Henry's Fork Watershed Council
P.O. Box 852 •604 Mail Street •Ashton, ID 83420

TEL 208-652-3567
FAX 208-652-3568
Email: council@henrysfork.org

WATERSHED INTEGRITY REVIEW & EVALUATION (WIRE)
COUNCIL PROCESS AND PROCEDURE

The WIRE process is the fundamental approach taken by the Henry's Fork Watershed Council to ensure that resource initiatives it endorses are well coordinated and will help maintain the watershed's integrity. In March 1994, more than 80 suggestions for maintaining watershed quality were brought forward by Council participants, and they were distilled into ten major categories of criteria which now are used in critiquing proposed projects.

This process requires that projects receive initial screening by the Facilitation Team and then achieve consensus of the full Council in order to receive endorsement. The three stages in the review process are:

Stage #1 - Initial Screening

To begin the process, the proposed project is summarized in written form by the sponsor and the official cover sheet is attached to the front. It should be submitted to one of the cofacilitators or sent to the Watershed Center at least one month prior to the date that Council review is desired. The Facilitation Team reviews new projects and it will determine the level of priority for consideration by the Council. The project may be placed on the agenda to be WIRED or it may be assigned to one of the three component groups for initial discussion.

The sponsoring agency/entity must ensure that an informed person is identified who can answer questions and discuss the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. The Facilitation Team will encourage the sponsor to strengthen the project for resubmittal at a later date OR the project will be placed on the next Council agenda.

Stage #2 - Full Council Consideration

The project description will be sent to all Council members at least two weeks in advance of scheduled meetings. The sponsor will be afforded sufficient time for a brief presentation and question/answer period in the morning session. Presentations should be professional, concise and illustrated with photographs or other graphics, if appropriate. (Note: Watershed Center staff is available to assist with sponsor's audio-visual needs.) The presentation should clearly state what is being asked of the Council in terms of project endorsement, agency assistance or financial support. WIRE checklists will be completed by the three component groups in the afternoon, so it is critical that sponsors illustrate how their project fulfills the WIRE criteria in both their written and oral presentations.

In the wrap-up session, groups will report if consensus was reached and/or what recommendations for improvement were offered. If the entire Council reaches consensus through WIRE, and if no financial assistance was requested, the Council may officially endorse the project at this stage. If financial assistance was requested, the Finance Committee will consider the proposal among other successful projects when it makes its recommendations for funding. Also, if certain conditions for approval were discussed, the sponsor must agree to meet a deadline to improve the project per the Council's suggestions.

WATERSHED INTEGRITY REVIEW & EVALUATION (WIRE)
PROJECT COVER SHEET

Instructions: Please complete this cover sheet including the brief summary requested on the reverse side. Attach a map of the project or problem area and provide no more than three pages of background information covering the following: a) Resource description b) Resource problem(s) addressed c) Scope of the project d) Timeline for implementation e) Nature of involvement—agencies, owners, etc. f) Financial considerations.

Submit the entire package one month prior to next scheduled Council meeting to one of the cofacilitators or mail to: The Henry's Fork Watershed Center, PO Box 852, Ashton, ID 83420.

Submission Date: _____

Project Title: _____

Sponsoring Agency/Entity: _____

Responsible Individual: _____

Mailing Address: _____ **Phone:** _____

_____**Fax:** _____

_____**Email:** _____

Subwatershed: _____

Project Location: _____

Other Agencies & Individuals Involved: _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

Estimate of Project Duration: _____

_____

Continued next page

Brief Project Summary (Cover the following: Goals or objectives, benefits, urgency, potential impacts, post-project monitoring and implications if no action taken. Use up to 2 additional sheets if necessary. Use the watershed integrity criteria for guidance in preparing the background discussion).

