



# 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](http://www.cbfwa.org)

**Final**

Coordinating and promoting effective protection and restoration of fish, wildlife, and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin.

**DATE:** March 25, 2011  
**TO:** Members of Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority  
**FROM:** Jann Eckman, CBFWA  
**SUBJECT:** Final Action Notes for March 10, 2011 Members Meeting in Boise, Idaho

**The Authority is comprised of the following tribes and government agencies:**

Burns Paiute Tribe

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead 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 & 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

Upper Columbia United Tribes

**Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority Members Meeting  
Thursday, March 10, 2011  
9:00 a.m. - 2:45 p.m. (MST)**

**[Hilton Garden Inn Boise Spectrum](#)**

**The Garden West Room**

**7699 West Spectrum Street, Boise, ID 83709**

**1-208-376-1000**

**[Members Webpage](#)**

**Final Action Notes**

**Attendees:** Jason Kesling, BPT; Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Ron Trahan, CSKT; Gary James, CTUIR; Brad Houslet, CTWS; Olney Patt Jr., CTWS; Elmer Ward, CTWS; Donnie Winishut Sr., CTWS; Chairman Billy A. Bell, FMPST; Environmental Director Duane Masters, Sr., FMPST; Council Member Dale Barr, FMPST; Lance Hebdon, IDFG; Deputy Director Jim Unsworth, IDFG; Vice-Chairperson Ron Abraham, KTOI; Tribal Council Member Gary Aitken, Jr., KTOI; Attorney General William Barquin, KTOI; Joe Mentor, Mentor Law Group, PLLC; Dave B. Johnson, NPT; Dave Statler, NPT; Robert Walton, NOAA Fisheries; FHBC Treasurer Tino Batt, SBT; Claude Broncho, SBT; Chairman Nathan Small, SBT; Doug Taki, SBT; Chairman Robert C. Bear, SPT; Buster Gibson, SPT; Terry Gibson, SPT; Edmond Murrell, SPT; Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Bill Tweit, WDFW; CBFWA Staff: Jann Eckman, Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, Dave Ward, and Trina Gerlack

**WebEx - Phone:** John Platt, CRITFC, Aja DeCoteau, CRITFC, and Deputy Director Art Noonan, MFWP

**Members Not Present:** Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation and Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife

<b>Time Allocation:</b>	Objective 1. Committee Participation	70%
	Objective 2. Technical Review	%
	Objective 3. Presentation	30%

**Invocation by Claude Broncho, SBT**

**Welcome and Opening Remarks by Chairman Rob Walton, CBFWA**

Chairman Walton thanked the Upper Snake River Tribes Foundation (USRT) for hosting the evening social on March 9. He recognized the Tribal leadership in attendance and acknowledged the organizational and regional benefit provided by the institutional memory of the established membership and skilled CBFWA staff. He spoke of the struggles in 2010 regarding membership challenges, time management issues, coordination funding concerns, and preserving CBFWA as a consensus organization, but felt it is time accept the changes and move on. Rob thanked Bill Tweit, WDFW and Tony Nigro, ODFW for their participation in the organization and acknowledged they will be missed. The Members of the CBFWA are strong and innovative. The fiscal year will start on April 1, 2011 with a new CBFWA work plan and budget. He emphasized the importance of all co-managers working together regardless of what organization they belonged too, because they are all in this together and share a common goal. He reminded everyone that it is the co-managers' job and responsibility

to protect and value our natural resources. Under the ESA obligations and FCRPS BiOp, the Federal agencies will monitor the resources and will take the required actions with or without the states and tribes participation; however, the federal actions will be strengthened by the co-managers' participation and products. He identified the importance of the co-managers to continue participation in the F&W Program, help assess and monitor the resources, carry out the policy directives, and continue working on the technical aspects of the Status of the Resources. He encouraged the membership to send the right people to the right meeting by tailoring their attendance to the subject matter at hand. He added that everyone should stop worrying about turf and demonstrate commitment, competence, and team work to protect our sacred natural resources. Chairman Walton believes this will be a good year for the CBFWA organization. He suggested that the CBFWA organization think outside the box by exploring new and innovative projects, such as one recently brought to his attention by Rod Sando to help articulate the importance of economic value of the resources being managed and the economic impacts of sport fishing, sport hunting, and wildlife viewing that could include public support and participation.

