



## Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region



Kalispel Tribe-  
Pend Oreille  
Lead Entity

Spokane



Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity  
P.O. Box 39  
Usk, WA 99180

**Todd Andersen(509) 447-7245tandersen@knrd.orgRegion Overview**

**Geography**

The Northeast Washington Region is comprised of native resident salmonid streams in Ferry, Lincoln, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties.

**Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA)**

Lower Lake Roosevelt (53), Lower Spokane (54), Middle Lake Roosevelt (58), Kettle (60), Upper Lake Roosevelt (61), Pend Oreille (62)

**Federally Recognized Tribes**

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, and Spokane Tribe of Indians

**Endangered Species Act Listings**

**Table 1. Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region Listed Species**

Species	Listed As	Date Listed
Bull Trout	Threatened	June 10, 1998

**Salmon Recovery Plan**

**Table 2. Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan**

Recovery Plan	
Regional Organization	
Plan Timeframe	
Actions Identified to Implement Plan	
Status	A draft bull trout recovery plan has been developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The lead entity for Pend Oreille County has developed a habitat strategy that is used for directing salmon recovery projects.
Estimated Cost	
Implementation Schedule Status	
Web Information	<a href="http://www.posrt.org">www.posrt.org</a> <a href="#">Habitat Work Schedule</a>

**Region and Lead Entities**

The Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region is not planning under regional salmon recovery planning. An effort took place several years ago to regionalize within Northeast

Washington, but it was unsuccessful. The Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille is the only lead entity within this geographic region. The Pend Oreille Salmonid Recovery Team was created under the Salmon Recovery Act for WRIA 62. The recovery team consists of a Technical Advisory Group and a Citizens Advisory Group and is coordinated by the Kalispel Tribe.

## **Regional Area Summary Questions and Responses**

Please note that because there isn't a regional organization, there is no region-wide process. The questions below were addressed to the Pend Oreille Salmonid Recovery Team and the answers provided reflect that structure.

### **Describe the process and criteria used to develop allocations across lead entities or watersheds within the region?**

All projects are submitted for WRIA 62. Funds are allocated across projects submitted for the WRIA.

### **How was the regional or lead entity technical review conducted?**

The Pend Oreille Salmonid Recovery Team uses a two-step process to evaluate and rank projects.

- The Technical Advisory Group uses a consensus-based approach to evaluate projects for benefit to salmonids and certainty of success.
- Once the Technical Advisory Group evaluation is complete, the results are provided to the Citizens Advisory Group to be considered during project ranking. The citizens group then uses a consensus-based approach to rank each project based on evaluation provided by the Technical Advisory Group.

### **What criteria were used for the regional/lead entity technical and citizens review?**

The Technical Advisory Group evaluated projects using the following criteria:

- **Benefit to salmonids**
  - Does the project address high priority habitat features or watershed processes?
  - Is the project in a high priority sub-basin?
  - Has the project been identified through a documented habitat assessment?

- Does the project address multiple species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or Endangered Species Act-listed species or non-listed species primarily supported by natural spawning?
- Does the project address an important life history stage or habitat type?
- Does the project have a low cost relative to the predicted benefits?
- **Certainty of success**
  - Is the project scope appropriate to meet its goals and objectives?
  - Is the project consistent with proven scientific methods?
  - Is the project in correct sequence and independent of other actions being taken first?
  - Does the project address a high potential threat to salmonid habitat?
  - Does the project clearly describe and fund stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years?
  - Is the project landowner willing to have the project done on property?
  - Can the project be successfully implemented or are there constraints which may limit project success?

The Citizens Advisory Group evaluated projects using the following criteria:

- Using the Technical Advisory Group evaluation of the project's benefit to salmonids, rate how well this proposal addresses sub-basin priority limiting factors and actions identified in the strategy.
- Using the Technical Advisory Group evaluation of the project's benefit to salmonids, rate how well this proposal addresses sub-basin priority species and areas identified in the strategy.
- Using the Technical Advisory Group evaluation of the project's certainty of success, rate the proposal's ability to address the priority areas habitat limiting factors.
- Rate the project's current level of community support.
- Rate how well the project will help promote community support for the overall salmonid recovery effort in WRIA 62.
- Rate how well the project proposal addresses the socioeconomic concerns identified by the strategy.

- Rate whether the project is a justifiable use of public funds.

