



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 | Website: www.cbfwa.org

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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: October 5, 2009
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Ken MacDonald, CBFWA, Nate Pamplin, WDFW
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for September 15-17, 2009 WAC Meeting and Monitoring Workshop

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting and Monitoring Workshop
September 15-17, 2009
Usk, WA

The support material for the meeting is posted at:

http://www.cbfwa.org/committee_wac.cfm

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Ken MacDonald, Paul Ashley (CBFWA); John Pierce, Michael Schroeder, Nate Pamplin (WDFW); Matt Berger, Ray Entz (KT); Sam Rushing, Richard Whitney (CCT); DR Michel, Chase Davis, Dustin Cousins, Laura Street, Miriam Woodley (UCUT); Kyle Heinrick, Jason Kesling (BPT); Norm Merz, Scott Souls (KTOI); Dwight Bergeron (MFWP); Katherine Cousins (IDFG); Angela Sondenaa, Loren Kronemann (NPT); Rich Alldredge (ISAB/ISRP); Tom Prewitt (CDAT); Carol Perugini (SPT); Peggy O'Connell, Jim Hallet, Kristi Kimmet (EWU); Jim Noyes (ODFW); Tom O'Neil (NHI); Aren Eddingsaas (SBT) Peter Paquet (NPCC)

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

ACTION: Agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Approve June 24, 2009 WAC Meeting Draft Action Notes

ACTION: This item was postponed until next meeting.

ITEM 3: UCUT – “A Regional Approach to Wildlife Monitoring for Habitat Restoration and Conservation” – Jim Hallet

Discussion: Monitoring and evaluation of management and habitat restoration projects are critical components for determining whether project objectives are being achieved. In recognition of the importance of M&E, the five members of the Upper Columbia United Tribes pooled their monitoring resources for 2008-2009 to create the UWMEP. This regional habitat and wildlife monitoring program is being developed to determine outcomes of habitat protection and restoration projects in and proximate to the reservations and aboriginal lands of the five tribes. This is now a stand alone project that supports the BPA wildlife mitigation projects of all five tribes. Evaluation of habitat change and vertebrate response to management or restoration activities is based on

comparisons between reference (desired future condition) and mitigation sites. Reference sites are monitored for 3 years to determine patterns of annual variation, whereas mitigation sites are monitored at 5-year intervals. Analytical tools for comparing similarity between reference and mitigation sites given limited sampling have been evaluated previously. Wildlife managers from the five Tribes have identified eight habitat types (shrub-steppe, grassland steppe, conifer woodland, mixed coniferous forest, riparian forest, riparian shrub, wetland meadow, and emergent wetland) for monitoring. Two reference sites have been identified for each of six habitat types and potential sites for the remaining two habitats are being explored. Monitoring of newly acquired reference sites commenced in 2009. Sampling adequacy of protocols developed for the Albeni Falls M&E Plan, the precursor to UWMEP, are being evaluated further for monitoring structure and composition of vegetation and population responses of birds, small mammals, and amphibians in habitat types added by creating the regional program. Benefits of a regional monitoring system include (1) consistent monitoring across all ownerships by employing experienced technicians to oversee data collection, (2) incorporation of both web-based and field-computer data entry systems to ensure data quality and reduce costs, (3) data storage in an existing Microsoft SQL Server 2008 database that initially will allow retrieval of both raw data and data summaries from a secure website and a more flexible query system at a later date, (4) improved evaluation of mitigation efforts, and (5) greater regional communication and understanding of both wildlife trends and project effectiveness.

ACTION: None- Information

ITEM 4: Kootenai Tribe of Idaho Ecological Framework – Scott Soultz and Norm Merz

Discussion: Kootenai River Ecosystem Operational Loss Assessment, Protection, Mitigation, and Rehabilitation Project (BPA Project Number 2002-011-00)

The Project presented RM&E principles (i.e., biological integrity, ecosystem measures, standardized methods, biological community index changes, etc.) used to assess integrated complex ecological systems and processes in an attempt to mitigate, restore and adaptively manage fish and wildlife habitats impacted by the Libby Dam hydrofacility. This includes, but not limited to, monitor environmental conditions and functions of an ecosystem, techniques for evaluation of habitat restoration, degrees of degradation and adaptive management efforts, focus on biological endpoints to define condition, assess ecological change in community indices, and apply standardized sampling and analytical methods.