Requested Assistance from the Council: (Check All That Apply)

_____ WIRE Endorsement/Letter of Support
_____ Financial Assistance (budget attached)
_____ Legislative/Political Assistance (specify)
_____ Basic Project Design (in response to a new problem)
_____ Technical Review Only (for ongoing projects)
_____ Other:

WIRE **CHECK LIST** *(rev* **12195)**

Group **PROJECT NAME** **Date**

1. WATERSHED PERSPECTIVE: **Does the project employ or reflect a total watershed perspective?**

The project demonstrates an understanding of the relationships that exist among:

a. Physical parameters of watershed (soil formation and other geologic processes).
b. Surface and ground water resources (headwaters and lowland resources).
c. Biological components (aquatic life, plants, animals and other species).
d. Ecological communities (forests, meadows, riparian zones, migration corridors, nutrient cycles, predator-prey relationships).
e. Human communities (towns, transportation corridors, historic & archeological sites, economies).
f. Climatic factors (weather patterns, air quality).

COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS: **Yes** **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

2. CREDIBILITY: **ls the project based upon credible research or scientificdata?**

a. The project demonstrates use of scientific principles and procedures (rather than strictly a response to political agendas or impending crises).
b. The project clearly cites references or current research results to support its approach, or meets research goals and objectives set by the Council.
c. The project has undergone appropriate regulatory processes.
d. The project's goals and approach are clear and understandable by the general public. **Yes** **No**

COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS:

NOT APPLICABLE

3. PROBLEM AND SOLUTION: **Does the project clearly identify the resource problems and propose workable solutions that consider the relevant resources?**

a. The project demonstrates that problems exist, using scientific evaluation.
b. The project contributes toward the maintenance, enhancement or restoration **of** specified resources to proper functioning condition. **Yes No** c. Cumulative effects of project strategies have been considered.
COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS: **Yes** **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

4. WATER SUPPLY: **Does the project demonstrate an understanding of water supply?**

a. The project describes the quantity, quality, timing and source(s) of water involved.
b. The project considers potential impacts to water interests within and beyond the Henry's Fork watershed.

c The project demonstrates an understanding of watershed dynamics and regional water policy (i.e. Snake Plain Aquifer, Minidoka Project, Columbia River Basin).
COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS:
Yes **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

5. PROJECTMANAGEMENT: **Does project management employ accepted or innovative practices, set realistic time frames for their Implementation, and employ an effective monitoring plan?**

a. The project sets reasonably achievable objectives with measurable results.
b. The timeline for project implementation is clear and has contingency plans.
c. A monitoring plan is in place to effectively evaluate the project.

COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS: **Yes** **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

6. SUSTAINABILITY: **Does the project emphasize sustainable ecosystems?**

a. The project recognizes the natural limits of the resources involved.
b. The project helps to ensure the sustainability of the ecosystem for future generations.
c. The project recognizes the importance of maintaining the Basin's biological diversity, preventing the need for species listing under the Endangered Species Act.

COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS: **Yes** **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

7. SOCIAL & CULTURAL: **Does the project sufficiently address the watershed's social & cultural concerns?**

a. The project provides/maintains educational, recreational and cultural opportunities.

b. The project considers community welfare, health and safety needs, and local lifestyles in Rs design.
c. An understanding of ongoing social change and its costs and benefits to local communities is demonstrated.
d. The project considers the development pressures being sustained **by** the basin.

COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS:

Yes **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

8. ECONOMY: **Does the project promote economic diversity within the watershed and help sustain a healthy economic base?**

a. The project creatively suppose a sustainable basin economy.
b. It is clear who benefits from and who is sharing the costs of the project.

Yes **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

9. COOPERATION & COORDINATION**: Does the project maximize cooperation among all parties and demonstrate sufficient coordination among appropriate groups or agencies?**

a. The project utilizes the expertise and talents **of** local citizens, agencies and scientists and outlines how communication among these interests will be maintained.
b. The project transcends political agendas and jurisdictional boundaries.

c. The project maximizes efficiency among agencies and is coordinated with other activities in the watershed/subwatershed. **COMMENTS AND/OR CONDITIONS:**

Yes **No**

NOT APPLICABLE

10. LEGALITY: Is the project lawful and respectful of agencies' legal responsibilities?

a. The project complies with federal, state and local laws and regulations, including NEPA and ESA.
b. The project respects vested water rights and protects the beneficial consumptive and nonconsumptive uses of water established by law.
c. The project points out any conflicts in legal mandates and suggests any needed changes in laws or regulations.
d. The project recognizes both public and private property rights in its design.

