



November 18, 1999

TO: Wildlife Caucus Distribution

FROM: Michele Beucler, Chair *Franklin R. Young* for

SUBJECT: October 27-28, 1999 Wildlife Caucus Meeting Draft Action Notes

Wednesday, October 27, 1999

Attendees: Michele Beucler and Ed Bottum (IDFG), Robert Walker and Peter Paquet (NWPPC), Haace St. Martin and Daniel Gonzalez (BPT), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Tracy Hames (YIN), Vinny Pero (SPT), Joe Deherrera (BPA), Maureen Smith (USFWS), Susan Barnes and Greg Sieglitz (ODFW), Frank Young and Cheron McGuffey (CBFWA), Ray Entz (KT), Robert Matt (CDAT)

Phone Attendees: Anders Mikkelson (SBT), BJ Kiefer (STI), and Scott Soultz (KTOI)

Thursday, October 28, 1999

Attendees: Michele Beucler and Ed Bottum (IDFG), Robert Walker (NWPPC), Frank Young and Cheron McGuffey (CBFWA), Maureen Smith (USFWS), Susan Barnes and Greg Sieglitz (ODFW), Robert Matt (CDAT), Terry Luther (CTWSR), Tracy Hames (YIN), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Ray Entz (KT), Haace St. Martin and Dan Gonzalez (BPT), Phil Havens (BPA), Paul Ashley (WDFW)

Phone Attendees: Anders Mikkelsen (SBT), Stacey Stovall (IDFG), and Jenene Ratassepp (WDFW)

ITEM 1: Review of Agenda

ACTION: The Agenda for the Oct. 27-28 meeting was approved as written with Thursday's agenda being flexible.

ITEM 2: Review of Action Notes

Motion: Carl moved to approve Action Notes with the following changes: Add Susan and Maureen to attendee's list; change chair name as appropriate. Ed seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion approved.

ITEM 3: Establish and Clarify WC Meeting Ground Rules

- One speaker at a time
- No side conversations
- Respect each other and each other's perspective
- Focus energy on issues
- Time outs are appropriate
- No swearing/shouting
- Address the issue not the person
- Open and honest communication
- Don't prejudge motives

ACTION: The WC informally approved Ground Rules.

ITEM 4: Clarify Group Expectations: ROLES

Chair:

- Agenda.
- Review action notes.
- Make sure WC performs tasks.
- Tracks tasks, assignments, ad hoc committees, etc.
- Provide group direction, assists with goals/objectives.
- Represent WC (or appoints representative) at MSG, Members Meetings and cross-caucus gatherings.
- Balance, as appropriate, the roles of facilitator and active participant.

Discussion: The WC agreed that generally the roles of facilitator and participant are not mutually exclusive, however, Michele felt that performing both roles at the same time is confusing and may lead to disorganized meetings and consequently be more difficult to accomplish group tasks and decisions.

Recorder:

- Be neutral.
- Focus on process.
- Record group discussions.

Discussion: There were various comments regarding the methodology of the notetaker. Several people expressed concern over lack of credibility of the action notes and requested more detailed notes. The idea of taping the meetings was presented. Various suggestions/arguments for and against this idea:

- Group notes on the flip chart would resolve any discrepancy with the Action Notes.
- Tape meetings without transcribing them to use for discrepancy in the future.
- A tape recorder would stifle freedom of communication.
- Could use the tapes selectively.
- Tape would be good for clarification; no need to archive.

Motion: Carl proposed motion a motion that the WC will use tape recorder all the time. CBFWA will take notes, which will be modified by Frank to make action notes.

Discussion: Do other caucuses use tape recorders? Why not? Weren't notes and flip charts enough? Frank indicated that tapes were used in the distant past but had not helped in resolving differences over discussion results. However, Brian said that the charter sunset issue was an example where confusion was solved by listening to the tape of the meeting. It was mentioned that the informal nature of meetings is the key to success.

Motion: Carl proposed modified motion. WC will use flip charts when appropriate and administrative staff will take notes. At the notetaker's discretion, recording of the meeting will be allowed with the condition that the tapes be saved only until the action notes are approved. Ray seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion passed as written.

