



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 | Website: www.cbfwa.org

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: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)

FROM: Ken MacDonald, CBFWA

SUBJECT: March 22, 2007 WAC Meeting Final Action Notes

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting
 March 22, 2007
 UCUT Office – Spokane, WA

The support material and reference documents for the meeting are posted at:
<http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=WAC&meeting=all>

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Ken MacDonald (CBFWA), Nate Pamplin (WDFW), Michael Pope (ODFW), Tracy Hames (YN), Scott Soultz, Norm Merz (KTOI), Dwight Bergeron (MTFWP), Anders Mikkelsen, Cam Heusser (CDAT), Ray Entz (KT), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Loren Kronemann, Angela Sondena (NPT), Matt Berger (CCT)

By Phone: Greg Servheen (IDFG), Joe DeHerrera (BPA)

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

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda and February 22, 2007 Meeting Notes

Discussion: There was some discussion regarding the WAC presentation to the NPCC and the subsequent Council response. Several WAC members suggested some field trips with Council members may help facilitate better communication and understanding.

Michael Pope asked if WAC members had responded to Roger Mann's email proposal for the IEAB Wildlife/PISCES O&M study. Not all members received the email. Roger Mann's email will be circulated again. Comments should be directed to Roger Mann with a copy to Michael Pope.

It was requested that copies of responses submitted to Patty O'Toole regarding the NPCC letter for comment regarding the use of PISCES data to review wildlife O&M be forwarded to the WAC. The individual comments are posted on the NPCC website at <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/wildlife.htm>

ACTION: Approve Agenda and February 22, 2007 Meeting Notes

The agenda for the March 22, 2007 meeting and the February 22, 2007 Action Notes were approved.

ITEM 2: MAG Meeting Update

Discussion: Nate Pamplin briefed the group on the March 20, 2007 MAG meeting. Primary discussion focused on the WAC response to MAG regarding the recently released BPA funding decisions. The WAC response to the MAG is posted at http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0320/FY0709_WildlifeDecisionMemo.doc

Several WAC members were interested to know how the MAG will be addressing the *in lieu* issue and want to be kept informed. It was suggested that a systematic process with specific criteria be developed for *in lieu* review of projects.

A draft example of the framework for the wildlife section of the Status of the Resource Report (SOTR) was circulated. One main comment was reporting by subbasin may not be appropriate for reporting wildlife status and accomplishments. Reporting by province may be more appropriate.

The Technical Committees are expected to report on their progress towards preparing for the Program Amendment process at the April MAG meeting. The May MAG meeting will be a workshop devoted to the Amendment Process.

ACTION: MAG Assignments

The WAC outline for addressing Amendments will be presented at the April MAG meeting with more detail provided at the May MAG meeting (See Actions for Item 6)

Nate Pamplin and Ken MacDonald will work with Neil Ward to further develop the wildlife section of the SOTR prior to the next WAC meeting. The example page is posted on the website and any comments the layout should be directed to Ken MacDonald

ITEM 3: Scott Soultz – Update on Operational Loss Assessment Process

Discussion: Scott Soultz presented the work to date to determine hydropower operational losses to fish and wildlife in the Kootenai River system. Key components of the process include:

- Focus on ecological losses
- Using a fluvial geomorphic approach
- Working to develop an Index of Ecological Integrity
- Using a multi-trophic approach

Scott would like future discussion and feedback on using the Kootenai

approach as a standard regional process to address operational losses. There was some concern on how the process would work to assess operational losses due to the lower four dams. The presentation is posted on the CBFWA website with the March 22 meeting documents

ACTION Information topic for possible consideration in amendment process, no specific action at this time

ITEM 4: Rat Entz – UCUT Wildlife M&E Program

Discussion: Ray gave a power point presentation on the effectiveness monitoring program the five UCUT members are developing. The program is designed to evaluate wildlife response to habitat restoration. The program goes beyond HEP which provides an accounting of structural loss but does not help assess whether the habitat is functional nor provide a desired condition. The UCUT program relies on the use similarity measures and reference sites. Reference sites are not necessarily a historical condition but sites that provide the best examples of a functional habitat type given current social constraints. The program is designed to fit within the BPA “soft-cap” on wildlife species monitoring. The presentation is posted on the CBFWA website with the March 22 meeting documents.

ACTION: Information topic for possible consideration in amendment process, no specific action at this time

ITEM 5: Ken MacDonald- Review WAC Poster

Discussion: Ken MacDonald posted the draft WAC poster to be displayed at the Wildlife Society meeting for comment. A number of suggestions were made including adding to the display some program information such as annual budget, total HUs lost, total protected, adding province boundaries, and some pie charts similar to ones in the SOTR.

ACTION: **WAC Poster Edits**

Ken MacDonald has put the poster on the Website. Suggestions for the poster should be directed to Ken recognizing the poster needs to be completed by April 4.

ITEM 6: Develop the Wildlife Work Plan for Amendment Process

Discussion: The draft outline attached to the February 22 Action Notes was reviewed and provided the basis for the discussion. Based upon the discussion assignments were made (see Action below). Unresolved was the topic of how to link State Conservation Plans to subbasin plans and the wildlife program.

ACTION **Wildlife Work Plan**

The following assignments were made to further develop the wildlife committee work plan.

- Review Old Fish and Wildlife Programs -Ken MacDonald will review the 1995 and 2000 Fish and Wildlife programs for definition of losses and to assess how the 1995 and 2000 program addressed components of the draft wildlife outline. Based upon the assessment, definitions and portions of the past programs may be identified to

specifically bring forward as a program amendment. By April 19, Ken MacDonald will post a draft of the assessment for group review. Michael Pope will get a copy of the Beak Report (*Audit of Wildlife Loss Assessments on the Columbia River and its Tributaries 1993, Project No. 73485*) posted for review as well.

- Crediting. Scott Soultz will draft alternative approaches for the MAG to consider addressing wildlife crediting issues including a standardized process for resolving crediting disputes. Will also address potential to include ecological function in the crediting discussion.
- O&M. Carl Scheeler will take the lead to develop the O&M white paper into a suggested amendment for O&M including the need for approaches to provide stable funding and ecological function.
- Monitoring and Evaluation. Scott Soultz and Michael Pope are leads to define potential Wildlife M&E amendment including defining appropriate species monitoring and monitoring for ecological function. The M&E discussion may include suggestions to link the Fish and Wildlife program with the state conservation plans. The Grand Coulee “Brown Book” was suggested as a potential source of amendment language.
- Draft documents should be sent to Ken MacDonald by April 19 if possible to be posted for review prior to the next WAC meeting
- Ken MacDonald, Michael Pope, Carl Scheeler and Scott Soultz (and any other interested WAC members) will meet on April 25 at 1:00 in The Dalles to edit and further develop the above work products prior to the general WAC meeting on April 26.

ITEM 7

Schedule Next WAC Meeting Date and Location

ACTION:

WAC Amendment work group and any interested members will meet at **1:00 April 25**. The next general WAC meeting which will focus on preparation of WAC products for the MAG meeting will be **April 26** beginning at 0900.

Both meetings will be located at the ODFW Screen Shop Conference Room in The Dalles, Oregon