

Chapter: 6

State(s): Oregon

Recovery Unit Name: Hood River

Region 1

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Portland, Oregon

DISCLAIMER

Recovery plans delineate reasonable actions that are believed necessary to recover and protect listed species. Recovery plans are prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and, in this case, with the assistance of recovery unit teams, State and Tribal agencies, and others. Objectives will be attained and any necessary funds made available subject to budgetary and other constraints affecting the parties involved, as well as the need to address other priorities. Recovery plans do not necessarily represent the views nor the official positions or approval of any individuals or agencies involved in plan formulation, other than the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Recovery plans represent the official position of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service *only* after they have been signed by the Director or Regional Director as *approved*. Approved recovery plans are subject to modification as dictated by new findings, changes in species status, and the completion of recovery tasks.

Literature Citation: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Chapter 6, Hood River Recovery Unit, Oregon. 66 p. *In*: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Bull Trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) Draft Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Hood River Recovery Unit Team includes technical experts from Oregon familiar with the Hood River Basin. A bull trout technical working group made up of area biologists was organized in the early 1990's to coordinate survey, monitoring, and restoration activities in the Hood River Basin. Group membership has varied throughout the meetings, and has expanded to include other resource professionals and interested parties. The team continued their activities after bull trout were formally listed under the Endangered Species Act (1998), and in addition to gathering new information, has lent their technical expertise to developing this recovery unit plan for bull trout.

The following individuals contributed to the development of the Hood River Recovery Unit chapter:

Dave Anderson, Oregon State Police
Gary Asbridge, U.S. Forest Service
Brian Barr, PacifiCorp
Chris Brun, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
Holly Coccoli, Hood River Watershed Group
Brian Connors, Middle Fork Irrigation District
Tim Cummings, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Chuti Fiedler, U.S. Forest Service
Rod French, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Steve Hansen, Longview Fibre Company
Mary Hanson, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Stephanie Hart, U.S. Forest Service
Jeff Hunt, Hood River County Planning Department
Brian Lampman, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
Richard Larson, Hood River Soil and Water Conservation District
Joe McCanna
Dan Miller, Inter-fluve Inc.
Joe Moreau, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Darcy Morgan, U.S. Forest Service
Dave Nolte, Trout Unlimited

Linda Prendergast, PacifiCorp

Steve Pribyl, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Ron Rhew, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Melissa Ringo, National Marine Fisheries Service

Bill Stanley, Middle Fork Irrigation District Anne Saxby, Hood River Soil and
Water Conservation District

Scott Woltering, U.S. Forest Service

Additional comments were provided by:

Cat Brown, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Kathryn Kostow, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

HOOD RIVER RECOVERY UNIT CHAPTER OF THE BULL TROUT RECOVERY PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CURRENT SPECIES STATUS

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued a final rule listing the Columbia River distinct population segment of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act on June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31647). The Hood River Recovery Unit includes the Hood River and Sandy River basins. The Hood and Sandy River basins are located wholly in Oregon. The Hood River drains an area of approximately 912 square kilometers (352 square miles) and is approximately 77.5 kilometers (48 miles) from its headwaters to the confluence with the Columbia River, 272 kilometers (169 miles) from the mouth of the Columbia River at the Pacific Ocean. Hood River enters the Columbia River 35 kilometers (22 miles) upstream of the Bonneville Dam.

The Hood River Recovery Unit Team identified one core area, the Hood River and its tributaries, containing two local populations (Clear Branch and Hood River local populations). The Clear Branch local population is currently contained in Clear Branch Hood River, Laurance Lake, and Pinnacle Creek, and the Hood River local population is currently contained in Bear Creek, Coe Branch, Compass Creek, Eliot Branch, the mainstem Hood River, and Tony Creek. Although bull trout have been sighted in East Fork Hood River tributaries and in the West Fork of Hood River, insufficient information exists at present to define local populations there. They are considered potential local populations, and establishing secure local populations utilizing these two major tributaries is essential for full recovery to occur. The Sandy River contains core habitat but additional research on bull trout use of the Sandy River is needed.

HABITAT REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITING FACTORS

A detailed discussion of bull trout biology and habitat requirements is provided in Chapter 1 of this recovery plan. The limiting factors discussed here are specific to the Hood River recovery unit chapter.

Within the Hood River Recovery Unit, historical and current land use activities have impacted bull trout local populations. Bull trout in the Hood River Recovery Unit are primarily threatened by isolation from dams and seasonally impaired water quality, and impacts to stream systems from past and ongoing forest management and agricultural activities. Bull trout above Laurance Lake in the Clear Branch of Hood River are considered to be at risk of a random extinction event due to low numbers, isolation, and restriction to a single known spawning area (USFWS 1998).

RECOVERY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of the bull trout recovery plan is to **ensure the long-term persistence of self-sustaining, complex interacting groups of bull trout distributed throughout the species' native range, so that the species can be delisted**. To achieve this goal the following objectives have been identified for bull trout in the Hood River Recovery Unit:

- ▶ Maintain the current bull trout distribution within the core area and re-establish bull trout in previously occupied areas within the Hood River Recovery Unit.
- ▶ Maintain stable or increasing trends in bull trout abundance in the Hood River Recovery Unit.
- ▶ Restore and maintain suitable habitat conditions for all bull trout life history stages and strategies.
- ▶ Conserve bull trout genetic diversity and provide opportunity for genetic exchange.

RECOVERY CRITERIA

Recovery criteria for the Hood River Recovery Unit reflect the stated objectives, evaluation of population status, and recovery actions necessary to achieve the overall goal.

1. **Distribution criteria will be met when bull trout are distributed among three or more local populations, including the existing Clear Branch and Hood River local populations in the Hood River Core Area.** In a recovered condition the Hood River Core Area will include up to four local populations. In addition to the two existing local populations (Clear Branch and Hood River), recovery actions may lead to defined spawning and rearing areas in the West Fork and possibly in the East Fork of Hood River. Additional population studies and a better understanding of bull trout fidelity to their natal streams is needed to better define local populations in the recovery unit. The extent of bull trout use of the Sandy River and mainstem Columbia River is a primary research need.
2. **Abundance criteria will be met when the estimated abundance of adult bull trout is at least 500 individuals distributed within the Hood River Recovery Unit.** Recovered abundance was derived using the professional judgement of the Recovery Unit Team and estimation of productive capacity of identified local populations. This abundance level would represent an intermediate level of threat. These goals may be refined as more information becomes available, through monitoring and research, including identified distribution and population criteria for the Sandy River.
3. **Trend criteria will be met when adult bull trout exhibit a stable or increasing trend for at least 2 generations at or above the recovered abundance level within the recovery unit.** Achievement of this recovery criterion will be based on a minimum of 10 years of monitoring data, or approximately two bull trout generations. The development of a standardized monitoring and evaluation program that would accurately describe trends in bull trout abundance is identified as a priority research

need. As part of the overall recovery effort, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will take the lead in addressing this research need by forming a multi-agency technical team to develop protocols to evaluate trends in bull trout populations.

4. **Connectivity criteria will be met when passage barriers to bull trout have been addressed at Powerdale Dam, Clear Branch Dam, Coe Diversion, Eliot Diversion, Farmers Diversion and Tony Creek Diversion, and seasonal water quality barriers have been addressed in the East and West Forks of Hood River.** Passage barriers must be addressed in the Hood River Core Area to ensure opportunities for connectivity within and among local populations. This also includes providing adequate diversion screening.

ACTIONS NEEDED

Recovery for bull trout will entail reducing threats to the long-term persistence of populations and their habitats, ensuring the security of multiple interacting groups of bull trout, and providing habitat conditions and access that allows for the expression of various life-history forms. Seven categories of actions needed are discussed in Chapter 1; tasks specific to this recovery unit are provided in this chapter.

ESTIMATED COST OF RECOVERY

Total estimated cost for bull trout recovery in the Hood River Recovery Unit is estimated at about \$16 million spread over a 25-year recovery period. Total costs include estimates of expenditures by local, Tribal, State, and Federal governments and by private business and individuals. These costs are attributed to bull trout conservation but other aquatic species will also benefit. Cost estimates are not provided for tasks which are normal agency responsibilities under existing authorities.

ESTIMATED DATE OF RECOVERY

Time required to achieve recovery depends on bull trout status, factors affecting bull trout, implementation and effectiveness of recovery tasks, and responses to recovery actions. It may be 3 to 5 bull trout generations (15 to 25 years), or possibly longer, before significant reductions can be made in the identified threats to the species and bull trout can be considered eligible for delisting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
Recovery Unit Designation	1
Geographic Description	3
DISTRIBUTION AND ABUNDANCE	7
Status of Bull Trout at the Time of Listing	7
Current Distribution and Abundance	8
REASONS FOR DECLINE	14
Dams	14
Forestry Management Practices	16
Livestock Grazing	17
Agricultural Practices	18
Transportation Networks	20
Mining	21
Residential Development and Urbanization	22
Fisheries Management	22
Isolation and Habitat Fragmentation	23
ONGOING RECOVERY UNIT CONSERVATION MEASURES	25

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER CONSERVATION EFFORTS	27
State of Oregon	27
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation	28
Local Planning Efforts	29
Northwest Power Planning Council’s Subbasin Planning	29
STRATEGY FOR RECOVERY	31
Recovery Goals and Objectives	31
Recovery Criteria	36
Research Needs	39
ACTIONS NEEDED	41
Recovery Measures Narrative	41
IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	52
REFERENCES CITED	62
APPENDIX A: List of Chapters	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of bull trout trapped at the Powerdale Dam upstream fish trap, Hood River County Oregon, from 1992 to 2001.	11
Table 2. Observed adult and juvenile bull trout numbers in several survey reaches in the Clear Branch Hood River above Laurance Lake, Hood River County, Oregon	13

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Bull trout recovery units in the United States. The Hood River Recovery Unit is highlighted.	2
Figure 2. Map of the Hood River Bull Trout Recovery Unit, Hood River County, Oregon, with the core area delineated.	3
Figure 3. Cumulative frequency of bull trout trapped in the upstream fish trap at the Powerdale Dam, Hood River County, Oregon.	11

INTRODUCTION

Recovery Unit Designation

The Hood River Recovery Unit is one of 22 recovery units designated for bull trout in the Columbia River Distinct Population Segment (Figure 1). Designation of the Hood River Recovery Unit is based in part on the designation of bull trout in the Hood River Basin as a Gene Conservation Group by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW 1995). The delineation of the Gene Conservation Group is supported by the genetic analysis conducted by Spruell and Allendorf (1997). There is one core area designated for the Hood River Recovery Unit, the Hood River Core Area (Figure 2). The Hood River Recovery Unit was further defined to include the Sandy River Basin as core habitat. Bull trout have only recently been discovered in the Sandy River, which is adjacent to the Hood River Basin, and there is insufficient information at present to determine the source of bull trout observed in the Sandy River, or define any local populations and their respective core areas.

The northwestern limit of the Hood River Recovery Unit extends to Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River. However, records of bull trout in the Bonneville reservoir, at Bonneville Dam, and immediately downstream of the dam indicate the possibility that bull trout from Hood River may be foraging and/or overwintering in the Columbia River. Further, three records of bull trout in the Sandy River indicate additional possibilities: (1) the Sandy River watershed supports a population of bull trout; or (2) bull trout foraging and/or overwintering in the Columbia River, possibly from the Hood River population, may occasionally be entering the Sandy River or other tributaries downstream of the Hood River Recovery Unit boundaries.

Figure 1. Bull trout recovery units in the United States. The Hood River Recovery Unit is highlighted.





Figure 2. Map of the Hood River Bull Trout Recovery Unit, Hood River County, Oregon, with the core area delineated.



Geographic Description

Three major tributaries of the Hood River Basin, the East, Middle, and West Forks, originate on the eastern slopes of Mt. Hood, flow generally north, and converge to form the mainstem Hood River about 19.3 kilometers (12 miles) from the confluence with the Columbia River. The basin is defined by the Cascade mountain range to the west, the Sandy and White River drainages to the south, the Columbia River to the north, and Surveyor’s Ridge to the east (Mosier, Mill, Threemile, Rock, and Fifteenmile Creek drainages). Basin elevations range from over 3,353 meters (11,000 feet) to about 23 meters (74 feet) at the confluence with the Columbia River. Of the approximately 1248 square kilometers (482 square miles) in the subbasin, about 881 square kilometers (340 square miles) are drained by the Hood River and its tributaries (Hood River Watershed Group (HRWG) 1999, Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) 2000); the remaining 367 square kilometers (142 square miles) are watershed areas for tributary streams that drain directly into the Columbia River.

