

FW IEAB Task 116 partial BPA funding plan to proceed

From: Michael Pope [Michael.D.Pope@state.or.us]

Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2007 11:27 AM

To: angelas@nezperce.org; carlscheeler@ctuir.com; soult@kootenai.org;
pamplnpp@dfw.wa.gov

Cc: Ken MacDonald

Subject: FW: IEAB Task 116, partial BPA funding, plan to proceed

Folks,

Please see Roger's email below. I think we need to chat about this email during our call this Thursday. I would like to send an email early next week to the other WAC members based on your responses (during the Thursday call) to his email below so we can narrow the discussions with Roger during our full WAC Teleconference. In other words focus on the major questions that he raised and discuss how we can participate in next phases of the IEAB's Task order. Thanks.

Michael Pope, PhD
BPA Wildlife Mitigation Coordinator
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Avenue NE
Salem, OR 97303
Office Phone: 503-947-6086
Cell Phone: 541-760-5044
Email: Michael.D.Pope@state.or.us

From: Roger Mann [mailto:rmecon@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2007 11:12 AM

To: 'Michael Pope'

Cc: 'Zelinsky,Benjamin D - KEWL-4'; 'Terry Morlan'; 'Lon L. Peters'; 'Joel R. Hamilton'

Subject: IEAB Task 116, partial BPA funding, plan to proceed

As you know, Pisces only counts BPA funds. I am aware of some fish projects where the BPA funds provide only a fraction of all project costs. Do you know if any of the wildlife projects also obtain significant funding from non-BPA sources? If so, which ones?

My current problem is to decide what additional "corrections" to make to the data. From the letters, I have only two changes that I could make without additional advice; for Hellsgate Big Game Winter Range, a re-allocation of \$98,545 from enhancement to maintenance, and for Spokane Tribe wildlife mitigation, "remove vegetation" should be enhancement, not maintenance. I would also like to talk to the Burns Paiute Tribe, Fish and Wildlife Department about their project-specific concerns. Who would be the best person to talk to there? Are you aware of other obvious project-specific data problems we should correct for?

One common theme of the letters is problems in aggregation of data into "maintenance" versus "enhancement" in the BPA spreadsheet. Might there be any single change to the aggregation scheme that would improve on this problem? This would be a good topic to discuss on the 25th.

With these issues resolved we can proceed with the grouping exercise. Recall that we should select a proxy for O&M. This proxy will be another good topic for discussion next Friday. The plan was to group similar projects and to explain variation in the proxy measure within and between the groups. I would like to discuss these groups on Friday.

Is this still an appropriate way to proceed? If so, then I want to cover these items on the 25th:

1. Potential to improve BPAs aggregation of work elements into "maintenance" versus "enhancement"
2. Selection of the O&M proxy
3. Selection of the project groups

Thanks

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

H:\WORK\WAC\2007_0525\IEAB_Task116PartialBPafundingPlantoProceed.doc