



**COLUMBIA
BASIN
FISH & WILDLIFE
AUTHORITY**

FINAL

September 25, 2006

TO: Members Advisory Group
FROM: Mark Bagdovitz, CBFWA
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for 9/19/06 MAG Meeting

**Members Advisory Group Meeting
September 19, 2006
1:00-5:00 p.m.
CBFWA Office, Portland, Oregon**

Final Action Notes

The support material and reference documents for the 9/19/06 Members Teleconference are posted at:

<http://www.cbfga.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=MAG&meeting=all>.

Attendees: Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Dave Statler, NPT; Phil Roger, CRITFC; John Platt, CRITFC; Lonny Macy, CTWSRO; Tony Nigro, ODFW; Doug Taki, SBT; Jim Waldo, GTHMP&D Law Offices; Doug Marker, NPCC; Lynn Palensky, NPCC and CBFWA Staff: Jann Eckman, Tom Iverson, Tana Klum, Kathie Titzler, Dave Ward, Frank Young and Pat Burgess, Trina Gerlack

By Phone: Lawrence Schwabe, BPT; Dale Chess, Cd'AT; Rob Lothrop, CRITFC; Gary James, CTUIR; Bill Hutchinson, IDFG; Chris Hunter, MFWP; Gwen Lankford, Sapphire Strategies; Mary Verner, UCUT; Bill Tweit, WDFW; and Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Discussion: Mark Bagdovitz chaired the meeting.

The MAG agreed that when Jim Waldo arrived that whatever agenda item they were working on would be finished up and Jim Waldo's presentation would begin, in addition, Item 6 would follow Jim's presentation because the NPCC amendment process issue is interconnected to the hatchery reform project.

Note: The agenda items are listed in the order as they were discussed at the meeting.

Action:

- Dave Statler moved to accept agenda as modified.
- Lonny Macy seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 2: Final Review and Approval Action Notes for 8/17/06 and 9/6/06 MAG Meetings

Action:

- Phil Roger moved to accept the 8/17/06 and 9/6/06 MAG meetings action notes as final.
- Lonny Macy seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 3: Establishment of a Public Relations Subcommittee

The Members assigned MAG to establish a subcommittee to work with Gwen Lankford, Tana Klum, and Brian Lipscomb to promote events in two areas and develop tools to utilize at these events. The events to start with will be 1) The SalmonPeople play, and 2) one or more local level events.

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb reported that the promotion of October 6, 2006 private showcase of the The SalmonPeople play is in motion. Tana and Gwen are sending the invitation to interested parties and 20 complimentary tickets to policy leaders. One local event identified is the roll out of the Status of the Resource (SOTR). Some other public relations tasks include redesigning the CBFWA website, CBFWA brochure and electronic business cards.

Mark called for volunteers to populate the Public Relations subcommittee. Brian Lipscomb stated that Rob Walton, NOAA-F agreed to participate on the subcommittee. Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS, John Platt, CRITFC volunteered but added they have busy schedules and may not be available for all meetings. If you would like to participate on the Public Relations subcommittee please contact Tana, Gwen or Brian.

The MAG requested that the PR subcommittee and STOR steering committee be consistent with each other when promoting the SOTR report.

Tony Nigro, ODFW stated, at this time the ODFW public relations representative is working on coastal recovery planning and other priorities and is not available to CBFWA.

John Platt suggested another production; The Ghost of Celilo is coming soon to the Portland March 22 -April 1, 2007 to be presented in conjunction with the observation of the 50th anniversary of the inundation of the Celilo Falls - the traditional fishing site of the native people on the Columbia River inundated by The Dalles Dam in 1957. Information is linked at:

<http://www.rossproductions.com/celilo/>

ITEM 4: Kalispel and Spokane Tribes Invitation Letters to Participate in CBFWA Activities

Discussion: Tana stated that the letters had been revised incorporating the MAG and staff edits and she is waiting for comments from Gary Aiken, Sr. or Sue Ireland, KTI on the revised letters. Gary is reviewing the draft letters to ensure that CBFWA is sensitive to Kalispel and Spokane Tribes' perspective and needs. The MAG suggested that the first paragraph state the purpose of the letter clearly and the sixth paragraph, first sentence needs editing. MAG should send additional comments to Tana Klum.