The Hood River Basin lies entirely within Hood River County, Oregon, with a 1999 population of about 19,000 people. Agriculture, tourism, and forestry are the primary industries. Approximately half of the land base is managed by the U.S. Forest Service, 6,880 hectares (17,000 acres) are in agricultural production, and over 20,235 hectares (50,000 acres) are privately-owned industrial forest lands (HRWG 1999, NWPPC 2000).

The Sandy River originates at an elevation of about 1,890 meters (6,200 feet) on the western and southwestern slopes of Mt. Hood and flows northwest approximately 89 kilometers (55 miles) to the confluence with the Columbia River. Its origins are in Clackamas County, Oregon, and it enters the Columbia River near the city of Troutdale in Multnomah County, Oregon. The Sandy River and associated tributaries drain an area of approximately 1316 square kilometers (508 square miles) (ODFW 1997).

The Hood River Basin is in a transition area between the moist marine flow characterizing the western slopes of the Cascades and the drier eastern slopes of the Cascades with a climate that is more continental in nature. Precipitation ranges from about 356 centimeters (140 inches) in the western portion of the watershed to about 76 centimeters (30 inches) on the eastern end. Much of this precipitation falls in the form of snow, particularly at higher elevations. Rain-on-snow events, with associated heavy runoffs, are not uncommon (HRWG 1999, NWPPC 2000).

The Sandy River basin lies to the west of the Cascade Mountain crest. Accordingly, the climate reflects the typical, moist maritime climate of western Oregon. Wet winters and snowfall amounts of up to 762 centimeters (300 inches) annually at the higher elevations of the western aspect of Mt. Hood are common. Snow and glacial melt influences water temperatures throughout the summer (ODFW 1997).

The Hood River Basin is a glacially influenced area of steep terrain, situated primarily on a volcanic bedrock formation of basalt and basaltic andesite. Glaciation and flooding have resulted in the formation of terraces of clay, silt, sand, and gravel at lower elevations (HRWG 1999, NWPPC 2000).

Similar to the Hood River, the Sandy River and its tributaries are influenced by glacial melt, steep terrain, and associated high stream gradients in the upper watershed. However, substrates in the upper reaches of the watershed are composed of loose alluvial rock, therefore high flows resulting from rain-on-snow events and glacial melt may affect channel configuration to a much greater degree than in the Hood River watershed. Below the confluence with the tributary Zigzag River the gradient is gradually more moderate until the confluence with the Columbia River (ODFW 1997).

All three tributaries to the mainstem Hood River receive some degree of glacial melt from Mt. Hood. The result is a steady supply of suspended sediment and bedload into the three forks and mainstem river, which is supplemented by periodic landslides and flooding, often prompted by rain-on-snow events. Many stream channels are moderate to high gradient in the upper reaches of the watershed, with generally decreasing gradients in the lower valleys. Stream channel substrates are typically boulder/rubble; channels are generally confined in narrow valleys (HRWG 1999, NWPPC 2000). The hydrology of the lower mainstem river is influenced by the Powerdale Diversion Dam and an associated water conveyance system running parallel to the river downstream to the Powerdale Powerhouse. A 4.8 kilometer (3- mile) reach of the river between river kilometer 2.4 and river kilometer 7.2 experiences reduced flows because of this diversion. Existing instream minimum flow requirements vary between 2.8 and 7.6 cubic meters per second (100 and 270 cubic feet per second). Proposed instream flow requirements associated with a new Federal Energy Regulatory Commission license vary between 4.0 and 7.1 cubic meters per second (140 and 250 cubic feet per second) (PacifiCorp 1998). Given that the license applicant has a 14.2 cubic meters per second (500 cubic feet per second) water right, and based on mean monthly flows from 1965 to 1993 (PacifiCorp 1998), the result is that under current operations approximately 29-82 percent of the instream flows are diverted to the water conveyance system, depending on the time of year. While the proposed instream minimum flows may represent an improvement relative to aquatic resources, reduced flows in general have the potential to negatively affect biological productivity, hydrological function, and other factors impacting aquatic resources (Ligon *et al.* 1995, Collier *et al.* 1997, Andrews 1986 *in* Montana Bull Trout Scientific Group 1998).

As indicated above, high flows resulting from rain-on-snow events and glacial melt may affect channel configuration in the upper reaches of the Sandy River watershed because of an erosion-prone substrate (loose alluvial rock). Below the confluence with the Zigzag River the gradient is reduced and the substrate is a combination of boulders, cobbles, and gravel over a basalt and sandstone foundation (ODFW 1997).

Fisheries. Fish species native to the Hood River watershed include fall chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), summer and winter steelhead (*O. mykiss*), coastal cutthroat trout (*O. clarki*), rainbow trout (*O. mykiss*), coho salmon (*O. kisutch*), Pacific lamprey (*Lampetra tridentata*), mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*), sculpin (*Cottus sp.*), suckers (*Catostomus sp.*), northern pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*), and bull trout. Native runs of spring chinook salmon and coho salmon are considered to be extirpated. Species from other watersheds that have been stocked include spring chinook, summer and winter steelhead, coho salmon, coastal cutthroat trout, and rainbow trout. Nonnative species currently residing in the watershed include brown trout (*Salmo trutta*), brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*), and kokanee (*O. nerka*) (ODFW 1992, Busby *et al.* 1996, Nehlsen *et al.* 1991, USFS 1996a).

Steelhead, coho salmon, and spring chinook salmon are supplemented in the Sandy River watershed by hatchery production programs. Wild runs of these species, as well as native cutthroat and rainbow trout, whitefish, sculpin, and northern pikeminnow, also occupy the watershed. Nonnative introduced species include brook trout, shad (*Alosa sapidissima*), and carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) (ODFW 1997).

DISTRIBUTION AND ABUNDANCE

Status of Bull Trout at the Time of Listing

At the time of listing, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service identified two subpopulations of bull trout in the Hood River basin within the Middle Fork Hood River drainage: (1) Laurance Lake (upstream of Clear Branch Dam) and (2) Hood River (downstream of Clear Branch Dam and including tributaries). Historically, bull trout distribution included primarily the mainstem, Middle Fork and tributaries, and a short reach of the West Fork; and bull trout likely used the Columbia River for juvenile rearing and adult foraging (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Punchbowl Falls is suspected to be a natural barrier to fish migration in the West Fork of Hood River during low flows; at the time of listing, only one bull trout had been captured at this location (Pribyl *et al.* 1996; Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Resident and migratory life history forms were identified above and below the Clear Branch Dam, and the total number of mature fish were believed to be below 300 individuals basin-wide (Buchanan *et al.* 1997).

Snorkel surveys of the Laurance Lake subpopulation detected 50 to 301 total bull trout annually from 1992 through 1996, including juveniles (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Although upstream passage was recently provided by a trap at Clear Branch Dam, at the time of listing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service considered this subpopulation isolated until information was available on trap effectiveness; the trap has subsequently been found to be ineffective. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service considered this subpopulation at risk of stochastic extirpation due to its inability to be naturally reestablished, existence of a single spawning area, and low abundance.

Bull trout in the Middle Fork Hood River subpopulation are believed to spawn in Compass Creek and the Middle Fork Hood River (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Nineteen fish with fork length greater than 200 millimeters (7.9 inches) were collected during surveys of Compass Creek in 1995 (Buchanan *et al.* 1997).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did not consider the Sandy River as bull trout habitat at the time of listing. At that time, there were no recent or historical

accounts of bull trout occurring in the Sandy River. Since the listing, bull trout have been sighted three times in the Sandy River.

Current Distribution and Abundance

Information on bull trout distribution and abundance in the Hood River Basin is from a variety of sources, and includes a number of sampling methods. Trap information is available from the Powerdale Dam trap, a trap on the Punchbowl Falls fish ladder (which was discontinued following the 1964 flood), floating screw traps at several locations throughout the basin, and a trap at the base of Clear Branch Dam. Other information has come from individual observations and snorkel and electrofishing surveys (see, for example, Pribyl *et al.* 1996).

Current bull trout distribution in the Hood River Recovery Unit occurs in five major areas within the basin: the Hood River, the East and West Fork of Hood River, the Middle Fork Hood River, and the Clear Branch of Hood River. Currently, bull trout are consistently found in only three of these areas, the Hood River, the Middle Fork Hood River, and the Clear Branch of Hood River. Bull trout distribution in the East and West Forks of Hood River are based on isolated, infrequent sightings. Historical distribution is believed to approximate current distribution based on existing knowledge. A comprehensive population assessment is not available, but at present the total number of adult bull trout in the recovery unit is believed to be less than 300.

Hood River Core Area. This core area includes the local populations defined as Clear Branch and Hood River. The Clear Branch local population is located above Clear Branch Dam, and includes bull trout in Laurance Lake and Pinnacle Creek. Most, if not all, of the current spawning activity occurs in Clear Branch upstream of Laurance Lake. The Hood River local population includes Clear Branch downstream of the dam, Bear, Coe, Compass, Tony, and Eliot Creeks, West Fork of Hood River and potentially Evans Creek and the East Fork Hood River.

Although confirmation is lacking for the East Fork Hood River and the number of observations is limited for the West Fork of Hood River, bull trout would

not have been precluded from using these tributaries historically, at least on a seasonal basis. Based on professional opinion, bull trout are believed to have occurred in the East Fork historically (USFS 1996a.). Analyses of East Fork tributary streams and stream segments for suitable bull trout habitat is not available at present. Bull trout are known from the West Fork of Hood River from two sightings, and U.S. Forest Service (1996b) identifies streams with suitable bull trout habitat based on temperature observations. Based on existing information, use of East and West Fork mainstems and tributaries appears to be for foraging, migration, and overwintering. According to Buchanan *et al.* (1997), William Stanley from the Middle Fork Irrigation District observed a bull trout in Evans Creek, a tributary to the East Fork Hood River, in the early 1990's. Subsequent survey of the area by a fisheries biologist did not yield any further detections (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Small numbers of additional sightings are documented for the East Fork tributaries on Evans Creek and at the mouth of Wisheart Creek, again attributed to William Stanley (USFS 1996a). Bull trout in Evans Creek and the East Fork Hood River may be traveling through the irrigation canal which runs from Eliot Branch (a tributary to the Middle Fork Hood River known to contain bull trout) (USFS 1996a), or they may be attracted to Evans Creek from downstream, due to the addition of Eliot Branch water.

There are two records of bull trout occurrence in the West Fork of Hood River. The earliest available documentation is from 1963 of one fish in the trap at Punchbowl Falls fish ladder (USFS 1996b, Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Another bull trout was captured at the mouth of Lake Branch, a tributary to the West Fork of Hood River, in the fall of 1997 by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The mainstem Hood River is formed by the confluence of the Middle Fork and the East Fork. At present, this section of river is believed to be used primarily for foraging, migration, and overwintering. Migrations include journeys into the Columbia River of unknown extent, however, at least two bull trout tagged at the Powerdale Dam trap have been recovered in 1994 and 2000 at or near Drano Lake on the opposite side of the Columbia River in Washington State (Pribyl *et al.* 1996; ODFW, *in litt.* 2001) and another tagged in 1994 was captured in 1995, 11 kilometers downstream of the confluence of the Hood and Columbia Rivers

(Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Overwintering in the mainstem Hood River is suspected because untagged adult bull trout have been observed at several locations within the Hood River Basin (USFS 1996a) indicating they have not crossed the Powerdale Dam and upstream trap. There are no known spawning locations on the mainstem Hood River, and primary information on bull trout use of the mainstem is the trap data from Powerdale Dam.

Prior to 1992, trap counts at Powerdale Dam were not consistent due to counting at only one of the two ladders, or the ladders themselves being inoperable (USFS 1996a). Numbers of bull trout counted during this period range from a high of 12 in 1967, to a low of zero in 1970, and average five fish annually over the nine-year period (USFS 1996a). Bull trout have been trapped at the Powerdale Dam fish trap continuously since 1992 (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Numbers trapped range from a high of 28 fish in 1999 to 2 fish in 1993. Table 1 below provides the number of bull trout trapped annually from 1992 to 2001.


As shown in Figure 3, bull trout migrate upstream in the Hood River from the Columbia River through the trap from early May to early October. The primary movement period appears to be from mid-May to mid-July.

