



# 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

**DATE:** January 25, 2007  
**TO:** Wildlife Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Ken MacDonald, WAC Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** Final Action Notes for January 11, 2007 WAC Meeting

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 government 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

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting  
January 11, 2007  
CBFWA Office – Portland, Oregon

## Action Notes - Final

**Attendees:** Michael Pope (Chair, ODFW); Angela Sondenaa (Vice-Chair, NPT); Loren Kronemann (NPT); Nate Pamplin (WDFW); Nathan Burkepile (YN); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Ray Entz (KT); David Speten (BPT); Peter Paquet, Doug Marker, and Terry Morlan (NPPC); Bill Maslen (BPA); Ken MacDonald, Paul Ashley, Tom Iverson, and Brian Lipscomb (CBFWA)

**By Phone:** Gregg Servheen (IDFG); Mary Verner (UCUT); Scott Soultz (KTI); Roger Mann (IEAB), Stacy Horton (NPPC)

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

**ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda; Approve December 12, 2006 WAC Action Notes**

**Discussion:** Agenda was reviewed with one addition to add a brief discussion regarding inclusion of wildlife in the next Status of the Resource Report.

**ACTION:** **Approve December Action Notes**  
Carl Scheeler moved to approve the December 12, 2006 Action Notes, seconded by Nathan Burkepile. There were no objections.

**ITEM 2: Review and Discuss White Paper on Wildlife O&M**

**Discussion:** Michael Pope initiated the discussion with background for the white paper by Carl Scheeler and Michael Pope concerning wildlife program O&M (see [http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007\\_0111/OMwhitePaperPopeScheelerJan2007.pdf](http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007_0111/OMwhitePaperPopeScheelerJan2007.pdf)).

**Discussion:** The white paper was developed to address concerns of the wildlife managers with IEAB **Task Number 116, Investigation of Wildlife O&M Costs**. Concerns of the group with the proposed IEAB task order include: the perception that wildlife program O&M costs are escalating; the reasons for variability associated with wildlife project O&M and the difference between O&M and Enhancement and Restoration (E&R) may not be fully understood by the Council; Pisces is not currently a good tool to analyze O&M costs as Pisces costs are estimates, data input to Pisces is variable, and Pisces was not constructed for such an analysis; information in Pisces is not always accurate and may be used out of context (can't compare fully funded projects/management plans with partially funded projects/management plans) and the data lacks specificity for such analysis; project sponsor accounting systems are generally not sophisticated enough to accurately differentiate costs of different activities; concern that the focus on O&M costs, a small portion of the overall program, ignores the bigger question of how best to cost effectively implement the Council's wildlife program

The group agreed that the Wildlife Managers should work in a positive manner with the IEAB to get an accurate assessment of O&M costs, develop appropriate tools to assess the O&M program, communicate the differences between O&M and E&R, and explore with IEAB ways to make the wildlife program more cost effective.

Carl Sheeler then led a discussion specifically on the white paper with focus on what to highlight during conversations with the IEAB under ITEM 3 below.

Carl presented a power point he developed to help present the conclusions from the white paper to the Council.

**ACTION:** A subcommittee including Carl Scheeler, Angela Sondenaa and Ray Entz was formed to present the Wildlife Manager's concerns and provide suggestions for addressing the costs of the wildlife program at the next Council meeting. This same subcommittee will offer to work with IEAB pending the outcome of discussions under Item 3, below.

**ITEM 3: Discuss IEAB Assignment (Task #116)**

**Discussion:** The group was joined by Doug Marker, Terry Morlan, Stacy Horton, and Bill Maslen and via phone with Roger Mann (IEAB).

Michael Pope began the discussion by stating the WAC assumed the IEAB wanted an accurate and comprehensive analysis of O&M costs; the WAC would like to work with the IEAB in a positive manner and that a subcommittee had been formed to directly work with the IEAB if desired. It should be noted that at this time, and later throughout the discussion, Roger accepted the offer of the subcommittee to assist the IEAB.

Carl Scheeler then led the group in a discussion of the major thoughts and concerns regarding Task Order 116, including;

- Pisces is not a good source for itemized project implementation expenditures,
- There are numerous reasons for O&M cost variability as outlined in the white paper
- Concerns were expressed regarding comparisons of BPA funded wildlife project O&M costs with costs for similar work conducted by other agencies such as state wildlife areas and the refuge system. Such comparisons have been made in the past and found not to be useful for various reasons, including insufficient funding available to the state and federal wildlife areas makes unit cost comparisons problematic. WAC subcommittee will try to get documentation of past studies to IEAB.
- Concerns with establishing benchmark costs for judging future wildlife program projects. Wildlife managers have attempted to establish standard cost ranges for projects in the past and found the variability caused by a variety of factors to be so great as to make benchmarking very difficult. As a result of the past efforts the Wildlife Managers decided to abandon establishing standard costs in favor of describing what work is appropriate for BPA funded O&M and what work would not be appropriate for BPA funded O&M.
- Task 116 includes evaluation of a sample of projects recommended by the Council for 2007-09 relative to cost-benchmarking methods. The original task order 105 did a preliminary assessment of a sample of projects. The results of that analysis were misleading due to the specific projects that were selected (i.e., Pine Creek Ranch shows a very low cost per HU, yet the management plan is not adequately funded to maintain the property).The WAC wishes to work with IEAB to establish objectives and criteria for project selection.
- Finally the WAC appreciates the need for the Council's program to be cost effective and propose that the WAC and IEAB explore avenues to improve cost effectiveness of the overall program as opposed to just exploring least cost O&M methods.

