



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 www.cbfwa.org

DATE: April 30, 2007
TO: Members Advisory Group
FROM: Brian Marotz, MFWP, Acting Chair and Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes from the 4/24/07 MAG Meeting

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 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

Members Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting

Tuesday, 4/24/07

9:00am - 3:00pm

@ Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Office, Portland OR

The support material and reference documents for the 4/24/07 MAG meeting are posted at

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

These action notes were approved as final at the May 22, 2007 MAG Meeting.

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Michele DeHart, FPC; Peter Hassemer, IDFG; Gary Sims, NOAA Fisheries; Doug Taki, SBT; Nate Pamplin, WDFW; Dave Fast, YN; Brian Lipscomb, Jann Eckman, Kathie Titzler, Tom Iverson, Trina Gerlack, Tana Klum, Ken MacDonald, Neil Ward, Dave Ward, Pat Burgess, CBFWA

By Phone: Lawrence Schwabe, BPT; Dale W. Chess, Cd'AT; Phil Roger, CRITFC; Brad Houslet, CTWS; Brian Marotz, MFWP; Dave Statler, NPT; Tony Nigro, ODFW; Gary James, CTUIR

Guests: Marc Porter, Essa; Chip McConnaha, Jesse Schwartz, Jones & Stokes; Patty O'Toole, Lynn Palensky, Karl Weist, NPCC; Rob Walton, NOAA Fisheries; Andy Appleby, WDFW (via phone)

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Mark Bagdovitz is on assignment with USFWS. Brian Marotz, MFWP, served as Acting Chair for the first half of the meeting and then delegated Doug Taki, SBT, to serve as Chair for the remainder.

Action:

- The agenda was accepted without a motion with a request to shift Item 10 to 1:00 p.m. and to add briefings on 1) the Fish Passage Center Oversight Board (FPCOB), 2) ad-hoc capital program planning committee participation, 3) response to the CBFWA letter sent to Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and Northwest Power Planning Council (NPCC) on the CBFWA Amendment Strategy, and 4) a CBFWA personnel issue.

ITEM 2: Review the 3/20/07 MAG Meeting Draft Action Notes and approve as Final

Action:

- Pete Hassemer moved to accept the 3/20/07 MAG meeting action notes as final. Seconded by Nate Pamplin. No objections.

NOTE: *The agenda items are listed in the order discussed.*

ITEM 3: Develop and Recommend a CBFWA Response to BPA's FY07-09 Actions

Discussion: Tom Iverson began the discussion by reiterating that after NPCC made their

recommendations to BPA last fall, BPA waited nearly two months to release their final decisions, completely separate from the NPCC recommendations. Tom stated that at this time it is difficult to adequately track the project recommendation changes BPA has made from the NPCC recommendations. The process that BPA created directs the decision making within BPA rather than project sponsors working through the NPCC to negotiate funding. This past week, the NPCC sent a letter commenting on BPA's decisions (to date, CBFWA staff has not received a copy of that letter).

CBFWA staff recommended that CBFWA Members 1) request a budget-to-actuals spreadsheet inclusive of the original BPA funding decisions and the current contracted and planned funding for all three years with a monthly update through the BOG process, and 2) support specific funding recommendations, consistent with MSRT recommendations, for projects providing technical support for F&W Managers involved in the implementation of the F&W Program and river operations decision making.

Questions that Tom presented to the MAG include: Should CBFWA comment to BPA on waiting until the end of the NPCC public process to come forward with their criteria and program level budget adjustments and on not heeding the NPCC process? If CBFWA does comment, what specific projects should be highlighted?

As individual agencies and tribes negotiate directly with BPA regarding their projects, large cooperative projects, recommended by the MSRT, may be lost in the process. Cooperative projects cited by Tom include FPC, CSMEP, CSS, ISEMP, and NOAA research to advance hatchery reform.

Tom stated that the current Program is vague enough for BPA to claim that their funding recommendations are consistent with the Program. BPA's actions have demonstrated the need for CBFWA's strategy toward making changes via the amendment process.

