



## Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

ENVIRONMENT, FISH AND WILDLIFE

In reply refer to: KEW-4

Mr. Frank L. (Larry) Cassidy, Jr.  
Chair, Northwest Power Planning Council  
851 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97204-1348

Dear Mr. Cassidy:

I am pleased to provide recommendations to the Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) on the FY 2001 Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan for ongoing Fish & Wildlife projects. This plan, once finalized by the Council, will set the start of year budget recommendations to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) for the Fish and Wildlife Program in Fiscal Year 2001. We also recognize these recommendations include only renewals for existing or ongoing projects funded by BPA. Any new efforts for Fiscal Year 2001 will come forward at a separate time through either through the Council's Provincial Review Process or as potential emergency actions or measures yet to be defined once the criteria for such work are finalized later this fall. We also anticipate providing comments in September 2000 on the "draft" Council Program language.

I have grouped our comments into three areas: Overall budget concerns, specific project comments relating to scope of work and supporting budget, and those that raise policy issues. I will highlight these areas below and have included more specific detail for each of these areas in the enclosure.

**Overall Budget Concerns** - The reconciliation process for closed fish and wildlife contracts awarded during the MOA period is ongoing and will return unspent funds back to fish and wildlife program placeholders for use by projects for Fiscal Year 2001. We currently have made available \$750,000 for other projects but unfortunately we will not have reached the CBFWA estimate of \$5 million by the start of Fiscal Year 2001. We have redoubled our efforts and expect to complete this process by April 2001. Please refer to the workplan for the reconciliation process in our enclosure for further details.

We propose leaving the placeholders for ESA intact, both for the NMFS Research Reserve and the Steelhead Biological Opinion. These placeholders were reserved for work defined in the current Biological Opinions issued by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for operation of the FCRPS. In recent conversations with NMFS staff, we expect additional needs for funding under these Biological Opinions in Fiscal Year 2001.

Finally, if the remaining fund balances within the unallocated anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife placeholders are immediately made available for use by projects in FY2001, then no dollars will be available for contingencies that may arise for the remainder of the year. BPA has

continually recommended each year that some level of funds remain in each of these categories to retain the flexibility needed for us to negotiate the specific contract amounts based upon the tasks identified in the proposals recommended by the Council.

**Specific Project Issues** - We have provided comments on project scope and budget and have specifically documented any reasons why BPA may not be able to implement projects as recommended by CBFWA in their draft work plan. Any remaining information needs to implement a project at the defined scope and budget as reported in the project renewal forms are described at this time to avoid any last moment issues arising at the time of contract renewal.

**Policy Issues** - As you are aware, NMFS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have issued draft Biological Opinions on the operation of the FCRPS that will not become final until later this year. The Federal Caucus has also issued an update of the All-H Paper, a draft basin-wide salmon recovery strategy. The new Council Plan is in draft form. It is critical to the recovery of the ESA listed fish and wildlife populations and to the success of the offsite mitigation measures that there remains a renewed collaborative effort among our respective agencies to integrate the planning, implementation, and monitoring of these plans.

Many of the efforts required by BPA in FY 2001 identified as technical support were PATH related projects for which the Council recommended no funding in FY 2000. During Fiscal Year 2001 the scope of the work for these efforts has changed to involve more interaction with other analytical processes that were initially begun in 1999, including the NMFS CRI analysis. These projects have evolved from being part of PATH to providing independent scientific analyses and modeling required by BPA for ESA Biological Opinions, NEPA Environmental Impact Statements, and In-Season management decisions. In addition, these projects provide technical support for BPA's input to regional fish recovery efforts such as the Federal All-H Caucus Process and the Council Framework Process. BPA proposes to continue these efforts, described in the enclosure, in FY 2001.

We are continuing to meet and negotiate with the Regional Wildlife Managers to resolve the crediting issue for the existing wildlife program. As the Council moves its program into an ecological, watershed based approach, our hope is to apply the lessons learned from the wildlife program to develop a crediting system that works across all of the offsite mitigation measures.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft recommendations for project funding in Fiscal Year 2001. We look forward to working with the Council as your new Program for recovery of fish and wildlife in the Columbia River Basin continues to evolve.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Austin



## POLICY CONCERNS

NMFS Draft Biological Opinion, Artificial Production, and Mainstem Research Requirements:

- The July 14, 2000 CBFWA FY 2001 AIWP does not address the requirement for BPA to budget for several hatchery actions listed under the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative in the draft July 27, 2000, Biological Opinion. Specifically, there are no funds allocated in the CBFWA AIWP budget for the following BiOp hatchery actions that could reasonably be funded as part of the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program:
- Fund a share of the operation and maintenance costs of hatchery reforms in the pertinent hatchery biological opinions and the Council's Artificial Production Review.
- Promptly fund benefit/risk assessments and development of HGMPs for 12 seriously depressed salmon and steelhead populations.
- Budget for safety-net interventions when benefit/risk assessments and HGMPs indicate that such interventions are vital to the survival and recovery of the listed populations.
- Budget for the contingency of additional benefit/risk assessments and HGMPs for any salmon or steelhead populations that NMFS identifies during the term of the Biological Opinion as critically depressed and essential for the recovery of the ESU.
- Fund the implementation of recommendations as part of the Council's Artificial Production Review, including reporting of hatchery performance based on the monitoring and evaluation programs within the HGMPs.
- Fund a share of critical research on 1) the effects of state-of-the-art supplementation and captive broodstock programs on the survival and productivity of listed populations, and 2) improving the quality of artificially propagated fish critical to the conservation of listed populations.
- Establish the appropriate level of funding and fund a share of a hatchery research, monitoring, and evaluation program consisting of studies to determine whether 1) hatchery reforms are reducing the risk of extinction for Columbia River Basin salmonids, and 2) conservation hatcheries are contributing to recovery.

- 

Crediting for Wildlife Projects:

- BPA may find it difficult to fund any new projects that will give credit to: Bonneville, John Day and McNary in Washington and McNary in Oregon, as these are fully mitigated for construction losses.

- This is particularly significant when viewed in the context of the program where no mitigation has yet been credited toward Anderson Ranch, Big Cliff, Deadwood, Detroit, Foster, Green Peter, Lookout Point, Minidoka and the Dalles in Oregon. Also, less than 10% has been mitigated for five other projects.
- As you are aware, we are in the midst of negotiations with the regional wildlife managers to resolve the issue of crediting over which some progress has been made to date. There is good agreement between the parties on the manner in which enhancement credit is documented but differences yet remain for how to account for crediting for land acquisitions. Existing contractual agreements between BPA and the wildlife managers are consistent with a 1:1 crediting scheme for wildlife losses due to construction of the FCRPS. We expect to fully document BPA's view of crediting for wildlife in late September when we submit our comments on the Council's "draft" Fish and Wildlife Program.
- 

ESA Research Reserve (CBFWA AIWP Page 2, last paragraph and Page 3, paragraph 1)

The research reserve was not set up to fund a proposed research plan, although one was anticipated. The research reserve was established to fund obligations under the 1995 BiOp. That document included specific Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives that the action agencies would perform to avoid jeopardy. The research plan was completed in final draft form, and was not brought to a Final Plan.

The remaining funds in this reserve totals \$2.6 million. This remaining amount is not sufficient to fund all future years of the ocean research effort, but all the remaining funds are needed to support work in progress and work planned which partially addresses actions required under the 1995 and the draft 2000 BiOp's. BPA recommends maintaining this placeholder as well as the placeholder for steelhead BiOp for needs anticipated during Fiscal Year 2001.