Discussions were very positive and Roger Mann accepted the offer to work with the WAC subcommittee.

**ACTION:** WAC subcommittee of Ray Entz, Angela Sondenaar, and Carl Scheeler will contact Roger to schedule time to work with IEAB.

**ITEM 4: Develop WAC presentation to Council on Wildlife O&M**

**Discussion:** Group discussed what they would like to present to the Council on January 17, 2007. An outline for the presentation was developed. In addition to explaining O&M costs, the presentation will suggest the focus of work should be how to improve and develop a cost effective wildlife program that can potentially be incorporated into the amendment process and 2010 rate case.

Group believes the necessary information is contained in the power points prepared by Ray and Carl.

**ACTION:** Carl Scheeler will prepare a first draft of the presentation and send to Ray Entz Friday morning (1/12/07). Ray will make edits and send back to Carl. Carl will then send the presentation to Ken MacDonald at CBFWA who will distribute the draft presentation the full WAC for comment. Comments will be due back to Carl by Tuesday afternoon (1/16/07).

**New ITEM: Status of the Resource Report (SOTR) - Wildlife**

**Discussion:** Neil Ward briefly reviewed the SOTR with the group. Currently wildlife is not included in the SOTR. A draft template will be made available to the WAC for review. An email will follow when the template is available. Neil would like the WAC to look at the proposed format and suggest any changes to make the report informative and useful for policy makers. CBFWA staff needs help from the wildlife managers on how best to present wildlife in SOTR. May want to consider which focal species to be included how to incorporate state conservation plans.

Two approaches were discussed and should be pursued:

- 1) The Wildlife Program is predicated on the habitat loss assessments. The objectives of the Program have been agreed to in terms of replacing those HUs, and each wildlife project is tied to specific construction losses. The Status of the Resource report should track the HU's for the wildlife program from the habitat loss ledger.
- 2) Each of the states has recently adopted state Conservation Strategies. In those efforts, focal species were identified for ecoregions within each state, for the purpose of tracking wildlife population/habitat improvements. The SOTR should include some level of wildlife population level tracking as established in the state conservation strategies (and coordinated with the tribes). This would also help make a tie between the state and tribal wildlife plans and the Fish and Wildlife Program.

**ACTION:** CBFWA will distribute a draft template for review and possible discussion at the next WAC meeting. Carl Scheeler and Ray Entz will develop templates for the Umatilla Subbasin and the Pend Oreille Subbasin to use for demonstration. WAC encouraged to look at SOTR, available at <http://www.cbfwa.org/sotr/>.

**ITEM 5: Lunch**

**ITEM 6: Develop WAC Work Plan for 2007**

**Discussion:** Group reviewed the draft 2007 work plan.

- 1. BPA funded wildlife acquisition O&M.** Previous discussions for ITEMS 2, 3, 4 outline work for 2007 as identified at this time.
- 2. BPA funded wildlife acquisition M&E.** Wildlife managers feel there is discrepancy between ISRP, BPA, the Council and the Managers. ISRP is critical of projects that do not include species/population response monitoring yet BPA is only funding monitoring of Habitat Units. After some discussion it was decided that M&E needs to be on the work plan. In the near term the WAC may be in a reactive mode on the issue but there was a suggestion that the WAC form a subcommittee to develop a white paper. Suggest Ray Entz possibly take a lead or provide a first draft. Ray shared the program that was started, but not completed (still draft as funding was pulled), for the Kootenai as a possible template <http://atlas.knrd.org>
- 3. Develop language for submission to the Program amendment process.** There was a short discussion on the topic. The group felt that the O&M and M&E topics could be considered for inclusion in the amendment process and should be further explored.
- 4. Development of operational loss assessments for the FCRPS.** Scott Stoultz lead a discussion on work they are doing to assess operational losses, moving away from HEP and incorporating an ecological unit approach including hydrology, geomorphology and trophic level responses. The group was interested in the discussion and would like to explore further, probably following the February meeting.
- 5. SOTR and Wildlife.** This topic was not discussed after lunch but in prior discussions (see New Item above) the group felt incorporation of wildlife into the SOTR was worthy of further discussion.

**ACTION:** WAC will continue to work on the O&M issue as described in ITEMS 2, 3, 4

WAC suggest including M&E on the work plan to be discussed

further at the February Meeting

WAC feels both O&M and M&E could be part of the Program amendment process and will discuss further at the February meeting

WAC would like to further discuss operational loss assessment process with a presentation by Scott Stoultz at a March meeting.

WAC will discuss how best to incorporate wildlife information into SOTR. See ACTION for New Item above.

**ITEM 7: Next Meeting – Set WAC meeting schedule for 2007**

**Discussion:** There was discussion on how often the WAC should meet, best times to meet and locations. Initial feelings were to possibly meet the third Thursday of each month as would allow WAC to review the results of the Council meeting for the month and allow time to prepare for presentation at the next Council meeting if needed.

**ACTION:** Next WAC meeting scheduled for February 22 at the UCUT office in Spokane, 1000-1500. Potential agenda items include:

- O&M subcommittee report on Council presentation
- Schedule for future meetings
- Discuss subcommittee for M&E
- Discuss “In – Lieu” issue
- Discuss incorporating wildlife into SOTR
- Discuss how to improve participation in the WAC