Action: Tony Nigro moved that the Executive Director Brian Lipscomb work with the Chairman Ron Trahan on the revised draft follow-up letters to clarify and welcome the Kalispel and Spokane Tribes participation on regional activities with CBFWA as members or non-members and include the MAG's edits and Gary's comments. A special MAG teleconference will be called to review and approve the revised drafts or the drafts will be reviewed and approved at the next MAG meeting.

Bill Hutchinson seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 7: Columbia River Hatchery Reform Project Presentation – Jim Waldo

Discussion: Jim Waldo presented an informational handout on the Columbia River Hatchery Reform Project. <http://www.hatcheryreform.us/>

In 2005, Congress directed an independent review of the hatchery programs in the Columbia River Basin to model after the Puget Sound and coastal Washington Hatchery reform project. The purpose of the Columbia River Hatchery Reform Project is to develop a management approach that allows tribal, state, and federal managers to manage the Columbia River Basin hatcheries to meet conservation and harvest goals that meet legal responsibilities. Decision requirements are based on broad policy agreements that are supported by technical and scientific information on hatcheries, habitat, and harvest.

The reviews will be conducted by a science technical team led by Dr. Lars Mobrand and a

facilitation policy team led by Jim Waldo. A schedule has been established to review the hatchery and wild populations in the Basin within a 2-year time frame from April 06-June 08. They have divided the Basin into 13 review regions that represent watersheds in the Basin. The technical team is developing an analysis tool called the Managing for Success or (MFS) tool. Prior to reviewing the programs in the region the technical teams will identify data and facilitate workshops to show managers how the MFS tool works prior to the reviews. The scientists will tour the hatchery facilities deliberate a set of options to help managers meet their program and recovery goals and informally present recommendations to managers to particular region and discuss the options as specific recommendations. The scientists will not address legal issues during reviews. After discussions with managers, the scientists will develop recommendations that include managers' comments and distribute a final report to the Congressional members and their staff, and all interested parties for review.

Jim Waldo is requesting fish and wildlife managers' participation to help improve the process and increase the value of the product to Congress. In addition, Jim is requesting funding support for workshop facilitation, travel, & labor for the co-managers to participate in the regional process. Assistance is needed to develop a base for objectives in the program by partnering with F&W managers to prevent program duplications. Columbia River Hatchery Reform Project is working with NOAA-Fisheries in preparing a preferred EIS process to integrate work into next round of decisions and develop a better demonstration of funding value per investment and change future decisions making in other processes such as the US v Oregon's harvest management, US Canada's 2008 decisions, and BiOp Remand's evaluation program.

The NPCC and BPA are supporting the Columbia River Hatchery Reform Project and using their data in the NPCC Amendment Process.

The MAG asked how is this different from the APR process and what is the added value.

Jim, stated that the added value is more time and resources.

The MAG asked Doug Marker where will the funding come from to participate in this process considering the recent recommendations to cut budgets to level funding. Doug Marker suggested using the coordination funding to participate in the process since manager's have more time now that the project solicitation process has ended. The NPCC staff is reviewing at the FY07-09 work plan, and do not expect a budget increase for this request.

The MAG is very concerned that the FY07-09 funding recommendations will be adopted by BPA and there will not be enough funding in the FY07-09 F&W budget to do their own work and provide funding support for workshop facilitation, travel, & labor for the co-managers to participate in the Columbia River Hatchery Reform Project process.

Action: The MAG is requesting a list of specific tasks to participate in this process. The CBFWA F&W Managers need to incorporate time, efforts, and costs when discussing the CBFWA work plan. Jim Waldo has provided a draft outline of this information to Tom Iverson. Tom will provide that information to the AFAC and MAG for discussion.

