These are the Biological Notes for the Upper Salmon Expert Panel 2015-2016, conducted in Salmon, WA. The spreadsheet contains both Look Back and Look Forward biological notes. Notes are specific to Steelhead. The Look Back and Look Forward meetings respectively occurred from 11/18/2015 to 11/20/2015 and 3/22/2016 to 3/23/2016. Raw notes were collected during Panel discussions, and later checked for typographical errors and for consistency with supporting tables. This spreadsheet also reflects revisions to look back uplifts and rationale in response to the Panel's review comments and revisions during the look forward meeting.

"EP table" or "Calculation Table" references are to spreadsheets developed and compiled during the session. This spreadsheet references both look back and look forward calculation spreadsheets (tables). These two files are named the following:

## Look Back Calculation Table (most recent version):

UpSalmon\_LookBack\_CalcSpreadsheet\_LFrevisions\_NTL\_4-23-16.xlsx

## Look Forward Calculation Table (most recent version):

UpperSalmon\_LookForward2016-2018\_CalcSpreadsheet\_042316.xlsx

Primary biological note taker: Kim Gould, Cardno, Inc.

## Key:

Bracketing in rationale columns demarks content added during the QA process after the meeting.

## File History Notes:

Immediately after the conclusion of the 11/20/2015 session with the AA team, the EP filled out remaining project tables and provided Biological Notes comments for a few remaining steelhead Assessment Units.

For LF 9.2 (Flow), the numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases. See the Panel's table of actions for details for each AU and LF.

Reviewed and noted modifications by EWL 2/5/16 5/26/16 Reviewed and updated by Mark Moulton (USFS) and RM (BPA) Reviewed and updated by EWW 6.30.16

Population East Fork Salmon	Code EFS1	Assessment Unit Bayhorse	2012 Standardized Limiting Factor 1.1: Habitat Quantity:	2012 Low Bookend	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012- 2015 Look Back) 0 100	Nov 2015 % Change 58.3	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale Expert Panel counted 1 project: Bayhorse Creek Culvert to	Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting)	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward ) Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments/ Rationale	Revised 2016-18 Low Bookend (Look Forward Meeting)	/ 2016-18 Bookend Comments/R ationale	2016 Low Bookend (incorporate s revisions or 2012- 2015 uplift)	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate	LookForw ard Updated 2018 Estimate % change	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018	2013-2018	High 2018 Bookend 70	2012 LF Weight 20%	2012 LF Weight and Bookend Comments low bookend raised	2012 Estimates Comments bayhorse ck 2 and 4	AU Weight Comments
River		Creek	Anthropogenic Barriers				Bridge (7 miles of access). Denominator: 12 mi of habitat (mileage adjusted by panel using local knowledge). Equals 58.3% uplift.									time period.				from 20, 8/9/12	diversion were consolidated in 2011; doesn't include bayhorse 1	
East Fork Salmon River	EFS1	Bayhorse Creek	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	20	0 57.5	37.5	1 action: SBaC-01 screen (3 cfs design flow). Using 8 cfs denominator from Morgan Case (IDWR) summation of diversions; = 37.5% uplift.						57.5	5 57.5	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		20	20%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS1	Bayhorse Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	90	D O		Expert Panel: "not a limiting factor."						90	90	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		90	20%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS1	Bayhorse Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	4	5 0	0	No actions. No change.						45	5 45	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		45	20%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS1	Bayhorse Creek	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	20	0 47.9	27.9	Expert Panel counted 1 action: 20 year lease of 2.23 cfs. The numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases. Using 8 cfs denominator from Morgan Case (IDWR) summation of diversions; =27.9% uplift.						47.5	75.8	27.9	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period. [4-15-16: Flow projects from the Look Back extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried forward and added to Look Forward uplift calculations. As a result, revised uplift = 27.9%]		20	20%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS2	Challis Creek	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	80	0 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						80	0 80	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		85	20%		Actions high up in stream benefit steelhead not Chinook	
East Fork Salmon River	EFS2	Challis Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	60	D O	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						60	0 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60.5	10%		Some improvement from project addressing Decreased Water Quantity LF	
East Fork Salmon River	EFS2	Challis Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	40	DO	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						40	40	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		40	20%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS2	Challis Creek	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	50	D O	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						50	50	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		50.1	10%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS2	Challis Creek	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	32	2 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						32	2 32	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		33	40%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS3	EF Salmon River	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	93	3 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						93	93	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		94	10%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS3	EF Salmon River	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	70	0 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						70	0 70	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		70	10%		Not enough info on Weir project to assess improvements at 8/9/12 workshop	
East Fork Salmon River	EFS3	EF Salmon River	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	60	0 60.6	0.6	Expert Panel counted 1 action only. E. Fork Fence Project: 0.8 mi; 3% functional. Denominator = 37.2 mi = 0.06 % change.						60.6	60.6	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60	25%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS3	EF Salmon River	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	50	DO	0	No action. No change.						50	0 50	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		52	25%		need alternative to push up dams in high velocity/bedload environment several other treatments needed	
East Fork Salmon River	EFS3	EF Salmon River	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	7:	1 0	0	Expert Panel: No significant actions. No change.						71	1 71	. 0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		71	15%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS3	EF Salmon River	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	60	0 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						60	0 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		61	15%	low bookend changed from 40, 8/9/12		
East Fork Salmon River	EFS4	EF Salmon Tributaries	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers		0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						0	0 0	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.			0%			
East Fork Salmon River	EFS4	EF Salmon Tributaries	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	70	D 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						70	70	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		75	20%		3 diversions on Road Ck reamining;	

