COLUMBIA BASIN
FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY
851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | 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

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

DATE: April 18, 2007

TO: Resident Fish Advisory Committee (RFAC)

FROM: Neil Ward

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the April 10-11, 2007, RFAC Meeting

RFAC Meeting
April 10-11, 2007
Spokane, WA 99201

These notes will be approved as final at the next RFAC Meeting

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: **April 10**: Jim Uehara (WDFW), Tom Friesen (ODFW), Mike Faler (USFWS), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Ed Shallenberger (CCT), Sheri Sears (CCT), Melo Maiolie (IDFG), Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel (STOI), Joe Maroney (KT), Ron Peters (CDAT), John Whalen (WDFW), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)

April 11: Jim Uehara (WDFW), Tom Friesen (ODFW), Mike Faler (USFWS), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Ed Shallenberger (CCT), Sheri Sears (CCT), Melo Maiolie (IDFG), Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel (STOI), Joe Maroney (KT), Ron Peters (CDAT), Dale Chess (CDAT), Steve Vigg (WDFW), and Neil Ward (CBFWA)

By Phone: **April 10-11**: Charlie Holderman (KTOI)

Time Allocation:

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

ITEM 1: **Review Agenda**

No new items were added to the agenda.

ITEM 2: **BPA Recommendations and In-Lieu Analysis**

On February 13, 2007, the BPA released their final in-lieu analysis and project recommendations. Major issues relative to resident fish projects included BPA's decision to: 1.) "invest less significantly than before in monitoring bull trout populations that are not directly affected by the FCRPS", 2.) not provide full funding to Lake Roosevelt kokanee projects until the ISRP completes their report, 3.) not provide funding for some projects because "no resident fish crediting mechanism exist", 4.) not provide funding to projects proposed above Hells Canyon Dam because it "may not be an FCRPS responsibility to mitigate above Hells Canyon Dam if not affected by the construction or operation of Black Canyon, Anderson Ranch, Boise Diversion, Minidoka, or palisades Reservoirs", 5.) indicate that "fish population status monitoring is a low priority", and 6.) identify new bull trout projects as "not a high priority." In addition, several project proposals were either not funded or received reduced budgets because BPA's believes an in-lieu situation exists.

During the March 8, 2007 RFAC Meeting, participants reviewed the BPA's recommendations/comments and developed work groups to address the major issues. The following is an update and timeline for each of the areas of concern:

Loss Assessment/Crediting, Projects above Hells Canyon – Although the participants expressed that there may be some policy issues associated with performing loss assessments, the RFAC recommended reviewing the approaches that Montana implemented for assessing fish losses and initiating a fish crediting process. The following website links provide information relative to the processes that were used to assess resident fish losses and implement a fish crediting process:

http://www.efw.bpa.gov/Publications/R00006294-4.pdf
http://www.cbfwa.org/solicitation/components/forms/Proposal.cfm?PropID=510
http://www.cbfwa.org/solicitation/components/forms/Proposal.cfm?PropID=344

Kokanee/ISRP Recommendations – The ISRP is meeting May 2-3, 2007, with project sponsors that submitted kokanee-oriented in the Intermountain Province. The RFAC recommended waiting until after the workshop to decide whether a written response was warranted from the managers.

Bull Trout Issues – Presently, discussions are occurring throughout the Columbia River Basin regarding BPA's decisions that: 1.) identified new bull trout projects as not a high priority and 2.) significantly less should be invested in monitoring bull trout populations that are not directly affected by the FCRPS. Because of the ongoing discussions, the RFAC decided temporarily postpone a written response. The RFAC anticipates providing a written response at a later date.

In-Lieu/Resident Fish Substitution – The RFAC tasked Neil Ward with developing a response for review by the participants. Neil provided the participants with a copy of the document on April 12, 2007 (attached). Pending RFAC approval, Jim Uehara will present the memo to the MAG on April 24, 2007.

