



# COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443

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 Department of 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

DATE: March 9, 2007  
TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)  
FROM: Jim Uehara, Chair  
SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the March 8, 2007 RFAC Meeting

## RFAC Meeting March 8, 2007 Portland, OR (CBFWA Office)

Support materials for the March 8, 2007, RFAC Meeting are posted at:  
<http://www.cbfga.org/Committees/RFAC/meetings/2007>

*These notes will be approved as final at the next RFAC Meeting.*

### Draft Action Notes

**Attendees:** Jim Uehara (WDFW), Tom Rien (ODFW), Mike Faler (USFWS), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Dave Statler (NPT), Ed Shallenberger (CCT), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)

**By Phone:** Chris Brun (CTWSRO), Ron Peters (CDAT), Dale Chess (CDAT), Hunter Osborn (SBT), Sheri Sears (CCT), Joe Maroney (KT), and Melo Meiolie (IDFG)

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

### **ITEM 1: Review Agenda**

No new items were added to the agenda

### **ITEM 2: Program Amendments**

During the January 24, 2007, RFAC Meeting, participants reviewed the "Outline of Program Amendment Recommendations" prepared by the CBFWA staff to evaluate what the RFAC could accomplish relative to the proposed amendment process. The RFAC agreed that the geographic scales (i.e., Subbasin, Province, and Regional) were sufficient; however, the RFAC recommended that an additional scale-oriented section (i.e., Policy/Principle Scale) should be included in the list to accommodate resident fish substitution and losses. The RFAC recommended that the Status of the Resources Project (SOTR) and its products (i.e., annual report and website) should be used to address the questions associated with the Subbasin Scale effort. The following is a brief description of the how the RFAC envisions using the SOTR to address the Subbasin Scale questions:

- Confirm focal species – Review each subbasin in the SOTR and add any species that were overlooked during subbasin planning (focal species depicted in the SOTR are those that were identified by the subbasin planners).
- Establish biological objectives – Review and confirm the biological objectives, as listed in the SOTR, for each focal species (biological objectives appearing in the SOTR are those that were presented in the subbasin plans or in management/recovery plans referenced in the subbasin plans). For many of the focal species, biological objectives were not provided in the subbasin plans. The RFAC needs to confirm whether biological objectives exist for those focal species.
- Confirm primary limiting factors and identify strategies and actions to address the limiting factors – The RFAC indicated that the subbasin plans should be reviewed to confirm and update the limiting factors. In addition, participants indicated that in many of the subbasin

plans' strategies were identified to address the limiting factors.

At the Province Scale, the RFAC agreed that adding data from individual populations across a province was not an appropriate method to create a province-scale biological objective. The RFAC suggested that the appropriate measure should be what proportion of populations are meeting or exceeding their respective biological objectives (e.g., the number of focal species that are meeting or exceeding their respective biological objective).

During the February 7, 2007, Members Meeting, the Members directed the technical committees to: 1.) define and clarify terms (i.e., focal species, objectives, how to express limiting factors, etc.), 2.) Confirm population level biological objectives, 3.) ensure that priorities affecting fish and wildlife are captured in this process, 4.) validate current limiting factors including out-of-basin affects, and 5.) review and build on strategies and actions necessary to reduce the limiting factors. The RFAC discussed these tasks and develop a plan and timeline to complete the Members request. Listed below are the RFAC's decisions relative to each task:

1. *Define and clarify terms* - The Anadromous Fish Committee initiated a process on March 8, 2006, to provide definitions for focal species, objectives, limiting factors, causative factors, etc. The RFAC suggested that the definitions should be the same for anadromous and resident fish. Consequently, the RFAC recommended that Neil Ward should work with Dave Ward (AFAC Technical Coordinator) during the development of the definitions. The RFAC recommended that, upon completion, the definitions developed by the AFAC should be forwarded to the RFAC for review to ensure resident fish requirements have been represented. ***It is anticipated that the definitions will be available for review by March 26, 2007.***
2. *Confirm focal species, biological objectives, and metrics* – The RFAC agreed that although definitions are currently being developed for focal species, objectives, etc., the RFAC participants could initiate efforts to confirm the focal species, biological objectives, and metrics that are represented in the CBFWA's 2005 *Status of the Resources Report*. To facilitate a review, Neil Ward provided a spreadsheet (see attachment) listing the focal species, biological objectives, and metrics reported in the Status of the Resources Report. Neil emphasized that this information was mined from the subbasin plans and direct communication with the managers. Neil requested that the RFAC thoroughly review the biological objective section and provide references to existing objectives that were not reported in the subbasin plans or status of the Resources Report. ***The RFAC was requested to provide their comments to Neil no later than March 26, 2007.***
3. *Priorities* – ***The RFAC will discuss this topic in April and May 2007.***
- 4-5. *Confirm limiting factors and associated strategies/actions* - The RFAC agreed that a review of limiting and causative factors as well as strategies should not be initiated until the definitions for limiting and causative factors are developed. ***The RFAC will begin reviewing the factors and strategies in April 2007 with a completion date of May 2007.***

### ITEM 3: In-Lieu Analysis

On February 13, 2007, the BPA released their final in-lieu analysis and project recommendations. Major issues relative to resident fish projects include BPA's decision to: 1.) "invest less significantly than before in monitoring bull trout populations that are not directly affected by the FCRPS", 2.) not provide full funding to Lake Roosevelt kokanee projects until the ISRP completes their report, 3.) not provide funding for some projects because "no resident fish crediting mechanism exist", 4.) not provide funding to projects proposed above Hells Canyon Dam because it "may not be an FCRPS responsibility to mitigate above Hells Canyon Dam if not affected by the construction or operation of Black Canyon, Anderson Ranch, Boise Diversion, Minidoka, or palisades Reservoirs", 5.) indicate that "fish population status monitoring is a low priority", and 6.) identify new bull trout

projects as “not a high priority.”

During the February 20, 2007, MAG Meeting, participants directed the technical committees to review, compare, and comment on the BPA’s recommendations relative to those provide by the NPCC and fish and wildlife managers and to provide a report to the MAG during the March 20, 2007, MAG Meeting.

The RFAC reviewed the BPA’s recommendations/comments and developed work groups to address the major issues. The work groups are as follows:

*Loss Assessment/Crediting – Dale Chess, Ron Peters, Lawrence Schwabe, Tom Rien*

*Projects above Hells Canyon - Lawrence Schwabe, Hunter Osborn, Melo Meiolie, Tim Dykstra*

*Kokanee/ISRP Recommendations – Jim Uehara, Sheri Sears, Ed Shallenberger, Neil Ward*

*Bull Trout Issues – Mike Faler, Chris Brun, Joe Maroney, Jim Uehara, Melo Meiolie, Tom Rien*

*In-Lieu/Resident Fish Substitution – Lawrence Schwabe and Ron Peters*

*Monitoring – Committee Chairs and Technical Coordinators*

**The RFAC advised individuals in each workgroup to provide their comments to Neil Ward no later than April 2, 2007. Neil will compile the comments, per group, and provide them to the work groups for a final review no later than April 5, 2007.**

**ITEM 4:**

**Next Meeting**

**Date:** April 10-11, 2007

**Location:** Spokane, WA

**Site:** To be Determined

**Time:** April 10, 2007: 1:00p.m. – 5:00p.m. (Possible work group meetings during a.m.)

April 11, 2007: 8:00a.m. – 2:00 p.m.