



**COLUMBIA
BASIN
FISH & WILDLIFE
AUTHORITY**

DRAFT

DATE: September 6, 2005
TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)
FROM: Neil Ward
SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the August 31, 2005 RFAC Meeting

If there are no objections within 8-days these actions will be considered final.

RFAC Meeting
August 31, 2005
Portland, Oregon

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Ron Peters (CDAT), Dave Ward (ODFW), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)

By Phone: Clint Muhlfeld (MFWP), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Mike Faler (USFWS), Sue Ireland (KTOI), and Joe Maroney (KT)

Time	Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
Allocation:	Objective 2. Technical Review	0%
	Objective 3. Presentation	0%

ITEM 1: Review Agenda

ITEM 2: Selection of a New Vice-Chair

Discussion: On October 1, 2005, Lawrence Schwabe will become the Chair of the RFAC thus, leaving the Vice-Chair vacant. As a result, the RFAC sought candidates and elected a new Vice-Chair.

ACTION: Jim Uehara (WDFW) was selected as the new Vice-Chair.

ITEM 3: FY 2007-2009 Project Selection Cycle – Northwest Power & Conservation Council (NPCC) and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) Proposals and CBFWA’s DRAFT Approach

Discussion: During the August 2005 CBFWA Members Meeting, Melinda Eden (NPCC) solicited the CBFWA for assistance in defining the process for the upcoming project selection including how the CBFWA would assist with defining provincial objectives, and the facilitation of project reviews and subsequent project selection. Tom Iverson reported that since the

**ITEM 3
discussion
continued:**

August 2005 Members meeting, the NPCC staff has developed the following draft FY2007-2009 project selection cycle:

- September-November 2005 – Project Selection Process development
- November 2000-February 2006 – Solicitation for projects
- February – July 2006 – ISRP review
- March – July 2006 – Project Prioritization
- July 2006 – Recommendation to NPCC
- July – September 2006 – Public review of draft recommendations
- September 2006 – NPCC recommendation
- September – December 2006 – BPA contracting

In contrast, the BPA has proposed that prior to soliciting for proposals, the region should engage in an exercise to “roll-up” the subbasin plans at a province level with a focus on population characteristics. The following points were highlighted in a letter that Greg Delwiche (BPA) forwarded to Melinda Eden on July 29, 2005, which provided BPA’s conceptual approach to the FY 2007-2009 project solicitation:

- “Identify priorities- by target species, geographic locale, and strategy, among and between provinces- to address the limiting factors articulated in subbasin plans rolled-up to a provincial scale, using the “currency” of population and environmental characteristics or conditions.”
- “Pursue a streamlined approach for developing province-scale budgets based on high level biological and environmental objectives for each province.”
- “Structure science and policy review of proposals to evaluate biological value, cost effectiveness and linkage to identified priorities in subbasin plans.”
- “Assess “headroom” for new starts in succeeding years, based on expected time frame for completion of selected projects and consideration of the logical sequencing of projects. For subsequent solicitations, describe a proactive approach to planning that schedules “new start” implementation to fill-in behind completed projects, while still allowing for some flexibility.”

Tom indicated that since the August 2005 Members meeting, the NPCC staff has developed the following draft Program amendment process:

- September 2005 – Completion of the NPCC AHA project
- October – December 2005 – Develop guidance document for Program amendment
- January – April 2006 – Request for recommendations

- May – July 2006 – Review recommendations
- July 2006 – Recommendation to NPCC
- August – September 2006 – Public review
- October – December 2009 – NPCC adopts Program amendment

ITEM 4: Biological Objectives and the All-H Technical Integration Process Resident Fish Population Status Report

Discussion: Using the “All-H Analyzer” (AHA) model, the NPCC intends to identify quantifiable biological objectives for the Fish and Wildlife Program. Habitat, hatchery, hydro, and harvest information relative to anadromous fish populations has been collected from subbasin plans, regional databases, and management plans and incorporated into the model.

During the June 2, 2005 RFC teleconference, Bruce Suzumoto (NPCC), briefed the RFC on the AHA model and indicated that the model was not developed for resident fish thus the NPCC was relying on the CBFWA and the RFC to assist in developing a process for identifying biological objectives for resident fish. The RFC requested that Neil Ward review the subbasin plans and assemble a data set that includes population data for resident fish focal species throughout the basin.

Through the review of the subbasin plans, data gaps and information needs were identified. Neil provided the RFAC with a draft template (minus the Mountain Columbia Province) that could be used to assemble resident fish information that will be comparable to what anadromous fish managers will be gathering through the AHA process. In addition, Neil indicated that the template could be used for the resident fish section of the Status of the Resources Report and the Regional Management Plan.

Since the template was not finished, participants agreed that the template should be reviewed during the next RFAC meeting. Several questions that will have to be answered include:

- What populations should be included?
- Have the appropriate population parameters been identified?
- Does data exist for these populations and where is it located?
- How will data input occur?
- How do we inform the region about the results of this effort and their relationship to the upcoming policy effort to adopt biological objectives into the Fish and Wildlife Program?

ITEM 5: Discussion Regarding the Fish and Wildlife Program’s 70-15-15

Discussion: Two recent correspondences (i.e., July 29, 2005, letter from Greg Delwiche (BPA) to Melinda Eden (NPCC) and August 2, 2005, memo from Doug Marker and Patty O’Toole NPCC Members) highlighted the region’s interest in conforming to the 70-15-15-balance between

anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife projects, respectively. The NPCC indicated a desire to “ensure that that the Council’s recommendations result in a 70-15-15 balance” and BPA indicated, “the overall levels of investment in anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife mitigation should be consistent with 70-15-15 allocation reflected in the Council Program.”

The NPCC’s and BPA’s proposals to manage the Fish and Wildlife Program using the 70-15-15 suggests that additional funds will have to be dedicated to resident fish efforts during the 2007 solicitation for the Fish and Wildlife Program to achieve an allocation of 15% of its funds to such projects. Although recent correspondences indicate an interest in managing the Fish and Wildlife Program using the 70-15-15 approach, there has been no reference to a process that will ensure that additional funds will be earmarked for resident fish efforts or that stipulations will exist that will safeguard against the loss of current funds.

Ron Peters and Neil Ward led the group in a discussion to evaluate the RFC interest in developing recommendations, to forward to the Members Advisory Group, that propose a process to ensure that the resident fish segment of the Fish and Wildlife Program receives 15% of the available funds and that the level of funding is maintained at 15%.

ACTION: An ad hoc workgroup consisting of Joe Maroney, Ron Peters, and Dave Ward was created to develop a 70-15-15 RFAC position statement that could be forwarded to the Member Advisory Group for consideration. The ad hoc workgroup is scheduled to meet Tuesday, September 6, 2005 at 2:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: September 20, 2005 at 9:00 – 3:00 (Pacific) at the CBFWA Office