
PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE

Section 1. General administrative information

Title of project

Fish And Wildlife Program Implementation

BPA project number: 8906200
Contract renewal date (mm/yyyy): 11/1999 **Multiple actions?**

Business name of agency, institution or organization requesting funding
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority

Business acronym (if appropriate) CBFWA

Proposal contact person or principal investigator:

Name	Brian J. Allee, Ph.D.
Mailing Address	2501 S.W. First Avenue, Suite 200
City, ST Zip	Portland, OR. 97201
Phone	503-229-0191
Fax	503-229-0443
Email address	brian@cbfwf.org

NPPC Program Measure Number(s) which this project addresses
3.2B.2, 3.1B.8, 3.3E.1, 3.1B.3, 3.1B.4, 3.1B.9, 3.1B.5, 3.2A.1, 3.2A.2, 3.1D.1, 3.1D.2, 5.1B.2, 7.0B.1

FWS/NMFS Biological Opinion Number(s) which this project addresses
Addresses portions of the US FWS Kootenai River White Sturgeon Biological Opinion and the NMFS Hydrosystem Operations Biological Opinion

Other planning document references
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Multi-Year Implementation Plan

Short description
Facilitate implementation of the FWP by providing the Draft Annual Implementation Workplan, Research, Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Program Accomplishments Annual Report, Columbia Basin Status Report, and the Recommended Additions to the Program.

Target species
All fish and wildlife in the Columbia River Basin.

Section 2. Sorting and evaluation

Subbasin
Systemwide

Evaluation Process Sort

CBFWA caucus	Special evaluation process	ISRP project type
--------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Mark one or more caucus	If your project fits either of these processes, mark one or both	Mark one or more categories
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anadromous fish <input type="checkbox"/> Resident fish <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multi-year (milestone-based evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Watershed project evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Watershed councils/model watersheds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information dissemination <input type="checkbox"/> Operation & maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> New construction <input type="checkbox"/> Research & monitoring <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation & management <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife habitat acquisitions

Section 3. Relationships to other Bonneville projects

Umbrella / sub-proposal relationships. List umbrella project first.

Project #	Project title/description

Other dependent or critically-related projects

Project #	Project title/description	Nature of relationship
9403300	Fish Passage Center	Supervisory oversight
9007700	Northern Pikeminnow Management Program	Technical administration
9600800	PATH Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses Participation	Contract administration
9600500	ISAB Independent Scientific Advisory Board	Contract administration
	All projects in the Fish and Wildlife Program	Coordination, logistical and technical support

Section 4. Objectives, tasks and schedules

Past accomplishments

Year	Accomplishment	Met biological objectives?
	See reference list in Section 6.	

Objectives and tasks

Obj 1,2,3	Objective	Task a,b,c	Task
1	Provide Draft FY 2000 Annual Implementation Work Plan to the Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA).	a	Maintain the Multi-Year Plan (MYP) as the basis for the Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan.
		b	Work with the Council and BPA to develop

			the form for the solicitation of project proposals for implementation of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP).
		c	Work through the Anadromous Fish Caucus, Resident Fish Caucus, and Wildlife Caucus to evaluate the technical merit and management priority of project proposals.
		d	Work through the full membership to develop a list of projects for inclusion in the Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan.
		e	Work with the Council and BPA to finalize recommendations.
2	Provide recommendations to the Council and BPA regarding changes and additions to the FY 1999 Annual Implementation Work Plan necessary for its implementation.	a	Work with the Council and the BPA to address regional or programmatic issues described in the Annual Implementation Work Plan decision document.
		b	Update protocols for making decisions on in-season adjustments to the Annual Implementation Work Plan.
		c	Evaluate referrals by Council and others for changes and additions to the Annual Implementation Work Plan.
3	Provide assessments to Council and BPA on how conclusions resulting from regional reviews affect fish and wildlife management decision.	a	Conduct, or participate in, and contribute to the review.
		b	Define and evaluate implications for fish and wildlife management based on review conclusions.
4	Provide draft Regional Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plan (RMEP) for the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program to the Council and BPA.	a	Identify and assign priorities to information needs based on goals, objectives and strategies in the MYP (research).
		b	Identify key performance measures of success based on goals, objectives and strategies in the MYP (monitoring and evaluation).
		c	Identify ongoing projects that address research, monitoring and evaluation needs.
		d	Identify outstanding information needs necessary to implement the research, monitoring and evaluation plan that are not currently addressed by ongoing projects.
		e	Submit draft Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plan (RMEP) to peer, regional, and public review process.
5	Provide to the Council and BPA estimates of dollars needed for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation and enhancement and recommendations on how those dollars are best allocated toward that end.	a	Refine estimates of out-year costs for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation, and enhancement.

		b	Review and comment on analyses by BPA and others being proposed as a basis for their financial obligations for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation, and enhancement.
		c	Highlight outstanding needs for the federal government to meet their fish and wildlife obligations (e.g. conditions in MOA annex).
6	Provide a report on how fish and wildlife populations have responded to implementation of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program and an assessment of how the Program could be modified to meet the goals and objectives set forth in the MYP.	a	Conduct periodic evaluations of projects and programs to assess progress toward stated goals and objectives and reaffirm consistency with Multi-Year Plan, in the Program Accomplishments Annual Report (PAAR).
		b	Develop a Status Report on fish and wildlife in the Columbia Basin.
		c	Develop an assessment of how the fish and wildlife program could be modified to meet the goals and objectives in the Recommended Additions to the program (RAP).

Objective schedules and costs

Obj #	Start date mm/yyyy	End date mm/yyyy	Measureable biological objective(s)	Milestone	FY2000 Cost %
1	11/1999	10/2000		Annual activity, next review in 2004	69%
2	11/1999	10/2000		Annual activity, next review in 2004	4%
3	11/1999	10/2000		Annual activity, next review in 2004	9%
4	11/1999	8/2000		Report completed 8/2000, review 2001	7%
5	11/1999	10/2000		Annual activity, next review in 2004	3%
6	11/1999	10/2004		Task 6a: Review 1st report 2001, next process-based review in 2004. Task 6b: Review after report completed in 2003. Task 6c: Review after report completed 2001	8%
				Total	100.00%

Schedule constraints

CBFWA will meet the 4/15 publication date for Objective 1 if the proposals are received prior to 1/1. Objectives 2, 3 and 5 are directly tied to schedules outside CBFWA's control. Objectives 4 and 6 are new initiatives and should be published on time.

Completion date

Objectives 1, 2, 3, and 5 and Objective 6 Task a are annual activities. Objective 4 will be completed in August 2000. Objective 6 Task b will be completed in 2003 and Objective 6 Task c will be completed in 2000.

