



February 25, 2000

TO: Anadromous Fish Committee (AFC)

FROM: Gary James, Chair  for

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for February 16, 2000, AFC Meeting in Portland.
If there are no objections within five days, these actions will be considered approved.

Attendees: Ron Boyce and Nick Bouwes (ODFW), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Bob Foster (WDFW), Tom Iverson, Tom Giese, Neil Ward, Frank Young and Brian Allee (CBFWA).

By Phone: Gary James (CTUIR, Chair), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Fred Olney (USFWS), Doug Taki (SBT), Patty O'Toole (CTWSR), Chris Fisher (CCT) and John Palensky (NMFS).

ITEM 1: Discuss Possible Changes to Today's Agenda

Agenda Item 2 was delayed until the next AFC meeting. Agenda Item 3 was delayed until 11 am.

ACTION: Agenda was modified and approved.

ITEM 2: Warm Springs Tribe Funding Request

This item was delayed until the next meeting of the AFC.

ITEM 3: Report from the Collaborative Analytical Work Group

Nick reviewed the Draft Proposal of a Collaborative Analytical Process Involving Federal, State, and Tribal Fish and Wildlife Managers.

Comments were provided to Nick at the meeting and additional comments should be forwarded to him at nick.bouwes@state.or.us. The next step is to develop a statement of work and budget to establish a team that will support collaborative analytical work related to the protection and restoration of fish and wildlife populations in the Columbia River Basin. This effort should include resident fish and wildlife interests as well as non-ESA populations.

Several concerns were raised which merit further discussion. The group agreed to meet, following the meeting of the Members Management Group on Friday, February 18, to continue the discussion. It was agreed that resolution of differences and initiation of a Collaborative Analytical

Process (CAP) should be sought very quickly to provide input into the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC)'s decision on post PATH funding allocations.

ACTION: The CAP development team will continue to work on establishing the process. Additional discussions will occur on February 18 following the MMG conference call.

ITEM 4: Review Draft “Innovative Project Proposal Identification Criteria”

The group reviewed the innovative project proposal identification criteria developed by the Resident Fish Committee (RFC). Specific concerns included:

- 1) Criterion number two implies that these may be long term projects (as long as three years). Since these projects are supposed to address critical uncertainties consistent with the needs identified in subbasin planning, the funding should be limited to one or two years with three year funding as an exception.
- 2) Another concern is that no maximum funding level has been assigned for these projects. Again, these projects should be “pilot” type projects with low cost. They should also be fully funded so that outyear costs are resolved before research is initiated.
- 3) Criterion number three needs elaboration. It is not clear how this criteria would be applied nor what need the criteria is trying to address.
- 4) Monitoring and evaluation components should be required to measure the success of the project and its ability to address critical management needs. A project that addresses a critical path for a management decision may be given a higher priority.

ACTION: Additional comments will be provided to Neil Ward at CBFWA by Friday, February 18, 2000.

ITEM 5: Discuss CBFWA Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Phil reviewed A Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plan for Restoring Fish and Wildlife Resources in the Columbia River Basin. It was agreed that this was more of an outline or guideline for writing a research, monitoring and evaluation (RME) plan. An improved version of this plan will be distributed next week. The group felt that it was important to include the NWPPC in the continued development of this plan. Gustavo Bisbal (NWPPC) will be contacted.

Research was discussed as a "top down" activity because many research questions will involve replicating studies in several subbasins. Regional oversight is needed to insure the replicate studies are designed and conducted in a standard manner to get the best results. Also, as we approach a scientific framework based process, the region will need to review and analyze the results of the program to determine the benefits. A

regional analytical team will be needed to evaluate efforts and options as the program is implemented. Several approaches to addressing research needs were provided in the Appendices.

