



May 8, 2002

TO: Members Management Group

FROM: Lynn Hatcher, Chair

SUBJECT: DRAFT Action Notes, May 8 and 9, 2002

**Members Management Group Meeting
 May 8th and 9th, 2002**

Draft Action Notes

May 8th

Attendees: Lynn Hatcher (YN); Maureen Smith (USFWS); Susan Barnes, Tony Nigro, and Greg Sieglitz (ODFW); John Palensky (NMFS); Catriona Black (CRITFC); Dave Statler (NPT); Tom Giese, Tana Klum, Frank Young, Jann Eckman, Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, Mary Marvin (CBFWA).

By Phone: Pete Hassemer (IDFG); Joe Peone (CT); Gary James and Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Ray Entz (KTI); Loren Kroneman (NPT); Mary Verner (STI); Doug Taki (SBT); Dave Johnson (WDFW); Sue Ireland (KTI); Theodora Strong; Amos First Raised (BPT); Fred Olney (USFWS); Ron Peters (CdA)

Time Allocation:	Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	75%
	Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	15%

- Additions/Changes**
1. Susan Barnes requested time on the agenda to discuss the Wildlife Committee's update on the subcommittee presentation next week. It was agreed that this item would become Item 7a and be heard before the Budget Review Process.
 2. Maureen Smith requested time on the agenda to share Doug Marker's unique view of the budget. This will occur either prior to or during the Budget Review Process.

ITEM 1: Budget Review

9:00-10:25

Tom Giese reviewed a preliminary document depicting his estimate of the money available for fish & wildlife projects, based on numbers from BPA. The document indicates approximately \$3M unallocated; however, Tom believes that, once all the monies are accounted for, the bottom line is actually \$0. This assumption is based on the following:

1. Some money may have already been spent;
2. The total doesn't account for within-year changes that have been approved by the Council, but no contracts are in place;
3. Other projects had unspent funds last year, which they assume are still available, and these amounts need to be deducted from the \$3M.
4. The Oregon Coalition (and projects like it) has uncontracted monies not identified in the preliminary evaluation of available funds.

Tom Iverson believes the Action Plan and High Priority funds should not be included as deductions to the original amount of \$47M.

Tom Giese will continue to research this issue to determine the actual amount available. Confusion has arisen because CBFWA and BPA are using two different accounting systems. He would like to devise a bookkeeping process that would give a more accurate accounting of the money available, one that could be used by CBFWA as a spending guide as well as a tracking device. He plans to request electronic copies of the past two years' transactions from BPA, put the numbers into a database, and apply our own accounting method. He would then meet with BPA and both systems would be compared and agreement reached on exact dollar amounts available.

Since it is unlikely that BPA will change their accounting method, it is up to CBFWA to make our own system to track BPA's accounting and reconcile as best we can. Currently, we are not prepared to challenge their numbers.

Several actions were proposed. The Kalispel Tribe proposed that activity on unallocated funds be suspended until solid numbers are known, effective today. This action met with concern about a proposal being put forward at the next AFC meeting regarding basin-wide HGMPs, and a concern about an oversight by the Council regarding allocation of funds in the Upper Snake, where the acquisition portion of a proposal appears to have been dropped. Subsequently, this action was withdrawn, but the Kalispel Tribe made it clear that they will not consent to further expenditure of supposedly unallocated funds until a firm dollar amount is available.

ACTION: Tom Giese will request from BPA copies of the past two years of transactions, from which he will develop a better accounting system, and work with BPA to reconcile the actual dollar amounts available for funding

projects currently approved.

ITEM 2: CBFWA FY 2003-2005 Proposal

10:25–11:20 Very little discussion occurred prior to actions being taken. This document is due to the Members by May 21, and to the Council by June 1.

Discussion
(CBFWA
Proposal)

ACTION

- Objective 6 (Distribute funds to reimburse subbasin planners for appropriate expenses) will be deleted and monies reallocated to other objectives, as appropriate.
- CBFWA staff will re-write Objective 7 in the Narrative to read: “Facilitate the collective involvement of the fish and wildlife managers in planning efforts.” Subheading 7.2 will read: “Coordinate the input of the fish and wildlife managers to provide the needed expertise.” Another subheading will be added which gives a definition of Proposal Development and Review Criteria.
- The MMG felt that CBFWA web site management should be designated as a specific task to be funded as it provides a usable product. The Objective could be to facilitate information exchange, with the Task as web site management and maintenance.
- A paragraph will be added clarifying that tasks are viewed as planning functions for CBFWA.

Discussion
(HEP)

The Habitat Evaluation Plan will not be discussed at Whitefish because NWPPC staff stated they had not heard of it or seen it. BPA will contact Doug Marker at NWPPC to urge HEP be put on the Whitefish agenda. If it does not make it onto the agenda, available monies will be re-programmed from 2002 funds for the first 3 months of HEP activity.

