



September 29, 1999

TO: Anadromous Fish Managers

FROM: Tony Nigro, Outgoing Chair
Gary James, Incoming Chair

 for

SUBJECT: DRAFT Action Notes from 9/21/99 AFM Meeting

Attendance: In Person: Tony Nigro (ODFW), John Palensky (NMFS), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Michele DeHart (FPC), Tom Iverson, Mary Marvin, Hugh Morrison, and Neil Ward (CBFWA).

On the Phone: Gary James (CTUIR), Patty O'Toole (CTWSRO), Fred Olney (USFWS), Bob Foster (WDFW).

Tony Nigro chaired the meeting for the first three agenda items, then had to leave. He turned the gavel over to Gary James, who chaired the meeting for the remaining agenda items, four through eight.

ITEM 1. Election of a New AFM Chair

Action: Because Tony Nigro was unable to stay for the entire meeting, he suggested that Item 7, Election of new AFM chair, be moved to the first item of discussion. Gary James was nominated as chair, with John Palensky as vice-chair. The nominations were seconded and the nominees were given an opportunity to decline. Each accepted his nomination.

ITEM 2. New Agenda Item

Discussion: John Palensky requested and was granted time on the agenda to report on the Subbasin Planning ad hoc Work Group meeting held on 9/20/99 to review the budget. Jenene Ratassepp, John Palensky, Gary James, Michelle Beucler, Hugh Morrison, Tom Iverson, Tom Giese, and Brian Allee attended the meeting. At that meeting, Jenene described an exercise WDFW completed that estimated the cost for fish and wildlife subbasin planning in the State of Washington as \$1.6 million per year for three years. This was equal to the average annual cost CBFWA staff estimated for the entire region (all four states) and was significantly more than the \$820,000 budget included in CBFWA's FY 2000

proposal. CBFWA staff recommended that CBFWA's FY 2000 efforts and the \$820,000 budget be focused on developing plans for five subbasins as pilot projects. They proposed that in the following three years (2001-2003) plans be developed for 16 basins per year. The annual budget in years 2001-2003 would be \$1.83 million.

Questions were raised by AFM members about the intended purpose and use of subbasin plans and the need to clarify those points before making decisions about how much money should be invested in subbasin planning. It was acknowledged that CBFWA needs to discuss these issues with the Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) before a recommendation can be made to the Members on what is needed to complete a comprehensive set of subbasin plans. This conversation should include Peter Bisson, who the Council appointed to work with the CBFWA on subbasin planning.

In addition to the need for defining the intended purpose and use of subbasin plans, AFM members made several points about subbasin planning. First, CBFWA should take a lead role in the development of subbasin plans. These plans should be tools that will be used to assist and guide decision making. Second, planning efforts should build on the considerable information available in previous studies and plans. Third, although past planning efforts have described desired outcomes and intended actions, the likelihood of success given those actions has not been quantitatively assessed. Finally, planning efforts should start out simple and balance planning with implementation.

Action: The AFM will send one to three representatives to meet with the Council, Peter Bisson, and the ISRP to discuss the intended purpose and use of subbasin plans and the content and level of detail needed. The results of those discussions will be presented to the Subbasin Planning ad hoc Work Group for use in developing recommendations to the Members at their October meeting.

ITEM 3. Pine Creek Acquisition

Discussion: The price of the Pine Creek property has gone up from \$2.6 million to \$5 million. BPA has raised questions about whether to proceed with the acquisition given the escalated cost. Patty O'Toole suggested that discussion of this item be deferred because it is unclear at this time what AFM action may be requested.

Action: AFM asked Patty O'Toole to track this issue and alert the AFM chair if action is needed before the October meeting.

ITEM 4. Approve July 27-28 Action Notes

Discussion: Tom Iverson reviewed and summarized the contents of the action notes.

Action: A motion was put forth to approve the action notes as written. It was seconded with no objections.

