



July 31, 2002

TO: Members Management Group (MMG)

FROM: Rod Sando, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Revised Draft 7/11/02 MMG Agenda

**MEMBERS MANAGEMENT GROUP  
MEETING/CONFERENCE CALL  
July 11, 2002  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
CBFWA Office, Portland, OR  
Conference Line 503 229-0191, ext. 7099**

Draft Action Notes

**Attendees:** Lynn Hatcher (YN); Catriona Black (CRITFC); Terry Courtney, Jr. (CTWSRO); Dave Statler (NPT); Tony Nigro (ODFW); John Palensky (NOAA); Carl Scheeler (CTUIR); Bill Tweit and David H. Johnson (WDFW); Scott Brattebo (Pacificorp); Terry Mundorf (WPAG); Jim Litchfield (Consultant); Mark Bagdovitz and Maureen Smith (USFWS); Larry Cassidy and Doug Marker (NWPPC); Rod Sando, Jann Eckman, Tom Giese, Neil Ward, Tom Iverson, Mary Marvin (CBFWA)

**By Phone:** B.J. Kieffer and Mary Verner (STI); Lynn DuCharm (CSKT); Chad Colter (SBT); Amos First Raised (BPT); Sue Ireland (KTI); Chris Jordan (NMFS)

<b>Time Allocation:</b>	Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	43%
	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	16%
	Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	41%

**Agenda Revision** Tony Nigro requested discussing CBFWA's participation in the NWPPC meeting next week regarding wildlife crediting. Because the FPC Oversight Board meeting was cancelled, Item 8 was removed from the agenda.

**ITEM 1: Slice Proposal**

9:10 – 9:20

Members of Pacificorp were not present, so Doug Marker gave an overview of the proposal. The effects of the proposal are considered “neutral to fish and wildlife.” Funding and equitable treatment are the main issues of concern for the fish and wildlife managers. It was surmised that there would be a huge increase in utility scrutiny of fish and wildlife activities if the proposal passes.

**ITEM 2: Attendance at the NWPPC Meeting to discuss Wildlife Crediting**

9:20 – 9:35

Peter Pacquet and John Ogan will make a presentation at the sub-committee meeting of the Fish 4. It was felt that it would be helpful if a member could attend and report back to CBFWA.

**ACTION:** Rod will attend the subcommittee meeting and report back to CBFWA.

**ITEM 3: Budget Review**

9:35 – 10:13

Tom Giese discussed the attachments to the letter to Doug Marker and explained the budget as set out in the spreadsheet. If a contract has an ending balance of more than 0, that amount should be attached to a specific project. It is important that at the start of the year, budgets reflect accurate amounts.

NWPPC Decision (A) → BPA Contract (B) → Sponsor Billings (C) →  
 (A-B)=Carry Forward (B-C)=Carry Over

Report A talks about how and when that money will be allocated:

- committed to the original purpose
- true surplus, stays with project

**ACTION**

- Rod and Tom Giese will meet with BPA to solidify the final dollar amounts in the budget.
- A work group will be created to meet with Tom Giese to develop a draft plan for capital projects for discussion at the next MMG meeting. Members interested in serving on this work group should contact Tom Giese. Dave Statler volunteered.

**ITEM 3: Research, Monitoring and Evaluation**

10:13 – 11:00

The federal government has established six subgroups that are reviewing the RM&E projects for their application to the FCRPS Biological Opinion:

1. Status monitoring
2. Habitat effectiveness research
3. Hydro
4. Hatchery/Harvest
5. Estuary/Ocean
6. Data Management

These groups are primarily made up of federal agencies.

The federal government is conducting this review because the BiOp is fairly general and some more specific interpretation is needed. Some

Members expressed concerns that the federal government has established another approval process which seems to focus on anadromous fish, to the possible exclusion of resident fish and wildlife.

BPA explained there are two goals for these groups:

1. Develop consistency on a regional level
2. Develop components that clearly show the BiOp is being met

These are another set of federal opinions that will affect how proposals relate to the RPAs. They will provide the project sponsors an opportunity to re-work their proposals to more effectively address RM&E issues and the RPA measures. Sponsors will receive more help in developing projects that meet the BiOps. It will allow members to review opinions and offer feedback. Then the opinions will be sent out as draft to the proposers for comments.

**ACTION** Jim Geiselman will send a roster of the members of each review group to the MMG.

**Item 3  
revisited**

11:00 – 11:30

Tom has estimated there is \$16.6M in the uncommitted placeholder. BPA has estimated there is \$23M in the same placeholder. Modifications are running \$3.7M, as of June 2002.

Tom reviewed his budget tables with the members.