ACTION: None - Information

ITEM 5: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Proposed Monitoring Program

Discussion: Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat Assessment on BPA-Funded Wildlife Areas in Washington; Michael A. Schroeder, John Pierce, Matt Vander Haegen, & Nathan Pamplin

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) are proposing a definition of ecological integrity for monitoring and evaluating BPA-funded wildlife areas. Ecological integrity can be defined as the observed biotic and

abiotic components and ecological processes relative to an ecosystem with minimal human influence. The WDFW is proposing using definitions of historical ecosystems, defined by the National Vegetation Classification Standard, as reference points for evaluating current ecosystem condition and trend analysis in ecosystem restoration. The WDFW also is proposing using a ranking system between A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), and D (poor) as a way to classify ecosystem condition and an ecological integrity assessment (EIA) based on three levels of monitoring (remote, rapid, and intensive) to evaluate ecosystem condition. The EIA would target ecosystem goals which would be determined based on current ecological condition, desired ecological condition, and potential and opportunity for restoration. The EIA would also be based on a ‘score card’ with weighted values for landscape, biotic, and abiotic characteristics that are based on ecosystem-specific characteristics. The WDFW is also conducting different types of monitoring and evaluation activities including management effectiveness, population response to management activities, and miscellaneous activities (HEP, harvest surveys, public access, etc.).

Monitoring Biodiversity on WDFW Lands Using Citizen Science - John Pierce, Michael Schroeder, Matt Vander Haegen, and Nathan Pamplin, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

WDFW is mandated to preserve, protect, and perpetuate all wildlife species in the state, which includes thousands of vertebrate and invertebrate species. Increasing pressure is put on remaining natural landscapes as more and more lands are converted to urban, agriculture and forestry and other landuse practices to match the growing human population. Washington’s human population are projected to increase by 50% in the next 50 years. In order to meet the challenge to our agency faces we proposed to enlist the help of citizen scientists to conduct long-term monitoring of the biodiversity found on WDFW lands. We envision a network built on statewide partnerships that link individuals, K-20 education, and local community groups with professionals from the public and private sector to improve scientific knowledge, inquiry and literacy of our natural resources that is useful to communities. We intend to pilot this approach on 8 BPA funded Wildlife Areas. Local schools and adult volunteer organizations will be enlisted to “adopt” their local wildlife area. High School Senior culmination projects will be used to help with this effort. The monitoring framework will be based on NatureServe Ecological Integrity Assessment methods. Citizen science efforts will be focused on providing Level 2 rapid assessment information to track long-term changes in ecological integrity. An existing Citizen Science program in Waterville school district is described at the following web address:

<http://depts.washington.edu/natmap/projects/waterville/index.html>.

ACTION: None - Information

ITEM 6: Northwest Habitat Institute Tools and Programs – Tom O’Neil

Discussion: Tom O’Neil lead a discussion on NHI programs and perspectives on regional monitoring.

ACTION: None - Information

ITEM 7: September 16, 2009 - Field trip to UCUT Monitoring Sites

Discussion: The previous day’s discussions were continued in the field with a review of the

different Kalispell mitigation sites, including restoration and reference sites, discussion of the challenge choosing reference sites and demonstration of UCUT monitoring program field techniques.

ACTION: None - Information

ITEM 8: September 17, 2009 - Next Steps

Discussion: Nate Pamplin led a discussion summarizing the previous days' presentations and discussions and presentations. The result is the following draft framework for wildlife mitigation project monitoring.

Elements of the FCRPS Wildlife Mitigation

Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Version: September 17, 2009

Management Questions:

Are the wildlife projects at or trending towards the desired ecological condition?

Are the management treatments effective?

Is the project meeting the goals/objectives of the subbasin plans?