Bull trout in the Middle Fork Hood River use the mainstem Hood River primarily for foraging, migration, and overwintering. Spawning and likely most rearing occurs in tributary streams. Two redds were detected in Bear Creek in 1999 by personnel from the U.S. Forest Service (USFS, *in litt.* 1999). The location of these redds, were located approximately 100 meters upstream of the confluence with the Middle Fork, this suggests that rearing bull trout will occur in

Table 1. Number of bull trout trapped at the Powerdale Dam upstream fish trap, Hood River County Oregon, from 1992 to 2001.

Trap Year	Number Trapped
1992	6
1993	2
1994	11
1995	11
1996	18
1997	6
1998	18
1999	28
2000	27
2001	12

Figure 3. Cumulative frequency of bull trout trapped in the upstream fish trap at the Powerdale Dam, Hood River County, Oregon.



vicinity, including the Middle Fork Hood River, which was later verified by surveys (USFS, *in litt.* 1999). A bull trout was radio tracked into Tony Creek, a Middle Fork tributary in 1998 (USFS, *in litt.* 1999). Rearing bull trout were observed in 1995 in Coe Branch and Compass Creeks by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife personnel (Buchanan *et al.* 1997), and one redd was found in Coe Branch in 1999 (USFS, *in litt.* 1999). At the Coe Branch diversion, six adult bull trout were passed manually above the diversion in 1995 (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). Bull trout have also been observed in Eliot Branch, even though swift water conditions inhibit adequate sampling above a diversion located in this reach (USFS, *in litt.* 1999). No population estimates are available for the Middle Fork Hood River and tributaries. Surveys in 1995 found 19 bull trout in Compass Creek (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Snorkel surveys conducted in Compass Creek from 1995 through 1998 detected a high of 19 fish in 1995, two fish in 1996, zero fish in 1997 and one fish in 1998 (USFS, *in litt.* 1999).

Bull trout in the Clear Branch of Hood River occur primarily above the Clear Branch Dam. One redd was found on the lower Clear Branch (below the dam) in October 1999, the first since 1992. Above Clear Branch Dam, bull trout forage and overwinter in the reservoir and spawn in the tributaries (spawning suspected in Pinnacle Creek and known in Clear Branch above the reservoir). Table 2 provides the total number of juvenile and adult bull trout detected in snorkel surveys conducted in index reaches of Clear Branch above the reservoir, including 1999 data from a non-index survey. Bull trout observations in Pinnacle Creek include three juveniles and one adult from 1996 to 1998, one adult and one juvenile in 1999 (USFS, *in litt.* 1999), and four adults and two juveniles in 2001 (USFS, *in litt.* 2002).

Table 2. Observed adult and juvenile bull trout numbers in several survey reaches in the Clear Branch Hood River above Laurance Lake, Hood River County, Oregon (USFS, *in litt.* 2002; Pribyl *et al.* 1996). Night snorkel counts are indicated by an asterisk (*). In 1995, 2000, and 2001, both day and night snorkeling was conducted.

Year	Adults	Juveniles
1991 (partial survey)	>12	n/a
1992	21	61
1993	39	262
1994	8	42
1995	6	17 (55*)
1996	18	200*
1997	23	63*
1998	30	119*
1999 (index)	4	n/a
1999 (early count)	57	301
2000	14 (39*)	194*
2001	4 (34*)	185*

Sandy River Core Habitat. There have been three bull trout observations in the Sandy River. Anglers have caught and photographed two bull trout; one approximately 43 cm (17 inches) near the mouth of Gordon Creek in the vicinity of Oxbow County Park in November 1999 (NPPC 2000), and another approximately 51 cm (20 inches) between Oxbow and Dodge Parks on January 23, 2002. The third observation was by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife staff operating the trap at Marmot Dam, where they trapped and released a 46 cm (18 inch) fish upstream of Marmot Dam.

REASONS FOR DECLINE

At the time of listing, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service considered bull trout in the Hood River Basin to be threatened by isolation (from dams and seasonally impaired water quality) and impacts to stream systems from past and ongoing forest management and agricultural activities. Bull trout above Laurance Lake in the Clear Branch of Hood River were considered to be at risk of a random extinction event due to low numbers, isolation, and restriction to a single known spawning area (USFWS 1998). At the time of listing, there were no current or historical records of bull trout occurring in the Sandy River, so threats and factors for decline were not identified in the Sandy River basin.

Dams

Existing and abandoned dams contribute to reduced migration and isolation of bull trout in the Hood River basin and are believed to be a major limiting factor (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). According to the Hood River Working Group (HRWG 1999), the use of water to operate saw mills, and dam and mill pond construction began in 1861. The Hines Lumber Company Dam was constructed on the mainstem Hood River in the early 1860's, and was at minimum, a periodic barrier to fish migration until its removal in 1966 (Newton and Pribyl 1993, Pribyl *et al.* 1996, Buchanan *et al.* 1997, USFS 1996a, HRWG 1999). Water used for hydropower production is the largest non-consumptive use of water in the Hood River Basin, and the total volume of all legal water rights for out-of-stream uses is approximately 94 percent of the median natural stream flow at the mouth of the Hood River (HRWG 1999).

Powerdale Dam, on the mainstem Hood River, was constructed in 1909 (USFS 1996a). Although a fishway and upstream trap were installed during the original construction, they continue to be a migratory impediment by allowing only some fish passage to occur upstream (Newton and Pribyl 1993, Pribyl *et al.* 1996, USFS 1996a, HRWG 1999). The Powerdale Dam diversion is the largest in the Hood River basin and holds the largest water right, allowing PacifiCorps to divert up to 14.2 cubic meters per second (500 cubic feet per second), (HRWG 1999).

Water diverted for power production may, at times, occur in sufficient amounts to preclude fish passage in the lower 5.2 kilometers (3.2 miles) of stream channel between the powerhouse and dam (USFS 1996a). Additionally, greater spill volume from the project at the west bank may mask attraction flow to the fish ladder, encouraging fish away from the ladder entrance (HRWG 1999). The inadequately screened diversion channel entrains downstream migrating fish, potentially trapping them in the penstock (USFS 1996a). The bypass reach is also identified as exceeding Federal Clean Water Act Section 303(d) standards for pH and temperature (ODEQ 2001).

Clear Branch Dam, constructed in 1969 without fish passage, isolated bull trout above and below the dam. The resulting reservoir partially inundated bull trout spawning habitat, as well as possibly the most productive coho and steelhead spawning areas in the entire Middle Fork Hood River watershed (USFS 1996a). The dam isolates the upper 4.5 kilometers (2.75 miles) of the Clear Branch Hood River from the rest of the Hood River basin and isolates Pinnacle Creek in its entirety (USFS 1996a). An upstream fish trap was installed at the facility in 1997, allowing fish to be passed above the dam, but only one fish has been passed upstream in 1997, and the trap presently is not effective for capturing bull trout. The outlet on the dam may entrain bull trout into the pressurized pipe system due to inadequate screening (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). Clear Branch Dam also prevents natural movement of stream sediments, which is important to maintaining adequate spawning conditions in Clear Branch below the dam and the Middle Fork Hood River. The relatively warm impounded waters increase stream temperatures below the dam beyond those suitable for bull trout at certain times of the year (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). The Clear Branch of Hood River (from its mouth to Clear Branch Dam), and the Middle Fork Hood River (from its mouth to the Clear Branch confluence) are currently listed as violating Federal Clean Water Act section 303(d) standards for temperature (ODEQ 2001).

Cloudy (discolored) eyes have been noted occurring on bull trout captured at Powerdale Dam. One possibility is damage from gas supersaturation. Dissolved gas levels need to be evaluated at both dams to identify potential impacts, if any.

Forestry Management Practices

Approximately 50 percent of the Hood River Basin is managed by the U.S. Forest Service, and commercial forest operations are also a major land use on non-Federal lands within the basin (NWPPC 2000). Hood River County manages 30,000 acres as industrial forest and 22,000 acres of private lands are owned and managed by the Longview Fiber Company within the basin (HRLAC 2001). Intensive logging of the lower valley and gorge areas occurred in the early 1900's, both for lumber production and to clear land for agricultural production, primarily orchards, (USFS 1996a). Area streams were dammed to power sawmills, and mill ponds were created at several locations as early as 1861; Neal and Green Point Creeks, the mainstem Hood River, and lower East Fork Hood River were indicated as supporting this activity (HRLAC 2001). The most important fisheries issue identified by the U.S. Forest Service (1996a) in the watershed analysis for the Middle and East Forks of Hood River was the loss of large wood from streams, and the future large wood recruitment potential from the adjacent riparian areas.

In addition to the relatively permanent dams constructed to store and process trees into lumber, the practice of splash damming streams to transport trees to sale or processing points is described as being common within the Hood River in the early to mid-1900's (NWPPC 2000). This activity involved building a temporary dam to impound water, cutting the surrounding forest and skidding the trees into the impoundment, and then releasing the flow all at once to transport the trees downstream. The results to streams and riparian zones, as well as fish and any wildlife in the immediate area, were cataclysmic; the slurry of water and trees wiping out any obstacle in the path of the flood flow. Stream habitat and levels of large wood remain inadequate and have not recovered in many locations due to this practice (NWPPC 2000).

Forest harvesting on Federal lands increased during the period between 1950 and 1980, with the most extensive harvest and road building activity occurring in the Tony and Bear Creek areas within the Middle Fork Watershed (USFS 1996a). Another practice common with forest harvest until the early 1980's was the removal of large wood from streams (USFS 1996a) in a mistaken attempt to improve fish passage, which has led in part to the observed deficit of large wood in stream channels.

The Clear Branch of Hood River was heavily logged prior to construction of the Clear Branch Dam in 1969 (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Wildfire in the late 1800's followed by salvage logging from 1954 to 1957 in the Clear Branch drainage was responsible for removing much of the riparian vegetation along Clear Branch for the majority of its length, resulting in a deficiency of large wood in the Clear Branch (Pribyl *et al.* 1996), and delaying recruitment of large wood through natural processes.

The West Fork of Hood River has been destabilized in parts of the watershed due to elevated forest harvest rates and associated road building activity (HRWG 1999). The relatively high rate of debris torrents in the West Fork compared to other areas of the Mount Hood National Forest, are associated with clearcuts and roads (HRWG 1999). Large harvest tracts (2970 hectares, 7340 acres), and extensive fires from mill or logging fire ignitions accompanied railroad logging of the West Fork of Hood River in the early 1900's (USFS 1996b.).

Current management of National Forest lands within the Mount Hood National Forest is specified, in part, by the Northwest Forest Plan. This plan has set up land allocations that are protective of certain groups of species and habitat conditions, and established an aquatic conservation strategy that applies in addition to allocation-based standards and guidelines. If adequately implemented, this strategy should allow constant improvement of stream systems subject to the influence of management activities on the National Forest.

Livestock Grazing

Euro-American settlement of the Hood River Basin began in 1880, and included sheep and cattle grazing in the upper watersheds, in meadow and forested areas (USFS 1996a). The Hood River Local Advisory Committee (HRLAC 2001) indicates that grazing use by sheep and cattle was common on the upper slopes of the East Fork Hood River prior to 1900. Although sheep herding and cattle grazing were banned following establishment of the Cascade Range Forest Reserve in 1893, these activities continued until after 1900 (USFS 1996a). Currently in the Hood River Basin, 809 hectares (2,000 acres) are actively irrigated for pasture, with the majority of livestock operations occurring on farms less than 8 hectares (20 acres) in size (HRLAC 2001). While livestock grazing can cause serious damage to stream and riparian systems, the extent and location of livestock grazing activities are not sufficient to be considered a substantial threat to bull trout in the Hood River Basin. However, the Northwest Power Planning Council (2000) indicates that a proposal is being developed that includes funding the construction of 1.6 to 8.0 kilometers (1 to 5 miles) of fencing along the East Fork Hood River or its tributaries to prevent livestock from accessing the riparian zone, to help control agricultural pollution. Since the full extent of bull trout use of the East Fork is currently unknown, impact from livestock grazing in this area is currently not considered an issue. However, in the future it may be determined to have some effect on bull trout recovery if current or potential use of the East Fork Hood River is judged to be greater.

