IMPLEMENTATION TEAM MEETING NOTES

October 7, 1999, 9:00 a.m.-4 p.m.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE OFFICES
PORTLAND, OREGON

I. Greetings, Introductions and Review of the Agenda.

The October 7, 1999 meeting of the Implementation Team, held at the National Marine Fisheries Service's offices in Portland, Oregon, was chaired by Brian Brown of NMFS and facilitated by Donna Silverberg. The agenda for the October 7 meeting and a list of attendees are attached as Enclosures A and B.

The following is a distillation (not a verbatim transcript) of items discussed at the meeting, together with actions taken on those items. Please note that some enclosures referenced in the body of the text may be too lengthy to attach; all enclosures referenced are available upon request from NMFS's Kathy Ceballos at 503/230-5420 or via email at kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov.

Brown and Silverberg welcomed everyone to the meeting, led a round of introductions and a review of the agenda. Ron Boyce announced that he will be taking over for Tony Nigro as Oregon's representative to the Implementation Team.

II. Updates.

A. In-Season Management. TMT chair Cindy Henriksen said that, at the last IT meeting, she had reported that the August flows in the system were well above average; in fact, she said, the August natural flow at The Dalles wound up at 196 Kcfs, 142% of normal. In general, the runoff was quite late in 1999; August inflow to Libby was the third-highest on record.

In September, the flows turned around somewhat, Henriksen said; the September average flow at The Dalles was only 98% of average, about 93 Kcfs in natural flow.
Henriksen said the Technical Management Team is now in post-season review mode; we met on Tuesday, and talked about how the TMT is doing, what the group will be doing in the future, and whether or not the Guidelines or process need to be revised. It was a useful discussion, although we didn't expect to receive definitive answers to these questions, Henriksen said; the various TMT members were asked to go back to their agencies and talk about their needs and desires for the TMT in the future.

We also discussed what we expect the Water Management Plan to look like in the future, as well as the TMT's decision-making process, Henriksen continued. A number of interesting questions

were raised, and in general, it was a very productive discussion. Silverberg added that a full-day TMT post-season review session is scheduled for November 3.

One issue that arose at the meeting was the question of whether or not the TMT meetings should continue to be completely open to the public, Henriksen said; we thought this was something the IT may want to address, because there is a desire, on the part of some TMT members, to have the ability to go into closed session to discuss certain issues. There are a variety of questions surrounding that issue; obviously, the TMT has been a very public and open process up to this time, she said. Perhaps we can ask the IT to consider this question in the future, said Henriksen.

Will TMT be developing a list of the issues they feel should be considered in closed session? Brown asked. A summary list would be one way to approach this issue, but we haven't really discussed that, at this point, Henriksen replied. It's on our agenda again on November 3; perhaps we can develop such a list at that time, she said.

Basically, the issue was whether or not there are times when the TMT discusses information that is sensitive to a particular agency, which might require going into closed session, Silverberg said. The TMT's participating agencies are exploring whether that would feasible or necessary; if so, it would only be for part of the meeting.

B. Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses (PATH). See Agenda Item III, below.

C. Integrated Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB). No ISAB report was presented at today's meeting.

D. Water Quality Team (WQT). Rich Domingue of NMFS said he is now the NMFS lead on the Snake River water temperature monitoring team, a subcommittee of the Water Quality Team charged with evaluating the current water temperature monitoring program in the Snake River. Basically, we're looking at whether or not the current program is adequate, he explained, as well as what changes may be appropriate.

One of the things we're trying to do is identify what the purpose of the Snake River water temperature monitoring program should be, now and in the future, Domingue said; as you might expect, there is no shortage of answers to that question. What we're trying to do is get the entities who are interested in Snake River water temperature monitoring to identify, as specifically as possible, the questions they would like the monitoring program to be able to answer. We are also in the process of evaluating the existing body of Snake River water temperature monitoring data, to see whether or not that database and the existing models may be sufficient to answer some of those questions, Domingue said. We will then be able to develop a list of areas where holes exist, as well as a plan for filling in those data gaps; the subcommittee should be able to provide that list to the IT within a couple of months.

