

**Attachment II: Resident Fish Table**

Summaries and comparisons of the agencies' and Tribes' 2008 Fish and Wildlife Program (Program) amendment recommendations and Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) recommendations with the state and federal fish and wildlife management agencies' and Tribes' recommended resolution to the inconsistencies.

The Members of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority have reviewed the recommendations provided to the Council for amending the Program. During the review it was noted that some of the recommendations provided by entities other than the CBFWA Members were inconsistent with the recommendations of the eleven tribes, four state, and two federal fish and wildlife managers. Of particular concern were recommendations by BPA for amending the resident fish portion of the Program. The following table displays the inconsistency in recommendations by summarizing or providing excerpts from the BPA and CBFWA amendments and offering the state and federal fish and wildlife management agencies' and Tribes' resolution to the inconsistencies. The following table and issue resolutions are offered in response to the BPA recommendations. The Members of CBFWA expect the Council to provide due weight to recommendations of the fish and wildlife managers in the Columbia River Basin, regardless of whether those recommendations are specifically mentioned in the attached table.

<b>BPA Recommendation</b>	<b>CBFWA Recommendation</b>	<b>Suggested CBFWA Resolution</b>
<b>Resident Fish</b>		
<p>1. Exotic Fish Species  Page 33 includes the following BPA recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct resident fish managers to ensure that the regulations they promulgate and enforce do not impede regional efforts to mitigate and recover listed species.</li> </ul>	<p>1. The fish and wildlife managers agree that management of all species should not impede progress toward native fish restoration. Existing state and tribal fishing regulations are promulgated to implement management efforts for the entire spectrum of fish species. The management efforts of the states and Tribes focuses on ecosystem management, utilizing the best scientific information as guidance. These parameters ensure that one species is not managed to</p>	<p><b><u>1. Recommendation:</u> The CBFWA recommends that the Council use its Program to provide fish and wildlife project funding guidance to the BPA. The development and enforcement of fish and wildlife regulations are the responsibilities and authorities of the tribal, federal, and state fish and wildlife agencies.</b></p>

<p>2. Loss Assessments  Page 34 includes the following BPA recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Properly executed subbasin plans provide clear pictures showing the appropriate mitigations for target species-including resident fish-representing the ecosystems in each subbasin. Resident fish assessments are not necessary, and certainly shouldn't be considered a ratepayer</li> </ul>	<p>the detriment of another; however, it is within the authority of the agencies and Tribes to determine the balance where management of multiple species may conflict. The agencies and Tribes are willing to review these regulatory processes with either BPA or the Council. In fact we are currently in the process of developing a workshop to review resident fish management practices. However, placing this requirement in the Program would be inappropriate. The Council's role is to develop a Program that "complement(s) the existing and future activities of the Federal and the State fish and wildlife agencies and appropriate Indian tribes" 839b(h)(6)(A).</p> <p>2. BPA's comment is in direct conflict with a statement by Greg Delwiche, BPA, in a December 31, 2007 letter to Dr. Tom Karier in commenting on the Program amendment process. In that letter, Mr. Delwiche explains "The Program's subbasin plans attempt to identify all factors limiting fish and wildlife, not just those factors caused by the federal dams that BPA (along with the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation) is</p>	<p><b><u>2. Recommendation:</u> Incorporate CBFWA recommendations 1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.4A, 2.2.4B, 2.2.4C, 2.2.5, into the Program.</b></p>
--	--	---

**CBFWA Fish and Wildlife Agencies' and Tribes' Amendment Comments**

**Attachment II: Resident Fish Table**

**June 12, 2008**

**Page 3 of 7**

<p>responsibility.</p>	<p>responsible for mitigating.” BPA has implemented this policy since the creation of the subbasin plans and has refused to “properly execute” the existing subbasin plans that called for resident fish mitigation. The 2000 Program explicitly identifies as an objective for biological performance for resident fish to “Complete assessments of resident fish losses throughout the basin resulting from the hydrosystem, expressed in terms of various critical population characteristics.” Without completed loss assessments, the Program objective for resident fish in blocked areas could be tied to substitution for anadromous fish losses, which is to restore native fish species to near historic abundance throughout their historic ranges. This could be accomplished by properly executing (funding) the subbasin plans, which is what BPA has refused to do since their completion.</p> <p>Resident fish populations and associated habitat were impacted due to hydro-development. Today, resident fish populations and their associated habitat continue to be affected by the annual operations of the hydrosystem. The subbasin planning processes were an effort to focus the identification of priority</p>	
------------------------	---	--

