

Tom Karier
Chair
Washington

Frank L. Cassidy Jr.
"Larry"
Washington

Jim Kempton
Idaho

W. Bill Booth
Idaho



Joan M. Dukes
Vice-Chair
Oregon

Melinda S. Eden
Oregon

Bruce A. Measure
Montana

Rhonda Whiting
Montana

March 1, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fish and Wildlife Committee Members
Council Members

FROM: Patty O'Toole
John Shurts

SUBJECT: Bonneville's FY2007-09 project funding decision letter

One topic on the agenda for the Council's March meeting, and the entire agenda for the Fish and Wildlife Committee's special meeting March 5, will be a discussion of Bonneville's decision in response to the Council's project funding recommendations for FY2007-09.

Attached to this cover memorandum are summary tables from the staff summarizing Bonneville's decisions and the key differences from the Council's recommendations. Staff will present additional information at the Committee and Council meetings.

Also attached is an outline of key issues presented by Bonneville's decisions. The list is the product of many collective and individual discussions and reviews over the last week and a half among members and central and state staff. This does not mean the list is exhaustive, but we do believe it captures the main themes.

The obvious question is whether and how the Council responds to Bonneville's decisions. That will be the main focus of the discussions with the Committee and the Council, and people have posited a range of reactions and responses. A couple of suggestions:

First, Bonneville has asserted a number of broad policy initiatives in this decision, especially in areas that the Council has also expressed an interest in engaging, such as reform in the program's load of monitoring and evaluation and related matters. The Council had a preferred approach to dealing with these issues: (1) *interim* funding for projects in certain areas, while the Council reviews and, if possible, develops better priority recommendations for elements of the program in the near term, with major resolution of these policy areas to take place in (2) the

program amendment process and (3) the next project review process. Our suggestion is that it still makes sense for the Council to focus its energy and resources in those upcoming reviews and events -- and especially on resolving these policy issues and the matter of roles and responsibilities in the program amendment process.

Second, this still leaves the question of what to do about project funding issues raised with the FY07 through 09 period itself. And the suggestion here is to engage in this way:

(1) Just as the Council treated its project funding recommendations in certain areas as *interim* pending further review and resolution of certain issues, the Council might let Bonneville know that the Council similarly treats Bonneville's assertion of these policies and their application especially in the 08 and 09 budget figures as just as *interim* as the Council's, while we pursue the review and possible reform of these elements of the program.

(2) We also have a series of important clarifications/commitments to ask of Bonneville. This includes the need for ISRP review of projects Bonneville added that did not yet get or complete ISRP review; assuring the appropriate Step review of added projects where appropriate; clarification of the rescheduling and carry forward rules after 07; and so forth, as outlined in the issue list.

(3) Engage with Bonneville on project-specific issues arising out of their decision as the need arises.

Again, there are other possible ways to respond. These are merely suggestions to consider.

List and description of issues arising out Bonneville's FY07-09 decision letter
revised March 7, 2007

Totals/Overall effect

- See Tables attached summarizing Bonneville's decisions and the differences from the Council's recommendations. The staff will have additional information at the Committee and Council meetings

