



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | www.cbfwa.org

May 4, 2009

TO: Bill Booth, Chair
Rhonda Whiting, Chair Fish and Wildlife Committee
Northwest Power and Conservation Council

FROM: Brian Lipscomb, Executive Director *Brian E. Lipscomb*
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority

SUBJECT: Bonneville Power Administration Fiscal Year 2009 Coordination
Funding Decisions

Thank you for meeting with Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Chairman, Elmer Ward and myself on Monday, April 13, 2009 to discuss the funding shortfalls faced by the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes for projects they rely on to provide management coordination, CBFWA – Annual Work Plan (CBFWA-AWP) and the Collaborative System-wide Monitoring and Evaluation Program (CSMEP). It is important to note that the management coordination definition provided by all 19 fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes defines the need for management coordination to occur in all aspects of adaptive management, planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program (Program). The CBFWA-AWP provides coordination in all of these areas while the CSMEP is focused on the coordination of monitoring and evaluation. The funding shortfalls faced are a result of Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) actions. As you requested, I have assembled a summary of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) funding recommendations and BPA decisions for fiscal years 2007-2009 for these projects. I have also included information regarding the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Project (PNAMP), since BPA has advocated and provided funding for it to take the place of the CSMEP.

Funding decisions for Fiscal Years 2007-2009 were based on project solicitations, reviews, and recommendations initiated by the Council and BPA in FY06. This briefing includes the recommendations and decisions that have resulted from that solicitation and begin in October of 2006.

As you will note the result of these decisions has been a combined reduction in funding for CBFWA and its Members of over \$1.4 million or 49% over two years. The CSMEP FY 2009 project year started October 1, 2008 and runs through September 30, 2009 and has no funding identified for this year. The CBFWA-AWP FY 2009 project year started April 1, 2009 and runs through March 30, 2010 and has a budget identified at \$311,049 or 17% less than that approved by the Council. With funding provided at these severely reduced levels, the CBFWA Members are contemplating their options. They may request action from the

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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

Council and BPA to address these funding shortfalls or they may reduce the workplan by eliminating some of the coordinated fish and wildlife management activities for implementing the newly amended Program, the 2008 Biological Opinion (BiOp), or both. If they are forced to choose the latter it will result in a reduction of capacity at CBFWA.

Work does continue in the development of a coordinated monitoring design for anadromous fish to meet the BiOp and amended Program needs; however, no funding commitments have yet been made to accommodate this work in combination with the additional management coordination work identified by CBFWA in their plan submitted to BPA in January of this year.

I hope you find this briefing complete as you can see the record is quite extensive. If there are any oversights I assure you they were not intentional. I welcome any thoughts or ideas either of you may have as we go forward.

BPA Funding for FY 2007

Project Name	Project Number	FY 07 BPA Funding
CBFWA AWP	198906201	\$2,071,450
CSMEP	200303600	\$997,500
PNAMP	200400200	\$50,000

BPA funding levels for FY 2007 for these projects was consistent with recommendations provided by the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes and the Council.

CBFWA Recommendation¹:

The CBFWA recommended funding for both CBFWA and CSMEP for all three years based on the Mainstem Systemwide Review Team (MSRT) evaluation², at \$2,071,405 and \$997,500 respectively for FY07, FY08, and FY09. Note this was a reduction from what was originally requested for both projects. The recommendation was based on the Northwest Power Act³ provisions for fish and

¹ October 6, 2006 Letter from Ron Trahan to Mark Walker regarding CBFWA supported coordination projects -

http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/CBFWA/2006_1006CBFWAtoNPCC.pdf

² Mainstem Systemwide Review Team funding recommendations for FY2007-2009 -

<http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/CBFWA/FinalMSRTrec072706.pdf>

³ Northwest Power Act - http://www.nwcouncil.org/LIBRARY/poweract/4h_program.htm

839b(h)(2). The Council shall request, in writing, promptly after the Council is established under either subsection (a) or (b) of this section and prior to the development or review of the plan, or any major revision thereto, from the Federal and the region's State fish and wildlife agencies and from the region's appropriate Indian tribes, recommendations for--

wildlife coordination. They were signed by Chairman Ron Trahan October 6, 2006.