The MAG deliberated considerably on whether CBFWA should comment on BPA's actions and what comments would be appropriate. Collective MAG member comments expressed include:

- Pass on specific project comments, with the exception of the cooperative projects.
- Comment on a broader policy context with follow-up via the Amendment process.
- Go on record with how this process proceeded to this stage articulating CBFWA's commitment to the three-legged stool.
- Don't see the value in CBFWA berating BPA with frustration.
- Seek to align with our allies (i.e., NPCC) to effect future change.
- Look at other ecosystem models and carry that into the Amendment process.
- This situation points to the need to have an explicit F&W Program consistent with the Act; however, some NPCC members may not welcome an explicit program.

The MAG decided to direct CBFWA staff to draft a letter detailing concerns about the process and to provide suggestions toward transparency of funding information.

- Action:**
- Tony Nigro moved to direct CBFWA staff to draft a letter to NPCC and BPA describing concerns about the process and make suggestions for the future process. Seconded by Pete Hassemer.

Motion Discussion: Nate Pamplin suggested that staff draft two letters with one letter containing overall comments and feedback on BPA decisions and a second letter commenting on the concern about loss of funding for the cooperative projects.

- Amended Motion:**
- The motion was amended asking CBFWA staff to draft two letters separating the issues as articulated by Nate Pamplin.

Motion Discussion: Tom Iverson requested assistance in identifying projects. The MAG directed CBFWA staff to create a comprehensive list of cooperative projects that were supported in the MSRT recommendations but may be lost in this process and making sure projects are not duplicative. The MAG will review the list for final consensus. The motion was passed

without objection.

Send content suggestions in bulleted format to Tom Iverson at tom.iverson@cbfwa.org. CBFWA staff will draft the letters and send them out to the MAG on Thursday, 4/26 requesting return comments by COB Friday, 4/27.

(Timeline for the letter was extended by Brian Lipscomb on 4/26: CBFWA staff will send out the letters to the MAG on 4/27 with comments due by COB Monday, 4/30.)

CBFWA Staff Analysis Memo & Funding Decision Spreadsheet:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/BPAfy07-09FundingDecisionAnalysisMemo042007draft.pdf

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/MSRT_BPA%2007_09_FundingDecisionSpreadsheet042007.xls

ITEM 4: Data Management Framework Subcommittee (DMFS) Update

Discussion:

The FY08-09 project funding for the data management projects is considered interim by BPA and NPCC pending the development of a data management framework that would connect the various data management projects. The DMFS was established by the MAG to provide short-term FY07 guidance to the StreamNet Steering Committee on data priorities for their FY07 statement of work. The committee determined that FY07 should be considered a transitional year for StreamNet without major modifications in its work plan, and that the committee should continue to meet to define a data management framework for the upcoming program amendment process.

Tom Iverson and Phil Roger provided the DMFS update stating that the DMFS has agreed that the committee should focus on 1) discrete data needs at the regional scale (for the F&W Program) validating that the F&W data called for in the SOTR and recovery plans are the base fish data and work toward identifying a few high level indicators from the PNAMP white paper to identify the base habitat data necessary for regional reporting, and 2) determine what projects are necessary to support regional (Program) reporting of the data. The DMFS has been discussing a draft conceptual diagram that shows the separation of the data management and monitoring frameworks. View the draft diagram at:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/DMFSdraftFrameworkMAG042307ver2.ppt

Draft Bulleted Update:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/DMFSbulletsApr24MAG042307.doc

Draft Action notes from 4/5/07 DFMS meeting:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/DMFSdraftActionNotes2007_0406.pdf

Nate Pamplin added that the MAG might want to discuss the current membership and solicit participation from a representative from each agency and tribe. The representative should be tied to policy concerns and have knowledge of data management. Tony Nigro suggested that action as a good next step once consensus is reached within CBFWA on the DMFS product. Nate concurred, and encouraged interested CBFWA members' participation in the interim period.

Action:

- Tony Nigro moved to recommend that the Members endorse the DMFS data management framework, and develop a list of critical FY08-09 projects. Seconded by Pete Hassemer.

The DMFS recommendations will be brought to MAG in May and to the Members for approval in June.

Motion

Discussion:

Pete Hassemer stated that the motion addresses the data management side of this equation but what about the monitoring framework? The MAG confirmed the motion intent is to address data management framework and clarified that the CBFWA technical committees and CSMEP are addressing the monitoring framework. The motion was passed without objection.

