

Judi Danielson
Chair
Idaho

Jim Kempton
Idaho

Frank L. Cassidy Jr.
"Larry"
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington



Melinda S. Eden
Vice-Chair
Oregon

Gene Derfler
Oregon

Ed Bartlett
Montana

John Hines
Montana

Council Meeting Coeur d' Alene, Idaho

November 16-17, 2004

Minutes

All were present, except Ed Bartlett who participated by telephone. The meeting was called to order by Council chair Judi Danielson at 8:10 am on November 17 and adjourned at 3:35 pm on November 17.

Melinda Eden moved that the Council meet in executive session at 4 pm on Wednesday, November 17 to discuss internal personnel matters. Jim Kempton seconded, and the motion passed unanimously on a roll-call vote. Eden moved that the Council meet in executive session at 8:30 am on Thursday, November 18 to discuss internal personnel matters. Gene Derfler seconded, and the motion passed unanimously on a roll-call vote.

Reports from Fish and Wildlife, Power and Public Affairs committee chairs

Ed Bartlett, chair, fish and wildlife committee; Jim Kempton, chair, power committee; and Larry Cassidy, chair, public affairs committee.

Kempton, chair of the Power Committee, said the committee discussed the public comments that have come in on the draft Power Plan and the treatment of resource adequacy in the plan. There have been suggestions that the Council should facilitate additional work on resource adequacy, including questions of enforceability and how to get a consensus in the region on resource adequacy standards, he noted. We also talked about power plan implementation, regional transmission issues related to Grid West, and the draft programmatic EIS on wind development on Bureau of Land Management lands, Kempton reported.

Danielson, who chaired the Fish and Wildlife (F&W) Committee in Bartlett's absence, said that the committee was briefed on the draft report to Congress on the Artificial Production Review and Evaluation (APRE), which will be submitted in February, and discussed subbasin plan adoption issues. We also talked about issues related to the project review and selection process for FY 2006 and beyond, including the schedule, allocation, and how to prioritize, she said. The committee discussed recommendations from a Council subcommittee on the Fish Passage Center (FPC), as well as the recent mainstem flow-survival symposium, Danielson stated.

1. Briefing on public comment on the draft Fifth Power Plan

Terry Morlan, manager, economic analysis.

We've had eight hearings on the draft Fifth Power Plan, and staff hopes the plan can be presented to you for adoption in December, staffer Terry Morlan told the Council. While we have yet to hear from BPA and the utilities, we have had a conversation with PNUCC, he said. We haven't received a lot of detailed written comments yet, Morlan pointed out as he summarized what has been submitted. There has been "universal praise" for the plan's treatment of uncertainty and risk and the modeling associated with that, he reported.

Most of the comments we've received thus far are very supportive of aggressive conservation, and some think we could be more aggressive, Morlan said. Some utilities think the plan is too aggressive, he added. Most comments support including demand response as a resource in the plan, Morlan noted.

Many people said they are pleased with the emphasis on wind generation in the plan, but we've also heard that the near-term development of wind reflected in the plan is far less than what is in utilities' integrated resource plans (IRPs) and what is happening with wind developers in the region, he continued. Some concerns were expressed about transmission access and the cost of integrating wind, Morlan said.

Most comments supported the plan's treatment of IPP generation, but there is still a concern that the plan will be used to thwart utility efforts to acquire new generation, he explained. Utilities are planning to submit an aggregated list of the resources contained in their IRPs and hope that the Council will include it as an appendix to the plan, Morlan said.

Will we run the utilities' IRPs through our model? Karier asked. There may not be time to do that much more analysis between now and the December meeting, Morlan replied. It could be done after December -- it's important to connect the Council's plan to the actual plans of the utilities, said Karier.

Some thought the treatment of climate change risk in the plan was useful, and some thought it inadequate, Morlan reported, continuing his summary. There were pleas for the Council to be an advocate for climate policy, rather than just presenting an analysis, he pointed out.

Among the comments we've received there has been significant opposition to including a coal plant in the plan -- "that raised a lot of hackles," according to Morlan. Some coal developers and utilities support coal as an option in the plan, while others have said if coal is included, it should be integrated coal gasification, he noted.

