



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 | Website: www.cbfgwa.org

Coordinating and promoting effective protection and restoration of fish, wildlife, and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin.

The Authority is comprised of the following tribes and fish and wildlife agencies:

- Burns Paiute Tribe
 - Coeur d'Alene Tribe
 - Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
 - Idaho Department of Fish and Game
 - Kootenai Tribe of Idaho
 - Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks
 - National Marine Fisheries Service
 - Nez Perce Tribe
 - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall
 - Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley
 - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
 - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Coordinating Agencies**
- Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
 - Upper Columbia United Tribes
 - Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: February 28, 2008

TO: CBFWA Members

FROM: Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA

SUBJECT: Final Action Notes for the February 20, 2008 Members Meeting

**Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (CBFWA) Members Meeting
Wednesday, February 20, 2008
@ CBFWA Office, Portland OR**

Support material is posted at:
<http://www.cbfgwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=Members&meeting=all>

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Larry Peterman, MDFWP; Cecil Dick, Lawrence Schwabe, BPT; Gary James, CTUIR; Elmer Ward, CTWS; Dave Statler, NPT; Elizabeth Gaar, NOAA Fisheries; Tom Rien, ODFW; Doug Taki, SBT; Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Nate Pamplin, WDFW; Kyle Prior, SPT; Brian Lipscomb, Tom Iverson, Neil Ward, Ken MacDonald, Pat Burgess, CBFWA.

By Phone: Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Bill Towey, CTCR; Michele DeHart, FPC; Angela Sondena, NPT

Guest: Joe Mentor, Mentor Law Group, PLLC

Time Allocation:	Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
	Objective 2. Technical Review	%
	Objective 3. Presentation	%

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

Action: The Members approved the agenda as presented. No objections.

Note: Items were reordered during the meeting: agenda items are listed in the order discussed.

ITEM 2: Draft Action Notes from the January 17-18, 2008 Members Meeting.

Action: The January 17-18, 2008 Members meeting were approved as final. No objections.

ITEM 3: CBFWA Response to Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) Regarding Independent Economic Advisory Board (IEAB) Tasks 116 and 117

Brian Lipscomb stated that Wildlife Advisory Committee (WAC) drafted a letter with attachments to the NPCC communicating their comments and concerns with regard to recommendations contained within IEAB Tasks 116 and 117. The draft letter was the consensus of the WAC. The MAG reviewed this letter in their meeting on February 19th and recommend that the Members approve this letter with the intent to stimulate conversations between the NPCC and the WAC to reach resolution on the IEAB recommendations.

IEAB Task 116: IEAB Investigation of Wildlife O&M Costs:
http://www.nwcouncil.org/news/2007_11/8.pdf

IEAB Task 117: IEAB Report on Alternative Strategies for Habitat Protection:
http://www.nwcouncil.org/news/2007_11/9.pdf

Angela Sondena, WAC Chair, added that the NPCC charged the IEAB to investigate

O&M costs for wildlife portion of the Program and look for efficiencies and cost savings. At the January 15th NPCC meeting agenda, a draft letter was on the agenda for discussion from T. Karier, NPCC to G. Delwiche, BPA regarding NPCC recommendations based on IEAB Task 116 and 117: <http://www.nwcouncil.org/news/2008/01/2.pdf>. The draft letter expressed the NPCC's desire to take action on some of the recommendations contained in the IEAB's reports. The request in the draft letter from the NPCC to BPA was initiated without any consultation with the fish and wildlife managers.

In a memo to Brian Lipscomb, the WAC recommended that CBFWA Members request that the NPCC delay comments to BPA regarding the IEAB Task Orders (#116 and 117) and request consultation with the WAC.

At the January 15th meeting, the NPCC agreed to postpone action for 90 days. During the 90 day period, the WAC will work with NPCC staff to decide the next steps. The WAC will be meeting with NPCC staff on February 25th and 26th to begin the process to come up with joint recommendations.

