


September 7, 1999

TO: Resident Fish Managers

FROM: Kelly Lillengreen , Chair  for

SUBJECT: RFM July 29, 1999 Draft Action Notes

**Attendees:** **In Person** - Kelly Lillengreen (Coeur d'Alene), Tony Nigro (ODFW), Tom Iverson (CBFWA), Tana Klum (CBFWA);  
**By Phone** - Jim Uehara (WDFW), Keith Underwood (STOI), Mike Faler (USFWS), Stacy Horton (NPPC), Nancy Hayes (NPT), Dave Statler (NPT), Vinny Pero (SPT), Brian Marotz (MDFW&P).

Sept 14..... RFM Meeting, Spokane  
 Sept 15.....Strategic Planning II Follow Up Session, Portland  
 Sept 15.....Additional material due to NPPC for second ISRP review for FY 2000  
 Sept 21.....NWPPC Meeting, Spokane  
 Oct 5..... RFM Meeting  
 Nov 2..... RFM Meeting  
 Dec 7 ..... RFM Meeting

**Agenda Changes:**

Two new items were added: Item 5, Strategic Planning and Item 6, Information to Forward to MSG. The other items were re-ordered: Item 4 was placed before Item 2.

**ITEM 1: DAIWP Update**

**Discussion:** Tom Iverson summarized the status of the DAIWP.

**ITEM 2: Programmatic Responses to ISRP**

**Discussion:** The AFM decided to use Version 1 of the NWPPC rolling decision document as a template for developing responses to the pertinent programmatic issues. A memo was distributed to AFM and provided to

RFM that described the general format of the responses and assigned volunteers from AFM to work on the various sections. Tony Nigro reviewed the AFM memo for the group. The RFM then decided to add volunteers to each section and proceeded down the list of issues to assign volunteers.

This discussion raised the need to address the issue of getting briefing packets to members in a timely manner for Members meetings.

**Action:** The RFM will join the AFM in developing issue specific responses using the 14 comments from Version 1 of the NPPC draft rolling decision document and the format presented in the AFM memo (dated July 29, 1999 providing Preface, General Impressions, and Issue Specific Responses) as general guidelines (adding and deleting as necessary) in responding to the NPPC rolling draft decision document.

Members volunteered (or were volunteered) for specific issues with the understanding that if someone felt strongly about any particular issue, they would provide some input for that issue.

**Action:** RFM project specific responses will be packaged with the most current response to the NPPC rolling draft decision document to be sent out for consent by the RFM on Wednesday, August 4, and responded to no later than Friday, August 6, understanding that this is outside normal timelines for consent mail under the existing CBFWA charter.

This is strictly a Residential Fish Caucus approval of project specific responses. Any changes that have occurred since the July 26 project specific response document will be highlighted in a table stating either “changed” or “new” under the comments column.

### **ITEM 3: Project Specific Responses to ISRP**

**Discussion:** Regarding project specific responses, it was confirmed that these are CBFWA responses. Responses need to be filtered to extract unnecessary information. Members need to contact Tom Iverson with any concerns regarding any project. So far, no comments have been received on any projects; however, any changes that do occur will be highlighted in consent mail.

**Action:** Tom Iverson will act as the coarse filter to insure that all project specific responses support the CBFWA recommendations. Tom will edit and modify the responses as necessary to insure continuity and remove any unnecessary “whining”. The RFM should carefully review all project specific responses and notify Tom if any changes should be made.

**ITEM 4: Multi-Year Review Projects**

**Discussion:** Because the ISRP recommended some projects for multi-year review, we could use this as an opportunity to begin the process of advancing projects on to a multi-year review process. The RFM put some of their projects through multi-year criteria, only one project passed in FY 2000.

If we review these projects, shouldn't all projects be subjected to review?

For FY 2000, caucuses weren't in the same position to promote multi-year review. Criteria was established and forwarded to NPPC for review, but no response was ever received.

It is apparent that all RFM members want multi-year funding. The RFM needs to develop caucus specific multi-year criteria.

Several motions were put before the caucus, three of which failed. First, the RFM moved the discussion of whether to proceed with the FY 2000 multi-year funding to the MSG on a draft decision for submittal to the Members. The motion was revised to change the year to FY 2001, but failed again.

The second failed motion was that the RFM would request that the AFM chair present the previously described process to the MSG and request that other caucuses be encouraged to initiate similar efforts to revive the Multi-Year Criteria.

The third failed motion was for the RFM to recommend to the MSG that an ad hoc committee be formed to review existing criteria to ensure relevancy and completeness, and develop a schedule and process for implementation for the year FY 2001. The group will meet no later than September 30.

**Actions:** Two other motions passed:

1. The RFM will dust off the existing Multi-Year review criteria and determine what documents are necessary to satisfy those criteria, with an evaluation of the criteria for adequacy and completeness. This review will occur within the RFM before the end of September.
2. The RFM will request that the AFM chair present the previously described process to the MSG and request that other caucuses be encouraged to initiate similar efforts to revive the Multi-Year criteria.

**ITEM 5: Strategic Planning**

**Discussion:** The Draft Strategic Planning Concept Paper was discussed. The paper in its current state is too narrow to productively facilitate a strategic planning discussion. The Conclusion section begins to address the appropriate needs for the strategic planning session. Tana Klum discussed the current state of the strategic planning preparation and advised that the members be prepared to answer a phone interview questionnaire preceding the Members meeting.

**ITEM 6: Information to Forward to MSG**

**Discussion:** The only issue to forward to MSG is to have the AFM chair present the strategy of dusting off the multi-year review criteria.

**ITEM 7: Next Meeting and Proposed Agenda**

**Discussion:** The next meeting will be September 14, 1999 in Spokane. The proposed agenda will include:

1. Multi-Year Funding
2. Issues For FY 2001 Process
3. Summary of APR
4. Summarize Members Meeting

Please call Neil Ward at CBFWA, 503-229-0191, with additions or modifications to this proposed agenda.