



## Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

RECEIVED

38672

MAY 16 2003

CBFWA

ENVIRONMENT, FISH AND WILDLIFE

May 14, 2003

In reply refer to: KEW-4

Dear Project Sponsor:

Thank you for submitting your proposal in response to the BPA Request For Studies (RFS) Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation of March 14, 2003 (<http://www.efw.bpa.gov/cgi-bin/FW/welcome.cgi>). As indicated, the RFS was intended to address research, monitoring, and evaluation requirements under Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) Actions 182 and 184 of the NOAA Fisheries' 2000 Biological Opinion (BiOp) on the Operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS). The Request for Studies (RFS) was needed to fill research needs for the BiOp that are not actively being addressed through the Bonneville Power Administration's (Bonneville) current implementation program.

Bonneville has reviewed the recommendations of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's (Council) Independent Science Review Panel (ISRP) (<http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2003-7.htm>) and the Hatchery/Harvest Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Subgroup (HHS) (attached) for the proposals that were received under this RFS. Both groups pointed out that, for many of the proposals, the decisions on whether to fund would be greatly enhanced by increased information. Furthermore, given the tight timeframe in which sponsors were originally requested to provide proposals, additional information could benefit the sponsor's opportunity to provide adequate information to reviewing entities. Given that the ISRP has suggested that these proposals are being reviewed in the same timeframe as with proposals submitted for the Mainstem/Systemwide and should be equally technically sound, Bonneville is offering an opportunity for sponsors to respond to the questions and comments raised in technical review. Review of the proposals has suggested that the schedules and products to be provided by sponsors to Bonneville will not be significantly delayed by the implementation of a response loop, allowing sponsors to reply to technical review comments. Therefore, Bonneville concurs with the recommendations and has consulted with the Council to determine the response loop procedures and schedule outlined below:

### **Proposals not requiring a response**

1. Bonneville concurs with the recommendations of the ISRP and the Hatchery/Harvest Subgroup that one project is fundable without a response to technical review comments.

**Proposal 6:** Relative Reproductive Success of Hatchery-Origin and Wild-Origin Steelhead Spawning Naturally in the Hood River (OSU)

**No response is required. The sponsor may choose** to respond to ISRP concerns in this response loop or elect to address them during the contracting process (should the proposal be funded), at the proposer's discretion.

The sponsor is cautioned to note that although Bonneville concurs with the recommendations that this proposal is generally technically sound, a decision to fund this proposal will not be made until all projects have gone through the response loop, recommendations from the Council have been provided, and Bonneville has made final funding decisions.

2. Bonneville concurs with the recommendations of the ISRP and the Hatchery/Harvest Subgroup that two projects will not be funded based on technical merits:

**Proposal 13:** Analytical Approach for Determination of Effects of Hatchery Reform on Extinction Risk and Recovery of Salmon and Steelhead (CRITFC)

**Proposal 5:** Assessment of the Reproductive Success of Reconditioned Kelt Steelhead with DNA Microarray Technology (Battelle)

**No response is required.**

3. Additionally, Bonneville concurs with the recommendation of the HHS that, given the significant number of projects that propose the use of in-basin stocks to address Action 182 (Studies to Determine Reproductive Success of Hatchery Spawners), the two proposals identified that use "out-of-basin" stocks can not be modified to the extent necessary to compete with the remainder of the proposals addressing this RPA. These proposal are:

**Proposal 2:** Evaluation of the Reproductive Success of Wild and Hatchery Steelhead in Natural and Hatchery Environments (UW)

**Proposal 7:** Reproductive Success of Hatchery Spawners in the Chinook River, Washington (Sea Resources)

**No response is required.**

#### **Proposals requiring a response**

All other proposals will need to respond to both ISRP and HHS technical review in order to be considered for funding. A project will be recommended for funding only if the response adequately addresses reviewer comments. Responses should focus on the technical comments, answer all review questions, and clarify uncertain information. Responses should be formatted to address concerns point by point, clearly identifying each concern and providing a response.

### **Response Loop Procedure**

Please provide the responses in the following format.

#### **Header**

Proposal Number (use ISRP's Designated Proposal Number)

Proposal Title

Sponsor

#### **Individual responses**

Indicate the origin of the review question/concern (ISRP or HHS)

Restate the question/concern

Provide the response

Any additional information that the sponsor wishes to provide that will help clarify review concerns should be provided. Note that some ISRP/HHS concerns that are indicated as being needed for all or many projects are in the "general review sections" of the documents, and are not indicated in the table or project-specific section for every project.

