



**COLUMBIA  
BASIN  
FISH & WILDLIFE  
AUTHORITY**

**DRAFT**

January 18, 2001

TO: Members Management Group (MMG)  
FROM: Brian Allee   
SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes from the January 11, 2001 meeting

**Members Management Group Meeting  
January 11, 2001  
9am – 4pm**

**Draft Action Notes**

**If there are no objections within five days these actions will be considered final. The draft action notes reflect the order of the original agenda, not the revised order of the meeting.**

**Attendees:** Amos First-Raised and Albert Teeman (BPT); Patty O'Toole (CTWSRO); Phil Roger (CRITFC); Bill Tweit (WDFW); Ron Boyce (ODFW); Robert Matt and Ron Peters (C d'AT); and Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Lynn Hatcher and Theodora Strong (YN); Fred Olney (USFWS); Mary Lou Soscia (afternoon presentation only); Brian Allee, Tana Klum, Kathie Titzler, Tom Giese, Frank Young, Tom Iverson and Neil Ward (CBFWA/F).

**By phone:** Bert Bowler (IDFG); Vinny Pero (SPT); Dave Statler (NPT); Sue Ireland (KT); BJ Keifer (STI); Chad Colter (SBT); Steve Judd (CTCR); and Gary James (CTUIR).

<b>Time allocation:</b>	Objective 1. FY 2001 Renewal Process	29%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	8%
	Objective 3. FY 2000 Adjustments	0%
	Objective 4. Template for watershed and subbasin assessment and plan	30%
	Objective 5. Coordinate program amendments	0%

**ITEM 1: Subbasin Planning "The Plan for the Plan"**

**ACTION:** The MMG agreed with the dates developed by the Plan for the Plan ad hoc work group on January 10 and provided a "Next Steps" handout.

In order to get the CBFWA tribal policy leaders up-to-date and engaged in the effort, CBFWA staff will pursue a tribal coordination meeting between the tribal policy leaders and other CBFWA policy leaders during the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians (ATNI) meeting in Portland scheduled for February 5-8.

**ITEM 2: Action Item: Innovative Projects**

**Discussion:** Tom Iverson lead the group through the innovative projects report as developed by CBFWA staff. The MMG approved ranking changes to a number of projects. Tom Iverson also wanted the MMG to note the report states that CBFWA is not in agreement with the ISRP on expansion of the \$2 million for innovative projects.

**ACTION:** Tom Iverson will make the requested ranking changes (for project specifics, please contact Tom Iverson) and will also restructure the report summary under "project recommendations".

Fred Olney expressed concern about project # 22033 that CBFWA ranked as "do not fund." After Fred explained the project, the MMG agreed that it should be ranked in the "fund" category.

The innovative project recommendations and report will be revised by Tom Iverson and sent for CBFWA Member Consent Mail on Friday, January 12, with a deadline of close of business Tuesday, January 16. The final report will be given to the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) at their meeting in Vancouver, WA on Wednesday, January 17. The NWPPC will make a decision on the innovative projects at their February 6-7 meeting in Portland.

**ITEM 3: High Priority Project Update**

**Discussion:** Tom Giese presented for MMG approval a rigorous schedule for making recommendations to the NWPPC on the high priority projects by their February 26 deadline. Giese also explained that some projects fell across state lines and were difficult to assign to a particular technical review team (TRT).

Although the NWPPC's December 20 letter confirmed the intent to review only anadromous fish projects, Fred Olney stated that in a conversation with Sarah McNary (BPA) it was agreed that resident fish and wildlife projects would be reviewed based on their benefit to anadromous fish.

Gary James attended the first TRT meeting in Pendleton on January 9, and expressed that of the 25 projects reviewed in that area (totaling \$40 million), \$12 million in projects passed the high priority criteria.

**ACTION:** Tom Giese will revise the schedule for the project review as agreed to by the MMG (sent January 12 by email and posted on the CBFWA website).

**ITEM 4: Action Item: FSOC Charter Approval**

**ACTION:** The MMG asked that the FSOC Charter be modified as consistent with the new CBFWA Charter. The MMG approved the FSOC Charter citing those consistencies, and Frank Young will make those changes.

**ITEM 5: Process for Approving Time Sensitive Land Acquisitions**

**Discussion:** CBFWA has agreed to respond to the NWPPC approval of recent projects like the Holliday and Arrowleaf land acquisitions, which did not reach the consensus of CBFWA.

