



December 14, 1999

TO: Anadromous Fish Managers

FROM: Gary James, Chair

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes - November 17, 1999 AFM Meeting

Attendance: Gary James (CTUIR), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Michele DeHart (FPC), Ron Boyce and Bruce Schmidt (ODFW), Doug Taki (SBT), Bob Foster and Dick O'Conner (WDFW), Travis Coley (USFWS), John Palensky (NMFS), Lynn Hatcher (YIN), Si Whitman (NPT), Tom Iverson, Tom Giese, Frank Young, Neil Ward, and Mary Marvin (CBFWA).

On the Phone: Chris Fisher (MDFW&P), Bert Bowler (IDFG).

ITEM 1. Discuss Possible Changes to Today's Agenda

Discussion: Additions from the last MSG meeting fell under Item 6 (discussing new/innovative criteria), Item 9 (discussing the Charter and reviewing the Members meeting agenda), and Item 8 (discussing the NWPPC's amendment process). A new item was also added: FPAC Chair nomination. Approval of the last meeting's action notes became Item 4.

ITEM 2. Discuss Fish Passage Center's Regional Database Memo

Discussion: On October 13, 1999 Michele DeHart (FPC) sent a memo to Brian Allee and the AFM regarding regional database technology. The AFM reviewed this memo at the last AFM meeting and suggested that each of the member's StreamNet representatives should review the memo and return today to discuss it. Several of the members indicated that they would instruct their StreamNet representatives to send responses to the memo directly to Michele. She explained that this was not an initiative that she was spearheading, it was a review of regional databases for the AFM to consider since the ISRP has indicated that a review of the data management projects would occur early next year.

The response from the StreamNet representatives present at the meeting was that the memo was a useful document to begin the discussion, but the issue is much broader than managing a regional database. This outlook is a symptom of a greater problem, as there is no current connection from

AFM to StreamNet. It was proposed that maybe we should use the amendment process to define the regional data needs and a new process for identifying and compiling them. It was suggested that once the Framework is established, it will identify a need for information/data, which StreamNet or some other regional database can provide.

It was unclear where the conversation should go from here. The AFM first needs to outline the future needs of the Program then develop a process for collecting and analyzing the information. Phil Roger suggested that the first step might be in the RM&E workgroup. The workgroup has been working on how to define data needs within the direct program. They will scope out anticipated needs and bring back a recommendation to the AFM.

Action: Phil will bring a draft report from the RM&E group to the next AFM meeting which will address some of the data needs. He will speak with Council staff regarding how to accomplish collaborative reviews and identify which Council staff would be willing to work with on this topic. We will continue this discussion at the next AFM meeting.

ITEM 3. FPAC Chair

Discussion: It is time to elect a new chair for FPAC. The Charter states that the chair rotates through the members, but there is a conflict of interest for several FPAC participants when a System Operations Request (SOR) needs to be signed. The only entities that do not have this conflict are USFWS, ODFW, and WDFW. Steve Pettit of IDFG stated that he would be willing to continue taking notes, and FPC will continue to do the "leg work" of setting up conference calls, etc. It was agreed that a shared chair between the three non-conflicted entities was acceptable.

ITEM 4. Approve October 19 Action Notes

Discussion: The action notes were reviewed and Tom Iverson provided the following updates.

- Regarding funding for the adult gas bubble trauma project, the Council staff received the letter from AFM addressing the known concerns with this project. Staff indicated that they still do not believe that this project should be funded and will not be recommending funding to the full Council.
- BPA received the letter from AFM concerning the Ives Island contract with Harza. BPA agreed to work more collaboratively on the Ives Island issue, and agreed to stop paying, especially now that the project has been completed. FPAC reviewed HARZA's statement of work and determined the work was redundant.

- The Collaborative Analytical Team (CAT) met last Thursday and a conference call is set up for tomorrow morning.
- The ISRP approved all Basin lamprey projects except for the ongoing Umatilla project. The Umatilla Tribe's project will be funded once review of a restoration plan has been reviewed and approved by the Council.

Action: The action notes were approved.

ITEM 5. Quarterly Review Issues

Tom Iverson distributed information on the budget resulting from the last BPA quarterly review and the Council's FY 2000 start of year budget. Currently, the Yakama's Teanaway project is the only project in line for any unallocated anadromous fish placeholder funds for FY 2000.

- Discussion:**
- 1) Hanford Reach Fall Chinook: A request for additional FY 2000 funding has been received from Paul Wagner (WDFW). Additional funding is needed for an increased level of field sampling as recommended by the technical and policy oversight committees. The cost share is 50% with the PUDs. The managers agreed that the funding should be provided for this project when it becomes available in the anadromous fish placeholder.
 - 2) Irrigation Diversion Consolidation & Water Conservation: During the project review process, this budget was reduced by almost \$500,000 and it is unknown how or why, although Tom Iverson believes it to be an error. CBFWA endorsed the project for \$293,000. The difference between the \$293,000 and the amount that CBFWA agreed to fund equals approximately the amount the program was funded for last year. Confusion may have been compounded by the fact that the same project number was used, yet this is a different project. The managers agreed that this project should be funded in full and receive the highest priority for funding within the anadromous fish placeholder.
 - 3) End of year project reconciliation: BPA has requested, and Tom Iverson urged closure of FY 1999 contracts when tasks have been completed and there are monies left unspent. This will allow unused funds to be returned to the anadromous placeholder and increase the amount of on-the-ground work accomplished in FY 2000.

Action: The AFM agreed to prioritize the projects as follows, to be funded as money becomes available from the placeholder:
 High Priority - Irrigation Diversion
 Second Priority - Hanford Reach Steelhead
 Third Priority - Teanaway Project

This will be distributed as a consent mail to the Members.

