

# Overview

---

- **Summary of Rolling Province Review, mainstem systemwide province, for FY 2003-2005**
- **Planning targets for FY 2007-2009**
- **Category descriptions for 2007-2009 Mainstem Systemwide province**
- **Summary of Mainstem/Systemwide proposals for FY 2007-2009**
- **Reminder of criteria and categories used for FY 2003-2005**

# FY 2003-2005 CBFWA Review and Approval of Mainstem/Systemwide Recommendations

---

- September 23-27, 2002, the CBFWA Province Review Group reviewed all project proposals which resulted in a consensus Yes or No
- September 9, 2002, the Resident Fish Committee (RFC) reviewed the resident fish related projects
- October 4, 2002, the Anadromous Fish committee discussed the PRG and RFC reviews and made some modifications to the province recommendations
- October 15, 2002 the final recommendations were reviewed and approved by the Members Management Group (MMG)
- The final step was the consensus approval of the project recommendations by CBFWA Members

# FY 2003-2005 CBFWA Project Recommendations

	# Proposals	\$ Requested	\$ Recommended
Core Program	17	\$23,935,681	\$21,431,626
Urgent	27	\$19,425,371	\$19,071,588
High Priority	19	\$7,637,882	\$7,449,786
Recommended Action	23	\$8,027,656	\$8,027,656
NWPPC responsibility	4	\$1,131,703	\$0
Do Not Fund	12	\$10,022,984	\$0
Withdrawn	2		
	104	\$70,181,277	\$55,980,656

**\*The budget allocation for Mainstem/Systemwide was \$37M.**

# NPCC Annual Program Planning Budget for FY 2007 - 2009

Budget Step	\$ Amount/step	Balance
Program planning target	\$153,000,000	-
Bonneville Program Support	\$11,000,000	\$142,000,000
ISRP/ISAB	\$1,050,000	\$140,950,000
Placeholders (planning estimate)	\$2,000,000	\$138,950,000
Province allocation	<i>\$92,894,502</i>	
Multi-Province allocation	<i>13,411,338</i>	
<b>Total</b>	106,305,840	\$32,644,160
Basinwide allocation	\$32,644,160	\$0

(From Council guidance document - <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/guide.pdf>)

# NPCC Province/other allocation.

Province	Percent of Allocation	\$ Allocation
Blue Mountain	6.7	\$7,127,528
Columbia Cascade	2.8	\$3,001,663
Columbia Gorge	5	\$5,312,554
Columbia Plateau	20.5	\$21,748,203
Intermountain	14.3	\$15,248,105
Lower Columbia	2.3	\$2,492,862
Estuary	3.4	\$3,662,490
Middle Snake	3.2	\$3,374,079
Mountain Columbia	11.8	\$12,590,537
Mountain Snake	15.8	\$16,761,459
Upper Snake	1.5	\$1,575,022
Multi-Province	Percent of Allocation	\$ Allocation
Systemwide	6.3	\$6,709,515*
Mainstem	6.4	\$6,701,823*
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$106,305,840</b>

\*Multi-province projects (total equals \$13,411,338).

(From Council guidance document - <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/guide.pdf>)

# Basinwide needs identified in the F&W Program

---

- Regional coordination
- Data management
- Mainstem habitat
- Research
- Regional monitoring and evaluation

# Regional Coordination

---

- Support coordination of F&W managers for project selection, implementation, system operations
- Council support – ISRP & ISAB
- Coordination of monitoring and evaluation for Watershed conditions and Artificial production
- Coordination of Research
- Coordination of information dissemination

# Data Management

---

- Support mainstem passage monitoring
- Maintain habitat data from subbasin plans
- Maintain artificial production data
- Maintain harvest data
- Quality standards from the F&W Program:
  - internet based distribution system
  - reporting consistent with the F&W Program



# Mainstem Habitat

---

- Water/land acquisition
- Predator control
- Mainstem habitat

# Research

---

- Artificial production
  - Supplementation effectiveness
- Fish passage/survival

# Regional Monitoring and Evaluation

---

Status, trends and effectiveness monitoring of:

- Hydro action effectiveness
- Hydro passage effectiveness
- Tributary habitat status and trends
- Estuary habitat status, trends
- Artificial production status, trends and effectiveness
- Predations
- Wildlife status and trends
- Harvest

# FY 2007-2009 Project Proposals

	# Proposals	FY07 \$ Requested
Coordination	11	\$ 4,483,509
Data Management	17	\$ 11,171,074
Habitat	4	\$ 9,966,045
Monitoring and Evaluation	35	\$ 33,720,077
Research	60	\$ 21,990,325
		\$ 81,331,030

# CBFWA Project Review Criteria

<b>Technical Criteria</b>	
1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	<b>Y or N</b>
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	<b>Y or N</b>
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	<b>Y or N</b>
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	<b>Y or N</b>
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	<b>Y or N</b>
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	<b>Y or N</b>
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	<b>Y or N</b>
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	<b>Y or N</b>
<b>Management Criteria</b>	
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin summaries?	<b>Y or N</b>
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	<b>Y or N</b>
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	<b>Y or N</b>
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	<b>Y or N</b>
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	<b>Y or N</b>
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	<b>Y or N</b>
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	<b>Y or N</b>

# The following definitions were used for the subbasin prioritization:

---

- Core Program - These projects are integral to the infrastructure and/or information needs of the F&W Program in the Columbia River Basin for planning and management.
- High Priority - These projects or tasks within a project are high priority within the subbasin. The project addresses a specific need within the subbasin (program) summaries.
- Recommended Actions - These are good projects that cannot demonstrate a significant loss by not being funded this year. These projects should be funded, but under a limited budget, they could be delayed temporarily without significant loss.
- Do not fund - These projects are either technically inadequate or do not address a need within the subbasin (program) summaries. These projects may be inappropriate for BPA funding.