Any progress in finding a funding source for an expanded Snake River temperature monitoring program? asked Jim Nielsen. No one has come forward with funds at this time, Domingue replied, although we have queried EPA and the Corps. While the Corps appears to have an interest in continuing some portion of its tri-level thermograph efforts, nothing is carved in stone at this time, and, so far, no one has stepped up to the funding plate.

The hope is that, following the completion of the data review, the work group will be able to

develop a scope of work for a Snake River water temperature monitoring plan, Jim Ruff said; this scope of work will outline the purpose of and need for an expanded monitoring program, if that need exists, as well as a plan for what needs to be done and an estimate of the cost. At that point, he said, we can explore potential funding sources more aggressively.

At the last IT meeting, the Water Quality Team said they needed funds to hire a contractor to conduct this data review, said Brown; it now sounds as though no funds were made available, but the agencies involved thought this work was important enough to get it done internally. That's correct, Silverberg said.

E. System Configuration Team (SCT). Bill Hevlin reported that it now appears that the SCT will have an adequate CRFM budget to work with in FY'00; the appropriation came in at $67.5 million, and the Corps has restored $14 million from the FY'99 CRFM budget. That should be adequate to fund the current list of FY'00 CRFM implementation and study items, Hevlin said, so that's good news. The SCT has succeeded in developing a prioritized list of FY'00 CRFM projects, following the submission of the tribal rankings last month. Although it now looks as though the list may not be needed, he said, it was a worthwhile exercise, because it gave us a chance to evaluate and discuss every project on the list.

Hevlin added that, at the request of SCT and IT, NMFS is putting together a letter, to be sent to the ISAB, requesting review of The Dalles juvenile survival studies. We plan to have a draft of that letter for SCT review at the next meeting of that group, he said; after that review is complete, we will bring the letter to the IT for approval.

Doug Arndt expressed the Corps' appreciation for all of the SCT's hard work in developing the prioritized FY'00 project list, in particular, for working with the tribes to obtain their priorities. We weren't able to accommodate all of the tribal rankings, he said, but it's an important step toward working more closely with the tribes and being able to address their concerns.

In response to a question from Ron Boyce, Ruff said he had talked with Chip McConnaha and Bill Muir of ISAB; they assured him that the ISAB would be able to review The Dalles studies in a timely fashion, as long as the assignment is made soon. There's a good chance the ISAB will be able to complete this task before next spring, he said. In general, said Ruff, we will be asking the ISAB to review the year-2000 study plan at The Dalles, to address some of the issues that have been raised about that study, and to consider, in general, what they feel is the best way to approach survival studies at other projects in the future. SCT has also discussed the feasibility of using new technology, such as radio telemetry tags, to conduct survival studies in the future; we will also be asking the ISAB to give us their opinion about the applicability of using that technology in future studies, Ruff said.

Has the SCT talked about the possible need to reserve some funds for a mid-course change of direction, once the Biological Opinion is released this spring? Bruce Lovelin asked. I'm sure the SCT has talked about that, Arndt replied; certainly in the Corps' budgeting process, we have recognized that there could be a change of direction, and have indicated to Headquarters and OMB that some of the dollars that are identified for certain activities should be construed more as placeholders, which could be used for other activities if a mid-course shift is needed.

Hevlin added that the SCT has already begun scoping the FY'01 CRFM budget; we are paying a

great deal of attention to the potential implications of the two main decision paths -- drawdown or existing system with improvements, he said. Most of the program for FY'00 is concentrated in areas that will be useful no matter which path is chosen, he added.