Agricultural Practices

As noted above in the section on Forest Management, one impact of agricultural systems in the Hood River Basin has been the loss of forest cover and its attendant values and functions such as stream shade, contributions of large wood to stream channels, bank stability, and attenuating landslides, debris flows, or glacial outbursts. (USFS 1996a). In addition to the loss of forest cover and streamside vegetation, many wetlands were drained and many streams were diverted as agriculture progressed up the valley (HRLAC 2001). The growth of the fruit industry may have been the largest factor altering natural vegetation patterns in

the lower Hood River Basin, with orchards replacing native forest and riparian vegetation (HRLAC 2001). According to the USFS (1996a, *citing* the Oregon State Game Commission 1963), two fish kills occurred in 1963 that were attributed to insecticide or herbicide use in Hood River Basin orchards. State and Federal water quality standards were exceeded in the spring of 1999 for the insecticides chlorpyrifos at Neal Creek and Indian Creek, and azinphos methyl at Neal Creek, Indian Creek, and the lower Hood River (NWPPC 2000). Herbicide, insecticide, and fungicide use in the Hood River Valley included the use of up to 43 different compounds in 1987 (USDA 1996a).

Five irrigation districts and one irrigation company operate in the Hood River Basin: East Fork, Mount Hood, Middle Fork, Dee Flat, and Farmers irrigation districts and the Aldridge Irrigation Company have combined water rights of 14.15 cubic meters per second (499.52 cubic feet per second) (HRWG 1999). In 1991, the total amount of irrigated area in the Hood River Valley was approximately 10,000 hectares (23,720 acres) (USFS 1996a). Several diversion structures may impede bull trout passage due to flow reduction below the diversions or potentially entrain juveniles or adults into the irrigation works due to inadequate screening (Pribyl *et al.* 1996, HRWG 1999). These structures include: the Eliot Branch (passage and screening) and Coe Branch (passage and screening) diversion structures operated by the Middle Fork Irrigation District, and the Farmers Irrigation District diversion (screening) on the mainstem Hood River (HRWG 1999). The Middle Fork Hood River, Indian Creek, Lake Branch Hood River, and Neal Creek are indicated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ 2001) as violating clean water standards for temperature, which is, in part, related to flow reduction due to water withdrawal for agriculture, and irrigation return flow (ODEQ 2001).

As described above, the area affected by agricultural activities is mainly along the lower (north) portions of the Hood River Basin. Degraded water quality from these activities at present does not occur in proximity to known spawning areas, but instead is more likely to influence existing migratory corridors, such as the Middle Fork and mainstem Hood River, and may impact bull trout recovery in the future. Direct impacts at present are attributed to inadequate screening at

diversion points, flow reduction and elevated water temperatures due to water withdrawal from stream channels, and a passage barrier at the Coe Creek diversion structure. Passage at the Eliot Branch diversion is a lower priority following the November 1999 glacial outburst, which filled a substantial portion of the stream channel with boulder-sized material that precludes bull trout use of most of Eliot Branch. Agricultural practices have altered Neal Creek through channelization and bank stabilization that confine the stream and isolate it from the floodplain (ODEQ 2001).

Transportation Networks

As with many stream systems throughout the Pacific Northwest and the country, extensive road networks may parallel existing stream channels exerting a variety of impacts, such as increased sediment loading from gravel or native surface roads, intercepting surface and shallow subsurface water flow and altering runoff patterns, and constraining stream channels from normal movement and adjustment patterns, among other impacts. Landscape analysis correlating road density to the status of four non-anadromous salmonids indicated that increasing road densities had a strong negative correlation with the status of the particular salmonid species (Lee *et al.* 1997). According to Lee *et al.* (1997) bull trout were generally found to be absent where geometric mean road densities were greater than or equal to 0.7 kilometers per square kilometer (1.13 miles per square mile) and the arithmetic mean road density of all upstream subwatersheds was 1.06 kilometers per square kilometer (1.71 miles per square mile).

The East Fork Hood River and Neal Creek have been severely affected by transportation corridor development in the Hood River Basin (ODEQ 2001). In particular State Highway 35 is considered a significant and chronic impact to the East Fork Hood River, and road construction and agricultural practices have altered Neal Creek through channelization and bank stabilization that confines the stream and isolates it from the floodplain (ODEQ 2001). The average road density of subwatersheds in the East Fork Hood River is 1.32 kilometers per square kilometer (2.14 miles per square mile), while Evans Creek has a road density of 2.99

kilometers per square kilometer (4.87 miles per square miles), well above thresholds noted for bull trout.

A Forest Service road paralleling Clear Branch of Hood River altered hydrology, constrained stream movement and contributed sediment to the Clear Branch, where bull trout spawn and rear (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). The road was blocked in 1995 and portions of it were obliterated (the upper 1.9 kilometers (1.2 miles) were obliterated in 1989, and another 0.8 kilometers (0.5 miles) were obliterated in 2000 and 2001) in an effort to reduce impacts to the stream system (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). Additionally, several culverts have been removed from Pinnacle Creek, one near the confluence with Laurance Lake (replaced with a bridge) and another further up Pinnacle Creek.

Roads and management-related debris flows account for the majority of fine sediment production in the West Fork of Hood River watershed (USFS 1996b). Road segments that pose chronic maintenance problems are identified for the West Fork of Hood River in U.S. Forest Service (1996b). The Oregon Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife compiled a list and maps of known fish passage problems in the Hood River Watershed, including culverts at road crossings (NWPPC 2000). According to the U.S. Forest Service (1996a) the Bear, Evans, Tony, and Trout Creeks, and the East Fork of Hood River have relatively high road densities that expand the drainage network by intercepting subsurface and overland flow, resulting in increased erosion and delivery of fine sediment to area streams. Many of the East Fork Hood River tributaries carry high loads of glacial sediments, potentially masking the effect of road-related sediment delivery (USFS 1996a).

Mining

Rock and gravel mining appear to be the main and possibly only sizeable mining activities in the Hood River Basin (USFS 1996a and b). This activity does not appear to be a significant limiting factor in bull trout survival or recovery at this time, although remediation of existing sites to reduce erosion would improve stream conditions at several locations (NWPPC 2000).

Residential Development and Urbanization

Hood River County covers the majority of the Hood River basin. Portions of Multnomah and Wasco Counties also occur within the basin. According to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ 2001), population within the county in 2000 was 20,411 people, and mainly dispersed from the small urban centers of Hood River, Cascade Locks, Odell, and Parkdale. (70 percent of the residents live outside these areas, which represent approximately four percent of the basin). Municipal and Industrial water demands are met through water rights administered by six entities: the City of Hood River, Crystal Springs Water District, Ice Fountain Water District, Parkdale Water Company Incorporated, Odell Water Company, and City of the Dalles (HRWG 1999). These entities hold water rights totaling 1.3 cubic meters (46 cubic feet per second) of flow plus the City of The Dalles water right that allows it to take all the available flow of the Dog River, which is in the range of 0.08 to 0.3 cubic meters per second (three to 12 cubic feet per second) (HRWG 1999). Given the relatively small increment of flow for municipal and industrial uses versus agricultural use, small size of urban centers, and their location away from bull trout local populations, residential and urban development do not pose a substantial threat to bull trout at present in the Hood River Recovery Unit.

Fisheries Management

There have been numerous occurrences of fish stocking in the Hood River Basin. According to Pribyl *et al.* (1996), juvenile steelhead were the first hatchery fish released into Laurance Lake. Brook trout have not been intentionally stocked or introduced into the Middle Fork Hood River at present, but they have been released for many years in other parts of the basin (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). Smallmouth bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*) have been found in Laurance Lake, the result of an unauthorized introduction. Unauthorized fish introduction is a significant problem in all the State's waters. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has ceased all brook trout stocking in the Hood River basin (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife began to change bull trout harvest regulations in the Hood River in 1991, due to concerns with the status of bull trout (Pribyl *et al.*

1996). Angling was closed in the Clear Branch Hood River above and below the Clear Branch Dam and Pinnacle Creek in 1994 (Pribyl *et al.* 1996). Bull trout may not be legally harvested in any stream within the Hood River basin, and fishing in some streams is restricted to artificial flies and lures, which reduces potential hooking damage compared to fishing with bait.

The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation hold federally-reserved fishing rights in the Columbia River and the Hood River watershed. The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation co-manage the fishery resources in the watershed with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation jointly implement the Hood River Production Program to (1) establish a naturally self-sustaining spring chinook salmon population using Deschutes River stock; (2) rebuild runs of summer and winter steelhead using native broodstock; (3) maintain the genetic characteristics of the wild salmonid populations; (4) restore degraded habitat; and (5) contribute to harvest opportunities. Monitoring facilities include an adult trap at Powerdale Dam and six screw traps that are seasonally deployed to monitor juvenile outmigrants. Carcasses of spawned salmonid broodstock are distributed, which benefits the food chain, and numerous habitat improvement projects have been implemented to address the effects of riparian and channel degradation and water diversions (ODFW 1992, HRWG 1999).

Isolation and Habitat Fragmentation

Isolation and habitat fragmentation mechanisms have been previously discussed under dams and agricultural practices above. The main structures in the Hood River Basin isolating bull trout are Powerdale and Clear Branch Dams (Buchanan *et al.* 1997). Irrigation diversions at Coe Branch, and Eliot Branch were not screened until 1988, and upstream passage is incorporated into the Coe diversion only (USFS 1996a). Farmers irrigation diversion on the mainstem is presently undergoing modification to its screening system to prevent juvenile salmonid entrainment, but may seasonally impede passage due to the volume of water diverted, 2.5 cubic meters per second (90 cubic feet per second). Dee

diversion on the west fork has adequate screening for juveniles, but may impede upstream passage (ODFW, *in litt.* 2001). The Tony Creek diversion is inadequately screened, and has no passage capabilities (ODFW, *in litt.* 2001).

It is important to note that periodic high magnitude disturbance events, such as glacial outbursts, are relatively frequent in the Hood River, emphasizing the need for more numerous, well distributed local populations. Well distributed local populations are essential to spread the risk of high magnitude natural events among more abundant local populations rather than the few that presently exist.

ONGOING RECOVERY UNIT CONSERVATION MEASURES

Efforts to recover anadromous species are ongoing in the Hood River Basin with a high level of cooperation between fishery entities on various projects. Spawning surveys have been a cooperative effort for many years. The Hood River basin has an active local watershed group dedicated to finding workable solutions to restoring native fish runs.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has a number of ongoing efforts to conserve bull trout. The department has reduced or eliminated brook trout stocking programs, adopted changes in angling regulations to prohibit take of bull trout, modified regulations on other fisheries to reduce incidental take, made changes to in-water work periods to better address bull trout needs, developed and distributed bull trout identification posters, and hired a bull trout coordinator in 1995 to complete statewide bull trout status assessment, map bull trout distribution, and develop conservation strategies for bull trout. When bull trout were listed the coordinator's effort shifted to recovery planning. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife also receives funding through a Section 6 cooperative agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which has helped support spawning surveys for bull trout.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, and U.S. Forest Service staff work cooperatively to gather conservation information and implement habitat restoration projects for bull trout.

The U.S. Forest Service also has a number of ongoing efforts to conserve bull trout. The U.S. Forest Service has developed and distributed bull trout conservation materials and identification posters in areas of recreation use where bull trout occur, has implemented a number of habitat restoration projects in the Clear Branch of Hood River, has removed culverts from Pinnacle Creek, replaced a culvert stream crossing with a bridge span near the mouth of Pinnacle Creek, has removed problem road segments along the Clear Branch of Hood River and Pinnacle Creek, and remediated a rock quarry near the Clear Branch of Hood River.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, has also conducted numerous anadromous fish, stream habitat and research projects in the Hood River Recovery Unit, that have been funded by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The U.S. Forest Service has also completed two watershed analyses that provide information important in planning additional conservation activities in the Hood River Basin. Federal lands within the basin managed under the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan are covered by a provision of the Northwest Forest Plan which amends the management plan in this area. This includes complying with an aquatic conservation strategy which includes riparian reserves, a network of key watersheds, watershed analysis, and watershed restoration as major components.

The U.S. Forest Service and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife operate fish traps at Clear Branch and Powerdale Dams that are important sources of information on fish movement, numbers, and age and growth. Information from these traps provides a conservation benefit for bull trout.

