



## Department of Energy

Official File Copy

Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

ENVIRONMENT, FISH AND WILDLIFE

February 15, 2001

In reply refer to: KEW-4

Mr. Frank L. (Larry) Cassidy  
Chairman, Northwest Power Planning Council  
851 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97204-1348

[Click for attachment: High Priority Projects](#)

Dear Mr. Cassidy:

I am pleased to provide you with Bonneville's initial analysis of the proposals received for the category of High Priority Funding under the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. Our analysis (enclosure 1) is based upon how well the proposals met the entire first tier criteria. Those criteria are: protects Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed anadromous fish; addresses a time-limited opportunity; describes immediate and tangible biological benefits; is not In Lieu funding; has all environmental/ ESA planning and permitting completed by September 2001; and would require a one-time only funding commitment to accomplish project objectives. Proposals that we determined met all of the criteria were placed in Category 1; those that met the threshold criteria of protecting listed anadromous fish and demonstrating immediate tangible biological benefits, but had some question as to whether all of the remaining criteria were met were placed in Category 2; and those that did not meet the threshold criteria were placed in Category 3. We also considered the budget figures included with each proposal as best estimates only at this time and reserve the right to negotiate statements of work, schedules and budgets for those projects that receive a final recommendation by the Council to Bonneville for funding.

We also appreciate the tremendous amount of effort expended by all of the proposers and recognize the large number of technically sound proposals that were received for this process. We suggest that many proposals that are not time-limited opportunities, particularly those rated highly by ISRP, are more appropriate to be submitted through the Council's Provincial Review Process for their respective geographic areas. Again, our prime interest with this solicitation was to identify those proposals with the best opportunity for providing ESA credit towards meeting the Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives in the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Biological Opinion for the operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) that would have otherwise been a missed opportunity if they had been required to follow the timelines set forward in the existing regional review processes. We anticipate receiving a more detailed analysis from NMFS identifying those proposals that, in their estimation, would meet their FCRPS Biological Opinion measures.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the process and we look forward to working with the Council as they move forward with the public review portion of the High Priority Process Review.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Austin  
Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife

Enclosure

bcc:

S. Wright – K-7

J. Smith – KT/Spokane

Official File – KEW (FW-24)

K. Hunt – KR-7

KEW Staff