ITEM 5: Collaborative Systemwide Monitoring & Evaluation Project (CSMEP) Work Plan

Discussion:

Ken MacDonald, CBFWA, and Marc Porter, Essa, provided a presentation giving an

overview of CSMEP and its organizational structure, challenges, problems facing CSMEP and steps taken toward solutions to those problems, CSMEP focus of key management decisions, FY07-09 products, CSMEP impact on Members programs, the future of CSMEP, and the consequences of loss of funding. View Presentation: http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/CSMEP_overview%20forMAG_042407.ppt

Tony Nigro recalled that CSMEP came into existence because the state and tribes needed a forum to complement the federal initiative to get the federal agencies together to develop a regional RM&E program in the context of the FCRPS BiOp and general recovery planning. Tony emphasized that any effort to scale this project back disproportionately affects the abilities of the states and tribal members of CBFWA to coordinate activities in a regional context and provide significant input to NPCC and to the federal government on a model RM&E program.

Dave Statler added that initially CSMEP was created to establish the coordination and regional framework necessary to have the M&E analysis capability that would span across the various areas and be useful on the regional level. Dave inquired about the timeline estimate with regard to completion of the regional framework capability and coordination and if there is a follow-up phase envisioned (i.e., retrospective analysis)?

Ken responded that as a product for FY08, CSMEP intends to develop, as part of the amendment process, a regional framework as a potential measure. CSMEP will take the work completed on the pilot (Snake & John Day) and take the same approach to other areas, incorporating resident fish. It is anticipated that CSMEP will be able to inform the programmatic piece, and the process will provide a forum to bring highly skilled technical people together to answer specific questions and help form designs in other areas under a regional framework. Ken stated that there is no current work plan in place other than finishing up the work that has been going on this year and through 2008.

Tony elaborated upon Dave's statement affirming that upon initiating this project the plan was that there would be a two phase approach. The first phase of developing monitoring alternatives to match up with the appropriate management decisions that M&E was intended to inform would be the basis of a RM&E program framework. Once the framework had been incorporated into an RM&E program, the second phase would involve participation in the ongoing monitoring efforts that occur under this framework and retrospectively, making sure we can assess how well the program is performing compared to our expectations and modify the program as necessary. As management questions evolve and we collect information and define our experiences, we should be able to refine these RM&E designs to be cost effective in terms of the decisions to be made.

Brian Lipscomb suggested communicating this information outside of CBFWA via a letter and presentation to NPCC and possibly BPA with the intent to encourage continued funding for FY08-09 encompassing: 1) the outline of the history of the establishment of CSMEP as expressed by Dave and Tony, 2) projects that have been accomplished along those lines, 3) how the accomplishments affect M&E coordination across the region, 4) future products and how they would be used to affect future M&E coordination, and 5) clearly articulate consequences of loss of funding.

- Action:**
- Nate Pamplin moved to direct CBFWA staff to prepare a letter and presentation to the NPCC. Seconded by Tony Nigro.

CBFWA staff will develop this presentation in May for approval by the Members in June anticipating discussions with the NPCC and possibly BPA.

Motion Discussion:

Pete Hassemer emphasized that it would be important to work with BPA on securing funding for 08 and questioned how the MAG could make that happen.

Brian Lipscomb stated that the NPCC and BPA are working toward consensus on funding for FY08-09 by July or August 1, 2007, but a specific process for their final decision has not been presented. This CSMEP presentation will suffice for the NPCC

request for information on CSMEP for FY08 and will provide the loss of funding consequences to encourage BPA and NPCC to continue funding for FY08-09. The motion was passed without objection.

ITEM 6: Ad-hoc Biological Objectives Workgroup

Discussion: In the March 20th MAG meeting, Brian L. advised that meetings have transpired between CBFWA (Brian L., Tom Iverson, Pete Hassemer), NPCC staff, BPA staff, and customer groups Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference (PNUC), Public Power Council (PPC), and Northwest RiverPartners. Brian L. presented the goals established by the workgroup since the last MAG update:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/GoalsForBiologicalObjectivesWorkgroup041307DRAFT.doc.

Tony Nigro raised concern regarding the ad-hoc group composition and whether or not other non-governmental organizations (NGO's) are aware of this group's existence and have been given an opportunity to participate.

Pete Hassemer agreed that other NGO's should be informed but shared his concerns about this being the right forum for other groups to participate or at least to enter the conversation at this point in the process.

Lynn Palensky, NPCC, articulated that the NPCC meetings are public and that the formulation of this group was discussed publicly in the monthly NPCC meetings providing an open door opportunity for other groups to participate.