Population	Code	Assessment Unit	2012 Standardized Limiting Factor	2012 Low Bookend	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012- 2015 Look Back)	Nov 2015 % Change	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale	Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting)	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward ) Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments/ Rationale	Revised 2016-18 Low Bookend (Look Forward Meeting)	2016-18 Bookend Comments/R ationale	2016 Low Bookend (incorporate s revisions or 2012- 2015 uplift)	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate	LookForw ard Updated 2018 Estimate % change	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale	High 20 2013-2018 Booker	18 2012 L Id Weigh	F 2012 LF Weight and t Bookend Comments	2012 Estimates Comments	AU Weight Comments
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS4	EF Salmon Tributaries	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	30	0 0	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						31	D 30	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		30 8	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS5	Garden Creek	1.1: Habitat Quantity Anthropogenic Barriers	: 20	0 34.8	14.8	Garden Creek project: 1.2 mi access. Denominator: 8.1 mi. = 14.8% uplift.						34.1	8 43.1	8.3	Same Syphon project as for Chinook (LMC6): 2 miles opened to next barrier upstream. Denominator for Garden Creek: Streamnet steelhead miles: 8.1 miles, but panel thought this was too short. Intrinsic Potential shows 12 miles. Panel decided to use 12 miles as denominator. This yields 8.3% expected uplift.		30 2	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS5	Garden Creek	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanica Injury	20	0 62	42	Expert Panel counted 1 project: SGC -01 (11.09 cfs). Flow denominator from Morgan Case (IDWR) is 26.4 cfs = 42.0% uplift.						6	2 62	2 0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		20 1	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS5	Garden Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	35	5 35	0	No action. No change.						3!	5 35	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		35 2	D%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS5	Garden Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	60	0 60	0	No action. No change.						61	0 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60 1	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS5	Garden Creek	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	20	0 26.1	6.1	2 actions in database. Expert Panel counted 1 (Garden 1.6 cfs permanent), not screen project. Denominator is 26.4 cfs from Morgan Case (IDWR) summation of diversions. = 6.1% uplift.						26.:	1 26.1	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		25 4	0%	Garden Ck. project to add abt 3 cfs	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS6	Herd Creek	1.1: Habitat Quantity Anthropogenic Barriers	: 71	1 71	0	No action. No change.						7:	1 71	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		75 1	0% high bookend reflects natural barriers that block access to entire AU		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS6	Herd Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	60	0 60	0	No action. No change.						6	D 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60 4	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS6	Herd Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	70	0 70	0	No action. No change.						70	0 70	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		70 3	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS6	Herd Creek	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	65	5 65	0	No action. No change.						6!	5 65	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		70 2	0%	8 cfs potential HC-3 pipeline from Lake Ck	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS7	Mainstem Salmon River	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	25	5 27.02	2.02	No action. No change.						27.0	2 27.02	2 0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		25 1	5%	Remember to update 2015 look-back w/any 12-mi reach easements/projects implemented after 2012	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS7	Mainstem Salmon River	5.2: Peripheral and Transitional Habitats: Floodplain Condition	60	0 60	0	No action. No change.						6	0 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60 3	0%	Remember to update 2015 look-back w/any 12-mi reach easements/projects implemented after 2012	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS7	Mainstem Salmon River	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	60	0 60	0	No action. No change.						6	0 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60 3	0%	Remember to update 2015 look-back w/any 12-mi reach easements/projects implemented after 2012	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS7	Mainstem Salmon River	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	50	0 50	0	No action. No change.						51	D 50	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		50 1	0%	Remember to update 2015 look-back w/any 12-mi reach easements/projects implemented after 2012	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS7	Mainstem Salmon River	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	50	0 50	0	No action. No change.						51	0 50	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		50 1	5%	Remember to update 2015 look-back w/any 12-mi reach easements/projects implemented after 2012	
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS8	Morgan Creek	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanica Injury	50	0 50	0	No action. No change.						50	0 50	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		50 2	0%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS8	Morgan Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	60	0 60	0	No action. No change.						6	D 60	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		60 2	D%		
East Fork Salmo River	n EFS8	Morgan Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	20	0 20	0	No action. No change.						20	0 20	0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018 time period.		20 1	0%		

		Assessment	2012 Standardized	2012 Low	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012- 2015 Look	Nov 2015 %		Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 Lf Weighting Comments/ Rationale	Revised 2016-18 Low Bookend (Look Forward Meeting)	r 2016-18 Bookend Comments/R ationale	2016 Low Bookend (incorporate s revisions or 2012- 2015 uplift)	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate	LookForw ard Updated 2018 Estimate % change	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale		High 2018	3 2012 LF	2012 LF Weight and	2012 Estimates	AU Weight
Population	Code	Unit	Limiting Factor	Bookend	Back)	Change	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale						61.0		122	No optione. No operation of a property of the providence in 2010	2013-2018	Bookend	Weight	Bookend Comments	Comments	Comments
East Fork Salmon	1 EFS8	Norgan	8.1: Water Quality:	6	0 61.8	1.8	Expert Panel applied now benefit % to Limiting Factor 8.1. =						61.8	64.1	1 2.3	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018		60	J 109	6		
River		Creek	remperature				1.8% uplitt.									time period. [4-15-16: Given dependance of						
																temperature uplift on flow (limiting factor 9.2) uplift,						
																temperature uplift was revised in response to carry						
																forward of look back flow projects. Revised uplift = 2.39	6]					
East Fork Salmor	n EFS8	Morgan	9.2: Water Quantity:	3	5 36.8	1.8	Expert Panel counted 1 action (Morgan Cr. 2 cfs 2014, 2015						36.8	3 39.1	1 2.3	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018		35	5 409	6		
River		Creek	Decreased Water				lease). The numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the									time period. [4-15-16: Flow projects from the Look Back	< Comparison of the second sec					
			Quantity				average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015,									extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried						
							plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases.									forward and added to Look Forward uplift calculations.						
							Denominator: 57 cfs from Morgan Case. = 1.8% uplift.									As a result, revised uplift = 2.3%]						
East Fork Salmor	n EFS9	Salmon River	9.2: Water Quantity:	3	0 32.2	2.2	Expert Panel counted 1 action Lyon Cr. 2.6 cfs permanent			1	1	1	32.2	2 32.2	2 0	No actions. No predicted percentage change in 2018		30	1009	6		
River		Tributaries	Decreased Water				right). Denominator: 118 cfs from Morgan Case. = 2.2% uplift									time period.			1			
			Quantity																1			