Council Recommendation⁴:

The Council approved funding recommendations for all projects for FY 2007 – FY 2009 in October of 2006. CBFWA-AWP was included in this but only for FY 2007. The project was grouped by the Council with four other projects, labeled as regional coordination, with a request to the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes for development of a definition for regional coordination with tasks and deliverables that would be appropriate for BPA funding. The funding level was consistent with CBFWA's recommendation at \$2,071,405.

The CSMEP was recommended for funding consistent with the CBFWA recommendation, but only for FY 2007 and FY 2008. Funding for FY 2009 was to be determined based on additional Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) review. The PNAMP funding was as recommended at \$50,000 for all three fiscal years. PNAMP requested an additional \$37,000 for coordination in April 2007 through the Budget Oversight Group (BOG) process and was eventually approved for a \$10,000 increase by BPA for FY 2007.

BPA Decision⁵:

BPA's decision for FY 2007 – FY 2009 was provided in February of 2007. The CBFWA was funded with the other coordination projects at the recommended level, pending definition of regional coordination and future recommendations from the Council.

The CSMEP was funded at the recommended level for FY 2007, reduced by half for FY 2008, and eliminated for FY 2009. CBFWA sent a response to this decision calling for a delay on final judgment until the completion of the ISRP review and Council deliberation on this project⁶. The PNAMP was funded at the recommended level of \$50,000 each year.

839b(h)(2)(C). fish and wildlife management coordination and research and development (including funding) which, among other things, will assist protection, mitigation, and enhancement of anadromous fish at, and between, the region's hydroelectric dams. [Northwest Power Act, §4(h)(2)(C), 94 Stat. 2708.]

⁴ October 2006 Final Council FY 2007-2009 project funding recommendations (2007 only for coordination projects until completion of review) - <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/reviews.asp>

⁵ February 21, 2007 Bonneville Power Administration FY07-09 Funding Decision Tables - http://www.efw.bpa.gov/IntegratedFWP/docs/2007/FY07-09_Decision_Tables.pdf

⁶ October 3, 2007 Letter from Daniel Diggs to Greg Delwiche regarding reduced funding for CSMEP project - [http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/BPA/Letterfrom_D.Diggs\(CBFWA\)to_G.Delwiche\(BPA\)_RE_CSMEP.pdf](http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/BPA/Letterfrom_D.Diggs(CBFWA)to_G.Delwiche(BPA)_RE_CSMEP.pdf)

BPA funding for FY 2008

Project Name	Project Number	FY 07 BPA Funding	FY 08 BPA Funding	% Change from 2007
CBFWA AWP	198906201	\$2,071,450	\$1,869,650	-10%
CSMEP	200303600	\$997,500	\$560,553	-43%
PNAMP	200400200	\$50,000	\$200,000	+300%

Funding levels from BPA for FY 2008 was consistent with the Council recommendations for CBFWA-AWP and reduced from the Council recommendations for CSMEP. Funding for PNAMP was increased to support the 2008 BiOp. Funding levels for PNAMP were not based on a formal proposal to BPA, but rather on a list of tasks generated through PNAMP work groups for other purposes.