There was wide support for the Council taking the lead in adequacy policy, Morlan stated. Most commenters were pleased the Council is taking a greater interest in transmission issues, but said the Council should push harder to get the region to resolve its transmission problems, he said. A few comments said the natural gas price in the plan is still too low, and one comment said it is too high, Morlan added.

The comments pointed out an inconsistency between BPA's proposal to serve only the Federal Base System (FBS) and the proposal that BPA play a large role in financing conservation at utilities, he said, adding "we have to deal with this issue." There are also concerns about the

treatment of conservation with respect to allocation of the FBS and about the allocation “atomizing” the various services BPA provides with its power, Morlan noted.

In the fish and wildlife (F&W) arena, we heard that the Council should revive its Loss of Fish Operations Probability measure and that the Council is not doing enough to protect F&W, he said. There were also requests for the Council to pay more attention to other renewables, such as geothermal, solar, and biomass, according to Morlan.

Karier suggested that the fuel switching policy be summarized in the plan’s executive summary

2. Briefing on public comment on subbasin plans

John Shurts, general counsel; John Ogan, senior counsel; and Lynn Palensky, subbasin planning project manager.

Staffer Lynn Palensky said that 29 subbasin plans were sent out for public comment in October and that public hearings have been held in each state. The second set of subbasin plans, which are now being worked on to address adoptability deficiencies, are on track to come before the Council in December, she noted.

Thus far we are hearing very little comment on the plans themselves, but we are getting a lot of comment on the subbasin planning process, Palensky said. Among the questions being asked are: how the Council will use the plans and what role they will play in future project selection and recovery planning, noted staffer John Shurts. We sent out an issue paper seeking comment on these broad issues last month, and we expect to get a lot more comment on them by November 22, he said.

We have received comments with conflicting views on whether the subbasin plans have sufficient specificity to move directly to project selection, according to Shurts. There is also the question of how the plans aggregate and how they will help the Council revise its F&W plan over time, he said. Most people think there needs to be some kind of aggregation in order to see “what the plans add up to,” but there’s no consensus on how to do that or how much time it will take, Shurts stated. And everyone wants to know about the F&W project selection process and when it will start, he added.

We’ll try to make progress on the big issues in parallel with the adoption of the individual subbasin plans, Shurts told the Council. The sooner we can address these broad issues, the better, observed Danielson.

3. Council decision on budget proposal for hatchery and subbasin integration

Bruce Suzumoto, manager, special projects.

Staffer Bruce Suzumoto said that many of the subbasin plans failed to adequately account for artificial production in their subbasins and those that had artificial production strategies didn’t describe how the strategy was integrated with habitat-related strategies to meet subbasin goals. The plans didn’t have measurable harvest or production objectives, he said. Staff proposes to try to fix this problem through the Artificial Production Review and Evaluation (APRE) and

recommends that the Council approve \$68,500 to organize an APRE/subbasin planning integration process, an amount of money that would be charged against the \$900,000 APRE placeholder in the FY 05 budget, Suzumoto stated.

Over the past two months, staff held workshops in two subbasins, facilitated by the Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife and Moberland Biometrics, that aimed to integrate information from the subbasin plans and the APRE process, and as a result, we were able to come up with harvest, escapement, and hatchery objectives for those subbasins, he told the Council. We thought the workshops were useful so we are requesting the \$68,500 in funding to continue this process and organize it as a basinwide effort, Suzumoto said.

The process used in the workshops is “a powerful technical exercise that gives people insights” - it’s a promising analytical tool, Shurts stated. It has potential that we want to explore further and is an essential piece to finish off the APRE, he said.

How will this be useful? Karier asked. This funding will enable us to do a few more subbasins, replied Shurts. What will the process produce? Karier asked. It produces a synthesis of what’s in the subbasin plan -- not all of the plans are organized in a way that you can technically aggregate them, Shurts replied. We are trying to set some clear objectives for what we are trying to do in each subbasin, said Suzumoto. We didn’t have all the information to do this earlier, and now we are trying to tie all the pieces together, he added.

