



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

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: December 8, 2008
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Ken MacDonald CBFWA
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes from December 2, 2008 WAC Teleconference

Wildlife Advisory Committee Teleconference

December 2, 2008

Portland, Oregon

9:00-11:00 a.m.

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

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Ken MacDonald, Brian Lipscomb (CBFWA), Lynn Palensky, Eric Schrepel, Erik Merrill, Mark Fritsch (NPCC)

By Phone: Angela Sondenaa (NPT), Alan Wood (MFWP), Nate Pamplin (WDFW), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Michael Pope (ODFW), Scott Soultz, Mark Burns, Norm Merz (KTOI), Jason Kesling (BPT), Carol Perugini (SPT), Kathy Cousins (IDFG), Doug Calvin (CTWSRO)

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved with the addition of Item 2a, and update from Brian Lipscomb regarding Program amendment discussions with the NPCC.

ITEM 2: Approve October 7 WAC Meeting Draft Action Notes

ACTION: The October 7, 2008 WAC Meeting draft action notes were approved as final

ITEM 2a: Update on Discussions Between CBFWA and NPCC Regarding Program Amendments

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb provide the WAC with a briefing on a recent meeting in Spokane between CBFWA staff and Elmer Ward, CBFWA Vice Chair, with Bill Booth NPCC Chair and NPCC staff to discuss CBFWA Program amendment recommendations and CBFWA comments to the draft Program. Brian indicated that the meeting went well and the Council chair was willing explore accommodating some of the CBFWA comments, especially those concerning development of multi-year work plans, updating subbasin management plans, and was willing to continue discussions regarding

monitoring. Brian reported however that at this time the Council was probably not open to further discussions concerning wildlife, especially but not limited to, the policy disagreement over the 2:1 crediting ratio.

The NPCC representatives expressed to Brian that the Council was divided over the 2:1 issue and were under the impression that the managers had been negotiating 1:1 agreements with BPA and the Council was not going to get in the way. It was noted that the 1:1 agreements regarded crediting to individual projects and not an agreement on mitigation obligation.

There was a question regarding the current amendment process schedule. Brian responded we have until December 19 to continue discussions at which time the public process will close. The final program is due to be released in February with “findings” rereleased in April.

Brian indicated the wildlife issue will be discussed during the December 3 members teleconference and the WAC should be prepared to potentially respond to a member action for the WAC to prepare talking points for a Member/Council consultation meeting scheduled for December 3. The Council is getting pressure from BPA and customers who express the mitigation obligation as 1:1. CBFWA policy representatives need to also work with the Council to express the importance of the 2:1 crediting policy.

Brian suggested that the wildlife committee consider, pending member assignment, prepare talking points regarding at least

1. The 2:1 crediting ratio is needed to mitigate wildlife losses from construction and inundation losses,
2. Maintain the crediting committee as currently in the draft program
3. the importance of a monitoring an evaluation program for habitat and ecosystem response is key to determine if acquired HUs are effectively mitigating for wildlife losses

ACTION: The WAC scheduled a December 8 working teleconference to develop talking points for the upcoming Member/NPCC consultation meeting pending Member direction on December 3, 2008.

ITEM 3: Wildlife Project Review

Discussion: NPCC staff Lynn Palensky, Eric Schrepel, Erik Merrill, and Mark Fritsch to discuss the wildlife project review process with the WAC and answer any questions. The following discussion summarizes WAC comments/questions followed by Council staff response.

- WAC - Members wanted to know about the process for completing the review and timeline after the January date for sponsor reports?
 - NPCC – there will be an opportunity for sponsor presentations to the ISRP. The date has not been set but probably will be within the next week or two. The ISRP will then develop a preliminary report about 6 weeks after the presentations with probably a three week comment period. Before the ISRP releases a final report. Sponsors are not required to give a presentation to the ISRP but most take advantage of the opportunity.

