



# 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)

**Final**

**DATE:** August 19, 2009  
**TO:** Members Advisory Group  
**FROM:** Brian Lipscomb, Executive Director  
**SUBJECT:** Final Action Notes for the Monday, August 17, 2009 MAG Teleconference

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

**Members Advisory Group (MAG)**  
**Monday, August 17, 2009**  
**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. PDT**  
**@ CBFWA Office Portland, OR**  
[MAG Webpage](#)

Final Action Notes

**Attendees:** Brian Lipscomb, Tom Iverson, Jann Eckman, Kathie Titzler, Ken MacDonald, Dave Ward, Neil Ward, Trina Gerlack, Patricia Burgess, CBFWA

**Phone/WebEx:** Brad Houslet, CTWS; Alan Byrne, IDFG; Brian Marotz, MFWP; Dave Statler, NPT; Tom Rien, ODFW; Carol Perugini, SPT; Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Bill Tweit, WDFW; Nate Pamplin, WDFW

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

**ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda**

Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS, requested an update from CBFWA staff on where the Council is with regard to the Power Plan. Tom Iverson, CBFWA, stated that he would provide that update under Item 4.

**Action:** The MAG approved the agenda with the addition of the Power Plan update under Item 4. No objections.

**ITEM 2: July 27, 2009 MAG Draft Action Notes**

**Action:** The MAG approved the July 27, 2009 draft action notes as final. No objections.

**ITEM 3: Regional HEP Team Coordinator Assistant Recruitment**

**Background:** At the July MAG meeting, Ken MacDonald, CBFWA, enlisted volunteers from the MAG to serve on the hiring subcommittee for the [Regional HEP Team Coordinator Assistant Position](#) selection process. The subcommittee is scheduled to meet on August 20<sup>th</sup> to review the applications, qualify candidates to be interviewed, and develop interview questions. The interviews are scheduled for August 31<sup>st</sup> at the Portland Airport Conference Center.

Per the [CBFWA Charter](#), after the applicants are interviewed, the subcommittee will provide a short list of at least three top candidates for MAG consideration. The MAG will review the candidates and forward the list to Brian Lipscomb with their comments, at which time Brian will make the final hiring decision. Under the current timeline, the subcommittee intends to notify applicants the week of September 14<sup>th</sup>. Given that timeline, the MAG would need to schedule a special teleconference between September 8<sup>th</sup> and September 14<sup>th</sup> with full quorum to fulfill the function. Personnel selection is the only instance where a quorum is mandated for the MAG under the CBFWA Charter.

**Action:** After contemplation of viable dates given the holiday and other meetings scheduled for that timeframe, the MAG suggested the following dates/time for consideration: Thursday, September 10<sup>th</sup> or Monday, September 14<sup>th</sup> from 8:30-9:30am. Chairman Houslet

requested that [CBFWA staff poll the MAG members via email](#) for a preferred meeting date/time with intent to achieve participation toward the required quorum.

One hour is being allotted; however, the process probably won't take much more than 1/2 hour. This will be an executive session as the recruitment process is confidential. The meeting will take place at the CBFWA office and WebEx will be arranged.

**Update:** Response from the email poll: the date selected for the MAG executive session is Monday, September 14<sup>th</sup> 8:30-9:30 a.m. Full meeting details will be emailed to MAG members.

**ITEM 4: Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) August Meeting Updates**

**Update:** [Sixth Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Plan](#): As requested, Tom Iverson provided an update on the Council's discussion at the August Council meeting. Tom stated that they intend to rely on conservation to make up for new energy production over the next twenty years and the Council is debating on the targets for conservation. It appears that the public utilities think that the targets are all right while the private utilities want lower targets. The Oregon and Washington members voted for the plan, and Idaho and Montana voted against the plan; as a result, several meetings are planned over the next three weeks to reach resolution. Tom stated that he believes that it is their intent to try to adopt the Power Plan at the September meeting in Astoria.