BPA Technical Support

**Project 1989-108-00 - Monitor and Evaluate Modeling Support**

**Project 1993-037-01 - Technical Assistance with Life Cycle Modeling**

**Project 1996-017-00 - Provide Technical Support to BPA and Regional Analytical Forums**

**Project 1998-001-00 - Analytical Support - ESA Biological Assessments**

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

**General CBFWA comment (paraphrased by BPA):** The NWPPC has decided to stop funding PATH related projects. These are generally PATH-related projects and should not be funded to remain consistent with the Council recommendation for tribal, state and federal agency participation in PATH. These projects fail to inform critical management decisions. These projects should include such services as a part of other projects tied to specific tasks or products.

These projects should not be funded as part of the Fish and Wildlife Program since they are not subject to the same standards of the regional review process.

The scope of the work has changed to involve more interaction with other analytical processes that were begun in 1999, including the NMFS CRI analysis. These projects have evolved from being part of PATH to providing independent scientific analyses and modeling required by BPA for ESA Biological Opinions, NEPA Environmental Impact Statements, and In-Season management decisions. In addition, these projects provide technical support for BPA's input to regional fish recovery efforts such as the Federal All-H Caucus Process and the NWPPC Framework Process.

**BPA response:** BPA proposes combining many of the tasks associated with these projects into what is now referred to as the Technical Support Project. Funding for specific tasks would not be associated with a specific project in the Council's Direct Program. The Technical Support Project would provide analytical capabilities and analyses needed for fish mitigation and fish impact assessments required of BPA and other federal agencies for compliance with ESA, NEPA, the NW Power Act, and the Clean Water Act. It provides critical analyses needed for management decisions on both a real-time and planning horizon basis and an assessment of the implications of those decisions. Much of this work is currently both direct and indirect support for ESA Biological Assessments and Biological Opinion (BO) consultations, and compliance with multiple analytical, research, and monitoring RPAs of the BO. Parallel analytical work is performed to support our oversight, coordination, and implementation responsibilities for the regional Fish and Wildlife Program. Following is a list of Technical Support Project tasks that BPA believes may be required during FY01 and estimated costs.

TASK	ESTIMATED FY01 COST
Participation, critical review, and coordination with NMFS CRI analyses	\$100,000
Participation, critical review and coordination with NPPC EDT analyses	\$50,000
Juvenile and adult fish passage modeling development, application, and data support	\$70,000
Conservation biology /extinction risk applications for recovery plans	\$50,000
Hydro measures assessments	\$50,000
Habitat measures and watershed assessments	\$150,000
Hatchery and harvest measures assessments	\$50,000
One-year and five-year Action Plan development and review	\$100,000
Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan development/evaluation	\$100,000
Management framework and performance measures development and application	\$50,000
BiOp consultation and review	\$50,000

Record of Decision development and review	\$50,000
Regional scientific forums/workgroups participation and coordination	\$50,000
Life-cycle modeling	\$50,000
Program integration and assessment of progress toward meeting mitigation and recovery goals	\$50,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>

**Project 1989-107-00 - Statistical Support for Salmonid Survival Studies**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$184,930

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$187,000

FY01 request: \$246,560

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

**New Funding: \$0**

**CBFWA comment:** An additional task has been added to the project to help design and develop new adult PIT-tag analysis capabilities (Section 6, Objective 3 for a total of \$59,500). This task has not been technically reviewed by CBFWA and appears to be duplicative of a new task within project 199105100. The new task at the request of the BPA is to participate in an interagency working group to design and implement an adult PIT-tag detection system for monitoring and evaluating adult salmonid upriver migration performance. The project will develop data analysis capabilities and operational recommendations for the new facilities.

**BPA response:** The successful juvenile PIT-tag studies in the Snake-Columbia River Basin occurred in large part due to the collaboration of biologists, engineers, data managers, and statisticians during the development of this technology. The juvenile PIT-tag facilities were engineered from the onset to provide the quality and quantity of data needed to successfully conduct juvenile survival and travel time studies. This same strategy of a coordinated interdisciplinary team (Application-Based Performance Requirements Evaluation Team) is being used to develop adult PIT-tag detection capabilities in the Basin. Results of the technical evaluation team are reported to the interagency Adult PIT Tag Oversight Team (APTOC). For consistency and application of the best available statistical methods to this effort, BPA has tasked the technical services of two UW projects to participate in the technical evaluation process. The technical services provided by these two projects are not duplicative. Project 198910700 is providing the statistical guidance based on the proven Cormack-Jolly-Seber models to determine minimum system design requirements for an adult detection system. Project 199105100 is being used to analyze historical adult PIT-tag detections at Lower Granite Dam and summarize radiotelemetry findings from the University of Idaho to identify performance levels needed for precise estimation of ocean survival and inriver survival of adults. The results on the detection efficiency requirements for a successful investigation, in turn, are providing guidance to the engineers designing and installing these detection facilities. The goal is to have an operational adult detection capability from the onset that will meet the expectations and needs of the fisheries managers as soon as possible. The product deliverable(s) from the technical services of these two UW projects will be technical reports to the evaluation team. These reports will be available to the FWP and the fisheries community through the technical report series, "The Design and Analysis of Salmonid Tagging Studies in the Columbia Basin."

**CBFWA comment:** This project fails to inform critical management decisions. It should include such services as a part of other projects tied to specific tasks or products. This project should not be funded as part of the Fish and Wildlife Program since it is not subject to the same standards of the regional review process.

**BPA response:** BPA supports the continuation of project 198910700 and contends its value needs to be considered in the context of improving monitoring and evaluation capabilities and providing consistent information and statistical technical support to BPA and the FWP.

The mission of Project 198910700 is the ongoing development of statistical tools for analyzing fisheries tagging data in the most precise and appropriate manner possible. This mission addresses the need to provide statistical support to Columbia Basin mark-recapture programs so that survival estimation is consistent and comparable among all tagging programs and across all life stages. This mission includes providing statistical guidance on the best ways to design and analyze tagging data. This mission continues because the technologies for fish tagging studies continuously evolve. In just the last decade, fisheries biologists have seen the evolution from freeze-brands and coded wire-tags (CWT) to PIT-tags, balloon-tags, radiotelemetry, and now, acoustic-tags. With each advance, the technology holds the promise of more detailed and precise information. However, the technology for analyzing and interpreting the data also becomes more complex as the tagging techniques become more sophisticated. The goal of the project is to develop the analytical tools in parallel with the technical advances to the tagging studies and the questions they can address, so that maximum information can be extracted on a timely basis. Associated with this mission is the transfer of these analytical capabilities to the field investigators to assure consistency and the highest levels of design and analysis throughout the fisheries community.

Ideally, each project and each investigator would invest in the statistical support needed for the successful completion of their study. However, this is an ideal that is rarely, if ever, attained. Furthermore, there is only a small pool of highly trained scientists in this specialized area of tag analysis here in the Northwest. Project 198910700 provides the financial support to sustain this local expertise on the statistical theory of tag analysis at the University of Washington and make it available to the fisheries community. Piecemeal and fragmented support from various agencies and organizations would be incapable of maintaining a center of expertise. The funding from BPA ensures the continuity of support needed to assist organizations on an as-needed basis, as well as provide the necessary support to develop the analytical technologies needed in the foreseeable future. This successful model for providing statistical support has assisted, among others, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Idaho Fish and Game, National Marine Fisheries Services, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Geological Survey, US Fish and Wildlife Services, tribes such as the Nez Perce, and various public utilities engaged in fish mitigation programs. By improving field studies, the project assists the fisheries community through better information and the management of recovering salmonid stocks. **BPA intends to fund this work under its Technical Support Project. Funds for this support would come from BPA's internal overhead. The estimated FY01 cost is \$246,560.**

**Project 1991-051-00 - Monitoring and Evaluation Statistical Support**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$340,357

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$343,000

FY01 request: \$368,300

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** There is an increase in lease rate for facilities and expanded scope of work. The new task includes analysis of adult tagging information (i.e., PIT-tag, radio-tag) to determine anticipated performance of a new adult PIT-tag system in the Columbia River (Objective 2, Tasks d and e for a total of \$25,300). This task has not been technically reviewed by CBFWA and appears to be duplicative of a new task within project 8910700.