Discussion:

Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS, questioned the consistent use of "CBFWA" throughout the letter rather than stating "fish and wildlife managers." Mark stated that as an ongoing observation, CBFWA is often viewed an agency unto itself as opposed to individual fish and wildlife managers who make up CBFWA. Mark asked if in correspondence it would be more effective for CBFWA to state "fish and wildlife managers" or continue to state "CBFWA?"

Brian Lipscomb advised that CBFWA staff is struggling with that question while developing the amendment recommendations. Brian suggested that in communication with the NPCC or in any use within the Program, we should all use the language of the Act that provides deference, i.e., "the fish and wildlife agencies and tribes."

Chairman Peterman, MDFWP, agreed that these were good points that warrant further discussion relative to the use of standard language in correspondence.

Mark Bagdovitz suggested that the WAC rephrase the last bulleted sentence under Task Number 117 in the cover letter using alternate wording other than "in lieu." The phrase "in lieu" has different meanings, particularly as it relates to the Act.

Brian Lipscomb suggested that the Members approve the letter to Bill Booth, NPCC, regarding IEAB Tasks 116 and 117 with the caveat that CBFWA staff work with Joe Mentor to determine an appropriate solution that meets the intent of communicating that it is the agencies and tribes that have reviewed and taken acted as facilitated by the CBFWA charter and then send the letter on to the NPCC. If Members are not comfortable with that plan for this letter, then in the future we can work on a standardized phrase to be used in correspondence.

Action:

The letter was approved by the Members with two caveats: 1) reword the initial sentence with an alternative phrase rather than stating "CBFWA," 2) rephrase "in lieu" language under the fourth bullet of Task Number 117 on page one of the letter and in the last sentence of Attachment II.

Motion Discussion:

Dave Statler, NPT, stated he does not have an objection to the letter but he stated discomfort with approving the letter contingent upon verbiage that will probably not be seen prior to the letter being sent out. Dave requested that this be worked out within the meeting.

Chairman Peterman placed the motion on hold to give Ken MacDonald and Angela Sondenaa an opportunity to rephrase the "in lieu" language and to consult with Joe Mentor on wording to use for appropriately stating CBFWA Member agencies and tribes. Chairman Peterman asked that they bring the letter back for final action before the end of the meeting.

Follow-up Discussion/Edits

Ken MacDonald returned with the following edits to the letter: 1) in the fourth bullet under Task Number 117 on page one of the cover letter, "should not be in lieu" was

to Letter:

replaced with “does not fulfill” *the defined* . . . and on Attachment II in the last sentence, “should not be in lieu of” was replaced with “does not fulfill” *the defined* . . .

The Members discussed alternatives to the use of “CBFWA” throughout the letter and suggesting several variations and settled on “Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Member agencies and tribes.”

Brian Lipscomb added that this may warrant a future conversation with BPA, NPCC, and others about what it means when the agencies and tribes take action through CBFWA. Alternately, a description could be integrated into the introduction to the amendment recommendations. A couple paragraphs could be added stating that we’ve all come together under the mechanism of the charter which is how we’ve organized to meet to come to conclusion on issues that affect us all in the management of the resources in which we share jurisdiction, etc.

Amended Motion:

The Members amended their motion to approve the letter with the edits as described by Ken MacDonald and to use the phrase “Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority Member agencies and tribes” as suggested by Dave Statler. No objections.

Final Letter sent to the NPCC:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2008_0220/IEAB_116_and_117_CBFWA_toNPCC_20Feb2008FINALsig.doc.pdf.

Note – Item 4:

Brian Lipscomb suggested that Item 4 Monitoring and Evaluation Amendment Recommendation update follow Item 7 Review CBFWA Program Amendment Recommendations.

ITEM 5:**Coordination Funding Update**

Brian Lipscomb provided an update stating that as assigned by the Members, the MAG reviewed the NPCC coordination funding decision with regard to the CBFWA project proposal. The MAG directed Brian Lipscomb, as Executive Director, to consult with all of the CBFWA Members individually to assure that the amount of money they have requested for FY 2008 is a true figure to achieve deliverables in light of the budget cut proposed by the NPCC.

