



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH & WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

DRAFT

February 9, 2006

TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)
FROM: Lawrence Schwabe, Chair
SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the February 7, 2006, RFAC Meeting

RFAC Meeting
February 7, 2006
Portland, Oregon

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Dave Ward (ODFW), Steve Waste (NPCC), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)
By Phone: Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Jim Uehara (WDFW), Mike Faler (USFWS), Joe Maroney (KT), Lee Watts (BPA), Chris Brun (CTWSRO), Ron Peters (CDAT), Melo Maiolie (IDFG)
Time Allocation:

Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
Objective 2. Technical Review	0%
Objective 3. Presentation	0%

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Action Notes from the October 24, 2005, RFAC Meeting

The action notes from the October 25, 2006, and February 7, 2006, RFAC meetings will be reviewed and approved during the February 22, 2006 RFAC meeting.

ITEM 2: Northwest Power and Conservation Council's (NPCC) Draft Columbia River Basin Research Plan

The NPCC is scheduled to adopt the Draft Columbia River Basin Research Plan (Research Plan) during their February meeting. The Research Plan that the NPCC will be considering for adoption is the "Example Summary Plan" that the ISAB and ISRP developed by extracting and adapting information presented in an earlier draft authored by NPCC staff. Presently, the "Critical Uncertainties" section of the Example Summary Plan does not adequately represent the needs of resident fish (focus is salmon and steelhead). The RFAC reviewed the comments that Neil Ward drafted relative to the Critical Uncertainties section of the Research Plan. The RFAC agreed that the proposed edits are appropriate and that the proposed changes provide critical research uncertainty statements that are more general and thus ensure that critical uncertainties for resident fish are adequately represented.

Steve Waste (NPCC) indicated that the next step, relative to the Research Plan, is the development of a workgroup to develop three-year implementation plans in concert with each of the NPCC's Fish and Wildlife Program's funding cycles. On March 14-15, 2006, the RFAC is convening the 2006 White Sturgeon Summit in Spokane, WA. During the White Sturgeon Summit, meeting participants will be asked to identify and prioritize critical uncertainties relative to white sturgeon as well as identify strategies to address the uncertainties.

ITEM 2: Northwest Power and Conservation Council’s (NPCC) Draft Columbia river Basin Research Plan
Continued

Neil Ward led the RFAC in a discussion regarding additional meetings at which participants would identify and prioritize critical uncertainties as well as identify strategies to address the uncertainties for species such as redband trout, westslope cutthroat trout, and kokanee. The RFAC expressed interest in convening critical uncertainty workshops; however, the RFAC expressed concerns about scheduling “overload” and suggested that a workshop should be convened every four months. The RFAC suggested that a workshop for kokanee should be convened during the second quarter, possibly in May at the Western Division AFS Meeting in Bozeman, MT or in late-June or July in Montana. Melo Maiolie indicated that he could assist Neil in organizing the Kokanee Workshop.

ITEM 3 Project Proposal Reviews

The RFAC discussed the utility of providing technical/management reviews of resident fish proposals submitted for consideration for funding during fiscal years 2007-2009 and agreed that the RFAC should review the proposals. The RFAC identified four tasks that must be completed before reviews can commence: 1) develop criteria, 2) establish a timeline and associated deadlines, 3) review the list of projects to ensure the correct proposals will be reviewed, and 4) seek volunteers to perform reviews. Although the RFAC did not agree upon a set of criteria, the RFAC decided that the criteria the Resident Fish Committee (RFC) used during the Rolling Provincial Review should be reviewed and updated if needed. The RFAC suggested that the RFC criteria (Table 1 and Table 2) could possibly be enhanced by including additional criteria being used by subbasin review teams (e.g., Intermountain Province Review Group’s criteria). If the RFAC’s comments are going to be useful to the region (i.e., subbasin teams, Independent Scientific Review Panel, NPCC, and BPA) the RFAC’s review must coincide with the following timeline that the NPCC has established for the 2007-09 solicitation:

- January 17 – June 16, 2006: Science review and local basinwide prioritization
- June 16, 2006: Science review report to the Council
- July 14, 2006: Responses for prioritized projects due
- August 31, 2006: Final science review report to the Council
- October 18, 2006: Council recommendations for funding to Bonneville

Based on a cursory review of the proposed projects, some proposals that were identified as resident-fish-oriented were mischaracterized (e.g., Ron Peters indicated that Project 200204500 is a wildlife project). As a result, the RFAC will have to review the list of proposals to ensure the correct suites of proposals are reviewed.

Table 1. – Technical Criteria that the Resident Fish Committee used to review project proposals during the Rolling Provincial Review.

Technical Criteria

1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles (best available science)?	Y or N
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y or N
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives	Y or N

and timeframe milestones?	
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y or N
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	Y or N
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	Y or N
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y or N
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y or N

Table 2. – Management Criteria that the Resident Fish Committee used to review project proposals during the Rolling Provincial Review.

Management Criteria

1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin summaries?	Y or N
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y or N
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and/or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	Y or N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y or N
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	Y or N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y or N
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	Y or N

ITEM 4: Next RFAC Meeting

February 22, 2006 - 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. (Pacific) at the CBFWA Office, Portland OR
Teleconference Line: (503) 229-0449 - Conference ID: 938569