The RM&E situation is unclear. Tasks and objectives need to be re-written. An additional budget cannot be developed; existing funds must be re-programmed.

ACTION

- The SOW will be changed to address the regional HEP team. It will state: “Facilitate the function and operation of a Regional HEP Team.” The narrative will describe the objectives and tasks of the Team.
- The MMG cannot approve the addition until the package is seen. Therefore, CBFWA staff will draft a letter for consent that includes the entire HEP package.
- The task should state: “Develop an annual fish and wildlife Evaluation Report.”
- On 5/9, Frank Young will send a re-written draft to Tony Nigro, Pete Hassemer, John Palensky, Mary Verner and Dave Statler for their input and approval. The reviewed and revised document will be sent to the MMG by noon on May 10. After their approval, it will be sent as a

consent mail to the Members, with a response needed by Close of Business on May 14. CBFWA staff will be directed to send a revised document for inclusion in the May 15 Members packet.

ITEM 3: Subbasin Planning

11:20-12:00

The draft letter to the NWPPC was revised by Tom Giese. He requested guidance from the MMG regarding the roles of CBFWA and the managers in the proposed NWPPC plan. The final document will be signed by the CBFWA Chair.

Tana Klum updated the group on the Contract. Approval of the contract by NWPPC has been pending input from the tribes. NWPPC has met with BPA to get approval; they are meeting again today to negotiate further in order to finalize the contract. All subbasin planning will be finalized in 24 months from the signing of the contract.

Concerns were expressed that the Contract does not provide a role for CBFWA under Conditions of Funding; however, Project Prioritization is a separate activity from Subbasin Planning. CRITFC tribes will be commenting on the prioritization issue. Subbasin Plans need CBFWA/fish and Wildlife Manager approval prior to their being funded. These concerns will be included in the letter Tom Giese is drafting today.

The difference between a measure and a project was described. A measure is a strategy or action. A project is the implementation of the strategy or action. It was felt that it would be helpful for NWPPC to create a document that clarifies these points. If no clarification occurs, NWPPC could be open to litigation.

Tom Iverson discussed Regional Coordination of Subbasin Planning meetings. CBFWA needs to be informed about these meetings in order to attend and share the information from the meetings with the MMG.

ACTION

A revised draft of the letter to Frank Cassidy will be sent to the MMG today for discussion at the continued MMG meeting tomorrow, May 9th.

ITEM 4: WDFW Project 199902400 “Columbia Gorge Bull Trout Investigations”

This item was deleted. The April 24 letter is sufficient. No other letter will be sent.

ITEM 5: Middle and Upper Snake River Provinces Letter of Request for Additional Fish and Wildlife Funds - Neil Ward, CBFWA

1:10 – 2:00

The Provinces have asked CBFWA to re-petition NWPPC to add back in the \$700,000 that was dropped due to an oversight.

Maureen Smith and Susan Barnes met with Karl Weist, Don Warren, and Doug Marker regarding the budget for ongoing projects. The NWPPC is holding ongoing projects at a static level in the Upper Snake, and intend to pull out the O&M only, add 3.4%, and make that the final budget for that province from 2003 onward. Any other projects (such as M&E, which are considered New Projects) would be considered discretionary by NWPPC.

It is possible this was an intentional action, as other provinces have received M&E funding. A letter to NWPPC pointing out the oversight and requesting reinstatement of the funds was drafted on May 6.

It was stated that there were some projects in other provinces that show “oddities” in how the budgets and allocations were reached. It may be that many projects were perceived as acquisitions, and the O&M portion was either missed or ignored. Overall budgets for these last five provinces are smaller; therefore, loss of one project makes a substantial impact in the province’s budget. If NWPPC has used a specific method for determining budgets, clarification is needed by the MMG, although conversations between Doug Marker and the Nez Perce Tribe on this issue have yielded no results.

ACTION Neil Ward, Maureen Smith, and Pete Hassemer will assist CBFWA staff in developing a letter to NWPPC requesting a detailed explanation of how the base budget was derived for each province.

ITEM 6: Alternative Project Selection Process

2:00 - 2:10

Addition of this item to the Members May 21 agenda was proposed.

ACTION This item will be added to the May 21 Members Meeting agenda as a discussion item only. Decisions on this item must be made after June 15th.

ITEM 7: FPC Oversight Board

2:10 – 2:35

Doug Marker contacted John Palensky last Friday voicing concerns that CBFWA had not provided the names of nominees for the NWPPC-created Fish Passage Center Oversight Board. An emergency MMG conference call occurred yesterday, May 6, to discuss this issue. The following was decided during that conference call:

- Names will be submitted to NWPPC by close of business Wednesday, May 15th. Follow through on this is important.
- CBFWA would like to explore adding a tribal representative from the four up-river tribes.
- The current board established by CBFWA remains in place to handle other ongoing issues that NWPPC would not have knowledge of. NWPPC does not have the power to disband the current board.
- Commitment to the new board by CBFWA will span 6 months. After that time, the new board will be evaluated and a decision made whether or not to disband the old board.