In conclusion, the MAG determined that fish and wildlife managers might consider participating in this group, if interested. It was reiterated that the process is open to other parties if MAG members have an interest in recruiting constituents. Brian L. advised that the next meeting of the Biological Objectives Workgroup is scheduled for Friday, April 27th from 9-12:00 in the NPCC conference room.

Not hearing any opposition from the MAG, Brian Lipscomb and Tom Iverson will continue to participate and will bring back products for deliberation and feedback.

ITEM 7: Amendment Strategy Timeline

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to 5/9/07 MAG Workshop.

ITEM 10: All-H Analyzer (AHA) Request

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb explained that initially this agenda item was meant to prompt MAG discussion for Member consideration toward CBFWA support of the Hatcheries System Review Group's (HSRG) efforts. At that time, Congressional appropriation funding was still pending and the HSRG was requesting support; however, appropriation funding was achieved for FY07 so that is no longer an issue.

Tom Iverson added that AHA has come before the MAG several times as a tool to develop objectives. The presentation today is about reviewing this tool to express strategies and actions and show the scientific framework and their linkage to the objectives.

Chip McConnaha and Jesse Schwartz of Jones & Stokes

<http://www.jonesandstokes.com/> provided an overview of AHA and roll-up tool. Andy Appleby, WDFW, participated via telephone.

Chip provided a review of the concept of the tools and how they operate. MAG members participating by phone were not able to view a live tool; however, the handout provided a representation of the live tool:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0424/AHA_ToolsForScenarioBioObjsAnalysis042407.ppt.

Chip stated these tools arose out of work by the HSRG in Puget Sound and in the Columbia upon realizing a need to include all the H's in the conversations. This started with a simple spreadsheet of the 4-H's and evolved to a sophisticated tool that is still in reality a spreadsheet with a MS Excel foundation, and one which because of its

simplicity, does not impose a particular scientific paradigm on the information as compared to most models. These tools are different from the more complex EDT or passage and harvest models but AHA does draw on those models.

AHA is a population level tool that looks at a single population of fish and how those fish function in the context of the 4 H's; therefore, when using AHA you are considering the performance of a single population of fish with each population producing a separate AHA performance run. Performance = abundance + PNI (proportion natural influence typically used for conservation or integrated programs) + pHOS (proportion hatchery origin spawners typically used for segregated programs).

The tool does not give a scenario of whether a particular H is good or bad, but instead pursues an approach of asking the question "what are you trying to accomplish" and the analysis expresses if your program makes sense given the methods you are using. Fitness factor is an input into the model.

Survival numbers would come in most cases from the BiOp, hydro from the hydro models, and Andy Appleby added that data for habitat is typically derived from the recovery plans, FMEP for harvest, and HDMP's for hatchery. This information is confirmed with the F&W Managers. Harvest rates are converted to brood year exploitation rates.

The roll-up tool in essence rolls up the information into larger scale conclusions. The objectives will emerge out of how individual populations are managed.

Brian Lipscomb asked if the F&W Managers were interested in using this, specifically for anadromous fish, as it may not work for resident fish. Do anadromous fish managers want to organize a discussion about biological objectives and use this as an analysis tool as we move forward?

Dave Ward advised that the Anadromous Fish Advisory Committee (AFAC) has had brief discussions regarding the use of AHA and will continue that discussion to determine feasibility of the use of the roll-up tool to capture/convert management units into biological units for incorporation into the amendment process.

ADDED ITEM: Fish Passage Center Oversight Board (FPCOB) Update

Discussion:

Brian Lipscomb advised that the NPCC agreed to reinvigorate the oversight board for the Fish Passage Center (FPC) at their April meeting in Libby MT. The Council decided that the membership of the oversight board will include:

- One member or representative from NPCC serving as Chair. (The NPCC has designated Bruce Measure to serve in this role.)
- Two tribal members representing upper and lower Columbia River Basin tribes.
- Two representatives from state fish and wildlife agencies.
- Two members from the scientific community, one of whom will be the designee of NOAA Fisheries.

The NPCC FPCOB press release can be viewed at:
<http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/releases/2007/0418.htm>

The NPCC did not take into consideration the request by CBFWA to postpone the decision until a meeting could be arranged; however, the NPCC is interested in continuing the dialogue and agreed that a NPCC member representative will participate in the May 2nd Members meeting to discuss the FPCOB decision.

