



# COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339  
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 | Website: [www.cbfwa.org](http://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 fish and wildlife 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 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

**DATE:** July 28, 2008  
**TO:** Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)  
**FROM:** Ken MacDonald, CBFWA  
**SUBJECT:** July 23-24 WAC Meeting Action Notes

## July WAC Meeting July 23-24, 2008 CBFWA Office – Portland, OR

The support material and reference documents for the meeting are posted at:

[http://www.cbfwa.org/committee\\_wac.cfm](http://www.cbfwa.org/committee_wac.cfm)

### Final Action Notes

**Attendees:** July 23 – Nate Pamplin (WDFW); Ken MacDonald, Paul Ashley, Brian Lipscomb (CBFWA), Norm Merz, Scott Soultz (KTOI); Alan Wood (MFWP); Angela Sondenaa (NPT); David Moen, Anne Warner, David Shepherdson (Oregon Zoo); Michael Pope (ODFW), Doug Calvin (CTWSRO), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Eric Loudenslager, Tom Poe, Colin Levings, Kate Myers, Rich Alldredge, Bruce Ward, Charles Henny (ISRP); Karl Weist, Eric Merrill, Mark Fritsch, Lynn Palensky (NWPPCC)

July 24 – Ken MacDonald, Brian Lipscomb, Paul Ashley (CBFWA), Lynn Palensky, Eric Merrill, Karl Weist, Peter Paquet, Mark Fritsch (NWPPCC); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Doug Calvin (CTWSRO); Angela Sondenaa (NPT) Michael Pope (ODFW); Eric Loudenslager, Tom Poe, Colin Levings, Kate Meyers, Bruce Ward, Charles Henny, Rich Alldredge (ISRP); Alan Wood (MFWP), Scott Soultz, Norm Merz (KTOI); Tom O'Neil, Cory Lanfhoff (NHI); Gina LaRocco, Sara Vickerman (Defenders of Wildlife)

**By Phone:** July 23 – Aren Eddingsass (SBT); Jason Kesling (BPT), Carol Perugini (SPT); Stacy Horton (NWPPCC)

July 24 – Aren Eddingsass (SBT)

<b>Time Allocation:</b>	Objective 1. Committee Participation	100
	Objective 2. Technical Review	%
	Objective 3. Presentation	%

### **ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda**

**ACTION:** The July 23-24 Agenda was approved as written.

### **ITEM 2: Approve WAC Meeting Draft Action Notes**

**ACTION:** The June Draft Action Notes were approved as written

### **ITEM 3: California Condor Reintroduction – Portland Zoo**

**Discussion:** David Moen, Anne Warner, and David Shepherdson from the Oregon Zoo gave a presentation on California Condor recovery with emphasis on

studies to determine the potential for condor reintroduction to the Northwest

**ACTION:** Information

**ITEM 4:** **Member/MAG/Draft BPA Funding Decision Update – Brian Lipscomb**

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb provided the WAC with an update on recent issues being discussed with the MAG and Members of CBFWA that should be of interest to the WAC

- The MAG is currently reviewing a letter from CBFWA to BPA and Council that requests BPA and the Council consult with the agencies and tribes in a collaborative fashion on issues of the Program amendment recommendations and comments, and development of 10-year work plans.
- BPA has released its draft FY09 expense budget. An initial assessment by CBFWA staff indicates that, subbasin by subbasin many of the Member's projects have been funded however, wildlife projects given the upcoming review process is more unclear. The fish and wildlife managers and BPA may not be in agreement with BPA's decisions on mainstem system-wide projects, especially RM&E projects and RM&E coordination. Of particular concern are projects such as CSMEP that are not funded and the consequences of increased funding to NED and PNAMP for undetermined activities.
- Currently there is a disagreement between BPA and CBFWA on where the HEP contract should reside. Currently the contract lies with Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation (CBFWF) and thus it is CBFWA's belief that Paul Ashley is an employee of CBFWF. BPA believes that Paul is an independent contractor and CBFWF is just used administratively for contracting purposes and in the future BPA will contract directly for HEP assessments. Concerns expressed by the group include:
  - BPA believes HEP is their project.
  - The fish and wildlife managers are the HEP experts and it is their technical tool used to account for construction and inundation losses and apply credit towards the losses.
  - HEP assessment teams need to use crews with local knowledge to be properly implemented, therefore the local managers need to be will coordinated with and involved.
  - The technical discussions of HEP need to be kept separate from the administrative decisions on how the numbers are applied (hence the CBFWA amendment recommendation for a crediting forum).
  - All managers agree the HEP assessments need to be objective and technically robust, and the results applied in a transparent fashion.
  - The managers and Paul Ashley believe the HEP contract

