

# FY 2004 – 2007 F&W Program Implementation Strategy

## FY 2005

### Program Focus:

Completing work on existing Council recommendations

Elements: As recommendations expire, consider: 1) renew work and budget for “core” program work, 2) complete other approved and recommended in the province reviews, 3) retire project where recommendations have expired, and work is not “core” program work or where continuing work does is not logical .

Subbasin plans adopted into F&W Program January 2005.

## FY 2006

### Program Focus:

Part I of subbasin plan implementation

Elements:  
Initiate consistency review of ongoing/ core projects with subbasin plans (in spring 2005)

Implement on-going/core program work that is consistent with subbasin plans, develop a long-term Council recommendation

Identify and recommend funding for urgent needs/key opportunities identified in subbasin plans

Initiate consultation on funding allocation (spring 2006),

## FY 2007

### Program Focus:

Part II of subbasin plan implementation (consider staggered review)

Elements:  
Initiate project solicitation and review for new work (spring 2006)

Implement proposals for new work consistent with subbasin plans

Implement new allocation strategy

New rate case begins



## **FY 2005 work plan and budget development**

- **Work with CBFWA and Bonneville to establish process for 2005 work plan and budget development**
- **Target June/July for 2005 Council recommendation**
- **Budget target to be \$139 million for fiscal year 2005**
- **General steps: perform review of the status of projects utilizing the Council recommendations, contracts and performance. Utilize this information in the development of the fiscal year 2005 work plan and budget.**
- **Develop a new work plan and budget with CBFWA staff, Bonneville staff, Council staff and project sponsor input/review.**



JUDI DANIELSON  
CHAIR  
Idaho

Jim Kempton  
Idaho

Frank L. Cassidy Jr.  
"Larry"  
Washington

Tom Karier  
Washington

Steve Crow  
Executive Director



MELINDA S. EDEN  
VICE-CHAIR  
Oregon

Gene Derfler  
Oregon

Ed Bartlett  
Montana

John Hines  
Montana

March 1, 2004

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Fish and Wildlife Committee

**FROM:** Patty O'Toole, Doug Marker; John Ogan

**SUBJECT:** Initial Program Implementation Strategy for FY's 2005 through 2007

### Introduction

The central and state staff has been scoping potential fish and wildlife implementation strategy for Fiscal Years 2005 through 2006. Those discussions have been at the general level, and represent policy choices for the Council. We want to discuss with the Committee what we see as the general implementation policy alternatives for the next three fiscal years of Program implementation. While we do not seek formal recommendations or approvals at this meeting, we do seek to have Committee guidance on our general strategic direction and some alternatives that we have identified.

### Large-scale issues that inform program implementation strategy for the next three years.

In discussing the general strategy for program implementation over the next few years, the staff has identified four major issues that it believes must shape program implementation strategy for the next three fiscal years:

1. Continue to support work approved in Council's provincial review decisions;
2. The Council's three-year provincial review approvals began to expire in FY 03, the Council's recommendations for four more provinces expire at the end of FY 04<sup>1</sup>, and all but mainstem/systemwide conclude with Fiscal Year 2005;

---

<sup>1</sup> Five other provinces have recommendations that extend through Fiscal Year 2005, and the mainstem/systemwide group Council recommendations expire after Fiscal Year 2006.

3. Subbasin plans become available to guide program implementation beginning in Fiscal Year 2006;
4. Program funding levels and project selection procedures for Fiscal Year 2007 and beyond are not established at this time.

Recognizing the above, the staff has generally framed program implementation strategy as represented in the preceding diagram. The following is a bit more explanation of what we are attempting to depict in the diagram, as well as an identification of some alternatives within the detail that the staff have discussed without consensus resolution.

### **Fiscal Year 2005**

Implementation in Fiscal Year 2005 continues to rely on the Council's completed provincial review process. The primary objective is to ensure that the work previously approved by the Council is completed. We will need new Council recommendations for the four provinces that have their provincial review recommendations expire at the end of Fiscal Year 2004.<sup>2</sup> However, the staff believes that there have been substantial implementation delays for work that the Council approved in its provincial reviews. Therefore, guided by an implementation policy that the Council continues to support the work it approved in the provincial reviews, a primary objective for Fiscal Year 2005 would be to review the implementation status of that work approved in the provincial reviews, and provide a workplan to complete it. For those provinces with Fiscal Year 2005 as the final year with Council recommendations, we would rely upon those recommendations except where unique circumstances for a project may dictate otherwise.

