



# 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.cbfga.org](http://www.cbfga.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 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

Upper Columbia United Tribes

**Final**

**DATE:** August 17, 2010  
**TO:** Members Advisory Group  
**FROM:** Brian Lipscomb, Executive Director  
**SUBJECT:** Final Action Notes for the August 12, 2010 MAG Meeting

**Members Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010**  
**8:30am – 11:30pm (PDT)**  
**@ CBFWA Office Portland, OR**  
[MAG Webpage](#)

Final Action Notes

**Attendees:** Chad Abel, BPT; Phil Roger, CRITFC; Brad Houslet, CTWS; Doug Taki, SBT; Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Brian Lipscomb, Jann Eckman, Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, Dave Ward, Binh Quan, Patricia Burgess, CBFWA

**Phone/WebEx:** Elizabeth Gaar, Robert Walton, NOAA Fisheries; Gary James, CTUIR; Lance Hebdon, IDFG; Brian Marotz, MFWP; Tom Rien, ODFW; Brodie Cox, Bill Tweit, WDFW

**Time Allocation:**

<b>Objective 1: Participation</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Objective 2: Technical Review</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Objective 3: Presentation</b>	<b>0%</b>

**ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda**

**Action:** The MAG approved the draft agenda as presented. No objections.

**ITEM 2: Draft Action Notes from the April 6, 2010 MAG Teleconference**

**Action:** The MAG approved the action notes from the [April 6, 2010 MAG teleconference](#) as final. No objections.

**Brian Lipscomb's Departure:** Referencing the [announcement that he sent out on August 9 regarding his departure](#) from CBFWA, Brian Lipscomb thanked everyone for the opportunity to work with them over the last five years. Members' Chairman Walton and MAG Chair Elizabeth Gaar, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), expressed their appreciation for Brian's hard work and efforts.

A [Members' conference call](#) has been arranged for Tuesday, August 17 to request a Members' decision with regard to an interim executive director and a suggestion to schedule a Members' meeting to review the work plan and CBFWA 2011 and beyond.

**ITEM 3: Alignment between Regional Processes and CBFWA work plan (Brian Lipscomb)**

Brian provided a presentation ([Work Plan Implementation Alignment with Agencies and Tribes Vision for Adaptive Management](#)) discussing and summarizing via the white board the overall vision and the components in process.

**ITEM 4: Work Plan Implementation Updates**

**Policy Directive 1:** Participate in and support ongoing assessments.

- Update on Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Strategy (ASMS) (Dave Ward)
- Update on the [Coordinated Assessments Work Plan](#) and Process and Data Management Link (Tom Iverson)
- Update on White Sturgeon Monitoring and Assessment Sideboards (Neil Ward)
- Update on Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy Work Plan (Tom Iverson)
- Update on Lamprey Monitoring and Assessment Sideboards (Dave Ward)
- Bull Trout Efforts (Neil Ward)
- Update on other Resident Fish (Neil Ward)

In lieu of CBFWA staff providing individual progress updates, Tom Iverson provided a comprehensive overview encompassing and summarizing the progress through the review of the following presentation: [CBFWA 2010 Work Plan Implementation Update](#). Posted for MAG review is a [Work Plan Update Timeline](#) available on the [MAG webpage](#).

The MAG members held a considerable discussion regarding the **Reservoir Fish Monitoring Strategy**. Tom Iverson explained that although this strategy may be unfamiliar to some of the MAG, it was in the work plan that the Members reviewed in January. Mark Bagdovitz, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), stated support for the reservoir monitoring strategy and the current direction as described by CBFWA staff. Mark commented that we need to start looking closer at reservoir fish monitoring and working it into our decision making process. It may become a bigger issue especially when looking at the Columbia River Treaty (CRT) renegotiations and the effects of flood control.

Chad Abel, Burns Paiute Tribe (BPT), expressed his concern about sending the message that mostly non-native fish are being put ahead of a monitoring strategy for native trout or cutthroat. Chad stated that from the BPT perspective, it may be more advantageous to look at Other Trout Monitoring Strategies before considering non-native resident fish. Tom Iverson explained that the Members developed the proposed approaches because many Members that have reservoir fish projects are very anxious to have a solid context for their categorical review coming up next April. The agencies and Tribes that have participated in the Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC) made the conscious decision to delay the “Other Trout,” possibly to go through the bull trout exercise first and have the model and example on how to do it.

Brian Marotz, Montana, Fish Wildlife and Parks (MFWP), added that historically there was considerable well-debated criteria for project selection before CBFWA stopped reviewing and prioritizing projects. Brian suggested that the historical criteria be reviewed.

Tom Iverson concluded the discussion on the Reservoir Fish Monitoring Strategy by stating that if it is BPT’s priority to get the Other Trout Monitoring Strategy built, the reservoir strategy does not preclude that. Basinwide coordination may be slower but getting the BPT strategy built so it could be brought in as an example would accelerate that process.