Other ongoing conservation efforts include, the placement of spawning gravel below Clear Branch Dam funded by the Middle Fork Irrigation District in an effort to augment the amount of available gravel; development of a basin assessment, a draft subbasin summary, and a draft watershed action plan providing conservation planning information led by the Hood River Watershed Group; completion of the Western Hood Subbasin TMDL process for water temperature in December 2001, and completion of the Hood River Agricultural Water Quality Management Plan in February 2001.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER CONSERVATION EFFORTS

State of Oregon

On January 14, 1999, Governor Kitzhaber expanded the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds (ODFW 1997) to include all at-risk wild salmonids throughout the State through Executive Order 99-01. Its goal is to “restore populations and fisheries to productive and sustainable levels that will provide substantial environmental, cultural, and economic benefits.” Components of this plan include (1) coordination of efforts by all parties, (2) development of action plans with relevance and ownership at the local level, (3) monitoring progress, and (4) making appropriate corrective changes in the future. It is a cooperative effort of State, local, Federal, tribal and private organizations, and individuals.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and Oregon Water Resources Department have established priorities for restoration of streamflow as part of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds (Measure IV.A.8). Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has prioritized streamflow restoration needs by ranking biophysical factors, water use patterns, and the extent that water limits fish production in a particular area. Oregon Water Resources Department watermasters will incorporate the priorities into their field work activities as a means to implement flow restoration measures. The needs priorities will be used by the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board as one criterion in determining funding priorities for enhancement and restoration projects. Watershed councils and other entities may also use the needs priorities as one piece of information to determine high priority restoration projects. Bull trout occupied streams in the recovery unit are included in the highest priority designation for streamflow restoration (NWPPC 2000).

Opportunities to convert existing out-of-stream flows to instream flows in Oregon are available through a variety of legislatively mandated programs administered by Oregon Water Resources Department, for example: transfers of type and place of use (ORS 536.050(4)); voluntary written agreement among water users to rotate their use of the supply to which they are collectively entitled (ORS

540.150 and OAR 690-250-0080); allocating “conserved water” to instream use (ORS 537.455 to 537.500); leasing all or a portion of consumptive water rights to instream purposes (ORS 537.348, OAR 690-77-070 to 690-77-077); exchanging water rights for instream purposes using water from a different source, being stored, water, surface, or ground water (ORS 540.533 to 540.543) or and substituting a ground water right for a primary surface water right (ORS 540.524). Oregon Water Trust purchases water rights from willing land owners for conversion to instream water rights.

Through the Western Hood Subbasin TMDL process, an Agricultural Water Quality Management Plan was developed to address agricultural sources of water quality impairment. The Agricultural Water Quality Management Program, established through the Senate Bill 1010 process (ORS 568.900 through 568.933), addresses water pollution associated with agricultural lands and activities. An agricultural water quality management area plan was completed for the Hood River basin in 2001 (HRLAC 2001).

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation

The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation hold federally-reserved fishing rights in the Columbia River and the Hood River watershed. The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation co-manage the fishery resources in the watershed with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation jointly implement the Hood River Production Program to (1) establish a naturally self-sustaining spring chinook salmon population using Deschutes River stock; (2) rebuild runs of summer and winter steelhead using native broodstock; (3) maintain the genetic characteristics of the wild salmonid populations; (4) restore degraded habitat; and (5) contribute to harvest opportunities. Monitoring facilities include an adult trap at Powerdale Dam and six screw traps that are seasonally deployed to monitor juvenile outmigrants. Carcasses of spawned broodstock are distributed to benefit the food chain, and numerous habitat improvement projects have been implemented to address the effects of riparian and channel degradation and water diversions (ODFW 1992;

HRWG 1999). Many of these efforts will also contribute to the recovery of bull trout.

Local Planning Efforts

The Hood River Watershed Group has been active for a number of years, and is chartered as a watershed council under the Oregon Plan. The group has compiled a number of watershed planning documents including the draft Hood Subbasin Summary for the Northwest Power Planning Council, the Hood River Watershed assessment, and more recently a public review draft of the Hood River Watershed action plan.

Northwest Power Planning Council's Subbasin Planning

As part of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980, the Bonneville Power Administration has the responsibility to protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife resources affected by operation of Federal hydroelectric projects in the Columbia River and tributaries. The Northwest Power Planning Council develops and implements the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program that is implemented by the Bonneville Power Administration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Coordination of Bonneville Power Administration's responsibilities for protection, enhancement, and mitigation and incorporation of recommendations by Northwest Power Planning Council is in part done through the development of subbasin summaries, which identify status of fish and wildlife resources, limiting factors, and recommended actions at the subbasin level.

The draft Hood River Subbasin Summary (NWPPC 2000), encompasses the Hood River Recovery Unit, and is consistent with bull trout recovery planning efforts to identify limiting factors. The draft subbasin summary identifies elevated water temperature, altered channel conditions, reduced instream habitat diversity, altered flow, altered riparian habitat condition, and passage barriers as factors contributing to the decline of bull trout. The overall fisheries goal of the draft Hood River subbasin plan is to "Protect, enhance and restore wild and natural populations

of anadromous and resident fish within the Hood River Subbasin.” According to the subbasin plan this goal will be achieved by the year 2016 or earlier. The Hood River Recovery Unit team will continue to utilize this planning process to identify and seek funding for projects to aid bull trout recovery.

STRATEGY FOR RECOVERY

A core area represents the closest approximation of a biologically functioning unit for bull trout. The combination of core habitat (*i.e.*, habitat that could supply all the necessary elements for the long-term security of bull trout including both for spawning and rearing, as well as for foraging, migrating, and overwintering) and a core population (*i.e.*, bull trout inhabiting a core habitat) constitutes the basic core area upon which to gauge recovery within a recovery unit. Within a core area, many local populations may exist.

Currently, one core area is defined for the Hood River Recovery Unit, the Hood River Core Area (Figure 2). The Hood River Core Area encompasses tributaries containing local populations (both current and potential as identified by the recovery unit team) and the mainstem Hood River from its headwaters downstream to the confluence with the Columbia River. Although we know Hood River bull trout migrate to the Columbia River and back, we lack a clear understanding of the extent of their use and distribution in the Columbia River mainstem. Currently, no core areas have been defined for the Sandy River, but it is designated as core habitat. At the time of listing, there was no known occurrence of bull trout in the Sandy River. Presently, there is insufficient information on bull trout distribution and use of the Sandy River to identify a core area, however, additional information on bull trout use of the Sandy River as well as the mainstem Columbia River is defined as a primary research need.

Recovery Goals and Objectives

The goal of the bull trout recovery plan is to **ensure the long-term persistence of self-sustaining, complex interacting groups of bull trout distributed across the species' native range, so that the species can be delisted.** To achieve this goal the following objectives have been identified for bull trout in the Hood River Recovery Unit:

- ▶ Current distribution of bull trout within the Hood River Recovery Unit is maintained and expanded to suitable habitat in the core area.

- ▶ Stable or increasing trends in abundance of bull trout in the Hood River Recovery Unit are maintained.
- ▶ Suitable habitat conditions for all bull trout life history stages and strategies are restored and maintained within the Hood River Recovery Unit.
- ▶ Genetic diversity and opportunities for genetic exchange within the Hood River Recovery Unit are maintained.

Rieman and McIntyre (1993) and Rieman and Allendorf (2001) evaluated the bull trout population numbers and habitat thresholds necessary for long-term viability of the species. They identified four elements, and the characteristics of those elements, to consider when evaluating the viability of bull trout populations. These four elements are (1) number of local populations; (2) adult abundance (defined as the number of spawning fish present in a core area in a given year); (3) productivity, or the reproductive rate of the population (as measured by population trend and variability); and (4) connectivity (as represented by the migratory life history form and functional habitat). For each element, the Hood River Recovery Unit Team classified bull trout into relative risk categories based on the best available data and the professional judgment of the team.

The Hood River Recovery Unit Team also evaluated each element under a potential recovered condition to produce recovery criteria. Evaluation of these elements under a recovered condition assumed that actions identified within this chapter had been implemented. Recovery criteria for the Hood River Recovery Unit reflect (1) the stated objectives for the recovery unit, (2) evaluation of each population element in both current and recovered conditions, and (3) consideration of current and recovered habitat characteristics within the recovery unit. Recovery criteria will probably be revised in the future as more detailed information on bull trout population dynamics becomes available. Given the limited information on bull trout, both the level of adult abundance and the number of local populations needed to lessen the risk of extinction should be viewed as a best estimate.

This approach to developing recovery criteria acknowledges that the status of populations in some core areas may remain short of ideals described by conservation biology theory. Some core areas may be limited by natural attributes or by patch size and may always remain at a relatively high risk of extinction. Because of limited data within the Hood River Recovery Unit, the recovery unit team relied in part on the professional judgment of its members.

Local Populations. Metapopulation theory is important to consider in bull trout recovery. A metapopulation is an interacting network of local populations with varying frequencies of migration and gene flow among them (Meffe and Carroll 1994) (see Chapter 1). Multiple local populations distributed and interconnected throughout a watershed provide a mechanism for spreading risk from stochastic events. In part, distribution of local populations in such a manner is an indicator of a functioning core area. Based in part on guidance from Rieman and McIntyre (1993), bull trout core areas with fewer than 5 local populations are at increased risk, core areas with between 5 and 10 local populations are at intermediate risk, and core areas with more than 10 interconnected local populations are at diminished risk.

For the Hood River Core Area, there are currently two known local populations (Clear Branch above the dam and Hood River below the dam). Based on the above guidance, bull trout in the Hood River Core Area are in the increased risk category.

Adult Abundance. The recovered abundance levels in the Hood River Recovery Unit were determined by considering theoretical estimates of effective population size, historical census information, and the professional judgement of recovery team members. In general, effective population size is a theoretical concept that allows us to predict potential future losses of genetic variation within a population, due to small population sizes and genetic drift (See Chapter 1). For the purpose of recovery planning, effective population size is the number of adult bull trout that successfully spawn annually. Based on standardized theoretical equations (Crow and Kimura 1970), guidelines have been established for maintaining minimum effective population sizes for conservation purposes. Effective

population sizes greater than 50 adults are necessary to prevent inbreeding depression and a potential decrease in viability or reproductive fitness of a population (Franklin 1980). To minimize the loss of genetic variation due to genetic drift, and to maintain constant genetic variance within a population, an effective population size of at least 500 is recommended (Franklin 1980, Soule 1980, Lande 1988). Effective population sizes required to maintain long-term genetic variation that can serve as a reservoir for future adaptations in response to natural selection and changing environmental conditions are discussed in Chapter 1 of the recovery plan.

For bull trout, Rieman and Allendorf (2001) estimated that a minimum number of 50 to 100 spawners per year is needed to minimize potential inbreeding effects within local populations. In addition, a population size between 500 and 1,000 adults in a core area is needed to minimize the deleterious effects of genetic variation due to drift.

For the purposes of bull trout recovery planning, abundance levels were conservatively evaluated at the local population and core area levels. Local populations containing less than 100 spawning adults per year were classified at risk from inbreeding depression. Bull trout core areas containing fewer than 1,000 spawning adults per year were classified as at risk from genetic drift.

Although accurate adult abundance estimates for the Hood River Core Area are not available, the recovery unit team estimates it at 300 or less. Trap count and snorkel count data support this estimate. This low adult abundance in the Hood River Core Area places it at risk from genetic drift. It is uncertain whether either of the two local populations are currently at risk from inbreeding depression, however, given the overall low abundance within the core area this remains a serious concern.

Productivity. A stable or increasing population is a key criterion for recovery under the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. Measures of the trend of a population (the tendency to increase, decrease, or remain stable) include population growth rate or productivity. Estimates of population growth rate (*i.e.*,

productivity over the entire life cycle) that indicate a population is consistently failing to replace itself also indicate an increased risk of extinction. Therefore, the reproductive rate should indicate that the population is replacing itself, or growing.

Since estimates of the total population size are rarely available, the productivity or population growth rate is usually estimated from temporal trends in indices of abundance at a particular life stage. For example, redd counts are often used as an index of a spawning adult population. The direction and magnitude of a trend in the index can be used as a surrogate for the growth rate of the entire population. For instance, a downward trend in an abundance indicator may signal the need for increased protection, regardless of the actual size of the population. A population that is below recovered abundance levels, but that is moving toward recovery, would be expected to exhibit an increasing trend in the indicator.

The population growth rate is an indicator of probability of extinction. This probability cannot be measured directly, but it can be estimated as the consequence of the population growth rate and the variability in that rate. For a population to be considered viable, its natural productivity should be sufficient for the population to replace itself from generation to generation. Evaluations of population status will also have to take into account uncertainty in estimates of population growth rate or productivity. For a population to contribute to recovery, its growth rate must indicate that the population is stable or increasing for a period of time.