**BPA response:** With regard to the “Lease Rate”: The increase in lease rate results from an expiration of the old lease and an increase in the new lease rate due to market conditions.

With regard to the New Support Task: A new support task, added for FY2001 under the element that provides statistical assistance to the BPA and the NW fisheries community, is the analysis of adult tagging information (i.e., PIT-tag, radio-tag) to determine anticipated performance of a new adult PIT-tag system in the Columbia River. The successful juvenile PIT-tag studies in the Snake-Columbia River Basin occurred in large part due to the collaboration of biologists, engineers, data managers, and statisticians during the development of this technology. The juvenile PIT-tag facilities were engineered from the onset to provide the quality and quantity of data needed to successfully conduct juvenile survival and travel time studies. This same strategy of a coordinated interdisciplinary team (Application-Based Performance Requirements Evaluation Team) is being used to develop adult PIT-tag detection capabilities in the Basin. Results of the technical evaluation team are reported to the interagency Adult PIT Tag Oversight Team (APTOC). For consistency and application of the best available statistical methods to this effort, BPA has tasked the technical services of two UW projects to participate in the technical evaluation process. The technical services provided by these two projects are not duplicative. Project 198910700 is providing the statistical guidance based on the proven Cormack-Jolly-Seber models to determine minimum system design requirements for an adult detection system. Project 199105100 is being used to analyze historical adult PIT-tag detections at Lower Granite Dam and summarize radiotelemetry findings from the University of Idaho to identify performance levels needed for precise estimation of ocean survival and inriver survival of adults. The results of the detection efficiency requirements for a successful investigation, in turn, are providing guidance to the engineers designing and installing these detection facilities. The goal is to have an operational adult detection capability from the onset that will meet the expectations and needs of the fisheries managers as soon as possible. The product deliverable(s) from the technical services of these two UW projects will be technical reports to the evaluation team. These reports will be available to the FWP and the fisheries community through the technical report series, “The Design and Analysis of Salmonid Tagging Studies in the Columbia Basin.”

**CBFWA comment:** The objectives are not clearly defined. This project appears to be an open-ended contract for statistical support on retainer. There appear to be no specific objectives with deliverables and due dates. It fails to inform critical management decisions. It should include such services as a part of other projects tied to specific tasks or products. This project should not be funded as part of the Fish and Wildlife Program since it is not subject to the same standards of the regional review process.

**BPA response:** BPA contends that the information and capabilities provided by this project are needed to help BPA and the FWP satisfy ESA responsibilities related to implementation of a comprehensive research monitoring and evaluation program. Ongoing tasks of this project are to:

Provide statistical analyses of historical tagging data to extract extra-value information on salmonid population dynamics and their interactions with the environment, and provide statistical guidance on the design and analysis of fisheries tagging studies.

Provide in-season statistical support by providing real-time analyses of smolt outmigration dynamics for ESA demes and runs-at-large for the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

Provide BPA and the northwest fisheries community with professional support as needed in the design, analysis, and interpretation of fisheries tagging studies.

These tasks provide an interrelated set of goals whose aim is to assure that the maximum information is extracted from the myriad of tagging programs in a cost-effective manner for the benefit of all members of the fisheries community.

The primary objective of Project 199105100 is to perform value-added analyses of existing salmonid tagging data, provide insights into the life history of recovering salmonid stocks, and guidance on the design of future fish tagging studies. A wealth of information exists in the current coded-wire-tag (CWT) and PIT-tag databases. The spatial and temporal breadth of these databases often exceeds the interests of the individual investigator contributing to the data. Individual investigators will typically only analyze their data for the immediate goals of their separate studies. However, the composite data includes information on spatial and temporal trends of potential importance to the fisheries community and beyond the immediate interests of the studies that generated the data. The unique goal of this project is to extract this meta-information to better interpret large-scale trends affecting salmonid recovery.

By performing value-added analyses of historical data, this project serves several purposes:

- Provides managers with information that might not be available if tagging data were analyzed solely for the immediate needs of individual studies.
- Provides guidance on the best methods for analyzing these long-term databases for consistency and maximum information extraction.
- Provides an empirically based alternative to complex model interpretations of the data.
- Provides empirical information to better design future studies so that study goals can be obtained with minimal expense or failure.

All of these products have as their goal to provide fisheries managers with up-to-date information on the status of recovering salmonid stocks and guidance on how to fill information gaps.

The analytical and information support services provided by this contract will continue to be needed in the future to help meet the continuing demands for information available for both in-season management of fish and river resources and decision making related to fish mitigation programs. The specific analytical support activities required each year will change to meet the needs of BPA and the Northwest fisheries community in their ongoing efforts to enhance and recover Columbia River Basin salmon runs. **BPA intends to fund this work under its Technical Support Project.**

**Project 1996-019-00 - Second-Tier Database Support (DART)**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$195,000

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$150,000

FY01 request: \$345,000

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** This project is proposing new work that has not been technically reviewed. This work also addresses a course of action (reliance on spawner-recruit models) that has not been agreed upon within the basin. It is premature to fund this work until a larger discussion on these issues is completed and the NWPPC Amendment Process is concluded. This would also put an intensive analysis task within a data base project. These tasks would be better addressed as a new proposal for FY 2002. The proposed budget is 74% larger than forecast last year due to the inclusion of new tasks 3 (\$95,000) and 4 (\$52,000). Task 4 anticipates ISRP recommendations to improve regional information planning and coordination. Task 3 reflects the need for consistent performance measures for assessing recovery and system wide adaptive management efforts. The remaining work approximates what was previously estimated at \$198,000. This project should not be funded as part of the Fish and Wildlife Program since it is not subject to the same standards of the regional review process. This project also appears to duplicate efforts supported within other data management projects (i.e. Streamnet).

**BPA response:** An FY01 budget could be developed that "just" keeps the database going. That amount would be approximately \$170,000. This assumes that other existing contracts with Skalski and Anderson, which underwrite common infrastructure and integrate part time employment of critical staff, would be funded. Should either component be reduced or removed, the continuity of service would be threatened. A stand-alone DART contract would cost about \$250,000 annually. In the meantime, BPA suggests to the Council that an independent contractor be selected and funded to evaluate each of the regional databases in order to objectively determine where there is and is not overlap or redundancy. The objective of this work would not be to evaluate the merits of the various databases, but simply to compare and contrast. The information provided to the Council should help inform a decision about which database(s) to continue funding from the Direct Program.

## OVERALL BUDGET CONCERNS

- Part of the budget for a major program of this size should be set aside as a contingency fund for emergency needs. However, on page 5 of the AIWP, a \$1,190,000 “Contingency Reserve” has been redirected towards funding of ongoing anadromous fish projects. Therefore, a contingency fund is lacking in CBFWA’s AIWP.
- CBFWA's carry-forward figures are not accurate for many projects, and should be corrected when developing final budgets.
- There is no analysis of carry-over in the draft AIWP. For some projects, carryover from FY2000 may substantially reduce FY2001 funding needs. One example is 1993-066-00. Our records show a balance of almost \$500k with half the year gone, so there could be substantial carryover here.

## **WORK PLAN for MOA CONTRACT RECONCILIATION PROJECT**

**Purpose** – To reconcile all BPA closed contracts for Fish and Wildlife Projects awarded during the MOA period and return unaccrued funds back to the Fish and Wildlife Program Placeholders for use by projects in the Program for Fiscal Year 2001.

### **PHASE I:**

**On-going – November 30**

**Steps** – This phase requires the physical review of 200+ closed contracts to reconcile billings and invoice data records between BPA Financial Management Systems (FRS) and Fish and Wildlife's internal tracking system.