Chairman Walton's expectations of the Members are to work with other co-managers, federal agencies, and Northwest Power & Conservation Council (NPCC) and demonstrate that the CBFWA organization is value added to the ongoing regional processes.

**ITEM 1: Introductions, Roll Call, and Approve Agenda**

**Action:** A quorum was confirmed and the Members approved the agenda as written. No objections.

**ITEM 2: Pass the Gavel to the New CBFWA Officers and Appoint CBFWA Committee Designees for Next Year**

**Action:** Rob Walton, outgoing Chair passed the gavel to Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation (SBT). Jim Unsworth of Idaho Department Fish and Game (IDFG) will serve as Vice Chair. Tino Batt, SBT will serve as Chairman Small's alternate.

**Discussion:** Chairman Nathan Small accepted the gavel and thanked Rob Walton for his style and frankness as the CBFWA Chair. Chairman Small believes in the CBFWA organization and its direction and he encouraged everyone to continue to work together. He thanked the WDFW and ODFW for their membership support through 2010 to present. Chairman Small welcomed Vice-Chair Unsworth.

Jim Unsworth announced that Director Cal Groen is retiring March 31, 2011 and the department will be in transition until the position is filled. IDFG is committed to CBFWA's foreseeable future and looks forward to helping out as Vice Chair.

**ITEM 3: Draft Action Notes from the September 28, 2010 Members Face-to-Face Meeting**

**Action:** The Members [approved the action notes for the September 28, 2010 Members Meeting as final](#). No objections.

**ITEM 4: Presentation by Fort McDermitt Paiute & Shoshone Tribe of Nevada and Oregon (FMPST) Representatives**

**Introduction & Presentation:** Chairman Small introduced Chairman Billy A. Bell, Environmental Director Duane Masters, Sr., and Council Member Dale Barr, FMPST who joined the Upper Snake River Tribes Foundation in 2009 and would like to join the CBFWA membership today.

Environmental Director Duane Masters, Sr., FMPST provided a [power point presentation of maps to help visualize where the FMPST reservation boundaries](#) are located and how they are related to the Columbia River Basin. Chairman Billy A. Bell, FMPST presented the map of traditional and ancestral territories of the FMPST reservation. The FMPST has always identified themselves through their culture. Due to the loss of hunting and fishing areas because of statehood and land ownerships they are on the verge of wanting to reconnect with their hunting and fishing traditional practices which are mostly confined to their reservation. In areas specific to their reservation they have a huge decline of wildlife, which is a direct connection between grazing habits and practices. The FMPST have their own traditional wildlife management practices with hunting and fishing seasons but see the value and are

interested in learning modern practices, technical and scientific measures to integrate with their traditional methods. Under Chairman Bell's leadership he realized that internal and external issues were affecting the FMPST. They have been involved in the Columbia River Treaty review as a member of USRT. The Columbia River Treaty has caused loss of hunting and fishing grounds and they see the vast loss due to competition between contemporary modern lifestyle and traditional culture lifestyle within the tribal youth and tribal elders causing a form of disconnect. Chairman Bell believes joining the CBFWA organization is an opportune time to get involved and share their cultural beliefs and practices and integrate their youth to be more involved in modern fishing and wildlife management arena. Chairman Bell and the FMPST offer their efforts and insight to the membership as an active member by participating in the committees, projects, and processes established by the organization mission statements.

Discussion: Council Member Terry Gibson, BPT spoke on behalf of the Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe (FMPST) stating, these are our People, the Burns Paiute People, Shoshone Bannock People, and Shoshone Paiute People are all related and relatives to Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone People. When the [Boise Valley Treaty was first negotiated in 1864-1866](#) through the Idaho territories, [one of the first signer on the Boise Valley Treaty was San to me Co](#) known as Soc-Co-Meets, meaning individual with a Special Face, a direct descendant, a great, great, great, grandfather to Council Member Dale Barr, FMPST. The native people who signed those treaties were in the Boise Valley areas, the same area as the BPT, SPT, and SBT. The native people, who were taken to McDermitt, originally lived on the Great Malheur Reservation near Burns, Oregon. To meet the needs of the immigrants and military, the powers that be dismantled that reservation and moved the native people to different areas in Warm Springs, Burns, McDermitt, and Duck Valley.