I have voted to fund hatchery reviews for six years, and now I hear there aren’t objectives, said Karier. I’ve heard that before -- at some point, we have to come to a conclusion, he stated. The APRE has accumulated an amazing data base, but it wasn’t fed systematically into the subbasin plans, which tended to focus on habitat, according to Shurts. We don’t have an integrated data base with habitat and harvest objectives, and this will provide that integration, he said.

All hatcheries have goals and targets -- what they lack is return rates and survival rates, said Karier. We now have more of those than we’ve ever had before, Shurts responded. It would have been great if we could have had the APRE data two years ago and fed it into subbasin planning, he acknowledged.

Will we have results after we spend the \$68,500, or when we have spent the entire \$900,000? Karier asked. We’ll see results as this first stage is completed, replied Shurts. Maybe you should do a master plan and not just do studies over and over that describe problems that exist with the hatcheries, Karier said. It seems like we could just ask the hatcheries to develop numerical objectives and report them to the Council within two months, he stated. The process we propose will produce that, replied Shurts. We want to see how useful it can be to inform decision-making, added Suzumoto. Having “specific deliverables” would help, said Karier. I think everyone is frustrated about this, but I think you’ll like the results of the proposed action, Cassidy told the Council.

Did the Council fail to tell the subbasin planners to integrate information from the APRE into the plans? Eden asked. We said we wanted to see integration, and while the plans did a lot of analysis of habitat, the plans still need to link up with the APRE data base, Shurts replied. It would have been nice to integrate this a year and a half ago, but the linkage didn’t get done at the time that people would have liked, he said.

Eden asked how the proposal related to the \$900,000 placeholder. The \$68,500 will take us to January, and then we'll see how things stand, replied Shurts. The \$68,500 doesn't automatically jump up to \$900,000, he said. If this looks promising to accomplish what needs to be done, we'll develop a budget for doing a master plan, Shurts added. If we decide to do additional funding, there should be a competitive bidding process, Eden said.

Kempton said he had the same concerns as Karier had expressed. If you spend this money, you will get more information, but you will still need to identify out-of-subbasin impacts, he stated. This will help in integrating in-basin and out-of-basin impacts, replied Shurts. This is an attempt to get all the pieces into the same package, he added.

I'll vote for the \$68,500, but I want to know what we will get as a result, said Karier. We'll get goals for harvest, natural escapement, and hatchery returns, replied Suzumoto.

Eden moved that the Council approve the budget, in an amount not to exceed \$68,500, to be charged against the \$900,000 Artificial Production Review and Evaluation (APRE) placeholder in the FY 05 budget, for initial planning and organization of the APRE and subbasin planning integration process and recommend that BPA contract to implement this project. Cassidy seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Briefing on recommendations for Council strategy on avian predation

Peter Paquet, manager, wildlife and resident fish

Last month, the Council asked staff for recommendations on possible strategies for Council involvement in three issues related to reducing predation on juvenile salmonids by several species of fish-eating birds, Paquet said. The first is the draft Caspian Tern Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being done by the Corps of Engineers and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with NOAA Fisheries, he stated. Because the agencies expect to have the Record of Decision signed by February 2005, we recommend waiting until then before deciding what action the Council should take, Paquet said.

The second issue is developing a regional approach to reducing avian juvenile fish predation, he noted. We have met with various parties, including BPA, Paquet said. A BPA document outlining avian predation strategies and proposed actions for the draft Biological Opinion (BiOp) will be available at the end of November, he stated. Staff recommends that the Council wait to see what BPA proposes and then decide if more needs to be done, Paquet said.

As for budget issues associated with avian predation, he said that discussion with BPA has indicated there should be a small (less than \$300,000) impact on the FY 2005 F&W program budget, but that there are likely to be increased costs for avian predation work in FY 2006 and beyond. The question, according to Paquet, is which portion of the work is the result of the hydro system and what BPA should be responsible for funding. In the past, BPA has provided partial funding for these activities, with the rest of the funding coming from the Corps and other federal agencies, he explained. We need a better handle on these out-year costs, and we think there needs to be cost-sharing, Paquet told the Council.