Section 5. Budget

FY99 project budget (BPA obligated): \$1,769,506

FY2000 budget by line item

Item	Note	% of total	FY2000
Personnel	See Key Personnel and Section 8 (h).	%58	1,258,024
Fringe benefits	Medical, dental, vision, retirement, group life, disability, vacation/ sick leave	%10	215,624
Supplies, materials, non-expendable property	Office supplies, telephone, printing copies, messengers, postage	%3	60,500
Operations & maintenance	Equipment and Maintenance	%0	10,000
Capital acquisitions or improvements (e.g. land, buildings, major equip.)		%0	0
NEPA costs		%0	0
Construction-related support		%0	0
PIT tags	# of tags:	%0	0
Travel	Cost for all members and staff to participate in accomplishing objectives	%11	245,000
Indirect costs		%18	391,383
Subcontractor		%0	0
Other		%0	0
TOTAL BPA FY2000 BUDGET REQUEST			\$2,180,531

Cost sharing

Organization	Item or service provided	% total project cost (incl. BPA)	Amount (\$)
BPA	Management Staff	%5	110,000
		%0	
		%0	
		%0	
Total project cost (including BPA portion)			\$2,290,531

Outyear costs

	FY2001	FY02	FY03	FY04
Total budget	\$2,245,948	\$2,313,326	\$2,382,726	\$2,454,208

Section 6. References

Watershed?	Reference
<input type="checkbox"/>	Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 1987. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority Charter. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 13 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1988. Smolt Monitoring Program 1987 Annual Report. Fish Passage Center. 112 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1989. Review of the History, Development and Management of Anadromous Fish Production Facilities in the Columbia River Basin. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 52 pp
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1990-98. CBFWA Directory. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1990. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority Wildlife Project Proposal Ranking Methodology. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1990. Proposed Mainstem Flows for Columbia Basin Anadromous Fish. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. 12 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1990. Proposed Mainstem Flows for Columbia Basin Anadromous and Resident Fish: Technical Addendum – Resident Fish Requirements. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. 58 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1991-94. Detailed Fishery Operations Plan. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1991. The Biological and Technical Justification for the Flow Proposal of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. 72 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1991. Integrated System Plan for Salmon and Steelhead Production in the Columbia River Basin. Document 91-16. The Northwest Power Planning Council. 527 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1991. Proposed Main Stem Flows for Columbia Basin Anadromous and Resident Fish: Technical Addendum. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1991. Recommendations for Early Implementation of Projects in Accordance with the Columbia River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Integrated System Plan. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. 115 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1992. Proposed Annual Implementation Work Plan for Fiscal Year 1993. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 100 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1992. Proposed Annual Implementation Work Plan for Fiscal Year 1994. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 90 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1992-93. Hatchery Operations Manuals. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1993 Detailed Fishery Operating Plan with 1994 Operating Criteria. Fish Passage Center. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1993-94. Integrated Hatchery Operations Team Policies. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1993-current. Pikeminnow Quarterly and Annual Reports. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1994. An Independent Review of the Pacific Salmon Treaty of 1985 and the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 21 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1994. CBFWA Member Comments on Draft Anadromous Fish Amendments to Columbia River Basin. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1994. Comments on Amendments to the Strategy for Salmon. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 235 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1994. FY 1995 Annual Fish & Wildlife Plan. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 245 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1994. Member Comments on Compilation of CBFWA on Snake River Recovery Plan Recommendation. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1995. Columbia River Basin Fish & Wildlife Program Work Plan for Fiscal Year 1996. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority & Northwest Power Planning Council. 52

	pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1995. DPEIS on Impacts of Artificial Salmon & Steelhead Production Strategies in the Columbia River Basin. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1995-97. Fish Screen Oversight Committee Annual Reports. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1996. Draft DPEIS - A Migration Corridor Assessment of the Cumulative Impacts of a Range of Artificial Salmon and Steelhead Production Strategies Designed to Balance Fish Allocations Among Existing Mandates in the Col. River Basin.CBFWA.pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1996. Draft Working Paper: Staff Presentation of Planning Objectives, Critical Factors and Interactions of System Configuration Operations on Resident and Anadromous Fish in the Columbia River Basin. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 40 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1996. Draft Multi-Year Implementation Plan For the Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement of Columbia River Basin Fish & Wildlife Resources. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1996. Draft Results of the Fish & Wildlife Managers' Review and Assessment of FY 1997 Projects. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1996. Impacts of Artificial Salmon & Steelhead Production Strategies in Columbia River Basin. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1997. Addenda Draft FY 1998 Annual Implementation Work Plan. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 13 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1997. Draft FY 1998 Annual Implementation Work Plan. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 119 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1997. FY 1998 Annual Implementation Work Plan. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 228 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1997. Integrated Watershed Projects: The Process & Criteria for Selecting Watershed Projects for the Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Program. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 17 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1997. Review of Projects Abstracts. Bonneville Power Administration. 295 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. CBFWA Response to NPPC Document 98-25 FY 1999 Annual Implementation Work Plan Funding Recommendations Version 2. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 30 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Draft FY 1999 Annual Implementation Work Plan Vols. I-IV. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 170 pp., 320 pp., 157 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Fish Passage Managers Annual Reports. Fish Passage Center. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Future Fish and Wildlife Costs. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 60 pp. plus Appendices.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 43 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. FY 1998 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation Review 2. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 33 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. FY 1999 Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan-Draft Decision Document (Phase I). Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 57 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. FY 1999 Watershed Project Technical Evaluation. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 38 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Guidelines for Enhancement, Operation, and Maintenance Activities for Wildlife Mitigation Projects. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 44 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. How to Improve Your FY 2000 Proposal. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. pg. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Multi-Year Anadromous Fish Plan Draft. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 115 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Multi-Year Funding: A Process and Qualifications for Project Slection Under the Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Program. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 6 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1998. Ten Year Fish & Wildlife Budget. Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority. 15 pp.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Northwest Power Planning Council. 1984. 1984 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. Northwest Power Planning Council. Section 102. 138 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1987. 1987 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. Northwest Power Planning Council. 246 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1992. Strategy for Salmon Volume II. Document No. 92-21A. Northwest Power Planning Council. 98 pp.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1994. Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program Document 94-55. Northwest Power Planning Council. pag. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____. 1995. Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program Resident Fish and Wildlife Amendments. Document No. 95-20. Northwest Power Planning Council. pag. var.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Law 96-501 96th Congress. 1980. Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act. Bonneville Power Administration U.S. Department of Energy. pag. var.

PART II - NARRATIVE

Section 7. Abstract

The 1980 Power Act created the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC) and charged it with developing the Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP) to mitigate for fish and wildlife losses caused by the construction and operation of the federal hydropower system. Under the Act, BPA funds the implementation of the FWP. This project covers the tasks and activities that the fish and wildlife managers collectively complete (with the support of staff) to fulfill FWP measures 3.2B.2, 3.1B.8, 3.3E.1, 3.1B.3, 3.1B.4, 3.1B.9, 3.1B.5, 3.2A.1, 3.2A.2, 3.1D.1, 3.1D.2, 5.1B.2, 7.0B.1. The overall objectives are to 1) develop and implement a *Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan* (DAIWP); 2) refine the DAIWP through reviews and with-in year modifications; 3) participate in reviews of program elements outside the current year's DAIWP; 4) provide a draft *Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan* (RMEP); 5) provide short and long-term estimates of the funding required to implement the program; 6) provide three program evaluation documents: the *Program Accomplishments Annual Report* (PAAR), the *Columbia Basin Status Report* (CBSR), and the *Recommended Additions to the Program* (RAP). The Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) is a consensus-based membership organization consisting of 19 fish and wildlife agencies and tribes and supported by nine professional and administrative staff. The CBFWA members and staff work through the anadromous fish, resident fish and wildlife caucuses to develop and implement the products described under the objectives.

Section 8. Project description

a. Technical and/or scientific background

In 1980, in response to growing concerns about the declining fish and wildlife populations and a predicted energy deficit, Congress passed the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act (Act). Section 4(a) of the Act created the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC) and charged it with creating a program to “...protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife...on the Columbia and its tributaries, affected by the development, and operation of [hydroelectric projects] while assuring the Pacific Northwest and adequate, efficient, economical, and reliable power supply...”. Section 4(h)(10)(A) directed Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to provide funding to implement the program.

