



September 22, 2000

TO: Members Management Group  
FROM: Brian Allee   
SUBJECT: Draft 9/7/00 MMG Meeting Action Notes

**If there are no objections within five days, these actions will be considered final.**

**MEMBERS MANAGEMENT GROUP  
MEETING/CONFERENCE CALL  
September 7, 2000  
9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.  
CBFWA Office, Portland, OR**

**DRAFT ACTION NOTES**

Attendees: Ronald L. Peters, CdAT; Keith Underwood, STI; Phil Roger, CRITFC; Chad Colter, SBT; John Palensky, NMFS; Fred Olney, USFWS; Susan Barnes, ODFW; Bruce Schmidt, PSMFC, Tom Iverson, Brian Allee, Jann Eckman, Tom Giese, Kathie Titzler, Neil Ward, Frank Young, CBFWA/F

By Phone: Carl Scheeler, CTUIR; Dean Osterman, KT; Bob Foster, WDFW; Theodora Strong, YIN; Bert Bowler and Michele Beucler, IDFG; Joe Peone, CTCR; Dave Statler, NPT; Sue Ireland, KTI

Obj. #1 = 8%; Obj. #2 = 13%, Obj. #3 = 2%; Obj. #5 = 71%, Other Business = 6%

**ITEM 1: Update on the Rolling Provincial Project Review Process**

Discussion: Tom Iverson said the 8/30/00 version of the CBFWA Project Review Process that was sent out incorporated the committee revisions:

- Revised roles and responsibilities of the subbasin teams and budget work groups;
- Numerical criteria changed to “yes/no”;
- Concurrent project review sessions were eliminated;
- Clarified that any CBFWA member can participate in the technical review process.

Concern was expressed about the application of the criteria – consistent or not. Frank said all criteria have to be considered, but criteria that don't apply to a specific proposal can be deemed inconsistent. Tom Iverson added that the criteria in the province review could still go under committee review and other criteria can be used.

**ACTION:** The MMG approved the final CBFWA Project Review Process as recommended by the ad hoc subcommittee and directed staff to forward the approved project review process, modified project review presentation schedule and agendas to the subbasin teams and fish and wildlife managers.

**ITEM 2: Review Issues for CBFWA Comments on the Draft F&W Program**

**Discussion:** Tom Giese reported that the subcommittee met and discussed:

- the near-term budget allocation – budget allocation can be changed each year based on mutual agreement;
- having no numerical budget targets “cap” as the reviewers decide which projects get funded and which don't;
- not having targets on future budget amounts;
- while the subbasin summaries are being finished the funds available for 2001 and 2002 would be the amount remaining under the MOA, plus early action and land and water trust;
- the budget for 2003 is demonstrated by need in the subbasin summaries.

It was mentioned that early actions and land and water acquisitions should be “needs” driven, not restricted by cost of living as in the NWPPC amendment. It has been characterized that once the provincial rolling review is finished that would be sufficient to address the needs for additional funding.

Phil expressed concern about the NWPPC proposal to have BPA be the agency to store the data in the subbasin assessment portion of the subbasin summaries. He indicated that it is a prejudgement since the NWPPC hasn't made an official decision yet. Fred said that CBFWA needs to sit down and talk with the NWPPC on the subbasin assessment process and needs. As far as issues that CBFWA could comment collectively on, John felt that the comments on roles and process should be collective. Dave asked if there are broad-brush issues such as mitigation that are still applicable for us to make comments on. Susan said that ODFW has concerns about collective comments. Fred recommended that each member go through the comments, check off those we feel we can collectively support, add issues we may have missed, and see if we can get agreement. Then get ODFW's input and see if there is a problem.

**ACTION:** The MMG went through each issue outlined in the “Possible CBFWA Comments on Draft F&W Program, 9/6/2000,” and made written comments. The MMG then reviewed those comments and directed Tom Giese with assistance from the MMG members who volunteered to help (Bert, Ron Peters, Chad, and Phil) to incorporate the suggestions and redraft. Tom Giese will send the draft comments to the MMG on 9/14 for comments back by 9/18. Based on comments, Tom will rework the issue document and send out to the MMG for advance review prior to the 19<sup>th</sup>. The MMG members planning on participating in the CBFWA testimony to the NWPPC on the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program will meet with Tom Giese the morning of the 19<sup>th</sup> to coordinate the issue comments. The entire issue package will be sent by consent mail to the Members with an approval deadline of 9/22/00.