Populat	ion Code	Assessment Unit	2012 Standardized Limiting Factor	2012 Low Bookend	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012- 2015 Look Back)	Nov 2015 Change	5 % e 2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale	Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting)	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments / Rationale	Revised 2016-18 Low Bookend (Look Forward Meeting)	2016-18 Bookend Comments/F ationale	2016 Low Bookend (incorpora tes revisions or 2012-	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate % change	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale	2013-2018	8 2033	High 2018 Bookend	B High 2033 Bookend	2012 LF Weight	2012 LF Weight and Bookend Comments	2012 Estimates Comments	2012 AU Weight Comments
Lemhi River	LR54	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	30	52.1	22.1	Expert Panel's xls table contains 7 projects in this Assessment Unit, but no credit for Kenny. Delete Soiux Lane project from database. No Steelhead benefit from SC-C13. Add SC-C3 (1 mi). Discussion of miles of steelhead benefit for each project. Steelhead benefit is generally longer than for Chinook for any given project. Add Bohanon IDFG Back Rd [already in database] and Upper Culvert [new] projects to database. Total treatment = 8.85 mi out of 40 mi = 22.1% uplift.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1 (renamed to Lemhi Tributaries and Salmon River Tributaries from Lemhi to North Fork (inc. Carmen)). It then matches the extent of LRC1. Combined denominator for steelhead is 180 miles. LRS3 is therefore deprecated. New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production.		Started with same limiting factors and weights as for LRC1, and then adjusted weights to account	30	See calc table for new low bookends for combined assessment unit. Increased low bookend to 30%.	30	42.1	5 12.6	Calc table contains projects from LRC1; panel adjusted projects to include lengths for steelhead distribution and Chinook and steelhead assessment unit non-overlap areas. Three projects-prorations considered seasonality of adult and juvenile migration, as it differs from Chinook. Same denominator as for Look Back. Yields 5.3% expected uplift. Panel then decided to combine LRS1 and LRS3 (see assessment unit weighting notes), and then added LRS3 projects to calc table and used combined denominators (180 miles). New expected uplift is 12.6 %.	45	4	5	90	10%		5.5 mi total access fixes 7/21 diversions	
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	30	61	31	Expert Panel's xis table: took Chinook projects, removed ones out of Assessment Unit, and added Lower Bohannon screen, which was out of range of Chinook. STC-03 does not belong in this Assessment Unit (it's on Tower Cr., I&S-3 Assessment Unit). Metric = Screen design flow in cfs. 6 projects = 49.7 cfs	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.			25		25	33.:	8.3	Calc table contains projects from LRC1; panel adjusted projects to include lengths for steelhead distribution and Chinook and steelhead assessment unit non-overlap areas. Added Bohannon Creek 13 Screen. Denominator was 950 cfs, as for Chinook. Yields 8.3% expected uplift.	45	, 4	5	90	15%		also includes 7 access projects; close proportion to access projects	
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	60	60	0	No riparian actions in database for this steelhead Assessment Unit. Expert Panel confirmed no change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.			50		50	) 50.:	3 0.3	See calc table for combined assessment unit. Same as Chinook, resulting in 0.3% expected yield.	62	2 64	4	75	10%	changed from 40/75, 8/8/12	3 mi fence- most of AU in good steelheadape, these are remaining treatment areas	
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	5.2: Peripheral and Transitional Habitats: Floodplain Condition					Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.		Added LF when AUs were combined because it	50	Reduced when assessment units were combined.	50	50.1	5 0.6	See calc table for combined assessment unit. Adjusted from Chinook, resulting in 0.6% expected uplift.								
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	60	60	0	No riparian actions in database for this steelhead Assessment Unit. Expert Panel confirmed no change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.			50		50	50.	7 0.7	See calc table for combined assessment unit. Adjusted from Chinook, resulting in 0.7% expected uplift.	61	6	3	75	5%	establisteelh eaded 8/8/12	include riparian LF projects also	
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	6.2: Channel Structure and Form: Instream Structural Complexity					Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.		Added LF when AUs were combined because it was an LF for LRS3.	40	Based on wood loading across assessment unit.	40	40.	0.4	See calc table for combined assessment unit. Adjusted from Chinook, resulting in 0.4% expected uplift.								
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	50	50	0	No riparian actions in database for this steelhead Assessment Unit. Expert Panel confirmed no change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.			35	Panel chose to reduce sediment low bookend. CHaMP GIS layers for poo sediment were queried, but do not exist for these assessment units (priority watersheds only available at this time).	35	35.1	0.6	For Lemhi general in LRS1 and LCR1: CHaMP data show total pool sand + fines = 25.67%. Compare this to average for tributaries of 19%, which can be used as a reference target condition. See calc table for combined assessment unit. Adjusted from Chinook; panel determined 0.6% expected uplift.	51	. 51	2	60	5%		considered riparian, and bed/channel form LF projects	
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	70	74	4	Expert Panel: Use flow change % (4%) + Riparian (0) = 4%	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.			40	Panel considered temperature data: DEQ TMDL 2012	40	4:	5	See calc table for combined assessment unit. Adjusted from Chinook. Sum of Riparian and Flow uplifts is 2.2% expected uplift. [4-15-16: Given dependance of temperature uplift on flow (limiting factor 9.2) uplift, temperature uplift was revised in response to carry forward of look back flow projects. Revised uplift = 5%]	, 71	1 72	2	80	5%		included riparian, bed/channel form LF projects	
Lemhi River	LRS4	Lemhi tributaries and Carmen Creek	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	30		4	See Expert Panel xis table of flow projects by lease/right type and correct database if/as needed. SCC-03 2 s/b 1.2 cfs. Carmen BS s/b 1 cfs permanent. The numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases. Fish screen installs should not count as flow benefit project. Denominator = 160 cfs. 6.34 cfs benefit = 4% change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1.			25		25	29.	7 4.7	See calc table for combined assessment unit. Same as Chinook; 1.9% expected uplift. [4-15-16. Flow projects from the Look Back extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried forward and added to Look Forward uplift calculations. As a result, revised uplift = 4.7%]	: 33	3	3	50	50%		~11 cfs affecting 1.1+ mi	
Lemhi River	LR52	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	85	85	0	Expert Panel: L-1 partial/seasonal barrier was not a problem fo steelhead. No change for steelhead.	r New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.	1	Added limiting factor 6.2 and reweighte d: used same weights as for Chinook.			85	8	5 0	No actions. No percentage change expected.	85.25	85.2	5	90	2%	stranding changed from 51/60, 8/8/12	evaluated only on L-1 project PLUS I-63, L-54, and L58a (described under LF 9.2)	
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstern Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	90	91.25	1.25	Add L-1 diversion project to this Limiting Factor. As discussed by Expert Panel for LRC2-23: LHC-08 screen projects (upgrade to new standard). Metrics: use # of screens, or quantity of water screened? Also include L-1 under this Limiting Factor as elimination of diversion and screen. L-1 benefit in context of # of screens in Assessment Unit (~100 screens as denominator). was a 2-2.5 cfs diversion out of ~50 cfs. Expert Panel: 1% for L- 1; 0.25 for LHC-8 = 1.25% uplift. Therefore, for Steelhead, the improvement similarly = 1.25%. EWL 4.1.16	New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.	2	Added limiting factor 6.2 and reweighte d: used same weights as for Chinook.			91.25	91.2	50	No creditable actions expected in 2018 time period.	91	. 9:	1	95	7%		Assumes 10 screen replacements are maintaining current function, not improving. Other screen projects are improving. Remaining screens include Basin Ck., some additional Backdoor issues	
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	35	35.1	0.1	See Chinook discussion and tables - same projects in table; same changes to actions. Demoninator for steelhead is 107.8 miles (Streamet). Need to add Amonson project for steelhead and for Chinook, but does not result in significant change in %. Relative treatment size = 22%; = 0.1% uplift per Expert Panel spreadsheet calculations.	New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.		Unchange d.			35.1	35.:	3 0.2	Overall assessment unit extent equals LRC2 geography, so same projects, but different fish distribution denominator (107.8 miles). Yields 0.2% expected uplift.	36	; 38	8	40	15%			
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	5.2: Peripheral and Transitional Habitats: Floodplain Condition	20	20.7	0.7	See Chinook discussion. Only 1 project in database, but added projects as per Chinook. Denominator for steelhead is 107.8 miles (Streamnet). See spreadsheet. Expert Panel: Uplift =0.7 change in %.	New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.		Unchange d.			20.7	22.9	5 1.8	Overall assessment unit extent equals LRC2 geography, so same projects, but different fish distribution denominator (107.8 miles). Yields 1.8% expected uplift.	20.5	2:	1	30	10%		Estimate 3.22 miles side channel enhancement.	

