



# 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 government 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: March 26, 2007  
TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)  
FROM: Jim Uehara (Chair)  
SUBJECT: Draft Agenda for the April 10-11, 2007 RFAC Meeting

**RFAC Meeting**  
**April 10, 2007**  
**1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. (Pacific)**  
**and**  
**April 11, 2007**  
**9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. (Pacific)**

**Upper Columbia United Tribes Office**  
**910 N. Washington, Suite 107**  
**Spokane, WA 99201**

**Conference Line:**  
**4-10-07 - 503-229-0449 ID:641883**  
**4-11-07 - 503-229-0449 ID: 887716**

Support materials for the April 10-11, 2007, RFAC Meeting are posted at:  
<http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=RFAC&meeting=all>

- ITEM 1: Review Agenda**  
**ITEM 2: Approve March 8, 2007, RFAC Meeting Action Notes**  
**ITEM 3: BPA Recommendations and In-Lieu Analysis**

On February 13, 2007, the BPA released their final in-lieu analysis and project recommendations. Major issues relative to resident fish projects included BPA's decision to: 1.) "invest less significantly than before in monitoring bull trout populations that are not directly affected by the FCRPS", 2.) not provide full funding to Lake Roosevelt kokanee projects until the ISRP completes their report, 3.) not provide funding for some projects because "no resident fish crediting mechanism exist", 4.) not provide funding to projects proposed above Hells Canyon Dam because it "may not be an FCRPS responsibility to mitigate above Hells Canyon Dam if not affected by the construction or operation of Black Canyon, Anderson Ranch, Boise Diversion, Minidoka, or palisades Reservoirs", 5.) indicate that "fish population status monitoring is a low priority", and 6.) identify new bull trout projects as "not a high priority."

During the February 20, 2007, MAG Meeting, participants directed the technical committees to review, compare, and comment on the BPA's recommendations relative to those provide by the NPCC and fish and wildlife managers and to provide a report to the MAG during the March 20, 2007, MAG Meeting.

The RFAC reviewed the BPA's recommendations/comments and developed work groups to address the major issues. The work groups are as follows:

*Loss Assessment/Crediting* – Dale Chess, Ron Peters, Lawrence Schwabe, Tom Rien

*Projects above Hells Canyon* - Lawrence Schwabe, Hunter Osborn, Melo Meiolie, Tim Dykstra

*Kokanee/ISRP Recommendations* – Jim Uehara, Sheri Sears, Ed Shallenberger, Neil Ward

*Bull Trout Issues – Mike Faler, Chris Brun, Joe Maroney, Jim Uehara, Melo Meiolie, Tom Rien*

*In-Lieu/Resident Fish Substitution – Lawrence Schwabe and Ron Peters*

*Monitoring – Committee Chairs and Technical Coordinators*

**The RFAC advised individuals in each workgroup to provide their comments to Neil Ward no later than April 2, 2007. Neil will compile the comments, per group, and provide them to the work groups for a final review no later than April 5, 2007.**

The RFAC will review and discuss the products from each of these work groups and develop a transmittal letter to the MAG.

**Proposed Action**

Review and approve the transmittal letter for consideration during the April 24, 2007, MAG Meeting.

**ITEM 4:**

**Program Amendments**

During the February 7, 2007, Members Meeting, the Members directed the technical committees to: 1.) define and clarify terms (i.e., focal species, objectives, how to express limiting factors, etc.), 2.) confirm population level biological objectives, 3.) ensure that priorities affecting fish and wildlife are captured in this process, 4.) validate current limiting factors including out-of-basin affects, and 5.) review and build on strategies and actions necessary to reduce the limiting factors. During the March 8, 2007, RFAC Meeting, participants developed a plan and timeline to complete the Members request. The RFAC has recommended that the Status of the Resources Project (SOTR) and its products (i.e., annual report and website) should be used to address the subbasin-level questions. Listed below are the RFAC's decisions relative to Tasks 1 and 2. The RFAC will review and discuss the products from each of these efforts

1. *Define and clarify terms* - The Anadromous Fish Committee initiated a process on March 8, 2006, to provide definitions for focal species, objectives, limiting factors, causative factors, etc. The RFAC suggested that the definitions should be the same for anadromous and resident fish. The RFAC recommended that, upon completion, the definitions developed by the AFAC should be forwarded to the RFAC for review to ensure resident fish requirements have been represented. The definitions (listed below) were distributed to the RFAC on March 20, 2007 for review and comment. ***Comments are due to Neil Ward no later than March 28, 2007.***
2. *Confirm focal species, biological objectives, and metrics* – The RFAC agreed that although definitions are currently being developed for focal species, objectives, etc., the RFAC participants could initiate efforts to confirm the focal species, biological objectives, and metrics that are represented in the SOTR. To facilitate a review, a spreadsheet (attachment) was provided listing the focal species, biological objectives, and metrics reported for each subbasin in the SOTR. ***The RFAC agreed to review the focal species, biological objective, and metric sections and provide references to existing objectives that were not reported in the subbasin plans or SOTR to Neil no later than March 28, 2007.***

**Proposed Action**

Review and approve the final set of definitions for focal species, objectives, limiting factors, causative factors, etc. developed by the anadromous and resident fish committees. (Information is due to the MAG on April 24, 2007)

**Proposed Action**

Review and approve the focal species identified for each subbasin. (Information is due to the MAG on April 24, 2007)

**Proposed Action**

Review and approve the biological objectives identified for each focal species. (Information is due to the MAG on April 24, 2007)

**Proposed Action**

Review and approve the metric used to evaluate the status of each focal species relative to their biological objective. (Information is due to the MAG on April 24, 2007)

**ITEM 5: Confirm Limiting Factors and Associated Strategies/Actions**

During the March 8, 2007, RFAC Meeting, participants agreed that limiting factors and causative effects could not be reviewed until definitions were developed and approved. With the completion and the definitions, The RFAC will develop a plan and timeline to identify limiting factors, causative effects, and strategies for each of the subbasins. A final product is due to the MAG on May 9, 2007.

