



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | www.cbfa.org

Final

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 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

Upper Columbia United Tribes

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: October 23, 2008
TO: Fish Screening Oversight Committee
FROM: Dave Ward, CBFWA Staff
SUBJECT: Final 9/10/2008 FSOC Meeting Draft Action Notes

FSOC Meeting
September 10, 2008
10:30 AM

@
Salmon, Idaho, IDFG Office

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Dave Ward (CBFWA), Eric Egbers (WDFW), Alan Ritchey (ODFW), Lynn Stratton (IDFG), Mandi Goddard (IDFG), Patrick Murphy (IDFG), Brian Zimmerman (CTUIR), Jody Brostrom (USFWS), Jamie Swan (BPA), Ray Hartlerode (ODFW),

By Phone: Bryan Nordlund (NOAA), Pat Schille (WDFW)

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

ITEM 1: Introductions

Discussion: This was the first meeting of the FSOC for sometime, so introductions included each person's role in their agency.

ITEM 2: Approval of Agenda

Discussion: The agenda was approved with the addition of two items. Mandi Goddard volunteered to take notes.

ITEM 3: Mitchell Act Funding Concerns

Discussion: The FSOC discussed cuts in Mitchell Act funding over the last few years while costs are steadily increasing.

Ray Hartlerode informed the committee that with costs rising, ODFW will be forced to curtail all non essential O&M for screens. From October of this year on his department will be curtailing spending, including laying off some of their full time employees. The budget for 2010 has no funding from NMFS. Oregon has 4 million dollars from the Oregon Lottery, which is all for capital expenditures. As he understood the zero-out was done at NMFS. If NMFS doesn't include a budget, it is had for Congress to bring it forward. A letter should be drafted and sent to the Congress, NMFS, and others.

Lynn Stratton declared that Mitchell Act for Idaho was reduced by 1% in FY08 and by \$177K in FY09. Most habitat programs are in one way or

another piggybacked to the Mitchell Act funding. Programs using FRIMA, PCSRF, SRBA, and BPA funds tend to use the Idaho Screen program for technical assistance, cost share, landowner relations and project development. Since Mitchell Act funding has been in place in Idaho since 1938 and has been the largest influence in the Salmon River basin, maintaining that original contract would be of the most benefit.

Pat Schille said the Mitchell Act in Washington also supports other programs involved in fish protection issues, although not to the extent of the other states.

Brian Zimmerman stated that there is a direct correlation between Mitchell Act funding and the intent of US v. Oregon. He indicated there would be a direct impact to hatcheries as well as screening and he thought that the screening portion of Mitchell Act should be addressed along with the hatchery concerns. He thought the next US v Oregon meeting was set for Oct 7. They are lobbying to increase funds to at least maintain current production. Screening will be tied into their plan, which historically has not been included. There are three items in the Mitchell Act budgets; hatcheries, screens, and monitoring. The budget funds are portioned out to these items by NOAA. As Brian understood it, the Mitchell Act funds are being overseen by Rob Jones.

Bryan Nordlund expressed his opinion that the best venue to get funding reinstated would be through state agencies lobbying through state venues. Bryan suggested compiling a FSOC memo to outline the committee's concerns and what the impact would be if funding for screen construction and O&M is not provided. He indicated he was not the Mitchell Act lead, but understood and agreed with the state members concerns about Mitchell Act funding reductions. RZ had applied pressure in the past to get funding for screens and O&M. Bryan will raise the issue in-house to see if there is more information and to bring the issue to the attention of upper management.

ACTION:

- Each member agency will develop a comprehensive outline showing the impact the proposed budget will have on the screening program and how that will in turn impact the hatcheries if it is approved. Information should include the large percent of the Columbia basin in which screens are located, studies and data showing importance of screens, accidental kills of hatchery stock from un-maintained screens, known instances where proper maintenance would have precluded loss, etc. Outlines are due to Dave Ward by September 30.
- Dave will compile the outlines into one comprehensive memo to the Members Advisory Group. Dave will distribute the memo to the FSOC for review and comment.
- Dave and the FSOC will present the memo to the MAG at its November 18 meeting.

ITEM 4: Formal Adoption of Current NOAA Criteria

Discussion: The FSOC discussed whether they should accept the most current version of NOAA criteria.