The federal agencies have asked for the Council's support in presenting their budgets to Congress, he noted. Staff proposes to work with the regional entities on these issues and try to identify areas for potential regional cost savings and report back to the Council after January 1, Paquet said. The budget issues are of primary concern because they could affect the long-term F&W funding agreement, he added.

Was the Council involved in the Caspian tern EIS? Kempton asked, and Paquet replied "indirectly." It would be good for the Council to participate to a greater degree in the EIS being done on the Double-crested cormorant than it did in the tern EIS, he stated.

I'm not convinced that if the birds are relocated, they will go to the sites that the agencies have outlined, said Cassidy. I hope we can get moving on this, and I'm encouraged that BPA is going to spend more money on avian predation, but I'm dismayed it won't be until 2006, he stated. Getting these birds to go to artificially established locations is a problem, agreed Kempton. We should be more active in the programmatic EIS on the cormorants, he said.

The Corps has said its dredging won't create new nesting sites, but I'm not convinced they have got that solved, and I intend to monitor that issue, said Cassidy. Is BPA thinking of doing an avian predation study for the lower Columbia, similar to what was done in the Mid-Columbia region? Karier asked. BPA is focusing on specific projects and may do some research that will fit with the Mid-Columbia study, replied Paquet. Keep the dialogue going, and we'll hear from you again in a month or two, Danielson told Paquet.

5. Presentation on Bonneville's year-end report for Fiscal Year 2004

Scott Hampton, Bonneville Power Administration.

Scott Hampton of BPA presented a year-end financial update, indicating \$132.8 million in F&W expense spending in FY 04 and \$7.3 million for capital projects. He said BPA had made internal cost reductions and saved about \$1.3 million in overhead costs this year.

The total spending for FY 03 and 04 totaled \$273.3 million, and when that is subtracted from the \$556 million in available spending for the FY 03-06 period, it leaves \$282.6 million in remaining funds for FY 05 and FY 06, according to Hampton. That makes an average for FY 05 and FY 06 of \$141.3 million, he noted.

Contractors and project sponsors have been getting invoices to us faster, thus reducing the risk of surprises, Hampton said. Spending appears to have a consistent pattern throughout the years, which will help with our forecasting, but BPA needs to continue to improve its forecasting, he stated.

BPA is going to continue putting an emphasis on getting contracts in place on time and begin enforcing spending caps, Hampton told the Council. Development of the PISCES software system will enable BPA to see where project delays are occurring and track milestones and accomplishments, he said. We are targeting FY 06 as the first year we'll be able to report all project accomplishments -- "it will be an exciting, fun year in making sure the money is spent appropriately and that we are accountable," Hampton added.

Why was only \$132.8 million spent when we sent BPA a F&W budget of \$151 million? Cassidy asked. Next November, I'll be able to answer that effectively, but in the meantime we are doing a quick analysis of the biggest projects to see why that occurred, replied Hampton. Cassidy asked whether BPA funded any capital projects in FY 04 that didn't come to an agreement with the agency on a 1-to-1 wildlife crediting ratio. We'll get you that information, Hampton promised.

As you refine BPA's ability to track the dollars, you need to resolve the reporting requirements for projects under the \$25,000 accrual limit, advised Eden. She also suggested that BPA include FY 02 spending figures in its analysis. Eden asked for the amount of funding associated with the non-enforcement of spending caps for FY 04, and Hampton said he would get that information to her. Karier complimented BPA on the "vast improvement" in its F&W financial reporting over the past year and a half.

Cassidy asked if projects that were "open from year to year" had been "cleaned up." It is more behind us than not, replied Hampton. We are embarking on a process to get rid of all contracts older than three years and to replace them with new contracts when appropriate, he explained. Eventually we will have no contracts older than three years, Hampton pointed out. Danielson asked how BPA would evaluate whether new contracts should be issued. We're in a transitional phase now, but when we are done, we will have looked at every contract to make sure its scope, level of effort, and priority are valid, Maslen said. We want to avoid creating a new bow wave of decisions ahead of us, he added.

It's probably a good idea to close out and re-evaluate projects with respect to their goals and objectives, not just their dollar amounts, said Danielson. "We agree completely," responded Maslen.