**Schedule** -We have progressed approximately halfway through this phase, and have completed reviews of approximately 95 contracts. Due to internal workload constraints caused by the implementation of BPA's new Enterprise Computer System (known as BSP) as well as availability of full time resources, this process is moving at a slower pace than we had originally anticipated. We are identifying and adding additional human resources to complete this phase of our efforts on schedule.

**Targets** - So far, we have identified approximately \$1.5 million potentially available for de-obligation. This number does not take into account the need for Phase II investigation and review of contract overhead charges. The final dollar total available for de-obligation may be greater than this amount but is uncertain at this time. We expect more certainty on available funds once the remaining closed contracts are reviewed during Phase I by the end of November 2000.

**PHASE II:****December 1 – March 1**

**Steps** - This phase will involve taking the researched findings prepared by BPA and coordinating with the contractors identified to confirm the financial data. If the billings cannot be reconciled during this phase then BPA will initiate financial audits on those contracts.

**Schedule** - This process is expected to be time-consuming and potentially requiring additional human resources and timely cooperation of these contractors. In addition, the cooperation of external federal agencies (such as Dept. of Interior) that have overhead rate negotiation/approval responsibility for many of the entities, particularly the Tribes, will be required to obtain those rate audits.

Support will be needed from Council and CBFWA to encourage project sponsors to understand the nature of this effort and to actively cooperate by providing the necessary staff support for this phase.

**PHASE III:****March 1 – May 1**

**Steps** - This phase will involve the actual de-obligation of unspent funds identified by Phase I and Phase II investigations. De-obligations to date are approximately \$750,000, immediately available for reallocation to projects in FY 2001.

**SPECIFIC PROJECT COMMENTS****Project 1988-053-01 - Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan**

This project shows an ongoing total of \$2,309,038 for FY2001. It was not clear that this is "new" money, that is, it was confusing as to whether this amount was to come from the capital construction placeholder. After clarification with Tom Geise of CBFWA, we determined the 2001 request was new money in addition to the placeholder. This needs to be clarified in the budget.

**Project No. 1996-040-00 - Evaluate the Feasibility and Risks of Coho Reintroduction in Mid-Columbia**

Recommendation: Full funding for this project.

Background: The recommendations that the USFWS take on the cost of egg banking, coded wire tags, and acclimation construction for a total of \$1,292,000 is not feasible for the USFWS. The operations for this project do not meet the mission for mitigation of Grand Coulee dam which is the funding basis for the Leavenworth facilities. Tom Scribner, Yakama's Project Manager, stated that a verbal agreement with council members was made for fully funding this project for FY 2001. BPA agrees with this recommendation.

Note: Current balance of unobligated funds for this project is approximately \$89,000 not the \$5,000 stated in July 14, 2000 draft AIWP.

### **Project No. 1988-115-25 YKFP Design and Construction**

There are four major initiatives (objectives) covered under this proposal:

1. Nelson Springs M & E Facilities Upgrade
2. Klickitat River O & M Facility
3. Cle Elum Hatchery Interpretive Center
4. Adult Fish Trap at Lyle, Washington

The FY 2001 request is for \$4,225,000. The FY 2000 request was for \$1,565,000. Based on FY 2000 analysis of end of year un-obligated balances (adjusted for “carry forward” estimates), there is a **balance of \$420,000**. This balance could be either returned to the Anadromous Fish Placeholder or retained and credited toward a Council approved budget for 2001.

#### **Initiative No. 1 - Nelson Springs M & E facility upgrade:**

Recommendation: Support Current AIWP budget level.

Background: Between 1991 and 1992, BPA purchased a total of 11.5 acres in an area of Yakima referred to as “Nelson Springs.” The purchases were made under the YKFP in anticipation that the location near the Naches River could serve as an acclimation site. The site was never developed for acclimation use and instead, has become the office and lab center for Yakama Nation staff working on the YKFP monitoring and evaluation program.

When the properties were purchased, they came with several buildings. These building included a house/garage, several accessory buildings, and a modular doublewide house. The buildings today serve as offices for ten to twelve staff (seasonal) and support the following YKFP functions: 1) modeling for Spring Chinook (Upper Yakima River, Naches and American River), Coho, fall Chinook, and Steelhead, 2) data Management, 3) library, 4) planning, 5) life history research, and 6) equipment storage. In looking at an overall needs assessment for the M&E function, the YKFP Policy Group identified the following needs for the Nelson Springs site: 1) renovations or reconstruction of office facilities, 2) storage facility, 3) meeting facility, 4) library facility, and 5) wet lab for biosampling.

The proposal correctly describes the condition of the housing/office space of the Nelson Springs site. The buildings are in a deteriorated condition and unsafe for workers. The determination that the building be demolished and or removed and be replaced with new construction is a reasonable proposal given the current mission of the site. At one time, BPA program management looked into disposing of the Nelson Springs property. Given the evolving requirements of the M&E function of the YKFP, disposing of the property does not appear to be a prudent option. The cost of alternative office space would be costly. Either the rental of office space or the purchase of property and building in another location would be expensive. The sunk costs of the property purchased at Nelson Springs suggest retaining the property is a prudent choice.

The design and development of the new facility will involve environmental review and siting considerations. A major portion of the property lies within the flood plain so careful consideration will have to be made for site and layout.

No NEPA analysis has been performed on this proposal yet and will have to be completed prior to initiation of construction.

Budget Estimate: The total proposed budget for the Nelson Springs upgrade totals \$1,525,000.

The estimate for engineering and design is \$175,000 and is based on information received from CH2MHill. The NEPA analysis is estimated at \$25,000 and is probably a best estimate. It is not clear at this time what level of environmental analysis will be necessary for this activity. Design, engineering and NEPA total \$200,000

The construction and related costs total \$1,325,000. Construction is estimated at \$1,300,000 and is on information received from CH2MHill. The estimate is based on a 5,560 sq. ft. building. (For comparison the office building at the Cle Elum hatchery is 2,130 sq. ft.) This estimate assumes construction costs of \$200 per sq. ft., (\$1,110,000) and design and “services during construction” of \$190,000. These cost estimates appear reasonable. Additional costs related to construction are for the demolition of the existing buildings (\$15,000) and temporary office space for employees displaced during construction (\$10,000). These cost estimates also appear reasonable

### **Initiative No. 3, Cle Elum Hatchery Interpretive Center:**

Recommendation: Full funding in FY 2001 for this initiative to design and construct the interpretive building and related displays: \$400,000.

Background: The hatchery interpretive building is an element of the master plan for the Cle Elum hatchery and was incorporated in the final design for the hatchery. Due to concerns regarding total construction costs for the hatchery, the interpretive building (designed as a 1,600 sq. ft. building) was deferred. Site preparation for the center was completed in 1997 as part of the general construction of the hatchery. The site prep included constructing a public parking area and public restrooms next to the area designed for the interpretive building.

There is significant public interest in getting the center completed and opened to the public. During the community involvement phase of planning for the hatchery, project staff identified the interpretive center as the link to public access to the hatchery and as the location for public learning and educational about the research conducted at the hatchery. The importance of the center’s link to public access to the hatchery is that the main hatchery buildings are not “open” to the public due to the biological specifications under which the hatchery operates as a research facility. As such, the interpretive center will serve as the primary location for public information and education about the facility.

In anticipation of the center being established, the operating plan for the hatchery incorporates authority for the manager to develop and operate a “hatchery host” program. The hatchery host

program will allow volunteers to provide information and interpretation about the facility to the public without involving hatchery staff.

Budget Estimate: The budget estimate for constructing the interpretive building is \$400,000. Pricing to construct the building was estimated by CH2MHill for \$220 sq. ft. (includes a 20 percent contingency) totally \$352,000. An additional amount, \$48,000, is estimated for interpretive displays, signs, building furnishings, etc. Based on the local interest and overall importance this facility holds for community and public involvement and learning, this budget estimate appears reasonable.

