



October 29, 1999

TO: Resident Fish Managers
FROM: Kelly Lillengreen, Chair *Neil Ward*
SUBJECT: Action Notes from the RFM September 14, 1999, Meeting

Attendees: **In Person** – Joe Maroney (KT), Kelly Lillengreen (CDA), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Kirk Truscott (CCT), Bill Towey (J-U-B Engineers), Vinny Pero (SPT), Keith Underwood (STOI), Nancy Hoefs (NRT), Dave Statler (NPT), Brian Marotz (MDFWP), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), Neil Ward (CBFWA)

By Phone – Sue Ireland (KTOI), Tony Nigro (ODFW)

Calendar:

- Sept 21-22.....NWPPC Meeting, Spokane
- Sept 22.....Artificial Production Review (APR) submitted to Council for review
- Oct 1Responses to ISRP comments due to Council
- Oct 1APR Meeting, NWPPC (Portland)
- Oct 5RFM Meeting, Spokane
- Oct 7MSG Meeting
- Oct 8.....ISRP comments due back to Council
- Oct 11.....APR Meeting, NWPPC (Portland)
- Oct 12-13.....NWPPC Meeting, Portland (Council will consider ISRP Recommendations)
- Oct 25CBFWA Principals Meeting, Portland
- Nov 3MSG Meeting
- Nov 2RFM Meeting, location to be determined

Agenda Changes:

One item was added: Multi-Year Funding was inserted as Item 5. Next Meeting and Proposed Agenda became Item 6.

ITEM 1: Summary of the Artificial Production Review

Discussion: Neil Ward provided copies of the APR's Performance Standards and Indicators (PSI) (Working Draft 9) and the Hatchery Genetics Management Plan (HGMP-Draft 4). Neil indicated the APR would be reviewed by the Council on September 22, 1999, and it is anticipated the Council will approve transmittal to Congress at their October 12-13, 1999, meeting. The APR would be sent to Congress by late-October and reviewed by the ISRP upon return. The PSI is being labeled as an informational item that should not be acted on by Congress. The RFM expressed concerns regarding the attachment of the HGMP to the APR since it was not developed in coordination with them and does not address non-native concerns.

Action: The Chair will draft a letter to the MSG to be forwarded to the AFM, APR committee and NWPPC, requesting that the HGMP not be attached to the APR and to not use it (HGMP) as an interim plan in the Columbia River Basin until the RFM have reviewed the plan.

ITEM 2: FY 2000 Process

Discussion: Tom Iverson provided an update on the current status of the FY 2000 process and indicated several Category 7 projects were identified as not meeting program measures. The following issues were addressed:

1. Tier 3 projects in Category 7 do not meet the measures and should not be considered for FY 2000 funding.
2. Six Tier 2 projects the NWPPC assigned funding to for FY 2000 (i.e., 20007-Category 7, 20028-Category 7, 20094-Category 7, 20036-Category 1, 20097-Category 1, and 9502700-Category 1).
3. Two projects in Category 5 (i.e., 20135-on going and treated as such and 20049-high priority ESA project) that will be pursued for funding by the sponsors.

The RFM reaffirmed they have identified a set of projects that do not fit into the program and should not be funded. In addition, the RFM reaffirmed the ISRP should not make programmatic decisions on Tier 3 projects and that their decisions should be limited to technical issues.

ITEM 3: Future Direct Program

Discussion: Tom Iverson summarized the NWPPC's "rolling" desired end state document Version 4. Tom encouraged the RFM to provide input to the

Council since they have indicated the document is an “open book “ at this time.

ITEM 4: Tom Iverson updated the RFM on the outcomes from the August 31 – September 1, 1999, Members Meeting in Portland. Concerns were expressed regarding the framework, guiding principles, and how the framework would be adapted to resident fish and native fish recovery. The RFM recognize that the framework could drive the amendment process and that there is a need for a clarification of the details. Thus, the RFM recommended that Chip McConnaha of the NWPPC be invited to the October RFM Caucus Meeting to address the RFM concerns.

The RFM made the following recommendation regarding the framework:

1. Establish and maintain a proactive role.
2. Assemble comprehensive subbasin plans using all existing materials.
3. Initiate subbasin planning regardless of the NWPPC process.
4. Become involved in the amendment process to address items such as multiyear and province goals and objectives.

ITEM 5: Multiyear Funding

Discussion: Tom Iverson provided an update on multiyear funding. During the discussion it was stressed that multiyear funding is implicit in the current proposed funding and that it should be made explicit.

ITEM 6: Next Meeting and Proposed Agenda

Discussion: The next meeting will be Tuesday, October 5, 1999, in Spokane. The proposed agenda will include:

1. Update on APR and HGMP status
2. Update on Council actions
3. Evaluation of subbasin planning approaches
4. Development of subbasin teams
5. Development of a process to develop subbasin review templates
6. Discussion about funding agenda and equitable allocation processes
7. Development of peer review and information exchange activities