



**COLUMBIA  
BASIN  
FISH & WILDLIFE  
AUTHORITY**

**DRAFT**

DATE: August 16, 2005  
TO: Resident Fish Committee (RFC)  
FROM: Clint Muhlfeld, Chair  
SUBJECT: Draft Agenda for the August 31, 2005 RFC Meeting

**Resident Fish Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, August 31, 2005  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. (Pacific)**

@

**CBFWA Office, Portland, Oregon**

**Bridge Number to Dial: (503) 229-0449  
Conference Id: 838034**

Draft Agenda

**ITEM 1: Review Agenda**

**ITEM 2: Selection of a New Vice-Chair**

On October 1, 2005, Lawrence Schwabe will become the Chair of the RFC thus, leaving the Vice-Chair vacant. As a result, the RFC will seek candidates (state or federal representatives (per the RFC Charter)) and subsequently elect a new Vice-Chair.

**ITEM 3: FY 2007-2009 Project Selection Cycle – Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) Proposals and CBFWA’s DRAFT Approach – Tom Iverson and Neil Ward (CBFWA)**

During the August 2005 CBFWA Members Meeting, Melinda Eden (NPCC) solicited the CBFWA for assistance in defining the process for the upcoming project selection including how the CBFWA would assist with defining provincial objectives, and the facilitation of project reviews and subsequent project selection. The following Draft schedule has been proposed by the NPCC for the FY 2007-2009 project selection cycle:

- September 2005 – Adopt Project Selection Process
- October 2005 – NPCC Solicit Program Amendment
- November 2005 – Solicit for FY 2007-2009 Project Proposals
- January 2006 – Project Proposals Due for FY 2007-2009
- February - June 2006 – Project Reviews
- March –September 2006 – Program Amendment  
Comments/Recommendations and Adoption with Province  
Biological Objectives
- July 2006 – NPCC FY 2007-2009 Project Selection (Provinces)
- December 2006 – NPCC FY 2007-2009 Project Selection  
(Mainstem)

In contrast, the BPA has proposed that prior to soliciting for proposals, the region should engage in an exercise to “roll-up” the subbasin plans at a province level with a focus on population characteristics. The following points were highlighted in a letter that Greg Delwiche (BPA) forwarded to Melinda Eden on July 29, 2005, which provided BPA’s conceptual approach to the FY 2007-2009 project solicitation:

- “Identify priorities- by target species, geographic locale, and strategy, among and between provinces- to address the limiting factors articulated in subbasin plans rolled-up to a provincial scale, using the “currency” of population and environmental characteristics or conditions.”
- “Pursue a streamlined approach for developing province-scale budgets based on high level biological and environmental objectives for each province.”
- “Structure science and policy review of proposals to evaluate biological value, cost effectiveness and linkage to identified priorities in subbasin plans.”
- “Assess “headroom” for new starts in succeeding years, based on expected time frame for completion of selected projects and consideration of the logical sequencing of projects. For subsequent solicitations, describe a proactive approach to planning that schedules “new start” implementation to fill-in behind completed projects, while still allowing for some flexibility.”

During the August 2-3, 2005 CBFWA Members Meeting, the Members agreed upon a draft schedule for an approach that CBFWA believes should be used for the FY 2007-2009 project solicitation. Tom Iverson and Neil Ward will describe the draft schedule that the Members approved.

**ITEM 4: Biological Objectives and the All-H Technical Integration Process - Resident Fish Population Status Report – Neil Ward (CBFWA)**

Using the “All-H Analyzer” (AHA) model, the (NPCC), intends to identify quantifiable biological objectives for the Fish and Wildlife Program. Habitat, hatchery, hydro, and harvest information relative to anadromous fish populations has been collected from subbasin plans, regional databases, and management plans and incorporated into the model.

During the June 2, 2005 RFC teleconference, Bruce Suzumoto (NPCC), briefed the RFC on the AHA model and indicated that the model was not developed for resident fish thus the NPCC was relying on the CBFWA and the RFC to assist in developing a process for identifying biological objectives for resident fish. The RFC requested that Neil Ward review the subbasin plans and assemble a data set that includes population data for resident fish focal species throughout the basin. Through the review of the subbasin plans, data gaps and information needs were identified. Neil Ward will lead the RFC in a discussion to address the following questions:

- Have all the populations that are managed been identified?
- Have the appropriate population parameters been identified?
- Does data exist for these populations?
- How will data input occur?
- How do we inform the region about the results of this effort and their relationship to the upcoming policy effort to adopt biological objectives into the Fish and Wildlife Program?

**ITEM 5: Discussion Regarding the Fish and Wildlife Program’s 70-15-15 – Ron Peters (CDAT) and Neil Ward (CBFWA)**

Two recent correspondences (i.e., July 29, 2005, letter from Greg Delwiche (BPA) to Melinda Eden (NPCC) and August 2, 2005, memo from Doug Marker and Patty O’Toole NPCC Members) highlight the region’s interest in conforming to the 70-15-15-balance between anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife projects, respectively. The NPCC indicated a desire to “ensure that that the Council’s recommendations result in a 70-15-15 balance” and BPA indicated, “the overall levels of investment in anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife mitigation should be consistent with 70-15-15 allocation reflected in the Council Program.”

In the last several years, some resident fish projects have been terminated or completed. Unfortunately, the funds that were associated with those projects were not reallocated to other resident fish efforts. Subsequently, only approximately 13.8% of the Fish and Wildlife Program’s budget is currently allocated to resident fish projects.

During the 1990's and early 2000's, funds that were allocated to resident fish projects, but not expended, remained in a "resident fish placeholder." The resident fish placeholder was used to accommodate funding requests that were resident-fish-oriented. If a project sponsor was interested in accessing the placeholder for funding assistance, he or she was required to submit a formal request that was reviewed by the Resident Fish Committee.

The NPCC's and BPA's proposals to manage the Fish and Wildlife Program using the 70-15-15 suggests that additional funds will have to be dedicated to resident fish efforts during the 2007 solicitation for the Fish and Wildlife Program to achieve an allocation of 15% of its funds to such projects. Although recent correspondences indicate an interest in managing the Fish and Wildlife Program using the 70-15-15 approach, there has been no reference to a resident fish placeholder that would function as a safeguard against the loss of funds previously earmarked for a resident fish project that is terminated or completed during a fiscal year. Ron Peters and Neil Ward will lead the group in a discussion to evaluate the RFC interest in developing recommendations, to forward to the Members Management Group, that address methods that safeguard funds dedicated to resident fish efforts.

Please contact Neil Ward at (503) 229-0191 or [neil.ward@cbfwa.org](mailto:neil.ward@cbfwa.org) if you have questions or would like to add additional items to the agenda.