



DRAFT

January 8, 2001

TO: CBFWA Members

FROM: Brian Allee

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes from the 10/25 & 26/00 Members Meeting

If there are no objections, these action notes will become final in five days.

**CBFWA MEMBERS MEETING
October 25 & 26, 2000
West Coast Pocatello Hotel
Pocatello, ID**

DRAFT ACTION NOTES

Attendees: Dave Statler, NPT
Bob Foster, WDFW
Virgil Moore, IDFG
Roger Fuhrman, IDFG
Lynn Palensky, NWPPC
Doug Taki, SBT
Darrell Eastman, BPA
David Moser, SBT
Larry Bagley, SBT
Claude M. Broncho, SBT
Jim Mende, IDFG
Jerome Hansen, IDFG
Robert Matt, CdAT
Michele Beucler, IDFG
Dick Scully, IDFG
Ron Boyce, ODFW
Jeff Allen, Sen. Mike Crapo staff
Hall, Rep. Mike Simpson staff
D.R. Michel, CTCR
Ted Howard, SPT
Joe Peone, CTCR
Larry Peterman, MDFWP
John Palensky, NMFS
Albert Teeman, BPA
Brian E. Lipscomb, CSKT
Lionel Boyer, SBT
Rod Sando, IDFG
Bert Bowler, IDFG
Theodore Strong, YN
Steve Williams, ODFW
Bill Tweit, WDFW
Ronald L. Peters, CdAT
Bill Shake, USFWS
Gary James, CTUIR
Bill Tweit, WDFW
Fred Olney, USFWS
Donna Darm, NMFS
Nancy Escheif Murillo, SBT
Keith Kutchins, SBT
Chad Colter, SBT
Amos First Raised IV, BPT
Richard Dick, SPT
Anders Mikkelson, SBT
Mark Trahan, The Seattle Times Col. Eric Mogren, USACE
Jeff Tayer, WDFW
Kathy Weaver, ISCC
Jerry Nicoleson, ISCC
Eric Bloch, NWPPC
Jeff Koenigs, WDFW
Frank Young, Tom Giese, Neil Ward,
Kathie Titzler, Brian Allee, Cheron McGuffey, and Tom Iverson, CBFWA

Time Allocation:	CBFWA Members Coordination Contract*	
	Objective 1. FY 2001 Project Renewal Process	0%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review	0%
	Objective 3. FY 2000 Project Adjustments	0%
	Objective 4. Watershed and Subbasin Assessment and Plan	60%
	Objective 5. Coordinate Program Amendments	7%

*Not all agenda items support the objectives identified in the coordination contract.

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approval of Agenda

ACTION: Agenda approved as written.

ITEM 2: Subbasin Planning

Discussion: Rod Sando discussed his experience in Minnesota with subbasin planning and said the key to successful subbasin planning is having a “plan.” The effort must involve all entities, have broad-based community support, citizen participation, and data system/mapping support. The states took a lead role with citizen elected chairs. Neutral and responsive facilitation that encourages dialogue and assists people in resolving their conflicts will achieve unimaginable results.

ITEM 2: Amendment Process-NWPPC Fish and Wildlife Program, Phase I-II

Discussion: Mike Field summarized the amendment process. It is the first revision of the Program since 1995 and will be accomplished in two phases. The first phase addresses the Columbia Basin as a whole with a basinwide vision, goals, and biological objectives. This allows for more effective project selection and also improves monitoring and evaluation reporting results. The next phase will begin in 2001 and likely last three years. The NWPPC, with local help, will develop plans consistent with basinwide biological objectives for 53 subbasins in the Columbia River basin. The Program will be implemented through these plans in the future. The plans also will provide the context for reviewing project proposals for Bonneville funding each year.

The Program describes a new process for project review and selection. New projects will be considered in approximately one-third of the basin each year. The other two-thirds of the projects will receive a less rigorous review to ensure objectives and budgets are being met. Every project will receive a thorough review by the ISAB every three years.

The Program creates a fund for land and water acquisition to allow for the NWPPC to have greater flexibility to respond quickly to acquire interest in land and water rights. The Program establishes a separate funding category for high priority projects. These are projects that need to be pursued during the transition period while subbasin plans are being developed. The Program includes the project funding principal that Bonneville should adequately fund the Program across the basin, not just focus on actions for ESA listed stocks. The Program retains the funding allocation of 70/15/15

for the time being. The total Program budget will not be clear until subbasin plans are completed, but the Program recognizes that the current budget is not enough to fund the requirements of the federal biological opinions and the NWPPC Program. The NWPPC plans to consider adding budget figures to the Program when it officially completes the first phase of the rulemaking by adopting findings in response to comments, possibly at the NWPPC's December meeting.

