



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

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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: February 24, 2010
TO: Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC)
FROM: Doug Calvin, Chair
SUBJECT: February 16, 2010 WAC Meeting Final Action Notes

Wildlife Advisory Committee Meeting
February 16, 2010, 1-5 pm
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Portland, Oregon

The support material is posted at [WAC Webpage](#).

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Doug Calvin (Chair, CTWSRO); Scott Soultz (Vice-chair) and Norm Merz (KTOI); Carol Perugini (SPT); Loren Kronemann (NPT); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Gregg Servheen (IDFG); Richard Whitney (CCT); Matt Berger (KT); Kelly Singer (STI); Tom O'Neil (NHI); David Byrnes, Paul Krueger, Steve Bottemiller, Dave Roberts, Sandra Fife, and Heidi Haserot (BPA); Peter Paquet (NPCC); and Tom Iverson, Paul Ashley, and John Andrews (CBFWA)

By Phone: Jim Noyes (ODFW); Nate Pamplin (WDFW); Kyle Heinrick (BPT); and Cam Heusser (CDAT)

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

ACTIONS: Agenda was approved with the following modifications: Item 3 was exchanged with Item 2 due to the large number of visitors with interest in that agenda item. No other modifications were requested; agenda was approved.

ITEM 2: Responses to proposed BPA Fish and Wildlife Appraisal Requirements

Discussion: David Byrnes introduced Steve Bottemiller and his staff from the lands division at BPA. They offered to answer any questions regarding the draft F&W Appraisal Requirements. BPA has received a few comments so far, from both agencies and tribes and from individual appraisal companies. Steve indicated that these requirements do not vary from the Yellow Book standards (Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions); however, the yellow book has never been a requirement for BPA funding but several sections of those standards are required now. Also, several of these requirements are not in the yellow book or federal guidelines but are required by BPA. BPA will review these policies every year to evaluate their effectiveness and they can be adjusted as necessary to ensure efficient land acquisition for the Fish and Wildlife Program. Comments are due on the draft requirements by March 5, 2010.

ACTION: No action was taken.

ITEM 3: Review and Approve as Final January Draft Action Notes

ACTION: The WAC approved the January 20, 2010 Action Notes as final.

ITEM 4: HEP Presentation for Wildlife Crediting Forum – Paul Ashley

Discussion: Paul Ashley conducted a HEP “ABCs” power point presentation that included HEP fundamentals and a comparison between how HEP was intended to be used and how HEP is employed in the Columbia River Wildlife Mitigation Program (CRWMP). The primary differences include:

1. CRWMP did not annualize HU losses or gains
2. HU credit was given for baseline/protection credit in the CRWMP
3. Loss assessments were developed differently across the Region. Some entities reported “net” HU losses while others did not
4. Follow-up HEP surveys appear unique to the CRWMP
5. Long lag time between project construction and compensation/mitigation
6. Compensation strategies not clearly defined resulting in a mix of “In kind” and “Equal” compensation/mitigation projects

Paul also presented a case study showing the potential results of annualization. It was clear that annualization is a “double edged sword” and may not equate to more HU losses over time. Regional HEP Team related issues were also discussed. These included evaluating out of kind cover types with appropriate HEP species models, HU/species stacking, modifying extant HEP models, and developing accurate loss assessment matrices as needed to guide HEP work.

ACTION: No action was taken.

ITEM 5: Draft Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy

Discussion: Due to time constraints, this discussion was postponed.

ACTION: The WAC deferred discussion of this agenda item until its next meeting. The primary focus of the next meeting will be to discuss the Monitoring Implementation Strategy. Doug encouraged the members of the WAC to read all of the support material prior to the meeting to be fully informed for the development of a work plan and guidance to developing wildlife assessments.

ITEM 6: Strategy for Participation in Wildlife Crediting Forum

Discussion: The WAC discussed the opportunity that the Wildlife Crediting Forum offers. Although BPA has walked away from the table in the past, with the Council staff and BPA customers attending, it may be possible to find solutions to some of the more vexing issues that have plagued wildlife mitigation in the BPA funded Program.

ITEM 7: Next WAC Meeting

ACTION: The next WAC meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2010 from 1-5 pm at the CBFWA offices in Portland, Oregon. Draft agenda and support materials will be distributed prior to the meeting. The focus of the meeting will be to develop a WAC work plan for supporting wildlife assessments including the development of a Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy to support the Council’s MERR document. Please read all support material prior to the meeting.