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Introduction

In 1998, the Burns Paiute Tribe (BPT) submitted a proposal to Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to acquire the Malheur River Wildlife Mitigation Project (Project) which included the Denny Jones Ranch and other Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL) leases and grazing allotments. The project approval process and acquisition negotiations continued for several years until the BPT and BPA entered into a Memorandum of Agreement, which allowed for purchase of the Project in November 2000.

The 31,781-acre Project is located seven miles east of Juntura, Oregon and is adjacent to the Malheur River (Figure 1). The Project includes 6,385 deeded acres owned by the BPT, 4,154 acres leased from the DSL, and 21,242 acres leased from the BLM, including 11 grazing allotments (Figure 2).

Figure 1: Location of the Malheur River Wildlife Mitigation Project.

The Malheur Wild and Scenic River Management Plan (U.S. Forest Service 1993) and the North Fork Malheur Scenic River Management Plan (U.S. Forest Service 1993) identified the Project area as a key component in the restoration of aquatic and terrestrial habitat within the Malheur River basin. The Project is culturally significant to the BPT because it
lies within their aboriginal territory. Historically, BPT members gathered roots, hunted, and fished along the Malheur River corridor. As a result, both the BPT and the public had a shared interest in permanently protecting the Project and improving habitat conditions for fish and wildlife species.

Figure 2: Project and surrounding area land ownership.
The Denny Jones Ranch (Ranch) is comprised of meadow, wetland, and shrub-steppe habitats and stretches for seven miles along the Malheur River. It is the largest private landholding on the river between Riverside and Harper, Oregon. Approximately 938 acres of senior water rights are included with the Ranch. The BLM grazing allotment, located south of the Ranch, is largely shrub-steppe habitat punctuated by springs and seeps. Hunter Creek, a perennial stream, flows through the BLM parcel. Similarly, the DSL grazing allotment, which lies north of the Ranch, is predominantly shrub/juniper steppe habitat with springs and seeps dispersed throughout the upper end of draws (Figure 2).

Habitat protection and enhancement measures will benefit diverse fish and wildlife assemblages and plant communities, BPT members and the public. General management goals include improving water quality; enhancing upland, floodplain meadow and riverine habitats; controlling weeds; protecting springs and seeps; managing BLM grazing allotments to meet wildlife objectives; preserving cultural resources; and providing public hunting and recreation opportunities.

Activities

During 2006, many activities occurred on the Project site to improve and/or maintain the vegetation communities for the benefit of wildlife populations. Haying, irrigation, grazing, pond construction, plantings, fencing projects, noxious weed control, studies and monitoring, and administrative duties all contributed to the Projects success.

Haying:

Haying practices have historically occurred since the Tribe acquired the Project. In 2006, the contractor utilized for haying activities in previous years was not interested in haying the property as it was no longer cost effective. Therefore, the typical hay harvest did not occur. A wildlife response was noted: geese, deer and elk were all seen utilizing the meadows less frequently than in previous years. In all cases I believe the grasses had become less palatable and contained less nutrients than other readily available food sources. It is recommended that haying or grazing occur during the summer months in future years.

An alfalfa crop was available from last years’ planting. Three cuttings occurred. The first was mowed as a management practice to reduce weeds and left to lie on the ground. The second and third cuttings were cut with a swather by a neighboring landowner, bailed with equipment borrowed from MB&L welding in Vale, and hand bucked by seasonal staff. No alfalfa was sold; all was stacked and secured for winter use by the ranch manager’s horses. In return for swathing services, the gentleman was provided the rye grass from the 205 field at no charge. He however had to cut, bail and remove the rye grass at his own cost and with his own personnel.

Irrigation:

Irrigation is a daily activity utilized to provide quality forage primarily for big game species but may also benefit migrating waterfowl, neo-tropical bird species, and keeps
ponds full to the benefit of amphibians and others. The direction and use of irrigation water is changed on a daily basis. Nearly the entire Project utilized flood irrigation. In multiple areas along the canal system, debris traps were placed and required daily cleaning. In addition, the irrigation dam and canals were monitored for structural integrity.

Ditch maintenance is a major activity associated with irrigating. Maintenance includes removal of sedimentation, repair of breaches, canal lining or piping and maintaining pump and dam structures (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Irrigation canals found on the Project.