COMMENTS ANDIOR CONDITIONS: Yes No

NOT APPLICABLE

Henry's Fork Watershed Council
Projects Reviewed using Watershed Integrity Review and Evaluation (WIRE) Criteria

Year	Project Name and Description	Sponsor	Cooperators	Council Action	Total Cost
1994	Bergman Ditch Replacement – Improved irrigation water delivery – Squirrel Creek State Agricultural Water Quality Project (SAWQP)	Yellowstone Soil Conservation District (YSCD)	Private landowners, Squirrel Creek Irrigation and Canal Company, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	Endorsed (E) No funding requested (NFR)	$250,000
1995	Diamond D Ranch Management Improvement – Riparian exclusion fencing on Targhee and Howard creeks, monitoring of rest-rotation grazing, and improved irrigation efficiency	Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), Diamond D Ranch	NRCS; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS); Henry's Lake Foundation (HLF); The Nature Conservancy (TNC); IDFG; Idaho Soil Conservation Commission (ISCC); Island Park Sportsmen Association (IPSA); Howard Creek Ranch	E, Funded (F): $10,000	$33,083
	Rocky Mountain Trumpeter Swan Relocation and Range Expansion Project – Hazing to disperse wintering swans from the Henry's Fork area	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BoR), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), IDFG	E, F: $5,000	$100,000
	Henry's Lake SAWQP – Fifteen-year project to protect riparian areas and prevent shoreline erosion	YSCD	Private landowners, NRCS	E, NFR	$650,000
	Publication of *A Homeowner's Handbook for Living in Teton Valley*	Teton County Economic Development Council	World Wildlife Fund, Greater Yellowstone Coalition (GYC), Community Association for Responsible Planning, Teton Valley/Regional Land Trust (TRLT), USFS	E, F: $1,500	$8,000
	Site-Specific Technology for Agriculture	Hess Farms	Idaho National Engineering/and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), NRCS, Ricks College	E, NFR	Unknown
	North Leigh Creek Amphibian Enhancement Project – Educate public about western boreal toad and spotted frog habitat	USFS	Wildlife Forever	E, F: $1,125	$2,250
1996	Buffalo River Fish Passage Facilities	Buffalo Hydro, Inc.	IDFG, HFF, USFS, USFWS, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)	E, NFR	$10,000
	Warm River Fish Hatchery – Reopen hatchery to produce rainbow and Yellowstone cutthroat trout	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes		Not Endorsed	Unknown
	Henry's Lake Flat Water Development – Riparian exclusion fencing and development of alternative water source for livestock	Idaho Department of Lands (IDL)	Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR), TNC, Farm Services Administration (FSA), NRCS, Howard Creek Ranch	E, F: $5,000	$43,000
	Targhee National Forest Revised Forest Plan – Comments submitted to the Supervisor of the Targhee National Forest	Council		Provided Comments, NFR	NA
	Davis Lake Allotment Well Construction – Develop a well water source for livestock to allow restoration of flow in Sheridan Creek	Clark Soil Conservation District (CSCD)	HFF, IDL, IDPR, Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR), NRCS, USFS, Davis Lake Allotment Permit Holders, ISCC	E, F: $2,000	$21,000

(continued) Projects Reviewed using Watershed Integrity Review and Evaluation (WIRE) Criteria

