



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

Final

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 Fish, Wildlife & 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: June 25, 2009
TO: CBFWA Members
FROM: Brian Lipscomb, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for the June 17, 2009 Special Face-to-Face Members Meeting

Special Face-to-Face Members Meeting
Wednesday, June 17, 2009
9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
CBFWA Office, Portland OR (via WebEx)

Meeting support material posted at http://www.cbfwa.org/committee_main.cfm.

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Chairman Elmer Ward and Brad Houslet, CTWS; Alan Byrne and Lance Hebdon, IDFG; Bruce Crawford, NOAA Fisheries; Tony Nigro and Tom Rien, ODFW; Ron Rhew, USFWS

Phone/WebEx: Phil Roger and Gene Shippentower, CTUIR; Michele DeHart, FPC; Dave Statler, NPT; Elizabeth Gaar, NOAA Fisheries; Scott Brandt, SBT; Bill Tweit, WDFW

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

Chairman Elmer Ward chaired the meeting and confirmed that the focus of the meeting was to address concerns about the framework for the anadromous fish monitoring workshops and CBFWA work plan and provide direction to staff for Members to consider at their July 1, 2009 teleconference. A quorum was not required for this meeting.

Brian Lipscomb provided an update on the upgraded WebEx format.

Action: The agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Implementation of the Anadromous Fish Monitoring Framework Workshop and Design

Background: At the June 3, 2009 teleconference, the Members reviewed and provided comments regarding the monitoring workshop strategy, timeline, and budget allocations.

- [Updated Monitoring Workshops Strategy \(Version 9\)](#)
- [Updated Monitoring Strategy Timeline \(Version 5\)](#)

As a result of that teleconference, the Members scheduled the June 17 special face-to-face CBFWA Members Meeting to discuss the agencies and Tribes roles in the implementation of the Anadromous Fish monitoring framework workshop strategy and design, the workload expectations, timeline, and funding allocation levels.

Today's meeting elements are:

- 1) a description of the CBFWA staff roles in the process;
- 2) guidance and expectations for Members' contribution as it relates to the outcome of the workshops and associated analysis to understand what is expected from staff commitments;

3) discuss available funding and financial support levels and allocation.

Discussion:

Brian Lipscomb facilitated a detailed review and discussion of the [timeline/schedule](#) focusing on the expected outcomes (shown in the yellow boxes), the process for developing the anadromous fish monitoring framework for the workshops and deliverables, the expected outcomes of staffs participation and work commitment, how the work is anticipated to transpire from the subregional workshops to regional workshops, the budget and funding allocations, and the [revised CBFWA AWP work plan](#).

Brian indicated that the initial assessment for monitoring of Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) and habitat and hatchery effectiveness is partly completed. Bruce Crawford, NOAA worked with Ken MacDonald and the RM&E workgroup to facilitate the completion of the hatchery and habitat effectiveness questions and tables. The draft tables that contain the latest Viable Salmonid Population, habitat and hatchery effectiveness monitoring inventory organized by Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU)/Distinct Population Segment (DPS) are posted for review and comment on the [Anadromous Monitoring Strategy website](#).

The [spreadsheet](#) was developed by Jay Hesse to use as a tool to assist in developing the framework model for each ESU/DPS, VSP parameters, and hatchery and habitat effectiveness. The idea is to use it as a starting point for each area and eventually form an access database linked to a GIS information layer and display the information geographically for use at the regional workshop in September. Each individual agency or Tribe will be expected to fill out the table and contemplate their perspective of the appropriate framework design for each ESU/DPS. A series of subregional meetings to facilitate and bring together each agency or Tribe's perspective of a monitoring framework in each area are scheduled to start in June and end in August. The expected output from the subregional workshops is a verified As Is Model (inventories of what you have) for monitoring and a verified To Be Framework for needed monitoring for BiOp and other, i.e. recovery plans, any monitoring for federal, states, & Tribes, and the Program.

Dave Statler, NPT inquired about the potential relationship between the Multi Year Action Plans (MYAP) and geographical reviews. He asked, if any scheduling had been developed for the RM&E plan and approach to the MYAP and/or geographical reviews? Brian responded that the Council has a proposed process for categorical reviews following with geographical reviews. The categorical review pertaining to this conversation is the RM&E and anadromous artificial production review is scheduled now. They will adjust the schedule for the anadromous portion of the RM&E review to be informed by the outcomes of the workshops. Subsequently, there will be a need to develop MYAP across the Basin to accommodate anything that comes out the categorical reviews, i.e. RM&E, Wildlife, Artificial Production, etc. Each category will have a list of actions/projects that design MYAP through the monitoring framework workshops. At this time the Council has not adjusted those schedules and CBFWA staff will provide an update at the July 29-30 Members Meeting.

Tony Nigro, ODFW asked if the states and Tribes have an opportunity to provide comments on the [criteria in the tables](#), according to [NOAA's guidance document](#). Bruce Crawford welcomes CBFWA's comments.