should remain with CBFWF since HEP is the managers' tool.

- Time to move forward and get the Program roles of HEP, CHAP, operational loss assessments defined.

**ACTION:** Ken MacDonald, on behalf of the WAC, will draft a letter to BPA for CBFWA signature clarifying the role of the managers in regards to HEP and why the contract needs to remain with CBFWF at least until issues regarding HEP and crediting are decided through the amendment and wildlife project review process. Ken will circulate the letter to the WAC for comment by close of business Monday. The letter needs to be on the Members August 6 meeting agenda.

**ITEM 5: Discuss Format and Topics for Wildlife Project Review Process**

**ACTION:** Due to time constraints Item 5 was dropped.

**ITEM 6: Wildlife Project Review Process**

**Discussion:** Wednesday afternoon and the first two hours of Thursday morning were dedicated to this topic and the review of the July 23, 2008 Draft "Wildlife Category Review Planning Phase" document. Lynn Palensky began the discussion by providing background of the wildlife review process. The intent is to review the current wildlife projects and make funding recommendations to put the projects on a long term funding track and identify any cross-cutting issues that may need to be addressed for program implementation. Throughout the ensuing discussions three related issues kept emerging;

1. The projects have been previously reviewed by the ISRP in the context of the 2000 Program. Why have a review now when the Council will have a draft Program amendment out for review in August. What is the value added of another review now? Shouldn't the review be conducted in the context of an amended Program?  
**Meeting resolution: Council staff believes there is value in providing the opportunity now for in-depth, focused ISRP review to allow dialogue between the ISRP and managers, identify cross-cutting issues, get long-term funding in place, and identify any gaps in the Program. The Council staff also noted that the last review was for the FY 2007-09 funding period and the Council assumes the projects will be reviewed for the results of their past funding and the implications of the results on future actions. The ISRP also emphasized this as the primary focus of the review of existing projects.**

**There was a suggestion that the ISRP site visits occur this summer and fall as planned but the review process and call for sponsor reports occur in the winter after the new program has either taken shape or been adopted. Such a schedule would also help the managers as they are currently busy with field work. Council staff agreed to explore this option. If the timeline cannot be altered and the review occurs before the amendment process is complete, it is the Council staff opinion**

**that any necessary changes needed for a project due to program amendments could be implemented over time through Program implementation.**

2. Project management plans are not consistent and many have not been updated. It may be better to have a common template for management plans to base the review on. **Meeting resolution: All agree it would be nice to have a common template for management plans, but timelines will not permit that to happen. Perhaps an outcome of the review could be development of a common template that could be applied to new projects and existing plans could be updated over time.**
3. How will cross-cutting issues be addressed/resolved? There are many cross-cutting issues that the WAC feel should be addressed and have addressed through program amendment recommendations. The cross-cutting issues include:
  - The use and application of HEP as more than just an accounting tool and strategy to identify losses and apply credit against the loss ledger.
  - Application of credits and crediting ratios including a clear definition of construction and mitigation obligations.
  - Monitoring and evaluation, incorporating a more ecological approach to mitigate loss of wildlife habitat and impacts to species.