It is important to have the FMPST at the table and embrace their rich cultural history as it pertains to their usage in the Idaho area to the Canadian border and beyond. The Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribal ceremonies and cultural issues are similar to the BPT, SPT, and SBT, if not the same. CBFWA should support FMPST because it is the right thing to do. The native people were forced marched after the Bannock War to Coyote Drum or the Weiser Valley area in 1878-1879 and held as prisoners of war at Fort Simcoe in Washington for five-years until released in different areas around Warm Springs, Burns, Duck Valley, and McDermitt. Where the FMPST reside should not have significant bearing on their involvement and interest in protecting and enhancing the habitat, fish and wildlife. Having FMPST involved can only strengthen the organization and we should support them as a member of CBFWA.

Discussion: Chairman Small added that the Fort Hall Reservation was established for the Bannock Tribe. During the times that the native people were removed from the traditional areas, the Shoshone Tribe was forced marched to the Fort Hall area. There are 15 different bands of Shoshones, Paiutes, and Bannocks on the reservation and they live as one people. The removal of the native people was traumatic and named the Trail of Tears as they were forced marched from one area to another. At that time, many treaties were drafted but never ratified. However, the native people never gave up the idea that the Boise area was their home land. The salmon was a huge resource that the Tribes were dependent upon. When the salmon started disappearing, the native people did not. One mission of the USRT Foundation is to reintroduce the salmon in their area. The USRT gladly accepted the FMPST as members and hope that CBFWA organization will too.

#### **ITEM 5: Fort McDermitt Paiute & Shoshone Tribe Membership Consideration**

According to the Charter Section 407 (B)(4) - Member Decision Process: "Members will review the request and will take action to either deny, grant admission, or table the application. If there are objections to the application, they must be explained."

Joe Mentor, CBFWA/F legal counsel since 1993, reviewed the FMPST's request for eligibility and provided his legal assessment to the Members Advisory Group at their 2/23/11 meeting. The Members Advisory Group (MAG) verified that the FMPST's application was complete and eligible for Members' consideration.

- Discussion: A motion to accept FMPST as Members of CBFWA was seconded and tabled for discussion. The FMPST members left the room while the CBFWA Members continue their discussion.
- Joe Mentor provided the [legal review of the FMPST request for membership in the CBFWA organization](#). The FMPST met the following requirements; the tribe is a federally recognized tribe with fish and wildlife management responsibilities. They met the criteria by owning land in the Columbia river basin and exercising fish and wildlife management responsibilities.
- A member asked why the Grand Ronde Tribe and Siletz Tribe were not granted membership when they applied in 2002.
- Joe stated, the Siletz Tribe did not own or control land within the geographic boundaries of the Columbia River Basin. The Grand Ronde Tribe and Siletz Tribe both signed agreements with the State of Oregon which ceded all regulation of member and non-member hunting and fishing regulation within those lands. At the time the determining factor was that neither tribe has asserted their right to manage fish and wildlife within their reservation. Since their requests, the CBFWA Charter has been revised to provide more clarity defining the criteria and acknowledged that circumstances change. Any member can acquire additional land and exercise management authority over that land either in a regulatory sense or as owner of the land. The decision may be different if they applied today, but at that time the agreements with the State of Oregon were the determining factor.
- Following the review, the Members had a discussion related to new interested parties joining the membership and how they would be funded.
- The Cowlitz Tribe in Longview, Washington may be interested in requesting CBFWA membership, but at this time no other Tribes from Nevada, Wyoming, Idaho, or Canada have shown interest in becoming members of the organization.
- A concern surrounding regional coordination funding was addressed. How will new members be funded for regional coordination? The MAG Subgroup met informally with Bill Maslen, BPA in February to discuss regional coordination and funding allocations. Bill Maslen stated when the Grand Ronde Tribe requested coordination dollars; BPA added dollars and funded them separately from dollars allocated to the original 19 members of CBFWA. The assumption is that BPA would add separate regional coordination dollars to fund Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe and Cowlitz Tribe, if they meet certain qualifications.
- Upon the completion of the discussion the FMPST members reentered the room.
- Action:** The Members granted admission to the Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of Nevada and Oregon as a Member of the CBFWA organization. No objections. Bill Tweit, WDFW abstained. The USRT and USFWS strongly supported the motion.
- ITEM 6: CBFWA Charter Modifications**
- Charter revisions necessitated by changes in membership and objectives (potential and realized) for Member review and discussion are:
- The addition of the Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe as a member of CBFWA and the modifications to the quorum definition language in the consensus decision making section regarding the withdrawal of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) as Members of CBFWA.
- Discussion: Joe Mentor, legal counsel presented the [revised Charter in the draft that added the FMPST as a Member of CBFWA and removed ODFW and WDFW from the membership](#). During the review the Members provided a second amendment to the revised CBFWA Charter when they requested that the last sentence on the first page be modified to read “The fish and wildlife managers are committed to ~~united in their desire to establish and maintain a mechanism to~~ coordinate their management activities.”
- Bill Tweit, WDFW stated that WDFW considered their decision to leave the membership a transition. The WDFW and ODFW will continue to participate in working groups and accomplish regional coordination through their own internal staffing. They will continue to contribute their ideas and energy to support the working groups and participate in regional

