



January 25, 2000

TO: Resident Fish Committee (RFC)

FROM: Kelly Lillengreen, Chair

SUBJECT: January 5, 6 & 11, 2000 RFC Meeting Draft Action Notes

Attendees: **In Person** – Brian Marotz (MFWP), Dave Ward (ODFW), Kelly Lillengreen and Ronald Peters (Cd'AT), Bert Bowler (IDFG), Dave Statler (NPT), Tom Iverson and Neil Ward (CBFWA), Keith Underwood (STOI), Joe Maroney (KT).

By Phone – Sue Ireland (KTOI), Stacy Horton (NWPPC), Mike Faler (USFWS), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), Vinny Pero (SPT), Jim Uherha (WDFW), Kirk Truscott (CCT), and Charlie Holderman.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 2000

ITEM 1: Review and Approve December Draft Action Notes and Discuss Possible Changes to Agenda

ACTION: The December Draft Action Notes were approved with no changes or additions. As a result of the Members Management Group (MMG) Meeting, an overview of meeting actions was added as Agenda Item 2, with the remaining items being renumbered in sequential order.

ITEM 2: Members Management Meeting Overview

Information: Following the motion and action taken by the Members during the December meeting, the Members Steering Group (MSG) was repealed and all functions previously served by the MSG were transferred to the MMG. The MMG met for the first time on Wednesday, January 5, 2000. As a result, Kelly Lillengreen provided an overview of the following meeting actions regarding subbasin planning.

1. **a.** The MMG approved the Interaucus Subbasin Planning Work Group (ISPWG) to take the draft Subbasin Planning Template(Outline to the Northwest Power Planning Council's (NWPPC) January meeting and to discuss it with them.
- b.** The MMG directed the ad hoc Amendment Committee (AC) to continue discussions regarding the budget and schedule.

2. The MMG approved seeking NWPPC approval of the bottom line CBFWA budget including the \$857,000 placeholder for coordination and continued development of subbasin planning. The following caveats were attached to the above actions:
 - The completeness of the products depends on the schedule and the budget – sliding scale.
 - The technical work group is still developing details – comments are due Friday, January 14, 2000.
 - Ask for feedback from the NWPPC.

ITEM 3: Subbasin Planning

Information: Dave Ward and Neil Ward provided an overview of the ISPWG’s progress regarding the development of draft subbasin planning products (i.e., outline\template, effort allocation, and funding allocation). In addition, the RFC were informed of the recent development that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) lacked commitment to the draft products.

ACTION 1: *Subbasin Planning and Watershed Assessment Defined Document*

- The RFC agreed to strike “watershed” from the document title, first header, and within the watershed assessment definition and replace with “subbasin”.
- The RFC agreed to strike the entire “Subbasin Plans” section and to replace it with the following verbiage:
 - Subbasin planning is a process that, based on existing information, identifies and prioritizes needs that must be met to achieve subbasin objectives.
 - A subbasin plan is a document that describes the results of the subbasin planning process.
- The RFC agreed that a RFC ISPWG representative would submit the edited definition document to the ISPWG for review and consideration of acceptance.

ACTION 2: *Subbasin Planning Template/Outline*

- Neil Ward will capture the RFC proposed changes and additions regarding the Subbasin Planning Template (January 3, 2000, Version) and submit them to Frank Young by Friday, January 14, 2000.
- Due to time restrictions, on Thursday, January 6, 2000, the RFC agreed to review the Coordination Funding and Effort Allocation documents and allow Neil Ward an opportunity to provide a brief

overview of the Artificial Production Review (APR) and Hatchery and Genetics Management Plan Template.

ITEM 5: Artificial Production Review (APR) and Hatchery and Genetics Management Plan (HGMP) Update

Information: Neil Ward informed the RFC that the APR was sent to Congress and that the Performance Standards and Indicators are being reviewed by the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) with an expected completion date of January 15, 2000. In addition, Neil reminded the RFC of the upcoming meeting in Spokane on Wednesday, January 19, 2000, at which time resident fish and hatchery managers will begin to review and modify the HGMP Template for resident fish purposes. Neil indicated a meeting announcement via email would be distributed by Friday, January 7, 2000.

