

- determine and analyze the probable effects of drawdown limits on the power system and flood control.

Relevant Parties

2.2E.5 Fund, as a high priority, all measures in the program that address reservoir operations, such as development of biological rule curves and determination of operational mitigation actions. These measures should be completed by December 31, 1996.

2.2E.6 In determining whether to establish biologically based constraints on hydroproject operations, and in determining whether to adopt any proposed project-specific constraints, the Council will review proposals and documentation against the following criteria:

- Protection and rebuilding of weak native fish stocks and those stocks that are resident fish substitutions under this program.
- Protection of tribal rights to fish at usual and accustomed fishing places and ceded areas.
- Integration with power and flood control rule curves to share the consequences of low water years.
- Availability of satisfactory peer-reviewed science substantiating the linkages

between such project constraints and protection of the stocks at risk.

- Effects elsewhere in the Columbia River system, including but not limited to effects on other biological species, on hydropower and on other uses of the river.

Fishery Managers

2.2E.7 Address biological trade-offs between resident fish and wildlife species affected by upriver reservoir releases and anadromous species affected by flow augmentation. Report to the Council in April 1995.

2.2F Budget Planning Target for Resident Fish and Wildlife

Funding for resident fish and wildlife mitigation, having proceeded at low levels in the past, will be accorded a higher percentage of budget outlay in the future.

Council and Bonneville

2.2F.1 The resident fish section of the program contains specific projects that should be implemented. These projects should be completed in rank order over the next eight years as outlined in the measures-- by the end of the year 2003. Each year, the Council will review the annual implementation plan and work with Bonneville in its budget planning

process to ensure implementation of
the Council's program.

Beginning in Fiscal Year 1996, Bonneville in its fish and wildlife project budget will allocate not less than 15 percent to resident fish and not less than 15 percent to wildlife. These figures are contingent upon enough approved Council projects to utilize the described budget allocation. The Council will review this budget allocation in 1996, after the resident fish loss assessments are completed.

In setting these funding levels for resident fish and wildlife, the Council does not encourage selective or slowed implementation of anadromous fish measures, nor does it expect unilateral decisions to amend or materially alter such measures. Full and efficient program implementation remains critical if the program is to do more than react to the Endangered Species Act.

2.2G Funding for Actions that Address Transboundary Species

In general, where mitigation measures are designed to benefit U.S. and Canadian populations, U.S. ratepayer funding should be in proportion to U.S. benefits.

Relevant Parties

2.2G.1 The Council calls for the development, funding and implementation of agreements between the fish and wildlife managers on both sides of the U.S./Canada border that recognize the mutual benefit of protection, mitigation and enhancement for transboundary species. Bonneville and the U.S.

fish and wildlife managers should negotiate with Canadian entities through the appropriate channels to determine the U.S. share of funding on a per-project basis. Protection, mitigation and enhancement of transboundary stocks includes, but is not limited to, agreements about the management of water quantity and quality, such as reservoir operations, storage activities, instream flows and pollution control/abatement.

2.2H The Need to Learn from Implementation

In forging a program to address the needs of fish and wildlife in the Columbia Basin, the region faces the problem of resolving these facts: 1) prompt action must be taken to arrest the declines in many populations; and 2) the scientific basis for many actions is limited and often conflicting. This conflict is recognized in the Power Act. Congress directed the Council to use the best *available* scientific information and not to await scientific certainty prior to acting.

Reflecting this charge, the Council has taken, and will continue to take, a number of significant actions on the basis of the available, and often limited, scientific information. The Council continues to recognize the need for prompt action despite scientific uncertainty. However, the region has made unsatisfactory progress on coupling these actions with evaluation to allow us to learn from their implementation. The Council emphasizes the need to improve the scientific basis for the program and to *learn* from the implementation of the program. This is reflected in the incorporation of the

principle of adaptive management as a
part of the 1987 Fish and Wildlife

Program. The Council continues to find that this technique is the only rational way to deal with the conflict described above. Further, the Council expects that monitoring, evaluation and learning protocols will be in place and must be an integral part of planned actions about which there is significant scientific uncertainty.

2.2I Rulemakings

Council

- 2.2I.1 Henceforth, the Council rulemakings will facilitate a system-wide approach that will assure that decisions made will take into account potential conflicts between measures.

W:\95AMEND\DRFTRULE\S02-CLN.927