December 2007 CBFWA Coordination Recommendation⁷:

To follow up on the 2007 recommendations Council staff worked with the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes to develop a definition for regional coordination which was approved by all 17 agencies and Tribes of CBFWA as well as the Kalispel and Spokane Tribes⁸. Responding to the Council’s request for funding recommendations to implement this definition, CBFWA prepared a revised work plan. In their efforts, the CBFWA Members investigated three alternative strategies for implementing coordination within the Basin; 1) a distributed services model that set up offices in Boise and Spokane, 2) a distributed funding model that split the funding 19 ways among the agencies and Tribes as proposed by the Kalispel Tribe, and 3) a needs based approach that established a budget with deliverables and work effort needed to complete the deliverables. The CBFWA Members deliberated on these alternatives for two months and provided the final recommendation on December 10. The distributed funding model and the distributed services model were rejected after careful consideration. The Members of CBFWA concluded that “coordination responsibilities among the sovereign management authorities vary significantly, resulting in variable funding amounts for each entity.” The budget request remained \$2,017,815; however, the statement of work was overhauled to reflect the new coordination definitions that were agreed to in November by all the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes (including non-CBFWA members).

⁷ December 10, 2007 Letter from Daniel Diggs to Tom Karier regarding recommendation for CBFWA FY08-09 funding -

http://www.cbfgwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/CBFWA/cbfgwaFY0809FundingLtr-Spreadsheet_20071210FINAL.pdf

⁸ Regional Coordination for the Fish and Wildlife Program -

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2007_1107/DRAFTCoordinationDefinitions_10-23-07MAGApproved.doc

January 2008 Council Regional Coordination Recommendation⁹:

The Council adopted a \$2.4 million funding cap for regional coordination and deliberated on three possible scenarios for allocating funding among the five coordination proposals¹⁰. The Council adopted Scenario A which equally reduced all proposals by 10 percent. The Council did not accept either Scenario B or Scenario C. Scenario C is a distributed funding model, which would have applied the 1/19th allocation of the funding cap for regional coordination. The Council’s transmittal letter for this decision explicitly states that funding should be “pursuant to the budgets for individual coordination proposals, consistent with “Scenario A”...” as represented in the following table. The Council anticipated revisiting regional coordination funding following adoption of a revised Fish and Wildlife Program part way through FY 2009.

Project number	Sponsor	Funding applied at current % rates
1989-062-01	Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority	\$1,869,650
2007-108-00	Upper Columbia United Tribes	\$62,814
2007-162-00	Kalispel Tribe	\$58,668
2007-106-00	Spokane Tribe	\$58,668
1998-031-00	Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission	\$189,542
2007-407-00	Upper Snake River Tribes	\$160,659
	TOTAL NEW PROPOSED BUDGET	\$2,400,000

March 2008 CBFWA accommodates reduced funding¹¹:

The CBFWA accommodated the \$202,165, 10% reduction in funding by reducing Member time and travel reimbursements, eliminating one staff position, eliminating a public relations contract, reducing information technology capabilities and reduced time and travel of CBFWA staff necessary to accomplish the remaining tasks. CBFWA recognized the need to move forward with Program amendments and agreed to delay further discussion of regional coordination until after adoption of a revised Fish and Wildlife Program in 2009.

⁹ January 17, 2008 Letter from Tony Grove to Bill Maslen regarding Council decision to recommend funding in FY 2008 and a portion of FY 2009 for regional coordination, including budgets for individual coordination proposals.

¹⁰ Decision Memorandum from Lynn Palensky to Council members regarding funding recommendations for FY 2008 and a portion of FY 2009 for regional coordination project proposals.

¹¹ March 7, 2008 Letter from Larry Peterman to Bill Booth regarding impacts of reduction of CBFWA funding for FY08-09 -

http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/CBFWA/CBFWAItToNPCC_re_ReducedCoordinationFunding_06March2008Final.doc.pdf

FY 2008 CSMEP funding:

The Council has not acted on the reduced funding level for CSMEP in FY 2008 or FY 2009. The ISRP completed its review of the CSMEP project on March 7, 2008¹² and concluded that the “CSMEP proposal (200303600) Meets Scientific Review Criteria (Qualified – for some components). The ISRP feels that some elements of this large project are making good progress (e.g., tributary habitat) while others (e.g., hatchery and harvest effectiveness monitoring) will require additional planning.” The CBFWA requested BPA restore funding in October of 2007¹³ and that the Council do the same. At the October 2007 Council meeting in Missoula, MT the Members recommended that “BPA should restore full funding through at least FY2008 as recommended and protect funding through 2009, pending NPCC/ISRP review.”¹⁴