Two substantial floods occurred in 2006. The first occurred in January when an ice dam broke upstream containing a major amount of water. The resulting rush of water destroyed the dam, breached the banks of the river flooding all the meadows, and caused damage to irrigation canals as the amount of water entering the system was uncontrollable. The second occurred in April when the irrigation district opened both Warm Springs and Agency Valley dams in response to spring rains and snow melt. Flows were great enough to again breach the banks of the river flooding the meadows (Figure 5) and causing damage to irrigation pumps and canals (Figure 4).

All irrigation pumps were completely inundated with sedimentation during the flood events. All pumps were dug out; some received new belts and other maintenance. The pump providing water to the 205 field was completely repaired as previously scheduled. The pump received new bearings, seals, belts, etc. MB&L welding in Vale provided the service. A pump house was also constructed over the unit and safety items such as stairs and rails were included.
Grazing:

Grazing began at the Project site in late November and is planned to continue until February 28th 2007. Grazing is occurring in the meadows to reduce the amount of residual grasses that may hinder grass growth in 2007 (Figure 6). As already mentioned, the contractor utilized for haying activities in previous years was not interested in haying the property as it was no longer cost effective. Removing vegetation during the winter will allow for more vigorous growth during the spring for big game species.

Grazing did not occur on the Department of State Lands (DSL) or Bureau of Land Management (BLM) grazing allotments in 2006. DSL granted a non-use request for the 2006-2007 winter grazing period for both the Road Gulch and Black Canyon grazing allotments. BLM also granted a non-use request for the summer of 2007 on the Jonesboro grazing allotment.

Pond Construction:

Four ponds were constructed within the large grazing pastures (Figure 7). We believe these will provide additional brood rearing and loafing habitat for waterfowl and shorebird
populations. In addition, the increase in riparian vegetation will host many amphibian, reptile and small mammal populations. The ponds were constructed from October 30th through November 2nd (Figures 8, 9). A Tribal monitor was present to detect cultural resources but none were found. Pond design was determined by department staff with advice obtained from Mike Shannon, regional coordinator for Ducks Unlimited in Klamath Falls, Oregon. A permit was acquired from the Department of State Lands for the removal and subsequent placement of fill. Due to time constraints, ponds were created smaller than ideal. Future efforts may include expanding the ponds to include a greater surface area.

**Plantings:**

Two planting projects, enhancing riparian and upland vegetation communities, occurred on the Project site; riparian shrub planting and bitterbrush and grass plug planting.

**Riparian**

On April 20th – 21st, two thousand one hundred and fifty riparian shrubs were planted along the Malheur River (Figure 10). The species list included snowberry (*Symphoricarpos albus*), blue elderberry (*Sambucus caerulea*), serviceberry (*Amelanchier alnifolia*), golden currant (*Ribes aureum*), wax currant (*Ribes cereum*), red osier dogwood (*Cornus seriecea*) and black hawthorne (*Crataegus douglasii*). Planting was completed using hoedads to first scalp the ground and then create a hole to receive the plant. All stock was bareroot.

Plantings occurred by first selecting a starting point, planting approximately 10 plants of each species and then moving to the next site about 100 meters away. Most planting groups covered an area about 1000 square feet. This planting strategy was used with the thought that birds would utilize the berries and seeds produced from the plants and deposit them between groups at which time natural recruitment would fill in the remaining areas.

Stock was purchased from Champoeg Nursery in Aurora, Oregon. All stock was in great shape when received. This nursery was chosen because they were the only nursery with all species available.
Post planting care consisted of watering all plants weekly. Herbicides were not used because we felt too much foliage loss would occur on the new plants. Upon multiple reviews, plant survivability appeared extremely low. Competition for resources was likely the cause. Because of the watering schedule, cheatgrass grew to several feet in height. In addition, soil types, nutrient levels and depth to groundwater may not have been able to support the planting. In the spring of 2007, we will be able to further analyze the success of the planting.

