



**COLUMBIA  
BASIN  
FISH & WILDLIFE  
AUTHORITY**

**DRAFT**

April 13, 2006

TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)  
FROM: Lawrence Schwabe, Chair  
SUBJECT: Draft Agenda for the April 26, 2006, RFAC Meeting

**Resident Fish Advisory Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, April 26, 2006  
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. (Pacific)  
@  
CBFWA Office, Portland, OR**

**Teleconference Number: (503) 229-0449 Id: 380106**

**ITEM 1: Project Proposal Reviews**

During the February 7 and 22, 2006, RFAC meetings, 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. Lawrence Schwabe informed the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Members, during their February 22-23, 2006, meeting, of the action that was approved by the RFAC. On April 5, the Members recommended that the CBFWA technical committees review the proposals.

During the February 22 meeting, the RFAC reviewed the criteria that the Resident Fish Committee used during the Rolling Provincial Review and agreed that the criteria, listed in Tables 1 and 2, should be used for the purpose of guidance and not as a checklist. The timeframe for the RFAC's review must be structured according to the following timeline:

- June 16, 2006: ISRP Report to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC)
- June 19-21, 2006: NPCC releases the ISRP's comments
- June 26-29, 2006: RFAC project review retreat
- July 11-12, 2006: CBFWA Members Advisory Group and Members meetings to approve technical committee reviews (tentative)
- July 14, 2006: Responses to ISRP for prioritized projects are due

The following tasks must be completed before reviews can commence: 1) establish a timeline and associated deadlines, and 2) review the list of projects and identify potential reviewers, 3) seek volunteers to perform reviews.

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)?
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and timeframe milestones?
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?
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?
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?
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?

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?
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and/or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?
4. 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?
5. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?
6. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?