



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

DATE: October 12, 2006
TO: Members Advisory Group (MAG)
FROM: Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for 10/04/06 MAG Meeting

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 United Tribes

MAG Meeting October 4, 2006 CBFWA Office, Portland, Oregon

Final Action Notes

The support material and reference documents for the 10/4/06 MAG Meeting are posted at:

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

Attendees: Tony Nigro, ODFW; Brian Lipscomb, Jann Eckman, Kathie Titzler, Tom Iverson, Tana Klum, Dave Ward, Neil Ward, Trina Gerlack, CBFWA

By Phone: Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Brian Marotz, MFWP; Paul Kline, IDFG; Sue Ireland, KTI; Dave Statler, NPT; John Palensky, NOAA Fisheries; Doug Taki, SBT

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Lynn DuCharme and Brian Marotz co-chaired the meeting.

Note: The agenda items are listed in the order they were discussed at the meeting.

Action:

- Lynn DuCharme moved to accept agenda as modified.
- Tony Nigro seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 4: Review Revised Kalispel and Spokane Tribes Invitation Letters to Participate in CBFWA Activities

Discussion: The MAG reviewed the draft letter welcoming the Kalispel and Spokane Tribes participation on regional activities with CBFWA as members or non-members and requested that staff revise second sentence of the sixth paragraph to read: "The members have worked diligently to address all of the original concerns outlined in your May 2005 letter of withdrawal."

Action:

- Dave Statler moved to accept the revised letter as modified for Chairman Trahan's signature and distribution.
- Brian Marotz seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 2: Executive Session

Review the CBFWA Subcommittee RM&E Wildlife Mitigation Coordinator Recommendations

Action: The MAG approved forwarding the ad hoc selection committee's recommendations to Executive Director Brian Lipscomb, who will make the final hiring decision.

ITEM 3: Review Draft CBFWA Response Letter on the NPCC's FY07-09 Funding Recommendations for Members approval at the 10/4 teleconference. Comments are due to NPCC by 10/6/06

NPCC link to draft recommendations

<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/draftrec/Default.asp>

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb and Tom Iverson introduced three draft documents for MAG's review and edits regarding the CBFWA Response on the NPCC FY07-09 Funding Recommendations:

1. Draft CBFWA Project Specific Response - (lengthy letter responding directly to the projects CBFWA has sponsored within the F&W Program)
2. Draft CBFWA Programmatic Response - (12 bullets for discussion from an overall perspective with regards to the F&W Program)
3. Draft CBFWA Table of Essential Projects and Tasks – (examples of essential projects or tasks at risk of not being funded in FY07-09 due to inadequate funding for the F&W Program)

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb presented the draft CBFWA Project Specific response on project #198906201, CBFWA AWP.

The MAG reviewed the Draft CBFWA Project Specific Response in detail. The CSMEP, HEP, and FPC are CBFWA sponsored projects are all related to regional coordination efforts.

The CSMEP project was created as long-term collaborative effort that provides a table for the states and tribal scientists to work together with the federal government to develop a RM&E plan and implement that plan over the long-term. The CSMEP Project was not designed to have an ending date and is intended to include more than the Anadromous ESA issues as a long-term infrastructure that would be maintained. The program is not process orientated, but a product orientated program with the scientists doing all the work.

The MAG requested that the CSMEP, HEP, and FPC proposals be rolled into the CBFWA AWP as a single letter. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on these four proposals that CBFWA has put forward for FY07-09. Describe how the NPCC's decision compares to the original proposed scope of work and budget and the NPCC draft scope of work and budget, explain how the NPCC's recommendation affects the scope and budget and recommend what CBFWA believes the NPCC should do instead.

Staff will incorporate the MAG's comments and revise the draft project specific letter prior to the 10/4 Members Teleconference.

- Action #1:**
- Tony Nigro moved to accept draft CBFWA Project Specific Response on NPCC's FY 2007-09 Funding Recommendations as modified for MAG's review prior to the Members' consideration on 10/4/06.
 - Dave Statler seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb and Tom Iverson expanded the discussion to programmatic level comments as they relate to the NPCC's recommendations. Tom presented a list of 12 bullets to assist in developing comments back to the NPCC on their recommendations to BPA. The NPCC only gave the region 3-weeks to respond to \$140M worth of projects.

Per the MAG direction, the staff polled the Members for answers to the following questions.

- 1) Were you satisfied with the state level process for project selection?
- 2) Were you satisfied with the Council's decision making process?
- 3) What are specific projects or tasks essential that are not going to be funded in this draft recommendation?

Brian Marotz will resend his comments today and Tom is welcoming all comments.

Tom created a list of essential projects in an excel table from the comments received and 12 key points identifying serious problems or concerns with the FY07-09 process for MAG's review and comment. Several Members are sending individual comments and CBFWA should be consistent with those comments.

#1 & #3 - The MAG raised concern that the NPCC's due date to respond was too short, it was unclear on how or what to comment on. The NPCC's decisions were not well documented and their decisions were inconsistent with the priorities of groups they assigned to do this work. Request that the NPCC provide all project sponsors comments and project priorities for review. Are they consistent with the regional priorities?

#2 - The poor status of the Columbia River resources and failure of the program to meet its goal would suggest the NPCC should be looking for more funding and are not meeting the Program goals.

