




June 26, 2002

TO: Members Management Group

FROM:  For Lynn Hatcher, Chair

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes

**Members Management Group Meeting
 June 13, 2002**

Action Notes

Attendees: Lynn Hatcher (YN); Bruce Schmidt (StreamNet); Bill Tweit (WDFW); Greg Sieglitz, Tony Nigro, Cedric Cooney, Susan Barnes (ODFW); Maureen Smith, Fred Olney (USFWS); John Palensky (NMFS); Dave Statler (NPT); Catriona Black (CRITFC); Eric Bloch (NWPPC); Jann Eckman, Kathie Titzler, Neil Ward, Tom Giese, Tana Klum, Tom Iverson, Mary Marvin (CBFWA)

By Phone: Chris Hunter (MDFWP); Sue Ireland (KTI), Lynn DuCharme (CSKT); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Mary Verner (STI), Ray Entz (KT)

Time	Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	10%
Allocation:	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	0%
	Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	90%

Agenda Maureen Smith requested time on the agenda to present a brief update of the Wildlife Crediting Convention that was held recently in Bend.

Revisions

ITEM 1:
9:15-10:30 am

Budget Review

Unallocated Placeholder – Tom Giese, CBFWA

Tom Giese summarized the categories of funding in the direct budget:
\$186M

–138M Council’s Start of Year

\$47.5M Start of Year

+14.2M Carry forward (unassociated with current projects; BPA has a
recalculation of \$10.2 M)

\$61.8M Subtotal

- 1.2M ISAB/ISRP

- 9.0M BPA overhead

- 7.6M Council’s Subbasin Planning Project

- 2.0M Innovative

- 1.0M Artificial Production Advisory

\$40.9M available to be reallocated January 2002

- 7.2M Columbia Plateau (above the current \$138M allocated)

- 1.6M Blue Mountain

- 7.0M Mountain Snake

- 3.7M Within Year Changes (including Hagerman)

\$21.4M Current Estimate of Available Funds

Caveats: 1. \$14.2M (or \$10.2M) is a one-time only amount. This may
result in the Final number actually being \$17.4M.

2. Some High Priority and Action Plan projects have already been
deducted by BPA from the \$186M.

BPA claims penalty again this year due to the condition of the market and
is slowing implementation down in order to conserve as much of the \$186
M as possible.

NWPPC has developed out-year costs. Those numbers need to be run
alongside the current budget numbers (see above). None of the five
provinces will be deducted from the \$186M in 2002. Capital will be
figured in when the 2003 budget is developed.

ACTIONS:

- MMG requested that this item be put on the agenda for the next MMG
meeting in July.
- Tom Giese will e-mail the MMG clarification of the numbers he
presented with a comments column that identifies where the funds
came from.

Wildlife Mitigation – Susan Barnes and Maureen Smith

Susan Barnes presented a letter to NWPPC, which outlines concerns about
the mitigation process. She would like the MMG to review it, comment,
and hopefully approve it at the next MMG meeting in July. There are
discrepancies between BPA’s budget numbers and those of ODFW’s
coalition. BPA states a budget of some \$7M remaining; the coalition

documents only \$3.5 remaining. NWPPC didn't allocate funding for FY02 on-going projects and needs to make corrections to the on-going 2002 provincial budget. This letter is a result of the meeting with Doug Marker who told the Oregon Coalition to put these issues in a letter.

MMG felt that the letter could actually be two or three separate letters.

ACTIONS:

MMG recommended staff draft three letters:

1) A letter to Doug Marker requesting information on how the base budget was reached, and whether consistent protocols were used. Make it clear that this letter is in response to Doug Marker's request. This letter will become a CONSENT MAIL for Member approval, pending approval from the Wildlife Committee.

2) A second letter outlining what we believe the problems are, and recommended solutions for the accounting needs.

3) A third letter addressing what the appropriate activities BPA should fund are, including coordination. This letter should include references to examples and address the delay issue and the length of FTE time it takes to get a project through from the funding recommendation to funding.

MMG recommended a draft of the second and third letter be available for review at the July MMG meeting.

ITEM 2:
10:30-10:35 am

Within-Year Budget Modification Guidelines – Neil Ward, CBFWA

Neil provided an overview of the draft guidelines. The draft guidelines will be reviewed by the AFC and WC at their next meetings and get comments back to Neil. A revised draft will be available for MMG action at their July meeting.

ITEM 3:
10:35-10:40 am

Within-Year Budget Modification – Tom Iverson, CBFWA

The project sponsor has withdrawn this request. They will be using FY02 funds to complete this project in December of 2002.

ITEM 4:
10:40-11:15 am

StreamNet Project – Bruce Schmidt, PSMFC

The goal of the project is to make data useful to users in the basin. StreamNet would like to see what CBFWA wants to see as regional priorities. They have explored expanding the services they provide and would like to present their augmented proposal to CBFWA and others. They have a web site: www.streamnet.org.

ITEM 5:
11:15 -12:25 pm

Alternative Project Selection Process – Eric Bloch, NWPPC

Eric indicated that this draft proposal came out of concerns voiced by various governors' offices and others to broaden participation in subbasin planning process. This draft version has been revised based on the input from Washington, Montana, and Idaho. Eric stated that review by CBFWA during the first phase is still viable.

Tom Iverson pointed out that CBFWA has successfully coordinated all of the provincial reviews to this point and that the current process mirrors the Alternative Selection Process. Eric acknowledged that the project selection process will need to be updated and may need additional review needs. He felt it would be good if CBFWA could provide feedback to NWPPC on what is good and can be improved upon and how CBFWA fits in with the managers' roles.

Suggestions were made to Eric how to improve the proposal process overall. It is more visionary than simple budgeting. Dialog needs to occur in NWPPC, between the CBFWA members, and then with the Members and NWPPC. Eric suggested sending a letter which narrowly focuses on the planning process, and sending a second letter raising the larger issues troubling the process, and seeking NWPPC's engagement in addressing those issues.

Eric stated that the entire process needs to become more public, and it may be that NWPPC's proposal is the best way to accomplish that. He felt that a "summit meeting" between CBFWA, NWPPC, and BPA might help, avoid a "train wreck."

ITEM 6: Members Meeting – Jann Eckman

12:25-12:30 pm

The next Members Meeting will be held in October in Helena, Montana. A firm date is yet to be set, but it will likely be before October 12.