



October 20, 1999

TO: Anadromous Fish Managers

FROM: Gary James, Chair  for

SUBJECT: Action Notes from October 19, 1999

Attendance: Trina Gerlack, Brian Allee, Tom Giese, Mary Marvin, and Tom Iverson (CBFWA), Ron Boyce (ODFW), Michele DeHart and Henry Franzoni (FPC), John Palensky and Mark Schneider (NMFS), Bob Foster (WDFW), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Travis Coley (USFWS), Gary James (CTUIR), Phil Roger (CRITFC)

On Phone: Keith Kutchins (SBT), Lynn Hatcher (YIN), Carter Stein (PSMFC)

Agenda: Several changes were made to the existing agenda. The action notes represent those changes and the additions suggested by participants.

ITEM 1. Fish Passage Center Response to ISRP Comments Regarding Regional Database

Discussion: Brian Allee requested a response to the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) comments on the Fish Passage Center (FPC) 2000 proposal to develop a recommendation on regional databases for the amendment process to the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) Fish and Wildlife Program regarding the Smolt Monitoring Program, Comparative Smolt Study, and regional databases. In the meeting, Michele DeHart and Henry Franzoni distributed a detailed memorandum, "Regional Database Technology – the Future." The response was developed through a series of steps. 1) Review all available documents. 2) Review the most current state of technology. 3) FPC developed a future concept for a regional database that meets the management needs or the needs of the agencies and tribes in the most cost effective way. Michele expressed the importance of a thought-out database process and knowing the purpose of the database before it is started.

Action: The Regional Database Technology document will be distributed to the StreamNet representatives. The AFM will review the document with

StreamNet representatives and bring comments back to the next meeting of the AFM. Michele and Henry will be available for questions.

ITEM 2. FYI Items

Discussion: Monitor Symptoms of Gas Bubble Trauma in Adult Salmonids
This project is the only one of its kind. It is supported by NMFS, CBFWA, and ISRP, but has been rejected by NWPPC staff. There is currently no focus on this type of adult monitoring, in either Oregon or Washington, state agencies tend to be neutral about the issue. A policy response should come from CBFWA. Brian suggested consideration of support from the ISAB/ISRP regarding a critical data gap in adults relative to reproduction.

Action: CBFWA will augment and finalize the letter submitted by Mark Schneider, and forward it to the Council by the end of this week. No MSG approval is needed for this action.

Discussion: Ives Island Issue
BPA apparently initiated a verbal contract with Harza for chum research. This contract did not follow the appropriate process, and initially, there was no Statement of Work. BPA claimed use of discretionary funds of \$20-30,000 to fund this contract. The stated purpose of this contract is to modify the Washington shore habitat, removing gravel to facilitate spawning. Michele DeHart and others reminded the group that this effort has already been tried at Vernita Bar in the past, at no little expense, with no success. The contractors have been requesting existing information from other agencies.

Action: Ron Boyce and Michele DeHart will draft a letter to Sarah McNary at BPA addressing key points (i.e., the collaboration process) this week. The letter will reiterate FPAC concerns and will include that data requests should be processed through FPAC. The letter will then go out as a consent mail before it is finalized and sent to BPA.

Discussion: Lamprey Status Report/Plan
The umbrella for ongoing projects is identified in Appendix F of the AIWP. The table was revised and sent out again to NWPPC with a cover letter from BPA.

Action: CBFWA staff will make minor formatting adjustments to the table and see that it is forwarded to the ISRP.

Discussion: Pine Creek Acquisition
According to Kelly Lillengreen, the matter is settled. The property has been purchased and no additional money came from BPA. However, the request was made for this item to be added to next month's AFM agenda.

Action: This item will be added to next month's AFM agenda.

Teanaway River Instream Flow Project

This project has been approved for funding and given high priority. If money is left over after the Council's final decision, the project will be funded. Information on the project will be provided at the December Council meeting.

Umatilla Hatchery Supplement (Pendleton Ponds)

The Nez Perce Tribe has offered to move money from one of their projects into a placeholder position for the Umatilla Hatchery.

Update of the Collaborative Analytical Team (CAT)

There has been no process meeting yet as it has been impossible to get all participants together. Because of the difficulty in assembling all personnel, the meeting may be arranged before 11/2 with whomever is available to attend. The Council will likely assign this issue to Gustavo Bisbal.

ITEM 3. Review and Approve September 21, 1999 Action Notes

Action: The minutes from the previous AFM meeting were approved.

ITEM 4. Discussion of Issues Related to the Future Fish and Wildlife Program

Discussion: Tom Giese distributed the draft Planning the Pilot Subbasins handout to the group, which they reviewed at the table. Brian suggested eliminating the word "guesstimate" and substituting "Identify Limiting Factors." The managers need to be fully reimbursed in order to encourage their best work. Justification for the additional FY2000 funding request is needed.

The Provincial Review process needs to be accelerated. Decisions need to be made regarding which province to review first, which ones will follow, and developing an interim budget. (The Council proposes reviewing the Columbia Gorge Province first.) Emphasis should be placed on coming back to each province to re-write the plan. Risks need to be identified and a management plan developed for them. Managers were encouraged to be realistic about what products will be provided at each step.

ITEM 5. Review of October 25, 1999 Principal's Meeting Support Information

Discussion: Jim Waldo will facilitate the meeting. It was observed that, in the early 1990's, the Council had a "from the bottom up" approach. This is now the preferred approach for the fish and wildlife managers, while the Council works "from the top down."

It is important that a good understanding of the process that has been followed should be made available and provided, clearly and powerfully,

to the policy leaders. Those responsible for making policy need to be primed to make decisions. Commitment is needed, and it is expected that the commitment will be recompensed. The fish and wildlife managers must decide on and define the goals, the commitment to those goals, then take the lead to see that these activities are accomplished.

It is also important to determine how to integrate Resident Fish and Wildlife in the plans, especially an allocation of funds for Wildlife. If there is no agreement on subbasin plans, funding is likely to be delayed or not provided. Areas of agreement should be capitalized on, and in areas where agreement has not occurred, the focus should be the goal of agreement.

The effort to include all entities in problem solving is felt to be unprecedented in the Basin, and the Managers are urged to manage change instead of resisting it, and take a leadership role in making change happen.

Action: The AFM agreed to present to the Members the need for letters from entities which detail and justify why not all the previously funded money for a project was not spent. An ad hoc group is needed to compile these documents by the first of December.

ITEM 6. Discussion of Issues Related to the Future Fish and Wildlife Program Revisited

Discussion: It has been decided that six new Tier 1 projects are not being funded. They have been identified Do Not Fund by the ISRP, but earmarked for funding by CBFWA. Five Tier 2 ongoing projects are also not being funded (one will be reviewed on 11/2, the John Day Riparian Fencing project). It was agreed that two law enforcement proposals could be reviewed and a recommendation made by 11/2.

ITEM 7. CRITFC Demonstration of Cohort Model

Discussion: Phil Roger demonstrated his computer population model.

ITEM 8. Next AFM Meeting