**ITEM 6: Identify and Confirm Fish Loss Numbers (Resident and Anadromous)**

During the March 21, 2007, MAG Meeting, participants expressed the need to identify resident and anadromous fish losses associated with hydro-development and operations. The identification of these losses will be essential to setting biological objectives at a regional-scale as well as justifying mitigation efforts. Neil Ward will present a report representing a compilation of resident fish and anadromous fish losses that are pertinent to resident-fish-oriented efforts in the Columbia River Basin.

**ITEM 7: Next Meeting**

## **Terms Used by CBFWA Technical Committees in Development of Program Amendments**

### **Biological Objectives**

Describe physical and biological changes needed to achieve the vision (or for AFAC needs, to achieve the Program or Regional objective). Objectives have two components: (1) biological performance, describing responses of focal species, and (2) environmental characteristics, which describe conditions needed to achieve biological performance. Biological objectives are intended to be measurable. Biological objectives should have a temporal component. When possible, objectives should have their basis in losses or a former condition, not on the expected outcome of a suite of actions.

### **Strategies**

Strategies are sets of actions to achieve biological objectives. Strategies include specific measures to be implemented, and are guidance for development of projects. Strategies should propose priorities and sequencing.

### **Limiting Factors**

Environmental (chemical, physical or biological) condition (i.e., dissolved oxygen, nutrients, water temperature, sediment, stream morphology, predation, etc.) that limits the ability of one or more species to effectively carry out one or more life history functions (i.e., spawning, rearing, migration, etc.).

### **Causative Factors (Threats)**

Activity or condition that contributes to, or causes, one or more limiting factors (i.e., upland tree removal, ground tillage for agriculture, livestock overgrazing on riparian corridors, dams, impoundments that convert flowing stream habitat to ponded habitat, mining, direct human disturbance of animal behavior, exotic species introductions, etc.).

### **Limiting Factor Categories**

The set of limiting factors is similar-to but different-from the set NOAA recommended in a 2005 Report to Congress. The set is identical to that developed by ODFW recovery planning staff:

1. **Water quantity/hydrograph** – Timing and magnitude of flow conditions.
2. **Water quality** – Water characteristics including temperature, dissolved oxygen, suspended sediment, pH, toxics, etc.
3. **Predation** – Consumption of naturally produced fish by one or more species (not to include fishery mortality).
4. **Competition** – Adverse interaction between naturally produced fish and hatchery fish or other species, both of which need some limited environmental factor (i.e. food or space).
5. **Nutrients** – This limiting factor is primarily directed toward the role of salmon carcasses.
6. **Disease** – Pathological condition in naturally produced fish resulting from infection.
7. **Physical habitat quality/quantity** – Quality or quantity of physical habitat. Examples include instream roughness, channel morphology, riparian conditions, fine sediment, etc.
8. **Habitat access** – Impaired access to spawning and/or rearing habitat. Examples include impassable culverts, delayed migration over dams, dewatered stream channels, etc. If, for example, a stream has been diked, thereby eliminating access to off-channel habitat, habitat access should be considered a problem. If off-channel habitat to which access has been eliminated is in impaired condition, it also considered an element of the physical habitat quality/quantity limiting factor.
9. **Population traits** – Impaired population condition(s) including: genetic, life history, morphological, productivity, fitness, behavioral characteristics, and population size. Although population traits are caused by other limiting factors, they may *also* and independently be a limiting factor.

### **Threat Categories**

Six categories of threats are used to describe causes of limiting factors:

1. **Current harvest practices** – Direct and indirect mortality – associated with fisheries – on naturally produced fish.
2. **Current hatchery practices** – Negative impact of hatchery practices on naturally produced fish. Hatchery practices include: number of fish released, removal of adults for broodstock, breeding practices, rearing practices, release practices, water quality management, blockage of access to habitat, etc.

3. **Current hydropower** – Negative impact of current hydropower-system management on naturally produced fish.
4. **Current landuse practices** – Negative impact of current landuse activities on naturally produced fish. Landuse practices include timber harvest, agriculture, urbanization, transportation, mining, etc. If current practices are not adequate to address problems caused by past practices, consider them here as well as under the legacy threat.
5. **Introduced species** – Negative impact of non-native plants or animals on naturally produced fish. The impact of hatchery fish should be considered under the hatchery threat category.
6. **Legacy issues** – Negative impact of practices that no longer occur but that created conditions that currently exert negative impacts. Examples of legacy threats include: historic splash damming, fishery harvest management, and ocean/climate conditions.