CBFWA staff provided the following information regarding “Other Tasks” not directly related to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council’s (Council)

Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Reporting (MERR) plan:

**Wildlife Operational Loss Assessments** – This is still on the Wildlife Advisory Committee's (WAC) radar but currently on hold because of the recent focus on the monitoring strategy. CBFWA staff is waiting for the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho's (KTI) pilot project to continue to provide guidance on operational losses.

**Resident Fish Construction and Operational Loss Assessments** – The [RFAC and CBFWA provided comments](#) to the Council last year. The Council responded stating that they will advise when they are ready. To date, we have not heard back from the Council on this subject.

**Anadromous Fish Biological Objectives** – The Anadromous Fish Advisory Committee (AFAC) spent considerable time last year developing basinwide biological objectives. The Council Program stated that this will be dealt with in a process rather than just accept what was submitted during the amendment process but the Council has yet to initiate that process. Updating the subbasin plans called for in the Program would include these biological objectives but it is not clear if the Council intends to call for updating subbasin plans in the near future. We'll have to keep an eye on this.

**Fish Screening Oversight Committee (FSOC)** – A Fish Passage training seminar is scheduled in Yakima, WA for Sept 13-16. This is a broad based training seminar for developing, operating, and maintaining fish passage structures that range from screens to culverts, etc. The announcement has been sent out to the FSOC members who will in turn circulate it throughout their agencies. The training is designed for both engineers and biologists who work with the design and implementation or evaluate any type of passage facility. There will be separate training for upstream/downstream passage.

**Lamprey Technical Work Group (LTWG)** – The LTWG has been working toward developing passage standards similar to anadromous fish passage standards. Dave Ward reminded the group that this assignment was handed down by MAG approximately 3 years ago. The LTWG broke the assignment down into three pieces: Phase I - identify all potential metrics available; Phase II - refine Phase I results to the few metrics that most believe are reasonable assessment standards for use in the future; and Phase III - develop standards for the metrics. Phase II is wrapping up now and Phase III will kick off at the October LTWG meeting. The LTWG is also working on technical papers that will form a lamprey management handbook. The first paper, on translocation, is nearing completion.

**Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP):** CBFWA is responsible for overseeing the regional HEP team. For the current budget year, the HEP team requested and received a one-time budget increase so they could run two field crews this year; however, the funding level will roll back to the original amount in the next contract year so they have put together a three option proposal that we will go before the Wildlife Crediting Forum (WCF). The WCF has the broadest representation of wildlife managers and includes involvement of the Council, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), and customer groups. It is believed that the WCF could help set the pace of future HEP surveys. If the WCF can set the pace then most likely the budget request will be successful.

**Bull Trout Critical Habitat Final Ruling:** Mark Bagdovitz announced that the USFWS will be coming out with a final ruling on bull trout critical habitat no later than Sept 30. The final ruling will probably include a discussion of how the USFWS intends to address comments received.

**Policy Directive 2:** [Status of the Resources \(SOTR\) Webpage](#) Updates (Neil Ward, Dave Ward, and Binh Quan)

- Quarterly Website Enhancements'
- Annual Report

Chair Gaar suggested that what will be important for the SOTR is the ability for it to be updated readily to keep up with what is developing in the world of recovery implementation. Chair Gaar added the NOAA Science Center is in the process of working on the data dictionary for limiting factors/ecological concerns and that CBFWA may want to be involved. Dave Ward stated that the NOAA data dictionary for limiting factors is on CBFWA staff radar and that the format for limiting factors has already been altered based on some previous work by NOAA.

Chad Abel, BPT, offered that he noticed some inaccuracies with regard to bull trout recovery units in the SOTR and asked to whom he should address comments. CBFWA staff advised that if Members have comments or find errors on the SOTR to contact Neil Ward ([neil.ward@cbfwa.org](mailto:neil.ward@cbfwa.org)) immediately and he will see that the changes are addressed. Neil advised that the entire bull trout section will be revamped by October/November 2010.

**Policy Directive 3:** Regional Activity (Brian Lipscomb & Tom Iverson)

- Program Implementation Update
- Sixth Northwest Power Plan
- CBFWA staff participation in non-CBFWA forums

**Regional Monitoring & Evaluation (RM&E) Categorical Review** proposals were due to the Council at the end of July. Sponsor presentations are scheduled for September 1-2 in Portland, September 7-9 in Pendleton, and September 13 in Portland. The Independent Science Review Panel's (ISRP) preliminary review should be completed by mid-October and sponsors will have a month to respond. The final ISRP recommendations are expected in mid-December. Council final recommendations for the RM&E categorical review are due in February 2011. The schedule is posted on the Council's website under the [FY 2010+ Program Review](#) webpage.

Tom Iverson suggested that folks give Lynn Palensky, Council Project Development, a call (503/222-5161) if they have submitted a proposal and have not received any type of response.

This is the first review in which CBFWA has not held a significant role.

**Wildlife Crediting Forum (WCF):** Tom stated that he believes good progress is being made and a write-up of the issues is expected by the end of August. The Council has commissioned the WCF for only one year and so they will need to approve it for another year for it to continue.