Figure 10: Riparian planting   Figure 11: Upland planting

**Upland**

Past land uses on the Project site have resulted in the destruction of native vegetation communities and encouraged the introduction of noxious weeds. For the 2nd year in a row, we attempted to reverse that trend with an upland planting. Approximately 6 acres were planted using a total of 2,000 bitterbrush (*Purshia tridentata*), 2,000 Idaho fescue (*Festuca idahoensis*) and 2,000 bluebunch wheatgrass (*Agropyron spicatum*) plugs (Figure 11). Ground drills were rented from a local company to create holes 2” in diameter and 4” deep to receive the plugs. Plugs were placed approximately 5 feet apart. Bitterbrush plugs were protected from herbivory with tree guards. Plugs were used with the hope of increasing survivability among plants. In addition, planting plugs required a minimum amount of ground disturbance which is essential to weed control efforts.

Plugs were purchased from the Colville Tribal Nursery in Nespelem, Washington. The Colville Tribe is utilizing some of the same plants and planting strategies on their Tribal lands and therefore was able to produce the stock needed for the Project.

In 2005, we conducted an upland planting with the same stock and methods. However, we ran into problems with the shipment of the stock resulting in poor initial survivability estimates. In April 2006, we re-evaluated survivability and concluded that less than 5% of the plants survived. All surviving plants were bitterbrush. The stock in 2006 was in much better condition when planted. Survivability will be assessed in 2007. If survivability is again low, plans to conduct a third planting in the fall of 2007 will be cancelled.
Fencing:
Fence removal, installation and maintenance occurred on the Project site. Approximately .78 miles of fence were removed that no longer serve the purpose of protecting the railroad grade (Figure 12). Fence installation also occurred on a spring site immediately adjacent to Hunter Creek (Figure 13). One additional spring site was scheduled for fence installation; however the spring was nearly non-existent and did not warrant a fence structure. In addition, maintenance occurred on all remaining cattle containment fences prior to releasing cattle in November.

Figure 12: Fence removal  Figure 13: Spring site protection

Fence removal and modification projects from the past 4 years have resulted in a large amount of used wire and bent fence posts. In 2006, we recycled all this material, removing it from the project site and received $221 in return.

Noxious Weed Control:
Under prior ownership, the Project’s ability to provide high quality wildlife habitat was compromised because of high cattle stocking rates, lack of an ecologically sound grazing plan and a proliferation of introduced vegetation (Ashley 2005). Noxious weed control has been important to reestablish native vegetation and increase habitat value to wildlife.

Nearly 500 acres were treated by Project staff. Both chemical and mechanical methods were used in 2006. Control was emphasized on grass pastures, fence lines, water canals, driveways and old railroad right-of-way’s. Chemicals utilized include Round-up, Telar and Escort. Mechanical methods include mowing, weed-eating and hand pulling. Many weed species are treated but emphasis was placed on Scotch thistle (*Onopordum acanthium*), perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), clasping pepperweed (*Lepidium perfoliatum*), hoary cress (*Cardaria draba*), blue mustard (*Chorispora tenella*), flixweed (*Descurainia sophia*) bur buttercup (*Ranunculus testiculatus*) and puncturevine (*Tribulus terrestris*).

Additional acreage was treated through the Malheur County weed inspector’s office to control skeletonweed (*Lygodesma juncea*) on the Project.
Studies and Monitoring:
Several studies and monitoring projects continued in 2006. Projects include fish studies, sage grouse surveys, bird surveys, small mammal habitat utilization and amphibian presence surveys.

Fish
A study entitled *Evaluation of the Life History of Native Salmonids in the Malheur River Subbasin* (Schwabe et al. 2006) has continued within the Projects boundaries. This study was initiated in 1997 to evaluate: the seasonal distribution of bull trout (Salvelinus confluentus), localized salmonid population status and trend, and genetic integrity of redband trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) and bull trout populations. The study is being conducted by Burns Paiute Tribe Department of Fish and Wildlife staff members.

In 2006, efforts were focused primarily on conducting stream surveys on or immediately surrounding the Project site. Streams surveyed include: Black Canyon, Canyon, Deadhorse, Indian, Road Gulch, South Trail, Sperry, Swamp and Trail Creeks. Management recommendations will be developed based upon the data gathered.

