



September 14, 1999

TO: AFM Managers

FROM: Tony Nigro, Chair  for

SUBJECT: DRAFT AFM Action Notes for July 27-28, 1999

**Attendees:** **July 27:** In Person- Bob Foster (WDFW), Doug Taki (SBT), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Tony Nigro (ODFW), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), Mary Marvin (CBFWA), Lynn Hatcher (YIN), Brian Brown (NMFS), Si Whitman (NPT), Gary James (CTUIR), Rob Lothrop (CRITFC), Tom Flagg (NMFS) and by phone- Bert Bowler (IDFG), John Palensky (NMFS), Fred Olney (USFWS).

**July 28:** In Person- Bob Foster (WDFW), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Tony Nigro (ODFW), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), Doug Taki (SBT), Gary James (CTUIR), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Kathie Titzler (CBFWA), Tom Giese (CBFWA), Si Whitman (NPT), Lynn Hatcher (YIN) and by phone- John Palensky (NMFS), Fred Olney (USFWS), Rob Lothrop (CRITFC).

#### Proposed AGENDA

- ITEM 1: Approve June 17 Action Notes**
- ITEM 2: PATH Discussion**
- ITEM 3: Status of Ad hoc Committees**
- ITEM 4: FY99 Budget Issues**
- ITEM 5: Multi-Year Review**
- ITEM 6: Council Meetings (SRT) Summaries**
- ITEM 7: Project Specific Responses to ISRP Report**
- ITEM 8: Programmatic Responses to ISRP Report**
- ITEM 9: Strategic Planning Discussion for Helena Members Meeting**

**ITEM 1: June 17 AFM Draft Action Notes****Action:** APPROVED**ITEM 2: Discussion of PATH**

NMFS will be releasing their revised Biological Opinion (BiOp) on operations and configuration of the federal hydropower system in March 2000 and is reviewing whether the existing institutional framework will remain unchanged in the revised BiOp. As part of this review, NMFS is considering changes to the regional analytical approach presently used to evaluate management alternatives under the BiOp.

Discussions to date have established three tenets guiding changes to PATH:

- Analyses must incorporate newly listed ESUs
- Work must continue on experimental management in Lower Snake
- Funding must continue for experts presently working on analyses to ensure those analyses are completed and they are available for future work

Although there was agreement that the FY 2000 proposed projects should continue and be funded until March 2000, agreement was not reached on whether a funding commitment beyond March 2000 should be made now or at some time in the future.

Three alternatives were discussed:

- A) Fund existing projects at the proposed amount with an understanding that an extensive review of the PATH process will be completed within the first six months of the contracts. A collaborative team (to be established by CBFWA) will review the purposes of the projects and, if necessary, recommend changes to the budgets and scope of work. Make it explicit in the contracts that the budget and scope may be revised in March consistent with recommendations by the collaborative team.
- B) Fund the existing projects for the first six months only and provide a placeholder for the second half of the fiscal year so money would be available for new contracts in April. This approach is intended to acknowledge the ISRP's concerns about the projects and emphasize that fundamental changes to the projects are likely. These changes may constitute the need for new contracts. Some concern was raised as to the possibility of having a placeholder set aside without tying it to specific projects.

- C) The third alternative is to acknowledge that not all PATH projects may warrant the same level of regional commitment. The state and tribal contracts should be fully funded since they will definitely be around in the new process, but only fund consultants for six months.

**Action:** Continue funding for objectives in all PATH proposals for FY 2000 as they are presently described. Initiate a complete review of PATH to be the basis of a FY 2001 proposal and to guide necessary revisions to the FY 2000 project proposals.

The review will be conducted by a collaborative team established by AFM (including ODFW, WDFW, NMFS, Shoshone-Bannock Tribe, CRITFC, and possibly others) to be completed no later than the deadline for preparing FY 2001 proposals, or for preparing the March 2000 BiOp (whichever is earlier).

