




**COLUMBIA  
BASIN  
FISH & WILDLIFE  
AUTHORITY**

February 26, 2001

TO: Members Management Group

FROM: Brian Allee 

SUBJECT: Draft 2/8/01 MMG Action Notes

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

**MEMBERS MANAGEMENT GROUP  
MEETING/CONFERENCE CALL**

**February 8, 2001**

**9:00 am – 4:00 pm**

**CBFWA Office, Portland, OR**

**DRAFT ACTION NOTES**

**Attendees:** Chad Colter, SBT; Phil Roger, CRITFC; Ron Boyce, ODFW; Lynn Hatcher, YN; Ronald Peters, CdAT; Gary Sims, NMFS; Elizabeth Gaar, NMFS; Amos First Raised II, BPT; Albert Teeman, BPT; Theodora Strong, YN; Guy Dodson, SPT; Joe Mentor and Peter Dykstra, Mentor Law; Jann Eckman, Kathie Titzler, Frank Young, and Brian Allee, CBFWA/F

**By Phone:** Bert Bowler, IDFG; Sue Ireland, KTI; Brian Marotz, MDFWP; Fred Olney, USFWS; Mary Verner, ST; Robert Matt CdAT, Dave Statler, NPT; Vinnie Pero, SPT; Greg Sieglitz, ODFW; Ken Rutherford, ODFW

<b>Time allocation</b>	Objective 1. FY 2001 Renewal Process	61%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	0%
	Objective 3. FY 2000 Adjustments	0%
	Objective 4. Template for watershed and subbasin assessment and plan	18%
	Objective 5. Coordinate program amendments	0%
	CBFWA Business	21%

**ITEM 1: NWPPC Actions from February 6 & 7, 2001 Meeting**

## Discussion:

Brian said that the NWPPC approved staff recommendations for Inter-Mountain and Gorge Provinces. Changes to the recommendations are listed in a table prepared by Doug Marker. On High Priority recommendations, the NWPPC basically accepted the consensus recommendations of the ISRP and CBFWA, with some exceptions. Funding: BPA recommends using only placeholder money, estimated at 17M but the funding amounts will be determined at the Quarterly Review. The Gorge and Inter-Mountain need 2001 funding, the other provinces will start in 2002. Therefore, BPA recommends using what we have under the placeholder for 2001. BPA says they are confident they can cover the other provincial needs through the 2002-2006 rate case.

Brian summarized the NWPPC Innovative Project recommendations and discussed specific projects that CBFWA said “do not fund” and NWPPC funded. Regarding “Plan for the Plan” NWPPC tentatively agreed to put on a policy level forum in March. Brian and Bob Lohn will get together and discuss this further. Brian indicated that the high priority and subbasin planning is in addition to the Direct Program funding and won’t come out of the Direct Program.

## ACTION:

Brian and Bob Lohn will meet at 4:00 p.m. today regarding a policy level forum to discuss subbasin planning before the NWPPC opens the Program. Brian and Bob will then go back to the ad hoc group (to include NWPPC staff) to work on developing an agenda for the policy forum. Dave Statler requested the NWPPC/CBFWA round table material be summarized and distributed to the MMG.

**ITEM 8: NMFS’ Proposed Recovery Planning Process**

## Discussion

Elizabeth requested advice from the MMG on how to communicate with the Tribes about the Columbia Technical Recovery Team (TRT). The TRT is the first phase of the recovery planning process. NMFS will be soliciting nominations for the TRT and are looking for 12 TRT members, two NMFS scientists and 10 non-NMFS members. An objective panel will select the TRT members. Phase II will have a policy team. The TRT will advise and work with them. Phase II will develop measures to achieve goals; TRT has to weigh the policy decisions that are made, so there is an ongoing deliberation between the TRT and Phase II recovery team. Although, the recovery team hasn’t been set up yet.

Elizabeth said that it is important to identify how to coordinate efforts and integrate plans. Some subbasin plans will be done before the formal recovery planning begins. A meeting with the states, Tribes, and feds to discuss where they are in the basin in planning and how it fits together was suggested. Gary Sims said he was meeting with the UCUT’s next week and would like to meet with the Snake Basin Tribes and then meet with the CRITFC Tribes. Chad said they will need full funding for this effort.

Elizabeth asked who NMFS should be meeting with to structure the funding request. Brian offered to provide information facilitation assistance to NMFS.

**ACTION:** Gary Simms will be coordinating the Tribal meetings. Elizabeth will provide Brian with material on this effort. NMFS's website has detailed information on the recovery plans. Elizabeth will work with Bert and Ron Boyce to set up a meeting with IDFG and ODFW.

**ITEM 2: FY 2001 Budget**

**Discussion:** Kathie described the changes in the Members allocation figures and explained the 25% reserve. She requested MMG approve the current summary to send to the Members for consent mail approval. A MMG member asked when CBFWA could ask for an increase in funding and Kathie said when we spend this year's money. There is still \$390K left and she is hoping most of the remaining funds will be spent. Ron Boyce said he still doesn't understand the strategy of waiting to make a funding request for the funds that we need in 2001 until we spend the 2001 funds. Frank said that last year; we asked for a ton, got it, and didn't spend it, so why would we do it again. Ron B. said we should still ask for the money whether we spend it or not. Lynn agreed. Mary asked why we just didn't ask for an unallocated placeholder.

