



July 2, 2002:

TO: Wildlife Committee (WC)

FROM: Frank Young, CBFWA *Franklin R. Young*

SUBJECT: Action Notes for June 20, 2002 Wildlife Committee Meeting

**Wildlife Committee Meeting & Site Visits
Portland, Oregon
June 20 & 21, 2002**

If there are no objections within five days, these actions will be considered final.

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Paul Ashley (WDFW); Mattie Allen (SPT); Robert Walker and Peter Paquet (NWPPC); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Loren A. Kronemann (NPT); Greg Sieglitz (ODFW); Tracy Hames (YN); Mark Berry (CTWSRO); Maureen Smith (USFWS); and Neil Ward and Frank Young (CBFWA).

By Phone: Anders Mikkelsen (CdAT); Amos First Raised (BPT); Mary Terra-Berns (IDFG); Joann Hunt (NWPPC); Kelly Singer (STOI); Scott Soultz (KTOI); and Jess Wenick (BPT).

Time Allocation:	Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	25%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	10%
	Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	0%

ITEM 1: Use of RVI Values Developed by NHI for Reservoir Open Water

This item was deferred until more information becomes available.

ITEM 2: Crediting

DISCUSSION: Greg Sieglitz reported that BPA is requiring ODFW to sign a statement that provides BPA with a 1:1 crediting ratio for protection credit that is at odds with the 2:1 ratio in the Council's Program. BPA is claiming that MOA language on crediting (common to MOAs with other agencies and tribes) requires 1:1 crediting. ODFW is disputing this and may invoke the dispute resolution mechanism in the MOA. A project acquisition is being held up because of this disagreement.

- DISCUSSION CONTINUED: Carl Scheeler provided a draft document on the history of the development of the managers' current approach to crediting for both permanent protection and short term riparian protection for WC review. Carl recommended WC members obtain a copy of Wildlife-Habitat Relationships by David Johnson and Tom O'Neil from the Northwest Habitat Institute in Corvallis habitat@nhi.org as a reference document. Carl suggested the development of a "Key Ecological Function" approach to determining whether a non-wildlife project qualifies for wildlife credits.
- ACTION: A Key Ecological Functions Subcommittee was formed, with Scott Soultas as Chair, to develop a methodology (by further developing Carl's draft) for crediting wildlife benefits from non-wildlife mitigation projects against secondary losses.
- ITEM 3: Develop an Approach to Work with Resident Fish Committee to Develop Recommendations for Allocating a Portion of the BPA Budget for Resident Fish and Wildlife**
- DISCUSSION: Neil Ward stated that the portion of the budget being spent on resident fish may be greater under the present process than under the old 15-15-70 per cent split approach. He suggested that WC members discuss this issue with their RFC representatives to determine their interest in jointly pursuing this issue.
- ITEM 4: Review of Pine Creek Ranch Wildlife Mitigation Plan**
- DISCUSSION: Mark Berry presented the Pine Creek Wildlife Mitigation Plan and responded to questions.
- ACTION: The WC approved the Pine Creek Wildlife Mitigation Plan as consistent with the CBFWA Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines. A Powerpoint presentation of this Plan will be placed on the CBFWA website for the use of those who were unable to attend the meeting.
- ITEM 5: Review Draft Letter to Doug Marker**
- DISCUSSION: Tracy Hames questioned the appropriateness of sending a letter under CBFWA letterhead that addresses only Oregon issues. It was pointed out that other states had similar issues and a more general letter on this issue would follow.
- ACTION: The letter was approved subject to modifying the first paragraph to reference the more general letter to follow on this issue and including language stating that the detailed list of problems in the OWC budget was being provided as an example of the type of problem that others are experiencing.

ITEM 6: Review Wildlife Proposals Submitted Under the NWPPC Innovative Project Solicitation

DISCUSSION: Projects 34011, 34015 and 34024 were determined to be wildlife projects and were reviewed by the WC.

ACTION: For projects 34011 and 34015 the WC concurred with the ISRP review comments. For Project 34024 the WC agreed with the ISRP review comment that more detailed information would be helpful, but disagreed with the ISRP Do Not Fund recommendation. The WC felt that the study would provide information useful for making decisions on project prioritization.

ITEM 7: Review Guidelines for Within-year Requests for Additional Funds

DISCUSSION: Neil Ward described the purpose of the Guidelines.

ACTION: The committee agreed conceptually with the guidelines and will provide any additional comments to Neil.

ITEM 8: Regional HEP Team

DISCUSSION: Paul Ashley reported that the funding for the Regional HEP Team for this season was approved by the Council at its June meeting in Bend. The Council approved \$93k with an additional \$20k provided by CBFWA for a total of \$113k. The funding for next year will depend on approval of the CBFWA Proposal for FY 2003-5 submitted under the Mainstem/Systemwide Solicitation. Paul stated that based on his experience to date, the regional team approach is working very well.

ITEM 9: Site Visits

DISCUSSION: Unfortunately only seven WC members were able to participate in what turned out to be a very informative and enjoyable tour of four Willamette Valley mitigation sites conducted by ODFW.

ITEM 10: Date and Location of Next Meeting

The date and location of the next meeting will be determined later. Please send your agenda suggestions to Frank Young along with any ideas on mitigation sites for the WC to visit.