A difficulty with a monitoring program is determining the appropriate scale with which to monitor. Monitoring basically has three parts that can be applied at each spatial scale (project, subbasin, subregion, and region):

1. Implementation (Did the actions accomplish their objectives?)
2. Effectiveness (Did the actions have the desired effect on the environment?)
3. Validation (Did the populations' respond as expected?).

The subbasin teams will address these questions at the project and subbasin level, whereas, the region needs to establish who will address the questions at the subregional and regional level. It was suggested that a regional analytical team could be assembled to perform this function. Currently, the NWPPC has implied that this function will rest with the EDT process.

The evaluation part of the plan is inseparable from the other two elements. As research and monitoring is performed, evaluation should occur at all steps. This evaluation needs to be assigned to a group of individuals to insure that consistency and activity is maintained for the benefit of the program.

The initial efforts of an RME plan should be focused on evaluating the outcomes from subbasin planning and tying efforts to a province and regional level. A location needs to be identified for the plan with (a) specific individual(s) responsible for managing, writing and monitoring its implementation.

ACTION: Tom Iverson will contact Gustavo Bisbal and invite him to the next AFC to further discuss the RME plan.

ITEM 6: Update from the Ad Hoc Subbasin Planning Work Group (SPWG)
Tom Iverson presented a graphic titled “Concurrent Process – CBFWA Concepts.” This diagram helps to explain what activities will be accomplished during FY 2000 versus activities that reach out into the future. The general conclusion was that the Managers would be involved in a budget review for all ongoing projects for FY 2001. This review will be similar to last year with the exception that the technical review will be minimized and the efforts will focus on balancing the budget. Two or three provinces will undergo a province review by the NWPPC Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP). These projects will be subjected to intense technical scrutiny. Enhanced subbasin summaries from the FY 2000 DAIWP will be used as “umbrellas” for justifying the project recommendations for each subbasin.

The work group will continue to meet (with NWPPC staff present) and develop a process for the upcoming province reviews.

ITEM 7: Update from the Ad-Hoc Work Group on the Amendment Process
Tom G. provided a summary of the current products from the Amendment Advisory Committee (AAC). The suggested CBFWA program amendment recommendations will define the decision processes used for planning and implementation of the Fish and Wildlife Program, the standards, principles and policies that those decision processes will be based on, and finally summaries of the existing subbasin planning efforts to date.

ACTION: A draft letter was sent out for consent mail requesting a six-month extension for amendments to the Program.

The AAC will meet again on Friday February 18.

ITEM 8: Update on the Northwest Power Planning Council's (NWPPC) FY 2000 Decision Process
The NWPPC made additional decisions regarding FY 2000 projects at its February 2 meeting. The NWPPC finally decided to fund 11 of those projects that the ISRP identified as fulfilling an unimplemented area of the Council program and having systemwide significance. The 11 projects will be provided with \$200,000 upon completion of a proof of concept proposal for FY 2000. The proposals will be screened by the ISRP before being funded to insure continuity with the sponsors' original concepts. No additional funding will be provided in the future for these projects until a final report is provided for the first year of work. Next year the projects will be compete with all other projects. No funding will be provided for the remaining 31 projects.

The NWPPC convened a conference call on February 15 to discuss the Nez Perce Tribe (NPT) and Columbia River Inter Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) conservation enforcement projects. By unanimous vote the projects were supported for funding for FY 2000. The projects will have to provide reports at the end of the year to demonstrate the effectiveness of the projects.

Two projects remain outstanding for FY 2000. The CBFWA funding and the adult gas monitoring project will be addressed at the next NWPPC meeting in Portland on February 23.

ITEM 9: Next Meeting and Potential Agenda

The next meeting is scheduled for March 15, 2000 in Portland. The meeting date may be changed to coordinate with other meetings in Portland.

Potential agenda items include:

1. FY 2000 Funding Issues
 - a. Warm Springs Tribe funding request
 - b. NMFS Nutrient Study
2. Discuss RME report (invite Gustavo Bisbal)
3. Update on the Amendment Process
4. Update from the SPWG