



March 20, 2000

TO: Members Management Group

FROM: Brian Allee

SUBJECT: Draft 3/1/00 MMG Action Notes

**MEMBERS MANAGEMENT GROUP
MEETING AND CONFERENCE CALL**

March 1, 2000

9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

CBFWA Office, Portland, OR

DRAFT ACTION NOTES

Attendees: Keith Underwood, STI; Ray Entz, KT; Bert Bowler, IDFG; Gary James, CTUIR; Bob Foster, WDFW; John Palensky, NMFS; Ira Jones, NPT; Janet Hohle, IDSS; Darin Saul, WSU; Brian Lipscomb, CSKT; Si Whitman, NPT; John Platt and Phil Roger, CRITFC; Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, Brian Allee, Jann Eckman, Frank Young and Kathie Titzler, CBFWA/F

By Phone: Kirk Truscott, CTCR; Sue Ireland, KTI; Dave Statler and Felix McGowan, NPT; Chad Colter, SBT; Brian Marotz, MDFWP; Theodora Strong, YIN; and Robert Matt, CdAT.

Discussion: Due to the fact that the CBFWA Charter material is not ready, agenda item 4, originally allocated to take an hour, will be a five minute status report.

ITEM 1: Nez Perce Fisheries Research & Habitat Project Modifications

(obj 3, 30%)

1) Lostine River Monitoring & Evaluation Project #9800702

- *Request for within-year change to the Statement of Work and budget to allow for the purchase and installation of a PIT tag monitoring system at the Lostine River Acclimation Facility. Action would require the use of 1999 Lostine M&E carry over funds in the amount of \$106,000 as a FY 2000 placeholder to cover costs.*

Discussion: Si Whitman summarized the request and said that BPA requires a consensus recommendation from CBFWA to the NWPPC before any action could be taken.

ACTION: MMG approved the request as identified in item 1 and directed CBFWA staff to submit the recommendation to the NWPPC.

2) Clearwater Focus Watershed Program

- *Request budget modification and amendment of FY 1999 and FY 2000 project and re-allocate funds for watershed assessment in the amount of \$391,000 as a no net budget increase.*

Discussion: Some concern was expressed about the change in the scope of work and budget, and how the changes affected the other projects' scopes of work. Ira Jones responded that the work on the other on-going projects has been scaled back. He said that this assessment provides the justification for those projects and needs to be completed before work can be continued. Ray Entz stated that although he supports the direction he feels the proposal is ill defined. Ray also stated that he has "process" concerns with this particular project.

ACTION: MMG approved the request with the following caveats:

- Ray Entz would not enter a formal objection to the motion but let the record reflect his concerns and reservations.
- The recommendation letter to the NWPPC would include the trade-off being made in each project that contributes money to this project.

ITEM 2: FY 2001 Rolling Review

(obj 2, 20%) - *Outline tasks, budget, contracting requirements and schedule, and discuss strategy to complete and deliver the product.*

Discussion: Brian Allee reviewed the task and budget material. He urged the MMG to review the NWPPC Rolling Review document because it specifically describes the requirements for subbasin/provincial reviews and participation rules. Tom Iverson presented the tentative provincial review schedule. The schedule is for two provinces for FY 2001 and CBFWA will be facilitating the meetings. He said that CBFWA and the NWPPC are working on developing a list of the subbasin team members. Frank Young went over the budget allocation material and asked the MMG to let him know by Friday, 3/3/00 whether they were going to do the work within their agency/tribe or use a consultant.

ACTION: MMG members that have not already responded will let Frank know by Friday, 3/3, whether they will be contracting the work within their agency/tribe or using a consultant. Kathie Titzler will make the appropriate modifications to the original contracts and statements of work.

ITEM 3: CBFWA Charter

Discussion: Jann gave a quick update. The materials that were to be distributed have not been completed. Once they are ready, Jann will forward the material to the Members using the consent mail process.

ITEM 4: Collaborative Analytical Process

(obj 2, 10%)

Discussion: Bert Bowler emphasized that NMFS has to be a “player” for this process to work, and expressed his concern with the timeline. John Palensky said he was convinced that the timeline was not going to be met. Ron Boyce recommended that these concerns be discussed with the NWPPC. Ray Entz stressed the importance that this be a “collaborative” regional integrated process.

ACTION: The CAP group will be meeting today after this meeting.

ITEM 5: Program Amendment Recommendations

(obj 5, 10%)

Discussion: Tom Giese provided the following update:

- the action notes from the Amendment Advisory Committee’s last meeting will be sent out this week.
- the AAC plans to send a final draft to the Members on 4/4.
- the AAC plans to meet again on 4/13 or 4/14, then send the amendment recommendations to the NWPPC.
- he is scheduling meetings with the agencies and tribes.

The MMG discussed a time extension for program amendment recommendations. Brian Marotz stated that MDFWP objected to the consent mail letter because they felt that a six-month extension was too long. They would have been more comfortable with a two or three month extension. John Platt said that CRITFC believes the time frame is too short and that there needs to be extra time to submit a set of measures that will keep the Program going for the next five years. Perhaps there is a minimum amount of time that CBFWA could request in the context of the Regional Act. Brian Lipscomb said he would recommend CBFWA write a letter to the NWPPC requesting that we meet with them to discuss these concerns. Brian Allee stated that we could possibly meet with them to discuss these issues at a workshop (Bob Lohn has indicated the NWPPC would do that). A meeting date of 3/13/00 was tentatively agreed upon.

ACTION: MMG directed staff to “shop” the 13th date around and then schedule it so the MMG can meet before the NWPPC Fish 4 meeting.

ITEM 6: Proposed FY 2001 Budget Review

(obj 1, 20%)

Discussion: Tom Giese outlined the budget assumptions used to develop the program and province budgets. Some MMG members expressed concern about these assumptions. Brian Lipscomb felt that we really wouldn't know what the fish and wildlife costs are going to be until we have a regional plan agreed to by everyone (feds, governors, and tribes). He was concerned that if CBFWA were to make those budget decisions we would be setting a precedent for BPA to tell us how much we spend on fish and wildlife. He felt the members should not limit themselves for FY 2001 projects and proposed that BPA and the NWPPC get involved in the budget/amendment process.

ACTION: MMG requested that these suggestions be discussed at the next AAC meeting.

ITEM 7: Hatchery & Genetic Management Plan (HGMP)

(obj 1-5, 5%)

Discussion: Neil Ward gave the history of the development of the HGMP. He said that the Resident Fish Managers were requesting the MMG approve forwarding this plan to the NWPPC.

ACTION: The MMG approved forwarding the HGMP to the NWPPC with the caveat that Attachment 2 be revised to include more appropriate resident fish examples.

ITEM 8: Monitoring and Evaluation in the Wildlife Program

(obj 2, 5%)

Discussion: Frank Young explained the background of the Wildlife M&E Report and requested MMG approval of the draft transmittal letter to the NWPPC that responds to the ISRP concerns.

ACTION: The MMG approved the draft transmittal letter and directed staff to finalize and send to the NWPPC.

ITEM 9: RFC, AFC, and WC Committee Reports

ACTION: Due to lack of time the committee updates were not given.

ITEM 10: Next Meeting

ACTION: The next meeting will be April 6 in Portland unless the Members need to continue discussions with the NWPPC, in which case the meeting would be held in Boise (the NWPPC April meeting location).