Congress recognized that the program would be a very ambitious effort involving many stakeholders spread over a large geographic area (259,000 square miles). To ensure success, Section 4.(g)(3) of the Act states that BPA and NPPC shall encourage the cooperation and participation of the federal and state agencies and Indian tribes in the preparation and implementation of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP). In addition, Congress, through the Act, recognized the expertise of the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes, accorded “due weight” to their views, and required that the FWP

“complement” their activities. In other words, the Act set up what we now refer to as the “three-legged stool” where BPA, NPPC and the fish and wildlife managers (managers) cooperatively implement the FWP.

NPPC adopted the first Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP) in 1982 and, through extensive public outreach efforts, amended it in 1984, 1987, 1991-93, 1994 and 1995. The goal of the FWP is “*a healthy Columbia Basin, one that supports both human settlement and the long-term sustainability of native fish and wildlife species in native habitats where possible, while recognizing that where impacts have irrevocably changed the ecosystem, we must protect and enhance the ecosystem that remains.*” Throughout its evolution, the FWP has recognized and institutionalized the central and unique role of the managers. The FWP now consists of a large number of measures that translate into 275 individual projects that protect, mitigate and/or enhance fish/wildlife in the Columbia Basin. A 1996 amendment to the Act established an Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP), under the auspices of NPPC, to evaluate projects proposed for funding under the FWP. In the three-legged stool model, it is NPPC’s responsibility to develop and amend the FWP and to make final recommendations to BPA about which projects to fund under the Direct Fish and Wildlife Program in any given fiscal year.

To support its leg of the stool, BPA executes, funds and administers the contracts which drive the projects in the FWP. Under the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) spanning fiscal years 1996-2001, BPA provides up to \$252 million dollars annually to cover three cost categories; 1) \$127 million to support the FWP (Direct Program); 2) \$40 million to reimburse Congress for appropriations to fund the Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Reclamation fish and wildlife activities (Reimbursable Program); and, 3) \$85 million to fund Corps improvements to the hydro-power system for fish and wildlife purposes (Capital Investment Program).

Although clearly envisioned by Congress, the managers leg of the stool has evolved since 1980. The managers are unique in the basin in that they have responsibility (based on federal and state statutes, treaties, Executive Orders and court actions) for managing Columbia Basin fish and wildlife. By law, the managers must oversee the fish and wildlife mitigation activities outlined in the FWP. In the early years of the FWP, the managers participated as a disparate collection of individual organizations. As the program gained momentum and grew more complex, the managers recognized the need to speak with one voice. In 1987, the following 19 organizations established, by Charter, the Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority (CBFWA): Burns-Paiute Tribe, Coeur d’Alene Tribe, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation, Colville Confederated Tribes, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation of Oregon, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Kalispel Indian Tribe, 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 Tribe, Shoshone-Paiute Tribe, Spokane Tribe, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

CBFWA is a forum for the managers (listed above) to exchange information and develop unified positions on issues affecting fish (both anadromous and resident) and wildlife in the Columbia Basin. The Mission of CBFWA is to *facilitate discussion among the fish and wildlife managers in a effort to find consensus, improve the quality of fish and wildlife decision-making, and to influence other regional decision-makers.* All actions and decisions supported by CBFWA are developed through a consensus process. This strengthens the FWP and simplifies the decision making process.

Although CBFWA is highly effective in building consensus, it is not a legally recognized entity. Thus in 1993, the managers formed the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation (Foundation) to serve as the administrative-fiscal arm of CBFWA. The Foundation (a non-profit corporation legally registered with the State of Oregon under the Oregon Nonprofit Corporation Act) manages projects approved by the managers. This proposal describes those projects in detail.

b. Rationale and significance to Regional Programs

NPPC recognizes that successful implementation of the FWP hinges directly on the full and active participation and support of the managers. Accordingly, through a variety of measures, NPPC has clearly defined the managers' individual and collective (CBFWA) roles in many key areas of the FWP. Section 3 Measure 3.1B of the 1994 FWP (amended in 1995) lays out two closely related parallel paths – coordinated implementation and program evaluation.

CBFWA has set a goal to: *Restore sustainable, naturally-producing fish and wildlife populations to support tribal and non-tribal uses and cultural and economic practices by restoring the biological integrity and the genetic diversity of the Columbia River ecosystem and through other measures that are compatible with naturally-producing fish and wildlife populations (DAIWP FY98)*. The roles assigned to CBFWA along each path, translate directly into the products delivered under the six objectives described in this proposal. The products (reports) are one tool used by the managers to achieve their goals.

The implementation path includes a number of measures (3.1B.2, 3.1B.8, 3.3E.1, 3.1B.3, 3.1B.4) that specifically direct CBFWA to develop the Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan (DAIWP) prepared under Objective 1 and refined in Objectives 2 and 3. The DAIWP serves as the engine that drives fish and wildlife mitigation/recovery actions outlined in the FWP. It is a comprehensive basin-wide annual work plan to protect mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife losses caused by the construction and operation of the federal hydropower system. All of the NPPC/ISRP annual project evaluations, public review processes and final recommendations use the CBFWA DAIWP as a starting point. BPA uses the project proposals and the DAIWP and NPPC/ISRP recommendations as the basis for contracting with the project implementers.

The program evaluation path (including measures 3.1, 3.1B, 3.2A.1, and 3.2A.2) calls on the region to address scientific uncertainties, identify monitoring needs, develop performance standards, and prepare an annual report evaluating program progress. Objective 4 of this proposal generates a *Research Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (RMEP)* to systematically improve the region's knowledge of what works, what does not work, and why. Within the annual work plan there are a number of critical projects (or parts of projects) that directly address research questions (scientific uncertainties) and/or monitor biological and environmental parameters. Each of these is effective in its own slice of the program but they do not tier off a comprehensive, regionally standardized plan. As a result, some of the data and information necessary to drive effective adaptive management are not readily accessible. The purpose of this objective is to make the research and monitoring elements of the existing program *explicit* and to identify (and plan for) areas where more work is needed. This is the crux of adaptive management.

FWP Measure 3.2 and the 1998 ISRP report on FY 1999 project proposals specifically call for an annual report evaluating program progress. Objective 6 Task a in this proposal answers that call by generating a *Program Accomplishments Annual Report (PAAR)* that evaluates the individual and collective progress and biological effectiveness of the projects included in the DAIWP. The implementers of many of the individual projects in the FWP routinely monitor and evaluate their success and these data are included in the annual reports available at BPA and on StreamNet. However, at this time, there is no single reference document that synthesizes these data. When completed, the PAAR will provide a single source and give the region a clear picture of its progress toward the goal. The PAAR, together with the RMEP, will complement, and ensure the success of other ongoing regional efforts.

c. Relationships to other projects

In addition to handling the overall coordination and logistics for the DAIWP, CBFWA provides specific services for the following four projects: 1. Project 9403300 Fish Passage Center is funded through a separate contract with PSMFC and operates under the policy oversight of the Fish Passage Center Board of Directors. CBFWA's Executive Director provides day to day supervision of the Fish Passage Manager. 2.

Project 9007700 Northern Pikeminnow Management Program is also funded under a separate contract with PSMFC and CBFWA provides technical administration and coordination for the six subcontractors involved in program implementation. 3. Project 9600800 PATH (Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses) Participation by State and Tribal Agencies is funded under a separate contract with ODFW but CBFWA provides contract administration and administrative support. 4. CBFWA provides contract administration and administrative support to Project 9600500 ISAB (Independent Scientific Advisory Board).

