



March 22, 2002

TO: Members Management Group

FROM: Lynn Hatcher, Chair *Jann Eckman for*

SUBJECT: DRAFT Action Notes, 3/14/2002

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Lynn Hatcher (YN); Howard Schaller, Mark Bagdovitz, Maureen Smith (USFWS); Phil Roger, Cat Black (CRITFC); Pete Hassemer (IDFG); Carl Scheeler, Gary James (CTUIR); John Palensky (NMFS); Tony Nigro, Susan Barnes (ODFW); Ron Peters (CdAT); Keith Lawrence, Dave Statler (NPT); Amos FirstRaised, Albert Teeman (BPT); Jann Eckman, Tom Giese, Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, Frank Young, Kathie Titzler, Tana Klum, Mary Marvin (CBFWA).

By Phone: Roy Sampsel (CRITFC); Doug Taki (SBT); Brian Marotz (MFWP); Mary Verner, B.J. Kieffer (ST); Sue Ireland (KtI); Joe Peone, Matt Berger (CTCR); Karl Weist (NWPPC); Bill Tweit, Paul Ashley (WDFW)

Time	Objective 1. FY 2002 Renewal Process	0%
Allocation:	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	75%
	Objective 3. FY 2001 Adjustments	25%

ITEM 1: **Mainstem and Systemwide Province Solicitation** – *Review draft guidance document for focusing on the solicitation.*
9:10 – 9:27

Discussion: BPA has requested assistance in providing guidance for the Mainstem and Systemwide Province proposal solicitation beyond the current program summaries. BPA has completed a detailed GAPs analysis for the mainstem, which Tom Iverson will distribute to the fish and wildlife managers either this afternoon or tomorrow. Tom suggested three possible foci for a response to BPA's request: 1) develop executive summaries of the existing program summaries; 2) summarize the MYIP and the 2000 Fish and Wildlife Program; and/or 3) develop a strategic plan for prioritizing RPAs according to the decision points identified in the NMFS and USFWS BiOps. Concern was expressed that the rules of the rolling review process not be changed and that it would not be appropriate to begin limiting the solicitation process at this late date. Consistency is necessary for all provinces in the completion of the first round of rolling review.

ACTION: CBFWA staff will craft a response to BPA referencing the sources of information the fish and wildlife managers may feel relevant, including changes voiced at this meeting. This letter will be taken to the committees for discussion and input, and brought back to the next MMG meeting.

ITEM 2: MMG Response to Blue Mountain and Mountain Snake Provinces Project Recommendations by NWPPC
9:27 – 9:53

Discussion: Tom Iverson reported that the NWPPC staff have balanced the Blue Mountain and Mountain Snake budgets with the assistance from individual members of CBFWA. The individuals in each province have reached tentative agreement on the project selection, but would not define that agreement as consensus support. CBFWA staff will develop recommendations focused on the NWPPC staff issue paper and solicit input from interested members. The comments will be put into a bulleted letter and member representatives will deliver the letter to the Council at the Fish 4 meeting in Boise in April. Four categories were suggested which would narrow the scope of the recommendations:

- What issues have the MMG already commented on
- What issues are being pursued in other forums
- What issues are unique to these two provinces
- What issues warrant focussed comments

When Tom Iverson has completed the letter, he will send it to Tony Nigro, Carl Scheeler, Howard Schaller, John Palensky, and Pete Hassemer for their comments, then will send it out to the fish and wildlife managers on Friday March 22nd for consent mail approval due March 29th. A small group of CBFWA members will present this letter to the NWPPC at their meeting in Boise.

ITEM 3: Within-Year Requests

9:53 – 10:55

- Discussion:**
- Project 199107200 & 199700100: It is the policy for the hatchery manager to live on site. The \$190,000 includes moving the facility, putting in sewer, electricity, water, driveway, etc., as well as building the house. Because this is a state project, all construction of this kind must go through Public Works. It was felt that the BPA contract office should discuss and dissect this budget. Pete Hassemer agreed to provide Ron Peters with a printed budget for this project.
 - Project 200101500: The letter written by Tom Iverson states that if the Council chooses to fund this project, it be funded out of FY 2002 innovative funds. The letter states that there is no CBFWA support to fund this project because the results were inconclusive. The MMG felt the letter should be clearer as to the future of this project, “as proposed.”
 - Project 199902400: All participants at the last RFC meeting except USFWS agreed that this project should go through the Rolling Review

process. USFWS emphasized several times in today's meeting that this was not a precedent-setting alteration. It has been done before. The RFC believes this project is important, but the timing is wrong.

- ACTION**
- Tony Nigro and Tom Iverson will work together to re-compose the letter addressing clarity for Project 200101500 and review those revisions with Gary James prior to its being sent out as a Consent Mail.
 - A motion was made and seconded that the first five projects identified in this item be submitted to the Members for consent mail approval and sent to the Council by March 26th to get in the packet for consideration by the NWPPC at their meeting in Boise, ID. The 6th project (199902400) will be returned to the RFC for review, then brought back to the next MMG to finalize discussions.