ITEM 5. FPAC Presentation on Smolt Monitoring Program

Discussion: FPAC had two requests of the AFM today. The first dealt with a contract for the Comparative Survival Study (CSS) Oversight Committee (Committee). The Committee reviews CSS analysis and makes decisions regarding study implementation. FPAC is requesting that the AFM consider the possibility of establishing an ISAB-type contract to fund the Committee. Due to a shortage of time, the Oversight Committee was left without a funding vehicle, although the money is being held by BPA. If an ISAB-type template is approved by AFM, Michele DeHart would work with BPA, PSMFC, and Brian Allee to put the contract together. There is currently \$28,000 available. Additional funding has not been requested, nor is it needed. Five persons have been assigned duties for the committee.

The second request was for AFM approval of a review of the Smolt Monitoring Program (SMP). FPAC would form a subcommittee to carry out the review and to develop a new design for the SMP for the year 2001. Major changes in the Smolt Monitoring Program based on what agencies and tribes need for management could result from this FPAC review. Michele stated that FPAC would submit a design to the AFM for their approval.

The third item discussed was informational. Brian Allee has asked for FPAC's review of comments submitted to the NPPC by PSMFC regarding the SMP, CSS and regional databases. PSMFC submitted comments outside of the CBFWA process and staff is unsure how those comments relate to the comments submitted by FPAC. FPAC is conducting the review per Brian's request. PSMFCs' administrative role versus management role was discussed.

Action: A motion was made for the AFM to recommend CBFWF develop an ISAB-type contract for the Committee. The motion was moved and seconded with no objections.

Action: The AFM gave informal approval for FPAC to continue developing their proposed alternatives for the Smolt Monitoring Program. Gary will discuss this issue with Phil Roger.

ITEM 6. FY 2000 Project Selection Process

Discussion: Tom Iverson put together a table of projects and their status and handed it out (emailed to all AFM members). Tom cautioned that the Council has not verified this table. The table that was in Version 3 of the Council's rolling issue document, but not in Version 4, was not available through the Council. Tom went through the table summarizing the Council actions for each category and highlighted projects that have special issues.

For Category 3, 4, and 5, projects will be reviewed a second time by the ISRP. The project sponsors in those categories can provide additional information to the ISRP by October 1. Each ISRP member was mailed a copy of the DAIWP, and the Council will forward all the information they have received from project sponsors to the ISRP. Tom urged all project sponsors to send tables, maps, summaries of other planning documents, the most recent review of the project's plans and efforts, and any other supporting information to the ISRP by October 1. The ISRP will provide the Council with another status table (Fund, Do Not Fund) and the Council will categorize the projects by November 2, at which time they will make a decision on funding. Project sponsors will have an opportunity to address the Council if their project is rated as Do Not Fund a second time by the ISRP. The Council will hold an extra meeting on November 16-17 to make recommendations on projects that did not complete Council policy review prior to November 2.

ITEM 7. Future Form of the Fish and Wildlife Program

Discussion: Although the Council has put together Version 3 and Version 4 of the rolling issue document, they have not invested much effort in the Desired End State, nor has there been a plan formulated for Provincial Reviews by either the Council or the ISRP. General ideas are floating around, but no solid plans or suggestions have been identified yet.

Tom Iverson presented below his idea of what a Provincial Review could look like. This proposal in no way reflects the wishes or desires of the co-managers and is provided merely as a foundation to begin a meaningful discussion.

Week 1:

1. A two or three day seminar consisting of presentations by the co-managers summarizing the subbasin management plans from the Province and project sponsors presenting overviews of their proposals. Representatives of the NPPC, ISRP, BPA, CBFWA subbasin teams and the general public would attend this seminar. This would provide context for the prioritization of projects in the Province and feedback to the co-managers.
2. Site visits would be available for closer inspection of the projects.
3. All supporting documentation would be provided to the ISRP for their review.

Week 2-5:

1. The ISRP would do a technical review of all proposed projects to determine if they will meet their stated goals and objectives. This review will focus on the specific methods proposed by the sponsors and the ability of the methods to achieve the stated objectives.
2. The ISRP might also review the subbasin plans to provide their perception of whether the goals and objectives within a subbasin will meet the goals and objectives of the Province.

3. The ISRP would provide a report to Council providing technical evaluations of the proposals (possibly with edited versions of the proposals) and a more general review of the Provincial goals and objectives.