Potentially the ISRP should review current program implementation with an eye on the cross cutting issues addressed in the amendment recommendations and provide comment on the recommendations in light of the review. Many of the issues may not appear to be scientific but administrative or legal. In actuality the cross-cutting issues may be scientific if looked at in the context of effectiveness and timeliness (rate of implementation) of the Program to meet the Power Act mandate to fully mitigate for wildlife losses due to construction and operation of the federal hydropower system. Certain programmatic issues may be more the purview of the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) such as whether HEP reflects the best available science for its current application in the Wildlife Program. If an objective of the review is to have the ISRP identify cross-cutting issues that potentially could be recommended for Council, manager, and BPA consideration, and as appropriate, ISAB review, then the process should be structured to include the questions,

- What is the evidence that the Program is or is not working?
- What needs to be changed?

**Meeting resolution: It was suggested and agreed that identifying cross-cutting issues be a clear objective of the review.**

The following highlights more specific points of discussion.

- Table 1. Some projects are hard to place into categories and many could be included in multiple project categories as they include O&M, monitoring, and acquisition. Monitoring and evaluation are also part of many projects and the NHI project (200307200) is actually a data management project not a monitoring and evaluation project. **Meeting resolution: The categories will be dropped and table will just include the projects to be reviewed but not grouped by category. Also related to Table 1, the WDFW Asotin O&M project needs to be added and the UCUT monitoring project has not been added because it is not a stand-alone project but is lumped within other projects. The projects in the table should include the project name as identified in the project proposal.**
- It would be helpful if the project sponsors had access to the original proposals electronically so they can be edited or “copy and paste” from as the new sponsor reports are developed. Council staff is working with BPA and Pisces staff to explore efficiencies in the proposal development process including automatic proposal uploads from previous proposals and Pisces statements of work; and providing management plans and agreement that are in BPA’s possession.
- Since the ISRP will not be able to visit every site, how will the projects be selected for field review? The project site reviews should be designed not as much as a review/critique of the project alone, but to help the ISRP understand the different types of projects and management approaches, understand the different ecological and logistic conditions, and help the ISRP understand the different management issues across the basin. Such an approach should provide the ISRP with better background for projects that are not visited. In the provincial reviews, CBFWA and project sponsors identified the sites to visit and organized the meeting. **Meeting resolution: Council will provide to the WAC for comment an initial list of projects suggested to be visited.**
- Page 5 Section 4i and 4ii. There is no common definition of “enhancement.” Suggest dropping the term and just use the term management or change to “identify the base work needed to manage for the protected and enhanced habitat.” Another suggestion was to combine 4i and 4ii to say something along the line of “Identify the base work needed to manage the property to maintain protected and enhanced habitat consistent with the BPA approved management plan.” Any discussion of “enhancement” then becomes a policy not a biological decision.
- Page 5 Section 4iii. Based upon changes to page 4i and 4ii, Section 4ii should refer to future work beyond the scope of current management plan or potential future acquisitions.
- Page 9, Attachment 1 Section B the “Narrative and Project

objectives” should be moved under the narrative in Section A.

- Page 9 Section A7. The ISRP stresses it is important to show the context of the project in terms of, and consistency with, broader plans such as the State conservation strategies and subbasin plans. Do not just provide a reference and link but briefly summarize the pertinent information, provide the citation and page number, and then an electronic link if available.
- Page 9 Section A6. It was felt providing copies of long term agreements would be useful.
- Page 9 Section B in reference to “Description of project effectiveness monitoring and evaluation (based on project objectives),” the ISRP suggests that sponsors refer to ISRP 2006 Retrospective report for examples (ISRP 2007-1). Reporting monitoring results does not need to be lengthy, just explain the results in the context of the project objectives. Data from other sources or projects (such as bird counts conducted through other programs) can be used if appropriate. The ISRP Metrics Report (ISRP 2008-7) should also be useful on defining potential reporting and monitoring metrics.
- Page 9 section B, bullet “Description of how income generated...” needs to also include how any income generating activities are consistent with (or not) the project wildlife objectives.
- Page 10, the question was raised as to why information on “Additional personnel...” was needed? Council staff responded that they and BPA use the information to help understand and explain costs. The information is already included in the project proposal form so it is not needed again. The ISRP noted they only need the CVs and FTEs for the key personnel including key subcontractors such as scientists at genetics labs.
- Page 10 Section C Acquisition Projects. There was a question as to why the section was focused on the Willamette, Albeni Falls, and Southern Idaho? It was explained the BPA only wanted the review to cover O&M projects and not address acquisition. Council staff thought the process should provide for some review of acquisition where identified in the project descriptions so included the three as a “compromise.” There are other projects where acquisition is a work element so where there are acquisitions associated with the on-going projects they should be reviewed as well. **Meeting resolution: Project sponsors will include acquisition if such work has been identified in the current project proposal and is a work element. One goal of the categorical and geographic reviews is to identify gaps in the program and to subsequently develop a plan to address those gaps in a sequences manner through RFPs.**
- Page 10 Section C Acquisition Projects. A follow-up question was, if the process is expected to be budget neutral and budgets flat, if there is an acquisition would there be opportunity to obtain O&M

