



DATE: October 5, 2001  
 TO: Members Management Group  
 FROM: Brian Allee (signed copy on file)  
 SUBJECT: Action Notes

October 5, 2001 Action Notes

**Attendees:** Fred Olney, USFWS; John Palensky, NMFS; Stephen Smith w/CTCR; Theodora Strong, YN; Brian Allee, Kathie Titzler, Jann Eckman, CBFWA  
**By Phone:** Gary James, CTUIR, Ray Entz, KT; Joe Peone, CTCR; Keith Kutchins and Claudio Bronco, SBT; Amos FirstRaised, BPT; Paul Ashler, WDFW, Pete Hassemer, IDFG; Mary Verner, STI; Chris Fisher, CTCR; Brian Marotz, MDFWP; Rob Lothrop, CRITFC; Pam Kahut, PSMFC

<b>Time</b>	Objective 1. FY 2002 Renewal Process	25%
<b>Allocation:</b>	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	42%
	Objective 3. FY 2001 Adjustments	33%

Fred asked that a funding request from the USFWS be added to the agenda after Item 4. It was also recommended that Item 2 be deferred until the Members meeting.

**ITEM 1: Update on NWPPC Meeting Actions**

**Discussion:** Brian described the tier levels of funding with Tier 3 being lost opportunity or cost share and Tier 4 basically do not fund. There will be another revision of their tiers and criteria for another review that will be available on the 10<sup>th</sup> for the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. Brian indicated that he doesn't feel the NWPPC will approval all the projects but may approve some categories of project funding. Brian also stated that the CBFWA would look at the first three provinces and scrub for possible deferrals for FY02. Subbasin planning funding was discussed. It is \$5M now but a motion to increase the funding was not approved and will be discussed on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Gary James said that CTUIR policy folks want to push the budget issue and storm the NWPPC meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Gary felt we should form a team and hit the NWPPC full force with a common strategy. He wants key briefing points developed on the 11<sup>th</sup> for transmission to the NWPPC on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

**ACTION:** MMG requested that CBFWA staff put together some briefing bullets on the budget issue to guide the discussions on the budget and MOA.

**ITEM 2: CBFWA Statement of Work**

**ACTION:** Defer until Members meeting

**ITEM 3: Within-Year Funding Request**

**Discussion:** Joe Peone explained the funding request and requested that it be on the 10/17/01 NWPPC agenda.

**ACTION:** MMG revised the draft letter to Chairman Cassidy to reflect that the proposal has strong support from USFWS, WDFW and NMFS. MMG recommended the revised letter and proposal request go out to the Members for consent mail approval with the intent to get on the 10/17/01 NWPPC agenda.

**ITEM 4: October 11, 2001 Special Members Meeting**

**Discussion:** Brian indicated that there was a request for someone to make a presentation on the impacts that the flow and drought has caused on wildlife. Brian suggested that the Wildlife Committee bring this up at the Members meeting, so we could get the Members thinking about who and how to get this information.

**ACTION:** Susan Barnes will look into this and get the ideas back to Brian.

**ITEM 5: USFWS Eagle Lakes Ranch Acquisition Project Funding Request**

**Discussion:** Fred Olney explained the request. Ray indicated that the money and the crediting issue needs to be articulated.

**ACTION:** MMG recommended a consent mail letter go out with Fred's letter. Send draft to Doug Marker, NWPPC and include provisional sentences about crediting issue that need to be addressed and that will be the key topic of Wednesday's meeting with BPA. If any product resulted from Wednesday's meeting, we would also include that in the packet material. MMG recommended this consent mail have a five-day turnaround.

**ITEM 6: FPC Contract**

**Discussion:** MMG discussed the possibility of transferring the contract administration from PSMFC to CBFWF and the pros and cons of making that change. Historically the Members have recommended that CBFWF administer the contract because the FPC reports to the CBFWA Members and PSMFC do not represent the fish and wildlife managers. Michele indicated that her main concern was that there were no negative impacts to the individual in the salary or benefit package caused by this transfer, particularly with the retirement program. Pam Kahut indicated that PSMFC legally could not transfer 100% of the employee's retirement account, only the portion that the employee was vested.

**ACTION:** Since this could clearly jeopardize some employees, the MMG requested that legal opinion from Pam in writing and deferred further action on this issue.