Once the Members have confirmed their participation needs, Brian will do an assessment of responsibilities of CBFWA staff utilizing the remaining funds. This assessment of responsibilities will look at whether or not all of the tasks can be completed within the reduced budget and how additional efficiency could be achieved.

Brian advised that he will provide an analysis of Member support funding detailing the FY07 level and the requested FY08 level and the adjusted FY08 level. Brian expects to have that completed by February 29th. The analysis will identify funding to assess what priorities can or cannot be accomplished with that funding level. Face-to-face meeting time (i.e., travel by CBFWA staff and Executive Director), public relations services, and adjustments in Information Technology delivery are the areas that would be considered to make up the savings; nothing else has been identified beyond that.

Brian added that included in the information for Members consideration will be a draft communication to the NPCC expressing Members overall frustration with the NPCC’s arbitrary decision. The NPCC decision does not take into account the hard work of the CBFWA Members toward: 1) developing a coordination definition, 2) applying that definition in development of a work plan, and 3) articulating the link between coordination and achieving on-the-ground success in a region where you have multiple jurisdictions overlapping and how essential that is for the accomplishment of that management and on-the-ground activities across the region.

Brian stated that the letter to the NPCC will include comments/strategy on how the budget will be balanced, or not balanced, and what will not get accomplished if additional funds are not granted.

Chairman Peterman stressed the importance that this information is presented in a context to discuss and explore how we can best utilize funding to make sure that CBFWA maintains a relevancy in the basin toward decision making, getting things

done on the ground, and in recovering species. Focus on what are the most relevant things that CBFWA does – internally and externally.

Dave Statler referenced the MAG discussion and the focus on work products and the connection of regional coordination to effective on the ground accomplishments, because of the notion in the region among certain entities that regional coordination is a frill. Dave added that the value of deliberation of critical issues and the in turn effective on the ground actions and accomplishments are not acknowledged and if that connection is not made, there is a continued danger of having the regional coordination looked upon as an extra.

When doing the budget exercise, Mark Bagdovitz suggested an “alternative” stance known as the Washington Monument approach in the federal circle. If we make cuts in areas that the NPCC doesn’t think is valuable, even though we think it is valuable, it will not present a persuasive argument for them to put dollars back into the budget; however, if we state that we must cut certain things that the NPCC wants, that may provide a better argument. Nate Pamplin, WDFW, suggested that if after the budget analysis we still need to come up with an additional 100K then Mark’s suggestion would be appropriate but make sure we have a lean budget in which to defend the additional cuts.

Brian added that if CBFWA intends to have a discussion with the NPCC at their March 11-12th meeting in Boise ID, CBFWA Members will need to finalize this conversation at their teleconference on March 5th. April 1st begins the new contract period with the new funding level.

ITEM 6:

Fish Passage Center (FPC) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) and CBFWA

At the November 20th meeting, the MAG recommended that CBFWA Members direct Brian Lipscomb, as Executive Director, to pursue an MOA for FY 2008 with PSMFC regarding the supervision of the FPC Manager and for FY 2009, with the intent that CBFWA will continue to pursue moving the FPC contract from PSMFC to CBFWA.

On December 5, 2007, the Members directed Brian Lipscomb to develop the MOA with PSMFC working in consultation with CBFWA legal Council, Joe Mentor, Mentor Law Group. The MOA would allow the CBFWA Executive Director to supervise the FPC Manager. It was agreed that the Members were delegating this responsibility to Brian with the understanding that unless something arises that could create a potential issue or controversy, Brian will not be required to bring this back to the Members.

At the January 17-18, 2008 Members meeting, the Members requested an update and an opportunity to discuss the MOA via Executive Session at the February 6, 2008 Members Teleconference and to review the draft MOA at the February 20th Members meeting.

Discussion/MOA:

Brian Lipscomb began the discussion by advising the Members that there are two items for consideration with regard to the FPC: 1) the development of the MOA between CBFWA and PSMFC, per Members’ instruction for the oversight of the FPC manager, and 2) Members consideration toward FPC Program amendment recommendations.

