

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

COLUMBIA BASINFISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443

DATE: November 28, 2007

TO: Anadromous Fish Advisory Committee (AFAC)

FROM: Brad Houslet, AFAC Chair, and Dave Ward, CBFWA Staff

SUBJECT: November 26, 2007 AFAC Meeting Action Notes - Final

AFAC Meeting November 26, 2007 Portland, OR

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Tom Rien (ODFW), Dave Ward (CBFWA), Ken MacDonald (CBFWA)

By Phone: Brad Houslet (CTWSR), Teresa Scott (WDFW), Gary James (CTUIR),

Ron Rhew (USFWS), Paul Kline (IDFG)

Time Objective 1. Committee Participation 100%

Allocation: Objective 2. Technical Review 0%

Objective 3. Presentation 0%

ITEM 1: Approve Action Notes From October 4, 2007

Discussion: This action was deferred until the next teleconference.

ITEM 2: Update on First Round of AHA Workshops

Discussion: Four of the five first round AHA workshops have been completed. In

general, the workshops have gone well. Member participation has been strong, and interested parties have attended most workshops. The AHA tool has been able to describe the current situation adequately for most

populations.

Many members are approaching the use of the AHA tool with caution, concerned about potential misuse of results. This cautious approach is justified, and all recognize that the tool is being used to provide broadbrush, or "ballpark" information to help the AFAC recommend which "H" or combination of "H's" should be addressed to improve the status of each

anadromous population.

One concern raised in the workshops has been the estimates of the effectiveness of hatchery fish spawning in the wild. The important thing to remember is that relatively minor differences among assumptions regarding effectiveness should not significantly affect outcomes in the

scale we are using.

ITEM 3: Planning for Second Round of AHA Workshops

Discussion: The second round of workshops will concentrate on evaluating the effects

of various scenarios on anadromous fish populations.

The AFAC determined that the scenarios should explore the effects of two

Page 2 of 3 FINAL

levels of habitat improvements, minor and major. All scenarios should include expected levels of harvest as determined by U.S. v Oregon. Most scenarios should include expected near-term hatchery operations, but one should include desired hatchery plans not yet firmly in place. Hydro inputs will reflect the proposed BiOp for most scenarios, but one scenario should explore the affects of hydro actions that are more aggressive than required by the BiOp. Finally, to evaluate the effects of the hydrosystem relative to the other H's, some of the scenarios should be run with a "no dam" option in addition to the "BiOp" option. Because only 4 full scenarios in addition to "status quo" are possible, exploration of all these potential scenarios will require the ability to "toggle" back and forth between the BiOp and no dam options within a scenario (i.e., scenario 2a and 2b, 3a and 3b, etc.).

Actions:

- Dave Ward will develop a matrix describing the proposed scenarios and distribute to AFAC members by November 27. Comments should be sent to Dave no later than December 3.
- Dave will research prospective inputs for future scenarios, especially the no dam scenario.
- Dave will confirm the ability to "toggle" within scenarios with Greg Blair of Mobrand-Jones & Stokes

ITEM 4: BPA Customers Amendment Framework

Dave Ward provided an example of the framework provided by BPA customers. The AFAC did not have time to discuss the framework, so AFAC members agreed to review and provide comments to Dave before the next teleconference. Dave will distribute the complete framework.

ITEM 5: General Schedule for Draft Amendments

The MAG is having a final amendment workshop December 18-19. Because an AHA workshop is scheduled for December 19, AFAC progress will be discussed on December 18. The AFAC should have draft amendments developed for the populations covered by AHA workshops conducted prior to December 18 (Idaho and Washington above Bonneville Dam). Pending MAG approval of progress to date, final amendments should be developed by the January 17-18 Members meeting.

It is also possible that the AFAC will be assigned the task of marking up the portion of the existing Program addressing anadromous fish.

ITEM 6: M&E Amendments

Ken MacDonald briefed the AFAC on general plans for amendments addressing M&E. Most are based on products from CSMEP.

Teresa Scott asked if help from Rod Woodin would be useful, because of his involvement in many aspects of the BiOp remand. Ken thought Rod's input in some specific areas would be helpful.

ITEM 7: Next AFAC Teleconference

The next AFAC teleconference is scheduled for December 10, 2007 at 2:00 PM PST.

Page 3 of 3

	Habitat	Hydro	Harvest	Hatchery
(1)	Recent	BiOp conditions	Recent (US v OR)	*
(2)	Subbasin/recovery plan (PFC?)	BiOp conditions	Recent (US v OR)	*
(3)	Subbasin/recovery plan (PFC?)	No mainstem dams	Recent (US v OR)	*
(4)	?	BiOp conditions	Change	*
(5)	?	?	?	*

- All scenarios can be run with hatcheries toggled both on and off
- The difference between scenarios (2) and (3) addresses FCRPS effects
- Scenario (4) is a placeholder for proposed changes in harvest
- Scenario (5) is undetermined climate change was discussed

A draft workshop schedule was also developed. Each workshop would be two-days:

Region	Location	AHA Input	AHA Results
		(Week of)	(Week of)
Idaho	Boise?	October 29	December 3
Washington	Yakima?	November 5	December 10
NE Oregon/SE Washington	Pendleton?	November 12	December 17
Oregon	The Dalles?	November 12	December 31
Lower Columbia	Portland?	November 26	January 7

A list of populations for each region needs to be developed. The list of starter inputs can then be distributed, and managers would then begin work to provide inputs for each scenario. All information for each population should be provided to Mobrand at least one week prior to the first workshop for that region.

Specific dates and locations need to be decided for each workshop. It would be helpful if a manager hosted each workshop so facility rental fees can be avoided.

Dave Ward will work with the managers to coordinate the effort needed prior to the first workshops.