



September 11, 2002

TO: Resident Fish Committee (RFC)  
 FROM: Joe Maroney, Chair  
 SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the September 9, 2002, RFC Meeting

**If there are no objections within five days, these actions will be considered final.**

**Attendees:** Dave Ward (ODFW), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)  
**By Phone:** Molly Webb (OSU), Blaine Parker (CRITFC), John Arterburn (CCT), John Skidmore (BPA), Ron Morinaka (BPA), Pete Hassemmer (IDFG), Robert Walker (NWPPC), Joe Maroney (KT), Clint Muhlfeld (MFWP), Brian Marotz (MFWP), Dave Statler (NPT), Ron Peters (CDAT), Dena Gadomski (USGS)  
**Time Allocation:**

Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	0%
Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	98%
Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	0%

Draft Action Notes

**ITEM 1: Review and approve agenda**

The following items were added to the agenda:

Item 4: Update on the status of the Unallocated Placeholder and the new guidelines for within-year requests for existing projects

Item 5: Update on drafting Statement of Work documents for BPA and BPA's decisions regarding FY2003 budgets

**ITEM 2: Review RFC comments/recommendations for the Mainstem/Systemwide Province**

The RFC reviewed eight project proposals (Table 1) and assigned the proposals to the funding category that the RFC believed was appropriate. Due to time limitations, the RFC was unable to complete the review of Proposal 35043 and Proposal 198605000. Although the RFC reviewed Proposal 198605000 and assigned it to the urgent category, the review of Objective 1, Task 1b was not completed.

**Action:** The RFC's reviews and recommendations are provided in Table 1.

**Action:** The RFC requested that the sponsors of Proposal 198605000 provide responses to the RFC's comments (relative to Objective 1, Task 1b) to Neil Ward by Tuesday, September 10, 2002, for an additional review on Wednesday, September 11, 2002, via a phone conference (503-229-0191) at 10:00 a.m. (Pacific).

**Action:** The RFC agreed to complete the review of Proposal 35043 during the September 11, 2002, phone conference.

**Item 3:** *Discuss the Coeur d' Alene Tribe's (CDAT) request for an RFC review of Project 199004400*

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has requested that the CDAT seek an RFC technical review of the "Habitat Protection Plan" (see attachment) for Project 199004400. The RFC discussed the appropriateness of BPA's request and suggested that the issue should be presented to the Members Management Group (MMG) for further discussion.

**Action:** The RFC will not conduct a formal review; however, if you have comments submit them to Neil Ward by October 1, 2002, at which time Neil will forward the comments to Ron Peters.

**Item 4:** *Update on the status of the Unallocated Placeholder and the new guidelines for within-year requests for existing projects*

Joe Maroney provided an update on the status of the Unallocated Placeholder (exceeds \$16 million) and the new guidelines for within-year requests for existing projects. The guidelines and application form were recently approved by the MMG and Members and are now available on the CBFWA website. Any project sponsor requesting a within-year modification must first complete the form. It is expected that the new guidelines (which includes review criteria) and form result in a consistent review by the CBFWA Resident Fish, Anadromous Fish, and Wildlife committees.

**Item 5:** *Update on drafting Statement of Work documents for BPA and BPA's decisions regarding budget increases for 2003*

Joe Maroney and Ron Morinaka briefed the RFC on the new procedures that BPA has implemented for submitting a Statement of Work. The BPA has indicated that the budget request that sponsors identify when drafting a Statement of Work should be the amount that the NWPPC approved. The NWPPC recommendation for your project is available on the CBFWA website. Regarding "scopes" and budgets, Joe indicated that they must be submitted to BPA three months prior to the end of the contract. In addition, Joe emphasized the importance of submitting reports on time.

The BPA has indicated that there will be no 3.4% cost of living increase for any project during FY2003. In addition, the 10% rule will not be implemented during FY2003. Finally, BPA indicated that a project's base budget for FY2002 (prior to any NWPPC and BPA 2003 agreement) will be used as the starting budget for FY2003.

**Table 1:** The Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority’s Resident Fish Committee’s comments and funding category recommendations for project proposals submitted for consideration in the Mainstem/Systemwide Province.

