

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: FINAL minutes for the 20 November 2013 FPOM Avian Task Group meeting.

The meeting was in the north meeting room at JDA navlock. In attendance:

Last	First	Agency	Office/Mobile	Email
Cordie	Bob	NWP-TDA	541-506-7800	Robert.p.cordie@usace.army.mil
Fone	Ken	USACE-NWW	509-527-7140	Kenneth.r.fone@usace.army.mil
Fredricks	Gary	NOAA	503-231-6855	Gary.fredricks@noaa.gov
Halter	Mike	NWW		
Lorz	Tom	CRITFC	503-238-3574	lorz@critfc.org
Mackey	Tammy	USACE-NWP	503-961-5733	Tammy.m.mackey@usace.army.mil
Madson	Trish	NWP-FFU		
Melanson	George	NWW-LGS		
Setter	Ann	USACE-NWW	509-527-7125	Ann.L.Setter@usace.army.mil
Trachtenbarg	Dave	USACE-NWW		David.A.Trachtenbarg@usace.army.mil
Zyndol	Miro	NWP-JDA	541-506-7860	Miroslaw.a.zyndol@usace.army.mil

1. Finalized results from this meeting.

- 1.1. All documents may be found at [http://www.nwd-
wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Task%20Groups/Task%20Group%20Avian%20
Hazing/](http://www.nwd-
wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Task%20Groups/Task%20Group%20Avian%20
Hazing/)
- 1.2. Need a spreadsheet that is accessible to both Districts and the Projects for regular updating.
- 1.3. Each Project will put together a write-up discussing what triggers (by species) might lead to additional hazing actions. This would be due by the 22 January FPP meeting.
- 1.4. Each Project will put together a write-up describing total costs for monitoring, reporting, and hazing activities.
- 1.5. Each Project will put together a write-up addressing the available tools they have in their monitoring and hazing tool box. This should include existing tools and tools they wish they had.
- 1.6. Information about other technologies will be looked at. Presentations by vendors may be scheduled in the future.

2. Discuss any Relevant 2014 BiOp Changes that may be relevant to mandate additional actions. If no changes, discuss existing language so everyone understands what/where any additional compliance can or may be requested.

Fredricks said the intent of the BiOp is to have effective monitoring and hazing at each Project. He said the monitoring doesn't need to be as extensive as what he has seen at some locations. He would keep it to three species: cormorants, terns and gulls (ring bill and California) and only for the out-migration of salmon, not the out-migration of shad. He would like to see this as an early warning system and a plan of action that would be implemented based on the monitoring results. Pelicans are still protected in the state of Washington so observations may be good but it won't help us much. Madson suggested that if you are out there counting birds, then you may as well count all the birds there. If you need the data later, it won't be there if you didn't collect it.

Fredricks would like to see the TG develop a Project by Project monitoring and action plan which would be included in the FPP.

Zyndol and Spurgeon said the problem isn't data collection; it's taking action. Fredricks said standardization means the species of birds and the time of year. Fredricks said he would like to see the flexibility to move hazers from one location to another. Spurgeon pointed out that there is an issue with moving hazers since each dam pays for their own hazers. Fredricks said those are the issues we need to discuss and see if there are ways to work around the perceived obstacles.

Fredricks said he doesn't see a problem on the Snake River or at BON. He recognizes the issues with getting a contract out in a short time frame. He suggested maybe the easiest route would be to equip some USACE folks so they could haze. Several biologists agreed with that approach but neither NWW nor NWP district leadership has approved such action.

Fredricks said he doesn't see this as being solely an O&M issue. There may be habitat actions the Region could take. He also said it may be more practical to look action at the colony and not just at the dam.

Setter brought up whether or not USDA is the best option for hazing. She noted there are limitations with government contracts.

The 2013 has limited hazing information in it. The 2014 FPP will have hazing information for each project. Setter said the goal would be to have the hazing and monitoring details in the FPP and a standardized database each Project could enter data in and access data from. The forms would be kept on site and then merged when someone asks for the info or adding it once a month. Fredricks suggested looking at what TDA and JDA are doing with their weekly reports and using that as a model.

Project Bios asked about the boundaries for monitoring. Should it be the same boundaries as JSATS, BRZs, Project boundaries?

Setter said she hears from some that the current monitoring and reporting is acceptable but then others say they would like to use the data for additional purposes. Those additional purposes need to find the funds to maintain the database. Spurgeon added that it would also need to have a research label instead of an O&M label.

Setter noted that some Projects are monitoring as time allows and not consistently. That needs to be considered when discussing standardization. Fredricks asked how costs are tracked, or if they are. He said costs include more than time. He would like to see the monetary and time costs for each Project. This includes hazing, monitoring, and reporting.

Cordie said that cost tracking is important. He said he has been asked to look at trimming 10% from the fish budget and his preference is to trim hazing.

Cordie suggested standardization of the tool box is needed as well. NWW has techs doing some hazing and is pursuing lethal take and yet NWP is doing neither. How do we standardize the tools? Fredricks said NOAA could talk to upper management as well.

Using FFU as the processing group was mentioned more than once. Zyndol suggested sending them the weekly data and letting them process however they need to. Setter said she could look into the options for NWW for using FFU but personnel and financial constraints may limit the options.

3. Discuss for each project the level of support or lack of for the ongoing data standardization, database, and analysis request for O&M funding support.

	Data Standardization	Database Maintenance	Annual Analysis
BON			
TDA			
JDA			
MCN			
IHR			
LMN			
LGS			
LGR			

4. Review project handouts and provide assurance that top 3 actions are identified. Discussion on each of these handouts as needed.
5. Should we schedule another meeting or web meeting to pull together speakers using other methodologies, ie: airports (Port of Seattle, Port of Portland), and from vendors that have expressed interest?

Spurgeon would like to know more about the audio deterrents. Zyndol discussed the LRAD test conducted a number of years ago.