[Update on RM&E and Artificial Production Category Reviews](#): Tom Iverson advised that Lynn Palensky, Council Subbasin Planning Project Manager, provided an update to the Council Members advising that the categorical review process and RM&E process is moving along. The anadromous fish monitoring piece is one part of the process but the RM&E Categorical review includes all of the mainstem systemwide projects. Overall, there are 5-6 subcategories that they need to deal with and they have yet to establish a plan of how to address those. Tom stated that a lot of time was spent on flow charts and diagrams generated by Washington Council Member, Dick Wallace. The charts/diagrams are posted for review on the Council's webpage: [FY2010+ Project Review](#).

With regard to Artificial Production, the Council is initiating the planning phase and it will probably take them a couple months to get going with that before they start asking for information from project sponsors. Project funding recommendations for the RM&E categorical review may come about in early/late spring 2010 so it will be FY 2011 funding where we start to see changes in RM&E and art production.

[Options for Consideration of Hatchery Scientific Review Group \(HSRG\) recommendations](#): Tom Iverson advised that Peter Paquet, Council Manager, Wildlife and Fish, addressed the Council with a summary of the HSRG recommendations. The Council in effect said that they are not necessarily ready to adopt any of the recommendations as policy but they will be considering the HSRG recommendations as part of their decision making process as they develop funding recommendations for projects.

[Charter and schedule for Wildlife Crediting Forum](#): Tom Iverson advised that the Council adopted the Wildlife Crediting Forum Charter. Joan Dukes, Oregon Council Member, tried to broach the question of who will sit on the forum and how they are to be selected, details of which was not spelled out in the Charter. At the July Council meeting, Peter Paquet stated that it should be BPA, Fish and Wildlife Managers, and BPA customer groups. They do expect it to include no more than 10-12 participants but it is unclear at this point on how they intend to populate the forum.

**Discussion:** The information provided by Tom regarding the Council Wildlife Crediting Forum prompted a discussion by the MAG on the Council's procedure for the process and how to best engage. Referencing the letter sent to Council Chairman Bill Booth from Chairman Elmer Ward on July 6, 2009 providing [CBFWA's comments on the Council's staff Wildlife Categorical Review project funding recommendations](#), Ken MacDonald stated that CBFWA provided general suggestions for the committee in the letter but did not make suggestions regarding membership.

**Action:** The MAG directed that the Wildlife Advisory Group (WAC) invite Peter Paquet to the September WAC meeting to discuss the Forum membership process. The MAG requested that the WAC provide a report at the September MAG meeting and if there are recommendations or comments those could be considered by the Members at their October 7<sup>th</sup> teleconference.

**ITEM 5: Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP)/Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB)/Tagging Report Recommendations**

**Background:** The ISRP/ISAB released their report ISRP/ISAB 2009-1 [A comprehensive review of Columbia River Basin fish tagging technologies and programs](#) in March 2009.

At the Council meeting in June, Jim Ruff, Council, Manager, Mainstem Passage and River provided a memo to the Council Members on [Council staff's Management Recommendations from the ISRP/ISAB's Tagging Report #2009-1](#).

At the June MAG meeting, Fish Passage Advisory Committee (FPAC) and the CSS Oversight Committee were directed to review the ISRP/ISAB 2009-1 report, and the Council staff recommendations, and report their findings to the MAG.

- The [CSS Oversight Committee comments](#) were distributed to the MAG via email on July 10<sup>th</sup>.
- The [FPAC comments](#) were distributed to the MAG via email on July 20<sup>th</sup>.

At the July meeting, the MAG directed CBFWA staff to initiate a draft letter of response using the CSS Oversight Committee and FPAC comments relative to the ISRP/ISAB report for review by the MAG at the August meeting.

**Discussion:** Brian Lipscomb advised that the September Council meeting has been reduced to just one day, September 9<sup>th</sup> in Astoria, OR, with the Columbia River Estuary Science Policy Exchange following on September 10-11<sup>th</sup>. As a result of that schedule, Brian advised that it is anticipated that the tagging report discussion will take place at the October Council meeting, providing the MAG additional time to review the letter before it goes before the Members for review.

Dave Ward reviewed the [draft letter](#) developed in collaboration with chairs of the CSS Oversight Committee and FPAC. The MAG members provided edits to the letter to include suggestions to further clarify and strengthen the statement requesting that the Council postpone their action until the RM&E framework is established.

