



FISH PASSAGE CENTER

1827 NE 44th Ave, Suite 240, Portland, OR 97213

Phone: (503) 230-4099 Fax: (503) 230-7559

<http://www.fpc.org/>

e-mail us at fpcestaff@fpc.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jonathan McCloud, BPA
Michele DeHart

FROM: Michele DeHart

DATE: January 27, 2005

RE: Smolt Monitoring Program 2005

This memorandum is in response to the questions we received in your email dated January 26 regarding the budget for the Smolt Monitoring Program in 2005. We understand that Calvin Sprague of the US Army Corps of Engineers contacted you to discuss the state, tribal and federal fishery agencies decision to eliminate funding of the Bonneville separator monitoring from the SMP budget in 2005.

Flat funding of mainstem projects

The elimination of separator monitoring is required by the flat funding policy implemented over the past three years by Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Council for Fish and Wildlife Program projects. These budget constraints are the only reason that separator monitoring is being eliminated from the SMP at Bonneville. The COE should fund the separator monitoring at Bonneville as they fund the separator monitoring at other projects. We recognize that it is most efficient and cost effective for SMP personnel to conduct the monitoring; we believe however that the COE should provide the required funding to PSMFC to conduct that funding. There is precedence and funding conduits that are established between the COE and PSMFC that will allow the \$60,000 required for separator monitoring to be transferred from the COE Portland District to PSMFC.

Who has done separator monitoring in the past?

Separator monitoring is a facility requirement and the established responsibility of the Corps of Engineers. Separator monitoring at Bonneville was included in the SMP in 2001 by agreement between the COE and BPA. The state, tribal and federal fishery agencies were not consulted. PSMFC employees have conducted the monitoring since 2001. Separator monitoring is a responsibility and requirement of the COE as facility operators at all of the mainstem projects

with sampling systems. Bonneville is the only project in which SMP personnel conduct the monitoring funded by BPA.

Why do you feel the SMP should not fund separator monitoring anymore and were there other reasons other than budget constraints?

Budget constraints are the only reason that the state and tribal and fishery agencies have decided that the SMP should no longer fund the separator monitoring at Bonneville. The Fish Passage Advisory Committee comprised of the state, tribal and federal fishery managers were forced to make cuts in the SMP when the project budget for 2005 was \$110,000 over the flat funding level allocated by BPA and the NPCC. The agencies and tribes recognize that separator monitoring is important, but they also recognize that it is a COE responsibility. The efficiencies and cost effectiveness of utilizing SMP to conduct this activity can be preserved by transferring \$60,000 of COE funding to PSMFC. PSMFC has funding agreements in place with the Corps of Engineers that address transportation program monitoring by SMP personnel at SMP transportation sites. This is analogous to the Bonneville separator monitoring issue.