

Staff summary of Issues & Recommendations

Regional Coordination

*Preliminary draft, please refer to full recommendations for complete review

10/29/2013 10:10 AM

2009 Fish and Wildlife Program Section

VIII. Implementation Provisions

F. Program Coordination (p.64) (*see language at the end of document*)

G. Coordination with other Regional Programs

Overview

Many recommenders urge the Council to take a leadership role in convening coordination meeting and to continue with science-policy workshops and similar activities. The void created by the disbanding of CBFWA was frequently cited.

Summary

Sixteen entities made recommendations on regional coordination activities. The majority of those recommendations focus on the need for the Council to take on a leadership role in the region, particularly with the disbanding of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. Many recommend that the Council be the regional convener to discuss issues related the Columbia River mitigation. They suggested that a forum be created at least annually to talk about a host of issues relevant in the basin, including but not limited to: an annual work plan and priorities for the basin; monitoring and evaluation, data management and coordination, toxics; non-native and invasive species, operations and maintenance costs' ocean and estuary issues, Willamette subbasin mitigation, and sponsoring/convening science/policy workshops. Most of the comments came from agencies and tribes and were very similar if not identical in specific language. A summary of the primary recommendations are listed below with the entities that support them (see excerpted recommendations beginning on page 3):

A. Data and Reporting: Use a Regional Coordination forum including BPA, Council, tribal, state, and federal resource managers, and data management leaders to develop and review regional restoration progress reports, discuss options to improve reporting, and provide policy guidance for data management efforts.

ODFW, WDFW, WA-GSRO, Cowlitz Tribe, KTOI, USRT, NOAA

B. Estuary, Plume and Nearshore: Fund a collaborative forum of scientists and managers to: 1) identify key management questions related to the estuary, plume, and nearshore ocean environments; 2) identify what research and monitoring has already been done that addresses these management questions; 3) identify ongoing baseline monitoring and research priorities; 4) identify opportunities for information sharing between scientists and managers and 5) recommend to the Council ways to improve the utility and in-river freshwater resource management benefits of both ongoing and proposed ocean, estuary and plume research conducted under the Program.

ODFW, WA-GSRO, Cowlitz Tribe, USRT, NOAA

C. Various Issues: Re-Establish a Regional Coordination Forum: Council should continue as a regional convener of issues related to the Columbia Basin mitigation. Council should create an annual forum for states, tribes and partners to coordinate and discuss annual work priorities. The forum would result in the creation of an annual work plan to ensure that we are collectively engaged in discussions on what is most important to the Council and the region. Through the five years of this program, we recommend the following priority topics, as others as they arise, for Council engagement:

- Monitoring and Evaluation –M&E costs; information needs at each level of Program reporting;
- Research - critical questions; improve reporting and integrate into decision making; improve funding mechanisms such that research projects are finished and new projects are identified
- Wildlife Mitigation – ensure continued value of BPA investments
- Zebra and Quagga Mussels – focus on prevention.
- Habitat Restoration –leverage existing projects to understand effectiveness
- Science/Policy forums – climate change, toxics, eulachon
- BPA funded assets –maintaining infrastructure; short-term and long-term O&M costs for existing and new facilities, including fish collection facilities, fish passage facilities, hatcheries, temperature control structures, and others.
- Non-native species – suppression and eradication; where successful, where not
- Coordinated Assessments – identify additional species for process

MFWP (invasives only), ODFW, WDFW, WA-GRSO, BPT, CRITFC, CSKT, Grand Ronde Tribe, Cowlitz Tribe, USRT, KTOI, NOAA

D: Willamette Basin Mitigation: Include identification of short-term and long-term O&M costs for existing and new facilities in the Willamette Basin, including fish collection facilities, brood holding facilities, fish passage facilities, hatcheries, temperature control structures, and others, as a priority topic for consideration under the Regional Coordination Forum.

ODFW

E. Toxics: The Council shall coordinate a leadership forum where governmental entities can discuss and develop a regional toxic-reduction strategy to include:

- a. description of the existing footprint of toxic substances within the Basin
- b. Identification of the principal sources of toxic substances imported into the Basin
- c. A coordinated process for identifying new contaminants of concern; and
- d. A 30-year implementation schedule to achieve toxic reduction objectives

Cd'A Tribe

F. General support for regional coordination to be in the program:

UCUT, KTOI, PFMC

G: Annual work plan: Use a regional forum to discuss/confirm/develop the Basin's annual workplan and priorities.

