



**COLUMBIA
BASIN
FISH & WILDLIFE
AUTHORITY**

DATE: June 1, 2004
TO: Anadromous Fish Committee (AFC)
FROM: Pete Hassemer, Chair  for
SUBJECT: Action Notes for the May 26, 2004 AFC Meeting

AFC Meeting
May 26, 2004
Portland, Oregon

Action Notes

Attendees: Pete Hassemer (Chair, IDFG), Dave Statler (Vice-chair, NPT), John Palensky and Rob Walton (NOAAF), Fred Olney, Tim Whitesel, and Douglas DeHart (USFWS), Bruce Suzumoto and Peter Paquet (NPCC), Beth Sanderson, Chau Tran, Holly Coe, and Kate Macneale (NOAAF – NWFSC), Johnathan McCloud, Sarah Branum, and Peter Lofy (BPA), and Tom Iverson and Frank Young (CBFWA)

On Phone: Doug Taki (SBT), Mary Verner (UCUT), Scott O’Daniel (CTUIR), Jen Stone (USFWS), and Heather Ray (?)

Time Allocation: Objective 1. Project Recommendations 0%
Objective 2. Regional Issues 80%
Objective 3. Annual Report 10%

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda
The group reviewed the agenda for today’s meeting.

ACTION: The agenda was approved with no changes.

ITEM 2: Lamprey Workgroup Update

On March 8th the Lamprey Technical Workgroup (LTWG) held a workshop at the Vancouver Water Resources Center. A total of 86 people were in attendance, 14 presentations were given, and the proceedings are published on the LTWG's website (<http://columbiariver.fws.gov/lamprey.htm>). On March 9th the Workgroup met to review the workshop accomplishments, approve the LTWG statement of purpose, discuss voting in the LTWG, discuss LTWG membership, and form an ad hoc committee to respond to the USFWS request for culvert passage criteria (due June 4th). The LTWG also worked on updating the "Lamprey Program Summary" critical needs and uncertainties and project tables. The updated program summary will be forwarded to the AFC. Minutes for the meeting are available on the website listed above.

The next meeting of the workgroup is scheduled for September 1 at CRITFC. It is possible that the workgroup might be asked for assistance with the Willamette Falls and Grant County PUD FERC relicensing processes regarding lamprey issues, but so far no formal requests have been received.

ACTION: No action was taken on this agenda item.

ITEM 3: Update on FY 2004 Budget Process and FY 2005 Budget Development*FY 2004 Budget Process -*

Tom Iverson provided a brief update on the current budget situation. The current BPA working budget (spending caps for all projects) totals approximately \$151.5 million, which is \$1.5 million less than the total allowed budget. However, there are many uncertainties in what will actually be billed in this year, so BPA is uncomfortable allocating all of the available funding. The NPCC has approved, and BPA is funding, all rescheduling requests that can be validated by BPA and NPCC staffs. No within-year modification requests are expected to be approved except for emergency actions. There are currently about 30 active within year requests that are waiting for resolution. They will only be addressed as they become emergencies.

NPCC FY 2005 Start of Year Budget Development -

A budget work group composed of NPCC staff (state and central), BPA staff, and CBFWA staff (Tom Iverson) is working on developing the base budget for FY 2005. The basis for this budget is to complete/continue the NPCC's rolling province review recommendations. Each project budget was reviewed, consistent with the NPCC recommendations, and provided in draft form for all project sponsors to review. The comment period ran from May 7 through May 24, 2004. The budget work group is now reviewing the sponsor's comments and updating the base budget calculation. NPCC Members will review the base budget at their June meeting. Also at the June meeting, it is anticipated that the NPCC will discuss the programmatic budget target for FY 2005. The funding level has not yet been officially determined by the NPCC. BPA is arguing for \$131.5 million and NPCC Members appear to be holding at \$139 million or more. The current base budget is between \$140 and \$145 million. Once the funding level is determined, the NPCC will evaluate different strategies for reducing the overall base budget to meet the planning target. Several strategies were outlined in the draft base budget documents that were reviewed by project sponsors. Others will be included as the budget work group develops them.

ACTION: No action was taken on this item. It was not clear how the AFC could engage in the budget discussion at this time. Project sponsors are encouraged to closely monitor the NPCC budget development process.

ITEM 4: APRE Issue Paper – Bruce Suzumoto, NPCC

The NPCC staff is finalizing the APRE Basin-level report, and is preparing an APRE Issue Paper charting the future direction of hatchery reform based on the Basin-level report. Bruce discussed the purpose of the Draft Artificial Production Review and Evaluation Issue Paper with the CBFWA

Members during the April monthly meeting. The paper is not available for public review, but the CBFWA members have deep concerns regarding the potential content, as presented to the NPCC at their May meeting. Bruce presented an issue paper overview to MMG on April 27, 2004. At that meeting, Bruce presented the three major recommendations highlighted in the APRE issue paper: 1.) Better align subbasin, basin and out-of-basin goals; 2.) Implement near-term prioritized hatchery reforms; and, 3.) Develop an ongoing, sustainable hatchery review process. The focus is on subbasin goals and needs and giving equal time and greater deference to local goals and objectives. The MMG expressed many concerns with the potential content of the APRE issue paper, and directed the AFC to continue discussions with Bruce regarding development of the issue paper.