Sage Grouse
Sage grouse surveys were conducted in coordination with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). Counts occurred on two leks; Tim’s Reservoir and Roy Reservoir. Each lek was counted 3 times. A summary of results and comparison to 2005 data is provided (Table 1). Weather information is included with counts as a possible explanation of results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lek Location</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>UniID</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/21/2005</td>
<td>Roy Res.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>40 degrees, No wind, light rain (drizzle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/2005</td>
<td>Tim’s Peak Res.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6:30 AM</td>
<td>40 degrees, No wind, light rain (drizzle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2005</td>
<td>Roy Res.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5:19 AM</td>
<td>40 degrees, wind 0-5 mph, Clear</td>
<td>Birds were very active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2005</td>
<td>Tim’s Peak Res.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>40 degrees, wind 0-5 mph, Clear</td>
<td>Extensive cattle use at lek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/2006</td>
<td>Roy Res.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5:20 AM</td>
<td>30 degrees, wind 5 mph, snowing</td>
<td>Males actively displaying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/2006</td>
<td>Tim’s Peak Res.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>30 degrees, wind 5 mph, snowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2006</td>
<td>Roy Res.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6:27 AM</td>
<td>30 degrees, no wind</td>
<td>Lots of activity (flying)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2006</td>
<td>Tim’s Peak Res.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7:08 AM</td>
<td>31 degrees, no wind</td>
<td>Birds were on the hill to west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/12/2006</td>
<td>Roy Res.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6:17 AM</td>
<td>38 degrees, no wind, cloudy/foggy</td>
<td>Hard to see birds due to fog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/12/2006</td>
<td>Tim’s Peak Res.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7:06 AM</td>
<td>38 degrees, no wind, party cloudy</td>
<td>No fog, Bird on hill to west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: 2005 – 2006 Sage grouse lek counts.

Birds
Bird surveys were conducted on June 27th and 28th. We utilized protocols developed by Huff et al. (2000). Four transects were established within 4 different habitat types (Figure 14). In addition, because of the importance of completing surveys within a few hours of sunrise, transects were divided between day 1 and day 2 enabling us to complete the surveys within the assigned time period. Within each transect, 5 locations were established in which the counts were conducted. Count locations are summarized in Table 2.
We were only able to gather base data in 2006. Therefore, little data was available for analysis. In addition, only one count was conducted rather than the 3 required by the protocol, also reducing the amount of information available. Regardless, some information was attained (Table 3) and catalogued for future years’ comparison. The program FLIGHT ATTENDANT 4 was utilized as the analysis tool (www.fs.fed.us/pnw/bird-populations) (Brown and Huff 2000).

Figure 14: Point count locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
<th>COMNAME</th>
<th>% Total Count</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>American Coot</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barn Swallow</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Quail</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinnamon Teal</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Nighthawk</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gadwall</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Blue Heron</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 in meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mallard</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsh Wren</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red-Winged Blackbird</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhill Crane</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sora</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow-Headed Blackbird</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland 1</td>
<td>American Kestrel</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brewer’s Blackbird</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullock’s Oriole</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark’s Nutcracker</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Meadowlark</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland 2</td>
<td>Chukar</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lark Sparrow</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prairie Falcon</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Say’s Phoebe</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black-Billed Magpie</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Swallow</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Raven</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Snipe</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 in upland1 and 2 in wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killdeer</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 in wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah Sparrow</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Mourning Dove</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Harrier</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 in meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Song Sparrow</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>644</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Species categorized by the habitat type in which they were found most often and the percentage of the total count that occurred in that habitat type.

**Small mammals**

Small mammal surveys were conducted using Sherman live traps to determine species presence and habitat utilization. Trapping was conducted in only 1 location: a sagebrush steppe habitat SE of the old corral system at the road switchback. Twelve individuals were captured during a total of 96 trap nights (48 traps x 2 days) including three species: deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus*), Ord’s kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys ordii*) and great basin pocket mouse (*Perognathus parvus*). 2007 trapping efforts will be focused primarily on population assessments.
Amphibians
Two methods to conduct amphibian surveys were utilized in 2006. As in previous years, funnel traps were placed in the wetland and resulted in the capture of ten individuals, all of the same species, brown bullhead (*Ictalurus nebulosus*). We trapped for 3 nights with 15 traps, resulting in a trap effort of 45 trap nights. This method has proved inadequate in previous years so a more active approach was taken to possibly find other individuals in the pond. We electroshocked the pond with the assistance of fisheries staff but did not capture anything.

