



# 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 | Website: [www.cbfwa.org](http://www.cbfwa.org)

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

DATE: March 1, 2007  
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee  
FROM: Ken MacDonald, CBFWA  
SUBJECT: February 22, 2007 WAC Meeting Final Action Notes

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting  
February 22, 2007  
Portland, Oregon, CBFWA Office

The support material and reference documents for the meeting are posted at  
<http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=WAC&meeting=all>

### Final Action Notes

**Attendees:** Angela Sondenaa (NPT), Nate Pamplin (WDFW), David Speten (BPT), Tracy Hames (YN), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Ken MacDonald, Tom Iverson (CBFWA), Michael Pope (ODFW), Ray Entz (KT), Peter Paquet, Terry Morlan (NPCC), Roger Mann (IEAB)

**By Phone:** Pat Tonasket (Colville Tribe), Gregg Servheen (IDFG), Kelly Singer (Spokane Tribe of Indians), Cameron Heusser, Anders Mikkelson (CdAT)

**Time Allocation:** Objective 1. Committee Participation 100 %  
Objective 2. Technical Review  
Objective 3. Presentation

**ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda and January 11, 2007 WAC Meeting Action Notes**

**Action:** The draft agenda was modified with two additions.

Carl Scheeler was asked to give an update on his Wildlife O&M presentation to the Council and his presentation at the Member's Boise meeting regarding the proposed WAC approach to the Council's program amendment process

Nate Pamplin gave an update regarding MAG assignment to CBFWA committees in response to BPA funding decisions (Items 2a and 2b below).

**Action:** The actions notes from the January 11, 2007 WAC Meeting were approved as final.

**ITEM 2a: Update On Wildlife O&M Presentation to the Council and Proposed WAC Approach To The Council's Program Amendment Process Presented to the Members**

**Discussion:** Carl Scheeler briefed the WAC about the presentation on Wildlife O&M at the January Council meeting. Carl stated there was some obvious opposition to the presentation from some Council members and there were some rather pointed questions. It appears some Council members question the integrity of the wildlife managers and do not have a good understanding of what is needed for O&M on wildlife projects. However, there were some positive comments on the information presented.

The proposed WAC approach to the amendment process given at the Boise Members' meeting was well received.

**ITEM 2b: MAG Assignment to CBFWA Technical Committees in Response to BPA Funding Decisions**

**Discussion:** Nate Pamplin provided the group with an update of the 2/20/07 MAG meeting. The MAG assigned the technical committees and CBFWA staff to review the final BPA funding decisions for the 2007-2009 periods and compare those decisions to (1) Manager's recommendations, (2) Council's recommendations, (3) BPA's decisions.

It was noted by the group that in some cases there was no coordination between project managers and BPA before some budget cuts were made, funds for some on-going projects were cut, there was no funding for biological monitoring and in some cases COTRs have indicated there are errors in the BPA tables.

**Action:** Nate Pamplin and Ken MacDonald were assigned to coordinate the WAC response to the MAG request. An email would be sent to the WAC Monday 2/26/07 requesting comments by 3/9/07. Ken MacDonald and Nate Pamplin will prepare a response to the MAG based on the comments received.

**ITEM 3: Program Amendment Process and Timeline**

**Discussion:** Tom Iverson gave a power point presentation on the CBFWA approach to the Council amendment process that was approved at the Members' meeting in Boise, including the Members' direction to the technical committees. The presentation included the proposed WAC approach for the amendment process and some further considerations for the WAC to discuss. Suggested specific topics for WAC consideration to address in the amendment process include:

- Define BPA obligations for Wildlife O&M
- Reduced funding for wildlife projects
- Identification of core wildlife indicator populations
- Tie the program to state conservation strategies and tribal plans
- Confirm existing projects and identify remaining needs
- Develop province level objectives based on core populations

See more information at:

[www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007\\_0222/WACFeb22Presentation\(Item%203\).ppt](http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007_0222/WACFeb22Presentation(Item%203).ppt)

After the presentation, there was considerable discussion. Discussion topics included:

- This is a time to reestablish and define the role of the wildlife managers
- Define BPA's obligation at a scale between the subbasin and Region
- Identify actions included in the subbasin plans that are BPA obligations
- Lack of funding for biological monitoring
- Need to link NPCC program with state conservation plans and other existing plans and insure the program does not replace or supersede those plans
- Need to define clear program measures including Wildlife O&M and Wildlife M&E for the NPCC program in the context of other monitoring programs.
- Define the role of HEP as an accounting tool and not a monitoring tool as a program measure.
- The need to move beyond just considering losses due to construction and inundation and identify operation and secondary losses with a link to the monitoring needs. Clearly define terms such as secondary and operational losses.
- The importance of the amendment process in helping to redefine the role of the wildlife managers and inform the 2010 rate case.

The amendment process is expected to begin in October and the WAC is to have a framework for the process by August.

**Action:** See ITEM 6:

**ITEM 4: Discuss IEAB Task #116 with Roger Mann (IEAB)**

[http://www.chfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007\\_0222/IEAB-Task116.doc](http://www.chfwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007_0222/IEAB-Task116.doc)

**Discussion:** Roger began the discussion by providing some background for Task #116. He explained that the task is exploratory to determine if the available data in PISCES can be used to manage costs. The Council wants to know if all program costs can be managed more effectively. The IEAB's role is to help the Council look at the cost effectiveness of the Fish and Wildlife Program and that working with the wildlife managers and the PISCES database was a starting point.

Roger went on to explain that the focus for this meeting would be on the use of PISCES for the O&M assessment recognizing there were some problems and reasons for cost variability but he needs to report to the council as tasked. Roger also stated he would like future help from the managers to:

- Help IEAB identify other appropriate agencies for costs comparison
- Explore the potential for benchmarking, understanding it is a difficult task
- Look at strategies to reduce Program costs

Each individual WAC member at the meeting was then asked to provide their thoughts concerning Task #116. Comments from the ensuing discussion included:

- There is no clear line separating O&M from enhancement in many cases. For example, burning can be an enhancement or maintenance activity depending upon the objectives. It is not clear in PISCES if a work element is O&M or enhancement
- There is a need for stable base level funding for managing wildlife areas including funding to maintain the necessary crews, vehicles and supplies.
- The individual managers are responding to a letter from Council regarding the use of PISCES data for the O&M analysis. Roger needs to read those responses as they will likely reiterate much of what he will hear during the meeting
- It is difficult to plan for O&M as the managers need to be reactionary given management needs in any one year.
- There is a need for a base level of monitoring to determine what O&M may be needed and HEP is not a monitoring tool.
- Roger needs to see the 1998 CBFWA paper defining appropriate O&M activities.
- PISCES has some useful information for the exercise but the limitations need to be clearly understood
- NPCC and BPA need to understand that the managers have overhead/administrative costs and these vary by management entity
- There are costs involved with administrating the BPA contracts and the current process does not allow managers the flexibility to capitalize on opportunities or react to needs. A more stable funding mechanism such as trust funds may actually be more cost effective and can encourage efficiencies.
- The O&M challenges are not unique to BPA and are faced by the managers internally as well.
- BPA and NPCC need to understand that there is a cost for work needed to be compliant with state and federal regulations.

- The O&M cost analysis must include multiple years because the costs for work on a particular property will vary annually.
- When looking at the PISCES data it is easy to assume that a project is fully funded. Some projects are fully funded but others are not which can lead to misleading results. When exploring the O&M costs of other agencies for comparison purposes or benchmarking the level of funding needs to be considered as many programs are under funded. The variability in funding levels is one factor that can make benchmarking difficult.
- There is a problem in that PISCES does not account for cost-share funds where a substantial part of O&M may be paid for from funds other than BPA, thus further making comparisons using only PISCES difficult.
- The managers are concerned that PISCES is being used for an analysis it was not developed for and a type analysis the managers were told the database would not be used for.
- There is a need to recognize economies of scale and that costs can vary by different habitat types, logistics and terrain
- Data is not entered into PISCES in a consistent manner. The managers are also concerned that PISCES may be “tweaked” to the point it becomes a greater administrative cost.

Next, Roger displayed the current O&M cost spreadsheet developed by BPA using the PISCES data.

