

Fish and Wildlife Committee notes from 8/29 on CBFWA budget/fish and wildlife manager coordination projects:

The Committee accepted the proposal for interim funding recommendations for this category as well, pending further review by the Council, the managers and Bonneville as to the appropriate level of support for coordination activities. Final recommendations will follow this review.

Timeline: Staff conveyed to members that depending on the Members' sense of urgency, this could be ready in October, but better for November

- Three of four Committee members agreed with Washington's proposal to accept separate coordination proposals from the Spokane and Kalispel tribes at their proposed amount; (ID, MT, WA);
- to accept the MSRT's recommended funding level for the CBFWA budget but then *minus* the amounts for coordination to be approved for the Kalispel and Spokane tribes; and
- to accept the MSRT recommended levels for the UCUT and CRITFC coordination projects.
- The CBFWA and CRITFC decisions were particularly tentative pending the ISRP's final report, as both received "response requested" in the ISRP's preliminary report.

The staff will include in the policy/programmatic section of the decision document a draft statement of a Council recommendation capturing the interim concept here.

The CBFWA Work Plan just received a "Fundable (qualified)" recommendation from the ISRP. The ISRP stated "*the recommended qualification to funding is that the project should develop an approach to monitor its impact in terms of changes in behavior and value to the members. In addition to the PISCES metrics, it would be useful to have CBFWA develop member-feedback instruments to evaluate member assessment of effectiveness and impact. In addition, the new cluster of products included under the Status of the Resource report provides an opportunity for user evaluation of product utility.*" The ISRP also stated that CBFWA provides regional coordination for two M&E coordination partnerships of PNAMP and CSMEP, as well as the Status of the Resources Project.

For the Spokane and Kalispel Tribal Coordination Funding proposals, the ISRP's final recommendation said that both are "*inadequately written proposals to perform coordination and meeting participation*". The ISRP also said that each "*proposal provides little explanation of how the requested FTE support and other funds will be spent. Budget figures are rounded and seem excessive (e.g., 0.7 FTE for coordination; \$10,000 to attend regional meetings). The proposal does not justify why the efforts described in this proposal, which would seem to be routine and to require minimal effort, are not a component of the four ongoing Spokane projects, or how conservation and management will be affected if the funding is not provided. This proposal and a*

twin proposal submitted by the Kalispel Tribe would seem to be covered under the more comprehensive (and less expensive) UCUT coordination proposal, which includes the Spokane and Kalispel tribes."

The ISRP gave the CRITFC Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit proposal a "Fundable (qualified)" rating. The ISRP's review stated that CRITFC provided helpful answers to many ISRP comments. The response concerning outreach was well done. The list of over 150 completed or ongoing projects is impressive. However, no lists of technical reports or data resulting from these projects could be provided because of the "limited time frame." *It is surprising that CRITFC does not routinely have this information available. Better evaluation and documentation of the effectiveness of previous coordination efforts and project implementation in the form of feedback from the four Tribes and other agencies could help CRITFC to identify those activities that have been most effective and to prioritize future efforts. The recommended qualification to funding is that the sponsors be required to develop an effectiveness evaluation plan."*

FINAL ISRP Recommendations for Regional Coordination - Full report

198906201 - Annual Work Plan CBFWA

Sponsor: Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority (CBFWA)

Province: Mainstem/ Systemwide **Subbasin:** Systemwide

Budgets: FY07: \$2,253,787 FY08: \$2,253,787 FY09: \$2,253,787

ISRP final recommendation: Fundable (Qualified)

Comment (from response loop):

The response includes a detailed description of the types of coordination and facilitation services that CBFWA is or could be providing. It adds information that was missing from the proposal regarding the operational meaning of general coordination terms. The response states that without CBFWA, the BPA, NPCC and the ISRP would find it difficult to staff activities such as holding meetings and providing website services. In addition, the response states that the "Columbia River Basin is dependent on the coordination, administration, and technical services that the CBFWA provides" for two monitoring and evaluation coordination partnerships (PNAMP and CSMEP). CBFWA activities in this regard include subcontracting services, participation in meetings, and website services. In 2005 CBFWA began to further expand its role to data inventory and reporting services. The response further states that the CBFWA role extends beyond coordination of its members to services for non-member entities.

Overall, a better demonstration is needed that CBFWA's services are provided in the most cost effective manner. The response provides a better description of the association of the \$900k budget line to the "annual report", including good detail on the range of products associated with the report. However, questions remain as to whether the costs are reasonable, especially given that a template of the website is already up and running.

The response also provides a description of the withdrawal of the Kalispel and Spokane tribes

from membership. It appears that the interests of these two entities were not being addressed at the policy level; however, little explanation is provided as to why this situation exists. Does CBFWA have mechanisms to cope with "under-represented" groups?

