



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: November 13, 2007
TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)
FROM: Mike Faler (Chair)
SUBJECT: FINAL Action Notes for the November 6, 2007, RFAC Meeting

Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC) Meeting
Tuesday, November 6, 2007
Spokane, WA, 99201

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Sheri Sears (CCT), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Mike Faler (USFWS), Jim Uehara (WDFW), Ron Peters (CDAT), and Joe Maroney (KT)

Phone: Tucker Jones (ODFW), Melo Maiolie (IDFG), Hunter Osborn (SBT), Dawn Anderson (MFWP)

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

ITEM 1: Review Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and approved with no modifications.

ITEM 2: Approve October 11, 2007, RFAC Meeting Action Notes

Action: The action notes were approved with no modifications.

ITEM 3: Independent Scientific Advisory Board's (ISAB) "Non-native Species Impacts on Native Salmonids and Guidelines for Use of Non-native Fishes in Resident Fish Substitution Projects Review" – Recap of RFAC's Meeting with the ISAB

Mike Faler led the group in a review of the RFAC's meeting with the ISAB on October 25, 2007, to address questions the ISAB had relative to resident fish substitution. Listed below are the questions for which the ISAB requested the RFAC to provided responses:

- 1) Do the Resident Fish Managers currently have and use a set of criteria or guidelines to follow when selecting a resident fish species for substitution?
- 2) Are native salmonid species, listed ones or species of concern (e.g. bull trout, westslope cutthroat, redband trout) present in the system to be stocked? If so, what measures are/will be taken to avoid undesired consequences if non-natives are to be introduced or enhanced?
- 3) Is sufficient M&E incorporated into resident fish substitution projects to determine success or needs for adjustments?
- 4) Are the fish community goals in subbasin plans useful in developing resident fish substitution objectives?
- 5) Are goals for economic and cultural benefits of substituted species relative to the economic costs of the substitution program developed?

Mike indicated that overall, the meeting was successful and that the ISAB appreciated the information that was provided by the RFAC. The following is Mike's recap of the meeting based on the recording that was mentioned.

Response to Question #1

Sheri Sears reviewed the Policy and Guidelines for resident fish substitution in the F&W Program

- Where habitat is irreversibly blocked, substitute fisheries can be used to replace lost anadromous fish
- Objective is to provide an alternative source of harvest
- Use native species whenever possible (where habitat supports it)
- Where suitable native fish habitat is not available, manage for non-native species and/or stocks
- This program provides for subsistence and recreational fisheries in blocked areas

Response to Question # 2

Sheri indicated that the substitution programs are managed in way to minimize impacts on native species, and gave a few examples of how this is done:

- The use of sterile fish
- The use of disease-free certified fish
- The use of barriers for confinement of non-natives

Response to Question # 3

Sheri pointed out that M&E has been incorporated into these projects

- M&E for resident fish substitution projects has already been reviewed by the ISRP
- The amount, complexity, and vigor of M&E in resident fish substitution projects is restricted by funding provided by BPA

Response to Question # 4

The RFAC did not fully understand this question, specifically in regards to fish community goals in subbasin plans. Sheri indicated that the subbasin plans set objectives by focal species rather than fish communities, and asked for clarification from the ISAB on this question.

The following question was re-phrased by Tom Poe:

How well did the subbasin plans, in your area, provide direction in the form of fish community goals?

The RFAC again pointed out that fish community assessments were not done as a part of subbasin planning, but instead (based on Council direction), focal species were identified for management.

- Resident fish species are selected for substitution programs based on cultural significance, management needs, and economic benefits

Response to Question # 5

Sheri used the Lake Roosevelt Fishery as an example for Economic Benefit and analysis:

- The Lake Roosevelt Fishery returns 1.3 to 9+ million \$\$ annually to the economy
- Even using the lower end of the economic bracket, it shows a positive return as a result of the fishery

Sheri also pointed out that cultural benefits cannot be easily measured and Resident Fish Managers have refrained from attempting this type of evaluation

Additional discussions

- The RFAC provided examples of where and how native species are being used in substitution projects
- The RFAC pointed out that habitat restoration is being focused on native fish habitat, and not intended to benefit non-native species
- There was a substantial amount of discussion revolving around non-game natives like largescale sucker and peamouth shiner, and at least one ISAB member indicated that these species could provide a substantial amount of fish biomass in a resident fish substitution program. This led us to believe that some ISAB members still did not understand the intent of resident fish substitution
- There was some discussion regarding non-natives vs. invasive species, and at what point does/can a non-native managed in a fishery become an invasive species. The concept here is that there must be a population threshold where this occurs. There was no “threshold level” suggested by the ISAB or RFAC.
- The discussion somehow migrated to contaminant levels in fish, and culminated in the a suggestion by an ISAB member that perhaps doing a comparative study on contaminant levels in humans from various tribes could quickly point out where contaminant problem exist and what those contaminants are.