Carl Scheeler described how the Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Lands have sometimes provided bridge funding for these types of projects, but usually at the request of a body like CBFWA or NWPPC. The WC has set aside funding in order to respond to this type of emergency, but without clear criteria. Ron Boyce proposed the need for flexibility within CBFWA to fund mid-stream high priority acquisitions and pointed out the difference between a long-term solid funding base and the need for short term flexibility. Carl proposed the need for criteria and setting goals for acquisitions within all subbasins, regardless of its place in line for review in the Provincial Review Process.

**ACTION:** No action taken. The discussion lead to an initiative to create a CBFWA Habitat Standing Committee. See Item 7.

**ITEM 6: Integration of the Clean Water Act into Subbasin Planning**

**Presentation:** Mary Lou Soscia (EPA), presented a handout listing the current activities of the EPA that are parallel to the Provincial Review Process for subbasin planning. Within the EPA's "Basinwide Recovery Strategy," there are over 2400 streams in which the "total maximum daily load" (TMDL) of pollutants will be developed in the Columbia Basin in the next 12 years. The EPA needs to allocate resources and would like to offer its assistance to CBFWA requests within the subbasins, but without duplicating efforts. According to Mary Lou, a benefit for CBFWA and the NWPPC is that the EPA already has employees stationed in communities who are working with locals to improve EPA's process.

Bill Tweit asked how EPA's priorities are different from the subbasin planning process. Mary Lou said she is not aware of the CBFWA process timelines, but EPA is open to helping however they can.

**ACTION:** Mary Lou will provide the MMG with a schedule and list of streams currently under TMDL development. She is available to work with the MMG and Members on request.

**ITEM 7: Discussion of an Initiative to Create a CBFWA Habitat Technical Committee**

Discussion: Relative to Item 5, Carl Scheeler proposed creating a new CBFWA technical committee to address habitat mitigation. Although the Wildlife Committee would take the lead on creating the details, the new committee would also enlist participation from CBFWA representatives more likely to be involved with anadromous and resident fish. Discussion points included:

- The concern that some anadromous projects could affect wildlife crediting. Land acquisitions get confusing between anadromous or wildlife funding when the watershed approach is taken.
- 70:15:15 funding rule is becoming moot with subbasin planning.
- Need for holistic watershed approach, not entrenched in anadromous, resident and wildlife funding application.
- NWPPC Program and NMFS BiOps stress the need, therefore CBFWA should create more focus in this area.

ACTION: MMG provide input to Carl Scheeler prior to the WC meeting on January 22 when it will be discussed. Carl invited the AFC to participate. Frank Young will draft a Charter for MMG review that is consistent with CBFWA committees.

The MMG will review the proposal and committee charter at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

**ITEM 8: Members Contracts for FY01**

Discussion: CBFWA staff needs guidance as many Members continue to underspend or neglect to bill CBFWF. Brian Allee added that the NWPPC and BPA will only understand the need for more funding if it is justified, and for the fourth consecutive year, the perception is that the Members do not need funding for participation because they neglect to bill. The MMG discussed:

- The need to better estimate what the level of involvement is for subbasin planning and the actual costs of doing business.
- The cost of subbasin planning is too great to be thorough using existing staff.
- Each agency and tribe will need more or less than others depending on the number and complexity of subbasins they are involved in.
- There is no flexibility in the current contracts for Members who may have unexpected costs, and there is no mechanism for contributing to another agency if there are surplus funds.
- The Members must continue to bill the CBFWF on time.
- Need a mechanism to begin allocating the \$770K in February, and also

need a mechanism for spending after February.

**ACTION:** The MMG agreed to send their billings for FY00 and their requests for FY01 to Kathie Titzler immediately. Kathie will send out a report once the numbers are in.

There is also a proposal to hold back 25% of the \$770K for FY01 contracts to fund shortfalls and unforeseen activities like hiring contractors, etc. The remainder of the \$770K would be allocated proportionately among the Members. The MMG would approve requests for allocation of the 25% reserve.

The MMG will review the numbers and consider action on the 25% reserve proposal at an **Emergency MMG meeting on January 19th at CBFWA from 10 a.m. to Noon.**

**ITEM 9: MMG Meeting Schedule for 2001**

**ACTION:** For 2001, the MMG will meet on the second Thursday of each month beginning February 8th.

h:\w\mmg\2001\_0111\anotes.doc