




February 26, 2001

TO: Members Management Group (MMG)

FROM: Brian Allee 

SUBJECT: Draft Actions from the February 21 Emergency MMG Meeting

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

**MEMBERS MANAGEMENT GROUP
EMERGENCY MEETING/CONFERENCE CALL
February 21, 2001
1 p.m. – 3 p.m.
CBFWA Office, Portland, OR**

DRAFT ACTION NOTES

Attendees: Brian Brown and Lynn Krasnow, NMFS; Fred Olney, USFWS; Brian Allee, Kathie Titzler and Tana Klum, CBFWA

By Phone: Bob Foster, WDFW; Sue Ireland, KTI; Gary James, CTUIR; Amos First Raised III and Dan Gonzales, BPT; Lynn Hatcher, YN; Chad Colter, SBT; Dave Statler, NPT; Mary Verner, STI; Bert Bowler, IDFG

Time Allocation	Objective 1. FY Adjustments	0%
	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	100%

ITEM 1: Discussion of the February 9 Memo from NWPPC Regarding the Mainstem

Discussion: There was agreement that the timing of adding a plan for the Mainstem hydrosystem of the Columbia and Snake rivers was important due to the Provincial Review Process and the energy crisis.

Brian Brown and Fred Olney said that neither NMFS nor USFWS were willing to reopen the BiOps, and Brian Brown recommended the MMG consider the following questions:

1. What kind of flexibility can the NWPPC provide relative to the BiOps?
2. Habitat approach – what are the biological requirements in the Mainstem and what can we do?
3. Power emergency – creates a new wrinkle in NMFS’s interpretation of the BiOps, as NMFS is already going outside the BiOps in emergency drafting. The action agencies are working on a contingency plan, however there is concern about the dynamic that the NWPPC could bring. There is also a need to reassess flood control, revisit the Canadian treaty opportunity, and consider how the NWPPC will reposition itself in power planning vs. fish and wildlife needs.
4. There is a legal need for the NWPPC to open the Amendment Process.

Brian Brown also discussed the linkage between the NMFS and NWPPC. He said that the river operations called for in the BiOp were primarily discussed in the Regional Forum (Executive Committee, Implementation Team and Technical Management Team). Offsite mitigation projects were being addressed through the Provincial Review Process and how projects get implemented will hopefully influence NMFS’s one and five year planning process. Details need to be included in the projects, then assessed by monitoring through provincial reviews.

When asked about the power crisis and BPA’s cash flow relative to fish and wildlife needs, Brian Brown responded that BPA does have principles for emergency declarations, and criteria are being developed during today’s IT/TMT meeting for implementation of operations for everything – BPA cash flow, BiOps, fish and wildlife funding, COE needs.

ACTION: Brian Allee will draft a letter for Member Consent Mail to be included in the NWPPC’s 2/27 briefing packet. The letter will highlight the following points:

1. The timing of opening the Program to include the Mainstem is not appropriate.
2. A request that the NWPPC staff meet with CBFWA Members and staff to discuss the schedule.
3. Outline the four points made by Brian Brown and include other questions if necessary.