The motion was tabled until NMFS could consult with additional policy representatives. On August 4, NMFS submitted a letter stating "The NMFS does not object to the motion as described. Our lack of objection is based on the understanding that this alternative to our preferred approach (i.e., six month funding) will accomplish the same result within six months. Should this approach fail to lead to the necessary refinements by April 2000, NMFS will withdraw its support."

**ITEM 3: FY99 Budget Issues**

- A) NMFS Manchester lab requested \$132,250 to install a power generator system for use as backup power during the winter. Tom Flagg detailed the request.

**Action:** Forward recommendation to MSG that CBFWA advise the Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) to support Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) funding for the request. BPA should fund the request using FY 1999 funds. Staff to contact NPPC and notify.

- B) The YIN requested \$231,000 to initiate a project that was approved in FY 1998 but never implemented. This project is to train hatchery employees and was not needed in FY 1998 due to sequencing issues in the construction of the hatchery. The request is to use FY99 funds that were carried forward from FY 1998.

**Action:** Forward recommendation to MSG that CBFWA advise the Council to support BPA funding for the request. BPA should fund the request using FY 1999 funds.

- C) A project sponsored by WDFW in FY 2000, Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program, Project Number 20020, needs a peer review of its master plan before it can be funded. The master plan development was funded through the Snake River Compensation Plan, but no money was set aside for review of the plan. WDFW is requesting that funds be made available, not to exceed \$15,000, to support a review of their master plan.

**Action:** Forward recommendation to MSG that CBFWA advise the Council to support BPA funding for the request. BPA should use FY 1999 funds for a peer review of the Tucannon River Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program Master Plan not to exceed \$15,000.

- D) FYI: Be aware, the Hanford stranding study is being reviewed this fall and it appears that additional work in FY 2000 may be necessary to satisfy the needs for a long term operations agreement with the hydroelectric operators and fisheries managers. No proposal was submitted for this work, but additional funding may be necessary.

- E) ODFW requested \$24,693 in FY 1999 funds to complete the Willamette Oxygen Supplementation Project. This would also free up funds reserved for this project in FY 2000. This will be the final year of the project.

**Action:** Forward recommendation to MSG that CBFWA advise the Council to support BPA funding for the request. BPA should fund the request using FY 1999 funds.

#### **ITEM 4: Strategic Planning Concept Paper**

The strategic planning concept paper was briefly reviewed and discussed. Questions were raised about the purpose of the paper, who initiated the document, and what eventual outcome would be realized from it. This issue was presented as preparation for the strategic planning session scheduled for the Members meeting in Helena, Montana. Issues that may be discussed at that meeting include the role of CBFWA for the coming year and the role of CBFWA in the NPPC amendment process.

The conclusion from the discussion was that the draft concept paper is too narrow in scope for usefulness at a strategic planning meeting. All Members were encouraged to get comments to Jann Eckman to help frame the strategic planning discussion.

**Meeting Adjourned until 8:30 am, July 28, 1999**

## Meeting Reconvened at 8:30, July 28, 1999

### **ITEM 5: Status of Ad hoc Committees**

#### A) Budget Equity Work Group

The budget equity group met on July 23, 1999 and discussed concerns regarding the allocation of funds between the three caucuses. Three main issues arose during that meeting. First, the budget allocation should be simplified so that it is transparent as to why funds are allocated to each caucus. Second, we need to pursue unspent funds under the current MOA. Finally, discussion needs to begin regarding needs by caucus following the current MOA.

For FY 2001, the budgets need to be provided to each caucus early to minimize uncertainty during the review process about the amount of funds available for projects. The mechanism for allocating among caucuses should be simple, clear and fair. And the mechanism should result in an allocation that is close to that of previous years.

#### B) MOA Work Group

The MOA work group met with BPA on July 15, 1999. A delegation of fish and wildlife managers discussed their concerns with the implementation of the MOA, as summarized in the CBFWA "Report Card". Presentation of this report card will be made at the Members meeting in Helena.

