

From: Roger Mann [mailto:rmecon@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 5:11 PM
To: 'Michael Pope'
Cc: 'Zelinsky,Benjamin D - KEWL-4'; 'Terry Morlan'; 'Lon L. Peters'; 'Joel R. Hamilton'
Subject: IEAB Task 116

I have attached BPA's most recent revisions to their cost data for wildlife projects from Pisces. Their work is discussed in some detail in Dorie Welch's e-mail below. I would now like to work with some of the individual managers to see if additional changes should be included to cover their concerns; in particular, where some shifts of costs between habitat maintenance and enhancement may be justified, and where cost includes only BPA's cost share. I will call you after I have reviewed the manager's letters and notes from our meetings. In the meantime, could you review the attached file and let me know if there are any other issues with the data that could be quickly addressed? Has there been any additional discussion in the WAC regarding useful changes to the PISCES data? Regarding the IEAB Task? Once we settle on the data our plan has been to decide on one "O&M" indicator, group the projects, and work with the managers to explain variation within and between the groups.

Thanks for your continued cooperation.

Roger Mann, Ph.D.
RMecon
1677 Colusa Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
rmecon@sbcglobal.net
530-756-1884
efax: 509-692-5175

-----Original Message-----

From: Zelinsky,Benjamin D - KEWL-4 [mailto:bdzelinsky@bpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 4:31 PM
To: Roger Mann
Cc: O'Toole, Patty; Terry Morlan; Lon L. Peters; Joel R. Hamilton; Welch,Dorothy W - KEWU-4
Subject: RE: FY06 Wildlife WE Budget Analysis 12Dec06.xls

There is no reason to wait to proceed from our perspective. Our original goal was to 1. respond to Karier's request and 2. provide a straw man to further discussion. We look forward to seeing what comes out of the next round of analysis. Perhaps a discussion of the definition of maintenance can be addressed in the next round of your work.

Ben

From: Roger Mann [mailto:rmecon@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 11:03 AM
To: Welch,Dorothy W - KEWU-4; Zelinsky,Benjamin D - KEWL-4
Cc: 'O'Toole, Patty'; 'Terry Morlan'; 'Lon L. Peters'; 'Joel R. Hamilton'
Subject: RE: FY06 Wildlife WE Budget Analysis 12Dec06.xls

I've reviewed the changes to the budget analysis worksheet and Dorrie's notes below and discussed them with the IEAB. I would now like to work with these data, Michael Pope and the WAC to determine if, for the purposes of the IEAB's work on Task 116 only, any more data changes should be accomplished. I like Dorries' organization below. We will work with the WAC to make any changes involving items 1 and 2, and we will add data under items 3 and 4, until we

have a revised database for the grouping analysis we previously discussed with the WAC. Is there any reason we should wait to proceed with this work? Are the data being changed any more in the near future? Should we wait until a more formal definition of "maintenance" is provided?

Thanks!

Roger Mann, Ph.D.
1677 Colusa Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
rmecon@sbcglobal.net
530-756-1884
efax: 509-692-5175

-----Original Message-----

From: Welch, Dorothy W - KEWU-4 [mailto:dwwelch@bpa.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 4:10 PM

To: rmecon@sbcglobal.net

Cc: O'Toole, Patty; DeHerrera, Joe - KEWU-4; Zelinsky, Benjamin D - KEWL-4

Subject: FW: FY06 Wildlife WE Budget Analysis 12Dec06.xls

Roger,

Attached is the revised spreadsheet. We have incorporated the acreage comments from the wildlife managers in the spreadsheet to allow analysis to continue, but we will need to continue to work with them to determine exactly where the discrepancies lie and to update our separate Wildlife Crediting database as necessary.

In regards to the other comments from the wildlife managers, they generally fell into one of four categories:

1. Division of work elements across the work categories

In our original presentation to the Council, we indicated that one of the limitations of the Pisces data is that the work elements identify the type of work that will be done but they do not indicate why the work is being done, i.e. is it enhancement, or is it maintenance?