Population	n Code	Assessment Unit	2012 Standardized Limiting Factor	2012 Low Bookend	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012- 2015 Look Back)	Nov 2015 % Change	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale	Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting)	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments / Rationale	Revised 2016-18 Low Bookend (Look Forward Meeting)	2016-18 Bookend Comments/R ationale	2016 Low Bookend (incorpora tes revisions or 2012-	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate % change	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale	2013-2018	2033	High 201 Bookent	8 High 2033 Bookend	2012 LF Weight	2012 LF Weight and Bookend Comments	2012 Estimates Comments	2012 AU Weight Comments
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	40	40.8	0.8	See Chinook discussion. Only 1 project in database, but added projects as per Chinook. Denominator for steelhead is 107.8 miles (Streamet). See spreadsteelheadeet. Expert Panel: Uplift = 0.8 change in %.	New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LR52, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.	13	Added limiting factor 6.2 and reweighte d: used same weights as for Chinook.			40.8	43	2.2	Overall assessment unit extent equals LRC2 geography, so same projects, but different fish distribution denominator (107.8 miles). Yields 2.2% expected uplift.	41	42		60	8%		Riparian & floodplain LF projects also contribute.	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	6.2: Channel Structure and Form: Instream Structural Complexity					New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.	16	Added limiting factor 6.2 and reweighte d: used same weights as for Chinook.	23	Same low bookend and rationale as for Chinook.	23	25.3	2.3	Overall assessment unit extent equals LRC2 geography, so same projects, but different fish distribution denominator (107.8 miles). Yields 2.3% expected uplift.								
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	30	30.8	0.8	See Chinook discussion. Added, changed, and removed project(s) as per Chinook. Hayden and Tyler are removed. Denominator for steelhead is 107.8 miles (Streamnet). See spreadsteelheadeet. Expert Panel: Uplift = 0.8 change in %.	New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.		Unchange d.			30.8	31	.0.2	Overall assessment unit extent equals LRC2 geography, so same projects, but different fish distribution denominator (107.8 miles). Yields 0.2% expected uplift.	30.5	31		35	8%		Projects addressing other LF;'s in this AU considered for this estimate.	
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	28	35.6	7.6	Taking into account upstream tribs, and adding LH 4.1 riparian flow benefits to LH 9.2 flow uplift = 7.6.	New AU weights: 60% LSR1; 40% LRS2, based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.		Unchange d.			35.6	47.8	12.2	Overall assessment unit extent equals IRC2 geography, so same projects, but different fish distribution denominator (107.8 miles). Yields 7.1% expected uplift. [4-15-16: Given dependance of temperature uplift on flow (limiting factor 9.2) uplift, temperature uplift was revised in response to carry forward of look back flow projects. Revised uplift = 12.2%]	29	30	,	45	10%		Projects addressing other LF's in this AU considered for this estimate	
Lemhi River	LRS2	Mainstem Salmon and Lemhi Rivers and Hayden Creek	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	23.5	31.1	7.6	11/18/2015: EP discussed 9.2 before 8.1, as per CHK. Same Donato reference, so same denom of 650 cfs. Same Tyler change to 12.7, and others in spreadsheet calc = 6% change. 11/19/2015: EP revisited to account for trib flow projects that benefit this AU. Added these projects from LRS3 to the LRS3 table, removing those that did not apply (e.g. Carmen Cr projects, Holly 18 mile, Upper Holly. The numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases. Denominator is 750 cfs; = 7.6% uplift.	New AU weights: 60% LSN1; 40% LSR2; based on relative production. See calc table for AU weights.	25	Added limiting factor 6.2 and reweighte d: used same weights as for Chinook.			31.1	43.1	12	Same denominator and uplift rationale as for Chinook. [4-15-16: Flow projects from the Look Back extending into the 2015-2018 period were carried forward and added to Look Forward uplift calculations. As a result, revised uplift = 12.0%]	24.5	24.5		30	40%		Upstream flow projects (LRS1) also considered for this estimate.	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	20	34.5	14.5	Expert Panel assembled xls table of opened steelhead miles from 10 fish passage actions for this Assessment Unit.Pratt project benefits=0,correcel in database.Streamnet shows 3.1 miles.Expert Panel: decided to not use Streamnet mileage. Instead, use Chinook 60 mi multiplied by 3 (to reflect larger Steelhead distribution), minus 40 mi (3 tribs not in Assessment Unit) for 13.4 mainstem miles, plus tributaries.Treatment=20.3 mi=14.5% change. *Uplift modified 1.8.16, to reflect 7 projects not considered during Expert Panel meeting.Based on additional river miles treated, uplift was modified to 19.9%- EWL	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LR3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	25	25		50	20%		steelhead use more tribs than chinook	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	20	21.7	1.7	2 actions in database: Holly Cr. and Tower Cr. Use screen design flows as metric. Denominator discussion: can use IRC1 cfs withdraws, adjusted by Expert Panel for tributaries that are included in this Assessment Unit. Expert Panel consensus: LRS3 (950 cfs diversions from Donato 1998 ms number minus 4 tribs: Carmen 100, Bohanon 20, Wimpy 25, Kenny 15)– 790 cfs; LRS1 = 160 cfs. 13.25 cfs screened = 1.7% change. ***Some details in this narrative are incorrect. See TAssessment Unitrus for corrected version. Change should be 1.9%. EWL *****	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	21	21		50	15%		whole lot more need to be screened	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	80	80.5	0.5	See Expert Panel xls table of actions: 2 actions in database, plus the additional actions added for Chinook. Total of 4 projects. Pratt goes to next Lookforward. Expert Panel: use with Chinook calculations for this Assessment Unit location. = 4.6 mi/140 mi = 0.5%	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	80.3	80.5	ý	90	5%	changed from 40/65, 8/8/12	~ 2 mi total	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	5.2: Peripheral and Transitional Habitats: Floodplain Condition	75	75.6	0.6	2 projects, as with Chinook for this Assessment Unit area. Lower Little Springs, Lee Creek Fencing (Big 8 Mile) = 1.4 mi treated/140 mi; = 0.6% change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	75.2	75.5	ý	80	5%	changed from 50/65, 8/8/12	included riparian, bed/channel, channel complexity LF projects	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	75	76.9	1.9	3 projects: Lower Little Springs, Lee Creek Fencing (Big 8 Mile), Lower Little Springs Channel Complexity = 2.6 mi treated/140 mi; = 1.9% change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	75.3	75.5	i	80	5%	establisteelh eaded 8/8/12	included riparian,floodplain condition, complexity LF projects	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	6.2: Channel Structure and Form: Instream Structural Complexity	75	76.9	1.9	3 projects: Lower Little Springs, Lee Creek Fencing (Big 8 Mile), Lower Little Springs Chan Complexity = 2.6 mi treated/140 mi; = 1.9% change.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	75.3	75.5	ý	80	5%	establisteelh eaded 8/8/12	included riparian, floodplain condition, and bed/channel form LF projects	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	50	50.5	0.5	4 projects (see xls table calcs with % current effective). If weighed as per Limiting Factor 4.1, = 0.5 % uplift.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	50.5	51		60	5%	hi changed from 70, 8/8/12	Riparian, bed/channel form, floodplain condition & complexity projects considered in this estimate.	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	70	73.2	3.2	Limiting Factor 9.2 2.7% change plus Limiting Factor 4.1 Riparian change 0.5% = 3.2 uplift.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	70.5	71		80	5%	changed from 60/70, 8/8/12	Project addressing other LF considered here.	
Lemhi River	LRS3	Other Salmon and Lemhi River seasonally and disconnected tributaries	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	22.5	25.2	2.7	Expert Panel's xis table of leases and permanent flow projects, contains 4 projects, all permanent = 21.4 cfs out of 790 cfs (see Chinook rationale = 2.7% uplift.	Merge LRS1 with LRS3 and call it LRS1. It then matches the extent of LRC1. LRS3 is therefore deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.								LRS3 is deprecated, and its actions are now considered in LRS1.	23.5	23.5	×	40	35%	lo changed from 20, 8/8/12		