**Send the file in MS Word to Cate Hanan** (as indicated in the deadline below) with the file name:

BPA RFS 14 Mar 2003 Proposal "X".doc (replace "X" with the ISRP proposal number)

### **Review Schedule**

**June 3** Responses due to BPA by 3 p.m. PST (Cate Hanan [cchanan@bpa.gov](mailto:cchanan@bpa.gov))

**June 20** ISRP response loop comments available  
(and will be posted on Bonneville website soon thereafter)

**July 7** Hatchery/Harvest RME Group review provided to Council

**July 9** Deadline for submission to briefing packet to Council members

**July 15-16** Target date for Council recommendation on the RFS proposals  
(Council meeting in Warm Springs, OR)

**August 4** Target date for BPA decision on RFS proposals

### **Funding decisions**

Sponsors are reminded that there is limited funding for these RPAs, and that a recommendation of "fundable" based upon technical merit does not guarantee funding

If you need further clarification please contact Jeff Gislason at 503-230-3594.

Sincerely,



Robert J. Austin  
Deputy Manager, Fish & Wildlife

Enclosures

cc:

Mr. Larry Rutter, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
Mr. Doug Marker, Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Mr. Steve Waste, Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Mrs. Judi Danielson, Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Mr. Mark Fritsch, Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Mr. John Ogan, Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Mr. Erik Merrill, Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
Mr. Rod Sando, Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority  
Mr. Tom Iverson, Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority

bcc:

S. McNary - KEW-4  
A. Redenbo - KEWB-4  
C. Hanan - KEWB-4  
B. Crawford - KEWB-4  
M. Affett - KEWB-4  
P. Lofy - KEWL-4  
J. Gislason - KEWL-4  
J. Swan - KEWU-4  
Official File - KEW (FW-24)

## Attachment 1

### Hatchery/Harvest RME Subgroup Comments on Proposals Received in Response to the Request for Studies

The BPA/NOAA Fisheries Hatchery/Harvest RME Subgroup (H/H Subgroup) reviewed the 15 proposals received in response to the March 14, 2003, Request for Studies (RFS) during the same timeframe as the ISRP's technical review. The H/H Subgroup had planned to review the ISRP's comments and recommend specific proposals for funding in time for a Council recommendation at the May 6-7, 2003, Council meeting. However, after review of the ISRP's comments, we fully support the ISRP's recommendation for a "response loop" and believe it would improve the quality of the proposals and result in better projects for implementation. If at all possible, the "response loop" should be completed in time to allow for a funding recommendation at the June 2003 Council meeting.

The H/H Subgroup sincerely appreciates the effort the ISRP invested in reviewing these proposals under the very short timeframe. The ISRP members' broad scientific expertise and experience was critical to the technical evaluation of the proposals. The ISRP's comment document was very thorough and was extremely useful to us.

To make the response loop process as efficient as possible, we have identified two proposals that could not be recommended for funding by the H/H Subgroup, regardless of the sponsors' response to ISRP technical concerns, because they are studies of out-of-basin populations or species not relevant to the FCRPS BiOp:

- **Proposal 2, Evaluation of Reproductive Success of Wild and Hatchery Steelhead in Natural and Hatchery Environments (Forks Creek (Willapa River drainage) - Southwest Washington Steelhead ESU)**
- **Proposal 7, Reproductive Success of Hatchery Spawners in the Chinook River, Washington (Lower Columbia River Coho ESU)**

Although preliminarily rated "fundable" by the ISRP, these two studies would have little or no applicability to the Columbia Basin ESUs that are the focus of the FCRPS BiOp. We appreciate the sponsors' response to the RFS, but we see no point in the sponsors spending additional time revising their proposals through a response loop. Additionally, the ISRP rated two proposals "not fundable" with no response requested. We agree with the ISRP. This would leave only 11 proposals to go through the response loop.

Assuming a response loop" will be implemented, the H/H Subgroup has some concerns and questions we would like addressed by proposal sponsors along with the ISRP's questions and concerns:

**All Proposals in the Response Loop:**

In the RFS, BPA indicated that it would use past performance of sponsors as one of the proposal evaluation criteria. Some proposals have identified several “Leads” but have not identified the Principal Investigator (PI). All respondents are requested to explicitly identify the Principal Investigators (the person or persons responsible for assuring that the project is implemented on time and in the manner contracted and that contract deliverables are met). Additionally, if the PI (or proposer) has a short (or no) history of leading complex projects under BPA funding, non-BPA references are requested for similarly complex projects.