The description of performance metrics is useful. As the sponsors indicate, existing performance metrics measure output (e.g. number of meetings, number of participants) but not impact (changes in behavior, value to the members). The table of number of meetings is interesting, particularly the very low number of PNAMP meetings (n=1) relative to other kinds of meeting such as "member meetings." However, evaluating performance on the basis of the number of meetings held, average number of participants, and reports produced is not, as the sponsors acknowledge, sufficient to assess impacts.

As recommended by ISRP, the sponsors conducted a literature review of metrics to assess coordination effectiveness. Review results were not provided but apparently were not considered applicable: "Results from coordination-oriented literature searches provide a broad set of techniques and metrics that are not consistent for coordination efforts, a situation that is comparable to differences that exist among monitoring and evaluation efforts for physical and biological projects."

Regardless of the range of approaches, the ISRP maintains that coordination efforts such as these can be evaluated. The response provides a vigorous defense of the need for the CBFWA, asserting that more coordination will result in better survival and recovery of fish and wildlife populations. However, no quantitative measures are developed for determining the degree to which this is the case. The Status of the Resource Project should provide useful information on key variables such as escapements, but the response does not give much information on project status or data QA/QC. Will Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife agencies rely on the project for data or will the project duplicate agency data?

The recommended qualification to funding is that the project should develop an approach to monitor its impact in terms of changes in behavior and value to the members. In addition to the PISCES metrics, it would be useful to have CBFWA develop member-feedback instruments to evaluate member assessment of effectiveness and impact. In addition, the new cluster of products included under the Status of the Resource report provides an opportunity for user evaluation of product utility.

200710800 - Regional Coordination for Upper Columbia United Tribes

Sponsor: Upper Columbia United Tribes

Province: Mainstem/ Systemwide **Subbasin:** Systemwide

Budgets: FY07: \$69,594 FY08: \$73,346 FY09: \$80,053

ISRP final recommendation: Admin (see comments)

Comment (from June 1 report):

This proposal describes coordination and information provision for the Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT) that seems quite useful and productive. A brief but clear section describes the role of the UCUT in coordinating its five member tribes with the Fish and Wildlife Program and

with CBFWA. It describes meetings coordinated and information provided to its members, as well as its function in communicating UCUT member positions within the Basin decision arenas. The proposal provides specific examples of UCUT's role in enabling coordination, communication and participation of its members in regional processes. It makes a good case for the relation of UCUT coordination support to the participation of the upriver tribes in fish and wildlife activities. It describes decreasing levels of UCUT funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), relates the funding declines to a decline in coordination activities, and states that project funding is necessary to maintain UCUT central office functions. The proposal would be strengthened by including more detail on the benefits to fish and wildlife of enhanced coordination activities. For example, what specific projects or resources are threatened if funding is not provided? How will conservation and management be affected if the funding is not provided?

The proposal has five objectives describing various aspects of coordination, participation, and long-term planning. Work elements are listed for each objective; all are activities that facilitate member tribes' participation in the Fish and Wildlife Program. Work elements are specific and relate well to the objectives. One set of work elements relates to the informing of and involvement in national legislation and international agreements that affect the tribes with regard to salmon and habitat issues and treaty storage water. This seems quite useful and forward-looking.

To strengthen the justification for the proposal, the sponsors should provide specific information on the basis for the following statement made in the proposal: "The upriver Tribes have been innovative leaders in proposing strategies for watershed-based Program management, equitable allocation of fish and wildlife funding, and multiple-purpose river operations."

In addition, because the objective of this project is coordination, the sponsors need to provide some measures by which the effectiveness of this coordination can be monitored and evaluated.

200710600 - Spokane Tribe Fish and Wildlife Planning and Coordination

Sponsor: Spokane Tribe

Province: Mainstem/ Systemwide **Subbasin:** Systemwide

Budgets: FY07: \$93,100 FY08: \$93,100 FY09: \$93,100

ISRP final recommendation: Admin (see comments)

Comment (from June 1 report):

This is an inadequately written proposal to perform coordination and meeting participation. The proposal provides little explanation of how the requested FTE support and other funds will be spent. Budget figures are rounded and seem excessive (e.g. .7 FTE for coordination; \$10,000 to attend regional meetings). The proposal does not justify why the efforts described in this proposal, which would seem to be routine and to require minimal effort, are not a component of the four ongoing Spokane projects, or how conservation and management will be affected if the funding is not provided.

This proposal and a twin proposal submitted by the Kalispel Tribe would seem to be covered under the more comprehensive (and less expensive) UCUT coordination proposal, which includes the Spokane and Kalispel.

The justification for the proposal is based in the need for regional cooperation, the MOU between BPA and the Upper Columbia United Tribes regarding consultation, coordination and participation, and the withdrawal of the Spokane Tribe from CBFWA. The proposal does not provide specific explanation of the Tribe's withdrawal from CBFWA.

