

**FISH PASSAGE CENTER OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING**  
**CBFWA Conference Room**  
**Portland, OR**  
**June 4, 2002**

The meeting began at approximately 1:05 p.m. on June 4, 2002.

**Board Members in attendance:**

Rob Walton - PPC,  
Frank L. Cassidy, Jr. – NWPPC  
Tony Nigro - ODFW  
Liz Hamilton NSIA

**Board Members in attendance by telephone:**

John Ferguson - NMFS  
Greg Schildwachter – IOSC  
Keith Underwood - ST

**Invitees in attendance:**

Pat Poe, BPA; Randy Fisher, PSMFC; Michele DeHart, FPC; Jann Eckman, CBFWA; Rob Lothrop, CRITFC; Brian Walsh, NWPPC WA

**Other attendees:**

Tom Giese, CBFWA; Tana Klum, CBFWA; Bruce Suzumoto, NWPPC; Jo-Ann Black-Burrell

**Other attendees by telephone:**

Keith Kutchins-SBT  
JoAnn Hunt-NWPPC

Larry Cassidy called the meeting to order and did a quick review of the agenda for the meeting including noting that the selection of the Board's officers for this group was an item that he indicated they would try to get done today, if possible, but that for organizational purposes, he would volunteer to chair the first meeting and the group could then decide who they want to be chair.

All attendees introduced themselves.

At his turn, Rob Lothrop-CRITFC identified himself as not being a member of the Board, indicating that the Lower River Tribes have yet to decide to recommend a position for the Board but that they have been working with "most of the folks in the room, however, for the last few months on these issues".

After introductions, Larry reiterated that there was one seat vacant on the Board, that being the seat for the representative of the Lower River Tribes. Rob Lothrop indicated that "The Commission will reconsider appointment of a Board member in June and has asked that a letter be prepared outlining operating procedures and roles of the Board as well as goals and the mission statement of the Board." Rob went on to say that he thought that "there probably needs to be some additional discussion at some point in the future between the Commission and the Council on a variety of things, as it was his sense was that the Commission's action reflected not just their concern about the FPC, but their concern about the relationship between the Commission, it's member tribes, and the Council." Rob also said that, "On the other hand, he'd been given direction to work with the Board to put together rules and operating procedures, but that he just won't sit as a Board member in doing so at this time and that he could "volunteer his time to work with the Board, but not as a Board member."

Larry indicated that the Board is hopeful that CRITFC will appoint a representative for the Lower River Tribes to the new FPC Oversight Board as soon as possible.

Larry Cassidy asked if everybody received the FPC Oversight Board Tasks document provided in the meeting packet? He indicated that while there are some organizational issues to deal with, that getting to the initial tasks today was not a great concern, as he preferred that they use this meeting to get structured and everybody get a sense to know each other and know they had completed some choices or have in the process some works to have those choices made by the next time the Board met.

The second item under Organizational Issues is setting Board meeting agendas and taking minutes. Jann Eckmann offered the recording device and Jo-Ann Burrell of Cassidy's office (NWPPC-Vancouver, WA) will take the minutes off and provide that staff function so that we can at least get all minutes of meetings recorded and provided to anybody who wants them.

Staffing assistance, minutes and record-keeping consistent with setting Board meeting agendas and taking minutes:

The task of setting Board meeting agendas was not resolved at this time. Will discuss later in this meeting.

Larry said that he'd like to leave selection of Board officers and by-laws until later.

"How often should we meet and who should be invited to Board meetings?"

Liz Hamilton indicated that she was interested in knowing how frequently the other Board found it necessary to meet and offered her opinion that she thought these meetings should be public meetings. Larry indicated that the meetings can be set up in whatever way the Board decides it wants to hold them. Rob Walton agreed.

Larry also indicated that while there's no need to restrict anything, maybe that would be set up in the by-laws or some other part of the systems under which the Board operates insofar as who participates in meetings. He indicated that if you are going to structure a meeting and make it run, you have to have certain people who can make input and certain people that need to listen and then, at some point in time, maybe invite public input  
Tony Nigro agreed.

Board Budgetary Needs:

Will talk about later.

Define the Board's relationship to NWPPC, CBFWA, PSMFC, others:

There is an existing Board that manages the FPC and it's made up out of the Council's 94-95 Plan, which the 2000 Plan says to continue on. It's made up of three anadromous and resident fish managers for a total of six and the ex-officio chairman is the Executive Director at CBFWA. They have been the "oversight" board for the FPC to date. PSMFC manages the contract with relation to benefits, issuing of checks, etc., the same function you provide for a myriad of monetary expenditures that (sounds like "Bonnie Miller") takes.