BPA Funding for FY 2009

Project Name	Project Number	FY 07 BPA Funding	FY 09 BPA Funding	% Change from 2007
CBFWA AWP	198906201	\$2,071,450	\$1,558,601	-25%
CSMEP	200303600	\$997,500	\$0	-100%
PNAMP	200400200	\$50,000	\$550,000	+1000%
Region Data Mgt Support and Coordination	2008727000		\$500,000	

Funding levels from BPA for FY 2009 for all projects are inconsistent with recommendations from both the Council and CBFWA. The funding levels are severely decreased for the CBFWA AWP and CSMEP and increased significantly for the PNAMP and a new BiOp project for data management coordination. The additional funding for data management coordination was intended to be processed through Northwest Environmental Data Network (NED), but has been forwarded through a newly developed Data Management Leadership Team of PNAMP to develop proposals for these funds.

July 2008 BPA Start of Year Budget¹⁵:

On July 3, 2008 BPA released their Start of Year budget for FY 2008-2009. In their start of year budget BPA acknowledged the \$2.4 million cap for regional

¹² Review of Collaborative Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Project (ISRP 2008-1) - <http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2008-1.htm>

¹³ October 3, 2007 Letter from Dan Diggs to Greg Delwiche regarding CSMEP funding - [http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/BPA/Letterfrom_D.Diggs\(CBFWA\)to_G.Delwiche\(BPA\)_RE_CSMEP.pdf](http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/BPA/Letterfrom_D.Diggs(CBFWA)to_G.Delwiche(BPA)_RE_CSMEP.pdf)

¹⁴ October 17, 2007 CBFWA Presentation to NPCC, Missoula, MT.

¹⁵ July 3, 2008 Bonneville Power Administration FY09 Start of Year Planning Budgets - http://www.efw.bpa.gov/IntegratedFWP/docs/2008/2009_SOY_final_July_3_2008.pdf

coordination, but did not identify FY2009 budgets for these projects, and did not identify a process for determining those budgets. The CRITFC budget was established through the Lower River Tribes Fish Accord, and only the Council recommended portion of their funding (\$189k) comes out of the regional coordination funding cap. BPA eliminated the CSMEP funding and shifted tasks to the PNAMP. In addition to the \$150,000 increase in funding for FY 2008, PNAMP's budget has increased to \$550,000 in FY 2009 with no review from Council or at the BOG. This funding has been provided to PNAMP with a request to develop a statement of work(s) to support the funding. It also appears that an additional \$500,000 is being directed towards PNAMP to address data management coordination identified in the BiOp, again without a prior proposal to perform the work or regional review.

BPA comments on Program Amendment recommendations¹⁶:

BPA submitted comments to the Council supporting their April 4, 2008 recommendations for proposed Program amendments. In those comments, BPA calls for the Council to reconsider the most appropriate way for BPA to support regional coordination efforts and calls for the Council to “facilitate further discussions among appropriate entities, outside of the amendment process, to revise its recommendations on regional coordination.” The comments go on to discuss regional coordination that falls outside of the authority of the fish and wildlife managers. Following this discussion, BPA discusses roles for NED, PNAMP, and the Pacific Northwest Regional Geographic Information Council (PNW-RGIC) in their comments.