Brian stated that at the January 2008 meeting, the FPCOB identified three areas that could be considered for possible amendment in the NPCC F&W Program: 1) oversight of the FPC manager, 2) determining if a technical advisory committee is necessary and appropriate, and 3) further clarification of the role of the FPCOB in relationship to the FPC and its oversight. Also discussed was clarifying data warehousing requirements of the FPC; however, Brian stated that he would advocate that is a technical discussion that would be better worked out between Michele Dehart and Dan Goodman, FPCOB member.

Joe Mentor advised that it was not necessary to go into Executive Session unless the Members enter into a specific conversation regarding FPC personnel and staffing. Joe presented a draft MOA for Members review and comment stating that the agreement is straight forward with the CBFWA Executive Director establishing procedures and

providing performance evaluations based on the CBFWF handbook and procedures. There would be coordination with PSMFC and PSMFC would remain as the contracting entity for purposes of reimbursement. It was noted that Michele DeHart had not had an opportunity to review and discuss the draft MOA. Once the MOA is finalized, Brian Lipscomb, Joe Mentor, and Michele DeHart will meet with Randy Fisher at PSMFC to reach agreement and put the MOA in place.

Joe Mentor provided some background information stating that the CBFWA Executive Director has been charged through the CBFWA Charter with the oversight of the FPC; however, the contract for operations has been entrusted with PSMFC. Under this contract, the FPC employees are employed by PSMFC; therefore, Brian Lipscomb does not have the legal authority to conduct personnel reviews and oversight of the FPC unless an MOA is in place between PSMFC and CBFWA. Although CBFWA has formally proposed that BPA move the contract from PSMFC to CBFWF, BPA has opted not to take action on that recommendation and renewed the FY08 FPC contract under PSMFC.

Joe Mentor advised that an MOA was in place between CBFWA and PSMFC with regard to supervision of the FPC Manager until 1996 but CBFWA has been providing that supervision informally since that time. Last year, with the reinstatement of the Fish Passage Center Oversight Board (FPCOB) discussions arose over the role of the FPCOB with regard to personnel oversight of the FPC Manager. Under Oregon Labor law, personnel oversight is only legal when it takes place in the context of an employer/employee relationship. The NPCC FPCOB discussions made it clear that there is a need to formalize the agreement between CBFWA and PSMFC.

The Members provided edits to the MOA and suggested that the content of the MOA to cover only the personnel management issue and to stay away from any policy details. The Members briefly discussed the benefits and considerations toward transitioning the FPC contract from PSMFC to CBFWA.

Brian Lipscomb anticipates having a completed document, reviewed and agreed to by Randy Fisher, PSMFC, by the Members April 2, 2008 teleconference.

**Discussion/FPC
Amendments:**

Brian Lipscomb opened the discussion regarding FPC Program amendment recommendations stating that one recommendation that CBFWA would like to pursue is to ask that the Program be brought under one cover. The mainstem amendments is where the most clearly articulated language for the FPC exists; however, Brian added, that CBFWA staff suggests since the FPC's function is primarily a monitoring function, that it would better fit under the monitoring section of the Program.

Brian asked the Members to consider providing direction on changes to that language when we transition it into the monitoring section of the amendment document. Specific areas to be addressed: 1) removal of the reference of who oversees the FPC manager, 2) removal of the development of a technical advisory committee (TAC), and 3) the overall role of the FPCOB. Brian stated that the FPCOB discussed that the language be removed from the Program because the current technical protocol review of the FPC technical work goes through the mainstem peer review group of the ISAB.

Brian advised that CBFWA staff will work with Michele Dehart and Joe Mentor and will lay out alternatives for Members to consider.

Joe Mentor suggested that the Members think defensively when making their recommendations as there may be recommendations from other entities inconsistent with what CBFWA would like to see happen with the FPC.

ITEM 7:

Review CBFWA Program Amendment Recommendations

**Discussion/
Amendment
Structure:**

Brian Lipscomb led the discussion stating that the MAG reviewed the current version of the amendment recommendation and directed CBFWA staff to continue with the amendment recommendation structure containing the three volumes: Volume I, Volume II, and Volume III. Brian outlined the volumes on the white board. View

white board images:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2008_0220/MembersWhiteBoardImages2008_0220.pdf.

