



March 8, 2001

TO: Wildlife Committee (WC)

FROM: Carl Scheeler *Franklin R. Young* for

SUBJECT: Action Notes for March 6, 2001 Wildlife Committee Meeting in Spokane

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

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Paul Ashley, Cindi Confer, Jody Taylor, Leroy Stream, and Jenene Fenton (WDFW), Steve Judd and Matt Berger (CCT), Dele Becker and Art Soukkala (CSKT), Alan Wood (MDFWP), Kelly Singer and B. J. Kieffer (STOI), Robert Matt (CdAT), Ray Entz (KT), Joe DeHerrera (BPA), Robert Walker (NPPC), Scott Soultz (KTOI), Tracy Hames (YN), and Frank Young (CBFWA).

By Phone: Greg Sieglitz and Ken Rutherford (ODFW), Michele Beucler (IDFG), Dan Gonzales and Amos First Raised (BPT), Carol Perugini (SPT), and Neil Ward (CBFWA).

Time allocation:	Objective 1. FY 2001 Renewal Process	10%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	90%
	Objective 3. FY 2000 Adjustments	0%
	Objective 4. Template for watershed and subbasin assessment and plan	0%
	Objective 5. Coordinate program amendments	0%

Item 1: Review SBT Recommendations for Project Proposals for the Mountain Columbia Province

Discussion: Some Members expressed their concern that the criteria used by the Subbasin Team (SBT) to prioritize project proposals were inappropriate or at least inconsistent with the existing WC criteria for mitigating construction inundation losses. There was some concern that the proposal budgets had not been reviewed by the SBT. It was unclear if the proposed budgets included actions that were the responsibility of other agencies or that were to be funded by other sources. Additionally, there was no requirement to categorize the projects by the existing “anadromous, resident, wildlife” categories and no guidance on how the WC should evaluate acquisition projects that appear to have wildlife benefits but were not focused on wildlife. Doug Marker has indicated that he would be receptive to considering additional budget input until March 27, 2001.

Action: The WC approved the SBT recommendations but requested that the Northwest Power Planning Council provide an opportunity to reprioritize the projects if funding is not available to fund all Urgent and High Priority projects. The WC established an ad hoc Budget Work Group of Carl Scheeler, Jenene Fenton, Ray Entz, Robert Matt, Scott Soult, Allen Wood and Dale Becker to review the wildlife components of the proposals for cost effectiveness. Proposals assigned to the Work Group for review are 24015, 24020, 9004401, 24012, 24013, 24018, 24019, 24014, 24016, 24021, 24023, 910600, and 92061. Carl agreed to update the Members Management Group (MMG) on the decision of the WC and the issues raised by this review. Additionally, Carl agreed to contact Doug Marker and discuss these shortcomings in process with the intent of avoiding the pending funding prioritization conflict.

Item 2: Presentation of the Wildlife Management Plan for the Wenas and L.T. Murray Wildlife Areas by Washington Department Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)

Discussion: Paul Ashley presented the management plan for consideration by the WC.

Action: The WC requested that the following issues be addressed prior to approval of the plan:

1. Explain how public access will be managed in a manner that is consistent with mitigation and enhancement objectives (especially control of weed vectors such as equestrian and ATV use.).
2. Explain how the area can be managed as a complex in a manner that does not put accomplishing Wenas objectives at risk. The WC believed the complexing proposal as written lent no value to the mitigation objectives of the Wenas project and in fact might reduce effectiveness of the management by spreading the existing staff too thinly and creating an accounting and accountability problem for mitigation funds and equipment use.
3. Explain how HUs were derived.
4. Revise staffing level to assure accomplishment of objectives. The WC believed the size of the Wenas project area and the ambitious enhancement schedule justified a full time manager and technical support staff.

Item 3: WDFW Request for Early Start for Funding of Mule Deer Study

Discussion: WDFW requested that Wildlife Placeholder funds be made available to allow an early start for the Mule Deer Study by Washington State University (WSU).

Action: The request was denied, as there was no assurance that this study will be funded for FY 2001.

Item 4: Planning for Subbasin Planning - An Update

Discussion: Carl Scheeler provided an update including a description of the Subbasin Plan Standards Guide being developed by Lynn Palensky. Individuals interested in providing input to required elements of an amendable subbasin plan were asked to send their input to Carl.

Item 5: Update on Funding for Wildlife Project Proposals in the Intermountain and Columbia Gorge Provinces.

Discussion: Frank Young reported that the Council has indicated that approved Intermountain and Columbia Gorge Province wildlife projects for FY 2001 will be funded from the Wildlife Placeholder that is part of the Quarterly Review Process. Unfortunately, there is less than \$1M available in the Wildlife Placeholder and the WC has already determined that these funds are to be distributed basin-wide (proportionately) to ongoing FY 2001 acquisition projects that were under-funded. Frank stated that his best guess is that full funding for approved ongoing and new starts for these provinces will not be considered until FY 2002. There appears to be adequate placeholder funds to fund all approved anadromous and resident fish proposals in these provinces.

Item 6: Date and Location of Next Meeting

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for April 24, 2001 in Portland to correspond with the Hornocker lecture on carnivores. If there is inadequate agenda items to justify a meeting, it will be postponed to a later date.