The Board discussed who has been responsible for the annual review of the Executive Director of the FPC. Randy Fisher indicated that task had been undertaken by the then Executive Director of CBFWA (Brian Allee) and himself, who would meet with Michele DeHart every couple of months to talk about issues – So, Brian had the responsibility of taking care of the

administrative functions. Michele would hand in contracts to PSMFC for review and processing. Present Board members responded that they understood how that relationship worked and there was no certainty that this relationship should change.

Larry said that the Council should get from him, via the minutes of these Board meetings, pretty clear information as to what's going on.

The Board needs to let Randy know whether they expect him or someone from PSMFC to attend these meetings. Jann Eckmann indicated that their expectations would be to follow what the Board wishes regarding that matter.

Setting Board Meeting Agendas:

Whoever is Chair should survey the members to see what they may have in the way of agenda items, consult with the manager, and put the agenda out.

Oversight Board By-laws – Liz Hamilton and Rob Walton will gather some examples of various Board by-laws to use as a template or starting point that could be modified to meet the needs of this new Board. The purpose of these by-laws will determine the rules of order for this group in making decisions and recommendations, etc. Rob Lothrop agreed to assist in this process in any way the Board thought he could be useful. His offer of help was accepted by the Board.

Michele DeHart – gave the Board a brief overview regarding the FPC's current responsibilities and tasks.

The presentation has previously been made to the full Council at their meeting a year ago in June 2001. It included items regarding 1) Project Goals, 2) Projects (i.e. Design, implementation, and analysis of the annual Smolt Monitoring Program (SMP) and design, implementation, and analysis of the annual Comparative Survival Study (CSS), as well as conducting the Adult & Juvenile Fish Facility Inspection Program), 3) Deliverables – Annual reports on the previously noted projects, ESA Section 10 permit, application accounting and reporting requirements, FPC website, deliverable data: all smolt monitoring data is updated daily, acquire data from other sites, maintain the FPC hatchery database – (i.e.: flow & spill and dissolved gas data, which they get from the Corps), weekly reports, annual reports, etc. The FPC also handles responses to requests various from all types of agencies (i.e.: review and comment, study designs, requests for specific data summaries, including historic data summaries). A handout was provided to Board members outlining the presentation. There were no questions regarding the presentation.

Larry indicated that his interpretation of the purpose of this new oversight board is to look at the FPC's mission statement and operations and try to come up with a recommendation as to whether "it's working just fine", "whether it's not working just fine", and/or where we go with it. He indicated that his interpretation was open to Board member input. He also indicated that he thought the Board might be under a timeline crunch, acknowledging that the FPC's new contract comes up again in January or February of 2003. Michele DeHart indicated that all of the project proposals (FPC, SMP, CCS) were due yesterday (June 3, 2002 @ 5:00 p.m.) and that they were all submitted to BPA for the usual processing (ISRP Review, etc)

John Ferguson indicated that he'd like to have Michele send the Board members copies of those documents and she indicated she'd do so as soon as possible.

Tony Nigro said that he thought the Board at some point soon needs to get into the discussion of what exactly this Board seeks from the FPC or what the FPC's role should be and whether or not this Board is the group defining that or whether what they are doing is facilitating a regional

discussion through the ISRP, the Council's project review process, etc., etc. It was determined that while there was definitely a need for this discussion, it would probably be a lengthy discussion and the time constraints of today's meeting will prohibit that discussion today.

Larry indicated that he'd like to put the following out for discussion with the Board:

He said that he thought that the FPC Oversight Board as presently formed came into being out of an expression of dissatisfaction from the Council about the FPC and instead of the alternative of a vote on a negative basis, the Council decided to create a new committee to take a look at it. He said he said he thought that the Board's "job" is to see what the FPC is doing today, does it meet the goals of the Fish & Wildlife Plan as described and the "group of participants" in this process for fish and wildlife recovery and operation of the hydro-system. He said that he was sure that there was much more this Board could do between now and the time the FPC's contract comes up for renewal in January or February of 2003. Larry indicated that he had no preconceived ideas as to whether they are the best or the worst with regard to the above-noted description. There are plenty of people around that keep "complaining" (his choice of words) about the FPC and when asked, "What is your complaint?" they can't give me one. At some point in time we need to get some specifics then those can be dealt with, but the overall picture that he perceives, subject to the Board's feedback, is that the Board is here to see whether, in fact, we have a diamond, a diamond in the rough, or one that needs to be polished. The data and functions coming out of the FPC are irreplaceable and we need to have it in order to be sensible fish managers.