[http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007\\_0222/FY06%20Wildlife%20WE%20Budget%20Analysis%201Jan07.xls](http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/WAC/meetings/2007_0222/FY06%20Wildlife%20WE%20Budget%20Analysis%201Jan07.xls)

The discussion on the spreadsheet included many of the points above plus:

- The acreages displayed are not always correct
- All project administrative costs were included as an O&M cost
- BPA assumed some work was O&M when it is actually enhancement. If the cost spreadsheet is to be useful the project managers need to help define which work elements for a project are O&M and which are enhancement
- The costs in PISCES are estimates and not actual expenditures. PISCES is not used by project managers as a cost accounting tool
- A project can consist of several work elements. For example, a noxious weed treatment could include coordination, spraying and planting.
- PISCES data does not account for different management strategies that are driven by budget realities.

There was discussion on how to make the data more useful such as:

- Grouping projects by habitat type and scale to help obtain a more useful comparison of costs and then look at costs within like groups.
- Possibly compare some projects to the WAC O&M white paper to assess reasons for cost variability.
- Identify which projects are fully funded and which are not.
- Partition administrative/overhead costs across all project activities

Roger Mann stated the first step would be to fix known errors in PISCES and potentially add a column to display the funding level.

**Action:** Roger Mann will send an email to the WAC clarifying what he needs/wants from the managers in as specific terms as possible so that the data is more useable. The email will include the spreadsheet so everyone is working off the same information.

Roger also expressed his interest to discuss with the WAC potential ways to improve Wildlife Program efficiency.

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

**Discussion:** There was much discussion on the topic particularly in regards to building program measures for the amendment process. The process offers the potential to establish a framework to define the wildlife program. The amendment process presents an opportunity to:

- Establish goals for the Program and define success.
- Define a reasonable rate of implementation to meet long-term wildlife goals.
- Define, as a program measure, a review process for management plans to improve the understanding and ensure cost effectiveness of the plans in a transparent manner.
- Establish metrics, including ecological metrics to report Wildlife Program progress towards wildlife goals to be reported in the Status of the Resource Report.
- Define program measures for O&M and M&E including linking M&E to broader strategies, regional efforts, and the state conservation strategies.
- Develop explicit crediting measures and define operational and secondary losses.
- Review what was good about the old Fish and Wildlife Programs and bring those items forward.

As a result of the discussion the draft outline for the “Wildlife Chapter” (Attachment 1) to the amendment process was developed.

**Action:** At the next WAC meeting, we will discuss and further develop the Wildlife “Chapter” outline and continue the discussion to develop program measures. The outline can be used to develop the program from which the specific measures can be defined.

**ITEM 7: Next Meeting Location and Critique**

**Action:** March WAC meeting will be held at the UCUT office in Spokane on March 22, tentatively scheduled from 10:00 AM to 3:30 PM Pacific Time.

Tentative agenda items include:

- Further discussion of the Wildlife Program Amendment outline (Item 6).
- Presentation by Scott Soultis on operational loss assessment process.
- Presentation by Ray Entz on the monitoring program being developed by the UCUT as a potential example for developing a Wildlife Program M&E measure.

Another action assignment is for Ken MacDonald to develop a WAC poster for the upcoming Wildlife Society Meeting. The poster should include a map with locations of BPA funded wildlife projects, the new CBFWA logo, include an example of what the wildlife SOTR information may look like and description of the role/activities of the WAC.

**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**Draft Wildlife Program Outline**

Past Program Amendments Forward

Review and summarize by Program year

Additional losses

How to measure and how to credit against losses

Define (operational, Secondary, remaining CI)

Monitoring and Evaluation

Link to larger scale (from hydro project to mitigation project, to subbasin plans, to ecoregions, etc.)

Define BPA obligation for impacted populations

Link to State Conservation Plans

Define reasonable project effectiveness methodologies

Crediting

Truth existing ledger

Address mis-credited projects

Define how future crediting will be done (CI, Op, 2<sup>nd</sup>) for wildlife, fish and watershed projects)

Operations and Maintenance

Define obligations

Define Operations and Maintenance

Long term agreements