- Whether looked at in terms of # of projects affected or \$\$ amounts changed, overall Bonneville made significant changes to the Council's project funding recommendations in the expense category (we do not know about capital yet). Bonneville did so in part by applying a set of policy and project preferences (many outlined below), with the following resulting effects:
 - An overall addition of money *to* anadromous habitat and production projects (and to other projects proposed by the tribes in the anadromous areas) and *to* certain rm&c projects favored by Bonneville.
 - An overall reduction of money *from* funding for projects above Hells Canyon and Lake Roosevelt and Lower Columbia; *from* rme&c projects and work elements in general (except for the rm&c projects favored by Bonneville); *from* new projects, and *from* 09 budgets for on-going projects labeled in lieu projects, based on this set of policy and project reasons. Also, Bonneville's decisions allocated the reserve amounts the Council left unallocated.
 - The end result does not necessarily mean a *shift* in funding from the areas reduced to the areas increased. Under the budget planning target the Council used, what Bonneville has done would indeed result in a shift, as Bonneville allocated up to that planning target. But the budget planning target Bonneville is using turns out to be much higher than the Council understood -- \$477 million over three years rather than the \$459 million the Council used. So even with Bonneville allocating a higher three-year total than the Council did, Bonneville estimates that there could still be as much as an additional \$20 million in planning flexibility. Because of the fact that more money is available than the Council expected, for provinces and project areas that show reduced totals compared to the Council's allocations, Bonneville said that its decision "does not overtly reflect moving these dollars to other provinces," and instead simply that "these dollars are not reflected as being spent" and that Bonneville invites the Council to work with Bonneville in deciding how to use the available funds. At the same time, the Council should note that while these additional funds may be available, they come with restrictions, including the policies Bonneville applied along the way to the reductions and a caution about adding more in Fy07. One big question going forward will be whether funds truly are available in the areas that show spending reduced compared to the Council's allocations, given the policy obstacles that led to the reductions in the first place (*see* below).
 - 08 and 09 budget totals may also be affected by the fact that most of the 07 Ops Agreement projects do not have 08 and 09 budgets (some do). This may be understandable under the legal circumstances, but the odds are that at least most will have 08 and 09 budgets, and so Bonneville's 08 and 09 totals may be higher than depicted (again, in anadromous areas), using up some of the flexibility.

Issues arising out of the disparate policy elements are outlined below. But a threshold issue is whether the Council wants to react to this overall picture, and if so, how? At its core, this presents less of a legal issue about direct instances of Program inconsistency and more of a mixed policy/legal concern about the appropriateness of Bonneville asserting an overriding programmatic policy approach in this forum, policies that seem better suited to the Program and a Program amendment process.

Broader policy and legal issues

- **Consistency with the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program**
 - After re-write, any problems with way Bonneville explains consistency? Still analyzing.
 - Any decisions clearly not consistent with Program? Are there explanations for deviations? None for law enforcement projects. Three more important questions will be:
 - (1) Do project decisions in any subbasin run counter to subbasin priorities and strategies?
 - (2) If Bonneville reduced or rejected a project that is based in program priorities, and did so based on an application of policies such as a lack of an FCRPS nexus or an in lieu situation, that would be an adequate explanation for a program inconsistency *if* those policies are appropriately applied. That will be a key question on a project-specific basis.
 - (3) Do the overall changes have a significant effect on the Program's 70-15-15 allocation provision? Bonneville says no (pp. 21 of the Decision Enclosure).

- **Bonneville's policy (which it calls "reinvention") of using proportionate spending goals to shift funding from rme&c to on-the-ground habitat and production actions**
 - What does the Council think of this particular policy? Resisted it before; still desire to resist?
 - On the other hand, the Council came to a policy conclusion in its recommendations that is similar or related to Bonneville's underlying concern: The program spends a lot of money on rme&c (and data management as part of that) without the best plans to guide this spending and thus without the best understanding of what are the priority tasks to fund. The Council's recommended method for responding to this situation was (1) to set *interim* funding levels for projects in these categories, often at less than requested levels, and then to review and develop a better set of priorities before making final recommendations for this rate period, and then (2) to use the Program amendment and next project review processes to resolve these concerns for the longer term. Bonneville's approach -- to go ahead and reduce rme&c budgets and shift funds to habitat and production actions with a percentage goal -- may be complementary *or* it may get in the way of the Council undertaking these reviews and finalizing project recommendations for 08 and 09.
 - So, what does the Council think of the *way* Bonneville imposed the policy, as a programmatic policy assertion outside of a Program amendment process and in a way that may (or may not) work contrary to the Council related initiatives in these areas? Again, this may not be a direct Program consistency issue, because the Program itself is quite general in these areas right now, but how appropriate is it for Bonneville to assert

such a direct programmatic policy in the absence of provisions on this topic in the Program and with a Program amendment process coming up?