#### C) Analyst Position Review

The Budget Equity Group also discussed the Technical Analyst positions and how CBFWA and the managers currently use them. Most of the specific issues that precipitated this discussion are currently being resolved through the development of the responses to the ISRP report. Other issues will be discussed at future meetings of the Budget Equity Group.

#### D) Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

The RME Group has met on several occasions and is developing clear objectives regarding RME needs in the Direct Program. There has been a common vision among all participants, which has simplified and strengthened the process.

- There are no direct disagreements with Gustavo's plan but that plan is definitely too general.

- The purpose for the plan is to allow the managers to make good decisions, using adaptive management and learning, and to make cost-effective choices.
- There are 3 levels of RME interest: project level, umbrella needs, and program needs.

Many documents exist that can be used to construct a regional RME plan. The Wildlife Caucus has a plan. The Anadromous Fish Caucus has produced several documents that can be considered resources for an RME plan, as has the Resident Fish Caucus. These documents will be heavily drawn upon to construct a comprehensive RME plan.

The schedule to develop the plan is as follows:

- send information out to SRTs by October
- incorporate information into 2001 proposals
- feedback to committee from project sponsors
- second draft complete by late January to use for 2001 project reviews

#### **ITEM 8: Programmatic Issues**

The project specific responses are near completion. The fish and wildlife managers still need to respond to the Programmatic Issues raised in the first version of the NPPC rolling draft decision document (D3). In the response, it must be emphasized that the ISRP review is only one part of the project review process. The general format was determined to be:

1. **Preface:** in responding to the ISRP comments, emphasize that the ISRP is one of several players with roles in the review process. Note that the fish and wildlife managers response to programmatic issues has been developed in this context.
2. **General Impressions of the ISRP Report:** Highlight where the ISRP review has informed and helped the fish and wildlife managers with finalizing their recommendations. Where critical to funding decisions, point out where the ISRP made mistakes, was misinformed, or reached erroneous conclusions. Raise concerns about sequencing of the ISRP review.
3. **Programmatic Issues:** Describe fish and wildlife managers' responses to specific issues the NPPC has identified in the D3. Each issue will be broken into three sections: Issue, NPPC Comment, and CBFWA Response. Tom Iverson will identify the Issue and the NPPC Comment from the D3 and Members will provide a response. A total of 14 issues

were identified in the D3 document and volunteers were sought for each section. Responses will be provided to Tom Iverson no later than close of business on Tuesday, August 3.

Tom Iverson was asked to contact the NPPC and request a courtesy copy of the most recent version of the outstanding issues document (D3).

**ITEM 10: Base Budget Issues**

Tom Giese provided a summary of the current status of the FY 2000 budget. No formal response has been received from BPA or the Council regarding the assumptions made in the April 16 version of the DAIWP. Also, since we know there is flexibility in the capital construction projects, the budget effectively remains balanced. Tom Giese will develop wording for the DAIWP that strengthens our argument supporting the existing budget.

**ITEM 11: Multi-Year Funding**

A workgroup was assigned to develop a response for the programmatic issues and to address the issue for the longer term. The criteria exists, there just wasn't time during the FY 2000 process to fully evaluate all projects using the criteria. Everyone agreed that a more aggressive attempt should be made during the FY 2001 process, however, that effort has to be comprehensive and fair to every project. No single project should be given multi-year review approval unless all projects that potentially qualify are provided the same opportunity.

**ITEM 12: NPPC Regional Meetings**

Several of the managers discussed their interactions with the NPPC at the regional meetings. Gary James provided a list of questions he asked the Council at his meeting. He is concerned that the Council really didn't have an answer to several of his questions. It was not clear how the Council intended to use the information gathered at these meetings to address FY 2000 funding decisions.

**ITEM 13: Next AFM Meeting**

The next AFM meeting will be at the CBFWA offices on August 24, from 9 a.m. until 4 p.m. Since Tony Nigro will not be available, Si Whitman will chair the meeting.

Possible agenda items include:

1. Discussion of the FY 2001 project selection process
2. Election of a new AFM Chair