coordination activities. WDFW will consider participating in major policy statements when appropriate, as non-voting members and interested partners. The WDFW and ODFW membership status may have changed, but they plan to continue to coordinate and collaborate with fish and wildlife managers, because that is when the best work is done. He expressed WDFW's appreciation to the CBFWA leadership, staff, and the other co-managers for their accomplishments.

Rob Walton added that the real authority under the Northwest Power Act is directed to the Members, as outlined in [Joe Mentor's white paper](#). If there ever comes a time in the future, when any Member thinks there is a legal, policy, or an important issue that needs to be addressed by the voices of the fish & wildlife managers, they can write a letter and pass it around for signature. The Members do not need CBFWA letterhead to exercise their authorities.

**Actions:** The Members adopted the CBFWA Charter as amended by legal counsel; to delete WDFW and ODFW as members of CBFWA and the associated modifications to change quorum requirements, and approved the addition of Fort McDermitt Paiute & Shoshone Tribe as a Member of CBFWA. No objections. Bill Tweit, WDFW abstained.

The Members adopted the second amendment to modify the last sentence on the first page under Part 1 – Preamble of the CBFWA Charter. [The Charter of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Adopted January 14, 1987 and Updated March 10, 2011](#) was approved by the Members. No objections. Bill Tweit, WDFW abstained.

**ITEM 7: 2010-11 CBFWA Annual Work Plan Status Updates**

**Updates:** Jann Eckman provided the CBFWA/CBFWF Status Report for FY 2010 and the beginning of FY11. She requested that the Members and their accounting departments submit all invoices and billings for time spent on CBFWA activities during the fiscal year April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011 and send invoices to the CBFWF accounting office before April 30, 2011 for reimbursement. CBFWA funding can only be used for policy directives outlined in the annual work plan and all unspent dollars will be returned to BPA at the end of that contract year. Typically, the CBFWA staff budget is spent, but the Members' budget usually has unspent funds at the end of the contract year. Jann referenced the February CBFWF budget summary comparison expenditure reports sent to the Members and in the meeting packet. An updated budget summary will go out later this month.

The Members expressed their concern regarding unspent funding in the budgets, in the future should they develop a work plan contingency, where the funds could be utilized like an ongoing project. The Members and Jann will consider all appropriate options to use the unspent funding.

Each Member has a contract with CBFWF for travel reimbursements and time spent on CBFWA related activities. At the start of each work plan, each Member is asked to identify their budget needs. In the past, a budget placeholder was established to provide security for the Members who spend their entire budget. There is no unallocated placeholder for Members participation in FY2011.

Jann reported that the 2010 CBFWF financial audit is complete and awaiting the final report. The business, personnel, and contractual responsibilities and obligations are being met.

The [FY 2011 CBFWA AWP](#) contract has been signed and entered into BPA's Pisces project management system. This contract period is April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012. The new Independent Cooperative Agreements have been mailed to each member for signature. A signed copy is due back to the CBFWF office by 4/30/11. Staff will continue to implement the Policy Directives as directed by the Members. The CBFWF personnel handbook has been updated to incorporate new and revised Department of Labor legislation. The Executive Director position will remain vacant this contract year.