**Budget Oversight Group (BOG):** The BOG is rewriting their process for next year and it is expected to go before the Council for approval in September 2010. It is currently unknown whether there will be a public review process. The BOG has removed the role of CBFWA as a participant generalizing it as "coordination organizations," and they have taken out the CBFWA Executive Director as a member of the management team which leaves the final decisions up to the Council and BPA.

**BPA Rate Case:** Last spring BPA started their Integrated Program Reviews (IPR) for the 2012-2013 rate case. CBFWA staff attended their inaugural fish and wildlife cost meeting and sent out the BPA presentation to Members/MAG via

email in June 2010.

**Council's Sixth Northwest Power Plan:** A lawsuit has been filed in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals by the Northwest Resource Information Center challenging salmon costs in the Council's Sixth Power Plan.

**Council's Eight Annual Report to the Northwest Governors:** This is the first report that the Council issued where they captured the 4(h)(10)(C) credits and its impact on fish costs. Tom stated that he believes that was based on [CBFWA's comments on their report](#) last year suggesting that they include this information in the report narrative.

**Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership** (PNAMP) and [StreamNet](#): CBFWA staff is working closely with PNAMP and StreamNet creating good working relationships. BPA created a 500K data management placeholder for all ten years of the BiOp but subsequently adopted financial policies for project management that doesn't allow placeholders so they put the money into a PNAMP project. We are working with the PNAMP coordinator to make sure that 500K is spent on BPA related data management to support the BiOp. PNAMP is working closely with us to ensure that the [Coordinated Assessments Work Plan](#) produces data management priority for that funding.

**Washington Monitoring Forum:** The forum recently requested comments on High Level Indicators (HLI's) for salmon recovery and watershed health. We have worked with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to provide comments to ensure that the WA Monitoring Forum HLI's stay consistent with Council and CBFWA efforts.

**Yakama Nation Status and Trend Annual Report (STAR):** The Yakama Nation STAR is an accord project for reporting status and trends and for evaluating implementation of their accord projects. They have included us in their planning to make sure what they build is consistent with the SOTR.

**CBFWA Seeking other Funding:** CBFWA staff contracted with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe (SBT) to help develop two accord proposals (i.e., comprehensive habitat proposal and hatchery development proposal). We are just finishing up the work under that contract.

Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS, asked what the process is for asking CBFWA staff to monitor other forums (e.g., an emerging issue is monitoring of the CRT process). Brian advised that the MAG member just needs to make the request to staff via email.

**The MAG provided overall feedback of the direction of the work plan and suggestions on communicating to the Members:**

Chair Gaar expressed that it has been a productive 18 months. The work on the ASMS, the Coordinated Assessments Work Plan, the emphasis on coordinating monitoring, and the emphasis on being product driven feels right and we want to keep it going. Our task is to be product focused and to stay focused on the value to the co-managers, Members, and others. Chair Gaar also commented that good progress has been made with regard to the SOTR. Chair Gaar suggested that when talking with the Members summarizing who is using the SOTR and how it is being used will be very important.

Brian Marotz, MFWP, stated that the work that has taken place in the last year is distantly related to the resident fish issues in Montana. The CRT renegotiation will be important to keep our ears and eyes on. Brian suggested that with regard to the SOTR to expand on bull trout and white sturgeon and to work with StreamNet

on the monitoring and data reporting they have already accomplished. Tom Iverson advised that CBFWA staff has been working with StreamNet; however, StreamNet has not been organized for reporting in basinwide priorities but we are working with them to sort out the basinwide priorities and how to report it in a way useful for regional decision-making.

Phil Roger, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), suggested adding a slide to the presentation when communicating to Members listing key things that have not been done and key issues that CBWA has not been involved in.

Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS, stated that overall he was ok with the direction of the work plan but felt that we should keep an eye on things. Mark suggested we look at what we are currently doing versus what are we missing and determine where we need to make adjustments to avoid important issues falling between the cracks.

**Item 5: Discuss Implementation of Revised CBFWA Work Plan** (Brian Lipscomb & Tom Iverson)

See input under Item 4.

**Item 6: Satisfaction Survey** (Brian Lipscomb)

Brian Lipscomb communicated that a request for a satisfaction survey was included in our Annual Work Plan (AWP) contract with BPA. Brian stated that it was more of a unilateral insertion by the BPA Contracting Officers Technical Representative (COTR). It is believed that it came out of a perception that staff was working independently of the Members to develop the work plan, and also to determine if the organization was meeting Members' needs. The Members' sign-off on the work plan sufficed for the satisfaction survey in the last round but Brian advised that BPA once again brought up the idea of a satisfaction survey.

The MAG discussed that to do a survey we would need to determine and discern what should be measured, who the audience should be, and how we can measure and tease out differences amongst the Members to clearly understand what the issues are. CBFWA may want to consider hiring an independent consultant to develop the questions, implement the survey, and help work though how to use the outcome effectively. The survey process could possibly be informed through conversations with BPA and the NOAA Science Center, both entities that have used satisfaction surveys extensively.

***Upcoming Meetings:***

**Council Meeting(s) 2010:** Sep 21-23 in Bend, OR and Oct 13-14 in Portland, OR