

Coordinating and promoting effective protection and restoration of fish, wildlife, and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin

The Authority is comprised of the following tribes and government agencies:

Burns Paiute Tribe

Coeur d'Alene Tribe

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks

National Marine Fisheries Service

Nez Perce Tribe

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Coordinating Agencies

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Upper Columbia United Tribes

COLUMBIA BASINFISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443

March 13, 2007

TO: Members Advisory Group

FROM: Jim Uehara (RFAC Chair), and Neil Ward (CBFWA Staff)

SUBJECT: Analysis of 2007-09 BPA Funding Decisions for Resident Fish

Projects

During the February 20, 2007 Members Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting, participants directed the technical committees to review the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) F&07-09 funding decisions in the context of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's (NPCC) recommendations and Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority's priorities. In the provinces, priorities would be defined by the managers that developed the respective subbasin plans.

Upon review, the BPA's proposed funding level for the resident fish portion of the Fish and Wildlife Program (Program) is \$36 and \$12 million less than the recommendations of the fish and wildlife managers and NPCC's, respectively (Table 1). In the context of the 70-15-15 objective, BPA's proposed funding levels for resident fish projects represents 19% of the Program's funds (Table 1).

Table 1. – FY 2007-09 funding recommendations by source and project type (excludes data management, coordination projects, BPA program support, and other placeholders).

| | Recommended to Council | | Council Recommendation | | BPA Decision | |
|---------------|------------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Resident Fish | \$112m | 22% | \$88m | 23% | \$76m | 19% |

A detailed review of the project recommendations, relative to the level of funds recommended per project, shows that the BPA's proposed start-of-the-year (SOY) budgets were reduced for 36% of the resident fish projects, whereas the fish and wildlife managers' and NPCC's proposed SOY budgets represented reductions to 17% and 24% of the resident fish projects, respectively (Table 2).

Table 2. – Number of projects with reduced recommended funding levels per entity's recommendation (≥10% change required to be considered reduction or increase). Number in () represents percent reduction.

| | Reduction |
|---|-----------|
| Fish and wildlife manager recommendations | 16 (17%) |
| NPCC recommendations | 22 (24%) |
| BPA recommendations | 33 (36%) |

The BPA's decision to: 1.) "invest less significantly than before in monitoring bull trout populations that are not directly affected by the FCRPS", 2.) not provide full funding to Lake Roosevelt kokanee projects until the ISRP completes their report, 3.) not provide funding for some projects because "no resident fish crediting mechanism exist", 4.) not provide funding to projects proposed above Hells Canyon Dam because it "may not be an FCRPS responsibility to mitigate above Hells Canyon Dam if not affected by the construction or operation of Black Canyon, Anderson Ranch, Boise Diversion, Minidoka, or palisades Reservoirs", 5.) indicate that "fish population status monitoring is a low priority", and 6.) identify new bull trout projects as "not a high priority" led to budget reductions, project termination, and the exclusion of proposals. The RFAC recommended that the committee develop a formal response for submittal to the MAG on April 17, 2007.

To facilitate the development of a response to the BPA's comments, the RFAC developed the following ad hoc workgroups to draft an appropriate response:

<u>Loss Assessment/Crediting</u> – Dale Chess, Ron Peters, Lawrence Schwabe, Tom Rien

<u>Projects above Hells Canyon</u> - Lawrence Schwabe, Hunter Osborn, Melo Meiolie, Tim Dykstra

<u>Kokanee/ISRP Recommendations</u> – Jim Uehara, Sheri Sears, Ed Shallenberger, Neil Ward

<u>Bull Trout Issues</u> – Mike Faler, Chris Brun, Joe Maroney, Jim Uehara, Melo Meiolie, Tom Rien

Monitoring – Committee Chairs and Technical Coordinators

During the December 19, 2006 MAG Meeting, the MAG directed the technical committees to review the final BPA in-lieu rankings. The BPA identified several resident fish projects as "In-lieu problem (2.3-3 rating), no funding for new proposals; where on-going proposals; where on-going proposal, budgets held to FY06 funding levels reflect BPA's expectation for increased cost-share as an interim remedy. The 15% reduction reflected in the FY09 budgets is not final. It is draft and may change as the in-lieu issue is addressed. BPA will be working with the region this year to establish further guidance for project-specific cost-share and other resolutions of in-lieu issues." Many of the resident fish projects that were affected by this decision are considered off-site mitigation. The RFAC created an ad hoc workgroup (i.e., Ron Peters, Lawrence Schwabe, and Joe Maroney) to develop a response that will be submitted to the MAG on April 17, 2007.

H:\WORK\MAG\2007 0320\RFACfundingAnalysis031307.doc