F. Quantitative Analytical Report (QAR). Hevlin reminded the IT that the objective of the multi-agency Mid-Columbia QAR effort is to determine the biological requirements of the two listed Upper Columbia species -- steelhead and spring chinook. It includes an assessment of population structure, interim recovery goals and extinction levels for these populations, as well as modeling to determine the effects of the proposed long-term actions on these species. The report will look at the effects of actions at both the federal and the Mid-Columbia PUD projects, as well as current and proposed supplementation and habitat improvement actions, Hevlin said.

Briefly, said Hevlin, there are now two QAR subgroups at work -- a Biological Requirements committee and a Modeling committee. The Biological Requirements committee, after a lot of hard work, has now reached agreement on the population structure for Upper Columbia spring chinook. They have concluded that there are three current populations -- the Methow, the Entiat and the Wenatchee; there was also a fourth historical population in the Okanogan. That population is no longer present, Hevlin said, but it may be possible to work to recover it. With respect to steelhead, he added, there is currently one population in the ESU. The next step for this group is to determine the numerical and distributional goals for these fish -- interim recovery goals and extinction levels. The committee currently has a working draft of its report, which is approximately 75% complete; they expect to finish this report by the end of October.

Moving on to the Modeling Committee's activities, Hevlin said this group has now developed preliminary historical life-cycle analyses for steelhead and spring chinook; they are now starting to work on population projections under differing scenarios and conditions. The first step is to look at generic survival improvements at different points in the life-cycle; after that, they will use the model they are developing to look at the effects of the proposed long-term actions. The Modeling Committee is expected to complete its report on the historical analysis of both listed stocks by the end of October, Hevlin said.

G. Federal Caucus and Framework Hydro Developments. Ruff reported that the Framework Federal Hydro Caucus group met to discuss mainstem hydro actions for the seven Framework alternatives on September 30. The purpose of the meeting was to review the results of the hydrosystem studies, which were conducted using the HydroSim model, as well as the biological analysis based on those results, Ruff explained.

We had five of the seven alternatives modeled at that time; the other two, Alternative 3 and Alternative 5, have now been modeled as well, Ruff said. The reason this modeling, which allowed us to look at flows and hydrogeneration, was done, was to allow us to get a handle on the costs associated with each alternative, he explained. The biological modeling results -- dam survival and reservoir survival estimates -- are now being plugged into the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) model. The Framework group is operating under an extremely tight schedule; they have been charged by the Council to finish their analysis by October, write their report in November, and complete their analysis of all seven alternatives by the first week in December, Ruff said. There is a lot of work left to do before they are finished, he added.

Ruff said he can provide the results from the hydrosystem modeling to anyone who is interested,

adding that he has nothing to report, as yet, on the habitat, harvest or hatchery "Hs." He added that Framework Alternatives 3, 4 and 5 reflect the options developed by the Federal Caucus; a great deal of effort has gone into integrating those alternatives, so that they are consistent with what is being developed under the Framework process. In response to a question from John Palensky, Ruff said the results from the HydroSim modeling have been provided to the Framework Human Effects work group, which is developing estimates of the cost of each alternative. I do not have specific cost estimates to share with you at this time, he said.

The group discussed the basis for the selection of the three Federal Caucus alternatives; Bruce Lovelin raised the concern that, based on the comments he has heard, it appears that the federal operators are giving serious consideration only to Alternatives 3, 4 and 5. That means we're just going through the motions on Alternatives 1, 2, 6 and 7, he said; to me, that only reinforces public skepticism that all seven Framework alternatives are unlikely to receive full and impartial consideration. Is that criticism intended to apply to the Council process? Brown asked. No, I would lay it at the feet of the federal agencies, Lovelin replied -- it doesn't appear to me that the other four alternatives really have much of a chance.

If you'll recall, said Arndt, the purpose of the Multi-Species Framework process was to ask a wide range of regional stakeholders to describe their vision for the future of the Columbia River system, and to test those visions through an analytical process. That was not, however, the stated purpose of the federal process, he said -- rather, the Federal Caucus was tasked to look at some alternatives, across all four Hs, which would allow the federal agencies to meet their mandates.