**Who completed the review (name, affiliation, and expertise) and are they part of the regional organization or independent?**

Technical Advisory Group members:

- Bill Baker, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, fisheries biologist
- Eric Berntsen, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, Natural Resource Department, habitat restoration biologist
- Erin Kuttel, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, biologist
- Jeff Lawlor, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, habitat biologist
- Rob Lawler, U.S. Forest Service, Colville National Forest, hydrologist and biologist
- George Luft, Pend Oreille County Public Works, engineer
- Todd McLaughlin, Pend Oreille County Planning Department, permitting and biologist
- Don Ramsey, Pend Oreille County Public Works, engineer
- Sean Stash, U.S. Forest Service, Panhandle National Forest, Supervisory Fisheries Biologist

**Were there any projects submitted to the SRFB for funding that were not specifically identified in the regional implementation plan or habitat work schedule? (If the projects were identified in the regional implementation plan or strategy but considered a low priority or is a low priority area, please provide justification.)**

Not applicable.

**How did your regional or lead entity review consider whether a project:**

- **Provides benefit to high priority stocks for the purpose of salmon recovery or sustainability?**

The Pend Oreille Salmonid Recovery Team's *Strategy for Protection and Improvement of Native Salmonid Habitat* identifies high, medium, and low priority sub-basins. These subbasins were further ranked based on seven additional criteria to create a sub-basin priority ranking. Priority actions were determined for each of the high and medium subbasins using information from the bull trout limiting factors report for WRIA 62 and the professional judgment of the Technical Advisory Group.

- **Addresses cost-effectiveness?**

Cost-effectiveness is considered in the Technical Advisory Group process as a specific criterion. The Citizen Advisory Group also considers cost effectiveness during final discussions on ranking the proposals

**Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your regional or lead entity process, if applicable.**

The SRFB Review Panel visited the Pend Oreille lead entity area on June 16, 2015. During the visit, our project sponsor presented the proposal (in the field) for the current round of funding. The sponsor, Technical Advisory Group, and Citizens Advisory Group members, lead entity coordinator, and SRFB Review Panel visited the proposed project site to evaluate the proposed project. During the visit, the panel member commented on the project, asked specific questions, and provided advice as to potential improvements that would increase the soundness of the project and the proposal. Following the visit, the review panel provided written comments to the lead entity and project sponsor. The coordinator recommended the sponsor consider the comments and suggestions and revise the project accordingly.

**Explain how multi-year implementation plans or habitat work schedules were used to develop project lists.**

Locally, we use our *Strategy for Protection and Improvement of Native Salmonid Habitat* (2007) as a tool for guiding the implementation of restoration efforts in Pend Oreille. This document uses multiple criteria for ranking sub-basins within the Pend Oreille as low, medium, or high priority for restoration improvements. Based on the priority, we develop projects that address concerns regarding native salmonid habitat. Typically, we focus on restoration efforts surrounding our Number 1 (bull trout) and Number 2 (west slope cutthroat trout) species. However, efforts also are made to address habitat issues that coincide with our Number 3 priority species (pygmy whitefish). For the current round, we focused on watersheds with projects that both directly and indirectly benefit bull trout and west slope cutthroat trout. We are continually in the process of updating our strategy and Habitat Work Schedule, but more importantly, we developed an implementation schedule in 2012 that directs our project list for three years. The implementation schedule (plan) focused on projects that are ready to go and have either received SRFB funding for the design phase or were submitted as an alternate recently. For out years, the priority areas and actions that provide the greatest benefit to declining stocks of native salmonids will be the focus of projects listed on the plan. Ideally, Habitat Work Schedule will assist in managing and updating the plan.

**Explain how comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews were addressed in finalizing the project list. Were there any issues about projects on the list and how were those resolved?**

During evaluation of projects, we use our Citizens and Technical Advisory Groups to develop the final list of ranked projects to be submitted to the SRFB. Typically, our Technical Advisory Group evaluates the projects based on criteria outlined above and scores each project accordingly. Next, the Technical Advisory Group has a discussion to address any issues or concerns surrounding each project. Following the discussion, the Citizens Advisory Group discusses and ranks the projects based on the Technical Advisory Group’s guidance and evaluation criteria associated with community interest and benefit (as described in the attached Citizens Advisory Group evaluation criteria). Finally, the lead entity submits the lead entity list memorandum with ranked projects based on final rankings by the Citizens Advisory Group. For the 2015 proposal, we discussed them as a group because 1. they had been evaluated previously, and 2. there was only one project proposed in 2015, and 3. the proposed project will be implementing a design funded with SRFB dollars in recent years.

**Project List Summary Table**

Following is a project list summary table, reflecting the region’s proposed project list as submitted on August 14, 2015. The Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region has one project requesting \$359,992 in SRFB funds and providing \$63,528 in matching funds.

**Table 3. Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region’s Proposed Projects**

Rank	Project		Sponsor	Primary Fish	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy
	Number	Name		Stock Benefited	
1	<a href="#">15-1106</a>	LeClerc Creek Restoration Phase III	Kalispel Tribe	Bull trout	Pg. 33. Action: Replace or remove culverts which have been identified as fish passage barriers. High priority area