, our understanding of how the existing facilities should be manipulated to optimize upstream passage under various conditions is limited. The assessment, as proposed, presents us with the unique opportunity to increase our understanding of precisely how ESA-listed fish species interact with facilities that will have been purposefully altered in configuration and function to accommodate fish passage. Never before have we had the opportunity to evaluate the site-specific physical and/or functional processes associated with fish passage under certain (e.g. low flow) conditions that will exist if this project is implemented. In the past, under status quo operations, the issue has been moot since routine flashboard installation in the spring precluded both upstream passage and the associated evaluation opportunities. The information acquired via the proposed assessment will be directly applicable to the site regardless of how the ultimate long term “fix” turns out. Dam modification/removal, in and of itself, does not automatically constitute a solution to this complex problem as their presence may actually prove beneficial to fish passage under certain conditions. In order to realize the full potential of having total discretion to manage the facilities for fish (as opposed to the industrial status quo) we must first acquire a thorough understanding of how fish interact with the system. The assessment will enable us to develop this understanding. Of course, acquisition of a single years worth of information may not be provide all the answers relative to the ultimate solution but it should nevertheless increase our understanding of the situation significantly.

In their review, IRSP stated that the proposal would have better met the established criteria if actions were directed at developing a permanent solution to passage problems at the dam(s). For the reasons mentioned above we believe that implementation of the proposal will, in fact, make great strides towards accomplishing this objective. The information generated by the project should prove invaluable in enabling the resource agencies to determine the best long term conservation strategy relative to management/manipulation of existing facilities and flows under a variety of possible scenarios (e.g. dam removal/modification/retention, etc.).

In addition to providing immediate on-the-ground benefits to listed fish species via a one-time funding mechanism (i.e. Tier 1), the proposal meets numerous criteria established for Tiers 2 and 3. Clearly, one of its major strengths is that it represents the efforts of the ad hoc working group tasked with seeking interim and long-term solutions to the deeply entrenched problems at the site. This group, which seeks positive solutions to satisfy numerous interests, is composed of federal and state agencies, water conservation groups and historical societies, and representatives from the Oregon legislature and Governor’s office. It is hoped that the successful implementation of these collaborative efforts will establish a model example by which other entities confronted with comparable challenges can benefit.

**From:** "Steve Mamoyac" <Steven.R.Mamoyac@DFW.STATE.OR.US>  
**To:** GWCB.GWPDx(Trina)  
**Date:** 2/12/01 4:52PM  
**Subject:** Response to ISRP review of 23071

Attached is a memo I wrote late today to Ron Boyce of our agency (ODFW) responding to the ISRP's review of project 23071. I've been unable to obtain confirmation that Ron had conveyed my remarks to you as required by the end of business today so I'm sending it directly to you.

>>> "Tom Giese and CBFWA staff (Trina Gerlack)" <Trina@cbfwf.org> 02/02/01 02:47PM >>>  
To: CBFWA Members, F&W Managers, and Sponsors of High Priority Proposals  
From: Tom Giese, CBFWA  
Re: FY01 High Priority Final Recommendations to the NWPPC from the ISRP & CBFWA and Comments Due by February 12, 2001.

The ISRP and CBFWA FY01 High Priority Recommendations are posted at the CBFWA web site at [www.cbfwa.org/Reviews](http://www.cbfwa.org/Reviews) of FY01 High Priority Proposals.

Files attached below:

1. CBFWA FY01 High Priority Transmittal Letter to Chairman Cassidy, NWPPC - 2 pages.doc
  2. CBFWA request letter for responses to the ISRP and CBFWA FY01 High Priority Final Recommendations to the NWPPC - 2 pages.doc
  3. CBFWA Comparison Table of the ISRP and CBFWA recommendations - 5 pages.xls
- If you have any questions or comments please contact the CBFWA office.

Distribution list:

Chris Fisher  
Linda Gould  
Scott Grunder  
Joel Hubble  
Tom Macy  
Sarah Ogier  
Libby Smith  
Amos First Raised, BPT  
Daniel Gonzales, BPT  
Wanda Johnson, BPT  
Lawrence Schwabe, BPT  
Jess Wenick, BPT  
Peggy Entzel, CCCD  
Paula Cox, Chelan County Public Works  
Gordon Congdon, CDLT  
Mike Reed, PDX  
Jerry Gillham, City of Scappoose  
Howard Funke, Cd'AT  
Robert Matt, Cd'AT  
Ronald Peters, Cd'AT  
Francis Sijohn, Cd'AT  
Ernie Stensgar, Cd'AT  
Brian Allee, CBFWA  
Jann Eckman, CBFWA  
Trina Gerlack, CBFWA  
Tom Giese, CBFWA  
Tom Iverson, CBFWA  
Tana Klum, CBFWA  
Mary Marvin, CBFWA  
Cheron McGuffey, CBFWA  
Kathie Titzler, CBFWA