

**Comparison of Outcomes
Between the 2000 and 2004 FCRPS Biological Opinions (BiOp) & Updated Proposed Action (UPA)
November 30, 2004**

Note: This document summarizes major differences between the 2000 BiOp and the 2004 BiOp/UPA. It does not reflect the technical changes and numerous responses to comments in the final documents. For further details, please see the final documents and the Response to Comments memorandum posted at www.salmonrecovery.gov

Component	2000 BiOp	Final 2004 BiOp/ UPA
Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action avoids jeopardizing listed species or destroying or adversely modifying critical habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action avoids jeopardizing listed species or destroying or adversely modifying critical habitat
Jeopardy Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavoidable Effects of dams not analyzed as part of environmental baseline (included in proposed action) Emphasis on population trends (lambda) Identified ESU survival gaps for all actions, not just the FCRPS Based on data from 1980s –1997 Proposed hydro actions only, including operations and configuration actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavoidable Effects of dams analyzed as part of environmental baseline, not included in proposed action Analyzed effect of action on viability criteria – abundance, productivity, spatial distribution & diversity Identifies ESU specific survival reductions caused by the FCRPS Based on data through 2003 Updated proposed actions including hydro operations, configuration and ESU-specific non-hydro actions
Jeopardy Standard Interpretation Note: These are statutory/regulatory standards and would not change, except for critical habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a high likelihood of survival and moderate to high likelihood of recovery, given the proposed action and other actions expected to occur? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there an appreciable reduction in the likelihood of survival and recovery associated with the proposed action Does the proposed action diminish the value of critical habitat for survival or recovery? Consistent with most biological opinions & ESA

**Comparison of Outcomes
Between the 2000 and 2004 FCRPS Biological Opinions (BiOp) & Updated Proposed Action (UPA)
November 30, 2004**

Component	2000 BiOp	Final 2004 BiOp/ UPA
Jeopardy Determination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeopardy for certain stocks with Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (199 actions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No jeopardy for 13 ESUs based on an updated proposed action focused on lifestage needs of specific ESUs • No destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat
Performance Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on survival of adult and juvenile salmon through hydrosystem and population standards (for all actions, including those outside of FCRPS). • Performance standards set by NOAA Fisheries as part of RPA. • Flexibility to adjust annual hydro operations so long as changes represent equal or better benefits for listed species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance standards set by Action Agencies in UPA • Adult survival performance standard • Updated juvenile survival standards • Non-hydro performance measures • Flexibility to adjust annual hydro operations so long as changes represent equal or better benefits for affected ESUs
Progress Reports and Check-Ins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual 1 and 5 year implementation plans • Annual progress reports • 3, 5 and 8 -year check-ins (2003,2005 and 2008) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic implementation plans • Annual progress reports • 3 and 6 year comprehensive evaluations (2007 and 2010)
COE, BPA & BOR Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to NOAA Fisheries' BiOp's Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) list of 199 "All-H" actions • Details addressed in annual implementation plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-hydro offsets described in Updated Proposed Action (UPA) • ESU specific actions and performance measures addressing NOAA identified limiting factors • Project level details in future implementation plans, including changes made through adaptive management
Juvenile Fish Passage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Configuration changes at hydro projects to improve passage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced with commitments to surface bypass improvements such as spillway weirs (fish slides) at Columbia and Snake River dams

Comparison of Outcomes
Between the 2000 and 2004 FCRPS Biological Opinions (BiOp) & Updated Proposed Action (UPA)
November 30, 2004

Component	2000 BiOp	Final 2004 BiOp/ UPA
Hydro Operations for Juvenile Fish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on spring and summer spill and flow targets by volume • Subject to adaptive management • Includes requirement for preliminary studies to remove four Lower Snake River dams if other standards not met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base operations continue • Increase spill in April • Modification through annual planning process • No provisions to study dam removal
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect & transport at four projects • Spread the risk (transport vs. in-river) in spring • Max transport in summer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same, but decreased transport in April • Future study of spill vs. transport after RSWs installed
Predator Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base pikeminnow management program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued base and enhanced pikeminnow management program • New Caspian tern management program
Tributary Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing passage barriers improve in-stream flows; riparian habitat and water quality in priority subbasins • Few performance metrics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on upper Columbia tributaries and on factors limiting viability for ESUs with greatest survival needs • ESU specific performance goals at 3 and 6 years • ESU specific tributary habitat conservation measures in the Lemhi, Upper Salmon, Little Salmon, Upper John Day, Middle Fork John Day, North Fork John Day, and Okanogan subbasins
Estuary Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programmatic approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific projects targeting ocean-type ESUs especially Snake River fall Chinook • Specific performance goals

**Comparison of Outcomes
Between the 2000 and 2004 FCRPS Biological Opinions (BiOp) & Updated Proposed Action (UPA)
November 30, 2004**

Component	2000 BiOp	Final 2004 BiOp/ UPA
Hatchery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programmatic approach through HGMPs • Safety net programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HGMPS mostly complete • Continue safety net programs for SR Sockeye, SR Spring/Summer Chinook, MCR Steelhead, LCR Steelhead, and CR Chum • New smolt production for SR Sockeye • Lower Granite Dam adult trap improvements to benefit SR Fall Chinook
Harvest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General provisions for assistance to improve survival to spawning grounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation measures as opportunity might arise for survival improvements
Research, Monitoring and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Called for future development – not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five part plan in UPA • Informs adaptive management