The current level of funding has not been generated as a result of a formal assessment of the actual costs of the program. The NPCC needs to lead a formal regional assessment of the true costs of the program. The subbasin planning process was in the position to do that because part of the subbasin planning guidance was to develop a 3-year implementation budget and 10-15 year long-term budget. The NPCC dropped this effort. The MAG is calling for formal regional assessment of the true costs to implement the program based on the call for 3-year and 10-15 year budgets for each of the 60 plus subbasins that have been evaluated.

The MAG agrees there should be funding available for the development of innovative projects and new ideas, because of the budget constraints, how can we put money aside at this time.

Quote the Act and the Program goals. Build off the biological objectives

Give specific examples for anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife needs.

#4 - NPCC did not identify how their draft recommendations tie to the 70/15/15 allocations. Call for that analysis.

#5 - Sets-up the list of essential projects excel table

#6 - Change language - State that the Council should act consistently with the recommendations. If they choose to deviate they assume the high burden of proof and they should clearly explain the bases for their deviations.

#7-9 - Combine these together as one bullet stating you can't afford to set any money aside for placeholders.

#10 - Delete

#11 - Don't park any money but add funding for innovative projects

Table 1: Delete example of FY07 annual funding shortfalls and use excel table of the essential projects being lost.

Discussion Summary:

The MAG provided comments to each bullet in the draft CBFWA Programmatic Response memo and discussed the subject and content of a letter commenting on the NPCC 07-09 Project Selection Process and their overall draft recommendations to BPA.

The MAG requested that some bullets be combined, deleted, or broadened with specific examples and recommendations, including a request that the NPCC be consistent with their recommendations; if they choose to deviate from the process, they should provide an explanation of their deviations.

Staff will turn the modified bullets into a draft letter and include a table with set of examples with specific projects affected by the process for Members consideration. Individual Members are providing their own comments to the NPCC FY07-09 project selection process and draft recommendations.

Action #2:

- Tony Nigro moved that the MAG recommend that staff incorporate the MAG's

comments and modified bullets into a draft letter to include the list of essential projects as a draft response on NPCC's FY 2007-09 Funding Recommendations for Members' consideration on 10/4/06. Send the revised draft to the MAG for review prior to the Members 10/4 teleconference.

- Dave Statler seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 5: Endorse PNAMP Steering Committee's Recommendation

PNAMP website link: <http://www.pnamp.org/>

Jennifer Bayer, PNAMP Coordinator is requesting that CBFWA consider endorsement, as a member of the PNAMP Steering Committee, the Best Practices for Reporting Locational and Time Related Data white paper. The paper was developed by the Northwest Environmental Data-Network (NED) and offers an opportunity to promote one important element for a strong and consistent data reporting foundation. The Steering Committee deliberations on this issue will be on 10/11/06.

The Colville Confederated Tribes support the Summit Environment Consultants Ltd. request to change the date formatting in the NED white paper to the universal medium date DD-MMM-YYYY (e.g., 04-Oct-2006). This format is recognized internationally and eliminates confusion when interpreting and entering data.

Action:

- Brian Marotz moved to forward the PNAMP Steering Committee's recommendation to endorse and implement the NED's Best Practices for Reporting Locational and Time Related Data white paper and include the Colville Confederated Tribes' request to change the date format to the universal date format for Members review and approval at the 10/4/06 teleconference.
- Lynn DuCharme seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

ITEM 6: Discuss Changing the Next MAG Meeting Date and Time

The regular 10/17 MAG meeting date conflicts with the 10/17-18/06 NPCC Meeting scheduled in Helena, Montana, where the decisions will be made on the recommendations for FY07-09 project funding. A suggested date and time is October 24, 2006 from 9:00am-Noon at the CBFWA office to discuss the agenda items below.

Draft agenda items:

1. Northwest Power and Conservation Council Amendment Process

The NPCC's request for comments are due 10/31/06 and posted at

[http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2006_0830/Item5\)2006_0822NPCCReqCommentReBioObj4Program.pdf](http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2006_0830/Item5)2006_0822NPCCReqCommentReBioObj4Program.pdf)

Review draft CBFWA comments on the NPCC's proposed amendment process calling for defined biological objectives for the Fish and Wildlife Program focusing on how to facilitate program amendments and how are biological objectives defined. The MAG agreed that the technical committees should perform the preliminary work to establish how best to define biological objectives for anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife for the subbasin, province, and program scales. The objectives should be consistent with other ESA metrics.

2. Approve as Final MAG Meeting Action Notes
3. Pacific NW Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) Survey Request Discussion
4. Update on October 17-18, 2006 NPCC Meeting in Helena, MT
5. Fish Passage Oversight Board Update
6. Communicating F&W Costs
7. CBFWA Technical Committee Structure Review and Updates
8. Announcement of CBFWA RM&E Wildlife Mitigation Coordinator
9. Status of the Resource Report and Steering Committee Update

10. Data Management 9/20-21/06 Workshop Update

11. CBFWA Public Relations Update Regarding Salmonpeople

Action:

- Lynn DuCharme moved to reschedule the next MAG meeting date and time to October 24, 2006 from 9:00am-Noon at the CBFWA office.
- Tony Nigro seconded motion. Motion passed, action approved.

**Additional
Agenda
Item**

Status Of The Resource Update

Brian Lipscomb reported that a presentation on the Status of the Resource will be given to the NPCC at the Helena MT meeting. The draft SOTR report will be available to the Members in few weeks.