A fundamental issue related to this is how you define enhancement and how you define maintenance. With regard to habitat units, the difference between maintenance and enhancement largely depends on the habitat response as measured by the Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP). Based on all of this, wildlife managers have differing opinions on how to distribute the work elements to work categories based on the work that is represented in their individual projects. While we understand these issues, we do not feel that it is appropriate to develop different work category assignments for each project because we do not have a strong understanding of the criteria that the wildlife managers used to create their statements of work and due to the consistency issues that this approach would create. However, we would like to work with the project sponsors to develop additional functionality in Pisces that will better enable us to determine the objective of each work element in the future.

2. Issues with work element budget estimates and foundational costs

Several of the sponsors expressed concerns about the time and effort involved with developing line-item budgets at the work element level, and they questioned the value of this level of detail. We appreciate their concern and agree that line-item budgets at the work element level provide little added value to the Program. Therefore, we created the work element budget estimate to provide a gross estimate of the cost of the work included in each work element. While we recognize that these are done quickly and at a

very high level, we feel that they provide us with the ability to summarize cost information at a program level. Sponsors also expressed concern about the addition of foundational costs (Planning and Coordination, Environmental Compliance, Project Administration, etc) into an analysis of Habitat Maintenance costs. While we agree that that we should determine how best to apportion these costs to the Habitat Maintenance category, we do not feel that it is appropriate to exclude them completely.

3. Use of acres instead of habitat units

By looking at the management cost/acre, we are unable to determine the wildlife habitat benefit that results from the habitat enhancement and maintenance funding received by each project. These benefits are translated into Habitat Units, which are tracked as part of BPA's wildlife mitigation crediting program. Typically, habitat unit surveys are conducted on a five-year interval to give the habitat time to respond to management actions. Due to this spacing, we do not have annual estimates of the habitat units associated with each property. We agree with the comment that HUs would provide a better basis than acres for comparing wildlife costs. The wildlife managers effectively point out the inherent differences between acres both in terms of wildlife benefit and potential management costs. This argument doesn't hold up, though, when applied to HUs. Assuming that 5 HUs are equal to 5 HUs, why would you pursue a project with a high cost/HU over one with a low cost/HU? Differences in terrain, property size and shape etc. will lead to different cost/HU and should be a factor in determining which wildlife projects to pursue.

4. The lack of data regarding other attributes that affect management costs

As we mentioned in our original presentation to the Council, Pisces data can be used to determine that there is substantial variation amongst wildlife projects with respect to wildlife management costs/acre and the distribution of funding amongst the work categories. However, additional analysis is required to determine if this variation is due to funding inconsistencies or some other factor such as life cycle (phase) of the project, differences in habitat quality, the size of the acquisition, etc.

There were several other valuable comments from the wildlife managers, which should be taken into consideration as you proceed with your analysis. For example, Pisces does not currently include an estimate of the cost share obtained for each project, which affects the proportion of the work that is funded by BPA.

Hopefully this will provide you with some useful information to consider in your continuing analysis. Please let us know if you have any additional questions

Thank you,
Dorie

-----Original Message-----

From: Roger Mann [mailto:rmecon@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2007 9:29 AM
To: 'Zelinsky,Benjamin D - KEWL-4'
Subject: RE: FY06 Wildlife WE Budget Analysis 12Dec06.xls

Ben, Terry and I met with the WAC last Thursday. Below, I have copied some text I sent to Michael Pope after the meeting:

Thanks for meeting with us on Thursday. Terry and I both thought that it was very productive.

Below, I have outlined the steps we discussed for explaining the Pisces data we reviewed at the meeting.

1. The IEAB will obtain your comment letters from Patty O'Toole and review them.
2. I will work with the letters, Ben Zelinsky and any other information you may provide to remove the most obvious errors from the Pisces data sheet. This step may include moving some work elements for some projects between Habitat Maintenance and Habitat Enhancement.
3. We will develop one indicator to be most representative of actual O&M. This indicator may include some shares of Planning and Coordination, Project Administration and RM&E.
4. The WAC will group the projects based on some underlying similarities.
5. The IEAB will work with the WAC to explain and write up why there are differences within and between the groups.

Please comment, and thanks again.

So, after I receive the comment letters from Patty I will be back in touch to discuss any additional updating that might be justified. Are you planning any more changes to the database?

It might be good to compare notes. Feel free to call anytime.

Roger Mann, Ph.D.
RMecon
1677 Colusa Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
rmecon@sbcglobal.net
530-756-1884
efax: 509-692-5175