CBFWA is a focal point for the Members to exchange information, develop unified positions, and create the DAIWP and other work products outlined in the six objectives in this proposal. In that role, CBFWA staff provides coordination, logistical, and technical support for all of the project sponsors who respond to BPA's annual project solicitation. In addition, CBFWA coordinates policy development, program budgets, and within-year adjustments to the work plan. Whenever a budget or overarching policy issue comes up, NPPC has relied upon CBFWA to make a consensus-based recommendation.

d. Project history (for ongoing projects)

This project began in 1989 as project number 8906200 titled CBFWA Coordination Grant. At that time the major activities involved the coordination and facilitation of the fish and wildlife managers collaborative activities on regional issues. Over the years the project has picked up (and dropped) other tasks beyond these "core" functions, including: developing the Integrated System Plan; supporting the Fish Screen Oversight Committee and the Integrated Hatchery Operations Team; organizing the Implementation Planning Process; and coordinating the Multi-Year Implementation Plan.

In 1994, CBFWA took over responsibility for compiling the DAIWP (for FY 1995) from BPA and its structure and content has evolved through adaptive management to meet the Council's specific needs and the region's general needs. In FY 1996, BPA changed the CBFWA contract from a service-based one to one delivering documents or products. In FY 1998, the managers outlined a set of objectives and tasks for CBFWA that were reflected in the FY 1999 project Statement of Work. This contract proposes to keep the defined products but also make explicit the services to be provided.

The products developed through consensus-based coordination of the region's managers are listed in the Section 6 References and the budget history is summarized in Section 8h.

e. Proposal objectives

OBJECTIVE 1. Provide the Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan to NPPC and BPA. Under this contract, the majority of work (62% of manager FTE and 64% CBFWA staff FTE) supports the DAIWP. Published in April, the Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan (DAIWP), describes the evaluation process, includes detailed technical and management evaluations of over 400 proposed and ongoing projects, recommends projects for funding for the coming fiscal year, describes the ecosystem-based management objectives strategies in each subregion and subbasin, describes the recommended projects and their accomplishments (collectively and individually), and includes a balanced budget not exceeding the available funds.

To prepare the DAIWP, the managers and CBFWA staff complete the following five tasks and supporting activities.

Task 1a. Maintain the Multi-Year Plan (MYP) as the basis for the DAIWP. The MYP (first developed in 1997 and included in part in the FY 98 DAIWP) provides the managers' goals, objectives and strategies for fish and wildlife in the Columbia River Basin and thus the framework for the managers' recommendations in the DAIWP. To

ensure that the MYP reflects the most current regional information, the following activities will be completed each year. The managers, with support from staff will: 1) revise subbasin summaries of goals, objectives and strategies to reflect, in a watershed-based ecosystem perspective, current fish and wildlife programs; 2) complete analyses of the likelihood that strategies will achieve objectives; 3) revise text of MYP to explain how what we know and learn influences our objectives and strategies (in response to the ISRP recommendation that we link past accomplishments to current programs); and, 4) summarize general strategic approaches that apply across basins and species.

Task 1b. Work with NPPC and BPA to develop the proposal form and to solicit project proposals. While the MYP described in Task 1a provides the framework for the DAIWP, the project proposal form and solicitation process create the foundation for all other DAIWP activities and evaluations. Like the DAIWP, the form and the solicitation process evolve each year to meet the changing needs of the region. Although a seemingly small cog in the wheel, a standardized form developed and supported by the region, helps to create a level playing field, greatly improves the quality and consistency of the proposals and the evaluation process, and makes it easier for the players to understand and implement the final project funding recommendations. Each year managers and staff work with BPA, NPPC and ISRP to recommend improvements to the form and solicitation process. Staff conducts proposal writing workshops to help prospective project sponsors understand and complete the form. To launch the annual evaluation process, staff ensures that completed proposal forms are properly sorted and distributed. CBFWA staff maintains a data base and budget information in common with NPPC, ISRP and BPA to follow proposals during their evaluation and to track projects during their implementation.

Task 1c. Evaluate the technical merit and management priority of project proposals. Building on and operating within the framework and foundation created in Tasks 1a and 1b, CBFWA caucuses review the technical merit and management priority of the proposals using multiple layers of project evaluation criteria. This task benefits the target fish and wildlife populations and ultimately the entire region by ensuring that each project recommended in the DAIWP meets high standards and forms a critical link along the strategic paths outlined in the MYP/FWP. This is the single most time consuming task under Objective 1 as well as in this entire proposal. To start the evaluation process, CBFWA staff establishes, organizes and oversees technical review teams consistent with the watershed-based approach. Together, the managers and staff develop technical, management and milestone-based evaluation (multi-year funding) criteria. After the criteria are approved, managers and staff conduct the project evaluations.

Task 1d. Develop a list of projects for inclusion in the DAIWP. The purpose of Task 1d is to compile a DAIWP that accomplishes as many of the objectives outlined in the MYP/FWP as possible within the available funds. The DAIWP clearly explains to regional decision-makers and the proposal/project sponsors the processes, decisions, and rationale behind the funding recommendations. Everyone benefits from the detailed explanation of the results. Working at the membership level (as opposed to the caucus level mentioned in Task 1c.), the managers and staff package the proposals into a tiered set of priorities, describe the past accomplishments, explain the link between the recommended projects and the MYP/FWP, and balance the available budget. CBFWA staff arranges the recommendations geographically and then publishes and distributes the DAIWP document to NPPC and BPA.

Task 1e. Work with NPPC and BPA to finalize recommendations. While Task 1d is the final step in completing the DAIWP, Task 1e covers the managers' participation in the NPPC public review process which culminates in the final annual implementation work plan recommendations to BPA. In addition to providing the region the opportunity to comment on the DAIWP and the ISRP review of the DAIWP, the public review process allows the managers to explain their recommendations and respond to ISRP's comments. Ultimately, the individual projects and the program as a whole benefit from open public debate. Under this task, the managers, in cooperation with CBFWA staff, participate in the public review process and respond to/ reconcile comments by NPPC, ISRP and others about program-level issues.

OBJECTIVE 2. Recommend changes and additions necessary to implement the annual work plan to NPPC and BPA. While the DAIWP developed in Objective 1 describes the annual implementation work plan, the activities under Objective 2 guide and refine actual program- and project- level implementation. Work on Objective 2 begins at the start of the fiscal year (October 1), shortly after NPPC makes its final work plan recommendations continues until all of the projects recommended for funding are renewed or initiated (usually close to September 30). In this objective, managers update protocols for making within-year adjustments to the work plan, evaluate specific changes to the work plan, and work with NPPC and BPA to address regional or programmatic issues identified during the fiscal year. Task 2a basically identifies the issues and projects, Task 2b sets the rules for handling the situation and Task 2c applies the rules to the issues/projects.

Task 2a. Work with NPPC and BPA to address regional or programmatic issues described in the NPPC work plan decision document. Through the work plan decision document, NPPC often initiates reviews of specific program areas or activities. Generally these reviews are specific to implementing the plan and explore issues in more detail than time permits during the public review process. While the timing of the reviews varies (some are ongoing and span more than one fiscal year, others are completed within a given fiscal year) all require participation by the managers at the technical and programmatic levels. This task also covers CBFWA member-generated activities such as assessing the need and priority for new initiatives, considering deferred proposals as funding becomes available, and evaluating proposed changes in scopes of work for ongoing projects. Under this task managers and CBFWA staff work with BPA and NPPC to develop a clear understanding of the issues, alternatives, constraints, and solutions.