Facilitator:

- Be neutral
- Focus on process
- Focus group energy on task
 - Traffic officer
 - Meeting chauffeur
 - Tool guide

ACTION: The WC accepted the above role description for Facilitator

Group Member:

- Active participant
- Content
- Devote energy to task
- Keep recorder and facilitator neutral
- F&W managers ("members")
 - CBWFA staff (1/4 of Frank's time not enough)
 - NWPPC staff (needs clarification, appropriate times only)
 - BPA staff.

Discussion: The WC felt it was important to discuss these roles but ran out of time to discuss today.

Motion: Ray proposed the motion to table the “group member role” discussion until the next meeting. Carl seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion approved.

ITEM 5: Council’s Perspective of the Crediting Issue

Discussion: Peter Paquet gave an overview of the issue:

- There are at least three more years of crediting
- Transition needs work
- Wildlife projects are moving ahead
- HUs are the basis of funding “inundation issues.”
- Council will send out an announcement of a meeting late November/early December to discuss and resolve crediting issues (i.e., the Council is stepping in to facilitate).

Question: Language suggests that BPA has veto power. Is that true? Peter indicated that the Council must facilitate consensus, “Bring parties to the table.” Consensus is not required but WC position is preferred over individual members’; more advantageous for a WC recommendation. Carl mentioned that it is best to take a list of items of agreement and unresolved issues to the Council. Peter indicated that crediting for wildlife losses may continue under watershed approach and a project ranking role for WC contemplated for FY01. Due to time crunch, shouldn’t the WC deal with crediting issues tomorrow?

Other Issues to discuss:

- Construction/Inundation losses, long-term plan for doing business
- Operational losses (HEP? Does it make sense?)
- Other losses; Multi Species Framework issues.

Peter recommended spending a half-day reviewing the history and rule-making of the crediting issues.

ACTION: The WC decided to table the crediting issue until Thursday’s meeting.

ITEM 6: Council’s Perspective of FY01 and Transition Funding

ACTION: WC postponed discussion until Thursday, when Brian Allee was present.

ITEM 7: Multi Species Framework

Discussion: Robert stated that the 4-H process focuses only on anadromous fish-does not address wildlife. Peter gave an update/overview of the Multi Species Framework:

- Four stocks of Chinook
- Two species of wildlife: black bear and beaver
- Rationale used by MSF is close to HEP
 - It is habitat based
 - It assumes that density dependence is key
- Habitat structure and character are determined by biological performance which is measured by:
 - Productivity
 - Capacity
 - Habitat Quality
 - Historical Perspective (ideal conditions are used as reference points)
 - Life History Diversity (measuring the loss of a species)
- Council staff plans to spend half a day in December discussing Framework issues with WC.

Thursday, October 28, 1999

ITEM 10: Modification of the Agenda

ACTION: The remaining agenda was discussed and prioritized.

ITEM 11: M & E Report

Discussion: Suggested changes to the report:

- Do legislative edits.
- Table of contents needs page numbers.
- Appendix A has inconsistencies and is hard to follow.
- Flip flop appendix A and B and connect w/text.

Motion: Ray made a motion to approve the report with the above changes. Susan seconded.

ACTION: Motion was approved and recommended Frank work with Maureen to assure that suggested formatting changes are made.

Discussion: The idea of an annual M &E report was discussed.

Motion: Ray made a motion to indefinitely table this issue. Susan seconded.

ACTION: The motion was approved.

ITEMS 6 Subbasin Planning
12, 13:

Discussion: Brian Allee gave an overview of the issue:

- Approach is bottom-up grassroots planning.
- Approach is ecosystem-based.
- The Strategic Planning Group submitted a document containing reports and suggestions to the NWPPC.
- Transition
 - CBFWA is proposing to do a pilot project in 2000
 - Feedback from this project will be used to improve subsequent planning efforts
 - 10-year plans (multi-year planning)
 - Principals meeting suggested a group including caucuses and CBFWA work with NWPPC to define transition
 - Proposing to use a variety of subbasins to insure pilot project is representative
 - Pilot plans may be used to help justify future budget requests
 - Plans with broad support will be higher priority for funding
 - Definition of what exactly is a “watershed assessment?” will probably will be discussed at December 9-10 workshop.