Additional information provided by Brian:

- An executive summary will preface the recommendations.
- Volume I will summarize the subbasin plans and in some cases the specificity of some of the subbasin plans will be replaced with updated information (i.e., objectives, limiting factors, threats, strategies and measures, etc.) and will incorporate the summary information into the Program main document. Volume I is anticipated to be approximately 500 pages.
- Volume II will contain the AHA analysis, explanation of adaptive management as an appropriate planning structure, and possibly Joe Mentor's white paper if approved by the Members for inclusion.
- Volume III will contain the scientific backup (e.g., technical references used by the AFAC to inform the AHA analysis). Full documents will be included here, not just references or links to documents.

Mark Bagdovitz asked what Members will be asked to approve. Brian responded that there will be approximately 75 pages of significant information to review and he advised that Members pull samples from the other pages and review for consistency picking out specific subbasins that Members may have concerns with to ensure the information is consistent with your agencies and tribes approach within that subbasin.

Tom Iverson added that the specific recommendations and measures are contained in Volume I and Members could possibly come to agreement on the language that would go in the Program without necessarily having full agreement on why it is the right language to put in the Program. With regard to Joe Mentor's white paper, it may be put in Volume III as a reference document instead of in Volume II.

All reference documents will be included in the overall submittal and will become part of the record. Joe Mentor referenced section 4(h)(3) of the Northwest Power Act which states that "All recommendations shall be accompanied by detailed information and data in support of the recommendations." Joe stated a concern that if CBFWA does not submit supporting information that the recommendations would not be deemed technically responsive to the call for amendments. Joe added that any challenges to the Program, on the basis that it did not comply with the recommendations, or didn't properly consider the recommendations, is a closed record proceeding. The NPCC is only required to consider the information that is in front of them. A reviewing court would only be allowed to review the record before the NPCC, with some limited exceptions.

Liz Gaar, NOAA, stated that her agency would be comfortable with the record containing technical information and analyses to support the recommendations but a legal interpretation document would be problematic with regard to achieving consensus.

Action: The Members moved to approve the staff recommendations of the three volume structure, as outlined by Brian Lipscomb.

Motion Discussion: Dave Statler, NPT, recapped that the recommendations are in Volume I, as Joe indicated and pursuant to the Act and the rest is supporting documentation. We could, as a modification, clearly indicate the recommendations and the rest of the information the supporting documents. Tom responded by stating that he tentatively entitled Volume II, Analysis and Justification. Brian added that ultimately we will rely on the specific language in the Act for the titles.

Joe Mentor stated that he has been surprised at the attention the white paper has received and emphasized that the white paper contains a history of positions taken by CBFWA and embodied in documentation. Joe stated that nearly everything contained

in the white paper was based on a letter or a position paper that CBFWA Members had already taken (e.g., capitalization, in lieu funding, etc.). Joe added that one way to get around the problem with the white paper is to submit copies of the actual letters and documentation under Volume II as part of the record, instead of using the white paper.

The motion passed without further discussion or objection.

**Discussion/
Volume I:**

Brian Lipscomb outlined the overall structure of Volume I, Sections 1-5, including the contents of Section 1(1.1-1.7), as discussed and recommended by the MAG. See page 2 of the white board images:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2008_0220/MembersWhiteBoardImages2008_0220.pdf.)

Action:

The Members moved to approve the overall structure of Volume I as discussed and recommended by the MAG. No objections.

**Discussion/
Volume I
Section 2:**

Brian Lipscomb reviewed the contents of Volume 1, Section 2 as recommended by the MAG. See page three of the white board images:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2008_0220/MembersWhiteBoardImages2008_0220.pdf.)

Brian stated that one of the limiting factors basin wide is hydro. There will be an explicit statement about the strategy to mitigate for hydro operations. The MAG is scheduled to meet on March 13th to talk through this item.

