**Review: 2013 Geographic Category Review**

Council Recommendation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Number:** | [2007-398-00-NPCC-20131126](https://www.cbfish.org/Assessment.mvc/CouncilRecommendationAssessmentSummary/Assessment/2007-398-00-NPCC-20131126) |
| **Project:** | [2007-398-00 - Yakima Basinwide Tributary Passage and Flow](https://www.cbfish.org/Project.mvc/Display/2007-398-00) |
| **Review:** | [2013 Geographic Category Review](https://www.cbfish.org/Review.mvc/Summary/700) |
| **Proposal:** | [GEOREV-2007-398-00](https://www.cbfish.org/Proposal.mvc/Summary/GEOREV-2007-398-00) |
| **Proposal State:** | Pending BPA Response |
| **Approved Date:** | 11/5/2013 |
| **Recommendation:** | Implement with Conditions |
| **Comments:** | Implement through FY 2018. See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring. |
| **Conditions:** |  |
|  | Council Condition #1 Programmatic Issue: A. Implement Monitoring, and Evaluation at a Regional Scale—See Programmatic Issue and Recommendation A for effectiveness monitoring. |

Independent Scientific Review Panel Assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Number:** | [2007-398-00-ISRP-20130610](https://www.cbfish.org/Assessment.mvc/IsrpAssessmentSummary/Assessment/2007-398-00-ISRP-20130610) |
| **Project:** | [2007-398-00 - Yakima Basinwide Tributary Passage and Flow](https://www.cbfish.org/Project.mvc/Display/2007-398-00) |
| **Review:** | [2013 Geographic Category Review](https://www.cbfish.org/Review.mvc/Summary/700) |
| **Proposal Number:** | [GEOREV-2007-398-00](https://www.cbfish.org/Proposal.mvc/Summary/GEOREV-2007-398-00) |
| **Completed Date:** | 6/11/2013 |
| **Final Round ISRP Date:** | 6/10/2013 |
| **Final Round ISRP Rating****:** | Meets Scientific Review Criteria |
| **Final Round ISRP Comment:** |
| This project is well done, especially with their efforts to build and maintain a team of partners from many agencies and groups. As an example of the type of effort, members of the team meet monthly to ensure that all members are aware of impending work, accomplishments, identify special needs, and discuss emerging issues. Additionally, the team has had discussions about their efforts in light of climate change and has discussed options. We commend the personnel on their work and suggest this project could be used as an example for other projects.**1. Purpose: Significance to Regional Programs, Technical Background, and Objectives**The sponsors clearly described the significance of their efforts relative to regional programs such as the 2009 Fish and Wildlife Program, the 2008 BiOp, and the Yakima Subbasin Plan.The sponsors also strongly made the point that tributary rearing is, for a number of reasons, a life history pattern more beneficial to salmon and steelhead than is mainstem rearing provided the habitat is of high quality and the out-migrants are not entrained in irrigation systems. The ISRP was pleased to see the sponsor’s use of literature citations to support the association between project activities and potential benefits to fish. This could serve as an example for other habitat projects to follow on the use of simple fish metrics to demonstrate benefits as well as the use of literature citations. This approach helps connect the project work to expected benefits for fishery resources.The five objectives were clearly presented and reasonable.**2. History: Accomplishments, Results, and Adaptive Management (Evaluation of Results)**The ISRP appreciated the lengthy, extensive presentation of accomplishments. There are detailed discussions of monitoring and assessing benefits to anadromous and resident fishes. The proposal provided good detail and photos for the several examples of completed projects highlighted in this proposal. Since 2003, YTAHP has implemented 133 projects, screened 190 cfs, and added 217 miles of rearing and spawning habitat.The review team offers the following as an example of the team’s use of coordinated adaptive management. When an ISRP team member asked the sponsors about their efforts to prioritize and respond to changes, he was told that field personnel rely heavily on Technical Working Groups (TWG) to help prioritize actions. Currently, TWG are most involved during the engineering phase to help ensure that what happens on the ground will meet needs of the fish and habitat, but because of good working relationships, TWGs are often used.**3. Project Relationships, Emerging Limiting Factors, and Tailored Questions**One of the strengths of this project is its relationship to other entities in the region. The presentation of emerging limiting factors is well done.