Donna Darm briefly described NMFS's recovery planning approach for listed salmon and steelhead in the Pacific Northwest. NMFS took a two-step approach to recovery planning.

The first step (phase 1) was to set biological recovery goals that represented self-sustaining viable populations and identified certain characteristics of viable populations, abundance, productivity, spatial diversity, and genetic integrity. NMFS established, on a pilot basis, two technical recovery teams: one in Puget Sound and one in the upper Willamette/lower Columbia region. NMFS looked for scientists from affected states and tribes, the academic community, and elsewhere to participate on the teams.

The second step (phase 2) was to determine the actions that need to be taken to achieve the goals since, in many cases, there are different scenarios that will achieve those biological goals. NMFS also needed to figure out how to integrate what NMFS needed to do with the efforts that were already going on. In Puget Sound, the direction that NMFS is proposing is to work through the regional level and the local level, using the regional process to establish some general criteria and guidelines for the local planning process. Without local involvement, implementation of a plan is unlikely.

Donna said that it would seem this general approach would work in the Columbia Basin too; but, because of all the jurisdictions involved, the Columbia Basin is more complicated than any place else to do recovery planning. NMFS feels that they could work with what NWPPC was proposing to do through the amendment planning process.

NMFS did work with the NWPPC in the early phases, with the subbasin assessment template, with what NMFS would need for ESA recovery planning, and with what the NWPPC needed. The thought was that the subbasin plans that were part of the NWPPC's program would plug into the NMSF recovery planning process, and would do the "how to" part of achieving the recovery goals.

As a model, Donna said, that still works, but there are some cracks in that model that this group needs to discuss and deal with over the next few days and months. Initially, a lot of what the NWPPC has done has been regional with basinwide implications, but when it starts getting into habitat projects, watershed planning, even subbasin planning, you are getting into local issues that affect state water rights, land use, individual tribal interests, and

others. The states and some of the tribes have started to indicate that they don't want the NWPPC dictating what they are going to do in their local watersheds or reservation. Most of the states have existing processes in place to engage in watershed planning. It is NMFS's desire to have a process to develop plans to achieve the biological goals for viable salmon populations, and work with the various governments in the basin to make this work. There must remain awareness of the sensitivity to this issue. It is necessary to determine how this regional process, which up until now, has determined how rate payer funds from the Federal Columbia River Power System get spent, is going to work with local planning processes.

Bill Shake indicated that this is a two-phase problem: 1) integration with all of the plans and processes that are going on and, 2) how to provide ESA sufficiency and coverage for the implementation of these plans. The planning processes he is aware of that are underway are:

- ongoing recovery planning with resident fish,
- completed recovery plans,
- NMFS's approach with anadromous fish,
- the federal caucus All-H Paper,
- the four governors plan for salmon recovery,
- the NWPPC's planning process,
- the amendments,
- the federal land management planning effort,
- ICBEMP, which calls for subbasin reviews and ecosystem analysis,
- at the watershed scale there are clean water action plans,
- state plans to deal with TMDL's,
- ongoing habitat conservation areas with irrigation districts and a number of streams in the Columbia Basin review

Bill Shake said that this is a huge coordination effort and we need to put some people to work on how to get started.

Brian Lipscomb commented that perhaps the key to successful subbasin planning was the sharing of powers. The decision-makers need to become facilitators rather than dictators and trust that the subbasin plans brought forward are going to be the subbasin plans that will work for that area.

ITEM 3: Implementation of the Four Governors' Salmon Plans

Discussion: Larry Peterman began the discussion. He stated that Montana does not have any anadromous salmon, but does have listed species, bull trout, and white sturgeon. Their main connection between the governors' salmon restoration plans and salmon recovery is primarily through the operation of