- Just as important, how consistently did Bonneville apply this policy? Budgets for a number of rm&e projects favored by Bonneville go up, not down, the net effect of which in part accounts for the fact that Bonneville reports an overall modest shift toward its spending goal.
 - Staff will have information on the magnitude of this shift at the meetings.
- **ESA implementation in anadromous basins**
 - Nearly all of the projects Bonneville *added* to the Council's recommendations are intended by Bonneville to implement the 2004 UPA, or to anticipate ESA requirements in the new FCRPS Proposed Action and BiOp, or to settle ESA litigation issues around 07 operations.
 - The fact that Bonneville decided to add these projects may not be as much of an issue for the Council as the possible effects these additions might have for the rest of the package, such as effects on the 70-15-15 target, etc.
 - Staff will have information on the magnitude of these effects at the meetings.
- **In lieu**
 - Overall policy -- Concern about continued reliance on what seems to us a relatively arbitrary cost share percentage as proof of no in lieu problem, especially the 15% reduction factor in FY09. Bonneville recognizes that there are other ways of proving that an in lieu situation does not exist, but for now relies on the cost-share concept, turning what is an in lieu prohibition into a cost share policy. Does the Council want to apply its staff and member resources to design and implement an alternative approach, as Bonneville essentially invites?
 - In lieu ratings -- particular problems?
- **Projects reduced or removed from list for lack of nexus to FCRPS or because Bonneville stated they are not a "priority" for the FCRPS. How to respond?**
 - areas of the basin -- above Hells Canyon and Grand Coulee and in the Lower Columbia
 - particular species, such as bull trout
 - types of m&e, such as population status monitoring -- concern over this shows up in the in the m&e "reinvention" and in lieu initiatives, too
 - for these last two categories, this seems to staff a relatively expanded and aggressive assertion of programmatic policy by Bonneville -- again, is this the right place for that kind of policy assertion and application, outside of a Program amendment process?

Other issues, including explanations, clarifications and commitments needed

- **Missing projects**
 - Without the *capital* table, impossible to evaluate what's next for capital expenditures and hard to evaluate how appropriate are the expense budgets for capital projects.
 - Apparently, a few within-year or close-out projects and budgets are missing, including Abernathy. Any others?

- ISRP and ISAB were not in the tables with the decision documents, but were in the Excel spreadsheet, fully funded.

Others?

- **ISRP review.** Need for ISRP review of projects that did not yet “pass” ISRP review, consistent with how the Council conditioned similar funding recommendations on further ISRP review. Bonneville added projects that ISRP rated not fundable, that got an ISRP rating of “response requested” but did not go through the loop again, and that never got reviewed (enforcement projects). Staff will have a list at the meetings.
 - same issue with projects added that are in Step review
- **Explanations.** In some cases, Bonneville still needs to supply explanations for changes that it made to the Council’s recommendations. Bonneville explained most of the changes it made in project budgets (and in removing projects from the list or adding projects to the list) as based on: (1) the policies noted above, such as the “reinvention” policy of shifting money from rme&c to on-the-ground activities; lack of FCRPS nexus; in lieu issues; or ESA needs, including settlement of 07 operations in the ESA litigation; or (2) a project-specific difference with the Council on the appropriate scope or work elements for a project unrelated to any broader policy issues (very few of these); or (3) a Bonneville re-evaluation of what is an appropriate budget for the work recommended, in a form of project-cost tweaking Bonneville usually engages in during contracting. But some changes in project budgets are not sufficiently explained to understand why they’ve been made, and need to be.
 - as a collective version of this issue, Intermountain project budgets and the provincial total seem to have reduced the most without full explanation. Is this an accurate perception?
- **Rescheduling and carry forward.** We need a commitment on rescheduling and carry-forward rules following 07.
- **June 1 deadline.** Bonneville has set a June 1 deadline for recommendations to change Bonneville funding decisions for the following fiscal year, such as from o&m or coordination or m&e review. *See* Page 7, footnote 9. Is this realistic?
- **Project specific issues from individual states**
- Other issues?

