



**COLUMBIA
BASIN
FISH & WILDLIFE
AUTHORITY**

DRAFT

July 30, 2001

TO: Members Management Group
FROM: Brian Allee
SUBJECT: Draft 7/27/01 MMG Meeting Action Notes

**MEMBERS MANAGEMENT GROUP
Meeting/Conference Call
July 27, 2001
9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.**

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: John Palensky, NMFS; Phil Roger, CRITFC; Maureen Smith, USFWS; Carl Scheeler and Gary James, CTUIR; Theodora Strong, YN; Amos First Raised III and Albert Teeman, BPT; Ron Boyce and Susan Barnes, ODFW; Brian Allee, Frank Young, Neil Ward, Tom Giese and Tana Klum, CBFWA

By Phone: Patty O’Toole and Terry Luther, CTWSRO; Dave Statler, NPT; Sue Ireland, KTI; Chad Colter, SBT; Robert Matt, Cd’AT; Matt Berger and Jim Priest, CTCR; Keith Underwood, STI; Ray Entz, KT; Bert Bowler and Pete Hassemer, IDFG; Bill Tweit, WDFW

Time Allocation: Objective 1. FY 2002 Renewal Process %
Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries 75%
Objective 3. FY 2001 Adjustments 25%

ITEM 1: Columbia Plateau - CBFWA Recommendations

Discussion: Chairman Bowler asked each committee chair to provide a summary of recommended actions:

Resident Fish Committee, Neil Ward for Brian Marotz

- The RFC reviewed six projects, did not change any ranking, but added comments and question possible in lieu issues with bull trout projects. The RFC reached consensus on their recommendatons.

Wildlife Committee, Carl Scheeler

- Carl opened the discussion with the memo from Ray Entz and the memo from the Spokane Tribe supporting the Kalispel Tribe's position on in lieu and crediting.

Carl said Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is not addressing the direction taken by the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) in the Fish and Wildlife Program (page 39 and 40) regarding crediting, especially the new 2:1 ratio versus the prior 1:1. Susan added that numerous attempts made by members of the Wildlife Committee to meet with BPA are either cancelled by BPA or the COTR's say there is no BPA policy yet. The COTR's are telling the managers the 1:1 is firm, even though the Program specifically calls for 2:1.

Carl added that some projects are difficult to determine because of cross over with anadromous and resident fish and habitat. He hopes this is an area where the CBFWA Habitat Committee could help.

- The MMG discussed in great length the need for objecting Members to be present during meetings where the issue is being discussed (Ray was not a participant until later in the meeting).
- In reviewing Ray's memo, Theodora pointed out a misunderstanding reflected in his comments on project # 199206200.
- Regarding the in lieu issue, Carl said it's difficult to address because Ray's memo does not identify "in lieu of what?"

Anadromous Fish, Gary James

- Gary reported the following issues considered by the AFC:
 1. See Brian's notes
 2. Some in lieu issues but no big deal, really defined a project by it's benefits to fish.
 3. Duplication and overlap work in monitoring and evaluation, so some projects received a conditional approval that some pre-coordination is needed.
 4. Whether or not a project should be high priority.
 5. Changed many of the CREP (need to know here what CREP is an acronym for) projects. Some were elevated to high priority, but there is a lot of cost sharing, etc. Priorities are also conditional to direct fish and wildlife benefits outlined in the subbasin summaries. Some are "fund for one year" to determine whether fish and wildlife managers are plugging in to what the conservation districts are doing on the ground. There are redundancies with conservation districts calling for "1 FTE" coordinator position for

projects that are not on the ground and it's not totally clear how much is really needed to assist the managers from an administrative standpoint.

- Regarding #5, Maureen pointed out the sometimes narrow, short term vision of some CREP projects. Gary added an example of John Day being a huge project with four new counties drafting proposals. Also, conservation districts tend to work lower on the river and fish and wildlife managers tend to work further up where life histories and multiple species exist.
- Gary would like to create a specific checklist of fish and wildlife benefits and develop criteria that the CREP proposers can work from.

