

Preliminary Draft Comments on the MERR

Need better definition of roles for Taurus, Pisces, MYAP database, and SOTR:

Page 7, Strategic Plan for Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Reporting – Several of the bullets under Expectations describe functions that the SOTR currently performs for the Program, possibly creating redundant RME efforts.

Page 9, Policy Guidance – Third bullet, delete “use protocols approved by the Council” and keep footnote attached to “analyses.” This statement creates unnecessary confusion regarding the Council’s authority to require specific monitoring protocols for fish and wildlife management actions.

Page 22, Monitoring Approach – In the last paragraph, delete the statement “and will use protocols approved by the Council” and keep the footnote attached to the word “analyses.”

Page 23, Compliance, Implementation, and Performance Monitoring – This section refers to data in several instances, but is not clear if the data is project level data or biological data. The last two paragraphs on

Page 24 neglect to identify a role for the SOTR. This section would benefit from a clear definition of roles for PISCES, Taurus, and the SOTR.

Page 27, Evaluation and Reporting Approach – Does the SOTR have a role in the functions listed here?

Page 30, Program Synopsis – This sounds like a description of the Status of the Resource Report. Need fuller description of the role of Taurus, SOTR, and Council’s MYAP web-based database and how these three web support tools can work together to support the Program Synopsis.

Page 33, Data Management and Sharing Requirements Approach – The agencies and tribes have not agreed that Taurus or PISCES is the appropriate location for storing biological data.

Draft wildlife comments extracted from March 16, 2010 WAC meeting notes:

Page 21, Types of monitoring – The MERR should be clear that HEP is Compliance Monitoring for wildlife mitigation actions funded by BPA and the Program needs a strategy for supporting Status and Trend and Action Effectiveness monitoring for wildlife populations and their habitat. The HEP surveys can provide some of the information for these other monitoring needs, but the procedure was not designed to address the management questions associated with these types of monitoring.

Page 34, Standardized Approach for Implementation Strategies – The WAC intends to begin developing the Wildlife Monitoring Implementation Strategy on an earlier timeframe than the Council describes.

Appendix 2: Council 2009 Program’s Quantitative Performance Standards

- These are focused solely on anadromous fish.
- Is HU mitigation at a rate of 2:1 a performance standard? Should it be?

Appendix 4: Priority Species and Habitat Characteristics

- Need to add Chum and Mt. Whitefish to fish species (and possibly others?).
- The list of priority wildlife species is very HEP oriented and is incomplete as far as the species that the agencies and tribes are managing. This list should be compared with the subbasin plans to ensure its completeness and accuracy.
- The habitat characteristics are focused on anadromous fish and should be broadened to represent resident fish and wildlife.
- The Council should ensure that all the lists of priority species are consistent with subbasin plans.