Year	Project Name and Description	Sponsor	Cooperators	Council Action	Total Cost
1997	Teton Watershed Integrated Resource Analysis Project – Develop an information management system for the Teton subbasin	INEEL	IDFG, HFF, TRLT, IDEQ, Fremont-Madison Irrigation District (FMID)	E, NFR	NA
	Operation of Ashton Gage on Fall River for 1997	FMID	IdaWest/Marysville Hydro, WD1, FMID, USGS	E, F: $1,800	$7,200
	Native Cutthroat Trout Conservation Project – Inventory of streams in upper Henrys subbasin	USFS	HFF, IDFG, Idaho State University (ISU), Gregory Aquatics	E, F: $3,200	$21,600
	Henry's Fork Weed Management Area Project – Noxious weed information and education	USFS, National Park Service (NPS)	BLM; BoR; Fremont County, ID; Teton County, WY; Idaho Department of Agriculture (IDA); IDPR; Idaho Department of Transportation (IDT); IDL; IDFG; Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation; Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative (FRREC); Union Pacific Railroad	E, F: $1,000	$10,000
	Squirrel Meadows - Grand Targhee Resort Land Exchange	USFS		Comments, NFR	NA
1998	Willow Creek Vegetation Management Project – Restore aspen-dominated plant community	USFS		E, NFR	U
	Ashton Visitor Center, Phase Two – Staffing and publication of brochures	Ashton Area Development Committee		E, F: $2,000	$10,000
	Henry's Fork Springs Investigation – Research into the mechanisms of spring recharge in the upper Henry's subbasin	HFF	USGS; FMID; INEEL; Utah State University (USU); University of Utah; University of Oregon	E, F: $5,000	$126,200
	Thurmon Creek Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout Restoration – Eliminate nonnative trout and reintroduce cutthroat trout	Native Trout Subcommittee	USFS, IDFG, IDPR, BoR	E, F: $1,100	$6,850
	Upper Snake River Managed Groundwater Recharge – Augment flow at Thousand Springs by recharging aquifer in Henry's Fork basin	Idaho Water Resources Board (IWRB)	Egin Bench Canals, Inc.; Fall River Irrigation Co.; Salem Union Canal Co.; Twin Groves Irrigation Co.; FMID; WD1; BLM; Private landowners	Comments, NFR	U
	Teton Dam Reservoir – Future Management Study, Phase I – Collect and analyze data to determine future management of area inundated by the reservoir upstream of the Teton Dam	BoR	IDFG, USGS, BLM	E, Comments, NFR	U

(continued) Projects Reviewed using Watershed Integrity Review and Evaluation (WIRE) Criteria

Year	Project Name and Description	Sponsor	Cooperators	Council Action	Total Cost
1999	Assessment of Nutrient Concentrations in Groundwater, Lower Henrys Fork and Lower Teton River Basins – Measurement of nitrate concentrations in ground and drinking water	USGS	IDEQ, IDWR, District Seven Health Department, IDA, Lockheed-Martin Idaho	E, F: $2,500	$37,000
	The Henry's Fork Ag Corridors Conservation Project – Perform education and outreach to preserve farmland and open space	TRLT	Private landowners, NRCS, IDFG, Land Trust Alliance, Fremont County Commissioners, HFF	E, F: $5,000	$780,000
	1999 Henry's Fork Weed Management Area Cooperative Early Detection/Eradication Project	Henry's Fork Weed Management Area Working Group	TNC, Fremont County (ID) Weed Control, Teton County (WY) Weed and Pest, IDA, IDPR, IDT, IDL, IDFG, USFS, BLM, NPS, NRCS, BoR, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)	E, F: $1,000	$19,250
	Publication of *Aquatic Resources of the Henry's Fork Watershed, Idaho,* a Special Issue of the *Intermountain Journal of Sciences*	Intermountain Journal of Sciences	American Fisheries Society, FRREC, Federation of Fly Fishers, HFF, IDFG, Montana Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit at Montana State University, Trout Unlimited (TU), USFS	E, F: $2,000	$10,000
	Greater Yellowstone Trumpeter Swan Initiative – Coordinate private and agency efforts to restore a regional population of swans	The Trumpeter Swan Society	USFS, HFF, IDFG, FMID, IDPR	E, NFR	NA
2000	Ashton Reservoir Water Quality Protection – Proposal for Clean Water Act § 319 funding	TRLT	Private landowners	E, NFR	$300,000
	2000 Henry's Fork Weed Management Area Cooperative Early Detection/Eradication Project – Mapping noxious weeds	Henry's Fork Weed Management Area Working Group	TNC, Fremont County (ID) Weed Control, Teton County (WY) Weed and Pest, IDA, IDPR, IDT, IDL, IDFG, USFS, BLM, NPS, NRCS, BoR, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)	E, F: $1,000	U
2001	Teton River Hydrologic Monitoring and Spring Creek Study – Install stream gages and monitor discharge, monitor water quality	Friends of the Teton River	Private landowners, Teton Valley Trout Unlimited (TVTU), IDFG, IDEQ, Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts (IASCD), USGS, Intermountain Aquatics, Inc., TRLT	E, F: $4,575	$22,875
	Sheridan Creek, Diversion 10 Restoration	IDPR (Harriman State Park)	NRCS, HFF, Sheridan Valley Grazing Association, Idaho Fish and Wildlife Foundation, IDL, IDFG, USFS, CSCD	E, F: $5,000	$100,000