Table 1. Summary of Bonneville decision, FY 2007-2009 totals

Data from BPA decision 07_09 for web (expense only)
draft 2/28/2007**Draft****Three
year
totals**

Province/area	Council recommendation	Bonneville decision	Overall province net impact	Total change in \$
Basinwide	\$83,393,276	\$94,120,997	Increase	\$10,727,721
Blue Mountain	\$21,351,492	\$23,648,072	Increase	\$2,296,580
Columbia Cascade	\$9,001,998	\$19,260,753	Increase	\$10,258,755
Columbia Estuary	\$10,979,912	\$12,975,000	Increase	\$1,995,088
Columbia Gorge	\$15,643,652	\$16,072,655	Increase	\$429,003
Columbia Plateau	\$64,081,909	\$67,594,810	Increase	\$3,512,901
Intermountain	\$45,861,678	\$39,785,202	Decrease	-\$6,076,476
Lower Columbia	\$7,545,387	\$6,520,708	Decrease	-\$1,024,679
Mainstem/Multiprovince	\$39,890,123	\$40,375,927	Increase	\$485,804
Middle Snake	\$10,122,237	\$4,856,997	Decrease	-\$5,265,240
Mountain Columbia	\$37,770,529	\$35,767,717	Decrease	-\$2,002,812
Mountain Snake	\$50,279,915	\$51,548,180	Increase	\$1,268,265
Upper Snake	\$4,725,066	\$3,144,223	Decrease	-\$1,580,843
Enforcement	\$0	\$610,000	Increase	\$610,000
Total	\$400,647,174	\$416,281,241	Increase	\$15,634,067
Innovative Placeholder	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000		
Basinwide Reserve	\$8,457,119	\$0		
Unallocated placeholder	\$6,000,000	\$0		
Within year reserve	\$0	\$6,000,000		
ISRP/ISAB	\$3,150,000	\$0	BPA includes in Basinwide	
BPA Program Support	<u>\$33,000,000</u>	<u>\$36,000,000</u>		
3-year total	\$454,254,293	\$460,281,241		
Annual average	\$151,418,098	\$153,427,080		