KTOI, PFMC, and NW Sportfishing Industry Assoc and Assoc of NW Steelheaders

Recommendations (excerpts)

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (2)

The Council should continue to be regional leaders coordinating science, policy and outreach to control the spread of Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) to, and within the Columbia River Basin.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife ()

A.

2.0 Program Performance Objectives -- 2.4 *Data Management*

Measure 2: ...reporting of Program actions and effectiveness which supports Program scale adaptive management: Use a Regional Coordination forum including BPA, Council, tribal, state, and federal resource managers, and data management leaders to develop and review regional restoration progress reports, discuss options to improve reporting, and provide policy guidance for data management efforts;

B.

7.0 Habitat (7.1 Full Incorporate Estuary, Plume, and Nearshore Ocean in the

Program)Recommendation 3: Insert the following language into the Fish and Wildlife Program:

“Management of the Columbia River Basin hydropower system directly affects the ocean environment primarily in two ways: 1) it changes the natural hydrograph by development of the hydro-system, and changes estuary and plume habitats along with the timing and quantity of natural flows; and 2) the releases of large numbers of hatchery fish from Columbia River hatcheries may trigger density dependent effects in the estuary, plume and ocean.”

Measure 1: Fund a collaborative forum of scientists and managers to: 1) identify key management questions related to the estuary, plume, and nearshore ocean environments; 2) identify what research and monitoring has already been done that addresses these management questions; 3) identify ongoing baseline monitoring and research priorities; 4) identify opportunities for information sharing between scientists and managers and 5) recommend to the Council ways to improve the utility and in-river freshwater resource management benefits of both ongoing and proposed ocean, estuary and plume research conducted under the Program.

Rationale: Regional coordination between researchers and Columbia Basin managers is necessary for sharing information and for developing scientifically sound recommendations on monitoring and research priorities that can inform management actions. This forum can help with addressing the following additional measures.

C.

8.3 Re-Establish a Regional Coordination Forum (Attachment 2, Section 8.3)

Current Program: Page 64, Program Coordination

Recommendation 1: Council should continue as a regional convener of issues related to the Columbia Basin mitigation. Council should create an annual forum for states, tribes and partners to coordinate and

discuss annual work priorities. The forum would result in the creation of an annual work plan to ensure that we are collectively engaged in discussions on what is most important to the Council and the region. Through the five years of this program, we recommend the following priority topics, as others as they arise, for Council engagement:

- Monitoring and Evaluation – In order to get a handle on M&E costs within the Program, specific information needs at each level of Program reporting should be clearly identified and incorporated to ensure cost effective and efficient data collection, data management, and data sharing.
- Research - What are the critical questions we need to answer? How do we improve reporting and integration into decision making? How can we improve funding mechanisms such that research projects are finished and new projects are identified?
- Wildlife Mitigation – moving into the future, how do we ensure continued value of BPA investments?
- Zebra and Quagga Mussels – focus on prevention.
- Habitat Restoration – How can we leverage existing projects to understand effectiveness of habitat restoration on populations?
- Science/Policy forums – variety of topics including climate change, toxics, eulachon
- BPA funded assets – What are the long term challenges of maintaining BPA funded infrastructure and how can we begin addressing them? This topic should include identification of short-term and long-term O&M costs for existing and new facilities, including fish collection facilities, fish passage facilities, hatcheries, temperature control structures, and others.
- Non-native species – suppression and eradication; where successful, where not: need to keep lines of communication open
- Coordinated Assessments – identify additional species for process

Rationale:

- The role of the Council has evolved over time to meet the needs of the Basin and to address endangered species listings in concert with BPA.
- The disbanding of CBFWA leaves a gap in regional coordination as no one state or tribe can play a regional coordinating role, with the consequence that States and Tribes work more directly with Council Members.
- As such, it falls to the Council and Council staff to play a greater coordinating role that meets the needs of all regional partners in serving and informing Council decisions.
- An annual work plan would provide sufficient advance notice to improve preparation and participation, ensuring that all parties benefit fully from the exchanges.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the Council continue the inclusion of Fish and Wildlife Program Coordination funding in the updated program amendment process. Program Coordination funding is important to the region's fish and wildlife managers, particularly for the Columbia River Basin's Tribes. The lack of any Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife entity to provide this basis for coordination makes it more critical to provide funding directly to those individual state and tribal managers who can provide their time and expertise. This coordination funding is also important for many of the tribes because it helps build capacity and levels the playing field, particularly for smaller tribes

across the basin. It allows for important avenues for participation and travel to meetings, efforts that would not occur without this level of funding support.

