

**SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT
FOR
JOHN DAY SUBBASIN REVISED DRAFT PLAN**

**DESCRIPTION OF REVISION PROCESS AND CHANGES MADE FROM
5/28/04 DRAFT TO 3/15/05 REVISED DRAFT**

The John Day Subbasin Draft Plan was submitted to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC) on May 28, 2004. Upon review of this draft by the Independent Scientific Advisory Board, the NWPCC decided additional time and funding was needed to do further work on the plan and revise the original draft.

The John Day Subbasin Revised Draft Plan, dated March 15, 2005, incorporates revisions made by the John Day Subbasin Coordination Team (coordination team) as requested by the NWPCC in October 2004. Funding to complete this revision was provided by the NWPCC and the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board. The revision process began in October 2004 when the coordination team reconvened to begin the process. Revisions to the plan, including substantial improvements to the assessment and management plan sections, were completed and the revised draft was submitted to the NWPCC on March 15, 2005.

Process

The coordination team utilized the Columbia-Blue Mountain Resource Conservation & Development Area (CBMRC&D) as the administrative organization in the revision process. CBMRC&D was the lead entity in the development of the plan, providing administration for the coordination team, serving as fiscal agent, and managing the contracts with the NWPCC and the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board. They also contracted with a number of consultants to complete the revision process. Those consultants include:

- The Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) was contracted to take the lead on the assessment section of the plan. Phil Roger was CRITFC's lead person for the assessment revisions.
- Mobrand Biometrics was utilized for EDT modeling.
- Lyn Craig from Provisions was project facilitator and performed the community outreach function.
- Rick Barnes and Jay Walters from Barnes & Associates, Inc. coordinated the organization and assembly of the revised plan. They also provided technical writing services for the revision process.
- Errol Claire with Canyon Mountain Technical Services provided local fisheries biologist expertise.
- Barbara Taylor provided assistance with editing.
- Various local stakeholders such as watershed councils and soil and water conservation districts were contracted to provide assistance for this effort.

Although there were numerous consultants involved in the process, a great deal of the work on the revision was completed by the members of the coordination team. In addition, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon also contributed valuable input into the revision process. They played a key role in evaluating fifth field watersheds (HUC5s) to identify strategies and establish local needs for habitat improvements.

The John Day Subbasin Coordination Team met frequently between October 2004 and March 2005 to further develop and revise the assessment and management plan sections of the subbasin plan. Team meetings were held at Spray, Fossil, Monument, and John Day. Team members kept their respective boards of directors and other local stakeholders informed during the revision process. The board of directors of CBMRC&D was also kept updated regarding the plan's revision process. All meetings were open to the public and meeting notes were sent directly to all watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, and involved state and federal agencies.

Deliverable Items for the Revision Process

The following is a list of deliverables established for the plan revision process.

Assessment

1. Review, revise, and update EDT and QHA ratings as necessary to evaluate life stages for steelhead, chinook, and bull trout focal species, including modification of data for analysis.
2. An evaluation of the biological performance of the steelhead, chinook, and bull trout populations relative to the environment.
3. An evaluation of the health of the overall ecosystem.
4. An analysis of the potential conflicts and compatibilities between individual focal species and ecological processes.
5. A determination of key factors that impede key focal species from reaching optimal ecological function and biological performance.

Inventory

6. An updated gap analysis comparing existing plans, projects, and programs with the assessment.

Management Plan

7. Biological objectives for the key focal species.
8. A prioritization of limiting factors that tie HUC5s to species populations.
9. A list of strategies for each HUC5 that address the limiting factors identified in the assessment and existing draft plan.
10. A prioritization or a prioritization framework to select projects for addressing the strategies.
11. A supplement to the management plan that includes items 7-10 above.
12. A response to review comments to incorporate into the final documents.
13. A synthesis of the items addressed above into the draft subbasin plan document.

Brief Description of Changes from Original Draft to Revised Draft

Section 1, Executive Summary. This section was revised for consistency with the revised draft and to include the revision process.

Section 2, Introduction.

Section 2.4, Overall Approach to the Planning Activity. This section was revised to add the approach used for the revision process.

Section 2.5, Process and Schedule for Revising/Updating the Plan. This section was updated.

Section 3, Subbasin Assessment.

Section 3.1, General Overview. Minor clarifications were made and some detail added throughout the overview section.

Section 3.2, Focal Species Characterization and Status. There were major changes to the aquatic portions of this section, including:

- Addition of new “Section 3.2.3, Model Methods – EDT and QHA” to summarize the EDT and QHA models, address the modifications to the model for the John Day Subbasin, and summarize the process used to produce model outputs.
- Updated Section 3.2.4 assessments of these aquatic focal species: summer steelhead, spring chinook, and bull trout. The revised assessments include population assessment results and the identification of limiting factors from model outputs as well as coordination team analysis of limiting factors.