**Action:** Dave Ward will edit the letter as discussed. The MAG did not request for the letter to be circulated for further review but Brian Lipscomb advised that CBFWA staff will post the edited letter with the Members' September agenda on Wednesday, August 19<sup>th</sup> giving MAG members the option to provide additional edits after the draft is posted but prior to the Sept 2<sup>nd</sup> Members meeting,

**ITEM 6: CBFWA FY 2010 Work Plan**

**Background:** At the July 29-30<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Members tasked CBFWA staff to develop, for MAG review and consideration, a draft FY 2010 work plan based on the specific deliverables and products identified by the Members' discussion of core activities. As directed by the Members, CBFWA staff forwarded the Draft FY 2010 work plan to the MAG on August 10<sup>th</sup> for an initial review prior to this meeting.

**Discussion:** Tom Iverson advised that based on the discussion in Kalispell, CBFWA staff developed a list of primary benefits, or [Core Activities](#), that the Members determined CBFWA provides. From the foundation of the Member identified Core Activities, CBFWA staff developed the [Draft FY 2010 work plan](#) and a list of corresponding [Deliverables](#).

Tom Iverson explained the format of the documents stating that the information contained within the **Deliverables** corresponds with the information contained within the **Draft FY 2010 work plan**. In addition, the reference numbers in the **Draft FY 2010 work plan** (Excel) document coincides with the numbering of items in the **Deliverables** (Word) document, and at the bottom of the **Core Activities** document CBFWA staff included

several unique topics discussed by the agencies and Tribes at the CBFWA table.

Tom confirmed that the **Draft FY 2010 Work plan** (Excel) table was prepared consistent with what is required in the recently adopted Council Fish and Wildlife Program. The corresponding **Deliverables** (Word) document was created to simplify the review process.

In addition, CBFWA staff posted for MAG review: [Members Suggestions for New Work to be Performed by CBFWA](#).

After some consideration about the best way to proceed with the review, it was determined that rather than get into detailed real-time edits of the [Deliverables](#) document, the group would review the materials from a broad stance to determine if CBFWA staff were on the right course.

Brian Lipscomb confirmed that the audience for the information would be the CBFWA Members at the highest (executive) level to brief them of what CBFWA does so they can decide whether or not they are going to support it in the future, and for that highest (executive) level of CBFWA to communicate to the Council and BPA.

**Review:**

The following is a summary of the questions, comments, and edits from the review facilitated by Tom Iverson.

[Deliverables](#) document section review: *1) Forum for information exchange between fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes.*

**MAG**

Tom advised that he did not include a category for the Members. It was later suggested in the meeting that CBFWA staff include the Members with the MAG heading.

Tom called attention to #3 *Maintain flexibility within CBFWA*. . . Tom noted this as an important point because a lot of the work that CBFWA does is unplanned at the beginning of the year and this is what gives CBFWA relevance, i.e., the flexibility to respond to important activities that are occurring. CBFWA does not have to initiate a new contract every time we take on a new topic. A lot of our communications address decisions that are made throughout the year that are on someone else's schedule so it is hard for us to plan for those into the work plan.

*#4 Consensus co-manager recommendations*. . . Tom advised that this was discussed in Kalispell and he put it under the MAG to trigger conversation. Nate Pamplin, WDFW, made a suggestion of adding a fourth section that would highlight new work with the first three as the ongoing efforts and the fourth would include items such as this.

Dave Statler, NPT, questioned the use of "forum" as a deliverable. Tom Iverson advised that forum is not in the list of deliverables. "Forum" was in the framework of [Core Activities](#) the Members discussed in Kalispell. The numbered items under the committee names are the deliverables, the forum and staff analysis and SOTR is the framework that we are putting these together under.

**AFAC**

Dave Statler, NPT, questioned the word "policy" as in policy reviews stating that the technical committees do technical reviews, not policy reviews. Tom advised that policy is used because it is stated as such in the AFAC charter, keeping in mind that all of this work moves up through the MAG and Members before it goes out on CBFWA letterhead.