Monitoring – The RFAC participants recommended that Neil Ward, Jim Uehara, and Ron Peters review monitoring information provided by the BPA's in their February 26, 2007 document and develop a response for RFAC review. Following committee review, participants directed Neil and Jim to meet with the other committee Chair and Coordinators to discuss the document that the RFAC developed.

Proposed Action Review and approve the transmittal letter for consideration during the April 24, 2007, MAG Meeting.

ITEM 3: Program Amendments

During the February 7, 2007, Members Meeting, the Members directed the technical committees to: 1.) define and clarify terms (i.e., focal species, objectives, how to express limiting factors, etc.), 2.) confirm population level biological objectives, 3.) ensure that priorities affecting fish and wildlife are captured in this process, 4.) validate current limiting factors including out-of-basin affects, and 5.) review and build on strategies and actions necessary to reduce the limiting factors. During the March 8, 2007, RFAC Meeting, participants developed a plan and timeline to complete the Members request. The RFAC recommended that the Status of the Resources Project (SOTR) and its products (i.e., annual report and website) should be used to address the subbasin-level questions. Listed below are the RFAC's efforts relative to Tasks 1, 2, 3, and 4. Efforts to complete task Task 5 will be initiated during the May 15, 2007, RFAC Meeting.

1. *Define and clarify terms* - The Anadromous Fish Committee initiated a process on March 8, 2006, to provide definitions for focal species, objectives, limiting factors, causative factors, etc. The RFAC reviewed the AFAC's definitions and provided edits (see edited version below). The revised definitions have been forwarded to the AFAC and Wildlife Advisory Committee for their review and consideration. Jim Uehara will present the RFAC definitions to the MAG and other technical committees during the May 9, 2007, *Joint Technical Committee and MAG Amendment Strategy Workshop*.

2. *Confirm focal species, biological objectives, metrics, limiting factors, and causative threats* – Due to time limitations, the RFAC was unable to complete the review of the focal species, biological objectives, metrics, limiting factors, and causative threats. Participants were provided with templates (information was also emailed prior to the meeting) that included focal species, losses, biological objectives, metrics, limiting factors, and threats. Consequently, RFAC participants were requested to provide their completed forms to Neil Ward no later than May 1, 2007. Jim Uehara will present the completed templates to the MAG and other technical committees during the May 9, 2007, *Joint Technical Committee and MAG Amendment Strategy Workshop*.

ITEM 4: Confirm Limiting Factors and Associated Strategies/Actions

Following the development of the definitions for limiting factors and causative threats, the RFAC discussed limiting factors and causative threats in the context of biological objectives for select focal species (e.g., Pend Oreille kokanee, Pend Oreille largemouth bass, and Lake Roosevelt rainbow trout) in the Columbia River Basin. Participants were provided with templates that included focal species, losses, biological objectives, limiting factors, and threats. Due to time limitations, participants were unable to complete the forms. Consequently, RFAC participants were requested to provide their completed forms to Neil Ward no later than May 1, 2007. Jim Uehara will present the completed templates to the MAG and other technical committees during the May 9, 2007, *Joint Technical Committee and MAG Amendment Strategy Workshop*. Strategies for addressing the limiting factors/threats will be discussed during the May 15, 2007, RFAC Meeting, 2007.

ITEM 5: Identify and Confirm Fish Loss Numbers (Resident and Anadromous)

During the March 21, 2007, MAG Meeting, participants expressed the need to identify resident and anadromous fish losses associated with hydro-development and operations. The identification of these losses will be essential to setting biological objectives at a regional-scale as well as justifying mitigation efforts. Neil Ward will present a report representing a compilation of resident fish and anadromous fish losses that are pertinent to resident-fish-oriented efforts in the Columbia River Basin. Due to time limitations, the RFAC was unable to review this item. This item will be reviewed during the May 15, 2007, RFAC Meeting.