Based on less than ten years of population trend data, the Hood River Core Area is considered to be at least at an intermediate threat level. However, the relatively moderate to high variability in annual snorkel counts conducted in index reaches, in conjunction with low adult abundance, is a source of concern.

Connectivity. The presence of the migratory life history form within the Hood River Recovery Unit was used as an indicator of the functional connectivity of the recovery unit and both core areas. If the migratory life form was absent, or if the migratory form is present but local populations lack connectivity, the core area was considered to be at increased risk. If the migratory life form persists in at least some local populations, with partial ability to connect with other local populations,

the core area was judged to be at intermediate risk. Finally, if the migratory life form was present in all or nearly all local populations, and had the ability to connect with other local populations, the core area was considered to be at diminished risk. The Hood River Core Area is considered at an intermediate threat level. Migratory life forms persist in at least some local populations with partial ability to connect with other local populations.

Recovery Criteria

Recovery criteria for bull trout in the Hood River Recovery Unit the following:

1. **Distribution criteria will be met when bull trout are distributed among three or more local populations, including the existing Clear Branch and Hood River local populations in the Hood River Core Area.** In a recovered condition the Hood River Core Area will include up to four local populations. In addition to the two existing local populations (Clear Branch and Hood River), recovery actions may lead to defined spawning and rearing areas in the West Fork and possibly in the East Fork of Hood River. Additional population studies and a better understanding of bull trout fidelity to their natal streams is needed to better define local populations in the recovery unit. The extent of bull trout use of the Sandy River and mainstem Columbia River is a primary research need.
2. **Abundance criteria will be met when the estimated abundance of adult bull trout is at least 500 individuals distributed within the Hood River Recovery Unit.** Recovered abundance range was derived using the professional judgement of the Recovery Unit Team and estimation of productive capacity of identified local populations. The natural productive capacity of the Hood River Core Area will likely keep it below 1,000 spawning adults annually, and therefore at continued risk from genetic drift. Abundance for the Hood River Core Area may be refined as more information becomes available, through monitoring and research, including identified distribution and population criteria for the Sandy River. The U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service will evaluate the identified abundance levels relative to the maintenance of long-term genetic variation which would provide the population the ability to adapt to natural selection and changing environmental conditions.

In the Hood River Core Area, increased abundance is expected to occur within existing population complexes, and through expansion to other areas as recovery progresses. We expect that it may take ten years or more to achieve an adult population level of 500 or more fish in the Hood Core Area. We do not know at this time how many adult bull trout occur in the Hood River Basin, and do not have sufficient information at present to estimate recovered adult numbers in individual local populations. There is potential to expand population abundance in the basin. Spawning habitat in the Clear Branch of Hood River needs to be protected, and in the Middle Fork Hood River it needs to be protected and expanded. There are opportunities to protect and expand year round rearing and migration habitat in the mainstem Hood River, and East and West Fork of Hood River, on public and private lands.

Opportunities to protect spawning and rearing habitat through purchase, conservation easement, land exchange or other means should be pursued. Restoration efforts to improve anadromous salmonid production in the Hood Core Area can be expected to benefit existing and potential migration corridors and overwintering habitat for bull trout, as well as improve their prey base.

3. **Trend criteria will be met when adult bull trout exhibit a stable or increasing trend for at least 2 generations at or above the recovered abundance level within the recovery unit.** Achievement of this recovery criteria will be based on a minimum of 10 years of monitoring data, or approximately two bull trout generations. The development of a standardized monitoring and evaluation program which would accurately describe trends in bull trout abundance is identified as a priority research need. As part of the overall recovery effort, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service will take the lead in addressing this research need by forming a multi-agency technical team to develop protocols to evaluate trends in bull trout populations.

4. **Connectivity criteria will be met when passage barriers to bull trout have been addressed at Powerdale Dam, Clear Branch Dam, Coe Diversion, Eliot Diversion, Farmers Diversion and Tony Creek Diversion, and seasonal water quality barriers have been addressed in the East and West Forks of Hood River.** Passage barriers must be addressed in the Hood River Core Area to ensure opportunities for connectivity within and among local populations. This also includes providing adequate diversion screening.

Identification of these barriers does not imply that other actions associated with passage and habitat degradation are not crucial for recovery to occur. To achieve recovery in the Hood River Recovery Unit, all four recovery criteria (local populations, abundance, population trends, and connectivity) must be achieved. It is likely, that meeting all four recovery criteria will not be accomplished by providing passage past only these barriers.

Recovery criteria for the Hood River Recovery Unit were established to assess whether recovery actions have resulted in the recovery of bull trout. The Hood River Recovery Unit Team expects that the recovery process will be dynamic and require refinements as more information becomes available over time. While removal of bull trout as a species under the Endangered Species Act (*i.e.*, delisting) can only occur for the entity that was listed (Columbia River Distinct Population Segment), the criteria listed above will be used to determine when the Hood River Recovery Unit is fully contributing to recovery of the population segment.

Research Needs

Based on the best scientific information available, the Hood River Recovery Unit Team has identified recovery criteria and actions necessary for recovery of

bull trout within the Hood River Recovery Unit. However, the recovery unit team recognizes that many uncertainties exist regarding bull trout population abundance, distribution, and recovery actions needed. The recovery unit team feels that if effective management and recovery are to occur, the recovery plan for the Hood River Recovery Unit should be viewed as a “living” document, to be updated as new information becomes available. As part of this adaptive management approach, the Hood River Recovery Unit Team has identified essential research needs within the recovery unit.

Columbia River. A primary research need is a complete understanding of the current, and future, role that the Columbia River should play in the recovery of bull trout. Bull trout migrate seasonally from the Hood River to the mainstem Columbia River, using the Columbia during a portion of their life history. It is essential to establish, with greater certainty, the current extent of bull trout distribution and seasonal use areas. To this end, the Team recommends development and application of a scientifically accepted, statistically rigorous, standardized protocol for determining present distribution of bull trout. Application of such a protocol will improve the Team’s ability to identify additional core areas, or revise the current classification.

Specifically, those tributaries where there have been anecdotal reports of bull trout captured should be targeted to clarify bull trout distribution within the recovery unit. These areas include, but are not limited to the East and West Forks of Hood River, the Sandy River, and the mainstem Columbia River.

Bonneville Dam on the Columbia is a potential barrier to bull trout, although it is laddered and passes anadromous species of fish. Incidental catch has only been recorded in the Fish Passage Center database since 1997, and there is no record of bull trout use during this period. Prior to 1997, a bull trout sighting could have been noted as a comment, but would not have been recorded in the database. Records prior to 1997 need to be examined for any documentation of bull trout in the comments. Evaluating passage facilities and reservoir operations at Bonneville Dam as to their suitability for bull trout is identified as a term and condition of the

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's biological opinion for operation of the Federal Columbia River Hydropower System (USFWS 2000).

Sandy River. There is very little information on bull trout use in the Sandy River. Initially, basic research and monitoring is needed to document fish presence, and existing use. Other basic research includes simply knowing where the fish observed in the Sandy River come from (*i.e.*, Are they migrants from other basins, such as the Hood River, or is there a small remnant population of bull trout remaining within the basin that has escaped detection?). Once these basic questions are answered, research can begin to focus on limiting factors and habitat needs for bull trout in the Sandy River.

Nonnative Fish Interactions in Laurance Lake. The recent discovery of smallmouth bass in Laurance Lake exposes bull trout to a predator or competitor that was previously unknown in the Hood River Basin. Research to determine the extent of any interaction between the two species will be necessary to determine if there is a direct problem, as well as identify possible solutions to any identified impacts.

ACTIONS NEEDED

Recovery Measures Narrative

In this chapter and all other chapters of the bull trout recovery plan, the recovery measures narrative consists of a hierarchical listing of actions that follows a standard template. The first-tier entries are identical in all chapters and represent general recovery tasks under which specific (*e.g.*, third-tier) tasks appear when appropriate. Second-tier entries also represent general recovery tasks under which specific tasks appear. Second-tier tasks that do not include specific third-tier actions are usually programmatic activities that are applicable across the species' range; they appear in *italic type*. These tasks may or may not have third-tier tasks associated with them; see Chapter 1 for more explanation. Some second-tier tasks may not be sufficiently developed to apply to the recovery unit at this time; they appear in *a shaded italic type (as seen here)*. These tasks are included to preserve consistency in numbering tasks among recovery unit chapters and intended to assist in generating information during the comment period for the draft recovery plan, a period when additional tasks may be developed. Third-tier entries are tasks specific to the Hood River Recovery Unit. They appear in the implementation schedule that follows this section and are identified by three numerals separated by periods.

The Hood River Recovery Unit chapter should be updated or revised when recovery tasks are accomplished, environmental conditions change, or monitoring results or other new information becomes available. Revisions to the Hood River Recovery Unit chapter will likely focus on priority streams or stream segments within core areas where restoration activities occurred, and habitat or bull trout populations have shown a positive response. The Hood River Recovery Unit Team should meet annually to review annual monitoring reports and summaries, and make recommendations to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

1. Protect, restore, and maintain suitable habitat conditions for bull trout.
 - 1.1 Maintain or improve water quality in bull trout core areas or core habitat.

- 1.1.1 Reduce general sediment sources. Stabilize roads, crossings, and other sources of sediment delivery. Complete sediment source inventory for non-Federal roads. Continue maintenance and rehabilitation on Forest Service roads as identified in watershed analyses. Reduce road densities as identified in watershed analyses. Work with irrigation districts to convert open canals to pipelines to reduce sediment delivery to streams.
 - 1.1.2 Reduce nutrient and chemical runoff. Reduce industrial, agricultural, and sewage effluent runoff (nutrients and chemicals). Continue monitoring for pesticides/toxic substances in the core area.
 - 1.1.3 Improve water temperature (water quality) below Laurance Lake during the spawning period (late summer to early fall). Identify the source of flows in the reservoir, and opportunities for cold water augmentation to reduce temperature.
- 1.2 Identify barriers or sites of entrainment for bull trout and implement tasks to provide passage and eliminate entrainment.
- 1.2.1 Reestablish connectivity at Clear Branch Dam. Reestablish connectivity above and below Clear Branch Dam. Restore passage over Clear Branch Dam by modifying or replacing existing trapping facility to improve trapping efficiency. Assess the effectiveness of downstream passage via spill (research need).
 - 1.2.2 Provide passage at Coe Branch Diversion. Provide downstream and upstream passage at Coe Branch Diversion

to meet National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service criteria.

- 1.2.3 Determine passage options for Tony Creek and Powerdale Dam. Determine passage options for Tony Creek diversions (upstream and downstream), at Dee Diversion (2-upstream), and at Powerdale Dam(upstream), and Eliot Diversion. Implement the most practical and cost-effective option.
 - 1.2.4 Improve fish passage at road crossings. Identify additional sites where road crossings might be a problem and where assessments are not completed.
 - 1.2.5 Determine the presence and extent of gas supersaturation at Powerdale and Clear Branch Dams. Cloudy (discolored) eyes have been noted occurring on bull trout captured at Powerdale Dam. One possibility is damage from gas supersaturation. Dissolved gas levels need to be evaluated at both dams to identify potential impacts, if any.
 - 1.2.6 Screen diversions and ditches. Screen water diversions and irrigation ditches. Improve screening to protect bull trout downstream migrants and adults at Powerdale, Farmers Canal, Tony Creek, Eliot, and others as identified. Work with water users and irrigation districts to fix problems.
 - 1.2.7 Improve instream flows. Restore connectivity and opportunities for migration by securing instream flows and/or water rights. High priorities include the East Fork of Hood River and others as identified.
- 1.3 Identify impaired stream channel and riparian areas and implement tasks to restore their appropriate functions.