- WAC – Will the ISRP review be based on the 2000 Program or an amended Program?
 - NPCC – Probably the new Program to the extent possible.
- WAC – Amendment recommendations and in earlier conservations it has been recommended that funding should be identified to meet the objectives of the management plan and not try to place funds into separate “bins” such as O&M and enhancement.
 - NPCC –the funding question as described is a cross-cutting issue that hopefully will be clarified in the new Program.
- WAC – Should the process include proposals for funding new acquisitions especially in adjacent areas and where needed to fulfill 2:1 crediting as in the 2000 Program and current Program? Should an estimate of capital costs be provided? Should common criteria be addressed in new acquisition proposals?
 - New acquisitions and costs should be identified, especially if can foresee the acquisition in the next three years. There may be a need for further discussion as the current review process may not be addressing new acquisitions and it is a potential disconnect between the review and amendment process. But potential near-term acquisitions should be identified, with as much detail on how the project meets entity management plans and fills gaps. Developing common criteria would probably be a good idea.
- WAC – how should inflation, COLA and costs of unforeseen circumstances (such as new weed infestation, fires, etc.) be accounted? Long-term funding agreements would help.
 - Sponsors should provide best estimate of costs and include to extent possible funds for unforeseen events. Probably should include a multiplier for inflation consistent with the Accords. NPCC staff will confirm the inflation rate used in the Accords.
- WAC – NPCC has been asked to give others such as COTRs read-only access to draft proposals so progress on process can be monitored. WAC feels strongly that access to draft work should only be given to the necessary staff within an entity and those outside the sponsor entity should not have access until the proposal is submitted.
 - NPCC staff will address and look into only allowing individuals within an entity to review draft forms.
- WAC – There is a word limit to the narrative that may not allow sponsors to provide all the information requested. Enough information needs to be presented so the ISRP has full understanding of the project and work accomplished. In the past the ISRP has not been favorable to tracking down references or needing to follow links to documents to find the necessary information. Sponsor reports need to provide the information the

ISRP is requesting

- NPCC –Sponsors need to provide the ISRP with the complete information necessary to answer review questions. But the ISRP does not need to see the full supporting documentation. It is okay to summarize past results and necessary background information with citations provided.
- WAC - There was concern that the email sent to project sponsors that provided access to the proposal forms included sponsor's passwords. Why and do passwords need to be changed?
 - NPCC staff present were not aware of the problem and would look into the matter.

ACTION

Wildlife Project Review

The WAC will schedule a meeting for January 6, 2009 to discuss criteria for new acquisitions. Ken MacDonald was tasked to prepare draft criteria to be distributed to the WAC by COB, December 12 for WAC review. A final list of criteria will then be recommended by the WAC at the January meeting.

Through the discussions there were several areas where NPCC staff were asked to provide answers or additional information that they were not able to address at the meeting. The following are Lynn Palensky's responses from an email sent to Ken MacDonald later the afternoon of December 2.

1. Login and passwords: Every project manager was sent an email under Lynn's name that included the PM's login and password to enable them to access their specific proposal form. They were not sent to others with the exception of Allen's at Umatilla that was not intentional. Sorry, I didn't delete that example before I sent to Ken as an FYI!
2. Kyna Powers (BPA) confirmed the 2.5% COLA committed in the rate case for non-accord projects.
3. Access to see proposal forms in progress: We will not grant access to draft proposal forms to anyone except the project manager unless it is agreed to by the submitting agency or tribe. For example if Nate wants to track the several WDFW projects and he says that everyone's good with that within WDFW, then we can create a read-only access for him for the WDFW projects that he lists. BPA COTR's will not have access to proposal forms until they are complete.
4. ISRP Schedule: We will let you know as soon as we figure out the date.

ITEM 4

Schedule Next WAC Meeting

ACTION:

The next general WAC teleconference is scheduled for January 6, 2009 0900-1100 (Pacific). After the meeting there was a request from Tracy Hames that future WAC meeting not be scheduled on Tuesday mornings as he has internal meeting conflicts.