ITEM 6. FY 2000 Project Selection Process

Discussion: Tom Iverson updated the group on the current FY 2000 Council decisions. All Tier 1 projects have been recommended for funding except approximately 21 “fund in part” and “do not fund” projects from the final ISRP review, seven PATH projects, and six projects being held for Council review. After these projects have been resolved, the remaining 42 ranked Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects will be addressed. One project in the current Council review list is the adult gas bubble trauma project that AFM supported at their last meeting. The AFM felt it was important that the Council formally respond to the letter CBFWA sent regarding the adult gas bubble trauma project and all other Tier 1 projects that do not receive funding.

Discussion occurred around the criteria for "new and innovative" projects. The criteria will be discussed further at the Council meeting on November 30. There have been no reports or updates on innovative research conducted in the past. The AFM would like to be part of the Council's decision-making process.

Action: Brian Allee will draft a letter to the Council requesting a formal response to CBFWA's recommendation for all the Tier 1 projects the Council determined not to fund. This letter will be brought to the next MSG meeting for Members approval.

ITEM 7. Update From the Inter-Caucus Subbasin Planning Group

Discussion: The work group concluded that CBFWA needs to develop the future project review process in collaboration with the Council. Based on the completeness of the existing subbasin summaries it was determined that three provinces could ready for review in FY 2000: the Gorge, the Intermountain, and the Columbia Plateau (which may be split into two provinces). Gary suggested a contractual lead could be assigned for each subbasin, as occurred 10 years ago during the previous subbasin planning effort.

Tom Iverson sent out a questionnaire to determine which tribes and agencies would be active in each subbasin and which manager would act as lead for each subbasin. This data is to be combined into a matrix table to help evaluate the level of effort necessary to complete subbasin planning. The desire is to fill in the table and bring the information to the next work group meeting on Friday, November 19, although it may not be possible to fill in all information at this point.

A Watershed Planning Meeting is set for December 9 and 10. The meeting is co-sponsored by CBFWA and the Council to assess who is currently doing watershed assessments and develop a template for watershed assessments and subbasin planning for the direct program.

Action: The managers agreed to fill in the table identifying participation in subbasin planning with as much information as possible.

ITEM 8. Discussion of the Upcoming Amendment Process

Discussion: Tom Giese distributed handouts (a memo sent to all Members on November 17, 1999) and presented details of the document, which dealt with the Council's amendment statutes and process. He suggested that the managers read the Power Act to determine the direction they wish to pursue during the amendment process. Tom Giese asked for a couple of volunteers for conference calls to discuss issues as they arise.

John Palensky and Tom Giese suggested re-writing the current Fish and Wildlife Program and submitting a complete program as the "Managers Amendment". The Council would then be required to respond to CBFWA recommendations in writing. Tom can do a draft, highlight the missing information, and distribute this to the AFM for their input. This issue will be brought up at the next Members meeting in December.

ITEM 9. Preparation for the December 1-2 Members Meeting

Discussion: No briefing packets are available for the Members meeting. The packets should be available soon. Tom Iverson briefly reviewed the agenda for the December 1-2 meeting. There was significant concern that the meeting should be reduced to a one-day meeting due to the lack of significant agenda items. Many of the items could probably be resolved using consent mail.

The sunset of the Charter will be discussed. There is a need for simple explanatory information regarding alternatives and what occurs if the Charter is allowed to sunset. Tom Giese will do a flow chart showing this information and provide it in the Members packet.

Tom Giese is also revising the FY 2000 CBFWA Scope of Work and helping to revise the budget. The key change is that the AIWP task will be changed to an "Initiate Subbasin Planning" task.

Action: Tom Iverson will present the AFM's concerns regarding the agenda for the Members Meeting to Brian Allee. These concerns include 1) can we reduce the meeting to one day, and 2) can we resolve any of these issues

through consent mail. A briefing packet will be distributed by Wednesday November 24, 1999.

ITEM 10. FY2000 Project Selection - Continued

Discussion: The ISRP ranked 42 Tier 2 and Tier 3 new and “innovative” projects. The Council is currently discussing funding \$2 million worth of those ranked projects. Of the top eight projects in this list, only three were originally considered “innovative” by the ISRP. There are only seven Tier 2 projects identified in the list of 42 which total approximately \$1.7 million. None of these Tier 2 projects were designated “innovative” by the ISRP. The outyear budgets for these seven projects total \$1.8 million in 2001, \$1.1 million in 2002, \$360 thousand in 2003 and \$380 thousand in 2004.

Since CBFWA already endorsed the Tier 2 projects, pending available funding, the AFM recommends that the Council fund these seven Tier 2 projects at the level CBFWA recommended in the FY 2000 DAIWP. This would total \$1.7 million out of the \$2 million being discussed for this category of projects. This recommendation needs to be forwarded to the full Membership for approval. Concern regarding outyear budgets and continuation of these projects should rely on verification of project need through subbasin planning.

The criteria used to determine which projects are "innovative" by the ISRP are unclear to the AFM. The AFM also recommends working with Council in the future to define the needs and criteria of an “innovative” category for project selection. A primary criterion for funding needs to be “management priority”.

Action: A letter will be forwarded for consent mail recommending that the Council fund the Tier 2 projects in the ISRP list of 42. Any remaining funds should not be spent on Tier 3 projects, but should be allocated to the BPA Anadromous Fish, Resident Fish and Wildlife Placeholders for each caucus to prioritize funding needs.

ITEM 11. Next AFM Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for December 21, 1999 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. at the CBFWA office in Portland.