



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

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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: March 30, 2010
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Doug Calvin, Chair
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for March 16, 2010 WAC Meeting

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting
March 16, 2010, 1-5 pm
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Portland, Oregon

The support material for the meeting is posted at:
http://www.cbfwa.org/committee_wac.cfm

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Doug Calvin (Chair, CTWSRO); Scott Soultz (Vice-chair) and Norm Merz (KTOI); Carol Perugini (SPT); Angela Sondenaa (NPT); Tracy Hames (YN); Gregg Servheen (IDFG); Richard Whitney (CCT); Matt Berger (KT); Kelly Singer (STI); Tom O'Neil (NHI); and Tom Iverson (CBFWA)

By Phone: Nate Pamplin (WDFW); Kyle Heinrich (BPT); and Dwight Bergeron (MDFWP)

Time Allocation:

Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
Objective 2. Technical Review	0%
Objective 3. Presentation	0%

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

ACTION: Agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Review and Approve as Final February Draft Action Notes

ACTION: The WAC approved the February 16, 2010 Action Notes as final with no modifications.

ITEM 3: Draft Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy

Discussion: Tom Iverson gave an overview of the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Reporting Plan (MERR) utilizing a PowerPoint presentation produced by NPCC staff member Nancy Leonard. The MERR plan was approved by NPCC to be distributed for public comment. Comments are due April 26, 2010. The MERR provides an overarching framework for monitoring and evaluation efforts in the NPCC's Fish and Wildlife Program. It is anticipated that individual monitoring implementation strategies will be developed for anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife that are consistent with and support the overarching framework. The NPCC will not engage in the development of the strategies until after the adoption of the MERR, expected sometime in July or August 2010. The NPCC staff does not expect to complete monitoring implementation strategies until the end of 2011.

The MERR was structured around the Fish and Wildlife Program, and identifies 9 management questions that are at the heart of the M&E requirements for the Program. Five of these questions pertain directly to wildlife. The MERR also identifies priority biological objectives, performance standards, and prioritization criteria for selecting M&E projects. Tom I. provided a MERR summary for this meeting that captures the relevant information for WAC consideration. As stated above, comments are due April 26th, and it is highly recommended that each

manager review and provide comments to their MAG representative by April 1. It is expected that the MAG will determine whether to provide comments individually or from CBFWA at their meeting on April 6.

Scott S. and Matt B. facilitated a discussion on the priority species and habitat characteristics provided in the MERR document. As they are currently presented, the wildlife species are very HEP oriented and the habitat characteristics are very fish centric. Matt performed some preliminary analysis to review species and habitats (provided as an attachment for today's meeting – Appendix C). Scott and Matt suggested that each project manager should review their species and habitat characteristics to determine if there are possibilities for rolling priorities up to a Province and Basinwide scale. Most participants felt that this effort was accomplished during the Subbasin Planning process and should be easy to obtain. There was some concern that the MERR does not appear consistent with the Subbasin Plans. In any case, the species list and habitat characteristics in the MERR are incomplete and would benefit from WAC member input.

The MERR document describes three types of monitoring: compliance; status and trend; and action effectiveness. The WAC stated it was essential to distinguish within the MERR that HEP provides monitoring for compliance and does not provide biological monitoring necessary for status and trends and action effectiveness for the wildlife portion of the Program. The HEP surveys can provide some of the information necessary for status and trends and action effectiveness, but the procedure was not designed to address these management questions. Moreover, the MERR needs to emphasize the wildlife program performance monitoring.

Tom I. gave a brief update on the RME/Mainstem categorical review. The categorical review will begin in June with a call for proposals. Project proposals will be due in August with a funding decision made by February 2011. The primary wildlife project affected by this review is the IBIS project. This project was level funded until it could be reviewed in the full context of RM&E for the Program during this categorical review. Although the NPCC staff will not be engaging in development of a Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy (WMIS) until the MERR document is adopted; they understand that the WAC may initiate development of WMIS prior to the categorical review in order to set priorities for basinwide wildlife and habitat reporting that may help guide the RM&E categorical review.

The WAC agreed to begin developing a work plan for developing the WMIS. After considerable discussion it was agreed that comments on the MERR would guide much of this discussion, therefore Tom I. will accumulate wildlife comments to the MERR (Please forward or CC Tom: tom.iverson@cbfwa.org) and begin development of a workplan for the next WAC meeting.

Tom O'Neil mentioned that a basinwide data management effort was underway for listed anadromous fish, which may produce information of interest to the WAC. Due to the need for habitat data, and the ecological interactions between anadromous fish and wildlife, the data management effort should be linked with wildlife monitoring priorities. Tom I. will provide a presentation on that effort at the next WAC meeting.

ACTION(S): The WAC will provide comments on MERR to their MAG representatives by April 1, 2010 **with copies provided to Tom I.**

CBFWA staff will post the 2004 ISRP Retrospective Report to the WAC website (<http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isrp/isrp2005-14.htm>).

NHI will send out IBIS focal species and related habitat for co-manager review by March 22, 2010 (available on CBFWA WAC website).

DRAFT WAC WORKPLAN

Date	Task
22-Mar	CBFWA staff to post ISRP 2004 Retrospective Report to WAC website
22-Mar	NHI to send out IBIS focal species and related habitat for co-manager review with basinwide roll-up
1-Apr	Provide comments on MERR Plan to MAG representatives with a copy to Tom I
26-Apr	Comments due on MERR Plan to Council
18-May	Next WAC - review SBP species and roll-up, prioritize basinwide species and habitat, data management presentation, WMIS work plan
19-May	Next Wildlife Crediting Forum meeting
4-Jun	Mainstem/RME Categorical Review begins

ITEM 4: Strategy for Participation in Wildlife Crediting Forum

Discussion: The WAC members were very disappointed in notes from the last Wildlife Crediting Forum. While it is clear that this is not a mediation forum, the key issues continue to remain undocumented and undefined. The WAC members generally feel that HUs will never get the managers to full mitigation, only settlement agreements will address BPA wildlife mitigation obligation. The HEP process has been compromised throughout implementation and a ledger of HUs will unlikely be able to capture all of the errors and compromises made along the way. There was some consternation that BPA was able to provide a wish list for the forum, but it doesn't appear that the manager's wish list was captured in the notes. The WAC agreed that they needed to help steer this forum towards developing products that could help facilitate settlements.

ACTION: No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 5: Next WAC Meeting

ACTION: The next WAC meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2010 from 1-5 pm at the CBFWA offices in Portland, Oregon. Draft agenda and support materials will be distributed prior to the meeting. Proposed draft agenda items include: review of species from Subbasin Plans, prioritize species and habitat characteristics basinwide, and data management presentation.