



# 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

**DATE:** December 15, 2006  
**TO:** Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)  
**FROM:** Tom Iverson, acting WAC Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** Draft Action Notes for December 12, 2006 WAC Meeting

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting  
December 12, 2006  
CBFWA Office – Portland, Oregon

## Draft Action Notes

**Attendees:** Michael Pope (Chair, ODFW); Angela Sondenaa (Vice-chair, NPT); Gregg Servheen and Steve Elam (IDFG); David Speten (BPT); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Ray Entz (KT); Kelly Singer (SPT); Peter Paquet and Patty O’Toole (NPCC); Buzz Cobell, Dorie Welch, Ben Zelinsky, David Byrnes, and Joe Deherrera (BPA); and Brian Lipscomb, Ken MacDonald and Tom Iverson (CBFWA).

**By Phone:** Kathy Cousins (IDFG); Rick Hayes (CTWSRO); and Scott Soult (KTI).

<b>Time</b>	Objective 1: Committee Participation	0%
<b>Allocation:</b>	Objective 2: F&W Regional Issues	75%
	Objective 3: Annual Report	0%
	Objective 4: RM&E	0%
	Objective 5: Other Issues	25%

### **ITEM 1: Election of Chair and Vice-chair**

**Discussion:** This item was deferred until after the discussion of the WAC work plan for 2007; then revisited when the group had a better understanding of the challenges ahead for the next year and the perceived level of commitment by the CBFWA membership to the work plan.

Carl Scheeler nominated Michael Pope for chair and Angela Sondena for vice-chair. Tom Iverson raised the question of whether the vice-chair would automatically become chair after 1 year. The group agreed that the WAC should re-elect both chair and vice-chair in one year. There were no other nominations.

**ACTION:** Carl Scheeler moved to elect Michael Pope for chair and Angela Sondena for vice-chair on the basis that each would serve for one year and the WAC would elect a new chair and vice-chair in December of 2007. Scott Soult seconded the motion and there were no objections.

### **ITEM 2: WAC Work Plan for 2007**

**Discussion:** Kathy Cousins reviewed the draft WAC Work Plan for 2007. Tom Iverson described how this work plan would fit into CBFWA’s larger work plan during the course of the next year, culminating in Program amendment recommendations.

The work plan was developed to address three priority tasks that need addressing by the WAC. There is a growing disconnect between BPA and the wildlife managers over what priorities each project should be addressing (i.e., modeled HUs versus ecological function). Resolution between BPA and the managers is necessary to stabilize the wildlife program. There was considerable concern that so much effort is being focused on ongoing O&M while land prices are soaring for significant ongoing acquisition commitments. Shouldn’t the committee be focused on how to accelerate mitigation

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

while land prices are affordable?

The group agreed that CBFWA needs to maintain a regional forum that balances the members interests – members are at different stages in their mitigation and therefore have different interests (O&M, continuing acquisitions, and pursuing operational losses). The WAC needs to develop solutions that provide the optimum benefits for all.

The group discussed the fact that wildlife managers were disadvantaged in the recent project selection process and could have been more successful if they spoke with a unified voice. If the managers engage for the next year, they could submit unified Program amendments that define issues guiding the wildlife program and should be given deference in their recommendations. In this context, a task needs to be added to the draft work plan specifically addressing the development of a Program amendment for wildlife and establishing long term security for funding wildlife O&M.

The group agreed that the issues identified in the draft work plan were of priority importance. They also agreed that it will take a renewed commitment by committee members to be successful. There is significant recent foundational information available (i.e., the states have each adopted State Wildlife Conservation Plans).

Kathy requested that when Ken starts in early January, that he outreach to each committee member and solicit input for the work plan and for participation over the next year. The committee agreed to hold a workshop specifically to develop a work plan for 2007 in early January. Kathy Cousins requested that the notes from the October 2004 meeting in Sand Point, Idaho be included in the workshop materials.