**Initiatives No. 2 and 4, Klickitat O&M Facility and Klickitat Broodstock Collection and Monitoring Facility at Lyle Falls:**

Recommendation: Recommend that a Council step review be planned as soon as possible to review the YKFP Klickitat River activities planned under these initiatives and that the budget estimates proposed for these activities be reviewed at the same time. Due to the time period needed to accomplish the Council review and NEPA analysis, it is not likely the sponsor will need all of the requested 2001 funds (\$2,325,000) in 2001. Partial funding in FY 2001 for these two initiatives to fund only design and NEPA: \$203,000.

Background: The design and construction of an O&M facility to support the Klickitat fisheries of the YKFP is estimated at \$175,000. Due to discussions between the Yakama Nation and WDFW over the possible change in operators for the Klickitat hatchery, it is not clear what role the O&M facility will play in the sub-basin. The broodstock collection and monitoring facility at Lyle Falls is estimated at \$2,325,000.

The O&M facility and the broodstock collection and monitoring facility at Lyle Falls are facilities intended to support the YKFP's fisheries activities in the Klickitat River. There has not been Council "step review" or approval for these facilities or the fisheries programs that these facilities will support. In addition, there has been no NEPA analysis of the fisheries program proposed for the Klickitat River under the YKFP or the facilities described above. While the proposal recognizes that NEPA is required (estimating NEPA at \$75,000), the time period for analysis could be from 9 months for an EA to 24 months for a supplemental EIS to the Final Yakima Fisheries Project EIS (FEIS). The Klickitat River was not incorporated in the FEIS.

**Project No. 1988-120-25 YKFP Management, Data and Habitat**

Recommendation: The CBFWA comments recommended a technical review be performed of this proposal during the Project Annual Review. We agree and would also suggest that the proposal/project be reviewed as part of a Council Step Review of the YKFP. Funding for this project in FY 2001: \$1,000,000.

Background: This proposal has three initiatives (objectives):

1. Support YN Management/Policy activities related to YKFP
2. Design, Develop and Maintain YKFP Data and Information Systems
3. Coordinate participation in water and habitat planning/development initiatives by various agencies, groups and committees.

The FY 2001 request is for \$1,141,232. The FY 2000 request was for \$750,000. Based on FY 2000 analysis of end of year un-obligated balances, there is a balance of \$100,000. This balance could be either returned to the Anadromous Fish Placeholder or retained and credited toward a Council approved budget for 2001. (See explanation below). The recommended funding level for this proposal in FY 2001 is \$1,000,000.

The reorganization of the activities described in the proposal correctly presents the work planned under this proposal. The proposal covers all the major management oversight by the Yakama Nation of the YKFP.

The data management initiative is an evolving and major function of the management of the YKFP. The investment in this aspect of the YKFP's activities is appropriate and deserves the highest priority. Collecting and distributing data is a major task of the YKFP. This initiative is the heart of this work.

The coordination of habitat planning into the YKFP occurred during the past year. The move is appropriate because it brings under the Policy Groups overview all the habitat initiatives that are undertaken in support of the fisheries resource. Note, the actual habitat projects are not included in this initiative. These projects are proposed and funded as stand-alone projects. BPA project managers coordinate on these projects and track their accomplishments through the YKFP Policy Group.

As part of the budget analysis for the renewal for this project for FY2000, \$100,000 is being recommended for returned the Anadromous Fish Placeholder. This amount reflected a contract balance at the end of the budget year of about \$100,000. In looking at the expanded scope of the project and taking into consideration the reorganization of activities reflected in the proposal, it is our recommendation that the funding request for FY 2001 be reduced by ten percent, or \$140,000, for a total of \$1,000,000.

**Project No. 1995-063-25 YKFP Monitoring and Evaluation**

Recommendation: Full funding for this project in FY 2001: \$4,136,432.

Background: This proposal has four initiatives (objectives):

1. Natural Production
2. Harvest
3. Genetics
4. Ecological Interactions

The FY 2001 request is for \$4,136,432. The FY 2000 request was for \$4,309,934. Based on FY 2000 analysis of end of year un-obligated balances (adjusted for "carry forward estimates), there is a balance of \$427,500. This balance could be either returned to the Anadromous Fish Placeholder or retained and credited toward a Council approved budget for 2001.

The recommended funding level for this proposal in FY 2001 is \$4,136,432.

This is a comprehensive proposal designed to incorporate all M&E functions planned under the YKFP for both the YN and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. During the implementation of this proposal, the activities assigned to the YN are incorporated in their contract (Project No. 1995-063-25) and those assigned to WDFW are incorporated in their contract (Project No. 1995-064-24). In order to track the overall performance of work authorized under this proposal the two projects must be viewed together. While the comprehensive nature of the YKFP M&E plan is desirable, developing a comprehensive report of findings and results is more challenging and the Policy Group should review this matter. Each entity reports on its assigned activities. The separation of the activities between the two entities reflects the discussions and agreements the two entities have made regarding the shared responsibilities for YKFP M&E.

The CBFWA comments recommended a technical review be performed of this proposal during the Project Annual Review. We agree and also suggest that the proposal/project be reviewed as part of a Council Step Review of the YKFP.

In anticipation of a step review by the Council and in consideration for the significant investment the YKFP has in M&E within the Yakima River Basin, it is recommend that the Council support the \$4,136,432 funding requested for 2001. It is at a level consistent with the prior years funding for these activities.

**Project No. 1995-064-25 WDFW Policy/Technical Involvement and Planning in the Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project**

Recommendation: For FY 2001, it is our recommendation that funding for this project be reduced \$60,000 to \$200,000. At this level, there should be adequate funds for all necessary activities and there should not be any adverse impacts on WDFW's implementation of the YKFP. The CBFWA comments recommended a technical review be performed of this proposal during the Project Annual Review. We agree and also suggest that the proposal/project be reviewed as part of a Council Step Review of the YKFP.

Background: This proposal has two initiatives (objectives):

1. Provide policy coordination and management oversight of the YKFP in cooperation with the Yakama Nation
2. Provide technical and scientific coordination of the YKFP in cooperation with the Yakama Nation

The FY 2001 request is for \$260,000. The FY 2000 request was for \$275,000. Based on FY 2000 analysis of end of year un-obligated project balances, there is a **balance of \$185,000**. This balance of funds could be either returned to the Anadromous Fish Placeholder or retained and credited toward a Council approved budget for 2001. (See explanation below.)

The recommended funding level for this proposal for FY 2001 is \$200,000.

The activities funded under this proposal are an important element in the co-management of the YKFP. The CBFWA comments recommended a technical review be performed of this proposal during the Project Annual Review. We agree and also suggest that the proposal/project be reviewed as part of a Council Step Review of the YKFP. The level of expenditures under this project in 1999 (covering most of the period of FY 2000) was below plan in large part due to staff re-assignments at the Department level. The budget request for FY 2000 (August 2000 through July 2001) is \$175,000. When the balance in the current contract budget period is accounted for, \$89,980 of FY 2000 funds are needed to fully fund this project in FY 2000 (August 2000 through July 2001). As a result, \$185,000 could be either returned to the Anadromous Fish Placeholder or retained and credited toward a Council approved budget for 2001.

**Project No. 1997-013-25 Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project Operations and Maintenance Recommendation:** The CBFWA comments recommended a technical review be performed of this proposal during the Project Annual Review. We agree and also suggest that the proposal/project be reviewed as part of a Council Step Review of the YKFP. Full funding for this proposal in FY 2001: \$2,482,880.

Background: This proposal has one initiative (objective)

1. To operate and maintain fish production and research facilities critical to the Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project

The funding request under this proposal is \$2,482,880. The proposal serves to support the O&M activities of the Cle Elum Supplementation and Research Facility (Spring Chinook)(Project No. 97-013-00) and the Lower Yakima River Supplementation and Research Complex (Coho and Fall Chinook) (Project No. 96-033-30). The two research centers operate under their respective Annual Operating Plans and budgets. Funding for both budgets will come from this proposal in 2001.