**Administration:**

**Access:**

A large number of access permits were requested in 2006. The main land use for the request was for upland bird hunting. A summary of hunter effort and success is provided (Table 4). The table summarizes all reports that provided both hunter hours and harvest information. Three additional permits provided a harvest of 24 birds but did not report hours.

Tribal members were also allotted Land Owner Preference (LOP) tags. Five (5) deer and 5 elk tags were distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permits Issued</th>
<th>Returned Reports</th>
<th>Hunter Days</th>
<th>Hours Hunted Upland*</th>
<th>Hours Hunted Waterfowl</th>
<th>Upland Harvested*</th>
<th>Waterfowl Harvested</th>
<th>Birds/ Hunter Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>225.25</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2005 data did not separate between upland and waterfowl for both hours hunted or harvest.

Table 4: Access requests and harvest statistics

**Grants:**

The Wildlife Department applied for and received several grants in 2006.

- **USFWS**, Tribal Landowner Incentive Program (TLIP): Covering 40% of costs associated with screening the McCoy Creek irrigation ditch, Malheur River irrigation ditch (Malheur River property) and installing fish passage on irrigation dam (Malheur River property). Approximately $109,000.

- **ODFW**: Covering 60% of costs associated with screening the McCoy Creek irrigation ditch, Malheur River irrigation ditch (Malheur River property) and installing fish passage on irrigation dam (Malheur River property). Approximately $164,000.

- **BPA**: The Department reapplied for grant funds covering the 2007 – 2009 budget cycle. We sought an annual 3% increase for both the Logan and Malheur River properties. It is uncertain whether the 3% increase has been granted, however it does appear funds will be allocated to continue work through 2009. Logan:
OSU MOU:

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was generated and signed by the Tribe and Oregon State University. The agreement was struck to “facilitate collaboration on science and engineering education and research efforts which will mutually benefit the signing parties.” There were four major points of interest:

- Identify areas of mutual educational and research interest,
- Facilitate the identification of staff who have expertise to contribute to these areas of mutual interest,
- Assist in information exchanges within these areas of interest, and
- Expedite the development of joint grant applications within these areas of interest.

CREP Program:

For much of the year, staff worked on the application process of entering the Malheur River Project into the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). The agreement protects riparian corridors on the property for the duration of 15 years. An annual rental payment will be provided to the Tribe for this protection. Sign-up bonuses are also provided and will be received once the application process is complete.

In return for rental payments, the Tribe agrees to protect the riparian corridors from activities detrimental to the establishment of riparian plants, stream structure, soil profiles, etc. In addition, a major planting effort will be conducted in 2007 to proactively establish riparian plants.

Project Income:

The Projects MOA, signed by BPA and the Tribe, requires the reporting of all project generated income and the expenditures covered by the income. A summary of all activities is included (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2006</td>
<td>Snowmobile Sale</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/2006</td>
<td>Truck Sale</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2006</td>
<td>Horse Sale</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2006</td>
<td>Four-wheeler Sale</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2006</td>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$3,006.12</td>
<td>$1,493.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2006</td>
<td>Recycled Old Fence Materials</td>
<td>$221.40</td>
<td>$1,715.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006-12/31/2006</td>
<td>House Rental</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
<td>$4,015.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006-12/31/2006</td>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$3,325.23</td>
<td>$7,340.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2006</td>
<td>Fire Debt</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>$840.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2007</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$840.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Expenses covered with project generated income
Staff:

The following staff members were involved in completing all aspects of the Projects success:

Lawrence Schwabe – Fish and Wildlife Program Director
David Speten – Wildlife Program Manager
Jason Fenton – Fisheries Program Manager
Jason Kesling – Wildlife Biologist
Jason Lipe – Fisheries Biologist
Neil Lunt – Ranch Manager
Todd Richards – Technician
Lucas Samor – Technician
Amos First-Raised – Technician
Eric Hawley – Technician
Jake Ott – Technician
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