Jenene listed several issues that need to be discussed:

- Crediting in a subbasin context
- In-lieu; FW managers vs. BPA responsibility
- Two steps:
 - (1) FW managers decide on areas of agreement and disagreement, and (2) Get other managers (land and water) involved
- Budget for CBWFA member participation.
- Identify which subbasins to recommend for pilot (political vs. FW concerns).
- Level of detail in subbasin plan
 - What do we use for criteria? Indicator species? Which ones?
 - How do we achieve consistency between plans?
- Pilot plans begin in January. We have inadequate time to insure product quality.
- Outyear budgets – WC needs to develop alternatives for NWPPC funding wildlife projects through transition.

ACTION: The WC selected Maureen, Jenene, and Susan to represent the WC on an ad hoc cross-caucus work group to develop recommendations to the Council on a schedule and process for developing subbasin plans.

ITEM (Add) FY 2000 Project Selection Process

Discussion: Brian indicated priority projects will likely be those with concurrence between the ISRP and the Council (innovative projects may have preference). The WC is concerned that they would be left out of reallocating funds if a wildlife project was not funded. Ray recommended a conference call on Monday to discuss policy implications if Tier 1 wildlife projects fall under "do not fund" recommendation by ISRP.

ACTION: A conference call was scheduled for 2 p.m., November 1, 1999 to discuss policy implications if any Tier 1 WC project received a "do not fund" recommendation by ISRP.

Topic will be addressed at the November 10 MSG meeting.

ITEM 14: Crediting

Discussion: Protection Credit - General points of clarification:

- Bonneville gets credit when it enhances land that would otherwise be developed
- Bonneville gets credits for net increase in HUs (with inundation we lost HUs, not land)
- The 3:1 ratio is a politically negotiated settlement. (because we can never biologically achieve full mitigation).

Motion: Robert made a motion to "Use a ratio of 1:3 as the baseline for HUs in the calculation of protection credits for permanent protection (as defined in the Draft Crediting Issue Paper) for new acquisitions." Ray seconded.

ACTION: Motion was approved.

Next Meeting will be December 2-3, 1999 in Portland. The second day will be available for the Council to facilitate a crediting meeting with BPA.

Subcommittees

1. Crediting

Membership: Carl Scheeler (Chair), Joe DeHerrera, Phil Havens, Susan Barnes, and Michele Beucler.

Deliverables: Develop method of dealing with crediting for operational and secondary losses. Develop assigned definitions and draft rationale for recommended approach.

2. Ranking

Membership: Ray Entz (Chair), Anders Mikkelsen, and Stacey Horton.

Deliverables: Develop proposal for new criteria to be reviewed and commented on by the Caucus.

Timeline: Subcommittee will remain inactive until crediting issue is resolved and subbasin planning activities are completed.

3. Relative Values

Membership: Paul Ashley (Chair), Matt Berger, Susan Barnes, Robert Matt, and Ray Entz.

Deliverables: This subcommittee will remain inactive until the crediting issue is resolved.

4. Operational Losses

Membership: Ed Bottum (Chair), Scott Soultz, Paul Ashley, and Maureen Smith.

Deliverables: Develop a draft Request for Proposals, addressing wildlife losses due to dam operations, for full Caucus review. Develop definition of operational losses with supporting rationale.

5. Long Term Operations and Maintenance

Membership: Loren Kronemann (Chair), Michele Beucler, Carl Scheeler, and Jenene Ratasapp.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation

Membership: Robert Walker (Chair), Paul Ashley, Susan Barnes, Matt Berger, Carl Scheeler, and Joe DeHerrera.

Deliverables: 1. Develop an interactive/standardized HEP modeling program that ties both vegetative and species response to mitigation activities.

- Develop a prototype program for review within three months.
- Funding will be through the Wildlife Plan money.
- Complete program with a Caucus review within six months.
- Make program available through existing web sources, i.e. BPA Net or StreamNet; also, explore a stand-alone system (CD, Diskettes, etc.) cost vs. the Net cost. A presentation of this model is scheduled for the December 8, 1999 WC meeting.