Task 2b. Update protocols for making within-year adjustments to the work plan. Here, the managers work through the caucuses to revise the rules for implementing within-year changes to the work plan that potentially result from the issues identified in Task 2a. This standard set of procedures ensures that all situations are handled fairly while at the same time providing enough flexibility to accommodate unusual and unforeseen events and opportunities. Under this task, the managers working with CBFWA staff will refine the protocols for: 1) defining and evaluating “emergencies”; 2) considering proposals submitted outside the formal solicitation process and; 3) funding deferred proposals as funds become available. The managers and staff will also work with NPPC, BPA and the project sponsors to clarify the process handling “carry forward and carry over” funds.

Task 2c. Evaluate referrals for changes to the work plan. In this task the managers apply the rules developed in Task 2b to the issues and activities identified in Task 2a. By following an open and public process for addressing each issue/activity, individual elements of the program (and the program as a whole) become increasingly more accountable, internally consistent, and fiscally and biologically effective. In this evaluation process, the managers and CBFWA staff first evaluate the need for and the merit of the issue/activity and then reconcile the funding requirements (if any) with the available dollars as identified through BPA’s Quarterly Review and CBFWA budget tracking system. The CBFWA members then present their recommendation (including changes in budget allocations) to NPPC for consideration.

OBJECTIVE 3. Provide assessments of how conclusions resulting from regional reviews affects fish and wildlife management decisions. Objective 3 specifically deals with reviews that arise outside the CBFWA/NPPC work plan process (e.g. the Artificial Production Review, the ISAB Review of Corps Capital Projects, ISRP evaluation of Corps Reimbursable program). Under this objective, the CBFWA

members produce a series of reports and/or comment letters that explain how the results of the reviews translate into real-time mitigation/management actions.

Task 3a. Conduct, or participate in and/or contribute to the review. This task covers the mechanics of participating in the review process. The amount and type of participation by the managers and staff depends on the type and scope of the review -- some of these reviews are open “regional” efforts and some are conducted “in-house”. Nonetheless, the managers will: 1) review and comment on plans or scopes of work; 2) produce and provide data and other information needed for the review; and, 3) produce or peer-review products of the review, including information summaries, analyses, interpretations of results, and conclusions.

Task 3b. Define and evaluate implications of the conclusions on fish/wildlife management. In this task the managers describe how the conclusions of the review relate to regional policies and how they effect the fish and wildlife program on the ground.

OBJECTIVE 4. Provide a draft Regional Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plan (RMEP) to NPPC and BPA. While Objectives 1, 2 and 3 collectively assemble the information necessary to answer the question, “Where do we want to go?”, the product of Objective 4 will provide the framework for asking and answering the questions that often trigger the reviews that arise under Objectives 2 and 3. As a first step, the managers will work through the caucuses and with BPA and NPPC to prepare a plan that identifies key performance measures and information needs and data gaps, and aligns ongoing and new projects with the identified needs. The product should be a comprehensive, regionally approved RMEP that fills the critical data gaps, generates standardized comparable data, and clearly answers the question, “How we will know when we get there?” (Implementing the evaluation phase of the plan is covered under Objective 6.) Creating this plan is an iterative process, with the first draft produced in FY 2000 and annual updates subsequently.

Task 4a. Identify and assign priorities to information needs based on goals, objectives and strategies in the MYP (research). The basis of an effective Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (RMEP) is a clear statement of the goals, objectives and strategies of the overall program combined with a solid understanding of what pieces of information are critical to its success. Work under this task covers the “research” part of the RMEP and describes the pieces of information needed to understand the functional relationships between fish and wildlife and their environments. Using a watershed approach, the managers and staff will compare “what they know” with “what they need to know” to effectively implement the FWP. The product will be a clear statement of the goals/objectives and strategies that drive the RMEP followed by a prioritized list of research needs for each subbasin.

Task 4b. Identify key performance measures of success based on goals, objectives and strategies in the MYP (monitoring). This task provides the bridge between research and program/project evaluation. The managers use the knowledge gained in Task 4a to identify specific monitoring activities that most directly demonstrate the inter-relationships within species and among species and their habitats. Working through the caucuses, using a watershed approach, the managers and staff will develop a list of biological and physical parameters that, if monitored through over time, will most effectively illustrate species responses to mitigation actions. This standardized regional list of key monitoring activities and associated performance measures is the foundation of the evaluation element of the plan described in this objective and the evaluation report described in Objective 6.

Task 4c. Identify ongoing projects that address RM&E needs. Here the managers and CBFWA staff compare the master lists developed in Tasks 4a and 4b to the research and monitoring components of the projects in the annual implementation work plan. The product is a prioritized list of ongoing projects that clearly explains 1) how the projects resolve critical uncertainties (research needs) and/or 2) which parameters are being monitored and how the resulting data support the program-wide and project level evaluation process (Objective 6).

Task 4d. Identify unmet research and monitoring needs. While Task 4c covers ongoing work, Task 4d describes what needs to be added to the core program in the future. Under this task, the managers and CBFWA staff produce a prioritized list of projects or activities that will collectively provide the supporting data for a comprehensive regional RMEP.

Task 4e. Complete draft RMEP, submit for peer/public review. In Task 4e, the managers and CBFWA staff merge the products of Tasks 4a-d into a draft RM&E plan which clearly shows how individual projects and suites of projects resolve critical uncertainties and generate standardized data that supports a rigorous evaluation of all levels of the program. When complete, the managers and CBFWA staff will release the draft plan to the NPPC for peer and public review. The end result of the review process will be regional agreement on the highest priority critical uncertainties, standard protocols for collecting monitoring data and standard methods for evaluating project/program accomplishments.

OBJECTIVE 5. Estimate the cost of fish/wildlife protection, mitigation and enhancement (PM&E). Provide budget allocation recommendations to NPPC/BPA.

The purpose of this objective is to accomplish the budget planning necessary to fund the Fish and Wildlife Program. Task 5a will develop budget projections. In Task 5b the managers and CBFWA staff will take part in the regional discussion of the future budget needs. The managers, with staff assistance, will work with BPA to carry out the activities called for under the Annex to the BPA Fish and Wildlife Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

Task 5a. Refine estimates of out-year costs for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation, and enhancement.

Activities to accomplish this task include: 1) refine out-year costs and performance periods for ongoing projects; 2) estimate proposed out-year costs for deferred projects in the Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan; and, 3) estimate out-year costs associated with anticipated new activities (e.g. research, monitoring and evaluation needs).

Task 5b. Review and comment on analyses by BPA and others being proposed as a basis for their financial obligations for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation, and enhancement.

While the managers will develop estimates of future budget needs in Task 5a, Task 5b allows the managers to participate in the regional discussion of BPA and other future fish and wildlife budgets. Under this task the managers and CBFWA staff will review alternative budget estimates relative to that developed in Task 5a, compile and present comments, and respond to comments on the managers' budget estimates.

Task 5c. Highlight outstanding needs for the federal government to meet their fish and wildlife obligations (e.g. conditions in MOA annex). The BPA Budget MOA defines several important accountability conditions in the Annex. Additional effort must be undertaken to implement these conditions.

OBJECTIVE 6. Provide to NPPC and BPA a report on how fish and wildlife populations have responded to the FWP and an assessment of how the FWP could be modified to meet the goals/objectives of the MYP. Under this objective, the managers prepare the following three reports: 1) *Program Accomplishments Annual Report (PAAR)* which describes the biological effectiveness of the projects recommended for implementation through the DAIWP; 2) *Columbia Basin Status Report (CBSR)* which compiles information about fish and wildlife populations addressed under the FWP and other programs; and 3) *Recommended Additions to the Program (RAP)* which describes how the FWP could be modified to be consistent with the MYP.