The concern is that we have two separate processes underway, which are more or less like two ships passing in the night, Lovelin said -- from my perspective, we want to ensure fair treatment of all seven Framework alternatives, including a thorough analysis of biological benefits, costs, compatibility with applicable laws and statutes etc. It now appears that the Kareiva analysis will not even look at all seven alternatives, said Lovelin; if that is the case, we aren't getting what we were promised initially. If that is what's happening, it's unfortunate, he said.

The Framework process, as initially conceived, was to analyze each alternative, using EDT, across the full range that Bruce has described, Brown said. Has this notion that this may not be the right way to conduct this analysis been placed before the Framework Management Committee? he asked. Not that I'm aware of, said Arndt – perhaps what Bruce is suggesting is that the Framework alternatives should also be analyzed using the CRI model.

My point is that the federal agencies are in the driver's seat, when it comes to choosing among these alternatives, Lovelin said. If they're only going to give serious consideration to Alternatives 3, 4 and 5, I'll go back to my members and tell them they're wasting their time advocating Alternatives 1, 2, 6 or 7, he said. The concern, from the federal perspective, is that Alternatives 1, 2, 6 and 7 will not meet the federal parties' legal requirements, Arndt replied. But you don't know that yet, said Lovelin – if the Matrix model concludes that a given alternative will not meet those statutory requirements, then we can debate that.

III. PATH.

PATH coordinator Dave Marmorek briefed the IT on results from PATH's now-completed fall

chinook report, and on PATH's progress in its experimental management work. Marmorek noted that the fall chinook report has been posted to BPA's Internet homepage. He distributed Enclosure C, the executive summary from PATH's fall chinook report, as well as Enclosures D and E, copies of the overheads used in his report.

Marmorek noted that, in accordance with the priorities laid out by the IT, PATH's fall chinook analysis has evaluated the following alternative hydrosystem actions only:

A2 (current hydrosystem operations under the 1995 Biological Opinion Interim Action, including 1995 BiOp levels of flow augmentation)
A2' (maximize transportation using surface bypass collectors)
A3 (natural river drawdown of the four Lower Snake River dams)
A4 (natural river drawdown of the four Lower Snake River dams and John Day Dam).

Working from his overheads, Marmorek then provided a comprehensive overview of the results of PATH's fall chinook analysis, touching on changes to the fall chinook analysis since the FY'98 report was released, the components of decision analysis, PATH's assessment of hydrosystem actions and the sensitivity analyses done in support of this work. Marmorek's presentation included the following summary of key results:

Assumptions about system operations in management scenarios generally lead to improvements in survival for all actions.
Outcomes depend on D (the relative post-Bonneville survival rate of transported vs. Non-transported fish) hypothesis.
All actions meet survival standards, regardless of D hypothesis.
Drawdown actions 1) meet recovery standards regardless of D hypothesis, 2) provide the most robust response across the uncertainties considered to date 3) show higher recovery probabilities and spawning escapements, and 4) are sensitive to assumptions about adult upstream survival.
For each D hypothesis, there is a non-breaching action that meets the recovery standard: High D: maximize transportation
Low D: current system configuration, stop transportation
There is no single non-breaching option that meets recovery standards under all D assumptions; non-breaching actions are not as robust.

Marmorek also provided a summary of key results from the fall chinook sensitivity analysis:

Assumption	**Action**	**Main Effects**
No transport	n/a	Recovery probabilities high/meet standard if D assumed low
Alternative harvest	A2	**High D**: meets recovery standard with all harvest scenarios **Moderate D**: meets recovery standard with extreme reductions in ocean and in-river harvest **Low D**: does not meet standards even with reductions in harvest.

