



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443

Coordinating and promoting effective protection and restoration of fish, wildlife, and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin.

The Authority is comprised of the following tribes and fish and wildlife agencies:

Burns Paiute Tribe

Coeur d'Alene Tribe

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks

National Marine Fisheries Service

Nez Perce Tribe

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Coordinating Agencies

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Upper Columbia United Tribes

DATE: February 14, 2007
TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)
FROM: Jim Uehara, Chair
SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the January 24, 2007 RFAC Meeting

RFAC Meeting January 24, 2007 Portland, OR (CBFWA Office)

Support materials for the January 24, 2007, RFAC Meeting are posted at:

<http://www.cbfga.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=RFAC&meeting=all>

These notes will be approved as final at the next RFAC Meeting.

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Chris Brun (CTWSRO), Ron Peters (CDAT), Jim Uehara (WDFW), Tom Friesen (ODFW), Mike Faler (USFWS), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Sheri Sears (CCT), Joe Maroney (KT), Ken Macdonald (CBFWA), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)
By Phone: Sue Ireland (KTOI), Charlie Holderman (KTOI), Hunter Osborn (SBT), and Melo Meiolie (IDFG)

Time Allocation:

Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
Objective 2. Technical Review	%
Objective 3. Presentation	%

ITEM 1: Review Agenda

No new items were added to the agenda

ITEM 2: Program Amendments

The Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) is expected to open the Fish and Wildlife Program for amendments in 2007. Brian Lipscomb and Tom Iverson briefed the RFAC and Anadromous Fish Advisory Committee. The amendment process is expected to take approximately a year to complete. Tom presented a summary of the amendment process which is posted at:

<http://www.cbfga.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=MAG&meeting=all>

The summary included an "Outline of Program Amendment Recommendations" and a "CBFWA work requirements/schedule."

During the Members Advisory Group's (MAG) December 2006 meeting, the MAG directed the technical committees to: 1) review the outline, 2) confirm what can be accomplished, 3) provide additional detail, and 4) provide a report during the January 25, 2007, MAG Meeting.

The RFAC reviewed the Outline of Program Amendment Recommendations prepared by the CBFWA staff to evaluate what the RFAC could accomplish relative to the proposed amendment process. The RFAC agreed that the geographic scales (i.e., Subbasin, Province, and Regional) were sufficient; however, the RFAC recommended that an additional scale-oriented section (i.e., Policy/Principle Scale) should be included in the list to accommodate resident fish substitution and losses. The RFAC recommended that the Status of the Resources Project (SOTR) and its products (i.e., annual report and website) should be used to address the questions associated with the Subbasin Scale effort. The following is a brief description of the how the RFAC envisions using the SOTR to address the Subbasin Scale questions:

- Confirm focal species – Review each subbasin in the SOTR and add any species that were overlooked during subbasin planning (focal species depicted in the SOTR are those that were identified by the subbasin planners).
- Establish biological objectives – Review and confirm the biological objectives, as listed in the SOTR, for each focal species (biological objectives appearing in the SOTR are those that were presented in the subbasin plans or in management/recovery plans referenced in the subbasin plans). For many of the focal species, biological objectives were not provided in the subbasin plans. The RFAC needs to confirm whether biological objectives exist for those focal species
- Confirm primary limiting factors and identify strategies and actions to address the limiting factors – the RFAC indicated that the subbasin plans should be reviewed to confirm and update the limiting factors. In addition, participants indicated that in many of the subbasin plans strategies were identified to address the limiting factors.

At the Province Scale, the RFAC agreed that adding data from individual populations across a province was not an appropriate method to create a province-scale biological objective. The RFAC suggested that the appropriate measure should be what proportion of populations are meeting or exceeding their respective biological objectives (e.g., the number of focal species that are meeting or exceeding their respective biological objective).

Update – Since the RFAC meeting, Jim Uehara has provided presentations to the MAG and Members that were well received. During both presentations, Jim stressed that the biological objectives and metrics associated with resident fish focal species are typically not ESA-oriented and may not be consistent across the basin. Jim reported that the RFAC recommended using the SOTR to evaluate the focal species and biological objectives and in doing so was met with no resistance.

ITEM 3: In-Lieu Analysis

The Power Act includes language stating that where entities other than the BPA have responsibility, BPA funding shall be in addition to, rather than in lieu of, funding by the other entity. In letters to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) dated August 3, 2006 and October 6, 2006, BPA assigned preliminary scores to all new and ongoing proposals relative to in lieu funding concerns. Scores ranged from 1 to 3. A “1” indicated no in lieu concerns, a “2” indicated possible concerns, and a “3” indicated concerns. The “2” rating was further subdivided into 2.1 (cost share appears reasonable), 2.2 (cost share may be reasonable), and 2.3 (cost share appears unreasonable).

The MAG directed the technical committees to review the final BPA rankings and provide feedback at the January 25, 2007 MAG meeting; however, the final rankings and analysis document was not released by January 24, 2007, thus the RFAC was unable to review the document and provide recommendations to the MAG.