Rationale: The current 2009 Council Fish and Wildlife Program describes the need for coordination funding provided by BPA for the purpose of various activities that support Program implementation. Activities range from activities such as data management and reporting, monitoring and evaluation, facilitating and participating in focus workgroups on Program issues, review of technical documents and processes, and information dissemination.

The Council in 2012 reviewed coordination projects and provided a decision on BPA coordination funding. In that decision document the Council included a table of detailed coordination activities appropriate for BPA funding. Those coordination tasks were designated by the Council as meeting priority needs for program coordination for the next two years, FY2013-2014. With this decision the Council indicated that these activities were well suited for program-level regional coordination funding and recognized that they would need the assistance from partners throughout the region. In addition the Council stated that all of the work was intended to be of benefit at a basinwide or regional scale and should inform the Council for policy, program performance evaluation, and implementation decisions. The Council also recommended that this work should be accomplished by the appropriate fish and wildlife agencies and tribes recognized in the program and other entities such as Tribal Consortia that have the experience and capacity to coordinate this work at a basinwide scale.

NPA. Section 839b(h)(2)(C). [The Council shall request...] fish and wildlife management coordination and research and development (including funding) which, among other things, will assist protections, mitigation, and enhancement of anadromous fish at, and between, the region's hydroelectric dams.

D.

9.2 Implement Willamette Basin Mitigation

Current Program: Page 44, Strategies in Specific Areas.

Recommendation: Include identification of short-term and long-term O&M costs for existing and new facilities in the Willamette Basin, including fish collection facilities, brood holding facilities, fish passage facilities, hatcheries, temperature control structures, and others, as a priority topic for consideration under the Regional Coordination Forum. The Council should urge the Action Agencies to adequately fund the long-term O&M needs of these facilities.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (4)

See ODFW's Recommendations A & C

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) (5)

See ODFW's Recommendation A, B & C.

Burns Paiute Tribe (12)

See ODFW's Recommendation C.

Coeur d'Alene Tribe (13)

A: *Include Regional Coordination in the program (no details; a general recommendation)*

B. Toxics Reduction

The Council shall coordinate a leadership forum where governmental entities can discuss and develop a regional toxic-reduction strategy. In addition to whatever priorities are identified at this forum, components of the strategy shall include:

- a. An accurate description of the existing footprint of toxic substances within the Basin, including the location of any authorized discharges or other sources;
 - b. Identification of the principal sources of toxic substances imported into the Basin
 - c. A coordinated process for identifying new contaminants of concern; and
 - d. A 30-year implementation schedule to achieve toxic reduction objectives, with decadal benchmarks, that could be used to inform a state or federal legislative response.
-

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (14)

See ODFW's Recommendation C.

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (16)

See ODFW's Recommendation C.

The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde (18)

See ODFW's recommendation C. ("Add a new paragraph under Program Coordination on Page 64, it should be stated that the...")

Cowlitz Indian Tribe (22)

See ODFW's Recommendation A, B & C.

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (24)

Recommendation 1:

The Council and BPA should work with States and Tribes to create an annual forum to coordinate and discuss annual work priorities. The forum would result in the creation of an annual work plan to support collective engagement in discussions on topics of high priority to the Council and representatives throughout the region.

Rationale for Recommendation 1:

The role of the Council has evolved over time to meet the needs of the Basin and to address endangered species listings in concert with BPA. The disbanding of CBFWA leaves a gap in regional coordination as no one state or tribe can play a regional coordinating role, with the consequence that States and Tribes work more directly with Council Members. The Council and Council staff can play a valuable coordinating role (e.g., Wildlife Advisory Committee) in engaging regional partners to help inform and support Council decisions.

Recommendation 2:

The Council should continue the inclusion of Fish and Wildlife Program Coordination funding in the updated program amendment process. Program Coordination funding is important to the region's fish and wildlife managers, particularly for the Columbia River Basin's Tribes. The lack of any Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife entity to provide this basis for coordination makes it more critical to provide funding directly to those individual state and tribal managers who can provide their time and expertise. This coordination funding is also important for many of the Tribes because it helps build capacity and levels the playing field, particularly for smaller Tribes across the basin. It allows for important avenues for participation and travel to meetings, efforts that would not occur without this level of funding support.

Rationale for Recommendation 2:

The current 2009 Council Fish and Wildlife Program describes the need for coordination funding provided by BPA for the purpose of various activities that support Program implementation. Activities range from activities such as data management and reporting, monitoring and evaluation, facilitating and participating in focus workgroups on Program issues, review of technical documents and processes, and information dissemination.