**CBFWA Fish and Wildlife Agencies' and Tribes' Amendment Comments**

**Attachment II: Resident Fish Table**

**June 12, 2008**

**Page 4 of 7**

<p>3. Assessing Resident Fish Mitigation to Date</p>	<p>restoration and protection strategies for habitat. Participants in the subbasin planning process were not directed to perform loss assessments to describe the historic losses of resident fish and associated habitat lost due to hydro-development nor the losses associated with annual operations. Subbasin planning was not intended to weave all facets of the ecosystem. Implementing the subbasin plans, as the BPA suggests, does not provide a clear picture of the appropriate mitigations for target species, especially resident fish in the blocked areas.</p> <p>The development and continued operation of the hydrosystem affects Columbia River Basin resident fish populations and their associated habitat. Subsequently, there is a continuing BPA and rate payer responsibility.</p> <p>Loss assessments (i.e., construction, inundation, and operation), such as those that have been conducted in Montana, are essential for determining BPA's mitigation obligation relative to resident fish.</p> <p>3. Unlike the wildlife portion of the Program, a "credit" accounting system for</p>	<p><b>3. Recommendation: Incorporate CBFWA recommendations 1.2, 2.2.1,</b></p>
--	---	--

**CBFWA Fish and Wildlife Agencies' and Tribes' Amendment Comments**  
**Attachment II: Resident Fish Table**  
**June 12, 2008**  
**Page 5 of 7**

<p>Page 35 includes the following BPA recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before seeking additional resident fish assessments or major new habitat initiatives, the Program needs to account for the extent of past resident fish value from wildlife habitat and anadromous fish projects. The reviews should include any mitigation done to mitigate impacts from the FCRPS, whether BPA funded it or otherwise.</li> </ul>	<p>anadromous fish and resident fish does not exist nor have any entities, other than BPA, indicated a desire to manage the program in such a manner. The BPA recommendation implies a desire to apply a credit-accounting approach to the management of the resident fish section of the Program. Regardless of the “mitigation credits,” the proposed termination of funding for resident fish assessments or new habitat initiatives, pending the completion of an accounting exercise, is not appropriate due to the annual losses that are associated with the operation of the hydrosystem.</p> <p>A baseline must be established upon which to compare gains from past efforts and compare success. Loss assessments (i.e., construction, inundation, and operation), such as those that have been conducted in Montana, are essential for determining BPA’s mitigation obligation relative to resident fish and appear to be an adequate way to monitor implementation efforts.</p>	<p><b>2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.4A, 2.2.4B, 2.2.4C, 2.2.5, into the Program</b></p>
<p>4. No FCRPS Impacts in Certain Subbasins  Page 35 includes the following BPA recommendation:</p>	<p>4. As highlighted in the Council’s 2000 Program, the Northwest Power Act allows off-site mitigation for fish and wildlife resources affected by the hydrosystem. The</p>	<p><b><u>4. Recommendation:</u> Maintain the 2000 Program language pertaining to off-site mitigation (pages 20-21).</b></p>

**CBFWA Fish and Wildlife Agencies' and Tribes' Amendment Comments**  
**Attachment II: Resident Fish Table**  
**June 12, 2008**  
**Page 6 of 7**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ascertains from the subbasin plans which ones document affects to resident fish from the FCRPS and consider the FCRPS a limiting factor. Address resident fish mitigation on an ecosystem basis. Question projects or measures calling for BPA funding in subbasins where the FCRPS did not affect resident fish and is not a limiting factor.</li> </ul> <p>5. Substitution Policy  Page 36 includes the following BPA recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If resource managers do not address the predation and competitive problems created by exotic resident fish, then the Program should consider those fish a substitute resource. If resource managers do address those problems, then the Program could reasonably call upon hydroelectric project owners, managers, and regulators to make further efforts to provide native indigenous resident fish substitution. Until resource</li> </ul>	<p>2000 Program stated that “some of the greatest opportunities for improvement lie outside the immediate area of the hydrosystem - in tributaries and subbasins off the mainstem of the Columbia and Snake rivers – this Program seeks habitat improvements outside the hydrosystem as a means of off-setting some of the impacts of the hydrosystem.” In addition, the Program’s anadromous fish substitution policy directs funding outside of the reach of the FCRPS.</p> <p>5. Until naturally reproducing populations of native fish, including Pacific salmon and steelhead supporting tribal, recreational, and commercial fisheries and other cultural and environmental benefits are restored to areas blocked by the hydrosystem, resident fish substitution is appropriate. The fish and wildlife managers believe that management of all species should not impede progress toward native fish restoration. Existing state and tribal fishing regulations are promulgated to implement management efforts for the entire spectrum of fish species. The management efforts of the states and Tribes focuses on ecosystem management,</p>	<p><b><u>5. Recommendation:</u> Incorporate CBFWA recommendation 2.2.2 into the Program</b></p>
--	--	---

**CBFWA Fish and Wildlife Agencies' and Tribes' Amendment Comments**

**Attachment II: Resident Fish Table**

**June 12, 2008**

**Page 7 of 7**

<p>managers opt for the latter choice, the appropriate circumstances for further resident fish enhancement activities diminish greatly.</p>	<p>using the best available scientific information as guidance. These parameters ensure that one species is not managed to the detriment of another; however, it is within the authority of the agencies and Tribes to determine the balance where management of multiple species may conflict. The selection of species for the purpose of management, regulation development, and enforcement are the responsibilities of the tribal and state fish and wildlife agencies. The Council's role is to develop a Program that "complement(s) the existing and future activities of the Federal and the State fish and wildlife agencies and appropriate Indian tribes" 839b(h)(6)(A).</p>	
---	--	--