



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 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: June 15, 2009
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Ken MacDonald, CBFWA
SUBJECT: June 3, 2009 WAC Teleconference Action Notes

WAC Teleconference
June 3, 2009
Portland, Oregon

The support material for the meeting is posted at:
http://www.cbfwa.org/committee_wac.cfm

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Ken MacDonald (CBFWA), Scott Soultis and Norm Merz (KTOI), Lynn Palensky and Peter Paquet (NPCC)

By Phone: Tom O'Neil (NHI), Paul Ashley (CBFWA), Carol Perugini (SPT), Nate Pamplin (WDFW), Aren Eddingsaas (SBT), Matt Burger (CCT), Angela Sondena (NPT), Michael Pope (ODFW), Doug Calvin (CTWSRO).

Time Allocation:

Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
Objective 2. Technical Review	0%
Objective 3. Presentation	0%

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

ACTION: Agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Approve May 5, 2009 WAC Meeting Draft Action Notes

Discussion: The notes were reviewed and suggested edits/clarifying language regarding the work items to be emphasized by the committee for the rest of the year.

ACTION: The suggested edits were approved by the committee and incorporated into the notes.

ITEM 3: Wildlife Project Programmatic Review Update and Discussion

Discussion: Council staff has been busy developing their funding recommendations for the wildlife project categorical review. Lynn Palensky and Peter Paquet provided the committee an update on the process and discussed some "cross-cutting issues" their work has identified.

Overall the Council staff feels the review has gone well and the feels the site visits were especially beneficial. As a general approach, the staff is trying not to get into the detail and critique of every project work element and associated costs. If the project meets the ISRP scientific review criteria the staff will generally recommend the project be funded at the requested funding level with programmatic comments or qualifications depending on ISRP's comments. In addition, Council staff will recommend areas of potential cost savings to provide guidance for how BPA might handle

issues in prior to or through contracting. BPA will make the final funding decisions and Council's staff expectation is that budget adjustments would not compromise the integrity of a project.

The staff identified several cross-cutting issues that have surfaced based upon the review and ISRP report: management plans RM&E; HEP/CHAP; and weed control. Most of these are not surprises but three areas specifically discussed during the WAC meeting were:

1. Weed control costs
2. Project coordination costs
3. Project HEP costs

Weed Control Costs. In their report, the ISRP discussed weed control in a number of projects, particularly the use of herbicides and the management approaches. Because the ISRP raised the issue the staff has tried to assess how much of the wildlife budget is spent on weed control and it could be close to 1/3-1/2 of the total wildlife project budget. The staff noted they were not passing judgment on these costs but it may be an area for discussion in the future. The ISRP report stated a concern that some sponsors appear to be spraying alone without taking an integrated weed management approach.

Project Coordination Costs. The Council staff noticed that many projects included work elements with descriptions for regional-coordination-related costs. In some cases the narratives were clear that the coordination costs were for local or provincial type project needs. In other cases the narrative and costs were less clear whether the funding need was for local coordination, regional coordination or both. The Council staff has identified that up to \$700k could potentially be duplicative of coordination work that may be funded under other contracts. These costs could be a concern for the Council and Bonneville.

There was considerable discussion on this topic. WAC members urged Council staff to work with individual sponsors to better understand the costs. There can be significant coordination needs with local co-managers and needs to coordinate local projects within regional forums. The WAC also noted problems with PISCES, trying to fit projects within the work elements and a lack of understanding and training in PISCES.

Project HEP Costs. Thirteen projects include HEP activities and costs totaling up to \$1 million above and beyond the regional HEP project with little consistency in the costs. Council staff understood in some cases the project sponsors used the funds to have their employees work with the regional team. It is not clear how well the project HEP work is coordinated with the regional project.

WAC noted that the variability in costs can be due to project specific logistic issues. At times project sponsors also need to "crystal ball" what future HEP needs may be. It was acknowledged that there needs to be clarification direction for HEP including who conducts surveys and how often HEP needs to be completed.

ACTION: The group thought they could address the regional coordination issue by the

committee meeting, but the HEP issue would take longer, maybe closer to the July meeting.

Lynn will provide Ken MacDonald an email outlining the questions Council staff have regarding HEP and coordination costs, as well as any other cross-cutting issues the staff may wish to have the WAC provide some recommendations to address. The Council staff will also be working directly with project sponsors regarding individual project questions. Ken MacDonald will forward to the WAC along with some potential approaches to address the questions.

ITEM 4 Wildlife Crediting Committee Letter

Discussion: The draft letter to NPCC Chair Bill Booth, with some previously suggested edits from Tom O'Neil was reviewed and discussed.

ACTION: The committee approved the draft letter to be forwarded to the MAG for review. The intent is for a final letter to be provided for Members consideration at the July1 Members meeting.

ITEM 5: August 18-20 WAC Meeting and Monitoring Workshop in Usk, WA

Discussion: There was brief discussion affirming the proposed WAC meeting and monitoring workshop August 18-20. Scott Soultis asked to be part of the group putting the agenda together.

ACTION: Ken MacDonald is to confirm meeting location and dates with Ray Entz (done) begin to figure out logistics and will begin work to build an agenda. Others who have agreed to help with the agenda are Scott Soultis, Ray Entz, Nate Pamplin, and Tom O'Neil.

ITEM 6 Next WAC Meetings

Discussion: Potential dates for the next WAC teleconference were discussed. Preliminary agenda topics include and follow-up discussions regarding the wildlife project categorical review and the agenda and logistics for the WAC monitoring workshop August 18-20.

ACTION: Next WAC Teleconference is scheduled for June 24, 9:00am-12:00pm (Pacific).