The proposal has a single objective of regional coordination, explained as being necessary for Spokane implementation of the Fish and Wildlife Program. Four work elements are generally explained as participation in meetings, exchanging information, providing Spokane information to regional reporting, and providing information to regional entities on Spokane policies, programs, and projects. Coordination is not specifically tied to improvements of fish and wildlife conservation and restoration on Spokane lands.

200716200 - Kalispel Tribe Fish and Wildlife Coordination

Sponsor: Kalispel Tribe

Province: Mainstem/ Systemwide **Subbasin:** Systemwide

Budgets: FY07: \$90,000 FY08: \$93,100 FY09: \$96,200

ISRP final recommendation: Admin (see comments)

Comment (from June 1 report):

This is an inadequately written proposal to perform coordination and meeting participation. The proposal provides little explanation of how the requested FTE support and other funds will be spent. Budget figures are rounded and seem excessive (e.g. .7 FTE for coordination; \$10,000 to attend regional meetings). The proposal does not justify why the efforts described in this proposal, which would seem to be routine and to require minimal effort, are not a component of the eight funded Kalispel projects, or how conservation and management will be affected if the funding is not provided. This proposal and a twin proposal submitted by the Spokane Tribe would seem to be covered under the more comprehensive (and less expensive) UCUT coordination proposal, which includes the Spokane and Kalispel. The justification for the proposal is based in the need for regional cooperation, the MOU between BPA and the Upper Columbia United Tribes regarding consultation, coordination and participation, and the withdrawal of the Kalispel Tribe from CBFWA. The proposal does not provide specific explanation of the Tribe's withdrawal from CBFWA. The proposal has a single objective of coordinating the Kalispel tribe fish and wildlife projects with the region. Four work elements are generally explained as participation in meetings, exchanging information, providing Kalispel information to regional reporting, and providing information to regional entities on Kalispel policies, programs and projects. Coordination is not specifically tied to improvements of fish and wildlife conservation and restoration on Kalispel lands.

199803100 - Implement Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit

Sponsor: Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)

Province: Mainstem/ Systemwide **Subbasin:** Systemwide

Budgets: FY07: \$234,205 FY08: \$234,205 FY09: \$234,205

Short description: This project will provide effective and efficient watershed restoration through coordination and support of tribal restoration planning and project implementation consistent with Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit and the NWPCF Fish and Wildlife Program.

ISRP final recommendation: Fundable (Qualified)

Comment (from response loop):

CRITFC provided helpful answers to many ISRP comments. The response concerning outreach was well done. The list of over 150 completed or ongoing projects is impressive. However, no lists of technical reports or data resulting from these projects could be provided because of the "limited time frame." It is surprising that CRITFC does not routinely have this information available.

Better evaluation and documentation of the effectiveness of previous coordination efforts and project implementation in the form of feedback from the four Tribes and other agencies could help CRITFC to identify those activities that have been most effective and to prioritize future efforts. But overall, the response misses the point and does not address the ISRP's comments on the need for better self-evaluation and monitoring of CRITFC activities.

The statement: "It is impossible to clearly state what the most effective activities are" is disconcerting in a coordination project, and can only be true if no attempts to evaluate effectiveness are made. Approval of projects by the CRITFC Commission does not constitute an evaluation. The sponsors need to take a more proactive approach to learn how to conduct an effectiveness evaluation and to conduct it. At present, effectiveness is asserted rather than documented. Responses #12 and 16 address some potential indicators of effectiveness, but these remain assertions rather than demonstrations of effectiveness.

If it is the case (response #12) that "Effectiveness may well be measured by the success of preserving the tribal institutional capacity and leadership to deliver on-the-ground projects, collaboration to make shared decisions with state and federal co-managers on key policy issues, participation in forums that shape future actions by BPA and other federal entities that oversee the operation of the hydrosystem, and education and outreach to build and sustain partnerships," the elements of this statement provide guidance as to the types of indicators that would be appropriate to assess performance.

Response 17 also addresses the effectiveness evaluation issue. Stating, "As already agreed to by the ISRP, monitoring of coordination effectiveness is difficult to evaluate quantitatively" is again missing the point. Although it is difficult, it is both desirable and possible. The point is that thought should be given to what effectiveness would look like and how it can be measured, then develop a plan to measure it and evaluate it. Agreeing to "document any incidences of overlap or redundancy with CRITFC and individual tribal projects if they occur as a measure of effectiveness" is not sufficient and does not address the central question of effectiveness. The response provides no indication of a prioritized approach to planning. Planning is apparently entirely reactive to short-term priorities expressed by CRITFC members. Response 15 describes some of the elements of consideration in coordination but does not explain the process of prioritization.

The recommended qualification to funding is that the sponsors be required to develop an effectiveness evaluation plan.