In addition to reviewing and scheduling the completion of work approved in provincial reviews, the Council would renew its recommendations for foundational operation and maintenance/monitoring and evaluation type of work. The staff believes that there is a certain amount of "core" program funding needs in each province and subbasin -- operation and maintenance of artificial production facilities constructed pursuant to the program is an example -- that would need to be renewed for Fiscal Year 2005. The staff believes that this core work would be funded at a level consistent with the provincial review funding recommendation. An implementation policy recognizing that subbasin plans should be the basis for confirming all Bonneville funding work suggests that a single year of "level funding" for this core work be recommended, with a closer review taking place for Fiscal Year 2006 when subbasin plans are available.

The final element discussed here is one that the staff is especially in need of Committee direction. It deals with funds that remain available within the original province allocations after funding the work discussed above. Specifically, the staff believes that a Fiscal Year 2005 workplan that focuses on completing the three-year provincial review recommendations and renewing core projects for one year may not consume the entire province funding allocation that was established in the provincial review process. Three alternatives regarding remaining funds have been identified: (1) count remaining funds as savings needed to balance the fish and wildlife program budget for FY 2005 overall and/or use the funds for within-year needs across

---

<sup>2</sup> Blue Mountain, Columbia Plateau, Mountain Columbia, Mountain Snake.

the program as a whole; or (2) reprogram those funds within the province for additional new or expanded work in Fiscal Year 2005; or 3) count remaining funds as savings that could be applied to the available budget in FY 2006.

## **Fiscal Year 2006**

The overall strategic direction is framed in this year by the major issues identified above. Subbasin plans will be available to review proposed work and guide project funding recommendations. Subbasin plans, rather than past provincial review decisions, will be the new guides for Council recommendations (especially if we successfully use Fiscal Year 2005 to wrap up the provincial review recommended work). We will be in the final year of the rate period in which Bonneville has committed an annual average of \$139 million/year in expense and \$36 million in capital access, yet we should have completed a long-term funding agreement that will set the overall budget level for FY 2007 and beyond.

The diagram shows that the major implementations strategy for Fiscal Year 2006 is to confirm the core or foundational work across the program and to also identify and implement the most critical needs and/or key opportunities that are revealed in subbasin plans. Implementing this strategy starts, obviously with adopting subbasin plans by early calendar year 2005, and initiating a solicitation for “core work” or “urgent needs/key opportunities” in the spring of 2005.

The staff does not see how a broad, basinwide solicitation for new work based on adopted subbasin plans would be justified for Fiscal Year 2006 in light of apparent extant overall program budget limitations. We believe that we would have to have considerably more certainty about overall program budget funding for Fiscal Year 2006 than we have now to justify planning a broad request for new and additional work. On the other hand, the staff has discussed using the Fiscal Year 2006 funding recommendation process to identify the core or foundational work that is supported by adopted subbasin plans, and extending longer-term Council funding recommendations for that work -- up to five years. The staff continues to weigh the pros and cons of this. On the pro side, we have discussed that putting the core work supported by subbasin plans on a longer-term approval would be a process-reduction benefit and allow the new solicitations to focus a narrower set of project proposals. On the other hand, some believe that this would eliminate the possibility of reviewing ongoing or core work along with new proposals, and that it would have the practical effect of making partial province funding allocation decisions. The staff is particularly interested on the Committee’s initial thoughts on the concept of approving, for a longer term, core work supported in subbasin plans in FY 2006.

## **Fiscal Year 2007**

This is the first year of the new rates period. We believe that work in FY 2007 program implementation begins with reviewing the basic project review and selection model. If we want to have a staggered process like the rolling provincial review again, some form of allocation formula appears to be necessary. Alternatively, Fiscal Year 2007 could be a basinwide solicitation, with the strength of subbasin plans and project proposals tied to them driving the funding decisions with no province allocations or only loose allocation guidelines in place. We could move into a rolling province review in Fiscal Year 2008 after that. We would like to initiate some discussion of the basic project review model -- staggered by province vs. basinwide -- with the Committee.

## **Conclusion**

There is clearly much more detail to be defined regarding process and schedule for developing workplans and budgets for Fiscal Year 2005 and beyond. However, we really must determine if the implementation strategies depicted on the diagram are headed in the right direction before we do more work on developing the needed process steps and schedule. If the Committee believes that the staff proposals are aimed at implementing the correct policy choices, and is able to guide us a bit in those areas where the staff have identified alternative courses, we will work with Bonneville and CBFWA staff to work out the next level of detail and outline the process steps and schedule.