




January 24, 2001

TO: Members Management Group (MMG)

FROM: Brian Allee 

SUBJECT: Draft Actions from the January 23 Emergency MMG Meeting.

If there are no objections within five days these actions will be considered final.

**Emergency MMG Meeting
 January 23, 2001
 1pm – 4pm
 CBFWA Office, Portland OR**

Draft Action Notes

Attendees Bert Bowler and Rod Sando (IDFG), Amos First-Raised III (BPT), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Terry Luther (CTWSRO), Brian Allee, Tom Giese, Tom Iverson, Frank Young, Neil Ward and Tana Klum (CBFWA).

By phone Ron Boyce (ODFW), John Palensky (NMFS), Bob Foster (WDFW), Joe Maroney (KT), Lynn Hatcher and Theodora Strong (YN), Sue Ireland (KTI), Fred Olney (USFWS).

Time allocation	Objective 1. FY 2001 Renewal Process	100%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	0%
	Objective 3. FY 2000 Adjustments	0%
	Objective 4. Template for watershed and subbasin assessment and plan	0%
	Objective 5. Coordinate program amendments	0%

ITEM 1: Review Draft CBFWA Recommendation on High Priority Projects

Discussion: Tom Iverson stated that the projects had been reviewed by the AFC, RFC, and WC. Project #23096 (sponsored by ODEQ), was somehow not listed in the table, but will be reviewed by the AFC with the other 15 projects.

Iverson also explained that the projects were separated into categories of HP "A", HP "B" and "Not HP" (see 1/23 Iverson memo).

There was a difference of opinion between the RFC and the WC rating of project #23016. It was determined that if the project did not meet all member's criteria for HP "A" then the project would be identified as HP "B".

Fred Olney was asked if Tom would identify and highlight the USFWS projects that fit into the BiOps.

The amount of BPA funding for these projects is undetermined. Of the projects recommended for funding, the committees have identified approximately (by category), \$39 million in the HP "A", \$30 million in the HP "B", and \$10 million in the "Not HP." John Palensky added that the NMFS BiOp projects in both the HP "A" and HP "B" categories totaled approximately \$20 million.

What method was used to determine the BiOp projects? Palensky said it was an internal review and the agencies and Tribes could help NMFS by identifying which specific BiOp RPAs are satisfied in each project.

There are 15 anadromous projects that the AFC would like more time to review, as well as project #23096 (see above).

- ACTION:
- The MMG agreed project #23016 be assigned to the HP "B" category.
 - Tom Iverson will draft a report on the High Priority Project Review similar to the recent report drafted for innovative projects.
 - The report will be sent with recommended projects on January 24 to the Members for a five day Consent Mail approval.
 - The 15 anadromous projects and project #23096 will be reviewed by the AFC from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m., January 29. The MMG will review these projects at their meeting from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. January 29, and a recommendation will be sent to the Members for a two day Consent Mail.
 - The report and CBFWA high priority project recommendations will be delivered to the Northwest Power Planning Council on February 1.