Population	Code	Assessment Unit	2012 Standardized Limiting Factor	Low Bookend	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012- 2015 Look Back)	Nov 2015 % Change	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale	Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting)	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments/ Rationale	18 Low Bookend (Look	Bookend Comment s/Rationa	Bookend (incorporate s revisions or	ard Updated 2018	ard Updated 2018	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale	2013-2018	2033	High 2018 Bookend	2012 LF Weight	2012 LF Weight and Bookend Comments	2012 Estimates Comments	2012 AU Weight Comments
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	40	54.2	14.20	Expert Panel:steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.PRS1 tream miles rationale includes estimate of stream miles in Pahsimeroi River and major connected tributaries from the mouth to the mouth of Big Creek, and including all known spring channels in current occupied, seasonally occupied, or potentially accessible habitat for steelhead. Straightline distance was calculated using the measure tool in Google Earth and a sinuosity factor was added using professional judgement. "During QA realized P-16 headgate project was not included in Expert Panel lookback consideration. 1.8.16, added P-16 headgate project to calculation spreadsheet. Changed uplift value by 0.2%-EWL	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use Chinook limiting factors. New assessment weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUS; set at 70%.	10	Increased weight for steelhead passage than for Chinook.			54.2	60.6	6.4	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined steelhead distribution from PSR1 and PRS3 is 151 miles. Yields 6.4% expected uplift.	4	5 45	60	20%	Steelhead habitat - lack of connectivity to tribs.	17.2 mi total - 30 mi from hatchery ladder project already included in other completed projects; hatchery project affects different life history stages. Most barriers in Sulphur & Fury Lane. Fall CK/Little Morgan projects not considered in this 5% estimate.	
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	65	73	8	Expert Panel: steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use Chinook limiting factors. New assessment weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs; set at 70%.	10	Reweighted limiting factors due to combination of assessment units.			73	76.8	3.8	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined diversion flows from PSR1 and PRS3 = 610 cfs (same as for Chinook). Yields 3.8% expected uplift.	7	5 75		15%			
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	50	52.1	2.1	Expert Panel: steelheadnumerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.	s EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use CHK LFs. New AU weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs:70%.	10	Riparian is a significant factor in this assessment unit.			52.1	. 53	0.9	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined steelhead distribution from PSR1 and PRS3 is 151 miles. Yields 0.9% expected uplift.	52.	5 55	i	10%	Steelhead habitat - lack of connectivity to tribs.	14.5 mi riparian enhancement. Estimate does not consider P-13 - include in 2015 look back if it is implemented.	
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	50	52.9	2.9	Expert Panel: steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use CHK LFs. New AU weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs:70%.	10	Reweighted limiting factors due to combination of assessment units.			52.9	55.8	2.9	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined steelhead distribution from PSR1 and PRS3 is 151 miles. Yields 2.9% expected uplift.	50.	5 55		5%	Steelhead habitat - lack of connectivity to tribs.	Sulphur Ck. Project & other projects from Fury Lane to P12 considered in this estimate - natural process changes.	
	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	6.2: Channel Structure and Form: Instream Structural Complexity					EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use Chinook limiting factors. New assessment weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs; set at 70%.	15	Added limiting factor 6.2.	20	Assessme nt unit needs much more instream complexit y.	20	22.8	2.8	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined steelhead distribution from PSR1 and PRS3 is 151 miles. Yields 2.8% expected uplift.							
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	7.1: Sediment Conditions: Decreased Sediment Quantity	20	21.5	1.5	Expert Panel: steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinox, so use PRC1 numbers for all lumiting Factors and actions in PRS1. Also add sediment benefit from upstream PRS3 projects (see Chinook tables): New total: 1.5%.	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use CHK LFs. New AU weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs:70%.	0	Zero weight. Remove limiting factor.			21.5	21.5	0	Zero weight. Remove limiting factor.	2	ס		0%	Make sure spreadsheet breaks is Big Creek (NOT Big Springs Ck)		
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	20	21.5	1.5	Expert Panel: steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use CHK LFs. New AU weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs:70%.	15	Reweighted limiting factor due to combination of assessment units.			21.5	22.8	1.3	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined steelhead distribution from PSR1 and PRS3 is 151 miles. Yields 1.3% expected uplift.	20.	21		5%		Estimate considers projects listed under Riparian IF; PRS3 contributes sediment loads to this AU.	
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	40	55.3	15.3	Expert Panel: steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use Chinook limiting factors. New assessment weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs; set at 70%.	10	Reweighted limiting factor due to combination of assessment units.			55.3	67.9	12.6	Same actions as in Chinook list. Uplift is the sum of limiting factors 4.1 and 9.2. Yields 3.6% expected uplift. [4-15-16. Given dependance of temperature uplift on flow (limiting factor 9.2) uplift, temperature uplift was revised in response to carry forward of look back flow projects. Revised uplift = 12.6%]	40.	5 41		5%		Estimate considers projects listed under Riparian & Decreased Water Quantity LF. Most of benefit from Sulphur Cr.to main Pahsimeroi.	
Pahsimeroi River	PRS4	Pahsimeroi River	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	30	43.2	13.2	Expert Panel: steelhead numerators and denominators will be the same as for Chinook, so use PRC1 numbers for all Limiting Factors and actions in PRS1.	EP combined PRS1 and PRS3, as with Chinook. PRS3 is therefore deprecated. Use Chinook limiting factors. New assessment weight: higher than the 60% sum of the two AUs; set at 70%.	20	Reweighted limiting factor due to combination of assessment units.			43.2	54.9	11.7	Same actions as in Chinook list. Different denominator: combined diversion flows from PSR1 and PRS3 = 610 cfs (same as for Chinook). Yields 2.7% expected uplift. [4-15-16: Flow projects from the Look Back extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried forward and added to Look Forward uplift calculations. As a result, revised uplift = 11.7%]	3	2 32		40%	Consider timing of spawning and juveniles between ST and CK. Steelhead habitat - lack of connectivity to tribs.	Sulphur & P13 are only projects that actually gain water; conservative estimate.	

