



**Final**

DATE: November 22, 2005  
TO: Members Advisory Group (MAG)  
FROM: Tony Nigro, Chair and Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA  
SUBJECT: Action Notes from the 11/15/05 MAG Meeting

**\*Note: These Action Notes were approved as final at the 12/8/05 MAG Meeting.**

Members Advisory Group Meeting  
November 15, 2005  
CBFWA Office, Portland, OR

**Action Notes**

The support material and reference documents for the 11/15/05 MAG meeting are posted at <http://www.cbfga.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=MMG&meeting=all>.

**Attendees:** Dave Ward, ODFW; David Speten, BPT; Paul Ward, YN; Lonny Macy, CTWSRO  
Doug Taki, SBT John Palensky, NOAA Fisheries; Greg Delwiche, BPA; Brian  
Lipscomb, Jann Eckman, Trina Gerlack, Tom Giese, Tom Iverson, Tana Klum, Neil  
Ward, Frank Young, CBFWA

**By Phone:** Ronald Peters, Cd'AT; Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Carl Scheeler, CTUIR; Gary James,  
CTUIR; Peter Hassemmer, IDFG; Dick Stone, WDFW

<b>Time Allocation:</b>	Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
	Objective 2. Technical Review	0%
	Objective 3. Presentation	0%

**ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda**

**Action:** The agenda was approved and re-arranged to accommodate time differences and completion of committee updates.

**ITEM 2: Approve Draft Action Notes from 10/25/05 MAG Meeting**

**Action:** The 10/25/05 MAG Meeting Action Notes were approved.

**ITEM 3: BPA Presentation on New Contracting Alternative**

Greg Delwiche, BPA Department of Environment, Fish and Wildlife will present the Draft BPA Proposal for capitalizing wildlife land acquisitions using a contract or MOA for fixed habitat units.

**Discussion:** Greg Delwiche reported that the contracting mechanism was developed primarily to address wildlife mitigation and where there is fish crediting, it can be used there as well. This proposal is going through an internal and external review process now. The goal is to develop at least two MOA's within this fiscal year to execute next fiscal year as pilots. The O&M currently will not be capitalized. BPA is looking for fish and wildlife managers to contract with to try this approach. This approach is different from a settlement. A settlement can be broader in scope but is more complicated to settle. The MAG invited Greg Delwiche to come back to the Members Meeting on 12/14 to offer the Members participation in the proposed MOA.

**ITEM 4: Standardized Technical Committee Charters**

**Discussion:** The addition under IV. Procedures "the mechanism for electing officers" was read by Tom Giese. The RFAC has a statement regarding rotating chair that the AFAC does not. The WAC decided to be silent in the committee charter and went by the main charter. In general, the WAC, RFAC, and AFAC charters are the same. The difference in the charters would be the II. Purposes of the committees.

Regarding the FPAC Charter issue, the managers need to think seriously about whether the work under the FPAC committee can be sent out under a smaller group of members without going through the CBFWA process. Under the current FPAC Charter, FPAC can do technical memos without going through the CBFWA Members. If there were crossovers in the letters between technical and policy, that would need to be addressed. The letters that go out by a coalition of the members go out under the FPC logo. Perhaps this issue should be brought up to the Members, but there should be some ground rules that are understood when Members decide to get together to develop a policy response, that may look like it is under the auspices of CBFWA. No action was taken on this issue. The MAG just wants Members to think about this issue.

**Action:** The MAG approved changing #3 in the IV. Procedures section to be standardized among the three charters deleting the rotating language in the RFAC charter and forward the AFAC, RFAC, & WAC Committees Charters to the Members for approval at the 12/14 meeting.

**ITEM 5: NPPC FY07-09 Solicitation Guidance Document**

- Review and discuss the NPPC Guidance Document for the Program Implementation for FY07-09.

**Discussion:** The MAG expressed their concerns with how the selection process is shaping up under the current guidance. Some of the issues of concerns are the lack of deference to co-managers, putting this solicitation to the local boards, the process is not defined, and how do the projects get prioritized and differences get worked out by the local groups versus the co-managers. In Idaho, the Council state staff and OSC are going to take care of this situation. The local group may be less likelihood of meeting those ESA applications in the anadromous fish subbasins. Depending on what you define at the local level and the size of some of the subbasins adds a layer of complexity. There are some places that it might work very well, but in others a spatial scale of some of the subbasins, it needs to be implemented by the fish and wildlife managers.

