**Wildlife Advisory Committee**

**Operational Losses Subcommittee**

**July 10, 2014**

**Portland, OR**

**DRAFT Meeting Notes**

**Attendees:** Jason Kesling (BPT), Paul Ashley (PSMFC), Norm Merz (KTOI), Peter Paquet (NPCC), Dwight Bergeron (MFWP), Alan Wood (MFWP), Chris Wheaton (PSMFC), Tom O’Neill (NHI), Philip Key (BPA), Karl Weist (NPCC), David Byrnes (BPA), Dale Becker (CTSKT), and Neil Ward (QW Consulting)

**By Phone:** Loren Kroneman (NPT), Aren Eddingsaas (SBT), Paul Dahmer (WDFW), and Lawrence Schwabe (GRT)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item 1 | **Introductions and Approval of Agenda** |
|  | Tom O’Neill’s CHAP presentation was added to the agenda. |
| Item 2 | **Adoption of Minutes** |
|  | Peter Paquet provided the participants with an opportunity to critique the meeting minutes from the May 29, 2014 meeting. Although no comments were received, Peter indicated that the opportunity to provide edits would be available through July 25, 2015 at which time they will be submitted into the NPCC’s Amendment process to ensure the concerns that have been expressed during the meetings are part of the record.  |
| Item 3 | **CHAP as a Potential Tool for Assessing Operational Losses**  |
|  | During the May 29, 2014 Operational Losses Subcommittee meeting, participants discussed the different methods that could potentially be used to assess operational losses. During the May meeting, the focus was on the utility of the KTOI/MFWP project for assessing operational losses in the Kootenai and Flathead systems and its transferability. Participants indicated that CHAP could potentially be used for the purpose of assessing operational losses. The participants proposed completing a side-by-side comparison of CHAP and KROME. To learn more about CHAP, the participants suggested that Tom O’Neill should be invited to the next meeting to provide a presentation about how CHAP could be used to assess operational losses. Per the subcommittee’s request, Tom provided a presentation during which he highlighted the how flexibility of CHAP has allowed it to be used to assess different systems throughout the West. ***To get a better understanding of how CHAP and KROME compare when used in the Columbia River Basin, meeting attendees recommended that a side-by-side comparison should be conducted for a braided reach of the Kootenai River.***  |
|  Item 4 | **Group Discussion: Review of Approaches and Strategies for Addressing Issues Identified by the Subcommittee** |
|  | During the May 29, 2014 Operational Losses Subcommittee and June 12, 2014 Wildlife Advisory Committee meetings, participants discussed how operational losses could be assessed. The participants agreed that there may be the need for new methods to assess operational losses that incorporate the results of the ongoing pilot project (i.e., KROME). These methods could include technical testing and evaluation of operational loss models and methodologies, or other alternative habitat evaluation models. However, before losses can be evaluated, several issues were identified that must be addressed (Attachment 1). Participants reviewed the issues that were identified during the May and June meetings and added several additional items to the list.  |
| Item 5 | **Develop Workplan and Schedules for Completing Operational Losses Recommendations** |
|  | Using the list of issues that were identified during the recent meetings (Attachment 1), Peter Paquet will develop a draft outline that will serve as the framework for a white paper that includes tasks to address the various issues. Peter indicated that the effort would begin in August, at which time there should be a better understanding of what will be included in the amended Fish and Wildlife Program. In August, Peter will distribute the draft outline to the subcommittee for review and comments after which the white paper will be developed and reviewed with assistance from the subcommittee.  |
| Item 6 | **Next Steps and Other Issues** |
|  | *To get a better understanding of how CHAP and KROME compare when used in the Columbia River Basin, meeting attendees recommended that a side-by-side comparison should be conducted for a braided reach of the Kootenai River. An effort will be initiated to assess the logistics required to allow for the implementation of the proposed comparison.*  |
| Item 7 | **Next WAC Meeting** |
|  | WAC Meeting August 9, 20141:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. (Pacific)August 10, 20149:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. (Pacific)Spokane, WA |

.

**Attachment 1**

1. OPERATIONAL LOSSES
	1. The need for new methods to assess operational losses that incorporate the results of ongoing pilot projects that have explored how best to fulfill that specific need. This could include technical testing and evaluation of operational loss models and methodologies, or other alternative habitat evaluation methods.
	2. Issues
		1. Timing
			1. Flathead

1 year bird data

* + 1.  Transferability
			1. Other systems
			2. Other systems with bird data/hydrological data

ID potential projects

Contractor

* + - 1. Contractor looking at treaty models

Flathead only

* + 1.  CHAP approach??
			1. Side by side comparison with IBI

Can they be combined?

* + - 1. Use the braided reaces only
			2. Webinar
		1. How do you translate to mitigation?
			1. Currently working on how to do it
			2. Land ownership issues
			3. Tasked to Kootenai project
			4. Offsite mitigation
		2. Relationship to fish mitigation
			1. COE basin wide flood risk assessment
		3. Look at the entire system?
			1. RFP to characterize the hydrosystem
1. Notes

See attached file(s): [oplosub\_28may2014meetingnotes.docx](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ccouncilvisitor%5CDocuments%5CWAC%5CHEP%20Subgroup%207_9_14.docx%20-%20Attached%20Files%5COperational%20Losses%20Subgroup%20%282%29.docx%20-%20Attached%20Files%5Coplosub_28may2014meetingnotes.docx)

* 1. Some of the meeting’s participants expressed concern that the comments their organization submitted were not include in the first draft, For example, Carl Scheeler expressed his dissatisfaction with the NPCC’s decision to not include the CTUIR’s comments pertaining to renewable energy and transmission lines.
	2. Participants suggested that the WAC may not be capable of presenting a suite of comments, as requested by the NPCC.
	3. WAC recommended that the definition for operational losses should include “wildlife habitat” (i.e., direct wildlife and wildlife habitat should be addressed).
	4. Participants acknowledged the utility of the model for the Kootenai River, concerns were expressed relative to whether it could be transferred to other basins besides the Flathead. Participants questioned whether a pilot study should be conducted on a larger downriver system, as it will have different issues that must be addressed. Participants suggested that good alternative test cases must be identified and potential prioritized. The participants also questioned how to translate functional impact to mitigation. Norm indicated that they are in the process of developing the translation
	5. Where do we go relative to evaluating operational losses? The participants agreed that there may be the need for new methods to assess operational losses that incorporate the results of the ongoing pilot project. These methods could include technical testing and evaluation of operational loss models and methodologies, or other alternative habitat evaluation models. Before the losses can be evaluated, the participants identified several issues that must be addressed