the Libby and Hungry Horse reservoirs; how and in what fashion those reservoirs supply water to downstream anadromous natives. For the past 20 years, Montana has been developing mitigation packages for those two reservoirs, defining reservoir operations that benefit resident fish, help recover bull trout and white sturgeon, and provide water for downstream salmon needs. Some real progress has been made. One of the things they have been discussing and promoting is more flexibility in the flood control operations, working both with the BOR and the COE and other entities. This will give greater refill probability and more flexibility for resident fish, as well as providing flows for anadromous fish. Montana has developed integrated rule curves (IRC's) which look at a lot of different operations for the reservoirs - resident fish, power, flood control, trying to restore at least a portion of the stream flows to a more natural hydrograph. Larry indicated that to some extent they have accomplished that at both Libby and Hungry Horse and this concept should be looked at throughout the basin in some of the other reservoirs. If this concept can be applied in other reservoirs, there could be substantial benefits to anadromous fish downstream. Another issue is developing reservoir operations that are sustainable over time. Sustainability not only meets the target flows downstream but also provides for some refill capability, so if there is a series of draughts, the reservoirs are not drained. Having a consultant attend many of the meetings that MDFWP can't attend has helped them in their reservoir operations efforts and with the anadromous recovery efforts and the four governors' plans.

Steve Williams, ODFW, said that although we have talked about the governors' plan, it is really a series of recommendations. It doesn't contain all of the issues involved in recovering salmon species because there wasn't agreement, but it is an excellent place to start. In Oregon the underpinning for watershed planning efforts will be the Oregon Plan. The Oregon Plan was designed to bring the local constituencies and the state agencies together, Department of Agriculture, Department of Water Quality, Forestry, Fish and Wildlife (headquarters and regional offices). Flow is another issue, both in the mainstem and the tributaries. ODFW will continue to support and look for ways to augment those flows. A big issue is harvest and the key for ODFW to implement sustainable fisheries will be to break the deadlock on the Columbia Fish Management Plan, as it is not working and ODFW wants to resolve it for the short and long term. ODFW is proud of the position that the governor has taken about dam breaching, but recognizes that there are a number of social and economic issues that need to be dealt with as well. There is still the issues of fish passage, transportation, and spill to deal with and ODFW will not step away from those issues. Steve discussed the salmon clubbing videos that have been a hot issue and said that there are a lot of differences of opinion about how ODFW deals with hatchery products. ODFW is looking forward to the next legislative session, discussing this issue, and considering some other view points in terms of hatchery products and how

to utilize them. Predation is another critical issue (terns, seals, sea lions). It is not “all or nothing” and we need to try to manage those populations at a level commensurate with the resources available.

Rod Sando, IDFG said there were a few things in the governors’ recommendation that he found intriguing. One of them addresses the question of administrative complexity, where it is recommended that there be a Czar appointed to handle all the salmon issues. This does highlight that in their view there is a need for better coordination of all the players. We need to think about how to get all these institutions and powers moving toward a common agenda. That may not be possible, but some kind of stronger coordinating and problem solving or decision may very what is needed. In Idaho there aren’t extraordinarily significant habitat problems, since much of the habitat is in federal ownership and a lot of it is in wilderness areas. Idaho is probably dealing with more of the other factors such as the critical water supply issue. The management of the reservoirs and water level regime as managed by the various agencies to be made available for the fish is critical. If we could get a couple of recommendations in place, we could make a lot of progress.

Bill Twiet, WDFW, said that as their agency looked at the governor’s recommendations they realized there were some things that were taken for granted and can’t be anymore, such as the goals. The four governors said “sustainable and harvestable.” WDFW hadn’t taken the “and harvestable” for granted; they weren’t sure it was going to make it through, but were very pleased that it did. Similarly, in the harvest and hatchery sections, the four governors indicated that the US v OR process was the appropriate process. Performance standards need a common approach.

Tape 2A Joe Peone stated that there are no longer anadromous fish above Hells Canyon dams due to loss of habitat and water contamination. The tribe is pushing for the re-establishment of anadromous fish above those dams.

Ron Peters said that tribal participation is mandatory in the Governors’ Plan.

Brian Lipscomb asked why the governors have a plan and so does NWPPC.

Steve Williams responded that the Governors’ Plan does not cover all of the issues.

Bill Tweit said it is important for the State agencies to know where solid ground is.

ITEM 4: Meeting the Financial Needs of Fish and Wildlife Resources in the Basin

Discussion: Eric Bloch referred to participants to the 10/20/00 letter, which identifies FY2001 addition needs for funding, and for which he is seeking comment. Provincial reviews can ask for new projects during the review. Three million dollars is needed for researching critical uncertainties. Category B

is intended to bring everyone together, addressing the same problem. Facilitators and coordinators are needed. In Category C, the Managers requested more timely land and water acquisition. The fund would accelerate that process and the money would be available in six months through FY2001. (The six month figure is \$10 million.) Category D was formerly early action (high priority). This is for species at imminent risk of extinction and offers time-limited opportunities.

