



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | 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: June 17, 2008
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Ken MacDonald, CBFWA
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for June 5, 2008 WAC Meeting

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting
June 5, 2008
9:00am-3:00pm
CBFWA Office – Portland, OR

The support material and reference documents are posted at

<http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=WAC&meeting=all>

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Ken MacDonald, Tom Iverson, Brian Lipscomb (CBFWA), Scott Soult (KTOI), Erik Merrill, Peter Paquet, Mark Fritsch, Karl Weist (NPCC),

By Phone: Angela Sondana (NPT), Nate Pamplin (WDFW), Michael Pope (ODFW) Alan Wood, Dwight Bergeron (MFWP), Gregg Servheen (IDFG), Lynn Palensky, Stacy Horton (NPCC)

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

ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda

ACTION: The June 5 WAC Meeting agenda was approved with a new added Item 5: HLI/SOTR/Monitoring.

ITEM 2: Review and Approve May 22, 2008 Action Notes

ACTION: The May 22 WAC Action Notes were approved as written.

ITEM 3: Wildlife Project Review

Discussion: Erik Merrill, Mark Fritsch, Peter Paquet and Karl Weist, NPCC staff, were present to discuss the upcoming wildlife project review process. Lynn Palensky and Stacy Horton joined by phone. The discussion was a continuation of the conversation during the May WAC meeting. Council staff had hoped to have a draft “white paper” outlining the review process including questions to be addressed by project managers available for the meeting, but due to continued discussions within the Council staff and with BPA the paper was not ready for WAC review.

The first order of business was to review the Council’s table of existing projects that are to be included in the wildlife project review. The Council staff has received some feedback on the table and encourages managers to contact them if there are questions regarding projects either on or off the list

and the categories projects placement.

After looking at the project table there was considerable discussion regarding the review process which all recognize is a work in progress. The following is a summary of the main discussion points brought up by the CBFWA members followed by a summary of the Council staff comments.

CBFWA Members

- The WAC needs opportunity to review and provide input to the project review questions.
- Is the context for the review, the current Fish and Wildlife Program or an amended Program? If the context is the current program, the review should be structured to describe the current situation with project implementation under the program, identify the evidence that the current program is or is not working, identify what needs to be done to remedy what is not working and keep aspects that are working through the review process and ultimately Program amendment.
- The WAC has completed much of the work assessing the current program, identifying what is or is not working and proposed solutions through the amendment recommendations.
- Assessing the current program through the review should help identify issues to resolve as the Program moves forward and target project solicitation including identification of areas that may need to be prioritized for future implementation
- During the review, the need for operational loss assessments and improved RM&E should be recognized.
- How will projects like the Kootenai operational loss assessment and other “watershed” type projects that may include assessment and implementation be reviewed?
- The WAC would like to know the time schedule for the review including time to provide input to the questions to be asked.
- It would be very helpful to discuss project review questions with the ISRP.

Council Staff

- The staff hoped to have a draft white paper outlining the wildlife project review process, including the proposed review questions available for input at the meeting. Because there is not consensus between the Council staff and BPA regarding expectations for the review the paper is not ready. It is acknowledged that original timelines may need to slip.
- It is acknowledged that the timing of the review is awkward due to the concurrent amendment process but the staff hopes to use the process, including site visits, to get the existing projects on a long-term funding track and help inform development of new projects.
- Hopefully, the review process will inform setting priorities for

future work. Are the Willamette, Albeni Falls and southern Idaho areas the most “under-mitigated” and thus priorities for future projects? At the same time the process most not lead to false expectations for those areas.

- Council needs to be gathering information on the status of work completed and needed for the existing wildlife projects to move them forward. The staff also needs to know the content of current agreements and identify any bounds contained in those agreements.
- There is still a perception by the some Council members and BPA that project funding will fall within an existing budget cap. The review may provide opportunity to display what needs to be accomplished to maintain and increase credited HUs including the cost and determine future priorities.
- The Council staff is still working on the nature of the review for the on-going Kootenai operational loss assessment project including which review category(ies) such projects will fall under.
- We will also need to decide how to deal with other projects that have broader geographic scope than an individual property such as the proposed UCUT monitoring project.
- The Council staff will be gathering and looking at existing information including management plans, amendment recommendations and comments to amendment recommendations as the review process is developed.
- Hopefully the July WAC meeting can include ISRP and BPA to finalize the process and set the review in motion.