Three questions raised at today's meeting are: What is the intent of the issue paper? Who is the audience? How do the current statutory mandates on hatchery operations fit within the context presented in the issue paper?

Bruce noted that the key issue driving the paper is the lack of a coherent regional plan or objectives for hatchery programs. There is no forum that is developing the basin wide plan for addressing the objectives provided within the individual subbasin plans. The intent of the paper is to provide context for the APRE final report, and a link to an Implementation Plan for hatchery improvements that will be developed later in the summer. The paper contains a vision statement and three recommendations: 1.) align subbasin level goals with hatchery operations, 2.) implement near term hatchery reform, and 3.) maintain an ongoing review process to adaptively manage hatchery operations.

Rob noted that NOAA Fisheries is providing 2 significant documents for public comment this week. NOAA will be confirming the listing status of 27 species of salmon and steelhead and will be releasing their draft Hatchery Policy. Both of these documents should influence the development of a hatchery issue paper. Also, the HGMP process will be concluding next month and will be a key driver in developing a hatchery reform implementation plan. Finally, the State of Washington has set a June 2005 deadline for developing recovery plans. NOAA will likely try to follow the same time table for the remaining recovery plans in the basin. The regional planners need a road map that everyone can buy into and follow for the next 6 months and year. There are definitely some milestones that cannot be missed in the coming year. The revised Draft BiOp is due in August with a final draft due in November. NOAA is expecting to include in that document specific hatchery reform with funding needs.

The issues being discussed in the context of the APRE issue paper are far greater than hatchery reform. The paper appears to attempt to fill an obvious void of basin wide planning. HGMPs need to be stacked up to determine how reform should be structured and phased. The group encouraged Bruce to slow down on the issue paper until a collaborative group could develop a road map for hatchery reform, and hopefully basin wide planning for hatchery implementation.

ACTION: Tom will set up an AFC work group to discuss hatchery reform planning. Fred, Doug and Rob volunteered to help steer the work group.

ITEM 5: BPA Fish Habitat Crediting – Peter Paquet, NPCC

The recent rolling province review identified many fish habitat projects that the Council did not include in the Expense portion of the Fish and Wildlife Program. BPA determined that those projects did not meet BPA's criteria for capitalization, and hence those projects were left in limbo for BPA funding. BPA is clarifying their policy for capitalizing land acquisitions and require some form of crediting mechanism to demonstrate that the actions get BPA relief from future obligations. The current criteria include: 1.) project must total more than \$1 million, 2.) project must have a useful life of more than 15 years, and 3.) project must provide BPA a benefit. A recent Montana agreement to purchase a large property on the Fisher River established a potential mechanism to use capital funds for resident fish mitigation. The State of Montana was willing to establish a mile for mile credit for habitat lost due to

construction of Libby and Hungry Horse Dams for a mile of habitat protected through land purchase. The mechanism did not address productivity impacts of the habitat and attempted to address quality differences in habitat on a qualitative, best guess, basis.

NPCC staff and BPA staff were working on a simple mechanism for fish habitat acquisition as presented to the NPCC at their May meeting in Walla Walla. BPA recently began raising additional questions that have significantly slowed the fish habitat crediting discussion. The questions included: 1.) how many miles of habitat have the existing hatchery programs already mitigated for, 2.) how many miles of habitat have the existing habitat projects already mitigated for, 3.) how many miles of habitat have the existing wildlife projects already mitigated for, and 4.) how does the mile for mile habitat crediting mechanism fit within the integrated strategy for biological opinion actions.

At this point, the fish crediting issue is now too complicated to address in the near term. Peter will keep CBFWA informed of future discussions regarding this issue.

ACTION: No action was taken on this agenda item.

ITEM 6: Anadromous Fish Project Reviews

The meeting announcement has been sent out to project sponsors. A detailed schedule of presentations was included in today's packet. It is important that all AFC members attend the project review conference, please mark your calendars for AFC project reviews for September 21-24, 2004 in Richland, WA.

ACTION: No action was taken on this agenda item.

ITEM 7: Fish/Power Conference Update – Pete Hassemer

A small group of AFC members have been meeting with utility industry staff to discuss a future fish/power conference. Progress has been slow, but steady. An update will be provided as discussions progress. It is important for tribal representatives to begin participating. Contact Tom Iverson if you are interested.

ACTION: No action was taken on this agenda item.

ITEM 8: Project Presentation: Assessment of three alternative methods of nutrient enhancement on biological communities in Columbia River tributaries – Beth Sanderson and Peter Kiffney, NOAA – NFSC

See presentation handout for project details.

The project sponsors have experienced implementation delays due to permitting. Out of the original 17 streams selected for implementation, only 4 are currently available for stocking with nutrients. The project currently has a within year request in the FY 2004 process to cover invertebrate analysis and some staff costs. Additional funding will be necessary to implement the project in FY 2005.

ITEM 9: Project Presentation: Habitat Diversity in Alluvial Rivers – Scott O'Daniel, CTUIR

See presentation handout for details.

This Innovative category project has completed its initial study as approved by NPCC. The project sponsor is putting together a follow on study and will request funding through the FY 2005 process from BPA.

ITEM 10: Next Meeting

No meeting date was set for the next AFC meeting.