6. Presentation on North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission

Larry Cassidy, Washington Council Member.

Cassidy made a presentation on the origin and activities of the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission, pointing out that it was established by the Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean, signed on February 11, 1992, and went into force on February 16, 1993. The members of the Commission, on which Cassidy is a U.S. representative, are Canada, Japan, Korea, Russia, and the United States. The Commission deals with the waters of the North Pacific Ocean and its adjacent seas, north of 33 degrees North Latitude beyond the 200-mile zones of the coastal nations, and its purpose is to promote the conservation of anadromous stocks in the Convention Area, he said.

Cassidy described the types of fish covered under the Convention, conservation measures under the Convention and enforcement procedures, and he explained how the Commission is organized. He provided a list of the documents submitted to the Commission and cited as an example the "Report on the 2004 Pacific Ocean Shelf Tracking (POST) Project," by David Welch, Gerry Kristianson, and Peggy Tsang.

Derfler asked if there are anadromous fish in countries like Russia. They have bigger and healthier populations than we do, Cassidy replied. Kempton said the Commission studies

indicate the availability of new technologies to be used in studying and protecting fish, and Cassidy said the Welch report is a good example of that.

7. Status report on Idaho Department of Fish and Game's Chinook Salmon Captive Rearing (199700100) and Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock (199107200) programs

Paul Kline, Principal Fisheries Research Biologist, IDFG.

Pete Hassemer and Paul Kline of the Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game (IDFG) made a presentation on the IDFG's Chinook Salmon Captive Rearing Program and its Sockeye Salmon Captive Broodstock Program. Our intent today is to contrast the two programs and look at what we have achieved and learned and future directions for the two programs, Hassemer said.

Kline explained the differences in the approaches of the two programs. He described the background and objectives of the captive rearing program for chinook, which he said was begun in 1995. Its goal is to maintain the continuum of adult chinook spawners in specific target streams using captive rearing technology, according to Kline.

We've gotten good results from the program, with 95 percent survival from collection through smoltification, he pointed out. The fish in the program are behaving like their wild counterparts, and in the last four years, 98,000 juvenile chinook salmon have been produced in the wild, and the hatchery-produced adults are successfully constructing redds with viable eggs, Kline reported.

The captive broodstock program for sockeye was initiated in 1991, and its goal is to use captive broodstock technology to prevent extinction of Redfish Lake sockeye salmon and conserve the genetics of the population, he explained. As a result of the program, 2 million eggs have been produced, and survival to maturation has been very good, Kline said. In 2004, 90 redds were observed in Redfish Lake from the release of 240 adults, he reported. In the six years of our program, 527 hatchery-produced salmon crossed Lower Granite Dam, Kline said.

Karier asked about the effects of attempts in past years to eradicate the sockeye in Redfish Lake. IDFG did poison the lake, and it may have impacted the population as a whole, but since the fish at that time were almost absent from the lake, the effects are hard to gauge, Kline replied, noting that IDFG did not poison any lakes where fish were present and producing.

In response to a question from Kempton, Kline described the genetics methodology being used in the programs and how tagging is done. Practicing a spread-the-risk approach to developing a reintroduction plan has been successful, he noted.

As for future needs for the captive rearing program, while clear progress has been made, more research is needed to address such things as adult size and female fecundity at maturation, Kline noted. The most critical need is to continue efforts under way to associate production of juvenile and adult chinook salmon with eggs produced by captive adults released to spawn, he said.

As a result of the captive broodstock program, in the past six years, more sockeye salmon have been returned to the Stanley Basin in Idaho than returned in the previous 16 years, Kline pointed

out. There is now a need to incorporate more adult returns into the spawning program, and to do that, we need to expand the program, he said. In 2004, we found IHNV disease for the first time, and to combat that problem, program managers are recommending that facility modifications be made, Kline stated.

Hines asked about the costs of the captive rearing program and the amount of the investment vis-à-vis the returning adults. We can get that information to you, but in general, I can say “make sure there’s a nice mattress behind you when you see the costs,” Hassemer said.