Ray Hartlerode questioned the possibility of past projects not being able to meet criteria from year to year as the criteria changes. Although every effort is made, some sites are not applicable. When would NOAA need to be contacted regarding sites that may not meet criteria?

Bryan Nordlund informed the committee that no significant changes had been made to the current NOAA screen criteria that were inconsistent from previous versions discussed by FSOC. The current version is posted on NMFS website at: http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/Salmon-Hydropower/FERC/upload/Fish_Passage_Design.pdf.

A significant change based on previous FSOC input was to increase the maximum flow for screens without active cleaning systems (i.e. passive screens) from 1 cfs to 3 cfs. He said that the posted version includes design criteria and design guidelines that are intended to accommodate site variability. Sufficient site specific evidence should be provided to support a design change that deviates from NOAA design standards, if a project needs to be submitted to NOAA for approval.

Jody Brostrom said that the Fisheries Division of the USFWS has adopted NOAA criteria for resident fish and bull trout.

Bryan Nordlund also stated that there is an annual process that will consider comments received, to update or correct the posted document as the need arises. He emphasized that this document was not developed by formal rule making, and are not Federal rules. However, they are widely considered to be best management practices to protect fish from entrainment into water diversions. Now is a good time to comment.

The committee voiced no objections to adopting the chapter of the NOAA criteria pertaining to screening (Chapter 11).

ITEM 5: FRIMA Reauthorization Concerns

Discussion: FRIMA has historically been a congressional add-on. The FSOC addressed their concerns for its continued funding.

Jody Brostrom passed out a summary of FRIMA funding (subsequently found to contain numerous errors). Congress may not reauthorize FRIMA. In fiscal year 2008 the U. S. Fish and Wildlife received \$6 million unspent by Montana to support the open rivers initiative. Any money from this fund is not usable for operating and maintenance. It needs to be tied to other funding sources to keep everything running in proper order.

Ray Hartlerode stated that he had learned that FRIMA re-authorization for the next fiscal year has been inserted into an omnibus bill and is currently on the Senate calendar. In the new authorization language, FRIMA projects can use BPA as a cost share. There is a new formula for sharing FRIMA administrative funds with the states (6%).

Brian Zimmerman expressed his appreciation of the program.

ACTION:

- Alan Ritchey volunteered to draft a letter from CBFWA expressing the committee's support of FRIMA. Alan will provide the draft to Dave Ward by September 30.

ITEM 6: Fish Screens and Passageways for Pacific Lamprey

Discussion: The major concern of the FSOC is the lack of knowledge of juvenile lamprey passage needs at screen sites. We want to make sure that all available data and studies done in the past are utilized to ensure informed decisions.

Dave Ward said that the CBFWA's Lamprey Technical Workgroup would like to have input or have questions that the committee would like to have addressed. The FSOC should compile them and submit the list to the LTWG, that they can then let us know what information they do or do not have data to support.

ACTION:

- Each member agency will develop a list of lamprey information needs and submit to Dave Ward by September 30. Dave will work with the LTWG to provide a summary of available information.

ITEM 7: Timing of Future Workshops

Discussion: Eric Egbers expressed that some departments have problems with funding for travel on election years. He suggested moving the workshops to odd numbered years to avoid conflicts.

CBFWA will encourage member agencies and tribes to allow participation at future workshops.

No objections were heard, with the agreement that we would stay on a bi-annual schedule. The next North Pacific Fish Screen and Passage Workshop will be held in Oregon in the third quarter of 2009.

ITEM 8: Future of the FSOC Committee and its Structure

Discussion: Dave Ward suggested scheduling quarterly teleconference meetings with annual meetings in person, and that a chair should be elected annually. Nominations for chair were opened. Ray Hartlerode was elected, his term will start Oct 1, 2008.

Ray Hartlerode stated that an invitation to participate in FSOC meetings should be extended to all CBFWA members, land managers (USFS and BLM), BPA, USBR, and the Council.

The next meeting of the FSOC committee will be by teleconference. It was scheduled the fourth Thursday of the quarter, October 23rd, at 8:30 am Pacific Standard Time.

ACTION:

- Dave Ward and Ray Hartlerode will develop an FSOC distribution list. Dave will also develop a draft Charter for the FSOC, similar in format to other CBFWA committee charters.