									Revised LF		Revised 2016	2010-18	2010 LOW	LOOKFOIN	LOOKFOIN								
			2012 Standardized	Low	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012	Nov 2015 %		Revised AU Weight (Look	Weight (Look Forward Meetin	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments/ Rationale	18 Low Bookend	Bookend Comment	Bookend (incorporate	ard Updated	ard Updated	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale			High 201	8 2012 LF	2012 LF Weight and Bookend		2012 AU Weight
Population	Code	Assessment Unit	Limiting Factor	Bookend	2015 Look Back	) Change	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale	Forward Meeting)	2016)		(Look	s/Rationa	s revisions o	2018	2018		2013-2018	2033	Booken	Weight	Comments	2012 Estimates Comments	Comments
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS2	Salmon River and Tributaries	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	6	5 80.5	15.5	Discussion of denominator mileage: mileage includes mainstem as well a tributaries: 61.8 mi from Streamnet. This might be a bit low. See Expert Panel xis table of access actions. Verified projects and benefit lengths. Remove duplicates from database. On table: Iron Cr: 4.5 mi; Poison Cr: 1. mi; Cow Cr: 3.5. Sum: 9.6 benefit/62 = 15.5% uplift.	s EP reweighed assessment unit to 30% due to 6 wanting weight of combined PRS1 and PRS3 assessment unit to					80.5	80.	.5 0	All projects listed in database are outside of the 2018 BiOp period. No change expected.	70	) 70		20	6	Includes McKim Warm Springs, and Poison Ck barriers Upwards of 12 more barriers remaining	
								be 70%.									L'						
Pahsimeroi Rive	r PRS2	Salmon River and Tributaries	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	4	5 46.1	1.1	2 projects: Poison Cr, Cow Cr screens. Use design flows as metric: 2.1 and 3.6 cfs. Sum: 5.7 cfs. Denominator: Morgan calculation of diversions: 497 cfs: = 1.1% uplift. Expert Panel: Note that 497 cfs includes Salmon River withdrawals. Should limit to the tributaries in the future.	I EP reweighed assessment unit to 30% due to wanting weight of combined PRS1 and PRS3 assessment unit to be 70%.	2 2				46.:	1 46.	.10	All projects listed in database are outside of the 2018 BiOp period. No change expected.	55	55		20	6	2 McKim fisteelheadscreens about 12 more to be screened	
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS2	Salmon River and Tributaries	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	7	70.6	0.6	See Expert Panel's xls, listing actions and % current function benefits improvements per project. Cole Ranch projects: Riparian fencing 1.96 mi and 0.09 mi planting actions (protection and active treatment) = 2.05 miles. Good cottonwood growth. 20% for fencing: 3% for planting Adjusted for % current function improvement: 0.6% uplift.	EP reweighed i assessment unit to 30% due to wanting weight of combined PRS1 and PRS3 assessment unit to be 70%.	,				70.6	5 70.	.6 0	All projects listed in database are outside of the 2018 BiOp period. No change expected.	70	) 70		20	6		
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS2	Salmon River and Tributaries	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	3	3 35.6	2.6	Expert Panel: Add uplifts from Limiting Factor 4.1 and 9.2 = 2.6 % total change.	EP reweighed assessment unit to 30% due to wanting weight of combined PRS1 and PRS3 assessment unit to be 70%.	, ,				35.6	5 37.	.5 1.9	All projects listed in database are outside of the 2018 BiOp period. No change expected. [4-15- 16: Given dependance of temperature uplift on flow (limiting factor 9.2) uplift, temperature uplift was revised in response to carry forward of look back flow projects. Revised uplift = 1.9%]	33	33		10	6		
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS2	Salmon River and Tributaries	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	6	5 67	2	See Expert Panel's xis table of flow actions and lease/permanent right type. Expert Panel: Checked & corrected flow amounts and both flow and benefit locations for projects. Delete duplicates in database. Poison Cr 6 cfs, Cow Cr. 2 cfs. Add Big Hat and Hat cr project 2.13 cfs. The numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases. Denominator: Use 497 cfs per Morgan as with Limiting Factor 2.3. = 278 wplift	EP reweighed assessment unit to 30% due to wanting weight of combined PRS1 and PRS3 assessment unit to be 70%.					67	7 68.	.9 1.9	All projects listed in database are outside of the 2018 BiOp period. No change expected. [4-15- 16: Flow projects from the Look Back extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried forward and added to Look Forward uplift calculations. As a result, revised uplift = 1.9%]	65	65		30	6		
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS3	Pahsimeroi Upstream Of Big Ck	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	2	0 34.8	14.8	Expert Panel: Use PRC2 projects benefit info for PRS3 (see Expert Panel's kls table), but with different denominator. Steelhead intrinsis potential mapping: similar overall extent, but more "green" channel line segments (89 miles). Big Creek up high has good habitat. Added 2015 McCoy Lane access project (culvert rExpert Panellaced with bridge) 0.5 mi opened and Lone Pine 2015 1.5 mi opened (but dExpert Panelendent on top ensasge), and Mill Cr. Reconnect 2015 1.5 mi. Note that some Assessment Unit maps confuse PRS2 and PRS3. Checking Big Cr/O'Neal (different actions, in this case) miles. O'Neal is same as Hamilton Ditch project. Big Cr barriers (n=2) lumped into one "Big Creek Culvert to Bridge" 3.7 mi entry in table. Also add Mill Creek Reconnect. Sum: 13.2 = 14.8% uplift.	0%. EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.								EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.	25	25		20	6 Different weights and bookends for steelhead due to steelhead use of tribs that chinook don't use	Steelhead benefits only - not for Chinook. Sink system - natural runoff/flow regime influences available water and access any given year. ADD: Estimate considers California Ditch project listed in PRC2 LF 1.1.	
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS3	Pahsimeroi Upstream Of Big Ck	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	2	0 20	0		0%. EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.								EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.	22.5	22.5		10	<sup>6</sup> Different weights and bookends for steelhead due to steelhead use of tribs that chinook don't use	ADD PROJECT The Pines Screen Diversion listed under PRC2 LF 2.3. This Pines is only 1 diversion out of many.	
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS3	Pahsimeroi Upstream Of Big Ck	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	2	20.1	0.1	Expert Panel: Use PRC2 projects benefit info for PRS3 (see Expert Panel's xls table), but with a different denominator. Steelhead intrinsic potential mapping: similar overall extent, but more "green" channel line segments (89 mile3). Add Bill Creek. Does not include O'Neal, which was moved to PRS1. 3.1 mi treated/89 = 0.1% uplift.	0%. EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.								EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.	23	28		10	Different wts and bookends for steelhead due to steelhead use of tribs that chinook don't use	Estimate considers benefits from projects listed under Decreased Water Quantity LF.	
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS3	Pahsimeroi Upstream Of Big Ck	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	2	20.1	0.1	Expert Panel: Use Riparian LH 4.1 projects, denominator, and rationale.	0%. EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.								EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.	20.5	21		10	6 Different wts and bookends for steelhead due to steelhead use of tribs that chinook don't use	Estimate considers projects under Decreased Water Quantity LF.	
Pahsimeroi Rive	PRS3	Pahsimeroi Upstream Of Big Ck	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	2	25.3	5.3	[see Expert Panel's sk table of leases and permanent flow projects: 2 projects: O'Neal/Big Cr Ranch and Page/Mill Cr. The numerator (in cfs) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent or long-term (e.g., 20 year) leases. Flow benefit sum: 17 cfs. Denominator is 319 cfs; = 5.3% uplift.	0%. EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.								EP combined PRS1 and PRS3. PRS3 is deprecated.	27.5	32.5		50	6/Different weights and bookends for steelhead due to steelhead use of tribs that chinook don't use consider timing of spawning and juveniles between STeelhead and Chinook	Estimate considers total of 23 cfs - 12 cfs from BIg Ck. Hamilton ditch closure adds another 11 cfs to Big Ck part of fury Lane/P16 suite of projects. Benefits better for steelhead than Chinook. Long term benefits to water quantity as system begins to seal water.	