The recommended funding level for this proposal for FY 2001 is \$2,482,880.

The budget request for this proposal appears reasonable given the level of effort and resources needed to accomplish the biological goals of these research and production facilities. The Cle Elum facility has a goal of releasing 810,000 Spring Chinook smolts annually from three acclimation sites. The current year (twelve month) budget for the Cle Elum complex is \$1,530,161.

The Lower Yakima River complex operates in a “feasibility study” stage for supplementing Coho and Fall Chinook. The feasibility study stage is likely to last two to five years. During this time a range of alternatives for pursuing a supplementation program for these stocks will be reviewed by the Council through the Step Review process and under NEPA by performing a Supplemental EIS to the Final Yakima Fisheries Project EIS. Based on the current experimental design for the project, this complex has an interim goal for releasing 1,000,000 Coho smolts into

the Yakima and Naches Rivers, with up to 500,000 coming from within basin broodstock. The balance will come from out of basin. The interim goal for Fall Chinook is to release 330,000 smolts into the mainstem Yakima River and 75,000 smolts into Marion Drain.

The effective current year (twelve month) budget for the Lower Yakima complex is \$936,000.

**Project No. 2000-048-00 Yakima Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI)**

This proposal should not be considered for FY 2001 funding because, as CBFWA's comments state, full project funding was approved under the FY2000 proposal. A contract is in place covering the four years of this project.

**Project No. 2000-071-00, Analyzing Genetic and Behavioral Changes During Salmonid Domestication**

This project is not in the FY 2001 AIWP because it was a short-term "new and innovative" research project approved by the NPPC for FY 2000 funding. It has not been funded because of ESA-related issues. Specifically, the sponsor (Washington State University) proposed crossing wild and hatchery spring chinook and wild and hatchery steelhead to produce the juvenile test fish to be used in genetic and behavioral experiments. The sponsor planned to collect the "wild" gametes from ESA- listed spring chinook and steelhead populations, requiring a Section 10 permit from NMFS. Unless the Section 10 Permit is obtained by the sponsor in time for BPA to fund the project with FY 2000 funds, or the sponsor is able to find adequate non-listed wild populations as the source of "wild" gametes, the funding will be proposed for carry-forward to FY 2001. The project would then be an FY 2001 new start and should be part of the Council's FY 2001 workplan.

**Project No. 1999-008-00, Oregon Water Trust-Water Rights Acquisition**

Recommendation: Restore full funding to this project.

Background: This project proposal's objectives are: tributary stream prioritization for water rights acquisition for anadromous fish, public education and outreach to find willing sellers of senior water rights, determination of ecological enhancement for fish if water rights are acquired, determination of the seniority and measurability of rights acquired, actual acquisition and transfer of water rights through the Oregon Water Resources Dept. and monitoring and evaluation of the rights acquired to assure that the water is staying in stream.

This work is to occur in tributaries of the John Day, Umatilla, Deschutes, Walla Walla and Fifteen Mile Subbasins. The specific acquisition opportunities provided by willing sellers are prioritized for acquisition by discussions with ODFW Fish Biologists responsible for management of the subbasin, discussions with the local watermasters, discussions with other stakeholders in the watershed and approval by the Oregon Water Trust Board, made up of tribal members, irrigators, ranchers, environmental advocacy groups and others.

Main points of CBFWA Anadromous Fish Committee comments (See page 101 for detailed comments):

- Funding status is to put the proposal in the hold category (zero funding unless more funds are obtained than the \$127,000,000 in the Direct Program).
- They question if the funding is a placeholder for ongoing acquisitions, or if specific acquisitions have already been targeted and require a technical review.
- They question if the proposed work is being done in high priority areas and suggest that a technical review or presentation be made to verify purchase locations.
- They think that once there are Subbasin Plans their questions will be clarified.

BPA Comments:

From CBFWA's AFC comments, it is unclear what is different about the 2001 proposal from the proposal in 2000 that was approved by CBFWA. The acquisition of water rights is a sensitive and complex issue that does not allow for certainty of the specific location of all potential acquisitions. The subbasins where acquisitions are occurring are designated in the proposal and they are the same as the 2000 proposal. All potential acquisitions are screened through the ODFW District Fish Biologist, local watermaster and the OWT Board.

They suggest that a technical review needs to be done but do not suggest the forum for this. It is unclear if 2001 funds could be approved if the reviewers were satisfied with the technical aspects of the project.

The AFC comment about the need for a subbasin plan to designate that the acquisitions are in the highest priority streams could be said about prioritization of any habitat/watershed project in the program. Using this as a reason for not funding the project has no meaning unless it was used for all projects. Council Program habitat projects are currently funded in all the subbasins designated by OWT for water rights acquisitions.

The BPA Project Manager, John Baugher, recently accompanied the OWT Project Manager, Ed Goodman on site visits to potential acquisition sites in the John Day and Umatilla Subbasins. They also met with the District Fish Biologists and the Water Masters for these subbasins. OWT has developed good relationships with the representatives of these agencies that are critical to the success of the project and all were encouraged by the level of collaboration involved. As an example of acquisition negotiations that are occurring, they visited a valuable tributary to the N. Fork John Day River and met with the property owner, the Director of the Oregon Soil and Water Commission, the N. Fork Watershed Council Coordinator, the Chairman of the Grant County Soil and Water District and the local watermaster who are all excited about the acquisition to put water in the stream that typically dries up in the summer. The group also met with the District Fish Biologist for this area and he concurred that increasing flow to the stream is a valuable asset for anadromous fish.

NMFS's draft biological opinion lists increasing tributary flow as one of the six major objectives for habitat enhancement. The OWT project is one of the only projects in the Councils program that is attempting to meet this objective. This is an innovative project that is breaking ground on ways to increase stream flow. OWT is also actively involved in big picture negotiations concerning water issues in Oregon legislation and Oregon Water Resources Department policy and are a model for other trusts organizations to emulate. The Washington Water Trust that was recently created used the OWT as a model.

It is critical that we find ways to increase stream flows. While OWT is still developing their methods of acquisition and monitoring and there is room for improvement, they are a valuable resource and should not have their funding eliminated after just one year in the program.

**Project No. 1992-024-09 - Enhanced conservation Enforcement for Fish and Wildlife, Watersheds of the Nez Perce.**

The project number for this work is not 199202409 but 200005500. When the contract was written, a new project number was assigned.

**Project No. 1992-061-00 - Albeni Falls Wildlife Mitigation Project.**

This project includes five (5) subprojects with sequential project numbers of 199206102/03/04/05/06 for each of the Tribal aspects of the overall mitigation work. Each has it's own budget and SOW, even though it's under the 9206100 umbrella contract.

**Project Nos. 1995-007-00 and 1989-029-00, Hood River Production Program**

To efficiently coordinate, implement and manage the BPA funded activities associated with the Pelton Ladder - Round Butte Hatchery Complex project number 199500700 (PGE) and 198902900 (ODFW) should be consolidated into one contract under project number 199500700.

**Project No. 1992-068-00, Implement Willamette Basin Mitigation Program**

**Project Sponsor: ODFW**

Recommendation: Based on the very high cost of providing HU's, the type of future projects planned and the small number of HU's provided (15 HU's in 5 years) in the Willamette Basin, we recommend the Council review this project.

Budget Background:

2001 Planning and Design Budget Request	\$91,750
2001 Construction/Implementation phase Budget Request	\$2,419,237
2001 O&M Budget Request	\$17,250
2001 M&E Budget Request	\$40,625
Total 2001 Budget Request	\$2,619,237
Less carryover/carryforward	\$2,419,237
Total New Money 2001 Request	\$200,000

This project was originally authorized in 1992 as the Western Pond Turtle Project. From 1992 through April 1995, it carried that title, and received \$330,684 in funding.