Karier brought up the ISRP’s suggestion that these programs could use a “decision tree.” The Council needs to decide if it wants a decision tree for project selection in the future and then decide, if you do, who should be involved in developing it, said Hassemer. Staff will make a presentation to the Council on these issues, staffer Mark Fritsch said.

8. Briefing and possible decision on recommendations from Council subcommittee on Fish Passage Center

Jim Tanner, administrative officer; Peter Paquet; and Sharon Ossmann, business manager.

The Council has the responsibility to make sure the programs it funds are cost-effective and that the programs actually do what they have been asked to do, said Gene Derfler before summarizing a Council subcommittee report on the budget and activities of the FPC. With the FPC, there seems to be duplication with other entities in the region that do data management, he stated. The subcommittee looked at the possibility of combining some of the FPC’s work with that of other organizations, Derfler said.

When the director of the FPC put on a “court press” to curtail our look at how the FPC does things, I decided it would be good to have an independent contractor review data management at the FPC and other entities in the region and make recommendations to us, he stated. Destroying the FPC is not our goal, but its director thinks it is, Derfler added.

The subcommittee also looked at all the programs where data is being gathered through the tagging of fish and found there is a lot of confusion about what fish are being tagged and for what reason, he told the Council. We recommend that the Council ask the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) and the University of Washington to take a look at the fish-tagging programs, Derfler said.

Staffer Jim Tanner reported that staff reviewed how the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) supports the FPC. We didn’t look at efficiencies of scale, such as moving the FPC under the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority, he noted. We met with the FPC staff about their budget increase request, and they told us they had done some “fairly severe” budget cuts that enabled the FPC to get back to its current level of funding, Tanner reported. The FPC cut out travel, lease payments, and office space costs, and BPA has given the FPC some computer equipment, he said.

Derfler asked about the salary increases that were part of the FPC’s earlier request for a \$145,000 budget increase. They said they had to take the pay increases because of federal salary

rules -- did they take them? he inquired. Yes, and they told us they didn't have to take them, Tanner replied. So they cut their service level, but not the pay increases, Derfler said.

Did they cut out all travel? John Hines asked. Yes, and they cut employee parking, some supplies and equipment rental, and they are moving from a fee-based software system to free software, Tanner replied. Hines said that the cuts won't solve the FPC's long-term problem, just delay it. What they've done will create less flexibility in their budget next year, he stated. BPA's giving them computers illustrates the benefits of consolidation, Hines continued. It shows there are efficiencies, and the more we try to ascertain ways to consolidate data management, the better off the region will be, he said.

I'm not very happy about the cuts made to get to a flat-line budget and to hear that they kept the salary increases and cut services, Larry Cassidy stated. We ought to follow through on the action being proposed today, but tomorrow the subcommittee should write to the FPC and ask them about these cuts and why they were made in this manner, he recommended. We need to find out what happened -- were the actions dictated by the PSMFC staff or what? Cassidy said. This is a separate, but serious issue, he added.

With three entities overseeing the FPC, there's nobody in charge, observed Derfler. We need to look at how they reduced their budget in order to get to a flatline, said Cassidy. Maybe we need to look at every line of their budget, but we need to find the reasoning behind the cuts, he stated. We didn't look at the FPC's functional costs, such as how the budget is allocated for activities like technical assistance or smolt monitoring, Tanner pointed out.

Tom Karier referred to the staff's reporting that the FPC salary increases were from 4.7 percent to 11 percent. I didn't realize there was such a broad range, he commented. It's tied to the federal system, and they told us they are following federal guidelines, said staffer Sharon Ossmann. I haven't talked with them about why some percentage increases are larger than others, she added.

The PSMFC told the subcommittee that the FPC is not required to follow federal guidelines on salaries, Hines stated. I interpret this as a discretionary action taken by the FPC, he said.

This review and brouhaha arose because the FPC asked for a budget increase, said Melinda Eden. In the meantime, the FPC has figured out a budget that fits within last year's amount and so the subcommittee has served its purpose by getting them to that point, regardless of whether we are pleased by that, she stated. Eden suggested the independent contractor could review some of the FPC procedures being questioned.