Alternative harvest	A3	**All D**: meets recovery standard with all harvest scenarios.
Alternative survival/recovery thresholds	A2	**High D**: meets survival standard; does not meet recovery standard **Low D**: does not meet survival or recovery standard.
Alternative survival/recovery thresholds	A3	**All D**: meets survival and recovery standard
Upstream survival	A2	**All D**: meets survival standard; does not meet recovery standard.
Upstream survival	A3	**Low D**: meets survival and recovery standard **High D**: meets survival standard; does not meet recovery standard.
Fixed values of D	A2	Meets survival standard at D 0.05 to 0.15 Meets recovery standard at D 0.20 to 0.40.
Fixed values of D	A3	Meets survival standard at D 0.05 to 0.10 Meets recovery standard at all D values

The bottom line is that you can select various combinations of assumptions that may get you to recovery, Marmorek said, but you also have to look at how likely or reasonable that combination is, relative to other combinations.

One of the interesting things about this sensitivity analysis is the fact that if you assume, as many in this room probably do, that the D value is very low, the conclusion is that you would benefit the fish most by stopping transport, Lovelin observed. If there is a body of scientific evidence that says the D value is very low, he asked, are we likely to see that alternative action receive greater consideration? This is for fall chinook, of course, Marmorek replied; in my upcoming presentation on experimental management, you'll see that one of the options we're looking at is a transport on/transport off scenario. Whether or not zero transportation is on the table as a management option depends on what the IT thinks, however, he said. There are a variety of options besides zero transportation, he added; the IT could also consider changing the way transportation is done -- barging rather than trucking, for example.

In response to a question, Marmorek said the D values for spring chinook are significantly higher than the D values for fall chinook.

What adult survival rate did you assume for the period after the dams were built? Ruff asked. I believe it was about 0.42 from Bonneville up to Lower Granite, Marmorek replied; if the four Lower Snake dams are removed, that adult survival rate jumps to about 0.8, as a base

assumption. In response to another question, Marmorek said the no-transport alternative assumes that 1995 BiOp flow augmentation levels would continue.

After lunch, Marmorek moved on to his experimental management presentation, "PATH Scoping of Candidate Research, Monitoring and Experimental Management Actions: Reducing Key Uncertainties and Concurrently Recovering Stocks." He worked from a series of overheads, which are captured in Enclosure E. Marmorek noted that PATH has developed a draft experimental management report, describing various experimental options -- variations of A1, A2 and A3 -- as well as habitat and other actions. We would like to get some feedback from the IT to incorporate into the draft report before it is submitted to the Scientific Review Panel, he said.

Marmorek touched on the various PATH experimental management objectives and task descriptions, noting that the overall objective of this task is two-fold: to find actions that 1) maximize the ability to achieve conservation and recovery objectives and, concurrently, 2) enable the region to learn something about key uncertainties in order to select long-term management actions.

Marmorek went through the key uncertainties for Snake River spring/summer chinook:

Relative post-Bonneville survival (D)
Extra mortality
Life-cycle models (common year effects, downstream stocks to act as controls for upstream stocks)
Length of transition period following drawdown
Equilibrated juvenile survival rate through free-flowing reach.

He also touched on the key uncertainties for Snake River fall chinook:

Relative post-Bonneville survival (D)
Extra mortality

Marmorek then moved on to the various hypotheses PATH is considering to explain the extra mortality key uncertainty, and the implications of these key uncertainties for long-term actions (please refer to Enclosure E for details). He then went through the 10 candidate experimental management approaches PATH is evaluating, including the potential knowledge gained, methodology and risks and tradeoffs associated with each:

ÿ Continue current operations; measure D
ÿ Modify smolt transportation, measure D
ÿ Transportation/no transportation
ÿ Breach two dams
ÿ Breach four dams (A3)
ÿ Carcass introductions/stream fertilization
ÿ Manipulate hatchery production
ÿ Predator removal experiments
ÿ Explore causes of delayed mortality
ÿ "Regime shift" monitoring.

