



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

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 fish and wildlife 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 Fish, Wildlife & 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: May 28, 2008
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Ken MacDonald, CBFWA
SUBJECT: May 22, 2008 WAC Meeting/Teleconference Final Action Notes

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting May 22, 2008 9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. (PST) CBFWA Office – Portland, OR

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

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Ken MacDonald, Tom Iverson, Brian Lipscomb (CBFWA), Angela Sondenaar (NPT), Alan Christensen (Western Rivers Conservancy), David Speten (BPT), Nate Pamplin (WDFW), Erik Merrill, Lynn Palensky, Mark Fritsch, Karl Weist (NPCC or Council), Michael Pope (ODFW)

By Phone: Scott Soultz (KTOI), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Ray Entz (KT), Dorie Welch (BPA), Cam Heusser, Anders Mikkelsen (CDAT).

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

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda

ACTION: The May 22 Agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Review and Approve April 30, 2008 WAC Meeting Draft Action Notes

ACTION: The April 30 Action Notes were approved as written.

ITEM 3: Project Solicitation Process

Discussion: Lynn Palensky, Erik Merrill, Mark Fritsch and Karl Weist, NPCC (Council staff), were present to discuss the upcoming Wildlife project review process. The process is still in the planning phase, but the general elements and steps are in play. The Council staff is working with the WAC to get feedback on the process and the evaluation questions. Given the overlapping timelines of the project review process, development of Program amendments and the rate case there was considerable discussion. The following is a summary of the main discussion points brought up by the Council staff followed by a summary of the CBFWA Members comments.

Council Staff

- Overall process: Lynn began the discussion stating that there is still

some disagreement between the vision of the Council staff and some Council members as to the expectations for some of the larger decision points in the overall project review process.

- Wildlife review: From the staff perspective, they would like to get the on-going wildlife projects on a long-term funding path with funding commitments for potentially up to 10-years with periodic check-ins at three to five year intervals. The “check-in” is still undefined, but staff stated the check-in would not be a full project review, but a review of project contract performance status. The staff was less clear how major scope changes and new acquisitions would be handled at this time, but the way it has been presented to the Council several times is that they would be reviewed, but set aside for a funding decision later in the process. Their main focus is getting the on-going work on a longer-term funding commitment.
- Integral to the project review is to build off the existing management plans with funding levels commensurate with implementation of those plans and not tied with current, somewhat arbitrary funding levels. Some Council members perceive that the solicitation process will be budget neutral with current funding. It will be very important to base budgets upon meeting the objectives of management plans to build the case for additional funds linking implementation of the management plans to the HUs credited to the project. Some sort of grace period would need to be developed for those projects that do not currently have management plans. There is a need to develop a common template (or necessary elements) for future management plans.
- The review process will include an ISRP review. Council staff and ISRP would like to see how the management of a project fits within broader wildlife management objectives, establishing context for the identified management objectives. In the future, this broader management context may be useful for selecting new projects. The projects have had ISRP review in the past so the new review should be an update of the current status and future management needs within the broader management context.
- It was made clear that the review process was not for new projects, but more of a review of existing projects and their status.

CBFWA Members

- There is concern that the current project solicitation timeline is ahead of the amendment timeline. The CBFWA amendment recommendations could change the way projects are reviewed, especially since the amendment recommendations put less emphasis on distinguishing between O&M and enhancement activities and focus on management needed to meet ecological objectives as defined by the management plans; the framework for an RM&E program is provided and attaining the HU credits is based on adequate funding to implement the management plans for the credited HUs. Any project review by ISRP would need to consider the recommendations. In other words, the review needs to

be based on an amended Program, not the current Program.

- The funding levels need to be based upon implementation of management plans and there should not be any attempt to benchmark O&M. RM&E needs to be included for adaptive management of management plans.
- The ISRP and Council would like to understand the broader management context from which a project management plan has been developed. The ISRP needs to understand that in many cases, the managers have considered broader context and that context is often included through references in the project proposals, and it is likely the ISRP has not reviewed those references for each project. The manager's management plan for a particular project may also exceed the management needs for the BPA share of the project, based on the broader context, and those additional management objectives may be difficult to separate out.
- The project solicitation process comes at a difficult time for the managers due to the overlap with field season, continuing work on the amendments, and the rate case.
- Much of what the Council may ask for in the project review was submitted in the original project proposal, so the information provided by the managers may not be much different from what the Council and ISRP already have. The ISRP review needs to be clearly defined.

ACTION:

- The Council staff will continue to work with the WAC on the project review process at the June 5 WAC Meeting, including developing the framework for the ISRP review.
- Lynn Palensky will work with Erik Merrill to identify potential dates for a meeting between the WAC and ISRP.
- Lynn Palensky sent the list of projects to be reviewed to Ken MacDonald for distribution to the WAC.
- Project sponsors should begin developing detailed three year budgets 2010-2012 and program level budgets for the out years, 2013-2018.

ITEM 4: Amendment and Rate Case Timelines

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb began the discussion with a review of the timelines for the amendment process and the upcoming rate cases. The recently signed MOAs between the BPA and several of the CBFWA Members provide a 10-year program of work. The Members of CBFWA are suggesting that the Council develop 10-year work plans for the entities without MOAs thus developing a well defined program of work for the Fish and Wildlife Program.

Development of 10-year work plans linked to the CBFWA Program amendment recommendations may be used to help develop the power rates. The current rate case timelines are developed based on factors other than an amended Fish and Wildlife Program. The Members need to encourage the Council to develop a budget to inform the rate case based upon an amended

Program.

Tom Iverson will be working with the CBFWA Members to develop 10-year work plans for inclusion in the 2010 rate case. These need to be completed by July 15. Comments to the 2009 rate case are due June 19, which will not provide time for all Members to develop 10-year work plans therefore the November 2007 "Critical Project" letter sent from CBFWA to BPA will be updated and submitted.

The WAC needs to begin thinking about 10-year implementation plans to submit to the Council to help influence the Program budget and the rate case by July 15.

ACTION: Ken MacDonald will send WAC the template Tom Iverson is developing for the Members 10-year work plans. The subject will be discussed further at the June 5 WAC Teleconference.

ITEM 5: Western Rivers Conservancy

Discussion: Alan Christensen gave a presentation to the group on the Western Rivers Conservancy to discuss how that group may be able to help the Members implement the Fish and Wildlife Program

ITEM 6: Amendment Comments

Discussion: The document prepared by Ken MacDonald comparing BPA's amendment recommendations with those of CBFWA were reviewed and discussed. The WAC decided that the document should be turned into a comment to be submitted with the CBFWA comments on Program amendments.

ACTION: Ken MacDonald will draft the comment language and send it to Nate Pamplin for review by close of business May 29. Nate will review, edit, and send the draft to the WAC for review, so the comment letter is ready for the June 4 CBFWA Members Meeting. The format of the comment will be similar to the current comparison document, and the CBFWA recommendation resolving the differences will be highlighted.

ITEM 7: Schedule WAC meetings

ACTION: The dates for the June, July and August WAC meetings are as follows:

- June 5, 2008 CBFWA office/teleconference 9:00am-3:00pm (PDT)
- July 23-24, 2008 Pendleton, OR – 1:00pm on 7/23 to 12:00pm on 7/24
- August 19-20, 2008 Sandpoint, ID (project field tour)