Elements:

Ecological Integrity

- Defining condition—reference sites or desired future condition or historic/undisturbed condition—as defined by the Manager's management plan for each ecological system (human element must be incorporated).
 - Desired future condition needs to be realistic and match the site potential (cannot be something that can never be achieved—from other influences or landscape context).
 - If using reference sites, managers should select sites that meet the desired future condition.
 - May have multiple reference sites for each condition
- Include abiotic, biotic (status/trends), and processes
- Coarse filter, biodiversity level (versus single spp approach)
- Factor landscape parameters (fragmentation, size, connectivity, etc.)
- Incorporate the appropriate communities and guilds; recognizing logistic/financial constraints and the ecological system that is being measured—find items that guide, but not dictate.
- Define elements at the rights resolution.
- As part of this framework, do managers want to define universal minimum M&E for each ecological system—normalize/standardized approach?
 - NatureServe classification of ecological system
 - We define the parameters in the framework for each

ecological system, managers can estimate as they choose

Action Effectiveness

Includes habitat response and population response

Can allow for experimental approach

Notes:

Need to define the terms: ecological condition/population response/functioning habitat

Not monitoring populations, but population response (status/trend or presence/absence) may be a useful indicator of ecological condition and action effectiveness

Managers can cater framework—protocols, etc.

Multiple tiers: 1) Remote sensing; 2) Rapid Assessment; 3) Intensive

Remote sensing: Use National Veg Classification Standard

Habitat restoration techniques—need to document what has worked; perhaps develop a manual and contract technical writers to assist managers document actions.

Consistent with other regional monitoring; coordination with other efforts. Meets the needs of the Program, but also fits with other managers' needs and broader regional monitoring efforts.

HEP is not M&E, but data may be useful. We need to look at information from HEP and possibly add other items or increase rigor/sampling to meet broader M&E goals. Data then used for the HEP HSI analysis and for the M&E framework.

Reporting and disseminating results

Adaptive management

Citizen science can be used to do the M&E.

Next Steps:

November WAC meeting to review Classifications of Ecological Systems and Conditions and key indicator parameters for each System

Framework—proposal to be developed and reviewed by WAC in November

Implementation: Inventory of ecosystems, assessment of condition

Proposal:

Managers agree to ecological system classification, and the ecological condition ratings/levels, and the minimum parameters used to assess ecological condition.

Managers used accepted protocols, their choice, to measure the minimum parameters. Need further discussion about the level of standardization of protocols that can be agreed upon by the managers and the precision of the parameters.

Managers set the desired ecological condition for their project based on management/ecological needs. (based on their management goals)

Framework allows managers to assess progress of implementing their management plan, allows for adaptive management to determine if O&M and Enhancement plans are achieving their desired ecological condition.

Framework outlines a standard reporting format.

For the Region, we report the number of acres meeting or trending towards the desired ecological condition.

ACTION: John Pierce, Mike Schroeder will develop a first draft of a monitoring framework based upon the above and the WDFW approach. The first draft will be distributed via email to a WAC sub-group including; Nate Pamplin Aaron Eddingsaas, Ray Entz, Matt Berger by **October 30**. The subgroup will provide comments back to John, Michael and Nate by **November 13** for full WAC consideration at the **November 18** WAC meeting. The intent is to develop a consensus monitoring framework for the Fish and Wildlife Program to be approved by the CBFWA Members, reviewed by ISRP and presented to the Council

ITEM 9: Wildlife Crediting Forum

Discussion: Peter Paquet (NPCC) was present to update the WAC on recent Council Action to charter the Wildlife Crediting Forum. Peter led a discussion of the history and problems regarding the wildlife crediting issue including; the 2:1 versus 1:1 issue, what is specifically in the existing wildlife agreements, what is the true credit ledger” and therefore outstanding mitigation debt for construction and inundation losses, what is time zero for the remaining losses as stated in the 2000 Program Table 11-4, what frequency should HEP assessments be completed how wildlife credit should be applied to fish projects.

The Crediting Forum Charter states that membership on the Forum will include BPA, Council, the BPA customers (probably represented by the two customer groups, and the fish and wildlife managers. Peter posed the question as to how the managers should participate, individually or through representative groups such as CBFWA, UCUT and USRT. The WAC members unanimously felt the issues should be dealt with by the individual sovereigns and as such each sovereign should have opportunity to be represented as they wish. Therefore, Peter said there would probably be a letter from the Council to the individual agencies and Tribes inviting them to an initial meeting. Peter also noted that the Council was advertising for an independent facilitator to assist the Forum discussions. Peter expected the letter to be sent within a few weeks.

ACTION: WAC will continue to monitor the Crediting Forum issue.

ITEM 10: Next WAC Meeting

ACTION: The next WAC meeting will be a teleconference scheduled for **November 18, 2009** from 9:00 AM – 2:00 PM (Pacific). The wildlife monitoring framework will be the primary agenda item.