ITEM 6: Next Meeting

Phone Conference

May 15, 2007

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. (Pacific)

RFAC PARTICIPANTS ARE ENCOURGED TO ATTEND THE JOINT COMMITTEES AMENDMENT STRATEGY WORKSHOP

May 9, 2007

(Boise, ID)

Terms Used by CBFWA Technical Committees in Development of Program Amendments (RFAC)

Biological Objectives

An objective is the desirable condition or state that one is attempting to achieve through a course of action. Objectives may have two components: (1) biological performance, describing responses of focal species, and/or (2) environmental characteristics, which describe conditions needed to achieve biological performance. Biological objectives are intended to be measurable and should have a temporal component.

Strategies

Strategies are plans of action to achieve biological objectives. Strategies include specific tasks to be implemented, and are guidance for development of projects. Strategies should propose priorities and sequencing.

Limiting Factors

Environmental (i.e., chemical, physical, or biological) condition (e.g., dissolved oxygen, nutrients, water temperature, sediment, stream morphology, predation, total dissolved gases, etc.) that limits the capability of a focal species population (e.g., spawning habitat, rearing area, migration barriers, etc.) to reach its biological objective. If removed, the target population would be expected to expand.

Causative Factors (Threats)

Activity or condition that contributes to, or causes, one or more limiting factors (e.g., upland tree removal, ground tillage for agriculture, livestock overgrazing on riparian corridors, dams, impoundments that convert flowing stream habitat to ponded habitat, mining, direct human disturbance of animal behavior, exotic species introductions, etc.).

Limiting Factor Categories

1. **Water quantity/hydrograph** – Timing and magnitude of flow conditions and reservoir elevations.
2. **Water quality** – Water characteristics including temperature, dissolved oxygen, suspended sediment, pH, toxics, etc.
3. **Predation** – Consumption of focal species (does not include harvest).
4. **Competition** – Interaction between/among organisms, both of which share a limited environmental attribute (i.e. food or space).
5. **Nutrients** – Lack of nutrients in tributaries (anadromous zone-insufficient carcasses) and reservoirs.
6. **Disease** – A pathological condition of a part, organ, or system of an organism resulting from various causes, such as infection, genetic defect, or environmental stress, and characterized by an identifiable group of signs or symptoms.
7. **Physical habitat quality/quantity** – Quality or quantity of physical habitat. Examples of measurable parameters include instream roughness, channel morphology, riparian conditions, fine sediment, shoreline development, etc.
8. **Habitat access** – Impaired access to spawning and/or rearing habitat. Examples include impassable culverts, delayed migration over dams, dewatered stream channels, etc. If, for example, a stream has been diked, thereby eliminating access to off-channel habitat, habitat access should be considered a problem. If off-channel habitat to which access has been eliminated is in impaired condition, it also considered an element of the physical habitat quality/quantity limiting factor.
9. **Population traits** – Impaired population condition(s) including: genetic, life history, morphological, productivity, fitness, behavioral characteristics, and population size. Although population traits are caused by other limiting factors, they may *also* and independently be a limiting factor.
10. **Knowledge Gaps** – Lack of information

Threat Categories

1. **Current harvest practices** – Direct and indirect mortality
2. **Current hatchery practices** – Negative impact of hatchery practices on naturally produced fish. Hatchery practices include: number of fish released, removal of adults for broodstock, breeding practices, rearing practices, release practices, water quality management, blockage of access to habitat, etc.
3. **Current hydropower** – Negative impact of current hydropower-system management on fish and wildlife populations
4. **Current land-use practices** – Negative impact of current land-use activities on fish and wildlife populations. Land-use practices include timber harvest, agriculture, urbanization, transportation, mining, etc. If current practices are not adequate to address problems caused by past practices, consider them here as well as under the legacy threat.
5. **Introduced species** – Negative impact of non-native organisms on fish and wildlife populations and their habitat.
6. **Legacy issues** – Negative impact of practices that no longer occur but that created conditions that currently exert negative impacts. Examples of legacy threats include: historic splash damming, and fishery harvest management, ocean/climate conditions.