ITEM 6: Review Actions and Change Agenda for Thursday's Meeting

Information: Due to time limitations, the RFC was unable to review the Subbasin Planning Effort Allocation and Funding documents. The RFC agreed to move those items to the Thursday, January 6, 2000, agenda.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 2000

Attendees: **In Person** – Brian Marotz (MFWP), Dave Ward (ODFW), Kelly Lillengreen and Ronald Peters (CDA), Tom Iverson and Neil Ward (CBFWA), Keith Underwood (STOI), Joe Maroney (KT), Ron Morinaka (BPA)
By Phone – Sue Ireland (KTOI), Stacy Horton (NWPPC), Kirk Truscott (CCT), Keith Moser (SBT), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT)

ITEM 1: Criteria for New and Innovative Project Selection and Prioritization

Information: Stacy Horton and Neil Ward provided an update on the NWPPC's progress regarding the selection and funding of new and innovative proposals. Although they indicated the NWPPC would most likely fund 8 to 10 projects, the amount and time period of funding was unknown. In addition, they indicated that the NWPPC suggested this project category would continue to be part of the Fish and Wildlife Program. Since no guidelines have been formulated for the identification, selection, and funding schedule of new and innovative proposals, Stacy and Neil suggested the RFC develop general criteria that could become part of the amendment process.

Discussion: During the December RFC Meeting, Brian Marotz developed the following criteria for new and innovative project selection and prioritization:

1. The project is considered high priority by resident fish managers
2. The project is short-term (two years or less)
3. Project budget has a small budget impact (i.e., can be accommodated through quarterly review process or funded without negative impacts to other projects deemed high priority)
4. The action must be taken immediately or the opportunity will be lost (i.e., there is little chance that the benefits to resident fish can be achieved if the project is deferred to future years)
5. In the case of innovative: if the project is successful, the project represents a new technique or treatment that has broad applicability throughout the Basin.

ACTION 1: The following actions are a result of the RFC review of the draft criteria. Innovative project criteria developed by the RFC include:

- The project must introduce a new idea, method, or device needed by fish and wildlife managers to satisfy specific management actions/needs. (Examples and definition of “new idea” will be provided in a narrative).
- The project is not expected to be a long-term effort, but must be designed to address critical uncertainties that could begin to be implemented by the end of a three year period (project funding not to exceed three years).
- Project must be designed so that results are applicable throughout the Basin.

2. Neil Ward will provide narrative for each innovative project criteria.

3. After having forwarded the innovative project criteria, including narrative, to the RFC for review and comments, Kelly Lillengreen will submit the criteria to the MMG during their February meeting.

ITEM 2: Subbasin Planning (continued from Wednesday, January 5, 2000)

ACTION 3: *Preliminary Subbasin Planning Effort Allocation*

No action was taken as most of the RFC members revealed they have not had an opportunity to meet with cooperating agencies to determine lead and co-lead roles.

ACTION 4: *Initial FY2000 Coordination Funding Proposal*

The RFC will discuss funding allocation for subbasin planning via a phone conference on Tuesday, January 11, 2000, from 1:00 - 4:00 p.m.

ACTION 5: *Miscellaneous Subbasin Planning Items*

The RFC requested that a RFC ISPWG representative request the ISPWG to consider moving the mainstem subbasins back into their original provinces.

ITEM 3: Amendment Process

Information: Tom Giese provided an overview of results from the January 5, 2000, AC meeting.

ACTION: Request MMG to direct AC to forward the initial amendment documents to the RFC for review.

ITEM 4: Next Meeting and Proposed Agenda

Discussion: The next RFC Meeting will be Tuesday, February 8, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. at EWU in Spokane, WA.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2000**Phone Conference to Address Subbasin Planning Issues**

Participants: Dave Ward (ODFW), Kelly Lillengreen (CDA) Tom Iverson, Frank Young, and Neil Ward (CBFWA), Keith Underwood (STOI), Joe Maroney (KT), Kirk Truscott (CCT), and Charlie Holderman

ITEM 1: Subbasin Planning

Information: Due to time constraints during the last RFC Meeting (January 5-6, 2000), an action was approved to conduct a phone conference to discuss subbasin planning issues (e.g., coordination funding and timelines).

ACTION: Keith Underwood will make a recommendation to the ISPWG at their meeting January 18. He will ask that they continue planning but develop a deadline for template development (or once the template is regionally accepted, develop a time frame for subbasin deadlines).

If you have any questions or comments please contact Neil Ward at (503) 229-0191 or by e-mail at neil@cbfwf.org no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2000. These action notes will become FINAL on January 30, 2000.