Task 6a. Conduct periodic evaluations of projects/programs to assess progress toward stated goals and objectives and reaffirm consistency with MYP. To prepare the Program Accomplishments Annual Report (PAAR), the managers and CBFWA staff will 1) establish protocols for technical and management peer review of reports of accomplishments and 2) conduct peer reviews (including annual project review symposium sponsored by CBFWA). Submitted to NPPC in October of each year, this report will clearly 1) show project- and program- level progress toward the goals outlined in the FWP and the MYP, and 2) explain what has worked and what has not. Because the projects “renew” (and complete their annual reports) at different times during the fiscal year, the PAAR will include the project accomplishments described in the most recent project annual reports.

Task 6b. Develop a status report on fish and wildlife in the Columbia Basin. This task generates the *Columbia Basin Status Report (CBSR)* which synthesizes information about fish and wildlife populations addressed under the FWP and under other programs. The managers and staff will develop this report in three steps. First, they will glean population information from projects in the Columbia Basin that are implemented outside the FWP. Next they will assemble information about fish/wildlife populations from reviews of projects and programs implemented within the FWP (Objectives 1, 2, 3 and Objective 6 - Task a). Some of this information will be gathered when the DAIWP and PAAR are prepared but since the DAIWP includes several ongoing stock status assessments, the data will not be available for several years. Last, the managers and CBFWA staff will synthesize information into an assessment of the status of fish and wildlife in the Columbia Basin.

Task 6c. Develop an assessment of how the FWP could be modified to meet goals and objectives of the MYP. The managers and CBFWA staff use the DAIWP (Objective 1), the program/project reviews (Objectives 2 and 3), the RMEP (Objective 4) and the PAAR (Objective 6 - Task a) to prepare a report titled *Recommended Additions to the Program (RAP)*. The RAP assesses how well the FWP is aligned with the MYP and has three distinct purposes: 1) to compare goals, objectives and strategies in MYP to the goals, objectives and measures in the FWP and to identify the differences; 2) to assess whether the MYP strategies not included in the FWP as measures will limit the success of efforts to protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife populations; and, 3) to describe how measures in the FWP may be modified or expanded to include MYP strategies necessary to protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife populations.

f. Methods

CBFWA uses two main strategies – coordination and information management - to produce the products generated in the six objectives of this proposal. The coordination element is described below and information management is described under Section 10 Information/technology transfer.

The members of CBFWA function in a hierarchical system having three main levels: caucuses and ad hoc committees, Members Steering Group (MSG), and Members. At the working level, CBFWA uses the Anadromous Fish, Resident Fish and Wildlife caucuses to develop draft policies, evaluate proposals/projects, prepare draft reports, etc. specific to their functional area. The caucuses, consisting of senior program managers from each member organization, meet once per month (or as needed) in person

and/or via teleconference. Each caucus (and MSG) has a CBFWA staff coordinator/technical analyst (and associated administrative support) who is responsible for facilitating all activities and ensuring that work products are completed on time and within budget. When completed, the caucuses forward draft products to the MSG for consideration. The caucuses (as well as MSG and the Members) operate by consensus where only products or policies supported by all 19 members go forward.

The MSG provides the link between the caucuses and the Members. At monthly meetings, representatives of the Members (senior policy staff) review draft policies, products and budgets and either refer the issue back to the caucuses for further discussion or recommend approval by the full membership.

At the highest level, the Members (Directors/Chairs of member organizations) meet as needed (but not less than quarterly) to develop policies and approve work products. When meetings are not timely, the Members approve products (letters, comments, reports, and budgets) through the Consent Mail process in which they have five days to respond. After the Members approve policies and products, they (or designated CBFWA staff) present (orally and in writing) them to the NPPC or other appropriate regional entities for consideration.

In addition to the caucuses, CBFWA facilitates several other technical work groups. The Watershed Technical Work Group (established in 1997) consists of regional experts in hydrology, geomorphology, fisheries and wildlife biology, soil and water resources and wetlands. This team evaluates all watershed-related proposals submitted during the annual project solicitation and prepares a report for general distribution outlining their recommendations and concerns. The Non-Watershed Technical Work Group evaluates the technical merits of non-watershed-related anadromous fish proposals and submits their findings to the Anadromous Fish Caucus. The Fish Passage Advisory Committee (FPAC), a standing committee of CBFWA working closely with the Fish Passage Center, reviews the technical aspects of mainstem proposals.

To keep the regional machine running, CBFWA staff provides a variety of critical but invisible services such as meeting coordination and logistics, travel arrangements and expense account processing, document production, record keeping, note taking, facilitation, etc.

CBFWA managers and staff work also closely with the BPA, NPPC, PPC, and other stakeholders in a number of different settings. For example, monthly Coordination Meetings are a collaborative forum where the four parties define significant policy questions and discuss concerns arising from program implementation. CBFWA members and staff regularly attend the Quarterly Review where BPA presents the most current information about program and project budgets on a quarterly basis.

g. Facilities and equipment

The CBFWA is centrally located in downtown Portland. Meeting facilities include two conference rooms with teleconferencing equipment, onsite parking, and reception/clerical services. Office equipment includes a high speed copier/scanner, networked computers with up-to-date software, broadcast faxing, email, telephone system, Xerox copier, and a web page with current calendar and directory information. CBFWA also maintains a comprehensive filing system, archives and a library. In addition, a fully equipped office is available for manager or meeting participant use.

h. Budget

From 1987 to 1991 the CBFWA operated under a series of individual contracts with BPA and NPPC in carrying out the Fish and Wildlife Program. At that time, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) contracted with BPA on behalf of CBFWA. These contracts included Integrated System

Planning (NWPPC), Support Technical Work Group (BPA), Implementation Planning Process (BPA), Scientific Review Group (BPA), and Scoping Groups (BPA). The FY 92 Coordination Grant was awarded to bring these multiple contracts into a single funding source. The FY 93 Coordination Grant included the funding for the Implementation Planning Process (IPP) and the activities changed from product deliverables to service functions. The specific budget amounts for these years may be available from BPA or PSMFC.

FY 95 was the first year that the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation (CBFWF), the legal entity supporting the CBFWA, contracted with BPA on behalf of CBFWA. Fish Screening Oversight Committee (FSOC), and Integrated Hatchery Operations Team (IHOT) were included in the CBFWA Coordination Project contract. In FY 96 the CBFWA contract was renamed, "Preparation of the Annual Implementation Work Plan (AIWP)" and FSOC and IHOT were separate contracts. In FY 97 a travel budget for CBFWA members to participate in the contract objectives and funding for the Multi-Year Implementation Plan (MYIP) was included in the AIWP contract. FSOC and funding for Artificial Production Coordination Assistance were combined with the AIWP which still included the MYIP funding in FY 98. FY 99 AIWP includes funding for "Fish and Wildlife Managers to Provide Information, Analyses, and Recommendations Necessary to Implement Measures Under the Northwest Power Act and Endangered Species Act to Protect, Mitigate and Enhance, Fish and Wildlife in the Columbia Basin" in an attempt to make funding for the managers' regional coordination activities explicit. This increased the CBFWA budget by \$500,000 over the FY 1998 budget.