Population	Code As	ssessment Unit	2012 Standardized Limiting Factor	2012 Low Bookend	Updated 2018 Estimate (2012	Nov 2015 %	2012-2015 Estimate Comments / Rationale	Revised AU Weight (Look Forward Meeting)	Revised LF Weight (Look Forward Meeting 2016)	2016-2018 LF Weighting Comments/ Rationale	Revised 2016-18 Low Bookend (Look Forward Meeting)	2016-18 Bookend Comments/Rationale	2016 Low Bookend (incorporates revisions or 2012-2015 uplift)	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimat	LookForward Updated 2018 Estimate %	2016-18 Look Forward Estimate Comments/Rationale	2013-2018 2	High 2011	2012 LF Weight 2012 LF Weight and Bookend Comments	2012 Estimates 2012 AU Weight Comments Comments
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS2 Main Salm	nstem Upper	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	40	40.5	0.5	Salmon River Headwaters USFS project: 2 mi; 20% function Remove the 2.5 mi duplicate action. Denominator from	-					40	5 40	0.5 0	No actions. No percentage change expected.	40.05	40.1	25%	Lightning Ck combined with rest
Salmon River upper	UMS2 Main	nstem Upper	7.2: Sediment Conditions:	51	51.5	0.5	Streamnet: 73.3 mi. = 0.5% uplift. Expert Panel used Limiting Factor 4.1 projects and rationale	£					51	5 51	1.5 0	No actions. No percentage change expected.	51	51	25%	of West Fork
mainstem	Salm	ton River I	Increased Sediment Quantity				Salmon River Headwaters USFS project: 2 mi; 20% function Remove the 2.5 mi duplicate action. Denominator from Streamnet: 73.3 mi. = 0.5% uplift.	-												
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS2 Main Salm	nstem Upper 4 10n River	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	51	62	11	Expert Panel summed riparian and flow uplift percentages =11% EWL 4.1.16	=						2 70	1.5 8.5	No actions. No percentage change expected. [4-15-16: Given dependance of temperature uplift on flow [limiting factor 9.2] uplif temperature uplift was revised in response to carry forward of lool back flow projects. Revised uplift = 8.5%]	51	51	25%	
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS2 Main Salmi	nstem Upper 9 Ion River 1	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	80	90.5	10.5	Expert Panel included UMS3 tributary flow projects: Pole C 12 d5 permanent; Pole C 2012 2015 5-6 d5 kaos, Baever C 5. 5 d-53 Joya Frances, These need to be added to database as benefit to mainten (also for limiting Factor 5.1]. Expert Panel's to table also includes Baever Creek Joy year lease. Do not include SPC fish screen project. The numerator (in c7) was calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefit of leases in 2012 through 2015, plus th um of permanent or long-term (e.g., Joy angl leases.	r e					90	5	99 8.5	No actions. No percentage change expected (4-15-36: Flow project from the Look Back extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried forward and adde to Look Forward upfilt calculations. As a result, revised upfilt = 8.5%]	80	80	25%	
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS3 Uppe Tribu	er Salmon River	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthropogenic Barriers	55	60.4	5.4	demoninatorinator: 210 cfs (from Morgan Case, IDWR diversions) Totul upifit = 10.5%. Expert Panel counted Pole Creek Niversions (7 m) and Henslee Cluerk Pole Creek (7 m). Correct these in databas denominatorinator from Streamnet: 184.5 mi. = 5.4% upifi	e.					60	4 61	.8 1.4	Copied projects and prorations from equivalent Chinook units (3 overlapping Chinook units: VCCC1, UMC1, UMC2) into calc table. Used steelhead denominators from Look Back. Yields 1.8% expected upff: 52/62/026: Copied actions from UMC1, UMC2 and VCC1. Changed denominator, added 5 milles for intrinsic value on Iron Creak: some arc. Intrinsic Nature on Iron UMC1, UMC2 and VCC1.	60	60	30%	Would treat all Pole Ck Lightning Ck access issues combined with rest of West Fork
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS3 Uppe Tribu	er Salmon River utaries	2.3: Injury and Mortality: Mechanical Injury	75	79	4	Pole Creek Screens: design flow sum is 15.3 cfs. denominatorinator: Morgan Case (IDFG) summation including Salmon River irrigation withdrawl. In the future, best to eliverative for examplication columns sized values						1	9 80	0.6 1.6	Chinook comments Copied projects and prorations from equivalent Chinook units (3 overlapping Chinook units: VCCC1, UMC2, UMC2) into calc table. Used steelhead denominators from Look Back. Yields 1.6% expecte mildls. FL/FL/Ck on a chinamer	75	75	10%	Pick up Goat/Meadow screens in 2015 look back
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS3 Uppe Tribu	er Salmon River utaries	4.1: Riparian Condition: Riparian Vegetation	40	40.1	0.1	6.5. 15.3/386- 4K, uplit. Corrected Pole Creek Fence - SBT Phases 1 & 2 mileage (should be 12% min 41.0 m); Skan 10% functional now denominator from Streamnet: 184.5 mi. = 0.1% uplif.						40	1 40	.8 0.7	Copied projects and prorations from equivalent Chinook units (3 coverlapping Chinoku units: VCCC1, UMC1, UMC2) into calc table. Used steelhead denominators from Look Back. Yields 0.4% expected upiff: 52/62/026: copied actions from UMC1, UMC2 and VCC1. Changed denominator, added 5 milles for intrinsic value on Iron Cashe come no. Chinae, Manu denominatoris in 800 entites. En	40.5	41	20%	
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS3 Uppe Tribu	er Salmon River 🛛 utaries I	7.2: Sediment Conditions: Increased Sediment Quantity	50	50.1	0.1	Expert Panel used Limiting Factor 4.1 projects and rationale denominator from Streamnet: 184.5 mi. = 0.1% uplift.						50	1 50	.5 0.4	Chinode comments Capied projects and prorations from equivalent Chinode kunts (3 overlapping Chinode units: VCCC1, UMC1, UMC2) into calc table. Used steelhead denominators from Look Back. Yields 0.4% expecte upfff. 5/24/2015. Copied actions from UMC1, UMC2 and VCC1. Changer denominator, added 5 mills for intrinsic value on into Creek, same as Chinok. New denomistar is 18.5 millions. See Chinode comments	50.1	50.2	15%	Influenced by riparian LF actions
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS3 Uppe Tribu	er Salmon River 1 utaries	8.1: Water Quality: Temperature	31	36.8	5.8	Expert Panel summed riparian (Pole Creek Fence - SBT Phases 1 & 2) and flow uplift percentages = 5.8% change to Limiting Factor 8.1.						36	8 44	15 7.7	Capied projects and prorations from equivalent Chinook units [3 overlapping Chinook units: VCCCL (MCCL UMC2) into data bable. Undo steehed demonstrator from cola Back. Sum of Rayarian and Prov upility yields & Bit expected upilit. [4-13-16: Given dependien of temperature upilit on foils (Imiting Extern 22) upilit, Imperature upilit assertised in response to carry forward of look back. Too projects. Revised upilit = 1333 (3) 2/20/2016. Copied actions from UMCL, UMC2 and VCCL. Includes typical actualization to the temperature upilit assertiable to the temperature evaluation to the temperature evaluation to the temperature evaluation to the temperature.	31.5 e	32	10%	Influenced by riparian and flow LF actions in Pole Ck.
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS3 Uppe Tribu	er Salmon River	9.2: Water Quantity: Decreased Water Quantity	23	28.7	5.7	Pole Cr 12 cfs permanent, Pole Cr 2012-2014 5-6 cfs lease, Beaver Cr. 5: 9 cfs 20 year lease. The numerator (in cfs) year calculated as the sum of the average annual flow benefic leases in 2012 through 2015, plus the sum of permanent of long-term (in 2, 2) year) lease. Denominators 386 cf (from Morgan Case, IDWR diversions). Do not include fish screen project. Delete other actions in database. Total uplit = 5.77						28	7 35	.7 7	formulated on VCL1 for U = 8.1. Capited projects and granitomic from equivalent Chronic anticl 12, Capited projects and granitomic from equivalent to the carbon Add Reach Create 2.4.5 back in: Used steefhead demonitations from tools fack. Yrelies 2.2.8.2.expected upUt: (4.5-15:6.7.6 bac projects from the Look Back extending into the 2016-2018 period were carried forward and added to Look Forward upUt fackLutotions. As result, revised upUt=1.2.5%]/2.1/2/2016. Copied actions from UULC1, UMC2 and VCL3: see Chronic comments	30	30	35%	Pole Ck large part of AU improvement