ACTION: Council Staff will send Ken MacDonald the “White Paper” outlining the wildlife project review including the questions for the project managers to address. Ken MacDonald will facilitate WAC review and comment back to Council staff. The intent is to have WAC comments incorporated into a final process by the July WAC meeting, therefore there may be need for continued discussions between members of the WAC and Council staff before the July meeting. Hopefully at the July meeting we can work with ISRP, Council staff and BPA to finalize the “white paper” and take steps to begin the review process.

ITEM 4: Amendment and Rate Case Timelines

Discussion: Tom Iverson led the discussion on the CBFWA approach to developing the Fish and Wildlife Program budgets and to help inform the 2009 and 2010-2011 rate cases. The general approach is to develop program budgets based upon the biological framework provided by the CBFWA amendment recommendations.

The MOAs that some members have with BPA provide a template for developing 10-year work plans and budgets. Some Members included work plans as measures in their amendment recommendations. Members who did not include work plan measures and budgets are encouraged to submit them as comments to the amendment recommendations. CBFWA will be championing the Council to develop 10-year work plans as part of their

amendments using the MOAs as an example. Tom provided an example worksheet that could be used by the members to develop work plans to submit to the Council as measures and inform the 2010-2011 rate case. Work and budgets for the first three years should be fully developed while work and budgets for “out-years” may need to be more programmatic; such as assume a reasonable rate of acquisition with accompanying HUs and average costs.

For the 2009 rate case CBFWA will be revisiting and resubmitting the November letter to BPA identifying critical and essential projects identified by the fish and wildlife managers.

Input to the 2009 rate case is due June 19 while input to the 2010-2011 rate case will be due in August. Tom will be working with the Members to help develop work plans to communicate to the Council and hopefully be used in the rate case.

ACTION: **Information:** Individual Members will decide what they will do to include work plans as amendment comments. The WAC members need to be sure the wildlife projects are included in any amendment comments and information developed for the rate cases.

ITEM 5: HLI/SOTR/Monitoring

Discussion: Ken MacDonald with Stacy Horton briefed the group on the current effort being led by Dr. Karier to improve the Council’s reports to Congress and the governors including the identification of High Level Indicators (HLIs). Ken showed the group the monitoring pyramid developed for anadromous fish reporting that was submitted to Dr. Karier as informal input to his list of potential HLIs. The pyramid and accompanying metrics display the linkages between monitoring and reporting at the population/sub-basin scale to the MPG/ESU/provincial scale to the basin scale. The information at each of these scales will be reported through the *Status of the Resource Report* (SOTR) and needs to be consistent with and facilitate other fish and wildlife manager reporting needs at the three scales. Dr Karier will be asking the Council to submit his list of HLIs to the region for input at the June Council meeting. He hopes to have the Council accept a list of HLIs at the August meeting that can be used not only for reporting but also to develop a monitoring framework for the program to inform FY09 monitoring project funding decisions and build into the amended Program.

Currently the only HLI identified for wildlife are the HUs credited or mitigated. In the comments to the Council’s report to the governors, CBFWA noted that the report should not only report the HUs credited but also display the credited HUs compared to the total mitigation obligation as described in the Council’s 2000 Program. The WAC will need to consider providing input to the HLI review and think about what the reporting and monitoring needs should be for the SOTR and Program using the CBFWA monitoring pyramid and amendment recommendations as a framework. At a minimum, the reporting should show HUs credited to hydroelectric facility compared to the mitigation obligation as defined by the Program.

ACTION: Once the Council’s formal request for comment on the HLIs is released Ken MacDonald will work with Angela Sondanaa to form a subcommittee

to develop the information to be reported for wildlife in the SOTR at the different scales of the pyramid, as appropriate based upon the manager's reporting needs and the needs of the program as defined by the amendment recommendations. As a start, Ken MacDonald will create an example SOTR table for wildlife projects that will display by hydroelectric facility:

- the identified lost HUs,
- the mitigation obligation as defined in the current program and the CBFWA amendment (2:1),
- the HUs credited to the facility and,
- the percent completion.

ITEM 6: Next WAC Meetings

ACTION: In order to facilitate ISRP and NPCC staff participation, the July meeting has been moved from Pendleton to the CBFWA office in Portland. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 10:00 July 23 and run through noon July 24.

The August WAC meeting is scheduled for August 19-20 in Sandpoint, Idaho. The meeting will include a field review of the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho's wildlife program. Scott Soultis is looking into the arrangements.