**Proposal-Specific Comments**

Recommendations from the H/H Subgroup have been appended to the ISRP’s Table of Proposals on the following pages. The H/H Subgroup’s comments should be made available to the respondents to the RFS so they can address them during the response loop.

Table of Proposals

Project	ISRP Recommendation	Page	H/H Subgroup Recommendation
<b>Action 184: Synthesis of Existing Analytical Approaches, or Development of a New Analytical Approach, for Determining the Effects of Hatchery Reforms on Extinction Risk and Recovery</b>		2	
<b>Proposal 10:</b> A Tool for Evaluating Risks and Benefits of Reform Actions in Hatchery Programs (WDFW)	Fundable at low priority subject to addressing minor criticisms.	3	Respond to ISRP's criticisms. Although this proposal did not provide the quantitative approach/methodology envisioned in the RFS, we believe it would provide a useful tool, albeit short-term and "stop-gap," for assessing the efficacy of potential hatchery reforms.
<b>Proposal 13:</b> Analytical Approach for Determination of Effects of Hatchery Reform on Extinction Risk and Recovery of Salmon and Steelhead (CRITFC)	Not Fundable	4	Agree with ISRP; not fundable, no response needed.
<b>Action 184: Reproductive Success of Natural-Origin, Hatchery-Origin, and Reconditioned Kelt Steelhead</b>		5	
<b>Proposal 4:</b> Reproductive Success of Natural-Origin, Endemic Hatchery Origin, and Reconditioned Kelt Summer Steelhead in the Tucannon River (WDFW)	Fundable at medium priority, contingent on adequate response to unaddressed RFS questions and ISRP concerns. RFS identified ESU -- Snake River Steelhead.	7	Respond to ISRP's concerns and unaddressed RFS questions.
<b>Proposal 5:</b> Assessment of the Reproductive Success of Reconditioned Kelt Steelhead with DNA Microarray Technology (Battelle)	Do not fund. No revision requested. This is not tied directly enough to the Kelt RFS.	9	Agree with ISRP; not fundable, no response needed
<b>Proposal 9:</b> An Evaluation of the Efficacy of Steelhead Kelt Reconditioning to Address Biological Opinion Action 184b: The Reproductive Success of Hatchery-Origin and Wild-Origin Repeat Spawners (USGS)	Qualified fundable for phase 1, contingent on adequate response to unaddressed RFS questions and ISRP concerns. This proposal is of the lowest priority of the three reconditioning (#4, #9, and #14) proposals because it does not have as direct application to the ESUs. Lower Columbia River Steelhead	10	Respond to ISRP's concerns. The uncertainty regarding the future implementation of Phase II (uncertainty over manageability of risk to the existing research program and extant wild Kalama River steelhead population) is a major weakness of this proposal. A funding investment in Phase I could not be made without complete assurance that Phase II would be feasible from a policy/management perspective.

Project	ISRP Recommendation	Page	H/H Subgroup Recommendation
<b>Proposal 14:</b> Proposal to Evaluate Reproductive Success of Natural-Origin, Hatchery-Origin, and Kelt Steelhead in the Columbia River Basin (CRITFC)	Fundable, contingent on adequate response to unaddressed RFS questions and ISRP concerns. This proposal received the highest ranking of the four proposals submitted for the RFS because it offers the most comprehensive application to the priority ESUs listed in the RFS (Multiple Candidate Steelhead ESUs). However, the proposal needs to be scaled back.	11	Respond to the ISRP's concerns and unaddressed RFS questions. This proposal definitely needs to be scaled back to bring it in line with the desired "level-of-effort" cost range in the RFS. We suggest reducing the number of sites (a thorough, detailed description of study site(s) should be included in the response), reducing equipment costs, and possibly personnel costs. Would it be more cost-effective to lease rather than buy a gene sequencer or send the tissue samples to another laboratory (that already has the necessary equipment) for analysis?
<b>Action 182: Studies to Determine Reproductive Success of Hatchery Spawners</b>		13	
<b>Proposal 8:</b> Evaluating the Reproductive Success of Natural- and Hatchery-Origin Columbia River Chum Salmon (WDFW)	Fundable contingent on an adequate response to ISRP questions and comments. RFS identified ESU -- Columbia River Chum.	15	Respond to ISRP questions and comments. The H/H Subgroup shares the ISRP's concerns over the proposed use of an artificial observation channel and will require a strong justification for not using the alternatives suggested by the ISRP, i.e., a direct study of reproductive success in the Gray's River or a weir-controlled tributary of the Gray's River. Using one of these alternatives would probably also reduce the estimated cost of the study, which is much higher than estimated costs for most of the other reproductive effectiveness studies and higher than the desired "level of effort" cost range in the RFS
<b>Proposal 7:</b> Reproductive Success of Hatchery Spawners in the Chinook River, Washington (Sea Resources)	Fundable contingent on an adequate response to ISRP questions and comments. Not RFS identified ESU -- Lower Columbia River Coho.	17	No response loop recommended. Lower Columbia River coho is not a species relevant to the RFS or the FCRPS BiOp. This cannot be fixed by a response loop.
<b>Proposal 15:</b> Natural Reproductive Success and Demographic Effects of Hatchery-Origin Steelhead in Abernathy Creek, Washington: Can Newly Developed, Native Broodstocks of Steelhead Derived from Captively-Reared Parr Potentially Contribute to Recovery of Naturally Spawning Populations? (USFWS)	Fundable contingent on an adequate response to ISRP questions and comments. Not RFS identified ESU -- Southwest Washington Steelhead.	19	Respond to ISRP's questions and comments. However, steelhead captive broodstock is not the focus of the Action 182 needs statement in the RFS, and this study would have very limited applicability to other ESUs.