**RFAC**

Nate Pamplin, WDFW, stated that recently there was the ISAB report regarding predation by resident fish on outlying breeding anadromous fish and questioned if the RFAC would want to call that out for the FY10. Neil Ward, CBFWA, advised that the RFAC is addressing that issue. At the upcoming Members meeting, the Members will have an opportunity to review a letter that the RFAC hopes to forward to the Council. The RFAC have taken a look at the risk assessment template and provided comments which they hope is the springboard to sitting down with the ISRP and the Council to work with them to finalize that document. Neil stated that they envision working with both the ISRP and the Council through the fall and early into next year with the intent to have this completed

prior to April 2010. Nate and Bill Tweit, WDFW, added that they felt it was doubtful that the dialogue would be done by then.

#### **WAC**

\*Referencing #17 (and #10 under RFAC), Bill Tweit, WDFW, suggested the statement be reworked to state that it would fill a needed gap or void, not just to ensure efficiency. Tom confirmed that CBFWA would add that specificity.

#### **FPAC**

Tom advised that FPAC is included because they are listed in the [CBFWA Charter](#) (Section 302). Brian Lipscomb clarified that FPAC does not provide policy direction to Fish Passage Center (FPC) but FPAC is where conversations about the day-day operations of the system take place. FPAC uses the FPC as a resource to help them to come to their conclusions. Dave Statler, NPT, noted that the FPAC charter is not posted on the CBWFA website, nor is there a FPAC webpage on the CBFWA site.

#### **FSOC**

Dave Ward commented that under #26, “Annual” should be “bi-annual.” Nate Pamplin, WDFW, suggested that text be added that provides for more of an action item for this deliverable relative to the reason why we are organizing/hosting the workshop, i.e., to share the latest technical information or research results to the managers in the basin, or wording that provides a little more of an action item for that deliverable.

#### **LTWG**

Nate Pamplin’s comment under FSOC relative to wording regarding the workshop applies to this section #29.

#### **M&EAC**

There have been discussions about chartering a committee to deal with M&E. Tom stated that under this category he separated out the three RM&E deliverables under this potential new committee, or an alternative is that they can be assigned to the RFAC or AFAC.

Bill Tweit, WDFW, asked for clarification stating that in #33 & 34 of this section, as well as under FSOC #27 and RFAC #16, isn’t it coordinating implementation or facilitating implementation? Tom explained that the intended point is that you all work together to provide comments on how better to implement an activity in the Council’s Program or elsewhere. Through this forum is also the opportunity to commit to implementing those changes, not just through BPA funding but through the Members’ own funding. It really does both of those things and the forum is the way the opportunity is facilitated. Bill added that it appears to be the way it is worded.

**Comments from the review of the [Deliverables](#) document Section 2) *Technical and policy analysis by experienced and knowledgeable staff shared by fish and wildlife management agencies and Tribes.***

Dave Statler, NPT, questioned the wording “Technical/Policy Analysis” stating that while there may be some technical/policy analysis, a lot of that can be seen as support (i.e., the website, etc). Tom explained that it is the core coordination functions that CBFWA staff provides and this has been placed here because it was consistent with the bullets under the Member directed Core Activities. This is where CBFWA staff saves time and money for the Members’ staff by providing that centrally located information. Dave suggested that it may be more appropriate to say technical/policy “support” and analysis.

**The group did not provide specific comments from the review of the [Deliverables](#) document Section 3) *Status of the Resource Report.***

#### **FY 2010 Work plan Comments:**

Dave Statler, NPT, referenced the FY 2010 work plan second column title, “Coordination Element from 2009 Program” and asked if there was a passage in the Program that calls for or anticipates for this to be done for implementation of the Program? Tom confirmed that the Program describes the coordination functions to support the Program, not just for the sake of coordination. It will support the 8 elements incorporated into the work plan.

Dave Statler commented that if the Program is calling for this to be done it would be good to specifically reference that Program measure.