The Council in 2012 reviewed coordination projects and provided a decision on BPA coordination funding. In that decision document the Council included a table of detailed coordination activities appropriate for BPA funding. Those coordination tasks were designated by the Council as meeting priority needs for program coordination for the next two years, FY2013-2014. With this decision the Council indicated that these activities were well suited for program-level regional coordination funding and recognized that they would need the assistance from partners throughout the region. In addition the Council stated that all of the work was intended to be of benefit at a basinwide or regional scale and should inform the Council for policy, program performance evaluation, and implementation decisions. The Council also recommended that this work should be accomplished by the appropriate fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes recognized in the program and other entities such as Tribal Consortia that have the experience and capacity to coordinate this work at a basinwide scale.

Nez Perce Tribe (25)

Recommendation: Council should convene forums to address key issues related to the Columbia Basin mitigation, including an annual forum for states, tribes and partners to help formulate annual work plans to assure comprehensive and effective implementation of Program measures.

Upper Columbia United Tribes (27)

The UCUT specifically propose the following to be included in the new Program: **Regional Coordination**

Upper Snake River Tribes Foundation (28)

See ODFW's Recommendation A, B & C.

NOAA Fisheries (30)

See ODFW's Recommendation A, B

Convening:

- The co-managers, BPA, and the Council need to coordinate on numerous topics and the Council is well-suited to convene coordination forums accordingly. This may help fill some voids left by the dissolution of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. There are many potential coordination topics including: annual Council work plans, biological objectives, high level indicators, and research plan updates.
 - Science and policy exchanges: The Council has already hosted successful science/policy exchange forums and we encourage it to continue in this role.
-

Pacific Fishery Management Council (34)

NPCC Role in Regional Coordination

The fish and wildlife management "landscape" in the Columbia Basin has changed significantly in recent years. Some changes have created opportunities for fish and wildlife managers to work together in new or expanded regional and sub-regional forums that focus attention and efforts on critical species in critical areas. However, there remains the need for the NPCC to regularly work with fish and wildlife managers individually and collectively when amending and implementing the Fish and Wildlife Program.

Recommendation: We recommend that the NPCC create a mechanism to receive key input from states, tribes, and other partners on an annual basis. An annual forum would help assure that prioritized discussions are maintained and that all partners are engaged in NPCC planning and prioritization processes.

Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association and the Association of Northwest Steelheaders (62)

Concurs with PFMC's recommendations:

Recommendation: We recommend that the NPCC create a mechanism to receive key input from states, tribes, and other partners on an annual basis. An annual forum would help assure that prioritized discussions are maintained and that all partners are engaged in NPCC planning and prioritization processes

Program Language

F. Program Coordination

The Council benefits from the coordinated efforts of many groups, committees and organizations in implementing the Council's Program on an ongoing basis. Continued coordination of various Program elements is expected, supported, and in some cases financed by Bonneville. The elements below represent the key areas in which the Council seeks continued coordinated efforts from fish and wildlife managers and interested parties throughout the region. Coordination funding should be focused on the following activities that support Program implementation:

- Data management (storage, management, and reporting)
- Monitoring and evaluation (framework and approach)
- Developing and tracking biological objectives
- Review of technical documents and processes
- Project proposal review
- Coordination of projects, programs and funding sources within subbasins
- Facilitating and participating in focus workgroups on Program issues
- Information dissemination (technical, policy, and outreach)

Any entity or organization receiving funding for coordination of Program activities must develop work plan detailing the coordination elements, objectives, deliverables, and budget. All coordination work will be reviewed as part of the Council's project review process and as necessary, scientific and administrative review. The Council will recommend to Bonneville the level and type of coordination required to implement the Program.

G. Coordination with Other Regional Programs

The Council will continue to pursue opportunities to implement the Program in coordination with other federal, state, tribal, Canadian, and volunteer fish and wildlife restoration programs. The Council will continue to work with national programs that influence our work in the basin, such as the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. The Council will coordinate with organizations that track 2009 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program 65 and monitor data on non-native species distribution, climate change, and human population change at the Northwest regional scale. There are also ongoing efforts to monitor trends in Northwest habitat quality, ocean conditions and fish and wildlife that the Council will continue to track and participate in as described in the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research, and Reporting section above. Continued coordination with these larger efforts is important as their products and reports can directly influence our work in the basin and help to guide decision-making.