

**Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Meeting with
Northwest Power and Conservation Council (Council) Fish and Wildlife Committee and
Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) Staff
April 20, 2011**

Meeting Summary

Three main points covered in the meeting:

- 1) **Current Status** – The CBFWA is alive and well with 14 members now in the organization. The names of the non-members and the dates they withdrew were provided to the Council members at their request. CBFWA Members Advisory Group (MAG) Chairman, Doug Taki, Shoshone-Bannock Tribe (SBT), explained that the CBFWA is now focused on implementing evaluation and technical analyses as opposed to policy positions and our contract deliverables are focused on assisting the Council and our Members. Bill Maslen, BPA, noted that this is just a continuation of last year's work plan under the same funding umbrella.

Bill Maslen had some questions about the strategies outlined in the policy directives. Particularly, regarding how non-members participate and how the CBFWA strategies help inform a broader regional strategy when issues span across all of the entities and some of them are not members. Bill also mentioned that resident fish loss assessments and Regional Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) team involve considerable policy issues rather than just technical.

Mark Bagdovitz, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), indicated that the CBFWA meetings are open to the public and non-members are welcome to attend. Ideally we would all be working together, but the CBFWA staff role is to facilitate our 14 Members' interests working to involve as many non-members as possible. Edmond Murrell, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes (SPT), questioned whether the other coordination contracts were held to the same standard as the CBFWA. Since the CBFWA needs to coordinate with all the non-members, are the other coordination contracts required to coordinate with the CBFWA? Bill Maslen said all of the coordination contracts are similar in scope but there are no directives to coordinate with CBFWA members in those contracts.

- 2) **Status of the Resource (SOTR)** – There is an opportunity to link with the Council's Multi-Year Action Plans (MYAP) and BPA Taurus systems. The CBFWA members asked the Council Members and Bill Maslen if the SOTR is providing the information that the Council needs for their evaluations as they go into the Fish and Wildlife Program amendment phase, and if it was providing BPA with the information needed for the BiOp analyses. Bill Maslen said that BPA uses the raw data in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries website for BiOp analyses as it is more flexible and useful for their

evaluation. Bill Maslen said that BPA is going to the source and not to a second tier of information. Staff noted that the SOTR is a product of the BPA, Council, and the CBFWA and that the annual survey recently conducted revealed that the BPA and the Council are big users of the SOTR. Neither the Council members nor Bill Maslen provided a strong endorsement for the SOTR.

3) Upcoming Processes – What is the Council going to be asking for in the Regional Coordination Categorical Review and what is the timeline?

Tony Grover, Council Fish and Wildlife Division Director, said that the Council will attempt to be as efficient as possible. Data management and Regional coordination naturally overlap and the Council doesn't want to put resident fish on hold until the data management and coordination review gets done, so they might run all those in parallel. To accommodate the field season, the Council may advance the sponsor submittal deadline into late fall or early winter. The Council is working closely with BPA and Taurus to make sure they can accommodate that schedule – starting in August with October being the formal submission period. Mark Bagdovitz said that the Council Program has specific elements in it for regional coordination and that the CBFWA proposal should reflect consistency with the Program. Tony indicated that was a good general statement, but due to the variety of issues that each entity deals with, the Council will develop a common set of questions and a nuanced set of questions for the entity they are dealing with. Therefore, individual sovereign needs will carry as much weight in the process as consistency with the Program.

Dick Wallace, Washington Council Member, indicated that he appreciated the work that has been done and the commitment to the implementation strategies, but it might be helpful for the CBFWA to do a cross check of things that the Council has been involved in, i.e., MYAP's, developing Biological Objectives, update of the research plan, and think about how the technical information feeds into policy and informs policy makers. It is better to increase the communication with Council staff and BPA so we will know the areas of coordination that you will not be capable to support with the reduced CBFWA staff. Talk to the recovery boards about issues beyond just the SOTR. In Washington the regional recovery boards are really where the coordination occurs; CBFWA staff was encouraged to increase coordination with them.

Doug Taki indicated that the Members directives are more technical but they do lead up to policy and it is at the CBFWA semi-annual Members' meeting where the policy makers are informed of those issues.

Mark Bagdovitz asked what the role of the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) was in reviewing regional coordination proposals and what they would look at. Tony Grover said they would be looking for a work element that connects the work to their management role.

It was asked if the action plans were going to be amended into the subbasin plans. Tony Grover said that the MYAPs are a work in progress until the next Program begins. He said the Council was going to pick a few subbasins where it is really obvious that the subbasins need to be updated. It is the Council's hope that the subbasin updates won't require a lot of effort but just a tune up. He indicated that they won't all get done before the next Program amendment, but they may set up a plan to have a rolling subbasin plan update process; updating in an opportunistic ad hoc way as some subbasins may need an update sooner.

Doug Taki said he assumes there will need to be changes when the recovery plans in Oregon and Idaho come out.

Mark Bagdovitz stated that the CBFWA has worked on the SOTR for several years now and funded it out of the coordination funds. CBFWA Members are starting to discuss if this is the right place to fund it as it is used much broader than the CBFWA Members, yet they are funding it. The Members would like to bring this up to think about and contemplate where it would be best funded.

Tom Iverson, CBFWA, stated that the CBFWA work plan is primarily focusing on implementation strategies, with an extensive effort to support the Council's Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Reporting (MERR) plan, resident fish substitution, a research plan with more priorities than in the past, and other issues that are coming up. There needs to be a regional dialogue as to what goes into a "regional priority."

Bill Booth, Idaho Council Member, stated that coordination with the CBFWA is required so it is important. He would like to visit with Tony Grover and Council staff and get their feelings of how best to facilitate that coordination.

Doug Taki reiterated that this was an informal update with the CBFWA Members Advisory Group and expressed appreciation to the Council members and Bill Maslen for attending.

H:\work\MAG\2011_0517\Summaryof42011mtgwithNPCCandBPA_Draft