**4. Deliverables, Work Elements, Metrics, and Methods**The sponsors describe 51 deliverables. The ISRP team was pleased to read the detailed description of work planned and believed this is an indication of team organization. The ISRP also interpreted these descriptions as an indication that there is some acceptance of the program by private landowners.The ISRP would have appreciated some degree of prioritization among the numerous individual sites to be screened or to receive other project actions. It is not clear that all 51 projects can be completed in the funding cycle.***Specific comments on protocols and methods described in MonitoringMethods.org***The ISRP appreciated the sponsor’s inclusion of fish metrics, such as redds, before and after past actions. |
| **First Round ISRP Date:** | 6/10/2013 |
| **First Round ISRP Rating****:** | Meets Scientific Review Criteria |
| **First Round ISRP Comment:** |
| This project is well done, especially with their efforts to build and maintain a team of partners from many agencies and groups. As an example of the type of effort, members of the team meet monthly to ensure that all members are aware of impending work, accomplishments, identify special needs, and discuss emerging issues. Additionally, the team has had discussions about their efforts in light of climate change and has discussed options. We commend the personnel on their work and suggest this project could be used as an example for other projects.**1. Purpose: Significance to Regional Programs, Technical Background, and Objectives**The sponsors clearly described the significance of their efforts relative to regional programs such as the 2009 Fish and Wildlife Program, the 2008 BiOp, and the Yakima Subbasin Plan.The sponsors also strongly made the point that tributary rearing is, for a number of reasons, a life history pattern more beneficial to salmon and steelhead than is mainstem rearing provided the habitat is of high quality and the out-migrants are not entrained in irrigation systems. The ISRP was pleased to see the sponsor’s use of literature citations to support the association between project activities and potential benefits to fish. This could serve as an example for other habitat projects to follow on the use of simple fish metrics to demonstrate benefits as well as the use of literature citations. This approach helps connect the project work to expected benefits for fishery resources.The five objectives were clearly presented and reasonable.**2. History: Accomplishments, Results, and Adaptive Management (Evaluation of Results)**The ISRP appreciated the lengthy, extensive presentation of accomplishments. There are detailed discussions of monitoring and assessing benefits to anadromous and resident fishes. The proposal provided good detail and photos for the several examples of completed projects highlighted in this proposal. Since 2003, YTAHP has implemented 133 projects, screened 190 cfs, and added 217 miles of rearing and spawning habitat.The review team offers the following as an example of the team’s use of coordinated adaptive management. When an ISRP team member asked the sponsors about their efforts to prioritize and respond to changes, he was told that field personnel rely heavily on Technical Working Groups (TWG) to help prioritize actions. Currently, TWG are most involved during the engineering phase to help ensure that what happens on the ground will meet needs of the fish and habitat, but because of good working relationships, TWGs are often used.**3. Project Relationships, Emerging Limiting Factors, and Tailored Questions**One of the strengths of this project is its relationship to other entities in the region. The presentation of emerging limiting factors is well done.**4. Deliverables, Work Elements, Metrics, and Methods**The sponsors describe 51 deliverables. The ISRP team was pleased to read the detailed description of work planned and believed this is an indication of team organization. The ISRP also interpreted these descriptions as an indication that there is some acceptance of the program by private landowners.The ISRP would have appreciated some degree of prioritization among the numerous individual sites to be screened or to receive other project actions. It is not clear that all 51 projects can be completed in the funding cycle.***Specific comments on protocols and methods described in MonitoringMethods.org***The ISRP appreciated the sponsor’s inclusion of fish metrics, such as redds, before and after past actions.Modified by Dal Marsters on 6/11/2013 1:22:56 PM. |