- The Members directed CBFWA staff to work with Bruce Crawford, NOAA Fisheries to develop questions to define the decision framework and address the Members concerns before they assign a person to participate in the process. Bruce Crawford suggested referencing the [draft NOAA Fisheries Guidance for Monitoring Recovery of Salmon and Steelhead](#) document to assist in defining the questions for the framework. The draft guidance document is designed to provide "guidance to salmon recovery partners concerning prioritizing monitoring efforts to address the viability of salmon populations and the associated threat and factors involved in listing certain Evolutionarily Significant Units and Distinct Population Groups under the federal Endangered Species Act". The draft NOAA guidance document has been available for review and comment and will be submitted to the Federal Register for publication by June 26, 2009, a 90-day public review period will follow the submission date.

The Members discussed the To Be Model database. The concept is to develop the To Be

Models from each ESU/DPS perspective, once designed, do the coordination step at the mainstem level.

Michele DeHart, FPC, questioned the process for monitoring for the VSP/ESU and monitoring specific parameters to collect data for a purpose of an analysis. What decision framework is the analysis supporting? What data is the priority to collect for the monitoring program that the analysis is going to support?

Bruce stated that the basic hypothesis is in the guidance document. The current monitoring questions have been adapted, based on ESA, ongoing allocations, harvest, etc. The questions have not been determined for each table.

Tony suggested an explicit decision framework and questions be developed and made available for review to identify the desirability and feasibility of the process to benefit everyone.

Bruce understood the concept but had not seen it expressed this way; to identify the decision framework to define funding for specific monitoring in order to test specific questions.

The Members discussed the difficulties for defining the questions for monitoring for habitat, hatchery, and harvest effectiveness. Washington has identified recovery plans accepted by NOAA and do not want to be left out of this process.

Dave Statler asked if there is a parallel process developed to determine the RM&E needs for anadromous salmonids/Pacific lamprey. Brian stated that the both Council and BPA have flagged Pacific lamprey as a concern but conversations will continue on how lamprey issues are designed and implemented into the process.

Dave suggested in the consideration of other species for on-the-ground collection of data efficiency to develop cross communication for data needs to benefit the monitoring efforts in the subbasins and mainstem.

The Members requested that the decision framework be defined and clarified to inform the workshop participants of work expectations and priorities to address the needs of the Fish and Wildlife Program. Following the workshops, a monitoring strategy effort is identified for each ESU to adjust, confirm or eliminate current monitoring and sideboards are needed to maintain order and purpose of the project.

Bill Tweit, WDFW is viewing this exercise as an opportunity or tool to inform them of the federal agency's priorities that would assist in their decisions regarding monitoring resources, funding, participating in the process, and linking monitoring efforts. These are important exercises for participating in monitoring the BiOp and working with NOAA Fisheries on VSP monitoring. The Upper Columbia products and discussions have been productive and informative.

Tony suggested tweaking the purpose in the subregional workshops to define the framework.

Bruce stated the conversations are going well and the process is happening with or without the CBFWA's participation. Regional unanimity is important among the agencies and Tribes regarding the priorities for lamprey, resident, wildlife, etc., but anadromous fish will be addressed now. The process has been slowed down to accommodate the workshops, which BPA, Council, and others support for the success of the process for the whole region's benefit. CBFWA should consider updating and facilitating this process every two years.

Should the subregional decision framework be coordinated at regional perspective and does the decision framework need consistency between the subregional areas, was a question Brian asked the Members.

Tony requested that the design of the To Be Models be based on the decision-making framework agreed upon by the fish & wildlife managers in their area. Keep it simple. The general parameters are captured in the tables, but the Members are requesting from the subregional workshops the questions and answers to what are the decisions and analysis expectations; who are the decisions important to and why; and how are the decisions going to be made and used. Design the access database tool to support the analysis and capture the participant's answers to the questions.

- The Members support working on the tasks in the As Is Model and utilizing the

monitoring guidance document as a reference and verifying the information.

The Members need more time to select their appointees who would work with Ken to design the database and framework questions.

The Members referenced the anadromous monitoring framework deliverables outlined on page two in the [June 9 letter from BPA to CBFWA regarding funding decisions](#).

Michele DeHart, FPC stated that the Comparative Survival Study (CSS) Oversight Committee, which is made up of states and Tribes, have been actively doing this work for several years. The CSS Oversight Committee will be participating at the July 7, 2009 Mainstem Coordination Meeting and this would be a good place to start the discussions to identify products for the workshops. Better coordination is needed between pit tagging and mainstem. Michele stated that marking integration has been going on for ten years and suggested listing out marking programs and the ongoing work to identify the groups and missing information to develop more smolt to adult returns (SAR).

- Michele agreed to provide this information prior to the subregional workshops to bring awareness of the current integrated hatchery or tributary marking programs for CSS.
- On 6/22/09 Michele DeHart, FPC provided the following information regarding [Mainstem monitoring: CSS; Coordination and integration of marking for estimation of SAR juvenile migration survivals and mainstem passage characteristics, The Smolt Monitoring Programs; juvenile migration characteristics including survival](#).

