

AGENDA
Public Review Meeting: BPA Fish and Wildlife Costs
Proposal for 2007 Power Rate Case
February 4, 2005
Airport Sheraton, Portland, Oregon
1 pm – 4:15 pm
Phone Bridge: 503/230-5566, pass code 5487#

1 pm – 2:30 pm Follow-up to January 28, 2005, Public Review Meeting

Introduction	10 minutes
Lower Snake River Compensation Program/Hatchery Reform	10 minutes
Risk Mitigation	5 minutes
CRFM	5 minutes
O&M/Fish Passage Facilities/Capital Investments	1 hour

2:30 pm – 4:05 pm Open Discussion of Questions Submitted by BPA

Operations & Maintenance/Fish Passage Facilities

We've described the process for determining fish O&M priorities to you.

- Are there other methods or criteria the region should be considering to help us in this process?
- Are there alternative approaches that should be considered to promote cost effective O&M activities?

We've described the process for determining CRFM priorities to you.

- Are there other methods or criteria the region should be considering to help us in this process?
- Are there alternative approaches that should be considered to promote cost effective CRFM activities?

Hatchery Issues

- How should the region approach the funding of future costs associated with implementing hatchery reform recommendations identified through hatchery genetic management plans or the conclusions of the Council's artificial production review and evaluation?
- How do we shape and pace the costs of implementing change? (This is relevant to the region's entire hatchery infrastructure)

Research, Monitoring and Evaluation

Currently, RM&E is funded and managed under the Integrated Program, the Corps of Engineers, CRFM Program and through the NOAA Fisheries Science Center. About \$40M of the Integrated Program expense budget for 2005 is dedicated to RM&E.

- How should BPA and the Council approve RM&E in the future to make it more strategic, efficient and focused on providing improved information in fish and wildlife management issues that regional policy makers are grappling with?
- Likewise, how would it apply to the broader combination of CRFM, NOAA-F and the Integrated Program?

Cost Sharing

BPA believes cost sharing is particularly appropriate in cases where specific responsibilities are not clear or where these are shared among parties.

- How might BPA structure a cost-sharing policy to ensure it is not missing opportunities to undertake important or priority mitigation that meets common goals of each?
- Further, what structure would facilitate increased partnering among parties with funds that may be available but are underutilized?

Capitalization

- Given the accounting requirements reflected in BPA's policy and how they constrain our access to capital funds, what structure for planning would you suggest to enable those priority investments (e.g., land acquisition, conservation easements) that do not meet the capitalization policy?

Allocation of Effort (Discussion of this topic will occur at the March Public Review Meeting)

There are three issues associated with mitigation: pace, prioritization, and mitigation responsibility. It's important to determine appropriate funding levels for the MOU and the next rate period, taking into account: the priority of actions, geographically, by recovery strategy, and by species. BPA will be setting program levels a year ahead of when a roll up of subbasin planning may be completed.

- How should these pace, prioritization, and mitigation responsibility issues be addressed in the near term in developing the Integrated Program funding level for the next rate period?

Wrap Up

10 minutes