Proposal Number	Title and comments	Funding category <sup>a</sup>
199007700	<p><b><i>Northern Pikeminnow Management Program</i></b></p> <p>Results from this project clearly show that it is an effective management tool that has directly benefited salmon recovery efforts in the Columbia River Basin. The project’s cost effectiveness appears to remain stable or slightly increasing, further corroborating the effectiveness and importance of this project to salmon recovery efforts and the need to continue funding through 2007.</p>	U
198605000	<p>A final review will be performed on Wednesday, September 11, 2002. The RFC requested the sponsors to address the comments pertaining to Objective 1, Task 1b. The RFC recommended that the rest of the proposal should be categorized as Urgent.</p>	U (except for Objective 1, Task 1b)
35002	<p><b><i>Determine Origin, Movements, and Relative Abundance of Bull Trout in Bonneville Reservoir</i></b></p> <p>The RFC acknowledges that the project’s objectives will aid with bull trout recovery efforts and is consistent with the goals of the NWPPC’s 2000 Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program and the USFWS Bull Trout Biological Opinion (2000). This project will collect some baseline data to help meet requirements 10.A.2.1, 11.A.2.1.c, and 11.A.2.1.d set forth in the FCRPS Biological Opinion for bull trout.</p> <p>The RFC recommends two years funding for Objective 1 to assess the feasibility and effectiveness of capturing bull trout in Bonneville Reservoir using various trapping techniques and suggests that various capture methods may be needed during the second year of the project if none of the capture techniques are effective. Subsequent funding (Objectives 2-6) should be contingent on results of Objective 1 (e.g., capture efficacy, distribution, and relative abundance information). At the end of two years, the RFC recommends that an RFC review of the results prior to the allocation of additional funds.</p>	HP (fund in part)
35028	<p><b><i>Evaluate White Sturgeon Nutritional Needs and Contaminant Effects Influenced by the Hydroelectric System</i></b></p> <p>Although the hydropower system has exacerbated the contaminant problem, it is not solely responsible. Significant cost share from contaminant sources would seem appropriate.</p>	RA
35042	<p><b><i>Evaluate the Effects of Prey Availability on Recruitment of White Sturgeon in the Columbia River</i></b></p> <p>White sturgeon upstream from Bonneville Dam are not listed as threatened, endangered, or sensitive; however, these populations have reduced productivity due to hydropower development. Some reservoirs upstream from Priest Rapids Dam no longer appear to support any reproduction. The project is complementary to planned restoration activities for white sturgeon conducted by states and tribes. Data provided will be useful in evaluation and interpretation of research and management activities involving release of hatchery and transplanted white sturgeon, interpreting reduced growth and recruitment in some reservoirs, and determining</p>	HP

	appropriate actions to restore reduced productivity (both planned and ongoing).	
35043	Will be reviewed during the Wednesday, September 11, 2002, RFC phone conference	NA
35044	<p><b><i>Determine Effects of Contaminants on White Sturgeon Reproduction and Parental Transfer of Contaminants to Embryos in the Columbia River Basin.</i></b></p> <p>The obvious, easily recognized benefit is knowledge of parental transfer, which may assist in eventual broodstock selection. Less obvious is what to do about contaminants in general. Although the hydropower system has exacerbated the contaminant problem, it is not solely responsible. Significant cost share from contaminant sources would seem appropriate.</p>	RA
35059	<p><b><i>Rapid Detection of White Sturgeon Iridovirus in Spawning Fluids, Eggs, and Juvenile Tissues of White Sturgeon and Project 35061, Prophylactic Treatments for White Sturgeon Infected with the White Sturgeon Iridovirus (WSIV)</i></b></p> <p>The RFC questions the utility of the proposed work due in part to the following information that was included in Project 198806400: In cooperation with pathologists from the USFWS Dworshak Fish Health Lab and pathologists from Clear Springs Foods (Buhl, ID.), Project 198806400 has “developed and implemented non-lethal sampling procedures for detecting an endemic sturgeon pathogen, White Sturgeon Iridovirus (WSIV). This development now successfully permits the examination of recaptured hatchery released fish and wild white sturgeon adults. Prior to this development, natural prevalence was undetectable. This collaboration provides great realized and potential utility, and is directly applicable by others for similar issues throughout the geographical range of white sturgeon.”</p>	DNF
35061	See 35059	DNF

<sup>a</sup> **Urgent (U)** - These projects or tasks within a project are of urgent need. They will either have a direct impact on survival or protection of a key species or will protect investments made in this subbasin. These projects should be able to demonstrate an immediate cost if not funded (loss of habitat, impact on a population, etc.). An example might also include ongoing O+M costs.

**High Priority (HP)** - These projects or tasks within a project are high priority within the subbasin. The project addresses a specific need within the subbasin summaries.

**Recommended Action (RA)** - These are good projects that cannot demonstrate a significant loss by not funding this year. These projects should be funded, but under a limited budget could be delayed without significant loss.

**Do Not Fund (DNF)** - This project is either technically inadequate or does not address a need within the subbasin summaries. These projects may be inappropriate for BPA funding.