(continued) Projects Reviewed using Watershed Integrity Review and Evaluation (WIRE) Criteria

Year	Project Name and Description	Sponsor	Cooperators	Council Action	Total Cost
2002	Ecology of Montane Wetlands in the Caribou-Targhee National Forest – Year 1 – Field research to better understand montane wetlands dynamics	USFS	University of Missouri-Columbia, IDFG, USFWS, BoR,	E, F: $2,000	$26,000 per year, 3 years
	Habitat Assessment and Restoration – Research and implementation to improve habitat for Yellowstone cutthroat trout	Friends of the Teton River	IDFG, TRLT, ISU, Intermountain Aquatics, Inc., TVTU, USFS	E, NFR	$70,000
	Foster's Slough Restoration Project	TRLT	Private landowners, NRCS, TSCD, IDFG, TVTU, Intermountain Aquatics, Inc., Ducks Unlimited, SAIC, NFWF	E, F: $500	$130,000
	Marysville Pipeline Project – Conduct a feasibility study to replace Marysville Canal with a pipeline to improve water quality in Fall River and the Henry's Fork River	Marysville Canal Company	NRCS	E, NFR	$750,000
2003	Ecology of Montane Wetlands in the Caribou-Targhee National Forest – Year 2	USFS	University of Missouri-Columbia, IDFG, USFWS, BoR	E, F: $2,000	$26,000 per year, 3 years
	Sawtell Creeks Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout Restoration Project – Restore stream connectivity to allow fish passage	USFS on behalf of the Native Trout Subcommittee	Private landowners, IDFG, NRCS	E, F: $2,000	U
	Watershed Perspectives on Hydrologic Alteration in the Henry's Fork Basin – Research and data analysis	ISU	USGS, HFF, TNC, TU, GYC, FMID, ISU Undergraduate Research Committee	E, F: $ 3,415	$17,095
	Henry's Fork Greenway – Construction of signs	City of St. Anthony	Henry's Fork Greenway Committee, City of St. Anthony Parks and Recreation Committee, Fremont County, BLM, TRLT, HFF, IDEQ, IDT, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	E, F: $1,800	$114,500
	Teton River Interpretive Trail	Teton Valley Trails and Pathways		Not Endorsed	NA
2004	Friends of the Teton River – Electronic Database project to make data accessible to others on a website maintained by FTR.	FTR	Chi Melville, Teton Computing, Driggs	E, F: $2,000	U
	Moody Creek Subcommittee – Discharge monitoring proposal to estimate the "normal" hydrologic regime of Moody Creek.	Moody Creek Subcommittee	Madison Soil Conservation District	E, F: $2,168	U
2005	ISU – Effects of Geology and water management on hydrologic regimes and fluvial processes in the Henry's Fork watershed, with emphasis on the lower Teton and Henry's Fork	ISU	Drs. Jennifer Pierce and Glenn Thackray, ISU Dept. of Geosciences, Garrett Bayrd, ISU graduate student, Kirstin Keetch, BYUI undergraduate student-mathematics, NSF, IDFG, HFF, FTR, TU, TNC, GRC, GSA, FMID (data), IDWR (data)	E, F: $5,000	$37,806