See: [http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/Meetings/2005\\_0323/WCactionNotes101904.doc](http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/Meetings/2005_0323/WCactionNotes101904.doc)

**ACTION:** The WAC scheduled a one-day workshop for January 11, 2007 at CBFWA to develop definitions and a detailed work plan with time lines and deliverables.

**ITEM 3: Summary of NPCC Fish and Wildlife Committee Discussion on Wildlife O&M**

**Discussion:** Brian Lipscomb summarized the proposed IEAB investigation of wildlife O&M costs (see [http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2006\\_1212/IEABInvestigationOfWildlifeOMcosts121206.pdf](http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2006_1212/IEABInvestigationOfWildlifeOMcosts121206.pdf)).

The purpose of the task is to determine the extent to which ongoing costs might be reduced by better cost accounting and management. CBFWA will have an opportunity to make a presentation to Council on January 16-17, 2007 in Vancouver, Washington. The WAC members agreed to provide input for that presentation.

Ray Entz summarized the UCUT presentation to the NPCC Fish and Wildlife Committee regarding wildlife O&M (see support material for this meeting at <http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=WAC&meeting=all>). Ray emphasized the need to validate BPA's PISCES data for each of the wildlife projects. Some costs identified in the analysis as O&M were actually enhancement or pre-acquisition costs. Also, acreage totals were not accurate or work elements misrepresented O&M activities. There is a need to define and standardize O&M for consistency in implementation. The 1998 CBFWA report is a good starting point for developing definitions. Ray does not support benchmarking in the traditional sense, and believes each BPA funded wildlife project should be reviewed on a case by case basis. Projects and programs have differing mandates causing significant cost variances.

*At their meeting on December 13, the Council decided to defer discussion of the IEAB analysis until it's January meeting. CBFWA has been invited to engage in the conversation with the IEAB and Council members to determine a reasonable approach to defining and standardizing wildlife O&M for the Program.*

**ITEM 4: BPA Presentation on Wildlife Project O&M Analysis**

**Discussion:** Joe began BPA's presentation by describing the context of BPA's interest in the analysis of wildlife O&M (see

[http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2006\\_1212/WildlifeProgramDec.ppt](http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2006_1212/WildlifeProgramDec.ppt)). Joe presented a theoretical model of how habitat condition relates to wildlife project funding, with an elevated level of funding to complete enhancements early in a project, then a reduction to long term O&M funding after some period of time. BPA is concerned that existing wildlife projects were approved under different funding cycles and so they are not equitable in their size and effort according to habitat units being protected. There was considerable discussion on how funding levels determine the pace of enhancement and differences among projects may only mean that different projects are on different schedules to complete their biological outcomes. Carl suggested that by focusing on cost per acre, it appears that BPA wants to slow all projects down to an equitable pace rather than boost all projects to accelerate their pace.

Dorie and Ben presented the information that was provided during the November Council meeting (see

[http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2006\\_1212/December2006WildlifeMeeting.ppt](http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2006_1212/December2006WildlifeMeeting.ppt)). Much of the data has been updated and improved, so many of their charts and analysis have changed since last month. BPA hopes to continue working on this issue, in collaboration with the project sponsors, to develop better definitions and accountability for the wildlife projects.

It is BPA's goal to demonstrate that the wildlife program is both cost effective and biologically effective. A coordinated effort between BPA and the managers should build transparency and credibility for future funding, and maximize the on-the-ground results. The WAC expressed a desire to make sure that the objectives of defining O&M are clear and that the process to define O&M standards is most cost effective. It does not make sense at this time to fund the IEAB to perform an analysis when there is not agreement that the analysis could be successful.

The WAC and BPA representatives agreed to work together to provide better analyses for evaluating the wildlife program.

**ITEM 5: Next Meeting**

**Discussion:** The next meeting was scheduled for January 11, 2007 at CBFWA in Portland, Oregon. The meeting will be a workshop to develop a work plan for 2007 and will take all day. WAC members are asked to attend in person to maximize productivity and confirm a commitment to the work plan for the next year.