**ACTION:** MMG directed members to get their billings in to Kathie by the February 28<sup>th</sup> deadline and directed staff to forward this budget to Members for consent mail approval. Ron's suggestion of requesting the full funding will be taken up at the March MMG meeting. In the interim Brian will bring this up at the next Quarterly Review. CBFWA staff to draft a letter identifying the extra needs and requesting the additional funds be set aside as a placeholder for the MMG to review at their March meeting.

**ITEM 3: CBFWA High Priority Recommendations**

**Discussion:** Tom Iverson presented the table sorted by ISRP rating. He said that there is very close consensus between the ISRP and CBFWA, but there are seven projects where there is an inconsistency between the ISRP and CBFWA rating, and described those seven. Tom explained the rating definitions of CBFWA and the ISRP. Therefore, if you have a project that is a CBFWA "HPA" and doesn't meet the ISRP "A", you need to write a justification. Bert agreed and said the justification is important so the ISRP won't "cherry pick" projects. Tom Giese said the comments need to be written in the format: project number, project title, sponsor, ISRP Rating, Comment, and your response, next ISRP comment, your response, etc. Keep your response "on point" and assume that our justification needs to override the ISRP recommendation. We need to prove why their rating is incorrect. A MMG member asked where the money was coming from and Giese said that is "new" money. Giese said that BPA's comments were due 2/1/01 but haven't been received. He indicated that we should reserve the

opportunity to respond to BPA's comments in the public comment period. Iverson told MMG to respond to the "C" ISRP ranking if CBFWA ranked an "HPA." Also respond to ISRP and CBFWA "A's" if there are ISRP comments.

**ACTION:** Project sponsors will provide responses to Tom Giese by 2/14/01 so the package can be submitted to the NWPPC on 2/15/01.

**ITEM 4: Basinwide Fish and Wildlife Budget**

**Discussion:** Mary said we are now one half the way through 2001 and we don't have a budget commitment from BPA. CBFWA should continue to push this issue. Even though there is an energy crisis, it shouldn't preclude funding our projects. Mary said we should write a strong letter to BPA and invite everyone to discuss this issue in an open forum. Fred agreed that a letter requesting a meeting is a good step. He said that a lot of agencies are relying on BPA or Appropriations to secure funding for projects. This issue should be brought up in a policy level forum as follow up to the round table discussions with the NWPPC. Brian said this would be a good discussion issue for the Members meeting and could also be a point of discussion at the round table/policy forum meeting in March.

Mary said the timeliness of the request is critical. We were told the funding would be there based on a "needs" based process/program. We are providing this information, and now the funding is "wishy washy." Mary asked if we wanted to fix her draft letter up and get it out. Guy said that we should discuss the brunt of the BPA budget going to ESA. The BiOp wants water but ignores the resident fish issues. Lynn agreed, the letter should be put in a framework that identifies our needs, recognizes theirs, provides the information that we developed in our ten year budget, adding the other funding sources (categories) and sent out for consent mail. Concern was expressed about the time frame and whether we really want to wait until the Members meeting or discuss at a policy level meeting on another date.

**ACTION:** Giese will work with Mary and other interested parties to develop a policy forum meeting in March and a written invitation to attend the April Members meeting.

**ITEM 5: Update on Governor Kempthorne's Request**

**Discussion:** Joe Mentor, CBFWA attorney, summarized Kempthorne's request and the Charter implications of getting a new member. Currently the Members are explicitly listed in the Charter. Preamble says members are fish and wildlife managers and it is not clear whether OSC is a fish and wildlife manager. Joe indicated that he would have to check on what was done when WDF and WDW joined and became WDFW and whether a resolution to the Charter was done. Frank said that we have two levels of participation now, members and/or participants. We should check how we handled Gordon Haugen's request for the Forest Service to be a member.

Joe indicated that he also wants to compare the statutory responsibilities of OSC versus IDFG. Bert says that OSC by statute only deals with listed fish and there is a move to broaden that. Bert said that the question is what is the problem with having the concerns represented by IDFG. Bert and Sue recommended we just say no to the OSC request. Joe said if the Members are predisposed not to allow this, they ought to have the courtesy to be invited to discuss with the group. Lynn said as a co-manager, he would like to invite OSC to come in and discuss their role. We should include some questions in our invitation. In the correspondence ask what the concerns are about your fish and wildlife agency representing you. Joe asked Jann to look for the '94 decision regarding the Forest Services request; that example may help in our approach. Ron Boyce agreed and said the way CBFWA handles this request is going to be very important particularly the way the politics are going now regarding the Governors approach to fish and wildlife in the State of Oregon.

**ACTION:** Joe will provide a briefing of the issue paper and draft letter with questions to send to the OSC for MMG's review and comments. The OSC can then decide to come and present their rationale to be a member at a meeting or write a letter. Action can be taken on the request at the April Members meeting.

**ITEM 6: Next Members Meeting**

**ACTION:** Staff will shop with the members the dates of the afternoon of 4/11, all day on 4/12 and a half-day on 4/13.

**ITEM 7: Next MMG Meeting**

**ACTION:** The next regularly scheduled MMG meeting will be 3/8/01. An agenda item for that meeting will be: Idaho Office of Species Conservation (OSC) Presentation by Joe Mentor.

h:\w\mmg\2001\_0208