Jann Eckman, Interim Executive Director will meet with the office landlords to discuss downsizing office space and renegotiating lease terms. The Members expressed concerns that the CBFWA/F offices may move out of the building to a different location. Jann assured

them, that she would research all options and keep them updated. The goal is to remain solvent and provide the organizational stability as we work through 2012 and beyond.

Annually, CBFWA Members appoint designees and alternates to serve on the groups and committees of CBFWA for the next year. Each MAG committee representative was emailed their 2010 form to be updated. Please confirm the designees and their contact information and return the updated forms to [Trina.Gerlack@cbfwa.org](mailto:Trina.Gerlack@cbfwa.org) by 4/1/2011.

Update:

Tom Iverson provided the semi-annual [CBFWA Work Plan Update Presentation](#); an update of the implementation of the FY10 work plan for Members review, direction, and adjustment. The CBFWA staff coordinators are completing the technical work to implement the policy directives identified by the Members in FY2010-11 AWP. The policy directives are 1) To support and participate in ongoing assessments for the status of the species, 2) Maintain and improve the [Status of the Resources \(SOTR\) website](#) and report, 3) Monitor and report regional activities to the membership, and 4) Seek other funding sources. The first policy directive has been interpreted as building the framework for getting status information organized across the basin and assembled, to support all future analysis and evaluations. CBFWA staff made a direct linkage between this work plan and the NPCC's draft Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Reporting (MERR) Plan through the anticipated Monitoring Implementation Strategies that support the MERR. The majority of CBFWA work has been focused on developing these implementation strategies.

The organization's operating functions have changed. The staff policy level outreach is inactive due to staffing changes however most of the work plan is directed at technical level work. Tom I. provided an overview of the Anadromous Fish, Resident Fish, and Wildlife strategies currently under development, and discussed the salmon and steelhead Coordinated Assessments effort that is paving the way for a comprehensive review of data management.

The SOTR enhancements are updated quarterly and improvements are being made by coordinating with external users to develop the most value added to the basin.

The NPCC is developing a website for their Multi Year Action Plans (MYAP) that follows closely the product of the Members Program Amendments Recommendations linking biological objectives with limiting factors, strategies, and actions. When the NPCC is finished building the MYAP website, it has the potential to enable monitoring of the full cycle of an adaptive management process for the Columbia River Basin. In following, the Members amendment process framework and the website will be a planning site that lays out the objectives, achievements, and defines the work to be completed. The BPA's Taurus project management system is the implementation reporting piece and the SOTR is the evaluation support piece. With some coordination, these three sites could be linked to support the full range of decision making for the BPA funded Fish and Wildlife Program.

In summary, the work has been focused on developing monitoring implementation strategies to support coordinated basinwide assessments to be organized for the Program Amendment and Evaluation processes. The next steps will focus on identifying high level indicators (HLI), determine the monitoring necessary to support the HLIs, coordinating the data management, and defining the reporting necessary to evaluate success. The work extends beyond April 2012, which was discussed later in the meeting.

Tom I. highlighted the following questions for the members' consideration as the development of the FY12 and beyond work plan begins: Do the Members continue to support the current policy directives? Are the CBFWA work products meeting the Members' expectations? Do the Members want to make adjustments to the work or policy directives?

Discussion:

This summer, the Northwest Power & Conservation Council (NPCC or Council) will begin the categorical review process for regional coordination and data management.

Rob Walton, NOAA referenced [page 64 of the NPCC 2009 F&W Program criteria F. Coordination Funding](#), listing the key areas where the NPCC is seeking coordinated efforts from the F&W managers and what activities should be funded to support Program implementation.

Rob's interpretation in Section F is that coordination and data merge. He would like to discuss the following questions. What questions will be asked of the Members regarding those two categories, coordination and data management? How will the Members comment on those questions? Do the policy directives focus on data management, etc.? How should the Members be commenting on the categorical review questions on data management? Is there money in data management budget for Member in addition to coordination money?

Tom I. replied, the NPCC's Program description of the Regional Coordination and BPA's Regional Coordination funding policy are disconnected, but they should come to resolution in the regional review. BPA has made it very clear there is limited money for data management. There may be some additional funding through the data management review, but the regional coordination funding appears fixed for the foreseeable future.