During the discussion with the ISAB, they requested that the RFAC assist them in obtaining documents that are pertinent to their review. In addition, RFAC participants identified additional references that would be useful to the ISAB. Subsequently, the ISAB requested that the RFAC provide said documents. Listed below are the ISAB’s requests and RFAC offers per the recording:

1. The ISAB expressed an interest that they would like to obtain copies of the Lake Roosevelt fishery cost benefit reports.
2. The ISAB indicated that they would like documents describing measures used to avoid undesired consequences from the use of non-natives. The RFAC participants provided the following insight:
 - Joe Maroney suggested that the ISAB review the BiOp, Bonneville Power Administration’s (BPA) reviews, and the NPCC’s 3-step process reviews associated with the Kalispel Tribe’s bass hatchery.
 - Ron Peters suggested that the RFAC could provide a list of project numbers (i.e., BPA assigned numbers) for which reports exists that contain information addressing this question.
 - Sheri Sears suggested that guiding documents such as the NPCC’s Fish and Wildlife Program, subbasin plans, and tribal/state program plans provide guidance.
3. The ISAB requested that the RFAC provide any specific documents that we believe assist them with their review.

Action: **The RFAC recommended that project sponsors provide a list of resident fish substitution projects to Neil Ward. In addition, the RFAC recommended that the project sponsors should provide links to reports that they believe would address the ISAB’s requests that were identified by Mike Faler (see above)**

ITEM 4: Lake Roosevelt Forum Conference Update

Neil Ward provided an update regarding the session that the RFAC will convene during the Lake Roosevelt Forum Conference scheduled for November 15, 2007. Listed below is the tentative schedule that Neil provided:

Intermountain Province

Session 1

11:00 – 11:20 *Habitat Restoration in the Sanpoil Subbasin*, Sheri Sears, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation

11:20 – 11:40 *Benewah Creek Temperature Dynamics in Relation to Native Westslope Cutthroat Trout Requirements*, Dale W. Chess, Coeur d'Alene Tribe

11:40 – 12:00 *White Sturgeon in the Intermountain Province*, Jason McLellan, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Session 2

3:20 – 3:40 *Non-native Fishes of Coeur d'Alene Lake*, Ron Peters, Coeur d'Alene Tribe

3:40 - 4:00 *Use of Antimycin, Rotenone and Barriers in Native Resident Fish Management*, Joe Maroney, Kalispel Natural Resources Department

4:00 – 4:20 *Northern Pike Status and Management in Box Canyon Reservoir, Pend Oreille River, Washington*, Jason Connor, Kalispel Natural Resources Department

ITEM 5: RFAC Participant List

Neil Ward presented an updated list of RFAC participants for the groups review. Neil indicated that he will include the email and mailing addresses as well as phone numbers. In addition, Neil indicated that there are a few members that he needs to contact to confirm their representatives.

CBFWA Member	Participant
Burns Paiute Tribe	Lawrence Schwabe
Coeur d'Alene Tribe	Ron Peters
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation	Barry Hansen
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	Sheri Sears
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation	
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	Jennifer Graham
Confederated Tribes of the Yakama Nation	
Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Melo Maiolie
Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	Sue Ireland and Charlie Holderman
Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	Joel Tohtz
Nez Perce Tribe	Dave Statler
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Christine Mallette
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall	Hunter Osborn
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley	Tim Dykstra
US Fish and Wildlife Service	Mike Faler
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Jim Uehara

ITEM 6: StreamNet Update

Joe Maroney will provide an update regarding StreamNet's Statement of Work and intentions relative to the warehousing of resident fish data. Neil Ward suggested that the RFAC invite Bruce Schmidt to attend the December RFAC meeting to provide an update regarding the status of resident fish data warehousing activities as they pertain to StreamNet.

Action: Neil Ward will contact Bruce Schmidt to seek his participation during the December 2007 RFAC meeting.

ITEM 7: Amendment Process Update

Neil Ward informed that RFAC that he would be distributing the templates that the Members and Member Advisory Group's (MAG) have directed the technical committees to use for developing measures and strategies for the NPCC's amendment process.

ITEM 8: Application of RFAC Proposed Resident Fish Habitat Loss Assessment Procedure

Sheri Sears provided a PowerPoint presentation (attached) demonstrating the implementation of the RFAC's proposed Resident Fish Habitat Loss Procedure to identify the amount of resident fish habitat lost due to inundation. Several participants expressed concerns about the proposed procedure.

Action: Sheri Sears and Mike Faler will present the presentation during the November 20, 2007 MAG meeting. The RFAC agreed to forward any concerns they may have that pertain to the proposed procedure to Sheri Sears so that she could create a slide that lists the concerns of RFAC participants. Mike Faler suggested that those individual that provided concerns to Sheri should attempt to participate in the MAG to ensure that their concerns are accurately represented.

ITEM 9-10 : Resident Fish Loss Assessment (operations/annual) Process

During the July RFAC meeting, Brian Marotz described the process that the Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks (MFWP) used to develop resident fish loss. The RFAC decided to use the MFWP's procedures as a foundation from which the committee would develop a loss assessment process that would be submitted for consideration during the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's amendment process. The RFAC continued to review MFWP's procedure; however, due to time limitations, the RFAC could not thoroughly discuss nor develop the procedure to assess operations/annual losses.

Action: The RFAC agreed that the focus should be native fish; however, the selection of species would be the responsibility of local managers.

ITEM 11: Next Meeting

Wednesday, November 28, 2008

UCUT Office

Spokane, WA

10:00 – 3:00 (Pacific)