



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

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead 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 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: July 6, 2010
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Doug Calvin, Chair
SUBJECT: June 22, 2010 WAC Meeting Final Action Notes

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting
June 22, 2010, 1:00-4:00 pm
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Office
Portland, Oregon

The support material for the meeting is posted at: http://www.cbfwa.org/committee_wac.cfm

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Doug Calvin (Chair, CTWSRO); Carol Perugini (SPT); Angela Sondena (NPT); Tracy Hames (YN); Paul Dahmer (WDFW); Jason Kesling (BPT); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Norm Merz (KTI); Lawrence Schwabe (CTGR); Tom O'Neil (NHI); and Tom Iverson (CBFWA)

By Phone: Scott Soult (Vice-chair, KTOI); Aren Eddingsaas (SBT) and Alan Wood (MDFWP)

Time Allocation:

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

ACTIONS: Agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Review and Approve as Final May Draft Action Notes

ACTION: The WAC approved the May 18, 2010 Action Notes as final with no modifications.

ITEM 3: Vegetative versus Wildlife Habitat Classifications

Discussion: Tom O. provided abundant support material for today's discussion. The material consisted primarily of chapters from the book *Wildlife Habitat Relationships in Oregon and Washington*. This book is a good foundation for discussion of monitoring wildlife and their habitat at a large scale over a long period of time. Tom provide a presentation titled "Vegetative versus Wildlife Habitat Classifications" in which he made the point that our ability to identify floristic types is greater than our ability to identify the associated fauna; therefore, each identifiable vegetation type probably does not represent a unique wildlife habitat. Long term monitoring should connect the wildlife with their habitats to ensure actual benefits to wildlife are being achieved.

Numerous vegetative classifications systems exist, many of which focus on a specific region. This increases the ability to describe local variation and specific plan communities but reduces their relevance to other broad scale systems. The result is national vegetation classification systems, which broadly describe plant associations, and local systems that must be cross-walked to other systems for many applications. Tom attempted to demonstrate the Pacific Northwest Habitat Classification System crosswalk tool, but due to technical difficulties with the CBFWA computer was unable to demonstrate the online tool. The crosswalk tool is available at: <http://icontoo.com/PHaCS/PHaCS.aspx>.

The IBIS cross-walk tool could be very helpful in establishing a monitoring framework for wildlife in the Columbia River Basin.

ITEM 4: Monitoring- What should we be recording now?

Discussion: Tom O walked the WAC through an example of what decisions may be required in the future for managing wildlife habitat and what information would be necessary to be collected now to adequately support those future decisions. Data should be collected serving the four primary ecosystem service priorities: water, land, biota, and atmosphere. Ecosystem function should be driving monitoring priorities.

ITEM 5: Presentation of the IBIS Proposal

Discussion: Tom O provided a quick overview of the Interactive Biodiversity Information System (IBIS). IBIS contains extensive information about Pacific Northwest fish, wildlife, and their habitats, but more noteworthy, IBIS attempts to reveal and analyze the relationships among these species and their habitats. The overarching goal of the IBIS project would be to map and support wildlife habitats over time to demonstrate losses or gains by species/communities.

The primary objectives of the proposal submitted for BPA funding were to enhance access to habitat and biodiversity information, update and refine wildlife habitat mapping at multiple scales, develop a GIS repository and decision support tools, develop regional coordination and conduct outreach and education. A large portion of the proposed budget (~\$465,000) is to support the agencies and tribes in participating and submitting data into the IBIS database.

ITEM 6: Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy

Discussion: Tom I provide a brief update on the development of the Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy (WMIS). At their May meeting, the WAC created small subcommittee to help develop a draft outline for use during the July workshop. Tom developed a revised draft outline that incorporated the work completed by the WAC last fall with the new version developed this spring. Tom distributed an updated outline to the subcommittee prior to this meeting, but has yet to receive any comments. The WAC will hold a workshop in Pendleton, Oregon in July to flesh out the outline and develop the first draft of the Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy as described in the MERR.

ACTION: Tom I will distribute a copy of the revised outline prior to the July workshop.

ITEM 7: Wildlife Crediting Forum Update

Discussion: Since the last Wildlife Crediting Forum meeting, Peter Paquet distributed an excel table of all Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) funded by BPA. CBFWA staff used that table to find point-on-a-map locations and map of all WMAs. CBFWA developed and distributed two maps for tomorrow's Forum meeting: 1) a map of all WMAs and the associated hydro-facilities where their primary mitigation is being credited against, and 2) a map of the fish habitat projects that are under consideration for wildlife crediting. The maps are posted for today's meeting.

The Fish Habitat Committee of the Forum met last week. The group worked through BPA's list of fish habitat projects that are proposed for consideration of wildlife crediting. The committee reviewed whether there was a management plan available, O&M funding provided, which dam mitigation credits would be applied to, and which ledger those credits would be assigned. There appears to be a group of about 5 projects where there is little disagreement that the projects should receive credits against the wildlife construction and inundation ledger; which hydro-projects those credits would be applied is still in question. There are another approximately 25 projects that BPA has proposed for crediting that are not quite so clear. The committee discussion resulted in most of those projects being assigned a negotiable crediting ledger assignment. Several of the projects do not appear to

meet the Program's criteria for C&I losses.

The WAC discussed their individual involvement in the Forum and whether their negotiating positions were being undermined by participation. There was some confusion about dealing with a detailed ledger after the Crediting Committee concluded at the last Forum meeting that the precision of the losses ledger was too imprecise to exactly "balance" the account. The WAC members should stay focused on the benefits to wildlife. The WAC was reminded to stay focused on the issues that need to be resolved or at least clarified and to not follow a path to negotiating HUs for individual projects at too fine a scale. It's about the issues, not the HUs. The WAC agreed that progress was being made, and that continued participation was required for a satisfactory resolution of the outstanding issues related to BPA's wildlife mitigation.

ACTION: No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 8: **Next WAC Meeting**

ACTION: There will be a WAC workshop convened on July 21-22, 2010 at the CTUIR offices in Pendleton, Oregon. The workshop will focus on the development of a draft Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy, consistent with the MERR Plan. Wednesday will be a full working day from 8 am until 5 pm. Thursday's schedule will begin at 8:30 and end at noon to provide a wrap-up of the workshop.

The next Wildlife Crediting Forum is scheduled for July 20, 2010 from 10am-5pm at the CTUIR offices in Pendleton, Oregon. The meeting will be followed by a BBQ at Carl Scheeler's ranch that evening.