Table 2. Summary of Bonneville decision, FY 2007

Data from BPA decision 07_09 for web (expense only)
draft 2/28/2007

Draft

FY 2007	No. projects Council Rec	No. of projects increased	No. of new projects by BPA	No. of project decreased	No. of rec projects not funded by BPA	Total number changes	Percent project change	Council \$ Rec	Bonneville \$ decision	Province net impact	Total change in \$	Comment
Basinwide	47	9	6	18	2	35	74%	\$ 30,356,447	\$33,518,581	Increase	\$3,162,134	Council rec \$30,306,446
Blue Mountain	18	2	5	4	1	12	67%	\$7,117,164	\$8,320,750	Increase	\$1,203,586	
Columbia Cascade	15	4	11	0	1	16	107%	\$4,038,665	\$7,488,622	Increase	\$ 3,449,957	
Columbia Estuary	5	2	0	1	1	4	80%	\$3,932,800	\$4,175,000	Increase	\$ 242,200	BPA number differs from pdf
Columbia Gorge	13	0	3	6	1	10	77%	\$4,559,181	\$5,199,751	Increase	\$640,570	
Columbia Plateau	52	14	9	9	3	35	67%	\$21,973,636	\$25,087,807	Increase	\$3,114,171	
Intermountain	24	0	1	7	1	9	38%	\$15,241,904	\$13,382,186	Decrease	-\$1,859,718	
Lower Columbia	13	2	4	1	5	12	92%	\$2,421,071	\$2,426,599	Increase	\$5,528	
Mainstem/Multiprovis	12	5	1	0	2	8	67%	\$13,410,639	\$14,777,493	Increase	\$1,366,854	BPA number differs from pdf
Middle Snake	13	0	0	4	5	9	69%	\$3,390,828	\$1,766,145	Decrease	-\$1,624,683	
Mountain Columbia	16	2	0	1	2	5	31%	\$12,589,847	\$12,597,108	Increase	\$7,261	
Mountain Snake	32	2	8	2	1	13	41%	\$16,933,305	\$17,756,975	Increase	\$823,670	
Upper Snake	5	0	0	0	2	2	40%	\$1,381,643	\$1,026,543	Decrease	-\$355,100	
Enforcement	0	3	0	0	0	3		\$0	\$610,000	Increase	\$610,000	
Total	265	45	48	53	27	173	65%	\$137,347,130	\$148,133,560	Increase	\$610,000	
								Innovative Placeholder	\$1,000,000	\$0		
								Basinwide Reserve	\$2,337,714	\$0		
								Unallocated placeholde	\$2,000,000	\$0		
								Within year reserve	\$0	\$2,000,000		
								ISRP/ISAB	\$1,050,000	\$0		BPA includes in Basinwide
								BPA Program Support	<u>\$11,000,000</u>	<u>\$11,500,000</u>		
								Total	\$154,734,844	\$161,633,560		

Table 3. Summary of Bonneville decision, FY 2008

Data from BPA decision 07_09 for web (expense only)
draft 2/28/2007

Draft

FY 2008	Province/area	No. projects Council Rec	No. of projects increased	No. of new projects by BPA	No. of project decreased	No. of rec projects not funded by BPA	Total number changes	Percent project change	Council \$ Rec	Bonneville \$ decision	Overall province net impact	Total change in \$	Comment
	Basinwide	40	8	4	16	4	32	80%	\$ 27,120,297	30,852,650	Increase	3,732,353	
	Blue Mountain	18	2	3	5	1	11	61%	\$7,117,164	\$7,767,240	Increase	650,076	
	Columbia Cascade	15	2	9	0	1	11	73%	\$3,023,665	\$6,384,174	Increase	3,360,509	BPA number differs from pdf
	Columbia Estuary	5	3	0	0	1	3	60%	\$3,519,712	\$4,475,000	Increase	955,288	
	Columbia Gorge	13	0	1	6	1	7	54%	\$6,558,587	\$6,458,952	Decrease	-99,635	
	Columbia Plateau	50	11	7	9	6	27	54%	\$21,061,636	\$21,376,996	Increase	315,360	BPA number differs from pdf
	Intermountain	26	0	1	13	1	14	54%	\$15,313,245	\$13,324,516	Decrease	-1,988,729	BPA number differs from pdf
	Lower Columbia	9	0	2	1	6	3	33%	\$2,271,988	\$1,917,061	Decrease	-354,927	
	Mainstem/Multiprovir	12	4	0	3	0	7	58%	\$13,271,558	\$13,031,033	Decrease	-240,525	
	Middle Snake	13	1	0	5	6	6	46%	\$3,290,350	\$1,611,145	Decrease	-1,679,205	BPA number differs from pdf
	Mountain Columbia	16	0	1	4	5	5	31%	\$12,590,145	\$11,794,138	Decrease	-796,007	BPA number differs from pdf
	Mountain Snake	31	1	5	1	4	7	23%	\$16,673,305	\$17,064,108	Increase	390,803	
	Upper Snake	5	0	0	1	2	1	20%	\$1,604,401	\$1,082,001	Decrease	-522,400	
	Enforcement	0	0	0	0	0	0		\$0	\$0	\$ -	0	
	Total	253	32	33	64	38	167	66%	\$133,416,053	\$137,139,014	Increase	\$3,722,961	
									Innovative Placeholder	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		
									Basinwide Reserve	\$2,457,820	\$0		
									Unallocated placeholde	\$2,000,000	\$0		
									Within year reserve	\$0	\$2,000,000		
									ISRP/ISAB	\$1,050,000	\$0		BPA includes in Basinwide
									BPA Program Support	<u>\$11,000,000</u>	<u>\$12,000,000</u>		
									Total	\$150,923,873	\$152,139,014		