The salary increase decision was a decision of management, said Derfler. I don't see how reducing all the items in their budget while increasing their salaries 11 percent allows them to do a satisfactory job, he stated. "It's germane to the management style of the organization," Derfler added.

The FPC is not entitled to the federal pay scale, said Jim Kempton. It's a lucrative way of moving up their pay, and it's artificial, he stated. But the larger issue we are asking for help from a consultant on is data management, Kempton noted. I have had problems for some time with the fact that the FPC's reports are not peer-reviewed, he said. Kempton asked to hear more

about the “siderails” on the consultant’s review of data management. What are we asking the consultant to look at? he inquired.

It is how data management occurs and the costs related to that, replied Cassidy. But we are not addressing the real tension here, he noted, which is that the FPC has information that lots of people in the fish recovery business don’t subscribe to, and that there are lots of people who don’t subscribe to the data from other entities in the region, like the Data Access in Real Time (DART) program at the University of Washington. Maybe we should look at recent pay increases at DART and StreamNet; “otherwise, we’re just beating up on the FPC,” Cassidy said.

Responding to Kempton’s question, Hines said that data management doesn’t mean evaluating the ability of the FPC to conduct studies. It is looking at data collection, data storage on computers, and providing the software and security that enables public access to the data, he stated. Staffer Peter Paquet said that among the things that might be looked at are security of the data and development of a “portal,” a single point for accessing the data. There is also the question of what to do with the data sets developed during subbasin planning, including who will manage those, where they will reside, and how to make them accessible to the public, he noted.

We need data centers in the Northwest for various activities such as harvest and hatcheries, but those don’t have to house the data, Karier said. They could be considered data “wholesale centers,” but there also needs to be a “retail outlet” where the public can go to access the data from the wholesale centers, he stated. Developing that vision could change the roles of the FPC, DART, StreamNet, and others, according to Karier.

Derfler moved that the Council authorize its executive director to negotiate a contract, in an amount not to exceed \$10,000, for “an analysis of the costs allocated to the data management function of regional data management entities, such as the FPC, DART, and StreamNet; recommend that BPA continue to fund the FPC at the current funding level, recognizing there may be additional budget implications that arise from the Council’s ongoing process of data management review; and direct staff to work with the FPC subcommittee to develop a scope of work that addresses the regional data management, PIT-tagging, and data collection issues identified by the subcommittee.” Hines seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

I’d like to send a letter to the FPC asking about its salary increases and the functional aspects of the cuts it made in its budget, Cassidy said. I’d also like to hear from BPA about how those cuts got through, he stated. Bill Maslen of BPA said BPA would “follow up” on the matter, and Council chair Judi Danielson asked the subcommittee to keep working to see those inquiries get made.

We need to send a clear message that the FPC is going to be around, Cassidy said, noting that the PSMFC is about to sign a lease for the building where the FPC is housed. He said he would discuss these issues with the PSMFC’s director.

9. Update on long-term funding agreement for Fish and Wildlife Program

Doug Marker, director, fish and wildlife division.

[This item was deleted from agenda]

10. Council Business:

– Approval of minutes

Eden moved to approve the minutes for the September 22, 2004 meeting in Portland, Oregon. Hines seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Eden moved to approve the minutes for the October 13, 2004 meeting in Missoula, Montana. Derfler seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

– Approve release of proposed IEAB appointments for public comment

Morlan presented a proposal to release for public comment the names of the members of the Independent Economic Analysis Board (IEAB) whose terms have expired and that the Council plans to re-appoint. Eden moved that the Council release for public comment the names of those proposed for membership on the IEAB, Karier seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

– Approve IEAB Task Order to review SAFE project

Morlan presented a proposal that would enable the IEAB to review the Select Area Fisheries Evaluation Project, noting that the IEAB will be working in concert with the ISRP on review of the project. Eden inquired who had asked for the IEAB review, and Fritsch said the ISRP had suggested that reviewing the economics of the project would be a good idea and that the review by both the IEAB and ISRP would help determine the future direction for the project.

Eden moved that the Council approve IEAB Task Number 93, Economic Review of the Select Area Fisheries Evaluation Project, Karier seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Approved December _____, 2004

Vice Chair

x:\jh\ww\minutes\nov04.doc