Budget History

1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
1,098,875	720,000	1,058,645	1,202,096	1,769,506

The proposed FY 2000 budget for CBFWA includes funds for the managers' travel and regional coordination. The Table 1 below summarizes the division of responsibilities between the managers and the CBFWA staff listed by objective. BPA is donating one FTE of management staff to assist the managers' efforts. The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are contributing their staff time to the regional efforts in this proposal.

Table 1. CBFWA Manager and Staff FTE Estimates By Objective.

Objectives	Member	CBFWA	Total
1. Provide to NWPPC and BPA draft FY2000 AIWP	7.93	6.67	14.60
2. Recommend to NWPPC and BPA changes and additions to FY99 AIWP necessary for implementation	0.41	0.45	0.86
3. Provide assessments of how regional reviews affect fish and wildlife management decisions to the NWPPC and BPA	1.21	0.59	1.80
4. Provide a draft Regional Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	0.93	0.58	1.51
5. Provide to NWPPC and BPA a budget estimate needed for F&W protection, mitigation and enhancement and recommend best allocation for those funds	0.34	0.28	0.62
6. Report on how fish and wildlife populations have responded to implementation activities	0.84	0.91	1.75
BPA Contributed Management Staff		1.00	1.00
KTOI, IDFG, USFWS, NMFS contributed	1.20		1.20
TOTAL FTE REQUIREMENT	12.87	10.48	23.35

The details of the proposed FY 2000 budget are summarized in Section 5 of the Proposal Form. Greater details on the FY 2000 budget are available from CBFWA.

Section 9. Key personnel

BRIAN JAMES ALLEE, Ph.D.

Executive Director

EDUCATION

University of Washington, Ph.D., Fisheries, 1974

University of Montana, Wildlife Science, 1965-66

University of California, B.A., Zoology, 1965

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Fisheries Society (AFS)

President, Fish Culture Section AFS 1993 - 1994

Chairman, Industry Advisory Council of the Western Regional Aquaculture Center, University of Washington

Industry Advisor, University of Washington Sea Grant Program

American Institute of Fishery Research Biologists

WORK EXPERIENCE

1996 - present **Executive Director, Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA).**

The executive Director is the Chief Administrative Officer and is responsible for carrying out the policy directives of the members. The CBFWA is an association composed of Regional Directors, State Directors and Tribal Chairmen of two federal agencies, four state agencies, and 13 Indian tribes, respectively, with fish and wildlife management responsibilities in the Columbia Basin, which encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Dr. Allee is responsible for supervising staff, preparing annual budgets and managing the fiscal affairs of the CBFWA. He is the liaison between agencies, tribes, the natural resource interest groups, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), and the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC). Annually, the BPA funds \$435 million for fish and wildlife mitigation and restoration. Dr. Allee recommends on behalf of the CBFWA members an annual work plan to the NPPC. The work plan is composed of projects to be funded within the \$127 million annual budget.

1992 – 1996 **Harza Consulting Engineers and Scientists, Bellevue, WA**

As the fisheries section manager and senior fisheries scientist, provided technical direction in the development, staffing and implementation of fisheries programs; participated in fisheries projects as project manager or as a fisheries scientist; and conducted the final review of all reports prepared by the fisheries staff.

1991 – 1992 **Clear Springs Foods – Coast Oyster Company, South Bend, WA**

As Vice President of Operations, was responsible for operating a large vertically integrated oyster and manila clam business. Operations included three processing plants, 21,000 acres of oyster and clam growing grounds in Washington and California, and a 20 billion capacity oyster larvae hatchery. Interacted extensively with county, state and federal agencies on water quality and product quality issues, and coordinated programs on research with Pacific Coast universities and agencies. Voted as President of the Pacific Coast Oyster Growers Association.

1987 – 1991 **Alaska Department of Fish and Game Division of Fisheries Rehabilitation, Enhancement and Development, AK**

As Division Director, managed a statewide public salmon enhancement program which included 38 hatcheries with a capacity of 1.4 billion eggs; genetics, limnology, pathology, and coded-wire tag

laboratories; a comprehensive regional planning section; fisheries engineering section and regional and area biologists. Worked extensively with the Alaska State Legislature, federal agencies, sport, commercial and subsistence fishermen, Alaskan Native Corporations and city and borough representatives to ensure that statewide enhancement needs were met. Appointed by the Governor to the Alaska Science and Engineering Commission and the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation.

1982 – 1987 Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation, AK

Served as President and directed a major salmon enhancement program which included two world-class hatcheries, multiple remote egg-take operations, and limnology and lake stocking research and development projects.

JANICE M. ECKMAN

Assistant Director

WORK EXPERIENCE

Possesses over 25 years in administrative and managerial experience. Training includes formal education in business, ongoing education and training through management and human resource classes and seminars, and on-the-job training classes offered.

Present Employment - Assistant Director for Administration, CBFWA, and Vice President, Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Foundation (CBFWF).

Works in concert with the Executive Director to establish and implement the management objectives, priorities and deadlines to accomplish the objectives of the Members as described in the CBFWA Work Plan. Serves as the Executive Director's representative at professional meetings and contract negotiations as directed. Oversees the activities and work flow of the administrative support staff to ensure quality and timely work products. Performs all duties associated with personnel administration and management, i.e., performance evaluations, position reviews, work plans, development and preparation of performance descriptions and performance reviews for all CBFWA support staff. Analyzes office operations and procedures for uniformity and efficiency. Maintains office operating standards and polices. Oversees comprehensive administration of group benefit policies and reporting requirements. Administers the fiscal staff and approves funding requests, contract proposals, budgets, and statements of work to assure consistency of project requirements. Responsible for assurance that the Foundation's legal requirements are met in fiscal operations, personnel, employment practices, and general liability coverages.

1996 – 1996 Acting Executive Director, CBFWA

- Coordinates agendas for all meetings.
- Maintains a close liaison with the CBFWA Members through frequent individual visits, phone conferencing and periodic meetings in conjunction with the NPPC meetings, and maintains a liaison between the Members and the natural resource interest groups.
- Assures the CBFWA staff represents all Members equally, performing duties with competence and initiative, but within the limits prescribed by the Authority's positions and charter.
- Supervises CBFWA staff and the fiscal affairs of the CBFWA, including preparing annual budgets in consultation with the Fiscal/Contract Administrator of the CBFWF, and supervises through the Assistant Director(s) the operations and administration of CBFWF contracts.
- Carries out all policy decisions of the CBFWA Members as they related to the Program. Responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the policy decisions developed directly between BPA, CBFWA and NPPC.
- Performs other duties as directed by the CBFWA Chairperson.

6/95 – 2/96 Assistant Director for Administration, CBFWA

(See above, Present Employment.)

DIANA M. GRITTEN MacDONALD

Resident Fish Technical Analyst

Education

Master of Science, Wildlife Biology. Washington State University, 1978

Bachelor of Science, Wildlife Biology. Washington State University, 1976

Work Experience

1997-present **Resident Fish Technical Analyst Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA)**

Provide the technical analysis and regional coordination (between CBFWA, Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC)) necessary to plan and implement the resident fish portion of the NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program. Coordinate and facilitate the CBFWA Resident Fish Caucus, create agendas, facilitate decision-making processes, invite technical speakers, prepare meeting packets and summaries, keep record of decisions and actions. Coordinate the \$15 million annual budget. Write technical comments and information papers pertaining to fish and wildlife mitigation in the Columbia Basin. Facilitate the CBFWA Watershed Technical Workgroup. Prepare recommendations on over 135 watershed projects.