John asked Bruce Suzumoto (NWPPC) to change certain points in his letter, specifically the second sentence under Discussion. He recommended it be removed or at least softened. Bruce refused. John has a meeting with Larry Cassidy (NWPPC) this Thursday to further discuss this issue.

ACTION The MMG will contact Bruce Suzumoto and request that he revise his letter. Further action will occur after Larry Cassidy speaks to the MMG at tomorrow’s meeting.

ITEM 7a: Wildlife Committee Presentation Update

2:35 – 3:15

Maureen Smith and Susan Barnes presented their Power Point presentation to the full Council on April 4 in Boise. It was successful. Some questions by NWPPC staff indicated that NWPPC was unaware of past decisions. Maureen and Susan will have three hours to meet with an ad hoc group in Whitefish. BPA still wants to credit one-to-one and this presentation clarified to many that this is not sufficient. Although they strongly recommend a three-to-one ratio, Susan and Maureen will support NWPPC's two-to-one ratio; however, there are some ambiguities that need resolution. It is the goal to have the recommended ratio applied retroactively to projects with re-opener clauses. CBFWA expects BPA to implement the two-to-one ratio at a minimum. This wording is preferable to saying CBFWA supports NWPPC's program. It was also suggested that this presentation and recommendation be brought before the ISRP perhaps at a later date for a scientifically-based response regarding mitigation.

May 9th

Attendees: Lynn Hatcher (YN); Maureen Smith (USFWS); Susan Barnes, Tony Nigro, and Greg Sieglitz (ODFW); John Palensky (NMFS Dave Statler (NPT); Tom Giese, Tana Klum, Frank Young, Jann Eckman, Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, (CBFWA).

By Phone: Pete Hassemer (IDFG); Loren Kroneman (NPT); Mary Verner (STI);); Catriona Black (CRITFC);); Fred Olney (USFWS); Dave Johnson (WDFW); Jerry Marco (CTCR); Greg Sieglitz (ODFW)

Time	Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	%
Allocation:	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	15%
	Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	75%

ITEM 8: Review and Approve Project Recommendations and Comments for Columbia Cascade, Middle Snake, Upper Snake, Lower Columbia, and Columbia Estuary Provinces.Columbia Cascade Province

The province allocation is \$4.09M.

High priority projects total \$10.8M

On-going projects \$4.04

Recommended action \$6.6M.

The Columbia Cascade province took a tiered approach to the high priority projects.

ACTION: The MMG recommended deleting the tier 1 and 2 category and associated comments. The Columbia Cascade project recommendations and comments were approved as amended to be forwarded to the Members for consent mail approval.

Middle Snake

The province allocation is \$2.2M

High priority projects total \$13M (2003), \$10M (2004), \$13.5M (2005)

Ongoing projects: \$8M

ACTION: MMG revised the comments on the crediting issue and recommended moving the comments into the project review comment section. The Middle Snake project recommendations and comments as changed were approved to be forwarded to the Members for consent mail approval.

Upper Snake

The province allocation is \$1.075M.

High priority project total \$8.6M (2003), \$10.5M (2004), \$10.8M (2005)

Ongoing projects total \$7.8M

ACTION: MMG requested Dave Statler to draft his concerns regarding Project 33001. The Upper Snake project recommendations and comments were approved to be forwarded to the Members for consent mail approval.

Lower Columbia and Columbia Estuary

The combined province allocation is \$6.6M.

Columbia Estuary:

High priority projects total \$6M

Ongoing projects \$2M in 2003, \$2.4M in 2004, and \$2.4M in 2005,

Lower Columbia

High priority projects total \$8.8M

Ongoing projects \$5.7M in 2003, \$6.4M in 2004, and \$6.6M in 2005

ACTION: MMG change Project 31007 from HP to RA as BPA may not be responsible for this expense. Project 30013 – no technical review has been done yet. Lower Columbia and Columbia Estuary project recommendations and comments were approved as amended and will be forwarded to the Members for consent mail approval.

ITEM 3: Subbasin Planning (continued from 5/8/02)

Discussion: MMG recommended that we clearly state that the members intend to participate in subbasin planning in our role as managers and tribal authorities. CBFWA is where we will work together to participate in subbasin planning.

ACTION: Tom Giese will revise the letter and forward to the Members for consent mail approval.

ITEM 9: Meeting with Larry Cassidy, NWPPC to Discuss FPC Oversight Board

Discussion: MMG representatives had a frank and open discussion with Larry regarding the FPC Oversight Board and the history of the Fish Passage Center.

ITEM 10: Executive Session to Discuss Personnel Issues

ACTION: Item withdrawn, no action taken

h:\work\mmg\2002_0508\FinalActionNotes.doc