- 1.3.1 Protect and restore riparian zones. Protect and restore riparian vegetation in the core area.
- 1.3.2 Restore channel conditions. Conduct stream channel restoration activities where warranted and cost-effective. Based on results from completed Clear Branch project, assess feasibility of additional helicopter wood placement. Assess feasibility of similar work in Tony and Pinnacle creeks.
- 1.4 Operate dams to minimize negative effects on bull trout in reservoirs and downstream.
 - 1.4.1 Evaluate effects of Columbia Dams. Evaluate effects of mainstem Columbia hydropower operations.
- 1.5 *Identify upland conditions negatively affecting bull trout habitats and implement tasks to restore appropriate functions.*
- 2 Prevent and reduce negative effects of nonnative fishes and other nonnative taxa on bull trout.
 - 2.1 *Develop, implement, and enforce public and private fish stocking policies to reduce stocking of nonnative fishes that affect bull trout.*
 - 2.2 *Evaluate enforcement policies for preventing illegal transport and introduction of nonnative fishes within the recovery unit.*
 - 2.3 *Provide information to the public about ecosystem concerns of illegal introductions of nonnative fishes.*
 - 2.4 *Evaluate biological, economic, and social effects of control of nonnative fishes.*

- 2.5 *Implement control of nonnative fishes where found to be feasible and appropriate.*
 - 2.6 *Develop tasks to reduce negative effects of nonnative taxa on bull trout.*
- 3 Establish fisheries management goals and objectives compatible with bull trout recovery, and implement practices to achieve goals.
- 3.1 Develop and implement State and tribal native fish management plans integrating adaptive research.
 - 3.1.1 Incorporate bull trout recovery into State and Regional Conservation Plans. Incorporate bull trout recovery actions into The Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Hood River Basin Plan, Hood River Watershed Action Plan, and the Pacific Northwest Power Planning Council Subbasin Plan. Request assistance with implementation of recovery strategies for bull trout through these plans.
 - 3.1.2 Integrate research results. Adaptively integrate research results into management programs.
 - 3.1.3 Restore forage (prey) base. Continue to restore historical prey base by reintroducing anadromous species where appropriate.
 - 3.1.4 Coordinate with other recovery efforts. Coordinate bull trout recovery with recovery efforts, management plans, etc. of other species, for example the Hood River Production Plan.

- 3.1.5 Establish bull trout in other areas. Assess feasibility of establishing bull trout in the West Fork of Hood River and East Fork of Hood River subwatersheds.
- 3.2 Evaluate and prevent overharvest and incidental angling mortality of bull trout.
 - 3.2.1 Assess impact of incidental harvest. Continue gathering statistical creel information below Powerdale Dam to estimate incidental harvest.
 - 3.2.2 Assess hooking mortality. Assess hooking mortality of bull trout in Laurance Lake, and modify angling regulations if necessary.
 - 3.2.3 Refine angling regulations. Develop and implement sport angling regulations that minimize incidental mortality of bull trout in fisheries closed to bull trout harvest. Periodically review harvest management and make recommendations for change as needed.
 - 3.2.4 Continue fish identification education. Continue to provide information to anglers about bull trout identification, special regulations, how to reduce hooking mortality of bull trout caught incidentally, and the value of bull trout and their habitat and their place in the ecosystem.
- 3.3 *Evaluate potential effects of introduced fishes and associated sport fisheries on bull trout recovery and implement tasks to minimize negative effects on bull trout.*
- 3.4 *Evaluate effects of existing and proposed sport fishing regulations on bull trout.*

- 4 Characterize, conserve, and monitor genetic diversity and gene flow among local populations of bull trout.
 - 4.1 *Incorporate conservation of genetic and phenotypic attributes of bull trout into recovery and management plans.*
 - 4.2 *Maintain existing opportunities for gene flow among bull trout populations.*
 - 4.3 *Develop genetic management plans and guidelines for appropriate use of transplantation and artificial propagation.*
- 5 Conduct research and monitoring to implement and evaluate bull trout recovery activities, consistent with an adaptive management approach using feedback from implemented, site-specific recovery tasks.
 - 5.1 Design and implement a standardized monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of recovery efforts affecting bull trout and their habitats.
 - 5.1.1 Evaluate restoration effectiveness. Evaluate effectiveness of different active and passive habitat restoration techniques in restoring watershed function and local bull trout populations, for example, Clear Branch above the dam and Pinnacle Creek (bridge removal).
 - 5.1.2 Coordinate with other monitoring efforts. Coordinate bull trout recovery monitoring in the Hood River Recovery Unit with the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds monitoring program.
 - 5.2 Conduct research evaluating relationships among bull trout distribution and abundance, bull trout habitat, and recovery tasks.

- 5.2.1 Assess threats from catastrophic events. Assess potential threats to bull trout populations in the Hood River basin from catastrophic events such as volcanic eruptions, fire, land slides, debris flows, etc.
- 5.2.2 Incorporate recovery efforts into county plans. Provide input in the county comprehensive planning reviews and updates.
- 5.2.3 Investigate bull trout ecology in Laurance Lake. Investigate bull trout ecology in Laurance Lake.
- 5.2.4 Evaluate food web. Evaluate food web interactions in the core area, for example, Laurance Lake.
- 5.2.5 Determine extent of use of the Columbia River. Determine use in the Columbia River by Hood River bull trout, including distribution, movement patterns, preferred habitat, and prey base.
- 5.3 *Conduct evaluations of the adequacy and effectiveness of current and past best management practices in maintaining or achieving habitat conditions conducive to bull trout recovery.*
- 5.4 Evaluate effects of diseases and parasites on bull trout, and develop and implement strategies to minimize negative effects.
 - 5.4.1 Monitor to detect pathogen effects. Monitor for effects of fish pathogens on Oregon bull trout populations. Follow department protocols (in development) for handling and disposition of bull trout mortalities, for example, submission to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife fish pathology laboratories for disease assessment.

- 5.4.2 Research eye abnormalities. Implement a research project to determine causes of observed eye abnormalities in Hood River bull trout. Take corrective action based on findings.
- 5.5 *Develop and conduct research and monitoring studies to improve information concerning the distribution and status of bull trout.*
- 5.6 Identify evaluations needed to improve understanding of relationships among genetic characteristics, phenotypic traits, and local populations of bull trout.
 - 5.6.1 Gather more detailed life history information. Determine life history of bull trout in the Hood River basin. Additional information needed includes, 1) annual abundance of breeders per local population and total for the recovery unit; 2) population structure and connectivity; 3) life history characteristics including age at first spawning, incidence, regularity and timing of repeat spawning, and total life span; 4) reproductive success in production of pre-adult offspring; 5) survival rates to breeding adult; and 6) reproductive success in replacement of breeders. Have scales read. Work with WDFW to record and report tagged bull trout from the Hood system that are captured in Washington tributaries to the Columbia.
- 6 Use all available conservation programs and regulations to protect and conserve bull trout and bull trout habitats.
 - 6.1 Use partnerships and collaborative processes to protect, maintain, and restore functioning core areas for bull trout.
 - 6.1.1 Support local restoration/conservation efforts. Support collaborative efforts by local watershed groups to accomplish site-specific protection/restoration activities. Support habitat

restoration efforts of the Hood River watershed council, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs, and the USFS. Improved habitat will provide for a more abundant prey base. Participate in restoration efforts, provide technical support, etc.

- 6.1.2 Provide long-term habitat protection. Provide long-term habitat protection through purchase, conservation easements, management plans, land exchanges, etc.
- 6.1.3 Cooperate on Columbia issues. Work cooperatively with Washington State on bull trout issues in the mainstem Columbia River.
- 6.1.4 Cooperate with Tribes. Work cooperatively with the Confederated Tribe of the Warm Springs Reservation government to implement recovery actions.
- 6.1.5 Identify and utilize all potential recovery resources. Identify and secure funding and cooperation to implement recovery strategies including pursuing cooperative funding, partnerships, challenge cost share opportunities, and other private and governmental grants; and utilizing mitigation and natural resource damage settlement funds as available.
- 6.1.6 Prepare and distribute educational materials. Develop educational materials on bull trout and their habitat needs, for example, watershed form and function, riparian and side channel restoration, large wood placement, marking storm drains in urban areas, etc.
- 6.1.7 Facilitate media coverage. Invite reporters from Oregon Field Guide or other programs to film activities focusing on bull trout in the basin.

- 6.1.8 Develop volunteer educational opportunities. Use volunteer opportunities to provide information to the public about bull trout, for example, fin clipping of rainbow by volunteers.
- 6.2 Use existing Federal authorities to conserve and restore bull trout.
 - 6.2.1 Incorporate recovery tasks into FERC relicensing. Identify opportunities to incorporate bull trout recovery actions into hydro-relicensing projects in the Hood River Recovery Unit, for example, Powerdale and Clear Branch dams.
- 6.3 *Enforce existing Federal, State, and Tribal habitat protection standards and regulations and evaluate their effectiveness for bull trout conservation.*
- 7 Assess the implementation of bull trout recovery by recovery units, and revise recovery unit plans based on evaluations.
 - 7.1 *Convene annual meetings of each recovery unit team to review progress on recovery plan implementation.*
 - 7.2 *Assess effectiveness of recovery efforts.*
 - 7.3 *Revise scope of recovery as suggested by new information.*
 - 7.3.1 Periodically review progress towards recovery goals and assess recovery task priorities. Annually review progress toward population and adult abundance criteria and recommend changes, as needed, to the Snake River Washington Recovery Unit chapter. In addition, review tasks, task priorities, completed tasks, budget, time frames, particular successes, and feasibility within the Snake River Washington Recovery Unit.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The Implementation Schedule that follows describes recovery task priorities, task numbers, task descriptions, duration of tasks, potential or participating responsible parties, total cost estimate, estimates for the next five years, if available, and comments. These tasks, when accomplished, are expected to lead to recovery of bull trout in the Hood River Recovery Unit. Cost estimates are not provided for tasks that are normal agency responsibility under existing authorities.

Parties with authority, responsibility, or expressed interest to implement a specific recovery task are identified in the Implementation Schedule. Listing a responsible party does not imply that prior approval has been given or require that party to participate or expend any funds. However, willing participants may be able to increase their funding opportunities by demonstrating that their budget submission or funding request is for a recovery task identified in an approved recovery plan, and is therefore part of a coordinated effort to recover bull trout. In addition, section 7 (a)(1) of the Endangered Species Act directs all Federal agencies to use their authorities to further the purposes of the Endangered Species Act by implementing programs for the conservation of threatened or endangered species.

The following are definitions to column headings in the Implementation Schedule:

Priority Number: All priority 1 tasks are listed first, followed by priority 2 and priority 3 tasks.

Priority 1: All actions that must be taken to prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly in the foreseeable future.

Priority 2: All actions that must be taken to prevent a significant decline in species population or habitat quality or to prevent some other significant negative effect short of extinction.

Priority 3: All other actions necessary to provide for full recovery (or reclassification) of the species.

Task Number and Task Description: Recovery tasks as numbered in the recovery outline. Refer to the action narrative for task descriptions.

Task Duration: Expected number of years to complete the corresponding task. Study designs can incorporate more than one task, which when combined may reduce the time needed for task completion.

Responsible or Participating Party: The following organizations are those with responsibility or capability to fund, authorize, or carry out the corresponding recovery task. **Bolded type** indicates the agency or agencies that have the lead role for task implementation and coordination, though not necessarily sole responsibility.

BLM	U.S. Bureau of Land Management
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CTWSR	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
ES	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
HCPG	Habitat Conservation Planning Group
HRC	Hood River County
HRWG	Hood River Watershed Group
ID	Irrigation districts
LCDC	Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission
LFC	Longview Fibre Company
MFID	Middle Fork Irrigation District
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NPPC	Northwest Power Planning Council
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
ODA	Oregon Department of Agriculture
ODEQ	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
ODFW	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

ODOF	Oregon Department of Forestry
ODOT	Oregon Department of Transportation
OSP	Oregon State Police
OWEB	Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
PC	PacifiCorp
RUT	Bull Trout Recovery Unit Team
SWCD	Soil and Water Conservation Districts
TMDLWG	Total Maximum Daily Load working group
USCOE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WC	Watershed Councils

Cost estimates: Cost estimates are rough approximations and are provided only for general guidance. Total costs are estimated for the duration of the task, are itemized annually for the next five years, and include estimates of expenditures by local, Tribal, State, and Federal governments and by private businesses and individuals.

An asterisk (*) in the total cost column indicates ongoing tasks that are currently being implemented as part of normal agency responsibilities under existing authorities. Because these tasks are not being done specifically or solely for bull trout conservation, they are not included in the cost estimates. Some of these efforts may be occurring at reduced funding levels and/or in only a small portion of the watershed.

Double asterisk (**) in the total cost column indicates that estimated costs for these tasks are not determinable at this time. Input is requested to help develop reasonable cost estimates for these tasks.