Other topics of discussion on the Columbia Plateau Recommendations

- Ron Boyce recommended that three projects (25020, 25012, 25042) be elevated to beyond high priority as "urgent," however the MMG disagreed and Susan Barnes moved that the projects should change from "urgent" to "high priority."
- Gary said projects #25066 and #25067 are examples where there would be benefits in applying the checklist and criteria recommended above. He added the checklist and criteria could be developed by the CBFWA Habitat Committee.
- Budget – For FY 2002, the projects in the Columbia Plateau total \$83.9M, last year the amount was close to \$40M. The MMG asked Neil Ward, who has been working on the budget, for a breakdown by category. Neil said this 100% jump has been typical in provinces reviewed so far, and that outyears for this province will be close but drop slightly. The acquisitions could be adding to the current budget.
- Susan Barnes reported that the comments for the Holiday Ranch Project #25086 should include a grazing allotment as a component, although it was not in the original proposal and it is unclear what the allotment will be (USFS is the lead).

ACTION: Following are the actions taken by the MMG on Item 1:

- Change the three "urgent" projects (Ron Boyce) to high priority category
- Project #'s 25066 and 25067 need a checklist and criteria applied prior to agreeing to fund (this was the proposal made by Gary James that I wrote got support for the Habitat Workgroup to develop, but by my notes, no formal charge was made to the workgroup)
- Interested MMG members will meet by conference call at 7 a.m. August 1, to discuss the in lieu and crediting concerns raised by the Kalispel, Spokane and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.
- The MMG agreed to send for CBFWA Member Consent Mail the

DWPW subbasin summaries and project recommendations for the Columbia Plateau Province (due August 2nd at 5 p.m.).

ITEM 2: Shoshone-Paiute Funding Request

Discussion: Frank Young said that CBFWA staff had done an analysis and recommends the approval of this request, as well as a request CBFWA had just received from the Shoshone-Bannocks for \$34K.

Bert asked if Frank had received the two requests from IDFG (\$68K total), plus another request that was on the way. These requests may total more than is available in the agreed to reserve fund.

ACTION: Bert will call Frank on July 30 to review the Idaho package (Bert, Chad and Guy), and bring a recommendation to the MMG at their meeting August 14.

ITEM 3a: Added Items

3a. Lower Columbia River Estuary Program (LCREP)

Discussion: Phil Roger said the LCREP is only half funded, and the request is for \$154K to complete the project. There is a time constraint to complete the aerial photography given the low water year. This project is really part of the subbasin assessment, and the sponsor is not requesting immediate funding, but rather a commitment from the Council.

ACTION: The MMG agreed to send a draft letter from Chairman Sando to NWPPC Chairman Larry Cassidy for CBFWA Consent Mail.

ITEM 3b: 3b. Duncan Creek

Discussion: John Palensky said at the last Quarterly Review meeting, the NWPPC elected not to fund this project which was identified in the High Priority category. At the same meeting, the reintroduction of chums into Duncan Creek was approved using ESA funds. When the ISRP reviewed the project, the original cost assessment was insufficient. The original estimate of \$420K needs to be increased to \$751K to allow for additional juvenile collection (\$73K) if water continues to be low. The remainder of the additional funds would cover some monitoring and evaluation. Construction needs to begin by September 15, and if the recommendation is before the NWPPC on August 7-8, they will ask for CBFWA review.

ACTION: The MMG agreed to send a draft letter from Chairman Sando to NWPPC Chairman Larry Cassidy for CBFWA Consent Mail.

ITEM 4: Reschedule the August 9 MMG Meeting

ACTION: The MMG agreed to reschedule the August 9 MMG meeting to August 14 to accommodate a conflict with an Implementation Team meeting.