



June 26, 2000

TO: Anadromous Fish Committee (AFC)

FROM: Tom Iverson, Anadromous Fish Analyst

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for June 21, 2000, AFC Meeting in Portland.
If there are no objections within five days, these actions will be considered approved.

Attendees: Ron Boyce (ODFW), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Lynn Hatcher (YIN), Paul Kucera (NPT), Phil Roger (CRITFC), and Tom Iverson (CBFWA).

By Phone: Doug Taki (SBT) and Patty O'Toole (CTWSRO).

Time Allocation:

CBFWA Members Coordination Contract*

<i>Objective 1. FY 2001 Project Renewal Process</i>	75%
<i>Objective 2. Rolling Province Review</i>	10%
<i>Objective 3. FY 2000 Project Adjustments</i>	5%
<i>Objective 4. Watershed and Subbasin Assessment and Plan</i>	10%
<i>Objective 5. Coordinate Program Amendments</i>	

* Not all AFC agenda items support the objectives identified in the coordination contract.

ITEM 1: Discuss Possible Changes to Today's Agenda

Neither the chair nor the vice-chair was able to attend the meeting. The group decided to have Tom Iverson lead the meeting. A new agenda item 5 was added to address within year budget modification requests. Support information for this topic was sent out on June 19, 2000.

ACTION: A new agenda item 5 was added and the agenda was approved.

ITEM 2: Subbasin Assessment Template (SAT)

Tom Iverson summarized the development of the SAT and reminded the group that comments are due by June 23, 2000. The intent is to combine CBFWA comments into a final draft. A letter supporting the concept of the SAT will be forwarded through MMG to NWPPC. This began as a

CBFWA product and it should be officially transferred as such to the NWPPC.

Phil Roger expressed concern that the Subbasin Assessment Oversight Team did not meet the charges in the original charter that established the group. He was disappointed that opportunity was not provided to review the primary information that was recommended by the drafters (EDT rules and results, CRI rules and results, etc.). He identified several major failings of the group. First, there was not adequate coordination between various tools to identify the potential for contrasting and complimentary interaction between tools nor was their coordination between fish and wildlife applications for analysis. The template does not identify specific data needs for the various tools that it recommends or provide a critical review of those tools (pluses and minuses of each). Finally, there is not a good description or comparison of the various tools that are recommended for use within the template.

Phil's conclusion was that as an outline, the current product is good (structure and recommended approach to assessment). It does not provide direction on how to actually fill in the template and develop useful, applicable results.

The group generally agreed that the SAT provides a good outline and strategy to developing a scientific foundation for subbasin planning; but the application of the SAT should allow for adequate modifications and iterations. Every subbasin is unique and one form cannot be developed that addresses all of the specific needs within all of them.

Comments should be provided on the SAT by June 23, 2000.

ITEM 3: Ongoing Project Renewal Process

All Sub-Regional Teams (SRTs) have met and reviewed the FY 2001 ongoing project proposals. The SRT comments were out for review prior to this meeting. The NPT and WDFW provided written comments prior to this meeting. The AFC reviewed all the SRT comments that related to projects that had new tasks and objectives identified. Also, PATH related projects were critically reviewed to be consistent with regional actions taken in the past year. Projects that were funded without regional support in FY 2000 were also emphasized in the AFC review.

A major concern was that many of the new objectives and tasks are supported by AFC, but no technical review opportunity exists for these projects. When and how that technical review can be completed will most likely be determined by MMG or NWPPC, depending on the final start of year budget determination.

ACTION: The SRT comments and recommendations will be forwarded to MMG for inclusion in the FY 2001 Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan. Tom Iverson will provide the most recent version of the comments with these action notes (see attached).

ITEM 4: FYI Issues

Tom Iverson presented updates on various issues that have been sent in to CBFWA over the last month.

1. There is a Fish Passage Short Course for watershed restoration planners and watershed councils on June 28-29 in La Grande Oregon.
2. On June 12 CBFWA, under Lionel Boyer's signature, forwarded a request to NWPPC to be active participants in the development of the next Fish and Wildlife Program.
3. The Gorge and Inter-Mountain Province Reviews are moving forward. The subbasin summaries will be completed on June 30. On July 10, BPA is scheduled to solicit new and ongoing proposals for projects within those two provinces. The announcement for the start of the Mountain Columbia province was mailed this week. The first meeting will be on July 25-26 in Kalispell, Montana.

ITEM 5: Budget Modification Requests

The first request is from Phil Roger for an additional \$7,930 for Project Number 9703500 (Watershed Evaluation and Habitat Response to Recent Storms). This project was funded in FY 1999 and scheduled to be completed in that fiscal year. Therefore, no funding was approved for FY 2000. Unforeseen problems have required additional time (contract extension) and funding. Since this delay will carry the project into FY 2000, CBFWA and NWPPC approval to establish a FY 2000 project placeholder is required. This funding will allow the project to complete its activities and end.

ACTION: The AFC will forward a letter to MMG requesting that \$7,930 be used from the anadromous fish placeholder to fund this request.

The second request is from Roy Beatty, CRITFC for an expansion of scope and additional FY 2001 funding for Project Number 200001700 (Recondition Wild Steelhead Kelts). This project is for FY 2001, but no technical review process is available to approve the expansion of this project. The request is for the AFC to perform a technical review prior to forwarding the FY 2001 recommendation to NWPPC.

ACTION: FPAC will review the proposal at their next meeting and comments will be provided to Tom Iverson prior to June 30. The AFC will forward a letter

to MMG requesting that this project be fully funded in FY 2001 upon the completion of this technical review.

ITEM 6: Next Meeting

After review of schedules for July, the meeting was changed to July 14. The change is tentative until a poll of the AFC members determines which date will provide maximum attendance.

h:\work\afc\2000_0621\ActionNotes.doc