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
1	1. 2. 1	Reestablish connectivity at Clear Branch Dam	5	MFID, USFS, ODFW, USFWS	75	5	10	25	25	10	
1	1. 2. 2	Provide passage at Coe Branch Diversion	5	MFID, ODFW, USFS, USFWS, NMFS	1000	10	10	900	60	20	
1	1. 2. 3	Determine passage options at Tony Creek and Powerdale Dam	5	ODFW, PC, HRWG, USFWS	250	5	10	175	35	25	
1	1. 2. 6	Screen diversions and ditches	7	ODFW, BPA, USFWS, ID	2000	150	150	150	150	300	
1	3. 1. 1	Incorporate bull trout recovery into State and regional conservation plans	5	ODFW, HRWG, OWEB	150	30	30	30	30	30	
1	3. 1. 2	Integrate research results	25	USFWS, ODFW, USFS,	500	20	20	20	20	20	
1	3. 1. 3	Restore forage (prey) base	25	ODFW, USFWS, BPA	4000	200	200	200	200	200	Salmon restoration activities
1	3. 1. 4	Coordinate with other recovery efforts	25	USFWS, ODFW, USFS, HRWG, NMFS	*						Part of existing funded efforts

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
1	5. 1. 1	Evaluate restoration effectiveness	25	ODFW, USFS, HRWG, USFWS, BPA	**						Costs depend on the number of completed projects
1	5. 2. 3	Investigate bull trout ecology in Laurance Lake	5	ODFW, USFS, ID, BPA	150	30	30	30	30	30	Several years needed to deal with variation
1	5. 2. 5	Determine extent of use of the Columbia River	25	ODFW, WDFW, USFWS, BPA, USCOE	500	50	50	50	50	50	Task may be able to utilize existing or planned infrastructure
1	5. 6. 1	Gather more detailed life history information.	10	ODFW, USFS, BPA, USFWS	500	50	50	50	50	50	Some aspects of this action are ongoing in the basin.
1	6. 1. 3	Cooperate on Columbia issues	25	ODFW, WDFW, USCOE,	*						Part of the existing funded efforts
1	6. 1. 4	Cooperate with Tribes	25	USFWS, ODFW, HRWG, USFS,	*						Part of existing funded efforts
1	6. 1. 5	Identify and utilize all potential recovery resources	25	USFWS, RUT	*						Part of the USFWS mission

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
1	6. 2. 1	Incorporate recovery tasks into FERC relicensing	1	USFWS, FERC	*						Applicable tasks may be used as terms and conditions or conservation recommendations
2	1. 1. 1	Reduce general sediment sources	Perpetual	HRC, ID, LF, ODOT, USFS, ODF, ODFW,	**						See road assessment in Watershed Assessment
2	1. 1. 2	Reduce nutrient and chemical runoff	Perpetual	ODEQ, ODA, USEPA, HRGSA,	**						Ongoing and changes with landowner and new
2	1. 1. 3	Improve water temperature below Laurance Lake during spawning period	5	MFID, ODEQ, USEPA, USFS, USFWS, USGS	1500	20	20	1000	410	50	Needs further research; MF mainstem,
2	1. 2. 4	Improve fish passage at road crossings	Ongoing	ODFW, LFC, OWEB, USFS	**						Pinnacle Creek bridge completed 2002.

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
2	1. 2. 5	Determin the presence and extent of gas supersaturation at Powerdale and Clear Branch Dams	3	USFWS, ODFW, ID, PC	10	2	4	4			Actual costs will depend on any structural improvements
2	1. 3. 1	Protect and restore riparian zones	25	USFS, HRC, NRCS, HRWG,	375	25	25	25	25	25	
2	1. 4. 1	Evaluate effects of Columbia River Dams	10	USFWS, USCOE, BPA,	500	50	50	50	50	50	Initial consultation completed
2	3. 2. 1	Assess impact of incidental harvest	25	ODFW, OSP, CTWSR, USFS	450	18	18	18	18	18	Creel and enforcement time
2	3. 2. 2	Assess hooking mortality	5	ODFW, USFWS	100	20	20	20	20	20	
2	3. 2. 3	Refine angling regulations	Ongoing	ODFW, USFS, USFWS	50	2	2	2	2	2	Ongoing
2	3. 2. 4	Continue fish identification education	Ongoing	ODFW, USFS, USFWS	100	4	4	4	4	4	Ongoing

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
2	5. 1. 2	Coordinate with other monitoring efforts	25	ODFW, USFS, BPA, CTWSR, USFWS,	*						Part of existing funded efforts
2	5. 2. 1	Assess threats from catastrophic events	3	ODFW, USFS, USFWS, BPA	50	20	20	10			
2	5. 2. 2	Incorporate recovery efforts into county plans	25	ODFW, ODEQ, CTWSR, HRWG	50	2	2	2	2	2	
2	5. 2. 4	Evaluate food web	10	ODFW, USFS, BPA, USFWS	250	50	50	20	20	20	
2	5. 4. 2	Research eye abnormalities	4	ODFW, USFS, USFWS, BPA	150	40	40	35	35		
2	6. 1. 1	Support local restoration/conservation efforts	25	USFWS, ODFW, HRWG, USFS	*						

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
2	6. 1. 2	Provide long-term habitat protection	25	USFWS, HRWG, OWEB, USFS	500	25	25	25	25	25	
3	1. 2. 7	Improve instream flows	15	ODFW, BPA, USFS, ID, HRWG, WC	200	30	15	15	15	15	Related to 1.2.6
3	1. 3. 2	Restore channel conditions	15	USFS, ODFW, HRWG, NRCS, USFWS	2000	50	50	50	50	50	
3	3. 1. 5	Establish bull trout in other areas	15	ODFW, BLM, USFS, USFWS	250	10	20	25	25	25	
3	5. 4. 1	Monitor to detect pathogen effects	25	ODFW, CTWSR, USFS, USGS	125	5	5	5	5	5	Fish Disease Lab in Underwood, Washington.

Implementation schedule for the bull trout recovery plan: Hood River Recovery Unit											
Task Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration (years)	Responsible Parties	Cost Estimates(in \$1,000 units)					Comments	
					Total Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		Year 5
3	6. 1. 6	Prepare and distribute educational materials	3	RUT, ODFW, USFS, USFWS	50	20	20	10			Should be able to use information from other units
3	6. 1. 7	Facilitate media coverage	<1	ODFW, USFS,	*						Staff time will need to be
3	7. 3. 1	Periodically review progress towards recovery goals and assess recovery task priorities	Perpetuity	USFWS, RUT	*						

REFERENCES CITED

- Buchanan, D. V., Hanson, M.L., and Hooton, R.M. 1997. Status of Oregon's bull trout. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Portland, OR.
- Busby, P. J., T. C. Wainwright, G. J. Bryant, L. Lierheimer, R. S. Waples, F. W. Waknitz and I. V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U. S. Dpt. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-27, 261 p.
- Crow, J. F. and M. Kimura. 1970. An introduction to population genetics theory. Harper and Row, New York.
- Franklin, I. R. 1980. Evolutionary changes in small populations. Pages 135-149 *In:* M. E. Soule and B. A. Wilcox, editors. Conservation biology: An evolutionary-ecological perspective. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- (HRLAC) Hood River Local Advisory Committee. 2001. Hood River agricultural water quality management area plan. Hood River, OR.
- (HRWG) Hood River Watershed Group. 1999. Hood River Watershed Assessment. Hood River Watershed Group and Hood River Soil & Water Conservation District. Hood River, OR.
- Lande, R. 1988. Genetics and demography in biological conservation. *Science* 241: 1455-1460.
- Lee, D.C., J.R. Sedell, B.E. Rieman, R.F. Thurow and others. 1997. Chapter 4: Broadscale assessment of aquatic species and habitats. *In:* T.M. Quigley and S.J. Arbelbide, editors. An assessment of ecosystem components in the Interior Columbia Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins Volume III. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and U.S.

Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, General Technical Report PNW-GTR-405.

Meffe, G.K., and C.R. Carroll. 1994. Principles of conservation biology. Sinauer Associate, Inc. Sunderland, Massachusetts.

Montana Bull Trout Scientific Group. 1998. The relationship of land management activities and habitat requirements of bull trout.

Nehlsen, W., J. Williams, and J. Lichatowich. 1991. Pacific salmon at the crossroads: stocks at risk from California, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. Fisheries, Vol. 16, No. 2.

Newton, J., and S. Pribyl. 1993. Bull trout population summary lower Deschutes River subbasin. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Dalles, Oregon.

(NPPC) Northwest Power Planning Council. 2000. Draft Hood River Subbasin summary. Portland, OR.

(ODEQ) Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. 2001. Western Hood Subbasin total maximum daily load (TMDL). Portland, OR.

(ODFW) Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. 1992. Hood River fish management plan. Portland, OR.

(ODFW) Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. 1995. Biennial report on the status of wild fish in Oregon. Portland, OR.

(ODFW) Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. 1997. Sandy River Basin fish management plan. Portland, OR

- PacifiCorp. 1998. Powerdale Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 2659, Hood River County, Oregon. Application for New License For Major Project - Existing Dam, Volume II.
- Pribyl, S., Ridgley, C., and Newton, J. A. 1996. Bull trout population summary Hood River Subbasin. The Dalles, OR.
- Rieman, B.E., and J.D. McIntyre. 1993. Demographic and habitat requirements for conservation of bull trout. U.S. Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. General Technical Report INT-302.
- Rieman, B.E., and F.W. Allendorf. 2001. Effective population size and genetic conservation criteria for bull trout. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 21: 756-764.
- Soule, M. E. 1980. Thresholds for survival: maintaining fitness and evolutionary potential. Pages 151-170 *In*: M. E. Soule and B. A. Wilcox, editors. *Conservation biology: An evolutionary-ecological perspective*. Sinauer and Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- Spruell, P. and F. Allendorf. 1997. Nuclear DNA analysis of Oregon bull trout. Final report to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana.
- (USFWS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1998. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; determination of threatened status for the Klamath River and Columbia River distinct population segments of bull trout. *Federal Register* 63: 31647.
- (USFWS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2000. Biological Opinion. Effects to listed species from Operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Regions 1 and 6, Portland, Oregon and Denver, Colorado.

(USFS) U.S. Forest Service 1996a. East Fork Hood River watershed analyses. Hood River Ranger District, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mt. Hood National Forest, Parkdale, OR.

(USFS) U.S. Forest Service 1996b. West Fork of Hood River watershed analyses. Hood River Ranger District, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mt. Hood National Forest, Parkdale, OR.

In Literature

(ODFW) Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2001. Hood River recovery unit team meeting notes from meeting on March 26, 2001. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland , Oregon.

(USFS) U.S. Forest Service. 1999. Bull trout survey information from a variety of methods through 1998. Hood River Ranger District. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mt. Hood National Forest, Parkdale, Oregon.

(USFS) U.S. Forest Service. 2002. Bull trout survey information from a variety of methods through 1998. Hood River Ranger District, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mt. Hood National Forest, Parkdale, Oregon.

APPENDIX A: List of Chapters

Chapter 1	Introductory
Chapter 2	Klamath River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 3	Clark Fork River Recovery Unit, Montana, Idaho, and Washington
Chapter 4	Kootenai River Recovery Unit, Montana and Idaho
Chapter 5	Willamette River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 6	Hood River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 7	Deschutes River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 8	Odell Lake Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 9	John Day River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 10	Umatilla-Walla Walla Rivers Recovery Unit, Oregon and Washington
Chapter 11	Grande Ronde River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 12	Imnaha-Snake Rivers Recovery Unit, Oregon and Idaho
Chapter 13	Hells Canyon Complex Recovery Unit, Oregon and Idaho
Chapter 14	Malheur River Recovery Unit, Oregon
Chapter 15	Coeur d’Alene River Recovery Unit, Idaho
Chapter 16	Clearwater River Recovery Unit, Idaho
Chapter 17	Salmon River Recovery Unit, Idaho
Chapter 18	Southwest Idaho Recovery Unit, Idaho
Chapter 19	Little Lost River Recovery Unit, Idaho
Chapter 20	Lower Columbia Recovery Unit, Washington
Chapter 21	Middle Columbia Recovery Unit, Washington
Chapter 22	Upper Columbia Recovery Unit, Washington
Chapter 23	Northeast Washington Recovery Unit, Washington
Chapter 24	Snake River Washington Recovery Unit, Washington
Chapter 25	Saint Mary - Belly Recovery Unit, Montana