



August 30, 2000

TO: Wildlife Committee

FROM: Carl Scheeler, Chair, Crediting Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Action Notes from the August 25, 2000 Meeting with BPA

If there are no objections within five days, these actions will be considered final.

**Attendees:** Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Susan Barnes (ODFW); Michele Beucler (IDFG) (phone); Steve Judd (CCT); Robert Walker (NWPPC); Sarah McNary, Phil Keyes, Phil Havens, Joe Deherera, Mark Shaw and Charlie Craig (BPA); Frank Young (CBFWA).

**Time Allocation:** *Objective 5. Coordinate Program Amendments* 100%

**ITEM 1: Protection Credit**

**Discussion:** Committee representatives stated their rationale for a protection credit ratio greater than the current 1:1 and asked Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) attendees whether they were willing to discuss moving to a lower ratio. Phil Haven pointed out that the current ledger shows that only 38% of the credits from Table 11-4 have been used and suggested that perhaps the Wildlife Managers should focus their efforts on areas with the remaining credits. Sarah McNary said that it appears that crediting is an issue only because project sponsors were bumping up against the crediting limits for some projects. Carl Scheeler disagreed and stated that the Managers have consistently opposed the 1:1 ratio on the basis that it does not achieve full mitigation and is inconsistent with HEP. He further stated that the reason that this issue is currently being addressed is because of the Northwest Power Planning Council's (NWPPC) current Program Amendment process (Program). Susan Barnes pointed out that the current Program requires the parties to address the crediting issue and bring any agreements back to the NWPPC.

**Action:** Sarah McNary stated that BPA was not inclined to move away from the current 1:1 ratio.

**ITEM 2: Areas of Commonality**

Discussion: The group agreed to develop a list of beliefs held in common by the two sides.

1. Acquisition provides the best long-term benefits for wildlife.
2. Crediting is a useful tool and should be retained in the amended Program.
3. BPA should receive some level of protection credit for acquisitions.
4. The wildlife mitigation program has been highly successful and accountable.
5. Mitigation must be long term.
6. Use of the most cost-effective method of mitigation for each circumstance is desirable.

**ITEM 3: Issues**

Discussion: The group agreed to list remaining issues that need to be addressed:

1. Disagreement over what constitutes full mitigation.
2. Disagreement over how credits are valued (whether BPA should receive more protection credit for permanent protection through acquisition than through conservation easements or leases).
3. Crediting inconsistencies between acquisitions purchased by wildlife and anadromous fish funds (Wildlife Managers are opposed to wildlife protection credits for anadromous fish acquisitions being credited against construction and inundation losses).
4. There is a concern by the Wildlife Managers that they will be at a disadvantage in competition for limited funds under the amended Program if a construction and inundation loss credit ledger is not retained. The concern is that Program funding priorities will be driven by anadromous fish recovery for ESA populations.

**ITEM 4: NWPPC Presentation**

Action: The group agreed that representatives of the two sides would appear before NWPPC's Fish and Wildlife Committee August 29, 2000 and present the results of this meeting.

**ITEM 5. Date and Location of Next Meeting**

Discussion: No additional meetings are planned at this time.