1996 **Consultant**

Provided expert technical and policy-level advice to the electric utilities on the implementation of the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. Generated ideas, identified big-picture issues and trends, analyzed details, wrote and edited technical comments. Organized regional utility-community environmental partnership program where local publicly-owned electric utilities actively support local watershed projects. Monitored Fish Passage Advisory Committee meetings for the Montana office of the Northwest Power Planning Council.

1995**Natural Resource Coordinator, Senior Wildlife and Fish Biologist, Public Power Council (PPC), Portland, Oregon**

Alerted PPC member utilities to significant issues and actions relating to the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, the Bonneville Power Administration and other federal and state agencies and Indian Tribes. Provided technical and policy-level information and facilitated utility action. Coordinated PPC's Fish and Wildlife Task Force and System Reliability Committee. Created agendas, prepared meeting packets and summaries. Generated and promoted electric utility interest in community environmental partnerships. Coordinated local utility participation in fish and wildlife habitat improvement projects. Organized PPC's project selection process. Delivered presentations to the Northwest Public Power Association and the Idaho Cooperative Utility Association. Wrote a variety of technical and non-technical reports including press releases, speeches, comments on the Council's Resident Fish and Wildlife Program, and monthly Fish and Wildlife Updates for PPC's Executive Committee. Created information packets about PPC's habitat projects, Lake Pend Oreille kokanee, and the National Marine Fisheries Service Reservoir Operating Committee.

1990 – 1995 **Senior Wildlife and Fish Biologist, Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee (PNUCC)**

Coordinated the PNUCC Fish and Wildlife Committee, created agendas, led discussions, invited technical speakers, prepared meeting packets and summaries, kept record of decisions and actions. Coordinated a wide variety of technical and policy-level projects involving PNUCC staff, utility biologists, and consultants. Worked with federal, state and tribal representatives on a variety of committees including the Lake Pend Oreille Kokanee Steering Committee, Kootenai River White Sturgeon Steering Committee, BPA Policy Review Group, Wildlife Scoping Group, Wildlife Advisory Committee, Mainstem Scoping Group, Montana Wildlife Trust Advisory Committee, Dworshak Mitigation Advisory Committee. Organized, summarized, analyzed and presented *published* technical and policy reports pertaining to wildlife, resident, fish and anadromous fish in the Columbia Basin to facilitate decisions by utility

managers and industry leaders. *Wrote* and presented a variety of policy and technical reports explaining the utility position on wildlife, resident fish, and anadromous fish issues in the Columbia Basin. Organized and coordinated several bridge-building workshops for utilities, consultants, environmental groups and sport fishing interests. Served as a data and information source on regional technical and policy-level resident fish, wildlife and anadromous fish issues. Provided the utility industry with annual updates on Bonneville Power Administration's fish and wildlife expenses. Testified before the Northwest Power Planning Council on technical resident fish and wildlife issues.

THOMAS G. GIESE

Funding Coordinator

EDUCATION

B.A. in Chemistry, Reed College

M.A. in Chemistry, University of Oregon

M.A. in Environmental Biology, University of Colorado

WORK EXPERIENCE

Funding Coordinator, Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (1993-present).

Responsible for coordinating and facilitating the development of an annual work plan by the CBFWA members to implement the Fish and Wildlife Program. This requires continuous liaison with the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes, the Bonneville Power Administration and Northwest Power Planning Council. Serve as the staff liaison to the Independent Scientific Group (formerly Scientific Review Group). Developed the CBFWA work statements, budgets, and negotiable contracts. Supervises one staff position.

Fish and Wildlife Manager, Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee (1990-1993).

In addition to the duties listed below, supervised three staff, managed consultant contracts, and did related work planning, scheduling and budgeting.

Senior Planner, Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee (1983-1990).

Formulated and presented policy on a wide range of issues for a regional electric utility trade organization. These issues include: fish and wildlife, hazardous waste, and alternative electric power generation. Managed projects in technically complex and politically sensitive areas, such as declining salmon runs on the Columbia River and PCB contamination from utility equipment. Organized volunteer committees, assisted in member relations and represented PNUCC before political and regulatory bodies, such as the Northwest Power Planning Council and Bonneville Power Administration.

Environmental Specialist, Bonneville Power Administration (1981-1983).

Wrote agency policies and procedures to instruct employees on complying with the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Reviewed BPA's Environmental Impact Statements to assure the agency's compliance with state and federal environmental laws.

Consulting Environmental Scientist (1978-1981). Worked and subcontracted on a variety of major energy and resource development projects. Responsible for business development, study design, staff supervision, budgeting and quality assurance. Projects included biological assessments, water chemistry studies, and hydrologic impacts for the Northern Tier Pipeline EIS, Amax molybdenum mine studies, EIS for Columbia River Interstate highway bridge, 500kV transmission line in southern Oregon, and studies of forest land management.

Staff Scientist, Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group (1976-1978).

Responsible for organizing, directing and presenting the results of environmental and health care research for a statewide public policy research group. In addition to research and technical

studies, the job involved numerous press conferences, delivering speeches, moderating public meetings and working with volunteers.

FRANKLIN R. YOUNG

Resource Coordinator

EDUCATION

1962 – 1964: M.S. Fisheries Science, Oregon State University.
1958 – 1962: B.S. Wildlife Science, Oregon State University

WORK EXPERIENCE

1993 – present: Resource Coordinator, Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority, Portland, Oregon.

1964 – 1993: Fisheries Biologist, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

PUBLICATION

Ward, David L., Raymond R. Boyce, Franklin R. Young, and Fredrick E. Olney. A Review and Assessment of Transportation Studies for Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Snake River. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 17:652-662. 1997

Section 10. Information/technology transfer

The phrase “eyes and ears of the fish and wildlife managers” best describes CBFWA staff’s role in information management. The staff operates an effective and efficient machine that distributes (fax, email, U.S. mail) information/ draft work products originating within the membership and information generated outside the membership. Over 100 people routinely receive internal information and working drafts. The global distribution list includes over 300 people representing all of the major stakeholder groups. To keep track of the large volume of incoming and outgoing information, CBFWA uses a detailed record keeping system that includes date of distribution (and/or receipt) and verification that all of the people on the distribution list actually received the information. As part of the contract, CBFWA provides BPA with a Monthly Report listing of all of the documents produced or distributed.

CBFWA’s web site at www.cbfwf.org describes CBFWA and the Foundation, displays the Fish and Wildlife Calendar, Directory and selected publications, and provides direct links to other important sites. The calendar, updated daily and distributed to over 500 people via fax/email is the life-line that keeps everyone current on meetings and regional events. The Directory is also updated daily and lists the names, addresses and phone numbers for over 1,600 people involving 410 organizations.

Once per year, CBFWA staff organize and facilitate a public project review symposium where the sponsors of ongoing projects present the results of their projects and explain how and where they fit into the larger mitigation picture. In 1997, the symposium tried to cover all of the projects in the FWP. In 1998, it focused on the projects in the Clearwater Subbasin. The 1999 symposium (scheduled for February) will highlight “watershed projects.” The focus of the FY 2000 symposium has not been defined yet. These symposia provide a good overview of the implementation of parts of the FWP.

CBFWA staff (in close cooperation with BPA, NPPC and ISRP) also creates the project proposal form used in the annual project solicitation and maintains the central Access database for all of the proposals received. This database base is used by CBFWA, NPPC and ISRP to generate their respective annual project evaluation reports. The database and ultimately the DAIWP are transferred to StreamNet’s web site and are used by a wide variety of parties needing information about the project evaluation process and about specific projects and costs.

Congratulations!