funding? The response from Council staff was such a request could be made through the BOG process and the BPA expense budget is up; managers should show what they need.

- Page 10 Section D. The questions in the section appear to apply only to HEP monitoring. It was suggested that the following from previous version of the document be added back: Do you include a monitoring and evaluation component in HEP-based management projects or programs that routinely assess the expected versus actual responses of both target and non-target wildlife species (ISRP 2005-14)? The ISRP considers HEP to be a tool for accounting crediting rather than an M&E tool for benefits to fish and wildlife.
- Page 11 Attachment 2. Attachment 2 is for ISRP use as they review projects and to organize the review. It may be tweaked a little by the ISRP if necessary for the wildlife review. A good sponsor narrative can greatly help the ISRP by providing the necessary detail for the ISRP to consider. As appropriate, summarize the pertinent information from other documents, provide the citation and page number as well as the link if available, but don't just cite or provide the link and expect the ISRP to wade through pages of documents.
- The ISRP appreciated the chance to have an open dialogue with the WAC on the overall process and the Wildlife Program in general.

**ACTION:** The WAC will continue to monitor the development of the process and provide input as the opportunity is provided.

**ITEM 7: Conservation Registry – Gina LaRocco, Defenders of Wildlife**

**Discussion:** Gina LaRocco, and Sara Vickerman from the Defenders of Wildlife gave a presentation on their Conservation Registry, an online data base to record, track, and map conservation activities. They gave a presentation for background then an on-line demonstration. The tool is being used in Oregon, Idaho and Washington to track implementation of the State conservation strategies.

One concern is that the fish and wildlife managers in the Columbia Basin have committed to use the Status of the Resource (SOTR) as the tool to track and report progress of the Fish and Wildlife Program. The Managers are collecting much of the same information for both BPA funded projects and non-BPA funded projects. While the SOTR is “Columbia-centric” and the Conservation Registry covers a broader landscape and is somewhat voluntary, the two processes should not be duplicative but complimentary and the SOTR remain the tool for reporting progress of the Fish and Wildlife Program.

**ACTION:** Information

**ITEM 8: CHAPS – Tom O’Neil, Northwest Habitat Institute**

**Discussion:** Tom O’Neil and Cory Lanfhoff from the Northwest Habitat Institute gave a presentation to the ISRP regarding CHAP and its potential uses in the Willamette Subbasin. Specifically, HEP doesn't include species that are

most relevant to wildlife management in the Willamette Subbasin but CHAP takes into account more appropriate species and their ecological functions.

**ACTION:** Information

**ITEM 9: Next WAC Meetings**

**ACTION:** The August WAC meeting was scheduled for August 19-20 in Sandpoint, Idaho. The meeting was to include a field trip to view the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho activities. Due to difficulties finding lodging at government rates that time of year the trip to Sandpoint is tentatively moved to September, date to be determined.

Ken MacDonald will work with Angela Sondenaa to schedule a WAC teleconference for August 19 or 20.

**ITEM 10: ISRP Site Visit**

**Discussion:** The ISRP went to the John Palensky Wildlife Mitigation Project. The review participants met at the site with Susan Beilke, project manager for ODFW and Mark Nebeker, ODFW Sauvie Island Wildlife Area manager. The ISRP toured the site and discussed the project objectives, management and monitoring programs, budget and ecological challenges.

**ACTION:** Information

***Meeting Adjourned.***