



March 2, 1999

TO: Anadromous Fish Managers

FROM: Tony Nigro, Chair *Mary for*

SUBJECT: Action Notes from February 23, 1999 AFM Meeting

Attendees: Tony Nigro, Chair, John Palensky, Brian Allee, Lynn Hatcher, Tom Clune, Tom Giese, Bob Foster, Phil Roger, Jerry Marco, Paul Kucera, Robin Schrock, Ira Jones, Felix McGowan, Emmit Taylor, Jr., Bert Bowler, Tom Iverson, Carter Stein, Gary James, Si Whitman, Capt. Adam DeLaVincenzio (phone), and Mary Marvin.

The Anadromous Fish Managers (AFM) began their meeting at 9:00 am. Item 1 on the agenda (Lamprey) was deferred until later in the day because Gary James had a scheduling conflict and could not lead the discussion until then. Item 3 (Review of Projects Funded from Sources Other than the Direct Program) was moved to another meeting date because Keith Kutchins was not present to lead the discussion. Item 8 (Completing the FY 2000 Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan) was moved to the end of the agenda as a prelude to the separate AFM meeting to evaluate mainstem/systemwide projects. At the request of John Palensky, an item was added to the agenda concerning Condit Dam. At the request of Phil Roger, two items were added to the agenda; one on regional monitoring and evaluation planning and one on a request for additional FY 1999 funding for a dissolved gas project. At the request of Bob Foster, an item was added to the agenda concerning the Yakima River Watershed Project.

Brian Allee (Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority) introduced Tom Iverson, the new Anadromous Fish Analyst to the AFM.

ITEM 1: Condit Dam

Discussion: John Palensky (National Marine Fisheries Service) discussed the breaching of Condit Dam and its potential ramifications on the FY 2006 or 2007 budget for the Direct Program. Matching funds may be requested from the Fish and Wildlife Direct Program for dredging or other activities needed to maintain the channel.

Action: None

ITEM 2: Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Planning

Discussion: Phil Roger (Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission) gave a presentation and led a discussion of initial efforts by an ad hoc group to develop a regional monitoring and evaluation plan. Phil, Randy Fisher (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission), Gustavo Bisbal (Northwest Power Planning Council), Bruce Suzomoto (Public Power Council) and others have been developing a set of critical questions by salmon life stage and arraying Council measures and projects under the questions to see where current efforts are focused. The AFM discussed the need for the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) to play a central role in development of the plan. Phil suggested using the Scientific Advisory Group to coordinate the ad hoc group's work with the Multi-species Framework and to keep CBFWA Members informed. Brian Allee emphasized the need for CBFWA, the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC) and others to work collaboratively to develop the plan.

Action: None. Phil Roger presented more details on the planning efforts to date at a "brown bag" seminar during the lunch hour.

ITEM 3: Conservation Enforcement Funding

Discussion: Tom Clune (CBFWA) reported to AFM that the ad hoc subcommittee on conservation enforcement has still not met to pursue resolution of outstanding issues related to FY 1999 funding of conservation enforcement proposals. Progress to date has come in the form of a proposal by the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) to conduct a series of conservation enforcement workshops. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) is the only Member that has offered comments on the workshop proposal. Si Whitman (Nez Perce Tribe) indicated that the tribe still intends to push this issue to the policy level.

Action: AFM directed Tom Clune to continue efforts to convene a meeting of the ad hoc subcommittee on conservation enforcement to pursue resolution of outstanding issues related to FY 1999 funding of conservation enforcement proposals.

ITEM 4: Preparation for April Meeting of CBFWA Members

Discussion: Brian Allee noted the dates of the next CBFWA Members' meeting have been changed from May 5 and 6 to May 4 and 5 in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. The dates were changed because of scheduling conflicts with other meetings. The focus of the May meeting will be discussions of overarching policy issues. Ann Badgely (US Fish and Wildlife Service) will

chair and every effort will be made to involve executive-level policy makers from the agencies and tribes. Brian asked AFM for suggestions for agenda items for the meeting. John Palensky suggested a discussion of the Anadromous Fish Appendix to the EIS on the Lower Snake River Drawdown Feasibility Study. Phil Roger suggested a discussion of the regional monitoring and evaluation plan.