Based on discussions with BPA representatives, RFAC participants indicated that BPA’s final recommendations would not be favorable for resident fish projects. The RFAC discussed potential CBFWA processes for addressing BPA’s final recommendation which included providing comments to the Members Advisory Group. The MAG expects the technical committees to take the lead in formulating a response to BPA’s ratings, by providing evidence of cost-share remedies or incorrect scoring.

Update – On February 13, 2007, BPA released their final in-lieu analysis and project recommendations at the NPCC’s Fish and Wildlife Committee Meeting. The document will be emailed to all CBFWA members and posted to the CBFWA website. Upon an initial review, the RFAC will need to reconvene to review the document and develop a response for consideration by the MAG.

ITEM 4: StreamNet Priorities

The Council has recommended “interim” funding for StreamNet pending review of data priorities. The StreamNet Steering Committee briefed the Council in December on the status of StreamNet’s revised FY 2007-09 Statement of Work. Four work plan tasks reflect

discussion and guidance from a data workshop held in September:

- (1) Improve data coverage and service (especially tribes and natural resource agencies);
- (2) Improve data timeliness;
- (3) Assess data/services to support future subbasin planning, the current set of draft core and/or high level indicators, or other regional monitoring and evaluation programs;
- (4) Acquire population-scale fish abundance indicators.

A summary of the StreamNet Work Plan Briefing FY 07-09 is posted at:

<http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=MAG&meeting=all>

During the December MAG Meeting, the MAG directed the technical committees to identify long-term data management needs and to provide feedback at the January 25, 2007 MAG meeting. The RFAC discussed StreamNet and suggested that StreamNet should be the warehouse for regional resident fish data; however, the RFAC expressed some concerns relative to StreamNet's current structure (e.g., not user friendly, broken links, outdated data, poor data coverage, reports not readily available) that should be corrected. The RFAC recommended that for resident fish, StreamNet's focus should be fishes identified as focal species during subbasin planning and that the data fields should align with the data reported in the SOTR for each of the focal species.

ITEM 5: Collaborative Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Project (CSMEP)

The CSMEP is a coordinated effort to improve the quality, consistency, and focus of fish population and habitat data to answer key monitoring and evaluation questions relevant to major decisions in the Columbia Basin. The CSMEP project was initiated in 2003 and is administered by the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority, with participation from over 30 scientists from federal, state, and tribal fish and wildlife agencies, and consulting firms. The CSMEP has the following goals:

1. Document, integrate, and make available existing monitoring data on listed salmon, steelhead, bull trout, and other fish species of concern.
2. Critically assess strengths and weaknesses of these data for answering key monitoring questions.
3. Collaboratively design improved monitoring and evaluation methods.
4. Work with other programmatic entities to implement projects that can provide better input to key decisions in the Columbia Basin

Ron Peters, who will be representing the Coeur d'Alene Tribe in the CSMEP process during this upcoming year, attended the January 16-17, 2007, CSMEP workshop and provided the RFAC with an update. Ron indicated that the Coeur d'Alene Tribe is participating in the CSMEP effort to develop monitoring and evaluation components for westslope cutthroat trout in the Coeur d'Alene subbasin. It is likely this effort will be a pilot-study comparable to those that have been implemented for anadromous fish in select subbasins.

Action: The RFAC tasked Ron Peters with the responsibility of keeping the RFAC abreast of CSMEP activities and products that relate to resident fish.

ITEM 6: 2007 Work Plan

The RFAC discussed the need to develop a work plan for 2007 to provide guidance and clarify expectations. Items discussed during the January 24, 2007 RFAC Meeting (i.e., Program Amendments, Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) in-lieu decision, StreamNet resident fish development, Collaborative Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Project inclusion of resident fish, and Innovative Project Solicitation reviews) as well as a monitoring

and evaluation-oriented workshop for bull trout and a review of the Independent Scientific Advisory Board's resident fish substitution "white paper" are processes that will require the RFAC participation during 2007.

Action: The RFAC directed Neil Ward to develop a draft timeline that illustrates the point of initiation and completion for each of the processes.

ITEM 7: CBFWA Response to Innovative Project Solicitation Alternative

Tom Iverson informed the RFAC that the NPCC plans to initiate an innovative project solicitation in February 2007. Tom indicated that the NPCC recommended \$3M for 2007-09 (\$1M per year) for innovative projects; however, BPA has not made a decision on the NPCC's recommendation. The NPCC envisions that the solicitation will end in March and that there would be a concurrent review by the ISRP and fish and wildlife managers. Following the ISRP and manager review, a public comment period will occur with a final NPCC recommendation occurring in July. Tom indicated that the innovative project contracts will not exceed 18 months.

Tom informed the RFAC that the CBFWA Members recommended, to the NPCC, that the NPCC should use the group of unfunded 2007-09 proposals as a pool from which to select innovative projects funding consideration. In addition, Tom indicated that the CBFWA Members recommended that the NPCC should work with the fish and wildlife managers to develop criteria that addresses fish and wildlife needs and defines proposals that meet the criteria.

ITEM 8: Next RFAC Meeting

Although a date was not identified for the next meeting, it is likely the RFAC will meet during early-March to discuss the BPA's project recommendations and initiate efforts to review focal species and their respective biological objectives.