Table 4. Summary of Bonneville decision, FY 2009

Data from BPA decision 07_09 for web (expense only)
draft 2/28/2007

Draft

FY 2009	Province/area	No. projects Council Rec	No. of projects increased	No. of new projects by BPA	No. of project decreased	No. of rec projects not funded by BPA	Total number changes	Percent project change	Council \$ Rec	Bonneville \$ decision	Overall province net impact	Total change in \$	Comment
	Basinwide	40	9	4	11	4	28	70%	\$ 25,916,532	29,749,766	Increase	3,833,234	
	Blue Mountain	19	2	3	3	2	10	53%	\$7,117,164	\$7,560,082	Increase	442,918	
	Columbia Cascade	11	2	9	0	1	12	109%	\$1,939,668	\$5,387,957	Increase	3,448,289	BPA number differs from pdf
	Columbia Estuary	5	3	0	0	1	4	80%	\$3,527,400	\$4,325,000	Increase	797,600	BPA number differs from pdf
	Columbia Gorge	14	1	0	6	1	8	57%	\$4,525,884	\$4,413,952	Decrease	-111,932	
	Columbia Plateau	51	10	7	12	7	36	71%	\$21,046,637	\$21,130,007	Increase	83,370	BPA number differs from pdf
	Intermountain	26	1	0	13	1	15	58%	\$15,306,529	\$13,078,500	Decrease	-2,228,029	BPA number differs from pdf
	Lower Columbia	13	1	2	2	7	12	92%	\$2,852,328	\$2,177,048	Decrease	-675,280	
	Mainstem/Multiprovir	12	4	0	3	0	7	58%	\$13,207,926	\$12,567,401	Decrease	-640,525	
	Middle Snake	13	0	0	6	6	12	92%	\$3,441,059	\$1,479,707	Decrease	-1,961,352	BPA number differs from pdf
	Mountain Columbia	13	0	1	4	5	10	77%	\$12,590,537	\$11,376,471	Decrease	-1,214,066	BPA number differs from pdf
	Mountain Snake	31	2	5	4	4	15	48%	\$16,673,305	\$16,727,097	Increase	53,792	
	Upper Snake Enforcement	4 0	0 0	0 0	1 0	1 0	2 0	50%	\$1,739,022 \$0	\$1,035,679 \$0	Decrease	-703,343	
	Total	252	35	31	65	40	171	68%	\$129,883,991	\$131,008,667	Increase	1,124,676	
									Innovative Placeholder	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		
									Basinwide Reserve	\$3,661,585	\$0		
									Unallocated placeholde	\$2,000,000	\$0		
									Within year reserve	\$0	\$2,000,000		
									ISRP/ISAB	\$1,050,000	\$0	BPA includes in Basinwide	
									BPA Program Support	\$11,000,000	\$12,500,000		
									Total	\$148,595,576	\$146,508,667		

Council Budget Planning

\$143 M Spending per year X 3 years

\$429 M 3-year spending target

\$ 30 M \$10M per year planning-to-spending difference

\$459 M 3-year planning target

\$153 annual planning target

(unallocated placeholder, rate case carry forward and basinwide reserve targeted on ESA, outyear budget needs, transition funds)

Bonneville Budget Planning

\$143 M	Spending per year X 3 years
\$429 M	3-year spending target
\$ 3M	additional from 07 operations agreement
\$ <u>9 M</u>	\$ carried forward from rate case
\$441 M	Revised spending target
\$ <u>36 M</u>	\$12 million per year planning-to-spending difference
\$477 M	3-year planning target
\$460 M	Bonneville budget decision
	<i>\$159M annual planning budget</i>
\$ 17 M	Available (<i>with restrictions</i>)