CBFWA comments on Program Amendment recommendations¹⁷:

The CBFWA Members provided management coordination measures for inclusion in the 2009 Amended Program. The recommendations were based on the definition for management coordination funding provided by the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes in the Fall of 2007. They did consider providing a funding recommendation at the time of the amendment recommendations; however, they concluded that with the variability in management coordination activities that exists at this time it would not be practical to include a funding recommendation. Instead, they recommended measures for inclusion in the Program that call for, “BPA to fund the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes’ coordination efforts to ensure appropriate and meaningful participation in Program decision making. The fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes will define their coordination needs, which

¹⁶ BPA comments on Program amendments submitted on June 10, 2008 - http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2008amend/view_comment.asp?url=comments&desc=Recommendations&id=273

¹⁷ CBWA Program amendment recommendations submitted on April 4, 2008 – <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2008amend/view.asp?id=111>
http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program/2008amend/view_comment.asp?id=218

may or may not include membership organizations, and provide recommendations to Council and BPA.”

Final Program language regarding regional coordination¹⁸

The Council recognized that coordination funding should be focused on specific activities that support Program implementation. The final Program states that “Any entity or organization receiving funding for coordination of Program activities must develop a work plan detailing the coordination elements, objectives, deliverables, and budget. All coordination work will be reviewed as part of the Council’s project review process and as necessary, scientific and administrative review. The Council will recommend to Bonneville the level and type of coordination required to implement the Program.”

December 2008 BPA accommodates a UCUT request for additional funding¹⁹:

The first official notice I was provided that BPA was negotiating with UCUT members to divide the regional coordination funding cap equally between the 19 fish and wildlife entities was an email sent to me on December 17, 2008. BPA informed me and Tony Grover that they were accommodating a request for funding from the UCUT Tribes from the \$2.4M coordination funding category, and that this allowed “plenty of time for entities affected by this to figure out how and where they will make their budget reductions.” Attached to the email were letters from the Couer d’Alene Tribe and Kootenai Tribe. The CBFWA was in the midst of developing our FY09 work plan, and we built a work plan based on the known elements of the soon to be adopted Fish and Wildlife Program and for coordinating the fish and wildlife agencies participation in the development of monitoring required in the implementation of the BiOp.

January 2009 CBFWA Members request for funding²⁰:

To prevent any loss of staff and capacity at CBFWA resulting from BPA’s decision to redistribute the \$2.4M coordination cap, the seventeen Members of CBFWA have combined the CBFWA-AWP work with the CSMEP work and requested a combined base funding of \$1,895,201 from BPA. The request was for BPA to work with the Members to develop proposals for Members time and travel necessary to support BiOp monitoring and evaluation (M&E) deliverables (previously CSMEP tasks) in addition to this base funding. It is anticipated that any additional funding when combined with the base funding would total less than

¹⁸ Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program 2009-02-
<http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/2009/2009-02.pdf>

¹⁹ December 17, 2008 Email from Greg Delwiche to Brian Lipscomb giving advance notice that CBFWA’s budget may be reduced.

²⁰ January 22, 2009 Letter from Elmer Ward to Greg Delwiche regarding CBFWA FY09 Budget -
http://www.cbfwa.org/RegionalIssues/Correspondence/CBFWA/Letter&Attachment_fromCBFWA_toBPA_ReFY09SOWFinal.pdf

that approved for CSMEP and CBFWA-AWP for FY 2007 and FY 2008. The detailed statement of work combines the tasks and deliverables from both the CSMEP and the CBFWA AWP. It identifies significant coordination required during FY09 to address multiple planning processes to implement the amended Program and BiOp, as well as other fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes plans (Monitoring, Multi-Year Action Plans, Subbasin Plan management plans, biological objectives, resident fish loss assessment protocols, Wildlife Crediting Committee, etc.).

February 2009 BPA e-mail on regional coordination funding for FY 2009²¹:

BPA responded in February by e-mail to me indicating that they were only willing to provide \$1,558,601 for implementation of the combined workplan based on a 1/19th redistribution of the \$2.4 million dollar coordination budget. They did not entertain any thoughts of reallocating any of the additional \$1,050,000 FY 09 PNAMP funds back to CBFWA. The following table was provided with that e-mail:

Project Name	Project Number	FY 09	
Grouped as Coordination Projects for Review	CBFWA AWP	198906201	\$1,558,601
	CRITFC	199803100	\$189,542
	UCUT	200710800	\$268,106
	Kalispel	200716200	\$75,000
	Spokane	200710600	\$74,316
	Coeur d'Alene	200901000	\$74,316
Total			\$2,400,000

March 2009 BPA discussion with CBFWA Members²²:

The Members invited Greg Delwiche to their March Members meeting to discuss the combined CBFWA-AWP/CSMEP workplan. Greg indicated at this meeting that there was only \$1.5M available for coordination within CBFWA, that the unallocated BiOp monitoring place holders were for anticipated monitoring tasks not coordination, and that a better solution may be for CBFWA to pursue implementation support for some of the Tribal accords as a solution for any CBFWA funding shortfalls. He did indicate that BPA would be willing to entertain the CBFWA-AWP/CSMEP proposal with a larger audience, including the Council, but was not prepared to do that at that time. He thought that a BOG request may be the appropriate vehicle for this conversation.

²¹ February 24, 2009 Email from Bill Maslen to Brian Lipscomb with regional coordination allocation table attached.

²² March 4, 2004 CBFWA Members Meeting Action Notes - http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2009_0304/MbrsActionNotes2009_0304Final.pdf

The Members continue to work on resolution of this issue:

BPA is implementing funding decisions for FY 2009 that are neither consistent with recommendations of the Council nor the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes. It appears in fact that these funding decisions are implementing BPA's own position provided in their comments to the Council in April of 2008 for inclusion in the amended Program, which as we understand it will be considered for implementation starting in FY 2010. These decisions have significant policy implications for the fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes and do need to include the Council. Developing a BOG request combining the CBFWA-AWP work and the CSMEP work as a vehicle to accommodate this conversation may not be appropriate since the criteria used by the BOG is designed to create transparency in technical adjustments to projects not facilitate policy shifts in Program funding.

The Members do agree that more detail would be helpful in any conversation for FY 2009 funding, and to that end have formed an Research Monitoring & Evaluation subcommittee that has developed a detailed work plan defining both the deliverables and work needed to provide the essential elements for monitoring of Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) parameters for Ecologically Significant Units (ESU) and Distinct Population Segments (DPS) for salmon and steelhead populations in the Columbia Basin.. These deliverables continue to be clarified and included as outcomes from the monitoring workshop being planned with both the Council and BPA.

We have explored other funding opportunities as suggested by Greg as well. All of the accord Tribes were offered assistance from CBFWA to implement their accords. At this time deliverables are being developed with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, however, implementing these deliverables will take staff time away from work needed for the deliverables in the FY 2009 CBFWA-AWP/CSMEP work plan developed in January. BPA offered for CBFWA staff to be detailed to BPA to perform duties in recently created staff positions for monitoring coordination and hatchery coordination. We have determined that detailing CBFWA staff to BPA would not be appropriate but we continue to work with BPA to explore how implementing the work plan could provide these services.

The Members are providing direct communication clarifying their policy position on participation in the development of a monitoring framework and the appropriateness of PNAMP as an entity to provide their management coordination. Letters from three Tribes: Nez Perce, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, and Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes have been sent. To my knowledge, letters are also being drafted to communicate positions taken by CRITFC and USRT in regards to CBFWA funding.

Bill Booth and Rhonda Whiting, NPCC

May 4, 2009

Page 11 of 11

The funding entity that implements the CBFWA-AWP, the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation (CBFWF) is a non-profit entity with no flexibility to accommodate this level of budget reduction without serious consequences. The contract year for the CBFWA-AWP for FY 2009 began on April 1, 2009. If the funding shortfalls are not restored by the end of May the Members will be faced with the task of reducing their work plan and identifying which deliverables will not be accomplished. This will result in a reduction of capacity at CBFWA and ultimately implementation of BPA's unilateral decision without any regional consideration: a situation that seems contrary to all that we have strived for since the adoption of the Northwest Power Act.

CC: Greg Delwiche, BPA
Council Members
CBFWA Members