ITEM 6: Northwest Power and Conservation Council Amendment Process

The NPCC's request for comments are due 10/31/06 and posted at [http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2006_0830/\(Item5\)2006_0822NPCCreqCommentReBioObj4Program.pdf](http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2006_0830/(Item5)2006_0822NPCCreqCommentReBioObj4Program.pdf)

At the 8/30-31/06 summer Members meeting, the Members directed the MAG to develop comments on the Council's proposed amendment process calling for defined biological objectives for the Fish and Wildlife Program focusing on how to facilitate program amendments and how are biological objectives defined. A special Members meeting will be scheduled to review the MAG's product.

The MAG agreed that the technical committees should perform the preliminary work to establish

how best to define biological objectives for anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife for the subbasin, province, and program scales. The objectives should be consistent with other ESA metrics.

Action:

The MAG assigned the staff to work with the technical advisory committees to:

1. Define populations, environmental attributes and metrics to be used to establish objectives and measure progress towards meeting for those objectives.
2. Define appropriate metrics for #1 per scale (subbasin) provincial, ESU, and regional relative to #1.
3. Comments on the program & ESU, and other management objectives/ metrics must be supportive and compatible.

ITEM 5:**Update on September 12-14, 2006 NPCC Meeting in Astoria, OR**

Tom Iverson reported on the results of the September NPCC meeting in Astoria. Tom reported that the Council had developed a complete set of draft recommendations that have been released for public comments (at <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/draftrec/>). Comments are due October 6, 2006. The Council did not allow any public testimony or project sponsor input during their deliberations. The draft recommendation leaves approximately \$6 million unspent in the FY07-09 budget, divided into three placeholders: \$2 million undefined placeholder, \$1 million innovative placeholder, and a \$3 million placeholder of un-allocated funds in the Basinwide budget category. It is likely the Basinwide funding will be used for ESA needs identified in the FCRPS biological opinion remand process.

Tom distributed a memo prior to today's meeting that provided suggested comments organized in the programmatic format of the Council's draft recommendation.

Section 1: Legal framework...

In the CBFWA staff memo it is suggested that the Council deviated from their process by creating a placeholder *after* the review teams had completed their work. This effectively reduced the Basinwide allocation and undermined the review and prioritization of these projects. Also, if the Basinwide placeholder is for ESA purposes, funding should have come from other provinces since ESA projects will likely be based in specific subbasins rather than systemwide. Is this actually a way for Council to remove funding from the Basinwide category and shift it to other provinces? The staff memo also raised the question of meeting the 70:15:15 allocations between anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife. Did the Council perform this analysis? Do they intend to? The MAG suggested adding a bullet to make a statement of whether CBFWA agrees with Council's determination of Capital versus Expense projects. Did the Council appropriately categorize these projects in their recommendation?

Section 2: Project Recommendations and Project-Specific Issues

Tom reviewed a list of project specific comments, which turned into a conversation about unfunded essential tasks and projects. The MAG determined that we need to know from each Member two key questions:

- 1) Was the state process to set funding priorities acceptable to your state/tribe?
- 2) Was the Council decision making process to create the draft funding recommendations acceptable to your state/tribe?

Once each member has answered that question, they should be able to state specific essential tasks and projects that will go unfunded if the draft recommendation is implemented. CBFWA will send a letter to follow up on our August 30 letter identifying essential tasks and projects. This second letter should be able to specifically identify actions that will not be funded and hopefully identify key

biological outcomes that may not occur.

Section 3: Programmatic and Broad Policy Issues

MAG generally agreed that an ESA placeholder should not be created from existing Program funds. If there are additional ESA needs beyond what was proposed for this funding cycle, BPA should make additional funds available.

CBFWA Projects:

The NPCC Members recommended funding for CBFWA work plan minus coordination funding for the Kalispel and Spokane Tribes which totaled \$186,000. All coordination projects have been directed to provide the Council defined tasks and deliverables. CBFWA staff is working with Council staff to meet any information requests in a timely manner.