FY 2007-2009 BPA decision data

draft March 13, 2007

FY 2007 - all

		Data	
FY07 % sort	Theme comment	Count of Proposal #	Sum of FY07 budget differences
<10-	FCRPS	2	-\$27,000
	In lieu	8	-\$274,902
	Other	18	-\$831,551
<10- Total		28	-\$1,133,453
<10+	ESA	1	\$25,000
	In lieu	2	\$19,575
	Other	2	\$71,061
<10+ Total		5	\$115,636
>10-	Agreement	1	-\$24,000
	ESA	1	-\$150,000
	FCRPS	2	-\$277,520
	In lieu	4	-\$559,055
	Other	19	-\$2,881,889
>10- Total		27	-\$3,892,464
>10+	Agreement	2	\$308,001
	ESA	9	\$2,793,904
	In lieu	5	\$589,437
	Other	19	\$3,012,206
>10+ Total		35	\$6,703,548
BPA Added	Agreement	14	\$4,882,431
	Close	13	\$1,686,743
	ESA	21	\$4,308,089
	Other	11	\$2,718,935
BPA Added Total		59	\$13,596,198
Not funded		25	-\$4,603,028
Grand Total		179	\$10,786,437

FY 2008 - all

		Data	
FY08 % so	Theme comment	Count of Proposal #	Sum of FY08 budget differences
<10-	FCRPS	1	-\$9,569
	In lieu	9	-\$322,014
	Other	26	-\$1,158,666
<10- Total		36	-\$1,490,249
<10+	In lieu	2	\$28,092
	Other	6	\$141,594
<10+ Total		8	\$169,686
>10-	Close	1	-\$484,500
	FCRPS	2	-\$162,000
	In lieu	6	-\$1,236,422
	Other	19	-\$4,091,113
>10- Total		28	-\$5,974,035
>10+	ESA	6	\$2,600,292
	In lieu	4	\$462,048
	Other	14	\$2,611,878
>10+ Total		24	\$5,674,218
BPA Added	Agreement	2	\$1,129,938
	ESA	19	\$5,552,918
	Other	10	\$2,441,545
BPA Added Total		31	\$9,124,401
Not funded	Agreement	3	-\$574,999
	FCRPS	19	-\$3,321,730
	In lieu	2	-\$157,872
	Other	14	-\$2,696,136
Not funded Total		38	-\$6,750,737
Grand Total		165	\$753,284

FY 2009 - all

		Data	
FY09 % sort	Theme comment	Count of Proposal #	Sum of FY09 budget differences
<10-	FCRPS	1	-\$19,282
	In lieu	2	-\$98,824
	Other	21	-\$1,047,839
<10- Total		24	-\$1,165,945
<10+	In lieu	2	\$28,092
	Other	5	\$141,550
<10+ Total		7	\$169,642
>10-	FCRPS	1	-\$100,000
	In lieu	21	-\$3,271,356
	Other	23	-\$4,934,296
>10- Total		45	-\$8,305,652
>10+	ESA	7	\$2,502,277
	In lieu	3	\$352,214
	Other	15	\$3,265,004
>10+ Total		25	\$6,119,495
BPA Added	Agreement	2	\$1,934,322
	ESA	19	\$4,625,383
	No change, not rec	1	\$595,965
	Other	10	\$2,373,886
BPA Added Total		32	\$9,529,556
Not funded	Agreement	3	-\$575,000
	FCRPS	17	-\$3,639,788
	In lieu	2	-\$170,667
	No change, not rec	1	-\$30,000
	Other	15	-\$3,176,988
Not funded Total		38	-\$7,592,443
Grand Total		171	-\$1,245,347