Dave Statler requested the mainstem be part of the regional decision framework and the need for appropriate questions to guide data collection and monitoring in the mainstem to include a policy level review.

The Members agreed that the CSS Oversight Committee has a good understanding of decision framework for the mainstem and is a good place to start. A policy level review of the framework for the mainstem decisions is needed and that group has to be identified to complete the process. It is important that the agencies and Tribes have an opportunity to set their priorities for the mainstem through the design of the monitoring framework at the regional framework workshop.

- The Members directed Ken to work with Michele and others to identify a draft set of decision framework questions for the mainstem.

The [ISRP-ISAB Tagging Report](#) is out for review and contains management recommendations that are being contemplated. The Council anticipates this workshop will provide a coordinated tagging plan. Will this process address the verified issues in the report was a question. The Members will be informed after the Fish Passage Center and Oversight Committee completes their review of the report.

As the decision framework is designed for other species, it needs to be clear of what the product does or does not represent and include a modification question/opportunity in the framework.

The Members reviewed the [revised CBFWA AWP budget](#) for the development of the monitoring workshop outputs. In May 2009, Chairman Ward and Brian met with BPA to secure funding to continue operations for the CBFWA organization. BPA has committed to provide CBFWA with \$336k for CBFWA staff and an estimated \$165k for the Members' portion of the budget. At the May 2009 meeting, BPA was informed that the Members' budgets needs for participation were not verified in the funding request. The estimates came from the development of the tasks that were provided in RM&E work plan, i.e. VSP parameters.

- Brian asked the Members to define their needs to participate in the process. At this time, NPT funding estimate is adequate, and ODFW, WDFW, and IDFG funding estimates are not confirmed for staff participation. They need more information to inform their funding needs to complete the monitoring workshop process.

Brian provided three options to increase funding for Members participation:

1. Members make up the funding difference.
2. Go back to BPA with a verified budget numbers and request more funding.
3. Reduce CBFWA staff budget.

The Members requested a verification of work for the \$336k allocated to CBFWA staff. Brian provided the staff workload estimates and reduction options outlined in the revised budget.

Tony Nigro, ODFW is concerned with the amount of work and time anticipated to participate in the workshop process and the importance of internal coordination to include district and regional members' support in the process. Tony requested confirmation of the Members budget needs to participate in the process, presenting a revised verified budget to BPA identifying the costs to complete the work, and prepare a contingency plan. If BPA will not provide more funding for the project, the Members need to make the decision not to participate in the process or identify the project as a high priority and reprioritize the work plan and/or reallocate funding to participate in the process. Tony suggested the discussion be in the context of sustainability; the CBFWA budget shortage conversation is significant because the CBFWA budget shortage will occur next year.

Bill Tweit, WDFW stated that WDFW involves four different ESUs. They estimate an \$85k budget to fund participation in the workshops and that budget request does not compensate past participation. Bill suggested further discussion on the division of the budgets funding allocation, reduction options, and approaching BPA with a verified revised budget. On an allocated budget of \$36k WDFW can only commit to doing work for one ESU and calling it a pilot or consider dividing the work between this year and next year.

Dave Statler, NPT stated that Jay Hesse's funding estimate is adequate.

Alan Byrne, IDFG, stated IDFG is not prepared to confirm the \$42k allocated funding estimate until IDFG meets to discuss the appropriate representative, time commitments, and costs to participate in the process. IDFG is struggling to plan, prioritize, and commit to the process without the defined framework. In addition, the RM&E process should be ongoing, after the plan is established, the plan will need to be implemented and modified.

Lance Hebdon, IDFG reminded the Members that they requested to be part of the process and should follow through on the process.

Brian stated the Council and others are realizing the value of the workshop products and the amount of work to achieve the outcomes.

- The Members recommend approaching BPA for more funding with caution considering past decisions and comments. Pending the results and analysis and the prospect of requesting additional funding for this effort, communication with BPA will be formal and presented by the Chair of CBFWA. The Members directed staff to contact the Members and verify the numbers in the CBFWA AWP and prepare three alternatives for 30% reduction out of CBFWA staff budget as a contingency plan and present those impacts and options for discussion at the July 1, 2009 Members teleconference. The subregional workshop schedule will be adjusted to accommodate the Members' July 1st decisions.
- The Members expressed the importance of having permanent conversations regarding CBFWA's work plan and sustainability; creating a RM&E workgroup/committee to develop, implement, maintain, and adjust the work plan; having CBFWA Members communicating their formal actions with BPA and Council; and attending the CBFWA meetings in person.

Upcoming Meetings:

Members Teleconference: July 1, 2009, 1-4pm (via WebEx)

Council Meeting: July 14-16, Portland, OR.

MAG Teleconference: July 20, 2009, 1-4pm (via WebEx)

Members Summer Face-to-Face Meeting: July 29-30, 2009, Kalispell, MT