Marmorek then went through PATH's proposed approach to the coordination of actions -- overall strategy and design, four possible strategic alternatives for implementing experimental actions, and next steps in the experimental management task.

It would be interesting to hear PATH's opinion, given the range of D and other variables, about what would be the most risk-averse plan that could be put in place to benefit the listed species, Lovelin said. The A-Fish Appendix and PATH both concluded that dam breaching was the most beneficial action, if you were going to take an action right now, Marmorek replied. As far as experimental management actions, that's something we still need to assess -- we haven't yet gone far enough in the analysis to show what the changes in the probability of survival and recovery might be if you take this action or that action. The length of time you delay, obviously, has an effect, he said.

You've said that you would like the IT's feedback on the experimental management report, said Brown -- is there something more substantive than this package of overheads that you would like us to respond to? We will have a draft report for you to review within the next two weeks, Marmorek replied. And what specific response would you like from the IT to that report? Brown asked. The feedback we've received from the IT to date is that we were to scope out the candidate options, but that trying to evaluate them quantitatively, at this point, is a waste of time, Marmorek replied. Basically, we would like you to review the list of candidate actions, so that we can begin to evaluate them, he said. If there is something on this list of actions that, for whatever reason, is not worth pursuing, please let us know before we spend our time and effort exploring it, Marmorek said. Also, if you had feedback along the lines of suggesting certain combinations of experimental actions in order to achieve a suite of objectives, that would be useful as well, before we begin developing tools and analyzing data to evaluate those options, he added.

So when we see the report, we will be looking for major show-stoppers -- options that we feel should not be considered by PATH? Boyce asked. That's one of the things we're looking for, yes, Marmorek replied. If there are any disagreements about that, what's the process for resolving them? Boyce asked. That will probably need to take place in a forum outside the Implementation Team, said Dan Daley -- it's a call that, in all likelihood, the regional decision-makers will have to make.

Jim Yost observed that considerably more information is needed about the D value and extra mortality before an informed decision can be made about something as momentous as the removal of the four Lower Snake dams. Howard Schaller replied that what PATH is asking for is simply feedback on what they should be analyzing in the experimental management realm.

What product does PATH ultimately expect this analysis to produce, in terms of information on which we can base future decisions? Brown asked. Basically, we plan to look at these experimental actions, using various passage models, life-cycle models, natural variability and sampling error, to yield an assessment of monitoring and conservation performance measures over time, Marmorek replied. If you did 10 hatchery manipulation experiments, for example, we would see how many times you would actually be able to detect the effect that you simulated. We will also be looking at the tradeoffs between the knowledge gained while delaying recovery actions while you gather this additional information, and the reduced probability of meeting a recovery standard, Marmorek said. Basically, what we're trying to do in this analysis is tell you

whether or not it is worthwhile to conduct a given management experiment.

The purpose of the experimental management report, as I understand the assignment, is to tell us what we will learn, and what the risks are while we acquire that information, Brown said. That's correct, Marmorek replied; the idea is that, after some or all of these experimental management actions are implemented, 10 to 15 years down the road, your options would be clearer. This quantitative evaluation of experiments is intended to simulate the learning that will occur over time. That may be too difficult a task, Marmorek said; the bottom line is that we simply don't know whether or not that's the case at this point.

Obviously PATH needs to continue to develop this analysis, said Brown; this being the case, if there is guidance the IT would like to provide, we need to decide how to develop that over the next month or so. After a brief discussion, Brown asked the IT participants to review the draft experimental management report when it is made available, and to come to the November IT meeting prepared to offer any comments they may have. Boyce suggested that it would be most useful if these comments could be provided in writing.

In general, said Marmorek, does the IT feel that this experimental management effort is potentially useful? That's a good question, said Daley, and one that I'll be discussing with others within Bonneville -- is this the most useful area for PATH to be expending its efforts? That will be part of our comments, he said.

