



**COLUMBIA
BASIN
FISH & WILDLIFE
AUTHORITY**

9923
Feb #16

February 13, 2003

Sarah McNary
Bonneville Power Administration
Fish and Wildlife KEW-4
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, OR 97208-3621

Dear Ms. McNary:

The Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) is writing to request the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) written comments on our proposal for Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RME) in the Columbia Basin.

As you may know, we submitted Proposal No. 35033 "*Collaborative, Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Program*" for RME in response to the Systemwide/Mainstem Solicitation. This proposal received strong support from the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) and the highest priority for funding from the CBFWA managers.

The purpose of our Collaborative Proposal is to provide fish and wildlife managers and scientists with the resources they need to collaborate with the Federal RME Process in designing and implementing programs throughout the Basin that will meet a number of Tier 1, 2 and 3 M&E objectives. Our proposal outlined how CBFWA and federal RME personnel would jointly plan and execute specifically targeted M&E tasks as full partners. This collaborative approach was enthusiastically endorsed by both the ISRP and CBFWA.

We have had several meetings with BPA personnel to discuss the proposal and address concerns expressed by BPA staff. The following is a brief chronology of the aforementioned meetings as well as resulting actions from those meetings:

- October 1, 2002 - CBFWA Members Management Group meeting at which Lorri Bodi presented the Federal RME Plan and promised that the BPA would provide written comments relative to Proposal 35003.
- October 25, 2002 - Meeting of the CBFWA RME Workgroup at which time an NMFS representative expressed his support for the proposal, provided that M&E analyses could be separated from "decision analyses" that were within NMFS's jurisdiction.

2501 S.W. First Avenue
Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97201

PHONE 503 / 229-0191
FAX 503 / 229-0443
www.cbfwf.org

COORDINATING AND PROMOTING EFFECTIVE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION
OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND THEIR HABITAT IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

- November 6, 2002 – Meeting between CBFWA and BPA staffs at which time BPA representatives expressed an interest in funding Proposal 35003 and subsequently requested a statement of work.
- December 10, 2002 – The CBFWA provides a Statement of Work to Nicole Ricci which identified a separation of “decision analyses”, that are within the jurisdiction of each agency, from the monitoring and evaluation work that is required to provide input to such decisions, while meeting the concerns identified by the NMFS. In addition, work tasks were clearly outlined to illustrate that the CBFWA work tasks would complement, not duplicate, the work of Federal RME workgroups.
- January 23, 2003 – Meeting between CBFWA staff and Nicole Ricci at which time no written comments were presented.

Despite these meetings, we remain uncertain of BPA’s intentions to fund Proposal 35003. Although BPA personnel promised CBFWA staff that written comments would be provided, such comments pertaining to the proposal and Statement of Work have not been received. Although additional meetings may be warranted, we suggest that the most productive approach to reaching closure on this Proposal would be for BPA personnel to provide written comments pertaining to the Proposal and Statement of Work prior to the next meeting.

We have developed the attached document to demonstrate the relationship of the work teams of the CBFWA Proposal and the Federal RME workgroups for your consideration. This information was requested by BPA at the last informal staff meeting January 23, 2003. We had not included this information in our original proposal because we were not aware that such workgroups would be formed at the time Proposal 35003 was written.

Please provide written comments by March 1, 2003 and contact Frank Young (503.229.0191) with questions regarding Proposal 35003.

Sincerely,



Rod Sando,
Executive Director

Cc: Lorri Bodi and Nicole Ricci, BPA
Doug Marker and Stephen Waste, NWPPC
Members and Fish & Wildlife Managers, CBFWA

ATTACHMENT

Relationship between the CBFWA Collaborative RME Process and the Federal RME Process

The CBFWA Collaborative Proposal does not describe the relationship between the Federal RME Process and the CBFWA Collaborative Process because the Federal RME Process was not yet determined at the time the CBFWA proposal was written. This is intended to describe the relationship between these two processes.

The CBFWA Collaborative Proposal establishes work teams for each work product and contemplates participation by the federal action agencies on these work teams. The Federal RME Plan relies upon six workgroups that have been formed to address the principle RME components and sub-components of the RME Proposal and contemplates participation by the fish and wildlife managers on these workgroups.

Many of the objectives of the federal RME plan Framework are also components of the CBFWA Collaborative Proposal, though the CBFWA Proposal has a broader scope, in geographic, thematic and ecological dimensions. This broader scope is one of the key reasons why the ISRP recommended that many other projects¹ be integrated into the CBFWA Collaborative Proposal. The broader scope and staff resources of the CBFWA Proposal also offers an opportunity for NMFS and the Action Agencies to better meet their M&E obligations under RPA180 of the NMFS 2000 FCRPS Biological Opinion, and to concurrently meet other obligations (e.g. USFWS Biological Opinion, NWPPC Fish and Wildlife Program).

BPA was concerned about the potential for duplication of effort. There is a very real potential for two concurrent M&E programs to duplicate their efforts unless they are closely coordinated. We therefore recommend that a Joint RME Planning Group be created to direct both programs and ensure that there is no duplication of effort. This Joint Planning Group would essentially meld the responsibilities of the Core Group outlined in CBFWA's original project proposal with responsibilities of the Federal RME Technical / Policy Oversight Group. They would ensure that quarterly work plans are developed and implemented, in a cost-effective, integrated manner. We further recommend that membership in Federal RME workgroups include CBFWA members, and that membership in CBFWA workgroups include NMFS / Action Agency members. Since these workgroups will have distinct, complementary tasks, there will be no duplication of effort. However, since these tasks ultimately need to be integrated together to address key questions (see CSMEP Draft Work Plan, Dec, 5, 2003), there must also be frequent

¹ These projects include StreamNet (#198810804), Smolt Monitoring (#198712700), PTAGIS (#199008000), Fish Passage Center (#199403300), Comparative Survival Study (#199602000), NMFS' Pilot Status and Trend Monitoring Program in the Wenatchee and Grande Ronde (#35019), and parts of other NMFS proposals (#35016, #35020, #35048). See ISRP 2002-14 Final Review of FY2003 Mainstem and Systemwide Proposals. November 5, 2002.

interaction and exchange. The joint planning and overlapping membership will ensure that this integration permeates each work product.

To assure adequate participation in the Federal RME Process CBFWA will designate a representative and alternate for each of the Federal RME workgroups. Any member will be free to participate on any workgroup in addition to the designated representatives. The CBFWA designated representative will be responsible for introducing draft work products from the CBFWA work teams to the appropriate federal workgroup for review. The CBFWA designated representative will also be responsible for keeping the full CBFWA membership fully informed of federal workgroup activities. We recommend that the Federal RME Process adopt an analogous procedure.