**ITEM 3: FY2000/2001 Budget Requests**

**ACTION:** MMG approved AFC recommendation to provide \$75K for the NMFS Genetics Study (project #198909600) for FY2000 from the NMFS ESA Research Placeholder.

MMG approved AFC recommendation to support the CRITFC Kelt Rejuvenation Study (project #20001700), the ODFW/WDFW Spawning Study (project #199900301) and the OWT Water Right Acquisition Program (project #199908800) as high priority projects to be funded as money becomes available in the Anadromous Fish Placeholder and put in the que for the next BPA Quarterly Review.

**ITEM 4: Wildlife Crediting Issue**

**Discussion:** Carl Sheeler, CUITR, summarized the recent meeting the Wildlife Crediting Subcommittee, Robert Walker, an observer for the NWPPC, and BPA had. No resolution was achieved at that meeting and Carl indicated that this issue is made even more difficult to resolve because there is not agreement within CBFWA on the use of crediting as a mitigation tool. There is no disagreement, however, that the current 1:1 crediting ratio does not equal full mitigation. Michele asked if the MMG could support a general letter that didn’t commit to any agreement with or support of the current wildlife crediting process but did support the position that if crediting is used to track mitigation progress, the ratio should be 3:1.

**ACTION:** The MMG recommended Carl draft a letter, as suggested by Michele, and sent it to Frank by 9/8/00. Due to the short time frame left to resolve this issue, the MMG directed Frank to circulate the draft letter to the Wildlife Committee and MMG concurrently for their consent mail approval. Upon

the WC and MMG approval, the letter would then be forwarded to the Members for consent mail approval.

**ITEM 5: Innovations in Harvest and Production Issue**

Discussion: Brian said that he had been asked by the PPC and NMFS if CBFWA would consider being a sponsor of an Innovations in Harvest and Production Workshop being held on 10/4 & 10/5 in Portland. CRITFC had also been asked to be a sponsor and had met today to consider the request. Brian indicated that he had been informed over lunch that CRITFC had agreed to be an official sponsor. Brian said an agenda that deals mainly with harvest and production was being put together today and would be released tomorrow. Brian asked the MMG if there was any reason that CBFWA would not want to be a sponsor and pay for CBFWA members to attend.

ACTION: MMG approved CBFWA being a sponsor of the Innovations in Harvest and Production Workshop and pay members travel if there was money in their travel budgets.

**ITEM 6: Update on NWPPC Approval of the FY 2001 Budget**

Discussion: Tom Giese said that he had received a copy of BPA's comments on the CBFWA's Work Plan. He said that the NWPPC staff is reviewing the CBFWA DAIWP and plans on adopting the DAIWP on 9/20/00. Tom Giese outlined some of the major comments made by BPA:

1. CBFWA hasn't allowed for money to fund BPA's reasonable and prudent actions;
2. CBFWA opted to spend two ESA placeholders and BPA wants to hold these funds;
3. BPA's audit of the closed contracts has identified \$750K in available funds and CBFWA estimated \$5M. BPA feels they can complete their audit by 4/01.
4. BPA is concerned that there is not enough money in the contingency fund. CBFWA recommended using the contingency fund and BPA wants to save it.

Tom asked if the MMG wanted to provide a CBFWA response to BPA's comments. He added that the NWPPC staff is examining BPA's comments and reviewing projects in accordance to their five principles. The NWPPC staff will provide a report and funding recommendation to the NWPPC at their 9/19-20/00 meeting in Spokane. Susan asked how much weight BPA's recommendations carry. Tom replied that the NWPPC would listen to BPA's recommendations regarding funding amounts but policy issues are more "iffy." Keith said we needed to make a "feed back" loop and Brian suggested that we find out what the problem projects are.

**ACTION:** MMG directed Tom Giese to work with Doug Marker to get information on potential problem projects. Individual MMG members would like to discuss this budget issue with the NWPPC at their 9/19 & 9/20/00 meeting.

**ITEM 7: October 25 & 26 Members Meeting**

**Discussion:** Keith expressed concern about not having decision items on the agenda and said that if no decisions were being made, the policy makers wouldn't attend. Bert said that Rod has expressed enthusiasm about this meeting and Brian said he felt it is important to have the states and Tribes participate in budget and strategic planning discussions. Chad indicated that he is interested in hearing from other Tribes about the tribal impacts of the Atlantic salmon issues.

**ACTION:** Bert will work with Rod to see if we could get some Tribal participation from the Tribes he worked with. CBFWA staff will continue their effort to get the other speakers.