Project	ISRP Recommendation	Page	H/H Subgroup Recommendation
<b>Proposal 2:</b> Evaluation of the Reproductive Success of Wild and Hatchery Steelhead in Natural and Hatchery Environments (UW)	Fundable, a high quality proposal, but does not specifically address the RPA 182 and some questions in the RFS. Not RFS identified ESU -- Out of Basin Steelhead.	21	No response loop recommended. A study of Southwest Washington ESU steelhead would have limited applicability to Columbia Basin steelhead ESUs. Other proposals responding to the RFS address more appropriate steelhead populations.
<b>Proposal 6:</b> Relative Reproductive Success of Hatchery-Origin and Wild-Origin Steelhead Spawning Naturally in the Hood River (OSU)	Fundable, high rank. If selected for funding the principal investigator should respond to the general ISRP comments in the contracting process. Ranked high even though it is not one of the RFS identified ESUs -- Lower Columbia River Steelhead.	23	Agree with ISRP's ranking of this proposal. It should be funded as soon as possible. Although this study is not located in one of the priority ESUs identified in the RFS, results should be highly applicable to other steelhead ESUs.
<b>Proposal 1:</b> Investigation of the Relative Reproductive Success of Hatchery and Wild Steelhead in the Deschutes River Basin (ODFW)	Qualified fundable. The study should be implemented in phases given adequate response to reviewer's questions and comments. The study is important and addresses RPA 182, but does not directly address the requirements of the RFS. RFS identified ESU -- Mid-Columbia River Steelhead.	25	Respond to ISRP's questions and comments. A comparison of reproductive effectiveness of stray hatchery fish with wild fish was not the intent of the Action 182 needs statement in the RFS. The focus of this study on stray hatchery fish would severely limit the applicability to other ESUs.
<b>Proposal 3:</b> Pedigree Approach to Determine Reproductive Success of Natural and Hatchery Origin Spring/Summer Chinook Salmon Spawners in Johnson Creek, Idaho (NPT)	Fundable in part for Objectives 1 and 2, contingent upon adequate response to the ISRP's questions. Objectives 3 and 4 require major revision as to how they will be accomplished. Low priority. Not RFS identified ESU -- Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook.	27	Respond to the ISRP's questions and comments.
<b>Proposal 11:</b> Comparative Reproductive Success of Wild and Hatchery Origin Spring/Summer Chinook Salmon that Spawn Naturally in the Pahsimeroi and Upper Salmon Rivers (IDFG)	Fundable contingent upon adequate response to the ISRP's questions and comments. Low rank. Not RFS identified ESU -- Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook.	30	Respond to the ISRP's questions and comments
<b>Proposal 12:</b> Evaluating the Relative Reproductive Success of Natural- and Hatchery-Origin Snake River Fall Chinook Spawners Upstream of Lower Granite Dam (WDFW)	Qualified funding of Phase 1, pending adequate revision. Do not fund Phase 2 at this point, pending successful demonstration of the approach. RFS identified ESU -- Snake River Fall Chinook.	32	Respond to the ISRP's questions and comments