Rob W. reviewed the Multi Year Action Plan website and it looked like the NPCC put out an ad hoc call for updates with no coordination or organization. Anyone could provide comments about the subbasin plans and implementation schedule. Rob asked how important is it for the Members to spend time on it; should they be working together and what the NPCC is going to do with it?

Tom I. agreed that the NPCC's Multi Year Action Plan website needs a lot of work and he admitted he presented the website with great optimism. The NPCC received some feedback on their MYAP web site, but are not hearing encouragement to continue its development.

**ITEM 8: Satisfaction Survey Result Summary**

Neil Ward thanked the people who participated in survey. Last month the survey was completed to evaluate the organization's coordination services and the value of products in the FY10 CBFWA work plan. For the 2010 contract year, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) required CBFWA to perform a satisfaction survey to assess the value of CBFWA's services. Results from the survey were to be submitted with the annual report. A general overview of the results is summarized in the [CBFWA Organization and Staff Survey: 2010 presentation](#). A total of 170 individuals were emailed the survey and 96 completed it. Overall most of the respondents were highly satisfied with the CBFWA services, products, and valued the organization good to excellent.

The [Draft 2010 CBFWA Organization and Staff Survey Report](#) was submitted for Members' review and approval before being submitted to BPA with the CBFWA annual report. The Members directed the MAG to review the draft report, and provide comments back to [Neil.Ward@cbfwa.org](mailto:Neil.Ward@cbfwa.org) by the end of the month. Following the MAG review, the Members directed CBFWA staff to forward the report to BPA and to post it to the CBFWA website.

Bill Tweit asked how often BPA will require this type of survey, because he is concerned the surveys may turn into criteria for funding. The CBFWA staff indicated that the survey is not a requirement in the FY11 CBFWA contract. If the survey was to be conducted again, CBFWA staff suggested the members consider seeking a professional review of the questions prior to their release.

Rob W. asked what it would cost to do the survey next year. CBFWA staff used Survey Monkey for \$20 and approximately three weeks of staff time.

Mark Bagdovitz requested future surveys to be more targeted toward the Members and technical committees.

**Action:** The Members directed the Members Advisory Group (MAG) to review draft and approve the survey summary report by 3/31/2011 for submission with the annual report to BPA. No objections. Bill Tweit, WDFW abstained.

*Working Lunch Provided*

**ITEM 9: Regional Coordination for 2012 and Beyond**

- Provide background for regional coordination.
- Discuss potential work for 2012 and beyond.
- Discuss timeline for regional coordination decisions.
- Members' discussion of the organization's role and function for FY12 and beyond.

**Discussion:**

Tom Iverson provided the [CBFWA FY12 and Beyond Presentation](#) outlining the CBFWA organization's status related to membership, policy directives, organizational chart, and current BPA regional coordination funding policy, budget distribution, potential budget impacts, and future anticipated work in 2012 and beyond.

The FY2010 Policy Directives carried over into the FY2011 AWP and some Members expressed interest and concern relating to future CBFWA work and funding.

This summer the NPCC is facilitating the Programmatic Review of Regional Coordination Projects. It is anticipated that the CBFWA will prepare a five year work plan that outlines the priority work and how it should be funded for this period. The Members Advisory Group and staff requested the Members guidance to develop the next work plan and budget.

Mark B. asked if the NPCC is embarking on the categorical review, is that review during the period of the rate case or is it a five year review? Why should CBFWA prepare a five year work plan?

Tom I. responded the NPCC has adjusted their recommendations from three years to five years unrelated to any rate case. BPA is implementing two-year rate cases to be more responsive in the changes in both electricity generation potential and in the market. The current rate period ends in September 2011. The FY12-13 rate period will run for two years after that. BPA will begin discussions regarding the FY14-15 rate period in January 2012. There is approximately three years remaining in the current F&W Program before it is amended again.

The NPCC may ask for a longer term work plan. The Categorical Review process lengthens the time between the project reviews. In 2002-2004, CBFWA participated in a three year rolling review process with three year funding recommendations, which NPCC discovered that they didn't get back to review some projects for four or five years. The NPCC's process for the Categorical Reviews and Geographic Reviews is a four year rotation cycle. The projects in the larger categories will carry their funding long enough to identify the project carry forward between reviews. The first three years require more detail, and fewer specifics are required in years four and five.