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS4 West Fork	t Fork Yankee	S.2: Peripheral and Transitional Habitats: Floodplain Condition	97	97	0	Espert Panel: No actions. No change. 1 project (West Fork Yankee Fork Habbat Enhancement Project) designated for Look Forward.						s	7 97	.5 0.5	Denominator: Steehead Intrinsi: Potential mitage: 20 mile: Same projects as for Chinos Assessment unit, but different denominato different prorations. Yields 0.5% expected uplift.	98	98	40% Expanded Expert Panel including the YF ID Team made up this round as compared to a small subset in Fall 2011 (convension to standardized limiting fractors) and SpS/summer 2012 ExPenden meetings. Changed low bookendy. Most of Ass Unit is "wilderness" with very little area disturbed that can be restored	Lightning Ck combined with rest of West Fork
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS4 West Fork	tt Fork Yankee I	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	97	97	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change. 1 project (West Fork Yankee Fork Nabata Enhancement Project) designated for Look Forward.						s	7 97	.5 0.5	Denominator: Steehead utrivis: Potential mikage: 20 miles. Same projects as for Chinoka auesament unit, but different denominato different prorations. Vields 0.5% expected uplift.	98	98	40% Expanded Expert Panel including the YF ID Team made up this round as compared to a small subset in r31 2011 (conversion to shandardiaed Limiting Factors) and SpSummer 2012 Exbanel incetings. Changed low bookend; Most of Ass Unit is Twilderness' with very little area disturbed that can be restored	
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS4 West Fork	it Fork Yankee	6.2: Channel Structure and Form: Instream Structural Complexity	97	97	0	Expert Panet: No actions. No change. I project (West Fork Yankee Fork Habitat Enhancement Project) designated for Look Forward.						S	7 97	1.5 0.5	Denominator: Steehead Intrinsic Potential mileage: 20 miles Same projecta as for Chinos dassesament units, but different denominator, different prorations. Yields 0.5% expected uplift.	98	98	20% Expanded Expert Panel including the YF ID Team made up this round as compared to a small subset in fail 2011 (conversion to standardized Limiting Factors) and Sp/Summer 2012 Expendem interlings. Changed low bookend, Most of Ass Unit is "wilderness" with very litile area disturbed	
Salmon River upper	UMS5 Yank	kee Fork	1.1: Habitat Quantity: Anthronomenic Barriers	85	85	0	Expert Panel: No actions. No change.						8	5 1	85 0	[Not discussed by EP; presume no actions]	95	95	5% Currently, tribs w/ barriers include Cearley,	Lightning Ck
Salmon River upper	UMS5 Yank	kee Fork	4.2: Riparian Condition: LWD	40	40.1	0.1	Expert Panel: See projects and functional % values used for	r					40	1 41	.4 1.3	Same projects as for Chinook, but different denominator and	50	55	Improving these get to 95%. 20% Expanded Expert Panel including the YF ID	of West Fork
mainstem			Recruitment				VFC3. Use 30 mi denominator for steelhead (longer than th 25 for Chinook). See Expert Planel's xis table.	e								prorations based on different use (e.g., regarding Pond Series project). Yields 1.3% expected uplift.			Team made up thir round as compared to a small subset in Fall 2011 (conversion to standardied limiting Facturos) and Sp/Summer 2012 ExPanel meetings. Switched Riparian condition for LWD Recruitment; Historical info suggest that riparian bablat was was not extensive in the mainstem Yankee Fork. Adjusted low booken: down of 2014	combined with rest of West Fork
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMSS Yank	kee Fork	5.2: Peripheral and Transitional Habitats: Floodplain Condition	50	72.1	22.1	Caper Them: See projects and functional 1% values: used for VPCIX. Use 20m demonstrator of Seelense 100 congert than the 25 for Chinooki, See Expert Panel's als table.	r e					72	1 76	.1 4	Same projects as for Chinook, bud Gifferent denominator and provortanin based on different use (e.g., regarding Pond Saries project). Yields 4.0% expected uplift.	60	65	25% Capanded Espert Packel including the 'T iD Team made up this round accompared to a small subset in All 2011 (conversion to standarduced limiting Factor) and Say/Summer 2012 Dehnel meetings. Changed to booloand from 2010 a So generativ because 2/3 of historic Chansols production cond these act 30 one interface state state states non dredged areas. Recognizing Jordan CL Impacts	
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS5 Yanko	kee Fork	6.1: Channel Structure and Form: Bed and Channel Form	50	76.2	26.2	Expert Panel: See projects and functional % values used for VFCJ. Use 30 mic commitants for Steahead (Donger than th 25 for Chinook). See Expert Panel's xis table.	r e					76	2 80	15 43	Same projects as for Chinook, bud Offreent denominator and provation based on offferent use (e.g., regarding Pond Series project), Yields 4.3% expected uplift.	60	65	20c Dispanded Easert Reveal including the YT ID Team mutue up this troad accompared to a small subset in Rial 2011 (conversion to standardised limiting Factors) and Sop/Summer 2012 Dehnel meetings. Changed buo boolend from 30 to Spercent because 2/3 of historic Chinoid production comes from areas outside of deap reach and there are still some impacts that occur in more deap areas. Recogniting to dan QC.	
Salmon River upper mainstem	UMS5 Yank	kee Fork I	6.2: Channel Structure and Form: Instream Structural Complexity	50	77.5	27.5	Expert These: See projects and functional 'N volume: used for VPCC, Use 20 mic domainance for Selensing Olivoyer than the 25 for Chinook). See Expert Panel's als table.	e e					77	5 83	1.5 6	Same projects as for Chinock build different denominator and procorations based on different use (e.g., regarding Pond Saries project). Yields 6.0% expected uplift.	65	70	250 Spapeded Egert Penet including the YT ID Tare mm det phil is rout accursement to a small subset in All 2011 (conversion to standarduel Limiting Factors) and Sp/Summer 2012 Defauel meetings. Changed to solocited from 30 to 30 percent because 2/3 of Issinic Chanada production and there are still some images. But occurs in non dredged areas. Recognizing Jordan C. Impacts	
Salmon River upper mainstem	uMSS Yank	kee Fork	7.1: Sediment Conditions: Decreased Sediment Quantity	50	72.2	22.2	Lapert Panet: See projects and functional K values used for VPCC. Use 3 on demonstrator for Seebenet Ologer than th 25 for Chinook). See Expert Panet's als table.	e					72	21 77	se 5.2	same projects as for Chinook, bud Offerent denominator and prorotation bade on deformer use (e.g., regarding Pond Series project). Yields 52% expected uplit.	55	60	5% I Dpanded Exert Panel including the Y iD Team mude up this trond as compared to a small subset in All 2011 (conversion to sandardued limiting Factors) and Sapfaumer 2012 Edmain meetings. Changed to kookend from 2018 to 50 generati- because 2/3 of thistic: Chinok production cond the autiliar to the same state of the same rand redged areas. Recognizing lordan CL, impacts: Onequel 17: 2.10: 2 due to much better description of conditions and how IF applies - lack of saddment there than they fines in graveh.	