Brown said NMFS continues to be supportive of PATH's experimental management effort, but noted that there is still a lack of clarity about what, precisely, this analysis is expected to produce. What exact information you'll get, by what date, is something we won't know until we have an opportunity to evaluate these actions more quantitatively, Marmorek agreed.

The value of this effort, as I see it, is that the region is finally getting an opportunity to discuss and evaluate what we need to find out -- what information is particularly critical, in terms of its influence on the key decisions we have to make, said Yost. It sounds, from what Dave has said, as though PATH may be able to suggest a package of experimental actions that will get us the information we need to make these major decisions, while still maintaining the viability of the listed stocks while this data is obtained.

Can you give us an assessment of whether or not these alternatives, given certain design assumptions, are going to provide quantifiable results? Daley asked. That would be another useful next step, as long as it doesn't require three months of PATH's time, he said. I think we can make some preliminary guesses as to which combinations of actions are likely to move us closer to resolving certain uncertainties, Marmorek replied. As far as how conclusively you'll be able to test those hypotheses over a given length of time, we need to do more work before we can really say, he added. How much more work? Daley asked. We have already developed simpler models to look at things like hatchery experiments, Marmorek replied; with a number of qualifiers, these might tell us something about how long it may take to see results. If you're suggesting that it may be a good idea to run these through a simpler model first to screen some of them out, then rank them, that may well make sense, he said.

I'm sensing that such a process might be useful to the IT, said Silverberg -- to get a better sense of which of these things will take a lot of time, and which won't. You're talking about how long

it will take to analyze the various experimental management options? Marmorek asked. Yes, Silverberg replied. I think that's essentially what we need to do, Marmorek agreed. I'd also like to get a sense of which alternatives are likely to produce useful results, and in what time-frame, Daley said, as well as which actions are likely to take longer, at more investment and effort.

It seems to me that there is a lack of policy guidance in this effort, said Lovelin -- someone, whether it's the Council, NMFS, or IT, needs to make a decision and tell PATH what road to go down. And I think what I've heard is agreement that each IT member will come to the next meeting with written comments and guidance on PATH's experimental management report, Silverberg said. In other words, we're going to step up to the plate and dodge the issue, said Yost. And for the record, I agree with Bruce, said Brown.

IV. Dworshak National Fish Hatchery Water Supply.

Palensky said agency and tribal representatives had an MOA meeting with BPA on September 17; as we promised, he said, we raised the issue of the Dworshak Hatchery water supply. In general, Bonneville is not predisposed to move money from one funding category into another, but they were willing to consider the possibility of doing so in the case of the Dworshak Hatchery improvements.

At the meeting, a subgroup was assigned to look into the scope and cost of the proposed improvements, Palensky said; they will report back at the next meeting of the MOA work group, and hopefully, we'll know more then.

The main issue, then, is whether or not money can be transferred from one cost category to another? Boyce asked. That was what we talked about at the meeting, Palensky replied; Bonneville agreed to look at whether or not the funds for this work could come from the unspent capital portion of the budget. Was there any indication of a possible timeline for this decision? Jim Nielsen asked. No, Palensky replied -- the MOA work group will be meeting again in a month or so, and as I said, we'll be discussing this issue further at that meeting.

V. Continued Discussion of the Scope of the Regional Forum, Post-2000.

It was agreed to defer discussion of this agenda item until the next IT meeting, when it will be placed at the beginning of the agenda.

VI. Approval of Minutes from the August 5 and September 2 IT Meetings.

The minutes from the August 5 and September 2 IT meetings were approved, with a few minor changes.

VII. Next IT Meeting Date and Agenda Items.

The next meeting of the Implementation Team was set for Thursday, November 4, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. at NMFS' Portland offices. Meeting notes prepared by Jeff Kuechle, BPA contractor.