Action: AFM encouraged its members to submit suggestions for the May CBFWA Members' meeting agenda to Brian Allee as soon as possible.

ITEM 5: Status of Integrated CBFWA Proposal for FY 1999

Discussion: Brian Allee reported on the status of NPPC deliberations on FY 1999 funding for the Integrated CBFWA proposal. Brian believes CBFWA has addressed all of NPPC's concerns. The proposal is functionally a business proposition under which CBFWA Members provide a prescribed set of deliverables. NPPC should reach a decision about whether or not to recommend funding for the proposal to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) at its February 24 meeting.

Action: None

ITEM 6: Funding Request from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission for FY 1999

Discussion: Carter Stein (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission) presented a request for additional funding for the PIT tag program. Additional funding is needed by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) to cover costs in three areas. The first area is additional responsibilities the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) recently transferred to PSMFC. These responsibilities include maintaining the "separation by code" system for PIT tagged fish and associated software support and conducting monitoring at Bonneville Dam. The cost would be \$192,000. The second area is the conduct of workshops to facilitate transition to the new PIT tag system. Workshops would cost \$28,000. The third area is expansion of data storage capacity to cover anticipated needs. Additional data storage would cost \$35,000. AFM questioned Carter as to why NMFS did not transfer dollars to PSMFC along with the additional responsibilities. Carter did not know why; NMFS has told him no dollars are available. AFM suggested to Carter that PSMFC, BPA and NMFS meet to determine whether funds are available in the existing NMFS' contract with BPA to fund transfer of responsibilities from NMFS to PSMFC. John Palensky offered to help sort that issue out.

Action: AFM deferred action on the request by PSMFC for \$192,000 to fund the transfer of NMFS responsibilities to PSMFC. AFM asked John Palensky to facilitate and report back to AFM on discussions between BPA, NMFS and PSMFC regarding the availability of funds in the existing NMFS'

contract with BPA to cover costs of responsibilities transferred from NMFS to PSFMC.

Action: AFM approved the request by PSMFC for \$28,000 to fund a 3-day workshop to facilitate transition to the new PIT tag system and \$35,000 to purchase an expanded data storage array, provided that money is available in FY 1999 (per Tom Giese's analysis).

ITEM 7: Funding Request from Jefferson County Soil & Water Conservation For FY 1999

Discussion: Brian Allee forwarded to AFM a request by Jefferson County Soil and Water Conservation District (Jefferson Co. SWCD) for additional funding for watershed assessment and development planning in Trout Creek. Several Members raised questions about the scope and cost of the proposed work. Phil Roger asked to what degree the Warm Springs tribe has been involved in the project. Gary James (Umatilla Tribe) raised the need for a consistent standard against which AFM could judge whether requests for watershed assessment work are appropriate. No one present could speak on behalf of the project sponsor regarding the questions raised.

Action: AFM asked Tom Iverson (CBFWA) to invite the project sponsors and co-managers to the next AFM meeting to discuss the request by Jefferson Co. SWCD for additional funding for watershed assessment in Trout Creek. Tom I. will contact one or more of the following persons: Marie Horn (Jefferson Co. SWCD), Tom Nelson (ODFW), Ron Graves (Wasco Co. SWCD), a representative of the Warm Springs Tribe, and Tom Morse (BPA).

Action: AFM asked Gary James to lead a discussion at its meeting in March of possible templates for watershed assessments. The intent is for AFM to adopt a template it would use when making decisions regarding funding watershed assessments. Gary will send an example of a template to Tom Iverson for distribution to AFM within the next two weeks.