The WDFW is supporting this process and they are going to work through the local groups (counties, cities, local watershed groups, etc.) which may be a much more difficult process than in the past, but the co-managers will be at the table. It is important to bring in the local stakeholders in the planning level, but it appears that these local stakeholders are getting more control into project implementation, which is

where the sensitivity is to the fish and wildlife managers. As co-managers perhaps we can steer this process down a better path than what is has been. It is more likely to be implemented. The upside of local support is a stronger implementation of the Plan and taking advantage of everyone's project knowledge as far what works and what does not work. We have a close enough team so that the local stakeholders would actually act as allies to support the managers in what we do best for fish and wildlife.

**ITEM 6: Within Year Budget Modification Process**

- Presentation on FY 06 Within Year Process
- Coeur d'Alene Trout Ponds Presentation

The BPA has the discretion to approve reschedule requests without getting NPCC's approval. If you have any reschedule requests that has not been reviewed get them in by December 31, 2005.

BPA started the year with \$2M for within year and reschedules. \$800K has been spent on reschedules leaving \$1.2M for within year requests. The BOG is an administrative review body for the within-year requests. The decision is made by NPCC staff and BPA staff (i.e., contract issues). Tom Iverson reported on the BOG process. The first Quarterly Review is November 30th. Look through existing recommendations and get your requests in by 11/30 if you want the funds for January 06.

The CBFWA could submit comments on the list of within year requests as a group or individually. Many of the submissions have been resolved and you can go into the budget tracking page on the CBFWA website and review all the budget tracking and detailed requests that have been requested. If you have any concerns or questions contact Tom Iverson.

Ron Peters requested that CBFWA create a list of projects that CBFWA feels should be funded and make a recommendation to the NPCC and/or BPA. Brian Lipscomb said if you submit your project within this within year process, we should be able to get a list pulled together for submission. The deadline is 11/30 for a January 1, 2006 adjustment and March for an April 1, 2006 adjustment. The BOG will meet 12/7/05 and at the end of the meeting there will be a list that has all of the within year requests on it and at that point we could provide comment on that list. Our likely comment on the list will be to make the funds available to fund everything on the list regardless of the \$1.2M identified by BPA. Brian outlined the process. We will see from the BOG a list of projects and we will know how many within-year projects the region is needing to maintain for FY06 and then we can generate a response that there is more than \$1M or perhaps \$10M available to fund those projects. The within-year budget proposals are projects that are ongoing and need an adjustment, not new projects. The MAG urged Ron to get his proposal submitted as soon as possible.

**ITEM 7: Work Shop on Cost Sharing**

This issue comes from a work element in CBFWA's contract with BPA to host a cost sharing workshop. Tom Giese presented three potential workshop ideas and he is seeking MAG's input on what the managers feel would be the most useful cost sharing workshop to schedule. One idea is open discussion on in-lieu funding issues. Another idea would be to pull together folks from BLM, NRCS, FS, COE, etc., to discuss and define their cost sharing programs and activities. The third is informational seminars on the use of cost sharing. The workshops would begin sometime in March 2006. The first idea presented may possibly lead to the crediting issue, so perhaps that idea won't

work. Another issue is that we do not give BPA the impression that we support cost sharing as a policy in project funding/implementation. If you cost share, does that mean you get to do more, or are you just lightening the load for someone else. Many considerations should be worked out internally before we get out in front of a big group of folks. Brian said we could certainly do a workshop focused toward the membership (along with BPA) about the programs available to cost share. CBFWA should have a structured discussion about it internally before we hold a workshop. Brian suggested that we invite someone to discuss the cost sharing programs, etc. To assist the Members discussions it would add helpful information to poll our Members and see what kinds of cost sharing they currently do. Providing a framework for the discussions, different types of cost sharing, benefits, drawbacks, etc. would form a better approach prior to going out and holding a workshop. Tom Giese will "frame" the issues for the 12/8/05 MAG meeting.

**ITEM 8: CBFWA Funding Diversity**

- Discuss ideas for grant proposals
- Funding for F&W Manager involvement in FERC processes

Tom Giese wants some systematic way of exploring this idea with the Members before going forward. Do we want to add funding diversity to the funding for existing staff, or do we want to increase funding to add new staff? This depends on the proposal and is exactly the type of discussion that the Members need to have. This item will be up for discussion at the 12/8/05 MAG meeting.