In April 1995, the project title was changed to Willamette Basin Mitigation Project. From April 1995 to present, BPA has invested \$745,017 in project planning and design and \$172,955 to purchase the Sorenson property for the project, bringing the total for the period to \$917,972. In return, BPA received 15 Habitat Units of Credit which equates to \$11,530 dollars per HU if just the cost of the Sorenson property is counted, or \$61,198 per HU if you include the design and planning money.

It is ODFW's contention that there are several other projects that will come on line in the coming years. These will contribute approximately 200-300 HU's each year. Although no documentation of the habitat units has been provided. We were also told last year that some of these projects were close to be implemented but nothing concrete has yet been provided.

We question the wildlife HU value of some of these projects. Working with Lane County Parks to improve wildlife habitat on an urban park, is an example of a project of limited value to wildlife. The proposed plan speaks to providing opportunities for low intensity outdoor recreation and education while protecting habitat, it also talks of how increased use may require septic drain fields. While some reasonable uses are compatible, it seems like the main purpose here is recreation, as an urban park should. BPA funded wildlife habitat improvements should not be degraded by grazing, drain fields, hiking trails and interpretive centers. Other proposed projects may not be of this nature, but this is the one example of a proposed BPA funded wildlife management plan which does not fit with our program.

**Project No. 1992-062-00, Yakima Nation - Riparian/Wetlands Restoration**

Recommendation: This project should not be funded from the anadromous fish budget because it is not an ongoing project, nor from the wildlife budget because the Washington Lower Columbia dams wildlife losses have been mitigated.

Background: This project was submitted and processed as a wildlife project. The Wildlife Committee did not budget FY01 funds for this project because of a crediting issue. The Washington portion of the wildlife losses for the Lower Columbia Dams have been mitigated for. CBFWA subsequently moved this project into the Anadromous Fish category commenting that it is a wildlife project with important benefits to fish. MMG agreed to fund from anadromous budget if not credited toward wildlife mitigation.

BPA comments: That position is inconsistent with BPA policy of receiving wildlife credit for permanent protection of habitat using anadromous budget. Please refer to our earlier comments on wildlife crediting.

**Project No. 1990-078-00** is not recommended for any FY01 funding on page 54, yet on page 19 of Table 4, and page 9 of Table 3, ongoing funding is identified as \$123,000.

**Project 1983-319-00 - New Marking and Monitoring Techniques for Fish**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$1,388,800

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$1,450,000

FY01 request: \$1,836,885

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$1,836,885

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** There is no change in scope of work. Although the MainSys SRT supports the purchase of the equipment, we question why these costs were not anticipated in the FY 2000 proposal.

**BPA response:** Prototype equipment for the detection of adult salmonids in mainstem dam fish ladders is being developed as of this writing. Anticipating production costs prior to prototype testing is extremely difficult.

**Project 1987-127-00 - Smolt Monitoring by Federal and Non-Federal Agencies**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$1,870,449

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$2,177,130

FY01 request: \$2,295,433

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$2,295,433

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** The increase in this budget is due to cost of living increases. There is no change in scope of work. The information provided in the proposal is confusing, since the cost of the project increased even though the price of PIT tags decreased.

**BPA response:** Funding support for project 198712700 is accomplished through 3 BPA contracts. Two contracts are administered under project 198712700 (PSMFC and USFWS) and one under project 199008001. The PSMFC administered contract under Project 198712700 supports the multi-year SMP effort sponsored by the Fish Passage Center (FPC), representing the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation and Columbia Basin Tribes. Funding of PIT tags and other fish marking support services for project 198712700 is provided through a separate BPA contract to PSMFC under project 199008001 and a separate contract to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under project 198712700. All program funds are allocated to project 1987127000 initially and then the costs for PIT tags are transferred to and obligated under 199008001.

The estimated FY2001 funding requirement of \$2,295,433 is essentially the same level of funding made available for the same scope of work in FY2000. The budget for the 198712700 PSMFC FY2000 contract, totaling \$2,066,036, was adjusted for \$400,000 carry-over so only \$1,666,036 in FY2000 funding was obligated. 198712700 USFWS contract obligated \$44,017. \$174,720 was obligated under 199008001 for purchase of 72,800 PIT tags.



concern because both may influence growth, disease resistance, and survival. Differences found between the water treatment groups will prescribe changes in hatchery rearing protocols to further the release of more disease resistant fish and to help determine if diet enhancement to improve disease resistance is justified.”

**BPA response:** BPA supports the increases in requested funding to maintain the capability of having project 198740100 respond to increasing requests from regional fisheries agencies for technical assistance in collaborative studies and analyses related to smolt condition. The technical reports and publications produced by this project are very commendable and this project continues to perform an important role for the FWP by providing consistency in technical assistance, research methods, analysis and reporting of results to regional fisheries agencies, hatchery programs, and smolt evaluation projects. Maintaining this capability contributes to consistency in reporting and the transfer of institutional learning and understanding of the interactions of the physiological condition of Columbia River wild and hatchery-reared salmonid and steelhead stocks with the environment and survival from emergence through adult returns. It is important to maintain this project and its technical capabilities to assist research monitoring and evaluation and the implementation of the recommendations that came out of the 1999 Artificial Production Review.

#### **Project 1990-078-00 - Evaluate Predator Removal: Large-scale Patterns**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$117,880

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$0

**FY01 request: \$123,193**

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

New Funding: \$123,193

**CBFWA comment:** The MainSys SRT is concerned that this is a second year of work that was not identified in the FY 2000 proposal. Therefore, it has not been technically reviewed, or at the least the recommendation from this group last year did not reflect two years worth of study. This work is being flagged as new due to the addition of a second year of work and possible changes in study design.

**BPA response:** Table 3 of the DAIWP indicates that CBFWA has recommended funding this project at the requested level. Whereas, in the text on page 54, the ongoing funding recommendation is \$0. It would be helpful if the DAIWP were consistent with itself. Interpretation of CBFWA's recommendation is difficult. Accordingly, assuming no additional funding is recommended, analysis and reporting of project results will be based on only one year of data from field sampling, and, therefore, will not represent the range of conditions that would most likely occur over time. In general, BPA believes that rigorous research and associated conclusions should be based on more than a single year of field sampling. Under the current recommendation of no additional funding in 2001, existing funds would be utilized to complete analysis and prepare a final report, anticipated by February, 2001.

**Project 1990-080-00 - Columbia River Basin PIT Tag Information Systems**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$1,364,976

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$1,419,575

FY01 request: \$1,592,551

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$1,506,301

New Funding: \$86,250

**CBFWA comment:** The MainSys SRT supports the addition of the Yakama Acclimation Ponds (Jack Creek (JCJ), Clark Flat (CFJ) and Easton (EAJ). However, the addition of the PTAGIS data training video would constitute a new task (Objective 4, Task G). The SRT also questions the high cost of the video production. There is no change in scope of work.

**BPA response:** Project 19900800, Columbia River Basin PIT Tag Information System, includes a new task: Objective 4, Task G) Produce "PIT Tag Data, Interrogation and Separation Systems training video" for distribution to PTAGIS data system users". CBFWA's review states that "the new task proposed to develop a training video should proceed through a technical review at CBFWA's AFC before funding." CBFWA recommends holding the budgeted \$86,250 pending review, approval, and availability of funds." This task resulted from a 1999 request from the Fish Passage Advisory Committee and has been planned by the PTAGIS Steering Committee and researchers, which included state and tribal participation. The training tape is needed to improve and maintain the quality and consistency of PIT tagging activities in the field.