Week 6-9:

1. The CBFWA co-managers would review the project proposals and subbasin plans in the context of the ISRP report.
2. The co-managers would update the subbasin plans and develop a priority list of projects to be funded for each subbasin, tied to a three year balanced budget. This package would have CBFWA consensus approval.
3. The managers would then present the subbasin plans, project lists and budgets to the Council.

Week 10-12:

1. The Council would review the subbasin plans, the attached project proposals and the three-year budget.
2. The Council would make adjustments according to policy and political needs.
3. The approved subbasin plans, proposals, and budget would then be adopted by the Council and become part of the Fish and Wildlife Plan.

Tom Iverson suggested this proposal would address several of the concerns of the Managers regarding ISRP first, ISRP doing technical “peer” reviews, ISRP performing site visits, multi-year funding, co-managers setting management priorities. He believed the proposal should address the concerns of the Council by allowing ISRP review of the subbasin plans and little or no action on project specific issues. The ISRP should appreciate that each project would then be specifically tied to a need stated in the subbasin plans and could perform a site review to boost their knowledge of each Province.

Tom Iverson suggested that the key to success of this or any program is that managers will have to use the subbasin plans and document their accomplishments. He pointed out that the managers should engage early and often with the Council in the next several months while the future Fish and Wildlife Program is being created.

Tom Iverson emphasized that the managers need to provide the Council with an ordered list of the provinces to be reviewed. He has heard that the first three would be Umatilla, Clearwater, and Yakama. He pointed out that resident fish above Hells Canyon and the upper provinces also need review and that it is important for the managers to set fish and wildlife priorities on ESA-related issues.

The Council staff has indicated that the next Fish and Wildlife Program will be a general set of program guidelines for key issues such as artificial production, habitat, RME, criteria for subbasin plans, and ESA integration. In addition, goals, objectives, and needs for each of the nine provinces will be established

using EDT and the Framework process. They wish to keep the program more general than specific. This program could be amended as subbasin plans are completed and adopted into the Program. At the end of three years, development of a complete program would be complete.

AFM members voiced concern about budget confusion in the initial program set-up phase. It was pointed out that with provincial reviews being completed every four months, the budget may be out of control for a time. It was suggested that it might be preferable to do three Provincial reviews in late winter simultaneously, then do a year-end budget. A point was made that when the program is completely set, the budget could be reviewed annually, and changes made only to add new goals and review the appropriateness of the standing projects.

Action: Tom Iverson will distribute a list of Eco-Provinces (and subbasins contained within each) developed by Council for Framework process to the AFM.

CBFWA staff will be working with Council staff to determine which subbasins will be aggregated to form Provinces. The most current list will be provided at the next AFM meeting.

ITEM 8: Outcomes of the Strategic Planning Sessions

Discussion: Tom Iverson summarized key points as follows: The strategic planning sessions have provided some insight as to where the Managers want to go in the future with their planning efforts. There has been unanimous support for the development of subbasin plans, however, the size, use and funding for the subbasin plans has not been determined. The CBFWA staff, with help from selected members, are preparing a CBFWA vision statement, subbasin planning template, and other supporting materials for use at the October Principals meeting. This material will be sent out to the Caucuses September 24th for edit and review. On October 8th the final version of the documents will be sent out as briefing material for the Principals meeting on October 25.

Tom Iverson noted that a meeting will occur between the principals to discuss the Desired End State. Items to be discussed may include:

- Subbasin Planning commitment level (Direct Program only, Comprehensive Plans for multitude of funding sources or somewhere in between?)
- Vision of future Direct Program
- Presentation of possible process and schedules
- A concise decision on Province priorities
- Contributions to the Amendment Process
- Discuss how these subbasin plans could set the groundwork for the next MOA

ITEM 9: Next AFM Meeting and Possible Agenda Items

October 19, 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM
CBFWA offices in Portland, OR

Possible agenda items include:

1. Pine Creek Acquisition
2. Regional Data Base Description by FPC
3. FY 2000 Council Decisions
4. Review of Version 5 of Desired End State (if released)
5. Review of Collaborative Analytical Team (CAT) Developments
6. Preparation for Principals Meeting