ITEM 4: Subbasin Planning – *Bullet three from Item 6*

10:55–11:07

Discussion: Phil Roger stated that he is meeting with Council staff today to present a letter of concerns. He asked if the Members want a special meeting prior to the Boise Council meeting to discuss their concerns. It was felt that there were areas the Council had not sufficiently addressed.

ACTION The MMG directed Jann Eckman and CBFWA staff to put a meeting together in mid-April to discuss the subbasin planning process.

ITEM 4: CBFWA FY 2003-2005 Proposal

11:07-12:00

Discussion: Discussion occurred regarding the value of CBFWA's role in the upcoming provincial review process. The idea that core functions should be funded immediately, as are those for BPA and the Council, was brought up, particularly since the core functions are not a part of the rolling review, but are part of the program itself. These deliverable-based tasks should be put in a process category and the budget submitted to the Council as soon as possible.

Tom Giese requested feedback from the MMG on this issue

Frank Young stated that the proposal needs to be reviewed to assure the wording is appropriate and expresses the desires of the group. The ad hoc work group could organize a workshop in April to discuss how CBFWA could contribute to the current process. The Council would be invited to attend this workshop. Clarifying the proposal and developing a budget could be combined into one proposal and identified as core functions. The budget could be built as an add-on to the current budget, primarily to fund additional agency and tribal staff to handle the added work. It would be important to define how this proposal would add to or be different from the current subbasin process, and how CBFWA can augment and improve the process.

ACTION CBFWA staff will assist in organizing an April workshop that will focus on core functions and finalize the outcome of the workshop prior to the May MMG meeting. The MMG recommended that staff arrange a two-day

workshop, one day to be dedicated to working on the CBFWA project proposal, and the other day dedicated to subbasin planning.

ITEM 5: NWPPC Mainstem Amendment Process

12:00-12:07

Discussion:

Further discussion with FPAC indicates that perhaps this process is a technical exercise. If it becomes a policy issue, it will be an extensive process. This item is being remanded to FPAC for technical comments. If you have comments to make about this process, please contact FPAC.

ITEM 6: NWPPC Meeting Update

1:00 – 1:55

Discussion:

- **FPC Oversight Board** – The Council appears to believe that the FPC Board of Directors has been eliminated. The question presented to the MMG was whether the current Board should be disbanded or continue independent of the Board the Council wishes to create. The FPC Board of Directors is not identified in the CBFWA Charter; it was a Members action in response to a Council request. Discussion centered around the Council's ability to eradicate a Board that the Council had not created. If two boards are created, the MMG was told that NMFS would participate on the Council's board rather than the FPC board. Although the Council's letter does specify three members of the new board would come from CBFWA, there was sufficient discomfort with the Council's decision that a letter to the Council was proposed indicating CBFWA has had insufficient time to discuss this with Members and the current Board; therefore, CBFWA can make no nominations at this time.

The question remains whether the FPC Board will be maintained, or whether CBFWA will populate the Council's Board, and if so, with current members or with new ones. Other questions are: 1) What will the new board do? 2) How will the new board operate? 3) What are the consequences of CBFWA not nominating members to the new Board?

ACTIONS:

- This item be added to the CRITFC Commission meeting agenda to be held next week, and the Commission respond to the MMG to clarify the intentions of the Council's new board.
- Michele DeHart will write a letter to the Council requesting written clarification answering the questions posed by the MMG, and setting a meeting with Larry Cassidy to further define the Council's rationale for creating a second board. The letter will be circulated among the MMG for approval before it is presented to the Council.

1:55 – 2:14

Discussion:

- **Review of Draft Project Selection Process** – The new version of the project selection process is somewhat clearer than the original. The MMG is encouraged to read the new version and the CBFWA staff response. A first draft response will be available at the next MMG meeting. The MMG was also directed to look at the Statement of

Work's (SOW) core functions, and comment to Frank Young.

- 2:14 – 2:44 Discussion: • **WDFW Protocol Proposal** – The focus was to continue with data collection and develop consistency in data collection protocol and fish count protocol. This proposal SOW was submitted to the Fish 4, Council approved the budget and the project pending ISRP review (which is now occurring and may have been completed). The proposal consisted of a three-page SOW and e-mail text. CBFWA has never been asked to review this proposal. Comments regarding this proposal need to address concerns about the need for common protocols.

ACTIONS:

- The MMG recommended that this proposal be remanded to the AFC and the RFC for further discussion. Decisions resulting from the discussions will be forwarded to the MMG, which will assign a priority rating.
- Frank will write a brief letter to the Council stating that CBFWA did not receive a request for comments and has referred this project to the AFC and the RFC for review.

ITEM 7: Wildlife Crediting

2:44 – 4:00

Discussion: BPA's wildlife crediting document contains numerous discrepancies with which the Wildlife Committee is taking issue. Response has been made regarding the legal and technical aspects of the position paper. Attempts will be made to educate BPA on the basic principles of methodology.

ACTION A detailed Power Point presentation was critiqued and suggestions for improvements were made to simplify the presentation prior to meeting with BPA.

ITEM 8: Next Members Meeting

ACTION Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.

ITEM 9: Executive Session

ACTION Due to time constraints, it was suggested that the Executive Session be rescheduled for next week, no later than March 20th.