ITEM 8: Lamprey

Discussion: In September 1998, NPPC deferred a decision on funding new lamprey work in FY 1999 pending further explanation by CBFWA of why proposed work is critical to meeting management needs. Gary James (Umatilla Tribe) presented a briefing paper he prepared that lists and explains lamprey management needs and describes projects, funded and proposed, that address those needs. The briefing paper can serve as a basis for explaining how proposed lamprey projects address critical management needs and relate to each other. AFM could use the paper as a basis for recommendations it makes on lamprey projects in the FY 2000

Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan (DAIWP). AFM could also use the paper as a basis for pursuing funding for FY 1999 lamprey proposals.

Action: AFM encouraged its members to provide Gary comments on the lamprey briefing paper by March 5. The intent is to have a revised working draft by the next AFM meeting (March 16, 1999).

ITEM 9: Funding Request from the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission for FY 1999

Discussion: Phil Roger (CRITFC) presented a request to use \$150,000 carryover from FY 1999 to complete sampling and analysis under CRITFC's dissolved gas study consistent with its existing scope of work. Additional sampling is needed to obtain missing data.

Action: AFM approved the request by CRITFC to dedicate existing FY 1999 carryover, total carryover not to exceed \$150,000, to complete detailed sampling and analysis (Objectives 2 and 3) consistent with the existing scope of work. CRITFC will route the revised proposal as a consent mail to the AFM.

ITEM 9: Yakima River Watershed Project

Discussion: Bob Foster (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife) and Lynn Hatcher (Yakama Tribe) described a request by Yakima River Watershed Interagency Council (YRWIC) and Kittitas-Yakima Resource Conservation and Development Agency (KiYak) to assume the responsibility to implement projects #99-0122 and #99-030 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. These entities are replacing the Yakima River Watershed Council, which was dissolved in July 1998.

Action: AFM approved the request for YRWIC and KiYak to assume the responsibility to implement projects #99-0122 and #99-030 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, provided the total cost not exceed \$64,000.

ITEM 10: Completing the FY 2000 Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan

Discussion: AFM discussed principles it will follow when conducting the management and milestone-based evaluations of projects proposed for FY 2000 funding. The following points were made:

- Tom Giese and Tom Iverson will record comments from AFM using the project evaluation form prepared by Tom G.
- If a project, or a project objective, is deferred, a clear statement will be made explaining why deferral is justified.
- If a project objective is deferred, the project budget will be reviewed to determine how deferral affects the budget request.
- The total cost of projects recommended for Tier 1 will be balanced against available dollars.

- Projects considered innovative will be labeled as such and “credited” against the \$2 million target the NPPC has suggested be set aside for innovative proposals.
- Budgets for capital and non-capital projects will be handled separately.
- Tom Giese and Tom Clune will work with NPPC and BPA to determine how \$1.2 million carryover from BPA’s Division of Fish and Wildlife should be handled in determining available dollars.
- Only Tier 1 projects will be considered for Milestone-based designation. Reviewers will not ask milestone questions of Tier 2 or 3 projects.

When reviewing mainstem and systemwide proposals, the AFM will:

1. work through each project to capture outstanding questions that warrant follow-up.
2. contact project sponsors by phone to resolve any questions that arise during the evaluation.
3. balance the total cost of projects recommended for Tier 1 against levels equal to 100% and 90% of the available budget.

In general, Tier 1 projects are “Recommended for Funding as Critical and Urgent,” Tier 2 projects are “Worthy of Funding, but are Less Critical and/or Less Urgent,” and Tier 3 projects are “Not Recommended for Funding.”

Action:

To facilitate milestone-based evaluations, Tom Giese will

- 1) provide AFM guidance on how it may determine if “there would be little or no biological or management benefit from implementing the project for less than the proposed duration,”
- 2) ask project sponsors to send him copies of their project/proposal work plans, and
- 3) check the status of ongoing projects with BPA

ITEM 11: Agenda for March Meeting

Because of the pressing need to begin proposal review, this item was not addressed.