The NPCC did not make a recommendation with regard to the CBFWA project proposal but they have not eliminated that as a possibility. Brian will keep the MAG updated on the CBFWA project proposal recommendation.

The NPCC is requesting FPCOB nominations by May 23rd and anticipates finalizing their selection of the FPCOB members at the NPCC June meeting in Bonners Ferry,

Idaho, on June 12-14, 2007. Review the NPCC nomination document:
<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/fpcob/nominate.htm>

Brian L. asked if the MAG wanted CBFWA staff to facilitate the conversation between CBFWA Member tribes and agencies on final nominees. The MAG members advised that they would facilitate their own discussions.

ADDED ITEM: CBFWA Personnel Recruitment Issue

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb advised that Amy Langston, CBFWA Systems & Data Manager, has tendered her resignation effective Monday, April 30, 2007. Per the CBFWA Charter, the procedure for recruitment of positions require that the position be posted for 30 days and a MAG subcommittee be established to do interviews and make recommendations to the Executive Director.

Considering that this position is a technical position dominantly serving internal CBFWA needs, Brian requested that the MAG consider a different process allowing Brian L. in his role as CBFWA Executive Director to work with CBFWA staff to recruit and fill the position, instead of working through a MAG subcommittee.

Brian L. advised that in the interim period, to maintain system integrity, CBFWA will continue to work with Outsource, (the company currently contracted to provide server/network, workstation, and PBX maintenance). In addition, Brian L. will approach Amy to determine if she is willing to assist in the transition.

Action:

- Tony Nigro moved to delegate authority to Brian Lipscomb to work with CBFWA staff to recruit candidates for the Systems & Data Manager position with the stipulation that Brian L. review and discuss the top candidate(s) credentials with the MAG prior to making an offer of employment. Seconded by Pete Hassemmer. No objections.

ITEM 8: Agenda for May 9, 2007 MAG Workshop

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb advised that the one-day MAG workshop is scheduled in Boise on Wednesday, May 9th. The workshop is scheduled from 10:00-5:00 allowing for same day arrival and departure in most cases. This workshop will be a joint effort between the MAG and the CBFWA technical committees. In addition, the AFAC is scheduled to meet in Boise on May 8th. The draft Agenda is posted for review:
<http://www.cbfga.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=MAG&meeting=all>.

ITEM 9: Development of a Comprehensive Management Coordination Strategy

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the 5/9/07 MAG Workshop.

ITEM 11: Science Policy Conference

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the 5/9/07 MAG Workshop.

ITEM 12: NPCC Innovative Project Solicitation Process

Discussion: Tom Iverson advised that the NPCC has initiated the Innovative Project Solicitation process. Proposals are due May 18th. An ISRP review is due June 26th and public comment on ISRP review is set for July 24th. The NPCC funding decision is due in August. Tom stated that a tentative CBFWA review process is to occur simultaneously with the ISRP review prompting the question: does CBFWA want to organize an F&W Manager review of the innovative proposals and do we want to engage given BPA's actions?

Due to time constraints, the MAG deferred discussion on this item until the May MAG meeting.

ADDED ITEM: Ad-Hoc Capital Program Planning Committee Recommendation for CBFWA Staff Participation

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the 5/9/07 MAG Workshop.

ADDED ITEM: Discussion on the response to the CBFWA letter sent to Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and Northwest Power Planning Council (NPCC) on the CBFWA Amendment Strategy.

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the 5/9/07 MAG Workshop.

ITEM 13: Next MAG Meeting Date and Time

Action:

- The MAG moved to schedule its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 from 9:00-12:00pm at CBFWA. No objections.

ITEM 14: May 2, 2007 Members Teleconference 1:00-4:00 pm Tentative Agenda

Brian confirmed that tentative Member agenda items include: 1) response to BPA's FY07-09 funding decisions, 2) NPCC FPCOB discussion with regard to CBFWA's comments, 3) NPCC F&W Committee Chair status report with an expected focus on the amendment process and an anticipated discussion on NPCC's view of the ad hoc biological objectives committee and the status of Science Policy Conference, and 4) a report from the CBFWA technical committees.

Action:

- The MAG moved to approve the Members' agenda for May 2nd. No objections.

Meeting Adjourned.