Brian advised that the Members did not need to take action on this section at this time as the detail still needs to be developed and reviewed by the MAG and the technical committees.

ITEM 4:

Monitoring and Evaluation Amendment Recommendation Update – Ken MacDonald, CBFWA

Tom Rien, ODFW, and Ken MacDonald, CBFWA, provided a presentation outlining the work that has been done in the ad hoc work group to develop research, monitoring, and evaluation (RM&E) background material and Program measures.

Tom reviewed the conceptual framework that the ad hoc group has been following, which was adopted by the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) policy workgroup, and consistent with the adaptive management outline that Brian Lipscomb has discussed. Tom stated that the ad hoc group is currently developing Program measures based on the framework presented.

Tom advised that this approach provided in the presentation is focused on salmonids. Ken MacDonald added that he thought that the framework would apply for other fish (i.e. westslope cutthroat, bull trout, redband); although probably not for resident fish substitution.

View presentation;

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2008_0220/CBFWA_RM&EAmdmentMbrs2008_0220.ppt

Tom Iverson suggested that they add the objectives under conceptual framework.

Brian Lipscomb advised that they are not looking for approval at this point but instead the goal was to get the framework laid out in front of the Members for review. Some variation of this information will be integrated into Volume 1 with appropriate justification in Volume II and III. Brian stated that as amendment recommendations take their final form over the next six weeks, we have some specific time established for the MAG to review this information in detail to make sure that it is clearly communicating what the Members want to see in the Program.

**Amendment
Timeline:**

Tom Iverson presented a revised timeline:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2008_0220/Feb20MbrsAmendRevSchedule.xls.

On Friday, February 22nd, CBFWA staff intends to have ready to send out for review to the MAG and the technical committees a revised Table of Contents (TOC) and a completed Section 1, and Section 2 Resident Fish and Wildlife, and Section 4 Resident Fish. Comments will be due on March 5th.

As the information is being reviewed, staff can be assembling supporting documentation into Volume II and filling out the bibliography for Volume III. By March 18th (MAG review), and March 19th (Member review) we intend to present Volume II and possibly Volume III.

Joe suggested that Volume III be started now and any Member that has anything to be added to submit it now to CBFWA staff and have staff create a list for everyone to review.

The Members are scheduled to meet on Wednesday, April 2nd just prior to the April 4th due date of the amendment recommendations. Brian Lipscomb stated that we are anticipating that Members be prepared with tribal resolutions and letters from the agencies to adopt the final set of recommendations and to add into the final package to go to the NPCC on April 4th.

Tom advised the Members that on April 15th at the NPCC meeting in Whitefish, Montana, CBFWA staff intends to provide a presentation presenting the CBFWA recommendations and Tom stated that he expects that the NPCC will allow time for individual fish and wildlife managers, and others, to present summaries of their recommendations.

Tom suggested that Members review the schedule to plan to have staff available at the pinpoint times when the documents are ready for review.

Mark Bagdovitz offered his assistance and stated that he is encouraged to hear from CBFWA staff that this undertaking is possible.

Brian Lipscomb added that when this amendment recommendation is submitted it will be a monumental and historical task. Brian stated that in his tenure of working within the basin, there has never been a more comprehensive set of recommendations. The Members have been working hard on this after laying out a strategy a year ago in February. The Members have not have not deviated from that strategy and have systematically worked through the process of putting together a set of recommendations to address the issues identified a year ago.

Dave Statler, NPT, added that with regard to carrying the weight of deference to the fish and wildlife managers, it is critical that Members achieve a consensus document.

A brief discussion was held regarding the substance and purpose for the MAG's March 13th meeting to discuss hydro operations as it pertains to the CBFWA Amendment recommendations (Section 2 Basinwide Provision/Strategies and Measures to address hydro power for anadromous and resident fish). Brian Lipscomb advised that CBFWA staff would be meeting with the MAG's Chairman, Brian Marotz, to plan the discussion for the March 13th meeting. A meeting notice will be going out to MAG with more details.

Meeting adjourned.