**Overall comments and Steps Forward:**

Bill Tweit, WDFW, stated that in Kalispell the Members asked CBFWA staff to show the Members what the core looks like and what Tom has reviewed today is core+ based on the Kalispell conversations. Bill stated that CBFWA staff accurately captured that and he believes that he could sell it in discussions with their policy folks as the core of what WDFW needs out of CBFWA; however, one part of the worksheet that he was expecting to see is how the deliverables line up with what we've got in the way of resources at CBFWA. Bill stated that he considers that to be the most important next step.

Brian Lipscomb suggested that executive policy decisions be developed in order for the work plan to come to fruition. This needs to be put into about 5-6 bullets listed out in a broad policy perspective detailing what it is that CBFWA is going to produce. At the highest level you would develop some succinct policy commitments as to what you plan to use CBFWA for, those that the Members will make amongst each other, to relate to the rest of the world what it is you intend to do with the CBWFA forum.

Brian Lipscomb stated that the members have not agreed to a reduced funding scenario for FY 2010; they asked for what the effect would be. We have the broad policy areas and something is going to fall off the table if the budget is reduced. You need to be prepared to have a conversation with BPA and the Council on how to fill the gap.

Nate Pamplin, WDFW, suggested that the Members be listed with the MAG heading on the Deliverables document (as noted earlier in these action notes). On the Core Activities document, Nate suggested that CBFWA staff list the new work suggested by Members as #4 and develop an executive summary of the FY10 work plan.

Dave Statler, NPT, stated that he agreed that we need to identify 5-6 major elements or deliverable arenas that CBWFA can essentially be involved in, but each one of those would have subtabs or subdeliverables associated with them so it may not be so easy to drop off one of the 5 or 6, it might depend on the budget. We may have to drop off bits/pieces within each of those arenas or deliverable areas that we are involved in. We need to make that first step in identifying those broad areas or must haves in the view of the Members and go from there. Dave stated that he thought we got some of that from Kalispell. If we have more than what was gleaned from the last Members meeting, we are going to have to have something that builds off of that and asks follow-up questions to get answers from the highest level.

Tom Rien, ODFW, stated that he agreed with the list of deliverables and he liked the idea of packaging it as a set of deliverables that is tangible for our decision makers but he doesn't believe that ODFW is at a point where they would state that a specific deliverable just wouldn't be done and agrees that it will probably come down to looking at it from a subtask level. Tom added that ODFW's thinking is not only whether the 5-6 items would be important to us but also is CBFWA the best forum to complete all the subtasks. Another way that ODFW will think about it is whether a task is the essential task that the State has to do in order to inform the Council or can we just react to products the Council is providing. Another point that is that Tony Nigro, ODFW, believes we need is to be providing a set of tasks that can be accomplished under the BPA budget cut scenario.

Chairman Houslet added that the 5-6 points and subtasks need to have a direct linkage to the policy statements.

In conclusion, Chairman Houslet asked if CBFWA staff has enough information to develop the 5-6 major topics or should the MAG to take the first cut to produce those? Brian stated that the 5-6 major topics will be teased out of the list of 50 in the [Deliverables](#) document.

**Action:** Brian Lipscomb advised that CBFWA staff will develop the 5-6 major topics and will

circulate the information to the MAG. Brian stated that this is a continuous process and CBFWA staff will request feedback from the MAG with the intent to continue the discussion at the September MAG meeting.

In the interim, CBFWA staff will provide an update to the Members at the September 2<sup>nd</sup> teleconference. If the update to the Members proves to be fruitful then the MAG would take the next steps at the September 21<sup>st</sup> MAG meeting.

***Upcoming  
Meetings:***

**Members September Meeting:** Wed, September 2, 2009, 1-4pm (via WebEx)

**MAG September Meeting:** Mon, September 21, 2009, 1-4pm (via WebEx)

**MAG October Meeting:** Mon, October 19, 2009, 1-4pm (via WebEx)

**Members Policy Level Meeting:** Thurs, October 29, 2009 *Details TBA*

**Council Meeting(s):** September 9<sup>th</sup> in Astoria, OR & October 7-9<sup>th</sup> in Ketchum, ID

**Council Columbia River Estuary Science Policy Exchange:** Sept 10-11<sup>th</sup> in Astoria, OR

*Meeting adjourned.*