Donna Darm outlined the following table:

INPUT	PROCESS	OUTPUT
\$		fish
<1995 \$60 + \$27mil	CBFWA-Council	NPA
>95 + \$40mil (127 tot)	NMFS-CBFWA & Council?	NPA, ESA

When we don't like the output, we blame process instead of looking at inputs and agreement of outputs.

The corporate cap investments go through a different process. There is hope that significant funds for habitat estuary and screening will be available. Bob Austin discussed the possibility of a unified plan being developed out of the NWPPC plan. Colonel Mogren said that none of their bills have been signed. Authorities state that estuary (Blumenhaver) work is not covered. However, there is \$23M for a hatchery, \$31M for fish passage O&M, and \$81M for the fish passage project.

No Ken is
Mentioned
In
attendees

Ken talked about the need for a cohesive team to address watershed planning and implementation. Resources are needed. Red tape needs to be cut. All parties need to meet and commit to a long term effort on the projects. It is estimated that \$30-\$40M is needed per year for implementation. The earliest appropriated funds will not be available until 2002. Eric Bloch said the role of CBFWA in the fish and wildlife implementation process is uncertain. Bob Austin said that need should be brought forward rather than having the money spent first.

?? Italics

Try to design subbasin plan for all cases of mortality, 4D, HGMP. Need time frame with 4D and subbasin planning. Gary James said to look at the pre- and post-development survivals when looking to fix the problem. The process has increased more than 5% and the cost of *inflation is doing proj. on ground*. Even though money has increased, we are still in the hole. Eric Bloch said the 10/20 letter is for 2001 only, not for the next multi-funding contract. Beyond 2001, it will be possible to demonstrate the need for much more funding. FY2001 min. \$149M + \$5M + \$10M + \$15M.

Bob Austin: Prioritization and review gives the program credibility. There are a lot of unanswered questions regarding who is responsible for what funding. This can be worked through in a quarterly review.

Joe Peone asked Col. Mogren if some money was going to the clean water act. Col. Mogren responded that the \$81M does include the clean water act

- ?? in _____, but not ones in the 2000 BiOp. Need to identify clean water in 2000 and work with the EPA to prioritize.
- Rod Sando: There should be a master plan for goals and infrastructure. NWPPC trying to move the rope by pushing it. Small changes are needed before such large changes can be effected. An advisory group is needed to work with NWPPC on a master plan and infrastructure.
- Eric Bloch: There are a lot of fundamental questions we don't have the answers for. A plan for the plan to achieve goals and targets is needed. We are past due on getting people together to work on this.
- 13.34 Ted Howard: NWPPC weighted heavily on science and data. Eric said Native Americans need data. The Native American people have lived with nature in harmony: that is their science. The question is, how to turn culture into data. Culture should be given more weight than it has in the past. The difference is values. The tribes' concerns are chased away by science. No cultural resource funding is mentioned in new MOA, and it should be included.
- Tape 3a Col. Mogren: Cultural resources are included in the \$23M for O&M. The 4H paper includes culture and cultural resources.
- Donna Darm: The draft BiOp annual and 5-year plans tried to match CBFWA and NWPPC timing. NMFS called for the 5-year plan to be done in January 2001, but it won't be done until March 2001. The first year, timing may not be right. The first 5-year plan will answer a lot of questions.
- Bert Bowler: The mainstem needs to be treated as a whole, not divided.
- Eric Bloch: Habitat (riparian areas) in Mainstem is dealt with in subbasin plans. Hydrosystem and operational aspects need to be dealt with in a separate plan. The October 2001 hydrosystem is targeted for development in the Program Amendment. *Scoping and call for recommendations. Address Columbia/ Snake system as a whole.*
- ?? Italics Robert Matt: Need to address blocked area mitigation for salmon. 70-15-15 is not allocated to where salmon are eliminated.
- Eric Bloch: Aspects of program do address blocked areas and resident fish. You need to be worried and stay on this. Keep reminding to address extinct and nearly extinct salmon to find the right balance.
- Lionel Boyer: recommends technical staff draft comments. Time has been set in Lewiston to meet with managers.
- ITEM 5: Business Items**
- Discussion: **Approve Change of Officers:**
- IDFG – Chair
- Yakama – Vice Chair

D of officers: Jeff, WDFW – moved

Larry, MDFW – seconded (unanimous)

Adopt Amended Charter

Verify names of tribes. Lionel: move to adopt with change of names. Bill Shake seconded. Adopted unanimously. Bill Shake: amend to amend (adopt FSOC) and adopt. Joe P seconded. Unanimous.