Year	Project Name and Description	Sponsor	Cooperators	Council Action	Total Cost
	Teton Headwaters Cutthroat Population Assessment	Friends of the Teton River	Caribou-Targhee NF, Native Trout Subcommittee, ISU, IDFG, Wyoming Game and Fish, Snake River Cutthroats, Federation of Fly Fishers, NFWF, AFS, The Community Foundation of Jackson Hole	E, F: $4,000	$64,520
	IP Trail Mapping Project	IP Gem Team	Harriman SP, USFS, Fremont Co. Parks Rec, IP City Council, IP News	E, F: $1,600	$13,000
	ISU-Watershed and Geologic Digital Maps of the Henry's Fork of the Snake River	ISU- Geosciences	Mel Kuntz, Blackrock Geological Cons. And USGS (emeritus), Bill Hackett, WRH Assoc, BYUI Geology Dept, IGS, IWRRI, USBLM	E, NFR	NA
	Yellowstone cutthroat trout status review and management strategy	Native Trout Subcommittee	HFF, Jim De Rito; Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Gregory Aquatics, Henry's Fork Watershed Council Native Trout Subcommittee	E, NFR	NA
2007	Teton Creek Restoration Project	Friends of the Teton River	Nelson Engineering, Confluence Inc., USFS, IDWR, NRCS, Harmony Design, City of Driggs, Teton County, Intermountain Aquatics, IDEQ,VARD, EPA, COE, and multiple landowners	E, NFR	$242,475
	Fremont County Comprehensive Plan	Henry's Fork Foundation	Teton Regional Land Trust, Fremont Growth Solutions	Comments, NFR	NA
2008	Upper Snake River Cloud Seeding	High Country RC&D	9 Counties, 12 Water Districts/Irrigation Districts, 9 SWCD's, 4 cities, Idaho Falls Power, Fremont County Snowmobile Club	E, NFR	NA
	Lower Henry's Fork Fish Passage Assessment	Henry's Fork Foundation	IDFG, FMID	E, NFR	NA
	Conjunctive management of surface and ground water in a Western watershed experiencing rapid development of irrigated agricultural land	Humboldt State University	FMID, FTR, HFF	E, NFR	$596,400
2009	Phase 3-5 North Fremont Canal System Gravity Pipeline	Marysville Canal Co.	NRCS, IDWR, Farmers Own Canal Co., 50+ landowners	E, NFR	NA
2010	North Fork Bio Engineered Bank Stabilization Demonstration Project	Intermountain Aquatics/North Fork Native Plants	IDWR, BLM, IDFG, NRCS, COE, IDL, TRLT, HFF, Univ. Idaho	E, NFR	U
	Henry's Fork Basin Special Study – WaterSMART Program	USBoR	IDWR	E, NFR	$400,000
2011	Henry's Fork Basin Study – Reconnaissance Study Alternatives	USBoR	IDWR	Comments, NFR	NA
2012	Conservation of Water Resources in the Henry's Fork Watershed: Final USDA Project Outreach Booklet	Rob Van Kirk, Humboldt State University	Friends of the Teton River, Fremont-Madison Irrigation District, Henry's Fork Foundation	E, NFR	$620,000 final project cost

Year	Project Name and Description	Sponsor	Cooperators	Council Action	Total Cost
2014	Long-term monitoring of biochemical and physical processes in the Henry's Fork and tributaries	Henry's Fork Foundation			$187,000
2016	South Fork Teton River Boat Ramp	Idaho Department of Fish and Game		Not Endorsed	

E – Endorsed, F – Funded, NFR – No Funding Requested
NA - Not applicable, U - Unspecified

55+ Projects - $75,293+ in Funding Distributed – More than 80 Cooperators