Section 3.3, Out-of-Subbasin Effects. This section was completely re-written, primarily to address the use and limitations of smolt-to-adult ratios (SAR) used in EDT outputs for the John Day Subbasin.

Section 3.5.1, Aquatic Limiting Factors. The contents of this section were removed, with the updated limiting factors placed within each species assessment in Section 3.2.4.

Section 3.6, Working Hypotheses. This section was removed from the assessment and placed in the management plan as Section 5.2.1.

More comprehensive runs of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) model were utilized for the revision process in order to produce quantitative measures of the potential impacts of environmental factors on the abundance and productivity of the anadromous focal species in the John Day Subbasin. To complete the EDT analysis, streams in the John Day Subbasin were broken into 1,264 individual reaches. The original draft utilized EDT ratings on only 70% of these streams. For the revision, 1,158 of the subbasin’s streams (92%) were used in the EDT model runs for the analysis of spring chinook and summer steelhead. The 106 reaches not rated using EDT is habitat currently available only to resident species and is located primarily above natural and human-made barriers. EDT was also used to examine the Properly Functioning Condition scenario (PFC) and its potential impact on fish populations.

The Qualitative Habitat Assessment (QHA) modeling tool was used for the revision to assess bull trout habitat in the subbasin. There was no QHA modeling done for the first draft. For QHA modeling, a reach system consisting of 61 reaches was developed by the John Day fisheries technical team. The reach system encompassed all streams that bull trout presently

inhabit, or are believed to formerly inhabit. The QHA model determined the attributes most important in each geographic area in terms of limiting bull trout productions. The QHA for bull trout provided a ranking of stream reaches for both habitat protection and habitat restoration.

Section 4, Inventory of Existing Activities.

Section 4.5, Gap Assessment of Existing Protections, Plans, Programs and Projects. A number of additional gaps were identified and included in the revision. The previous gap addressing the need for juniper control studies was deleted.

Section 5, Management Plan.

Section 5.2.1, Working Hypotheses. This section was revised and moved to the management plan from the assessment section of the original draft.

5.2.2, Aquatic Species. Based on the results of the assessment and inventory, teams of resource managers, technical experts, and stakeholders throughout the subbasin developed biological objectives, habitat objectives, and restoration strategies and priorities, located in Sections 5.2.2.2, 5.2.2.3, and 5.2.2.4. Further, the coordination team identified 10 broad restoration strategies and 42 specific types of actions that make up these strategies. These strategies and actions are described in detail in 5.2.2.4.

Three technical teams met to establish restoration priorities within three geographic areas of the John Day Subbasin. These geographic areas are:

- Lower and Middle John Day River (below Kimberly)
- Middle Fork and North Fork John Day River
- Upper Mainstem and South Fork John Day River

Each team set priorities within each HUC5 for restoration strategies and established a restoration priority ranking between HUC5s.

EDT restoration and protection rankings provided the basis for prioritization between HUC5s. The technical teams revised the rankings based on local expertise and professional opinion. The largest general difference was EDT gave high priorities to HUC5s that contained mainstem reaches. While these HUC5s are of high importance to both the local and upstream spawning populations, the teams felt that restoration work in tributary streams would be the most cost-effective strategy to achieve mainstem improvements. Therefore, the team tended to rank HUC5s with large tributaries as higher priorities for restoration. Also, HUC5s that were ranked highly for protection by EDT tend to be limited in their restoration opportunities by their relatively intact habitat.

The restoration priority rankings established by the local technical teams were reviewed by the John Day Subbasin Coordination Team and presented to watershed councils and soil and water conservation districts for comment at regularly scheduled meetings.

The prioritization framework included in the revised plan will be used to assess proposed projects to ensure that widespread restoration efforts are done in the most efficient manner. The John Day Subbasin is a large watershed with widespread fish habitat and diverse stressors. The wide dispersal of focal species throughout the area and the need to address widespread changes

in habitat make prioritizing specific actions challenging. Fisheries project proposals will be evaluated based on three sets of criteria that address 1) the benefits to focal species, 2) technical soundness, and 3) socio-economic appropriateness.

Section 5.4 Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation. This section was completely re-written and now addresses specific needs in the areas of research, monitoring, and adaptive management.

Appendix. There were many additions made to the appendix since the original draft. Appendices F and H through W are new to the revised draft. These new appendices include, among others:

- EDT and QHA model attributes and stream reaches used as model inputs
- EDT modeling process modification notes
- QHA ratings for bull trout under current and reference conditions
- EDT baseline and diagnostic reports for chinook and steelhead

Appendices G through K – the aquatic assessment syntheses for each of the five John Day Subbasin steelhead populations – were deleted from the revised plan appendix. These syntheses were replaced by EDT model outputs.

In the development of the revised draft, the comments from the Independent Scientific Advisory Board as well as the numerous comments received from the many stakeholders involved in the process were considered and incorporated as appropriate. It is recognized that the NWPCC will seek public comment on the revised draft.