



September 5, 2002

TO: Resident Fish Committee (RFC)

FROM: Joe Maroney, Chair

SUBJECT: *Revised* Draft Agenda for the September 9, 2002, RFC Meeting  
*(Notice change of time and location)*

**Resident Fish Committee Meeting  
September 9, 2002**

*Hotel Lusso  
Spokane, WA  
10:00 p.m. – 12:00 p.m. (Pacific)*

**Conference Line; (503) 229-0191 x 7099**

**ITEM 1: Review and approve agenda**

**ITEM 2: Review RFC comments/recommendations for the Mainstem/ Systemwide Province**

During the July 2002 RFC Meeting, RFC members volunteered to review proposals (Table 1) submitted in the Mainstem/Systemwide Province for funding consideration through the Rolling Provincial Review. For purposes of consistency, the reviewers performed the reviews by implementing the same criteria (Table 2) used by the subbasin review teams.

**\*\*Reviews are due to Neil Ward no later than Thursday, September 5, 2002, and will be provided to the RFC on Friday, September 6, 2002.**

**ITEM 3: Discuss the Coeur d' Alene Tribe's (CDAT) request for an RFC review of Project 199004400**

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has requested that the CDAT seek a RFC technical review of the "Habitat Protection Plan" (see attachment) for Project 199004400. The RFC will develop an approach for reviewing the document that will conclude with a discussion of the review during the October RFC Meeting.

**Table 1 - Resident fish proposals submitted for funding consideration in the Mainstem/ Systemwide Province**

198605000	White Sturgeon Mitigation and Restoration in the Columbia and Snake Rivers Upstream from Bonneville Dam	ODFW
35042	Evaluate the Effects of Prey Availability on Recruitment of White Sturgeon in the Columbia River	USGS-CRRL
35043	Monitoring and Models for Adaptive Management of White Sturgeon	USGS-CRRL
35044	Determine Effects of Contaminants on White Sturgeon Reproduction and Parental Transfer of Contaminants to Embryos in the Columbia River Basin	OSU
35028	Evaluate White Sturgeon Nutritional Needs and Contaminant Effects Influenced by the Hydroelectric System	PSU
35059	Rapid Detection of White Sturgeon Iridovirus in Spawning Fluids, Eggs, and Juvenile Tissues of White Sturgeon	USFWS
35061	Prophylactic Treatments for White Sturgeon Infected with the White Sturgeon Iridovirus (WSIV)	USFWS
199007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	PSMFC
35002	Determine Origin, Movements, and Relative Abundance of Bull Trout in Bonneville Reservoir	WDFW and YN

**Table 2 - Technical and management criteria used by Subbasin Review Teams and the RFC for the purpose of performing project proposal reviews.**

**Technical Criteria**

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>

**Management Criteria**

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 a 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>

h:\w\RFC\2002\_0909\RevisedDraftRFC\Agenda.doc