ITEM 6. Panel Discussion: Salmon Recovery – How Do We Make It Work

Discussion: Jeff Koenig: Local approach to watershed state's responsibility for recovery.

Steve Williams: need an evaluation of how programs are working before addition funding is requested.

Virgil Moore: Focus: spend money where the results are seen. Sanctuary areas need designation and management. Need collaborative science back. Maybe CBFWA can do a peer review – who better to do so? Need watershed money.

Chad Colter: fish need access to clean water and habitat. Removal of 4 ½ dams and moving fish upstream would produce cleaner water, and eliminating mixed-stock fisheries would increase available habitat. Roles need to be defined. Water quality and quantity: have to work with local folks. Need legislation for instream flow. Streams are over-appropriated. Remember the cultural side of fish recovery also. Need a good master plan.

Joe Peone: need a trans-boundary approach. Need incentive to get fish back where there are none. A workshop is being held in Colona (?) and it is hoped state and federal entities will participate. The predator issue in being seen now in the upper Columbia too. Look at historical habitat. The fish management plan should include everyone. A fifty-fifty allocation did not include the upriver tribes. Can have 50% of 100 or 50% of \$1M.

Larry Peterman: The basic societal values of today are in direct conflict with conservation. Until there is a change in attitude, recovery efforts won't work. We need to carry the message and demonstrate it ourselves. There is a credibility issue. It would be better to promote image and credibility.

Donna Darm: NMFS admits to a lack of collaboration. Now time to find the goal or quantify it. There is leadership in science. Need to set up two pilots on technical recovery teams with wide participation: one team for Columbia River, one for Snake, one for Upper Columbia, one for Mid-Columbia groups. Then solicit nominations, and have those nominations reviewed by an independent panel. It is important to know how tribal government will fit into the establishment of recovery goals. In order to de-list, adequate tribal recovery must exist. There are questions associated with the introduction to blocked areas, such as, is there adequate habitat?

The issue of trust responsibility on salmon recovery in blocked areas has not been addressed. Need to work out the details in the policy area, not the technical.

39

Ted Strong: Another risk assessment needs to be developed. The current one does not deal with Native American cultures.

Tape 4b

Donna Darm: In the BiOp, some implicit and some explicit risks are taken because of treaty rights.

Ted Strong: A protocol to address cultural impact needs to be developed.

Lionel Boyer: There is no statement in any documents to achieve goals in blocked areas, nor have the ISAB and ISRP mentioned culture. How can a dollar amount be put on the loss of traditional and spiritual values. Once culture is eliminated, we are no more. It is hoped those who have power and authority will do something about it.

ITEM 7: How Do You Manage for Success- Hatchery and Harvest Strategies?

Discussion: Jeff Koenig: A long term agreement for recovery is needed. He supports the NWPPC hatchery plan, which will take a new direction with habitat. He also supports funding research on hydropower and data is needed on spill and flow augmentation. How are we going to use the water is the question. Offsite mitigation: who does it and where?

?? Italics

Steve Williams: Oregon's strategy is changing. *Chip proposal (comp hatchery enhancement proposal)*. Harvest is the wave of the future. One must look outside the box to find solutions.

Gary James: Hatcheries and harvest fight the most in those areas.

Hatcheries: there seems to be an "all or nothing" attitude. We can agree to disagree and apply a diversified approach, perhaps taking on more risk. Implementation with M&E is a full-scale restoration tool. Need flexibility to get through this bottleneck. Need a local hands-on role in developing goals. Need same level of goals. Is mass marking really needed to maximize escape? Balance solutions on what's "most broken."

?? Italics

Donna Darm: The devil is in the details. We must talk about individual hatchery programs. *BPA and NMFS to fund A list*.

?? Italics

Fred Olney: We need to be proactive instead of reactive. Funding is a big benefit. *Newly threatened listed chinook – 4D rule*.

No quorum now.

Is this an action?

Response to 10/20 NWPPC letter – discuss talking points for the 11/1 meeting with NWPPC. 3-5 in Lewiston. Giese to send out suggested letter members may want to use for 10/30 written comments.