**Project 1991-028-00 - Monitoring Smolt Migrations of Wild Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook Salmon**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$325,200

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$325,000

FY01 request: \$325,000

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$325,000

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** There is no change in scope of work or budget. This project is not coordinated well with managers. Data could be collected in conjunction with other studies. Concerns with tagging populations on the verge of extinction. Data gathered may not be worth the risk to the populations. Information provided by the project has only been marginally useful. This project is viewed by NMFS as a requirement under the Biological Opinion.

**BPA response:** BPA intends to implement projects NMFS declares as required under the relevant Biological Opinion.

**Project 1994-033-00 - The Fish Passage Center (FPC)**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$1,079,363

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$1,119,984

FY01 request: \$1,293,787

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$1,119,984

New Funding: \$173,803

**CBFWA comment:** The primary reason for change in the estimated budget is the addition of an analytical staff position, which would benefit the agencies and tribes by enhancing the FPC ability to respond to requests for analysis, review of proposed studies and review of research results and their applications to fish passage management and mitigation decisions. Change in budget is \$173,803. The addition of this position has not been agreed upon by CBFWA. The tribes have a desire to have their manager position reinstated as a priority over additional analytical staff. This is a policy discussion that needs to be resolved at CBFWA.

The volume of data generated by the Comparative Survival Study (CSS) is increasing. Specific analytical expertise would assist FPC in completing the data analysis and report for CSS Oversight Committee review more quickly. The CSS study has an increasingly broad application and could become a significant component of the Artificial Production Review. Additional analytical capability allows the FPC to better respond to the agencies' and tribes' analytical needs in this process. The regional process has added a large burden to the agencies' and tribes' technical staffs for reviewing study proposals and research results. These research projects become the basis for fish mitigation decisions. Review of research proposals and results by FPC staff is efficient because initial staff technical work is provided to all agencies and tribes which reduces duplication of effort. State, tribal and federal salmon managers use technical reviews to develop positions on research funding and application of results.

**BPA response:** BPA agrees that the data generated by the project 9602000, Comparative Survival Study (CSS), is increasing and that it is important to complete timely data analysis and reporting of results to the scientific fisheries community. **To best accommodate this need, it is suggested that the FPC and CBFWA consider adding the requested analytical staff position to project 9602000 rather than project 199403300.**

**Project 1996-020-00 - Comparative Survival Rate Study (CSS) of Hatchery Pit Tagged Chinook & Comparative Survival Study Oversight Committee**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$936,201

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$983,011

FY01 request: \$851,979

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$851,979

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** There is no change in scope of work. Some line item costs such as PIT tag per item cost has decreased.

**BPA response:** The CSS long-term mark-recapture project has the potential to provide information that will be very helpful to deciding a number of critically important management issues relevant to salmon recovery in the Columbia River basin. The data generated by the CSS is increasing and it is important to complete timely data analysis and reporting of results to the scientific fisheries community. To most efficiently accomplish timely data analysis and reporting of results, it is suggested that the FPC and CBFWA consider adding an analytical staff position to the PSMFC contract under project 199602000. The data analyst would work closely with the Oversight Committee and the technical staff of the FPC.

**Project 1997-026-00 - Ecology of Marine Predatory Fishes: Influence on Salmonid Ocean Survival**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$0

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$180,000

FY01 request: \$180,000

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$180,000

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** No change in scope of work or budget. This project has been funded through the NMFS ESA placeholder. The co-managers agreed that beginning in FY 2001, the project would be funded under the BPA direct program.

**BPA response:** This project has been incorporated into the NMFS' 1995 BiOp required project, 199801400, Ocean Survival. CBFWA's recommended funding will be added to the BiOp required work funded by the ESA set aside.

**Project 1998-008-00 - Regional Forum Facilitation Services**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$75,000

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$200,000

FY01 request: \$154,500

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$154,500

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** The Facilitation Team has worked hard to streamline efforts in all areas. This year's budget is based on data over a two year period which may have enabled us to more closely forecast future costs. There is no change in the scope of work.

**BPA response:** BPA is internally funding (not from BPA's overhead) the BiOp and All-H facilitation performed (\$81,948). This work began on September 1, 1999 and we have budgeted through December 2000 using BPA internal funds. The funds used for the BiOp and All-H facilitation that came from the Council's Direct Program (\$73,548) are in the process of being moved back to the direct program. The FY00 recommended budget for facilitation was \$75,000,

which is about half of what is needed in the FY00 budget period ending April 30, 2001. Approximately \$71,000 should be added from the Direct Program to the FY00 contract to continue the facilitation services for the Regional Forum. The net result for the direct program is essentially a wash. The cost to BPA is an additional \$81,948.

**Project 1998-014-00 - Ocean Survival of Juvenile Salmonids in the Columbia River Plume**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$0

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$830,000

FY01 request: \$845,000

Ongoing funding recommendation: \$845,000

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** The changes to the budget reflect costs to assess genetic stock composition, insulin-like growth factor (IGF-1) concentrations, and pathogen prevalence in juvenile salmon sampled from marine waters associated with the Columbia River plume. Genetic analyses of samples were previously covered under a different project. Some costs are being shifted to this project to reflect the importance of this information to this project specifically. IGF-1 concentration is a revolutionary approach to evaluate recent growth histories of individual juvenile salmon and is consistent with the scope of the project. Similarly, pathogen loads reflect on the health of juveniles and are also within the scope of the project. Some costs are being shifted to this project to reflect the importance of these items to this project specifically. Charges to the budget have been shifted to minimize the impact. No change in the scope of the work has been proposed. This project was funded under the NMFS ESA placeholder in FY 2000.

**BPA response:** The work is funded through the ESA set aside that was established under the MOA. The work is an ongoing effort and project 199702600 is now incorporated into this project (see above). We anticipate the project will continue for another 8 years and we are currently finalizing plans to add a broader ocean research project covering Canadian and Alaskan waters beginning in the fall of 2000. We anticipate the addition will be deemed by NMFS to be required under the 1995 BiOp and is consistent with the Draft 2000 BiOp.

**Project 1990-080-01 - PIT Tag Purchase and Distribution**

SRT: MainSys

FY00 funding level: \$0

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$0

FY01 request: \$240,000

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

New Funding: \$240,000

**CBFWA comment:** This is a change in scope (addition of a task). The budget is generally determined by needs from other projects. The new task is to establish a "Tag Bank" to minimize risk of a tag shortage when projects request tags on short notice. The SRT would like to see a

more detailed plan and strategy for managing and using the tag bank. Although this is generally a good idea, there is question whether the current BPA budget can support this activity. This project raises several questions about the distribution of tags among projects within the basin. Are costs significantly less by buying in bulk? Is there a tracking system for overhead charges among the agencies and PSMFC? Do all PIT tag projects use this system for purchases?

**BPA response:** BPA, the Council and PSMFC are working to streamline the PIT tag purchase, inventory and distribution process. Historically, tag costs have been lower by buying in bulk. As the technology has advanced, as with other technology-based products, the cost of tags has come down. It is unclear at this point whether bulk purchasing still affords a savings. PSMFC has always tried to save money on tag purchases where possible. Estimation by project sponsors of exact PIT tag needs one year in advance of actual use, is challenging at best. Although overestimation of tag needs does occur, it is usually the other way around. Having a tag bank would allow for timely distribution of tags to those projects that underestimated tag needs. However, the funding for those additional tags may have to come out of the project itself and not the tag bank account.

**Project 2000-058-00 - Effects of supersaturated water on reproductive success of adult salmonids**

SRT: NWPPC Innovative

**FY00 funding level: \$149,972**

FY01 forecast from FY00: \$848,533

FY01 request: \$156,391

**Ongoing funding recommendation: \$0**

New Funding: \$0

**CBFWA comment:** This is a FY 2000 innovative project that is not eligible for FY 2001 funding until completion of the initial work and a final report on that work (NWPPC 2000-6).

**BPA response:** This contract was let late in FY2000; it may not need any additional funds until FY2002.