The CSMEP project is recommended for only two years of funding. It is clear that the Council does not understand the CSMEP project and CBFWA members need to be meeting with Council members to help them understand its importance.

The CBFWA Data Management for Systems Operations and the Fish Passage Data project (functions previously performed by FPC) were not funded, a portion of unallocated balance will be available for NPCC to make a final recommendation for the fish passage science and analysis. No Council recommendation will be made for fish passage functions until after the Ninth Circuit Court ruling. The MAG agreed that CBFWA should support their own project to provide these key analysis functions. The current vote on the Council is 6 to 2 to support the Battelle/PSMFC proposal for fish passage functions. It is not clear if the Council would need to amend their program if this option is eventually chosen.

Action:

The MAG assigned Tom Iverson to develop a draft letter commenting on the NPCC 2007-09 draft project funding recommendations incorporating today's discussions, questions, and 8/31 CBFWA letter to NPCC supporting essential projects and tasks. The MAG will review and comment on the draft letter by next week. Comments are due to NPCC by 10/6/06. A MAG and Members meeting may be scheduled to review and approve the final letter.

Each Member will need to provide information to the following questions.

- 1) Did the state level process created by Council to set funding priorities provide an acceptable list of projects to support the Fish and Wildlife Program from your agency/tribe's perspective?
- 2) Did the Council's decision making process at the regional level to create their draft project recommendations provide an acceptable list of projects from your agency/tribe's perspective?
- 3) Are there projects or tasks that will not be funded under the Council's current draft recommendations that your agency/tribe believes are essential to implementing the Fish and Wildlife Program?

In addition, CBFWA will go on record stating the Fish Passage Center's functions should be funded through the CBFWA project.

ITEM 8:

Status of the Resource Steering Committee Update – Neil Ward

To view the prototype of the Status of the Resources website go to www.cbfgwa.org/sotr

Discussion: Neil Ward and Dave Ward reported that the Status of the Resource (SOTR) Report Steering Committee (Dave Statler) provided input on the draft report for the Columbia Gorge and Hood River subbasins.

Due to time limitations, the MAG requested a summary of the SOTR Steering Committee revisions be distributed to the MAG for review and feedback. Deadlines to present the report are near and comments are due by 9/22/06 to Dave Ward.

NOTE: *Time ran out and the following agenda items are deferred to the next MAG meeting. The 10/17 MAG meeting date conflicts with the Oct. 17-18 NPCC Meeting scheduled in Helena where the decisions will be made on the recommendations for FY07-09 project funding.*

ITEM 9: **Data Management 9/20-21/06 Workshop Update** – Tom Iverson

The workshop information is linked at <http://www.cbfwa.org/conferences/FY06Data/default.cfm>.

ITEM 10: **Pacific NW Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) Survey Request Discussion** - Frank Young

PNAMP is requesting your participation in a survey of current monitoring activities in the Pacific Northwest. The questionnaire is on-line at <http://pnampsurvey.streamnet.org>. Contact Kristal Talbot at 541-757-4263 x250

Recommended Action:

- Should CBFWA respond to the request for help from PNAMP

ITEM 11: **CBFWA Technical Committee Structure Review and Updates**

- The Members directed the MAG to review the Wildlife, Resident Fish, and Anadromous Fish committees' structure.
 - Review the technical committees' structure and evaluate the roles of the each committee.
 - Does the present structure serve the needs of CBFWA?
 - Next steps

FYI Item: *The next MAG Meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2006 from 9:00am -12:00pm at the CBFWA office.* Pending or Deferred Agenda Items

- Fish Passage Oversight Board Update
- Communicating F&W Costs
- Kalispel and Spokane Tribes Invitation Letters to Participate in Regional Activities with CBFWA
- CBFWA Technical Committee Structure Review and Updates
- Data Management 9/20-21/06 Workshop Update
- Pacific NW Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) Survey Request Discussion