



DRAFT

February 14, 2006

TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)
FROM: Lawrence Schwabe, Chair
SUBJECT: Draft Agenda for the February 22, 2006, RFAC Meeting

Resident Fish Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 22, 2006

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. (Pacific)

@

CBFWA Office, Portland, OR

Conference Line: (503) 229-0449 Conference Id: 938569

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Action Notes from the October 24, 2005, RFAC Meeting

Review and approve the draft action notes from the October 24, 2005, and February 7, 2006, RFAC meetings.

ITEM 2: Project Proposal Reviews

During the February 7, 2006, RFAC meeting the participants discussed the utility of providing technical/management reviews of resident fish proposals submitted for consideration for funding during fiscal years 2007-2009 and agreed that the RFAC should review the proposals. The RFAC identified four tasks that must be completed before reviews can commence: 1) develop criteria, 2) establish a timeline and associated deadlines, 3) review the list of projects to ensure the correct proposals will be reviewed, and 4) seek volunteers to perform reviews. Although the RFAC did not agree upon a set of criteria, the RFAC decided that the criteria the Resident Fish Committee (RFC) used during the Rolling Provincial Review should be reviewed and updated if needed. The RFAC suggested that the RFC criteria (Table 1 and Table 2) could possibly be enhanced by including additional criteria being used by subbasin review teams (e.g., Intermountain Province Review Group’s criteria). If the RFAC’s comments are going to be useful to the region (i.e., subbasin teams, Independent Scientific Review Panel, NPCC, and BPA) the RFAC’s review must coincide with the following timeline that the NPCC has established for the 2007-09 solicitation:

- January 17 – June 16, 2006: Science review and local basinwide prioritization
- June 16, 2006: Science review report to the Council
- July 14, 2006: Responses for prioritized projects due
- August 31, 2006: Final science review report to the Council
- October 18, 2006: Council recommendations for funding to Bonneville

Based on a cursory review of the proposed projects, some proposals that were identified as resident-fish-oriented were mischaracterized (e.g., Ron Peters indicated that Project 200204500 is a wildlife project). As a result, the RFAC will have to review the list of proposals to ensure the correct suites of proposals are reviewed.

Table 1. – Technical Criteria that the Resident Fish Committee used to review project proposals during the Rolling Provincial Review.

Technical Criteria

1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y or N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y or N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and timeframe milestones?	Y or N
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y or N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y or N
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?	Y or N

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?	Y or N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y or N

Table 2. – Management Criteria that the Resident Fish Committee used to review project proposals during the Rolling Provincial Review.

Management Criteria

1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin summaries?	Y or N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y or N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and/or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y or N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y or N
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?	Y or N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y or N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y or N