**ITEM 9: CBFWA Committee Report**

- Status reports from Standing Committee Chairs

AFAC – Tom Iverson talked about the Research Plan the NPCC has released. Everyone is leery about the Research Plan. Tom Iverson will defer to Neil Ward to discuss the subject in detail. The AFAC feels that the Members need to provide some comment on the Research Plan either individually or as a group. Steve Waste, NPCC has contacted CBFWA staff informally that he wants comments by 12/15/05. Steve indicated that ISAB and ISRP reviews are due by 12/15/05 also. The AFAC suggested that we don't want to lose flexibility in the Program and that we need to track it closely. The tracking needs to be on the allocation because there is so much uncertainty in the spending of the money. The Status of the Resource Report does not contain a lot of new information but it gets complex quickly. CRITFC is building a comprehensive database that looks a lot like the Status of the Resource database. What we are really talking about is the "E" in an M&E Program. How do we report the accomplishments biologically on the Program? We agreed to move forward with baby steps and build our first draft report on population abundance information and maybe some trend information. Build a basin wide report, get the first cut out within our contract period, and then add in life stage survival, limiting factors, etc., once we get the framework built. Neil Ward is working on a draft Status of the Resource mock-up report on the Columbia Gorge. A draft will be presented at the 12/8/05 MAG meeting.

RFAC – Neil Ward reported that the draft NPCC Research Plan has been released and it has improved little since the first draft. The 7/15/15 discussion that was to occur among the chairs will happen before the next MAG meeting. It was postponed because of scheduling conflicts. The RFAC is sponsoring a "white sturgeon summit" and the potential date is sometime in March 2006 in the Spokane area. RFAC and CBFWA are co-sponsoring a sturgeon symposium in Bozeman, MT next year. RFAC will be

providing an update on what the Status of the Resource will be - focusing on the Columbia Gorge.

WAC – No update was provided. The WAC has not met since the last MAG update.

**ITEM 10: PNUCC Project Review**

- Discussion of PNUCC project review process

The PNUCC developed a memo that listed the 10 worst projects in the Program according to PNUCC. The MAG asked PNUCC to come to the meeting and discuss this list. This list was an initial effort for the utilities to become more familiar with the projects in the Program and understanding the process. The PNUCC went through the CBFWA website and reviewed 300 projects using four basic criteria, applied the criteria to the project using the project titles and descriptions, looked at some of the ISRP reviews, and FY06 comments just as exposure to the Program. At this time, PNUCC doesn't really intend to go any further with this list except to go in front of the NPCC to talk about this exercise and their intent. This presentation to the NPCC should be a good indication of whether or not this should be a potential "red flag" for the managers to be concerned.

At the RFAC it was determined that PNUCC wasn't familiar with the Program. On behalf of resident fish, there is an opportunity to brief them on what, why, and how resident fish supplementation is used. It would be good to prep the PNUCC in advance. Pete Hassemer feels that because this group is presenting to the NPCC, CBFWA staff should listen to the PNUCC presentation and consider bringing this issue the Members. Staff should coordinate with Terry Flores and others to get PNUCC to make a presentation to the Members at the December Members meeting. Dick Stone sensed from conversations with Doug Marker that Doug might be thinking about having the utilities take a role in project prioritization so it will be interesting to hear what PNUCC has to say to the NPCC on Thursday. Brian Lipscomb said that this would be a good opportunity to promote fish and wildlife and the managers' role within the Basin.

**ITEM 11: Next MAG Meeting Date/Location and Other Meeting Information**

12/8/05 - The MAG will meet in the afternoon at the CBFWA office to discuss: 1) Within-year BOG list; 2) Funding Diversity; 3) Cost Sharing; 4) Status of the Resource draft mockup on Columbia Gorge; 5) 70/15/15; 6) NPCC's Research Plan.

12/14/05 - The Members will meet the afternoon to: 1) Adopt the WAC, RFAC, AFAC Charters, 2) Approve contracts for FY07 on CSMEP, HEP, and CBFWA.

December 13, 14 & 15, 2005- NPCC Committee Meetings, Portland, OR

December 20, 2005 – MAG Meeting 9:00 to 5:00 p.m., CBFWA Office