



June 2, 2000

TO: CBFWA Members

FROM: Brian Allee

SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes from the 5/10/00 Members Meeting

CBFWA MEMBERS MEETING
May 10, 2000
7:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Embassy Suites Hotel
Portland International Airport
Portland, OR

DRAFT ACTION NOTES

Attendees: Howard Schaller, USFWS; Bill Tweit, WDFW; Maureen Smith, USFWS; Robert Matt, CdAT; Elizabeth Gaar, NMFS; John Platt, CRITFC; Haace St. Martin, BPT; Chad Colter, SBT; Terry Gibson, SPT; Richard Dick, SPT; Randy Settler, YIN; Lynn Hatcher, YIN; Greg Sieglitz, ODFW; Ned Pittman, WDFW; Ray Entz, KT, Deanne Osterman, KT; Joe Peone, CTCR; Bill Bradley, YIN; Sue Ireland, KTI; Billy Barquin, KTI; David Johnson, WDFW; Bob Foster, WDFW; Guy Dodson, SPT; Brian Marotz, MDFWP; Paul Lumley, CRITFC; Guy Dodson, ODFW; Carl Scheeler, CTUIR; Keith Underwood, STI; Ronald C. Peters, CdAT; Rapheal Bill, CTUIR; John R. Palensky, NMFS; Lionel Boyer, SBT; Bert Bowler, IDFG; Bruce Schmidt, PSMFC; Tom O'Neil, NHI; Barry Espenson, CBB; Mary Marvin, Frank Young, Neil Ward, Brian Allee, Jann Eckman, Tana Klum, CBFWA

Obj. 4 = 33%, Obj. 5 = 67%

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Discussion: Bert asked why the Wildlife Committee's budget issue was not on the agenda. Jann responded that when this issue came up at the 5/3/00 Members Management Group meeting there was not a quorum, so the MMG requested the Wildlife Committee Chair to write a memo for the MMG's consent mail approval to put the item on the 5/10/00 Members agenda. Since that had not occurred, the intention was to handle this request through the consent mail process. Guy Dodson said his Tribe

would like to see this issue discussed at this meeting. Chairman Lionel Boyer noted the request, but in view of the agenda topics and presenters schedules, would address the issue after lunch.

ITEM 2: Approve the Subbasin Assessment Template

Discussion: After the presentation, some concerns were expressed about the template such as:

- the ability to complete the assessment in the timeframe;
- how it will it be used – who decides;
- will it guide funding decisions and subbasin priorities;

Some Members expressed that they could adopt the template for the science but not for the policy - there would need to be guidance as to how it would be applied. YIN indicated that the Tribe did not want to be constrained by this assessment and would not support this as a CBFWA work product.

ACTION: No consensus reached on this document, referred back to committee.

ITEM 3: Overview of the Analytical Tools for Subbasin Assessment

- *Columbia Basin Technical Participation in Analytical Assessment of Provincial and Subbasin Plans (EDT Validation and Ground Truthing)*
- *Coarse Scale Screening/Habitat Correlation to Fish Populations*
- *Establishing Baseline Key Ecological Functions of Fish and Wildlife for Subbasin Planning*

Discussion: Each project proposal was presented and discussed.

ACTION: Although the Members may have supported the project proposals individually, they did not agree to support them through CBFWA as part of the amendment recommendation.

Non-agenda

ITEM: Non-funding of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes Wildlife Projects

Discussion: Guy Dodson requested time to present a letter written by Tribal attorney, Terry Gibson regarding the Shoshone Paiute Tribes concerns about the CBFWA Project Review process. Terry Gibson read the first two paragraphs of a letter addressed to Brian Allee expressing the Tribes dissatisfaction with the review process and requesting that the projects be re-reviewed receiving the equal and full consideration other CBFWA Member's project proposals receive.

ACTION: Members recommended this issue be on the agenda for discussion at the next Wildlife Committee meeting.

ITEM 4: CBFWA Program Amendment Recommendation

Discussion: Tom indicated that there were two major issues:

- As fish and wildlife managers what do we want to do in regards to this amendment;
- Where are we with a consensus document.

Tom reviewed the May 9th version and pointed out the revisions. Several Members requested all references to “harvest” be removed. Other Members felt CBFWA shouldn’t be in a leadership role driving and developing the subbasin plans, should be agencies and Tribes. John Platt asked what the strategy was for the amendment document. Do the Members want to use this document as the fish and wildlife recommendations or do the Members want to use it as comments at the end of the document comment period. A consensus recommendation could trump individual recommendations. Tom Giese asked if the Members wanted to submit those recommendations that everyone is in agreement with:

- the trust and Treaty obligations to the Tribes;
- the purpose - to protect, mitigate and enhance populations of fish and wildlife in the Columbia River Basin, etc.
- the schedule.

Some Members wanted to submit a CBFWA recommendation, but others expressed reservations.

ACTION: There was no consensus approval of the CBFWA Program Amendment Recommendation. The Members would submit their individual Program Amendment Recommendation and would use portions of the CBFWA Program Amendment Recommendation document as needed.

ITEM 5: Select Next Meeting Date and Place

ACTION: The Members decided to meet during the month of October in Ft. Hall, Idaho.