The second Quarterly Review was cancelled and that left some projects hanging without resolution. Concern was voiced that continuation of the Quarterly Review needs to be ensured, or a new process needs to be developed.

**ACTION** The MMG will create a subcommittee entitled Capital Planning Team to work with Tom Giese to develop a plan for region-wide capital projects. Members will contact Tom if they are interested in being part of this team.

**Item 1  
revisited**

11:30 – 12:30

Presentation was made by Scott Brattenbo, Terry Mundorf, and Jim Litchfield.

The goal of the Slice Proposal is to reach a long-term solution to eliminate all litigation and not repeat past errors in power management. There are alternate power sources being considered, but specific information wasn't available.

The presenters would like a return engagement with the MMG to bring answers to questions posed during their presentation.

**Working  
Lunch**

12:30 – 1:10

Discussion centered on the best approach to use in presenting the CBFWA proposal to Larry Cassidy and Doug Marker in the afternoon.

It was decided that Item 6 would be postponed due to Ray Entz's letter vetoing any budget modifications until a firm unallocated placeholder budget is available.

**ITEM 5: Within-Year Budget Modification Guidelines**

1:10 – 2:05

Requests are often delayed because forms are not filled out completely. NWPPC may want to revise its process as well. Concern was expressed regarding the language on pages 6 and 7 (“Can be funded through unallocated placeholder.”) and what it means for prioritizing. Is it first-come, first-served? A definitions document is needed for terms used, such as “significant and urgent.” It was also felt that wildlife should be included in #3 under Unanticipated and Urgent. There was a question about the timing of requests and the actual funding of them with the unallocated funds.

On page 11, Task 2, it was pointed out that the project sponsors make the presentations.

Although the intent is for this to be a regional document (as indicated by the inclusion of BPA and NWPPC on the cover), the other agencies have not provided entries indicating what they will do. The current document only addresses what CBFWA will do. The document, for now, should include only CBFWA on the cover page because it only describes the process CBFWA uses for its in-season review of projects.

**ACTION**

Item #7 will be rewritten to read, “Does not create an adverse bow wave . . .”

Staff will change cover page and content, as necessary, to indicate the document only describes CBFWA’s approach to its in-season management review.

The MMG directed staff to arrange a special MMG meeting to complete the Within-Year Guidelines, come up with a reasonable budget and a capital plan. Tentative date for the special MMG meeting was scheduled for July 25<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 until 12:00 noon.

**ITEM 6: CBFWA FY 2003 – 2005 Project Proposal**

2:05 – 3:15

The briefing on the proposal began with a short history of CBFWA and the focus in the 1980s, and how the current organization can assist NWPPC and BPA now and in the future.

Mr. Cassidy voiced his support of CBFWA and his hope that CBFWA will begin to “think outside the box” and do their jobs better.

**PROPOSAL OBJECTIVES**

1. Produce review comments for the second Rolling Reviews
2. Produce FY-SOY Budget
3. Produce recommendations for within-year process
4. Produce comments on Program Amendments
5. Produce comments on regional issues
6. Facilitate managers’ involvement in regional planning
7. Facilitate regional discussion on fish and wildlife issues
8. Compile an annual report on status and trends of populations
9. Coordinate regional RM&E

## 10. Facilitate regional HEP

Mr. Cassidy believes roles are changing in the region. There is a need to engage the agricultural industry in order to enlist their assistance in fish and wildlife issues. An infrastructure should be constructed to monitor subbasin planning in the region. Better “PR” is needed to eliminate the negative view of CBFWA that has built up in various parts of the region. Mr. Cassidy counseled patience in dealing with those holding negative views. He feels that CBFWA should and will continue to have an important role in the region, and that the majority of forces do not wish to eliminate CBFWA. Fish and wildlife agencies nation-wide are the recipients of criticism of their programs and their employees.

**ACTION** Rod will contact Steve Norman and Sarah McNary of BPA and invite them to attend an upcoming MMG meeting.

### **ITEM 7: NWPPC Bylaws**

3:15 – 3:50

- Election of a chair is not possible as there is no consensus.
- Amendment of the bylaws to adopt the proposed Chapter 14, per Governor Kitzhaber, is not possible as there is no consensus. The wording should be less offensive.

**ACTION** No action was taken.

**Next** Thursday, August 8<sup>th</sup>.

- Meeting:**
- An emergency MMG meeting will be scheduled for the end of the week of July 22.
  - Budget Review, Issue Stacking, and the Calendar will become permanent items at each MMG meeting.
  - Review of the Within-Year Budget Modifications will be scheduled for the next MMG meeting in August.