



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

December 2, 2008

TO: Members

FROM: CBFWA staff

SUBJECT: AFAC Review of NOAA Data Dictionary and Monitoring Guidance

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 government 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 & 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

State managers are currently reviewing the documents internally but probably will not have the review complete until the end of December (status of Tribal reviews is unknown). Each state will be responding to NOAA.

CBFWA staff will identify any overarching themes that come from AFAC discussions.

Current themes identified (unofficial, based on conversations to date):

1. General agreement that NOAA guidance and priorities and Data Dictionary are a good exercise.
2. NOAA should consider that methodologies will differ among agencies, regions and even over time with new technology. NOAA should consider focusing on accuracy and precision of data and estimates and not necessarily methodologies.
3. Frustration that funding has been lost for collaboration that would have ensured fuller participation by Members in reviewing this product and would have better ensured that CSMEP experience and products are represented.
4. Developing confidence intervals, the ability to detect change, and fill “gaps” will be costly, so how will costs, priorities and concerns over time required to get information be addressed?
5. Agencies should be more than data collectors for NOAA—should be part of the entire process: planning, implementing, evaluating, and revising.
6. NOAA’s products only represent a subset of state management interests. M&E for listed species must be integrated with agency management responsibilities that are broader than ESA.
7. The NOAA documents are not a regional RM&E plan as developed in the CBFWA amendments or the work plan for CSEMP as described in the proposed Amendment for Collaborative Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation.

H:\WORK\MBRS\2008_1203\DataDictionaryReview_MbrsBrief_3Dec2008Ver2.doc