Rob Walton, NOAA referenced [page 64 of the NPCC 2009 F&W Program criteria F. Coordination Funding](#) and confirmed that all entities and organization receiving funding for NPCC's F&W Program coordination activities must develop a work plan detailing the coordination elements, objectives, deliverables, and budget. Are all regional coordination projects held to that standard? Tom responded that CBFWA meets that standard.

Bill Tweit, WDFW referenced the 7<sup>th</sup> [presentation slide](#) current CBFWA funding regarding BPA's Regional Coordination funding policies. He asked if the policy is in writing anywhere and do BPA and NPCC support this information?

Tom I. responded yes, in 2009, CBFWA Members expressed their concerns regarding the 1/19<sup>th</sup> funding allocation policy. Bill Booth, NPCC requested information from Elmer Ward and Brian Lipscomb regarding the regional coordination funding history. On [May 4, 2009 CBFWA responded to the Bill Booth's request in the BPA FY2001 Coordination Funding Decisions to the NPCC](#) with a compendium history report and added the [May 14, 2009 memo regarding BPA funding](#). The [June 9, 2009 letter to CBFWA from Greg Delwiche, BPA](#) and the February 2011 MAG Subgroup meeting with Bill Maslen, BPA confirmed the BPA's Regional Coordination funding policies. The June 9, 2009 letter specifically cites Section 839b(g)(30) of the Northwest Power Act authorizing BPA to contract with sovereigns to provide input into the development and implementation of the Fish and Wildlife Program.



Bill T. asked who or what does BPA consider a full consensus decision?

Tom I. suspected that the full consensus would be a decision made by the original 19 CBFWA Members. The NPCC helped create this policy during 2008-09 funding recommendations for regional coordination. The CBFWA staff helped facilitate the development of a regional coordination definition during FY2007, which achieved full consensus among the fish and wildlife managers. While the fish and wildlife managers had full consensus on the definition of regional coordination, they disagreed on the funding model. The seventeen CBFWA Members delivered a [December 10, 2007 CBFWA letter requesting the coordination funding model process remain the same](#), two non-Members tribes requested separate funding. The CBFWA Executive Director Lipscomb went in front of the NPCC and requested that they accept the funding model approved by the majority of the fish and wildlife managers. Bill Booth, NPCC delivered the message to the Members, that in order to respect those two Tribes sovereignty, the coordination funding would be divided equally among the 19 original CBFWA Members. This policy appears inconsistent with the policy that is in the [NPCC's F&W Program](#).

Tom I. reported that the Policy Directives and work will likely remain the same through 2013, which is developing basinwide assessments and identifying high level reporting to evaluate the success of the programmatic strategies. Most of the work is focused on data management to identify what needs to be reported and confirming how the information will be managed to produce a report. In 2013, the work shifts to evaluating the information to identify the regional assessment of the strategies to produce a high level strategy document for the next Program Amendment Process.

Rob W. asked if there is an opportunity for CBFWA to have a role in standardizing the check-in report for the BiOp. He suggested one role for co-managers is to be the conscience in the region for reporting, for better or worse. Are the metrics correct and are they being adequately assessed? Are the final reports being reported honestly?

Gary James, CTUIR asked if the NPCC is planning to redo the subbasin plans. He supported the focus on implementation, monitoring and reporting, not developing and spending more money on planning.

Gary J. and Rob W. agreed that reviewing and updating the 2004 subbasin plans and identifying inconsistencies and duplicate efforts falls under the Policy Directive 1. The Anadromous Fish Advisory Committee participated in the NPCC's MYAP review request and getting the message out. CBFWA staff is busy working on other tasks. It is the co-managers responsibility to report and is consistent with the new CBFWA work plan. This task does not need to be a CBFWA product. The co-managers can contact the NPCC individually and provide comments and updates, if they support the MYAP website as the subbasin plan. It contains key elements outlined in the CBFWA Program amendment recommendations, which are the biological objectives, limiting factors, key strategies, and actions. These key elements should be updated every five years.

Mark B. stated the Status of Resources (SOTR) product is a regional resource, and it is being funded out of coordination funding. What are the pros and cons for funding the SOTR separately from CBFWA?

