

Judi Danielson
Chair
Idaho

Jim Kempton
Idaho

Frank L. Cassidy Jr.
"Larry"
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington



Melinda S. Eden
Vice-Chair
Oregon

Gene Derfler
Oregon

Bruce A. Measure
Montana

Rhonda Whiting
Montana

January 11, 2005

TO: Council Members

FROM: Patty O'Toole
Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation Manager

SUBJECT: Fiscal year 2006 project review process

PROPOSED ACTION: Discuss and recommend fiscal year 2006 Fish and Wildlife work plan and budget development process.

SIGNIFICANCE: A workplan and budget must be prepared by staff and recommended by the Council prior to the start of FY 2006. This plan will recommend specific projects for funding by Bonneville and their associated recommended budgets. Staff is targeting the July Council meeting for Council consideration of the recommendations, and therefore, must begin work immediately. The schedule described below will guide Council, Bonneville and CBFWA staff to ensure recommendations are ready for Council consideration by July.

BUDGETARY/ECONOMIC IMPACTS: Development of the workplan and budget for FY 2006 will occur between January and August 2005. Costs for producing the workplan include staff time for Council, Bonneville and CBFWA staffs, and any additional costs associated with the alternative chosen to perform project reviews.

BACKGROUND:

Recommendations for all projects from the provincial reviews, with the exception of mainstem and systemwide projects will expire at the end of FY 2005. A provincial review will be performed in FY 2006 and provide a set of recommendations for funding for FY 2007. Interim recommendations need to be prepared to guide project funding for FY 2006. In prior discussions with the Fish and Wildlife committee, we have identified two tasks to be achieved in preparation of a work plan and budget for FY 2006.

First, last year the Budget Oversight Group (BOG) identified a group of projects that warrant an in-depth review of accomplishments, deliverables or scope. The group was unable to perform such review last year due to lack of time and resources but a review could be performed in

preparation for FY 2006. Some research, demonstration and assessments projects should be nearing completion, and may be ready to close.

Second, with the adoption of subbasin plans, a comparison of existing project objectives and priorities in the subbasin plans could be performed. For subbasins that do not yet have an adopted plan, we would propose to use the draft plan as it stands at the time of the review. We expect those plans, though not yet adopted, still offer useful information.

ANALYSIS: Staff proposes the following list of tasks and schedule to develop a workplan and budget for FY 2006.

<u>Tasks:</u>	<u>Time frame:</u>
1. Council adopts a process and schedule for workplan and budget development:	1/15/05
2. Review of existing projects and draft workplan and budget:	1/15/05-3/1/05
Includes:	
a. Subbasin plan consistency/priority review.	
b. Accomplishments/deliverable/scope review.	
3. Public comment begins:	3/15/05
4. Close comment:	4/15/05
5. Review comments and revise workplan, budget	5/15/05
6. Present and review workplan/ budget with F&W committee	6/15/05
7. Present and review workplan/budget with Council (recommendations)	7/15/05

Staff would provide a recommendation for consideration by the Council at the July Council meeting. Once approved by the Council, the recommendations would be sent to Bonneville with enough time for implementation at the start of FY 2006.

ALTERNATIVES:

There are a few alternatives to consider to complete the review of existing F&W work for accomplishments/scope and the review of existing project work against the subbasin plans.

Accomplishments/project scope review:

One alternative would be for the Budget Oversight Group (BOG) to be authorized to perform this reviews, utilizing assistance from Bonneville project managers. This could be accomplished in the timeframe described above, but would require focused attention from Council, Bonneville and CBFWA staff. Costs associated with this alternative would be primarily associated with staff time of the various members of the BOG.

Another alternative would be to task the one or more of the reviews to an outside entity (contract). One advantage to performing the review this way would be to free up staff to work on other issues such as the organization of the next round of provincial reviews, province planning or “roll up” and other tasks. The costs of this alternative, has not been estimated at this time.

Subbasin Plan / existing work review

An alternative to complete the review of existing projects against subbasin plans would be for central and state Council staff perform the review with the assistance of “level 2” state planning coordinators.

Another alternative would be to task this review to an outside entity (contract). One advantage to performing the review this way would be to free up staff to work on other issues such as the organization of the next round of provincial reviews, province planning or “roll up” and other tasks. The costs of this alternative, has not been estimated at this time.

RECCOMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the BOG be authorized to perform a review of the accomplishments of projects, utilizing information gathered during the FY 2005 work plan development. There are some staff members that believe that BOG may not be capable of performing this review for a number of reasons. We learned during prior project reviews that it is necessary to have participation from Bonneville project managers in order to have the detailed budget and contracting information that is necessary to understand how projects are performing and whether they have accomplished their objectives. Project managers from Bonneville may not be available within the timeframe we need in order to deliver draft recommendations to the Council. In addition, policy issues often arise during BOG project review discussions that prevent the group from reaching a recommendation. The current focus of the work of the BOG is to track budgets and implementation issues and addition direction from the Council and Bonneville may be necessary to empower the group to perform a review of project accomplishments.

Staff recommends that the review of existing fish and wildlife projects against the priorities of the subbasin plans be performed by Council staff (central and state), with assistance from the “level 2” subbasin planning coordinators. We recognize, however, that this will be a significant undertaking and would reduce the time staff would have available to work on other important program issues, such as provincial review organization and province planning.

Staff will continue to develop these and possibly other alternatives and provide a full discussion at the January Council meeting.