Tom I. responded the upside is the SOTR would have more value if the NPCC and BPA more directly supported the report; they could use it to report to Congress and rate payers. The SOTR is a fact reporting document, no analysis, no evaluations, just the status overtime of the populations and access to the data being reported. The downside of BPA and Council oversight is if the SOTR report is not positive, collecting and reporting information may be changed, for political reasons, to bias the report.

Rob W. stated that the FCRPS has a 2013 implementation report check-in date, what is the relation to that reporting process and SOTR?

CBFWA staff has contacted BPA staff and asked if the SOTR data could help them develop the template for the 2013 report and make it look more like a regional partnership report. The SOTR can provide support in some elements of the report, like population abundance, but not

in habitat and hatchery effectiveness.

Rob W. asked, is there a role for all twenty co-managers to be participating with BPA on reporting to NOAA Fisheries on the results of the BiOp. Should the co-managers take interest in how BPA is developing the report, metrics, populating the data, and do the co-managers agree.

At the 2016 check-in, BPA will start reporting on biological performance. The work the co-managers are doing now through the CBFWA work plan provides the framework and data for reporting the necessary trends.

Dave Statler asked if the purpose of Policy Directive 2 was to report to Policy Directive 1? How do the Members view the role of the SOTR? After the data sharing business practices are developed; how does the region maintain the standards and protocols for sharing data and where does the data go?

Bill T. reported that WDFW will be working on Skamania Lodge Workshop results for implementation. WDFW has a role in monitoring, identifying the gaps in FCRPS, who should fill the gaps, and how to report the status of the resources. The WDFW's approach to the long term agreements is implementation. Reporting should include, status reports on co-managers' work, monitoring and evaluation procedures, in years eight through ten, are the populations responding, and evaluate the implementation of the plan.

John Platt, CRITFC suggested that the fish and wildlife managers look outside their circles and focus on educating the public on how their money is being spent on fish recovery and providing information to the congressional delegation and utilities that this money is being spent efficiently. The SOTR document and website could be the vehicle for reporting the results to media on the region and on the fish and wildlife managers' successes, achievements, and efficiencies.

The Members agreed that it is important to define a clear role and mission statement for the SOTR. The SOTR mission statement should define the purpose and the audience for the report.

Mark B. supported keeping the Policy Directives separate. CBFWA will help determine whether enhancement efforts are successful and the SOTR will report the facts and access to the data being reported.

Vice Chair Unsworth asked how the organizational chart changed from last year and why there is money left in the budget? Staff provided the update and the unspent funds in the staff budget are related to the vacant executive director position salary, benefits, and travel costs.

Should the CBFWA organization fill the Executive Director (ED) position, or not?

In the FY 2011 CBFWA work plan, the Members committed to not filling ED position. Filling the ED position will be considered during the development of the CBFWA work plan for FY 2012 and beyond. There are significant costs involved in that decision.

Rob W. stated that the current policy directives are focused on technical issues and the current arrangement with Jann Eckman as the acting ED and Tom Iverson is working well. At this time, CBFWA does not need a policy level ED. If the NPCC or BPA would like to discuss policy issues, the organization can decide based on the issue, which Member can address the issue with NPCC or BPA.

Gary James supported Rob's comments and added the organization should have the five-year work plan drafted because the coordination projects will be ready next year for the programmatic review. The policy directive tasks should be identified first to understand how the current staff will handle the work and identify the gaps before hiring new employees. What is the priority work for the current staff to address? Identify the gaps if staff cannot address the work assigned?

The next Members Meeting will be in the summer to review and approval the next work plan for the NPCC's Project Review process.

**Assignment:** The Member assigned the MAG to develop the draft CBFWA five year work plan and review the staffing levels to complete the work. The current MAG Subgroup's work is consistent with the direction of the assignment.

**ITEM 10: Next Members Meeting**

**Action:** The summer Members Meeting is scheduled for August 2011 in Coeur d'Alene pending NPCC's review process schedule and due dates.

Jim Unsworth, IDFG requested that the technical committee Chairs or a representative from each committee provide a brief status report of their achievements and products at the summer meeting.

**Meeting Adjourn**

H:\WORK\MBRS\2011\_0310\ActionNotes\_10March2011\_MbrsMtg\_FINAL.doc