Tony Nigro referred to the list of Initial Tasks included in the meeting packet, Item #3-Review existing protocols for data management and analysis. Tony said there are two ways the Board can do this – one way is that by reviewing the existing protocols means that what we are going to do is work with the FPC and make sure that we adequately represent and display how present business is being done so people can understand it. The other way you can do this is that we not only work with the FPC to display this so that we can understand it, but then the Board passes some sort of judgment on whether those protocols are adequate. His thought was that most people would look at the task with the second definition in mind with respect to the Board making some judgment as to whether or not those protocols are adequate. Adequate against what standard? So, therefore it makes sense that we need to talk about what really brings us together and what it is we expect to do. We can work together and make sure the data is displayed in a way that it is easily understood what the FPC is doing with respect to how it manages and analyzes data. We do not want to stop short of saying whether or not that indeed is adequate or not, based on somebody's expectation of what we need.

John Ferguson said he thought that may be too detailed for the Board, indicating that he didn't think that the Board as a whole had the ability to judge data analysis. He said that he agreed with Larry in that he thought that the FPC was a resource for the region, but they have a credibility problem and the Board's job is to try and figure out ways to get their credibility back.

Tony said that in order to do that, you have to understand what the source of the problems are. Liz Hamilton agreed.

There was significant discussion regarding the depth of this Board's responsibility regarding the review of protocols for 1) data management and analysis, 2) system operation requests (SOR) and relationship to Fish Passage Advisory Committee (FPAC), and 3) transparency and public accountability of FPC operations as noted in the meeting handout "FPC Oversight Board Tasks" Initial Tasks, bullets #3,4,&5.

There was general agreement that when it comes to the Board reviewing the existing protocols as noted above, they are making sure that the Board has an understanding of what the protocols are and that they can communicate those to others and if they need to be reviewed in a more detailed manner, (i.e.: judgment as to whether or not those protocols are adequate) then a science-based group or someone with that type of technical capability should be called upon.

Liz Hamilton voiced concern regarding trying to address peoples' concerns and the fact that those concerns must be specific. Larry Cassidy concurred that there needs to be specific input. Liz indicated that if there are no specific complaints articulated then the Board may just need to take a look at the current program and see how it communicates itself to our neighbors, non-technical people who are involved in the process, and whether it is meeting the needs of the fish managers

John Ferguson indicated that he thought that the role of the Board should be more along the lines of what the FPC **should** be doing as opposed to what it **is** doing.

Tony Nigro suggested that the Board can solicit that input from the region as to what the FPC should be doing – it should be done in the context of making sure that the region clearly understands what the FPC is currently doing so that they have some basis upon which to put together their proposals.

John indicated that was why he requested copies of the documents that the FPC submitted to BPA on June 3, 2002, as those documents would define what they are proposing to do, their activities, their objectives, their hypotheses, their monitoring programs, etc., which will really tell the Board members what they are doing or what they propose to do for BPA funding.

Tony Nigro also reiterated that the Board needed to be very careful in distinguishing between their expectations of the FPC as individual members of their agencies versus what service we are providing to the region as a member of this Board.

John Ferguson agreed that while he would bring the NMFS' perspectives to the table, he felt that “we are a Board of Directors overseeing this group and it's our responsibility to collectively administrate what they do, how they do it, and what role they serve to the region beyond just what NMFS wants.

Greg Schildwachter said that regardless of whatever else the Board does, the first thing that needs to happen is that we need to get a straight answer to the question of “if the FPC isn't 'tuned up' in peoples' minds right now, why not?” That will then set the Board up to do something about it. He expressed his willingness to work collaboratively with this team to get an answer to that question, which seems as though is pretty fundamental to the mission of the group.

Greg Schildwachter signed off of this meeting at 2:10 p.m. PST with the final comment that he really felt that the first objective of the Board should hit on is getting an answer to what the specific concerns are or else the Board will not be able to do anything about what might be wrong.

Liz Hamilton asked the phone participants to identify themselves before speaking.

Brian Walsh recalled the meeting with the Council one year ago when Michele DeHart made her presentation and the Council expressed their concerns, which at the time seemed to relate primarily to Michele's fourth topic: “Response to requests that they get” and the question was

how these originate? Who gets the results? How are they reviewed as well as the question of transparency as it relates to those requests.

Bruce Suzumoto inquired as to whether there is an operations manual or anything written that outlines all of the different protocols for these various things whether it's information requests or the relationship with FPC, etc., and Michele DeHart indicated that there was the CBFWA charter that outlined interaction between the FPC and "everybody else". In terms of how the FPC operates (i.e. legal, personnel matters, the usual stuff to run an office or unit) they use the PSMFC manual. Michele indicated that, in terms of projects, they are guided and reviewed by the NWPPC/BPA processes.

She indicated that she didn't recall any specific complaints at the Council meeting a year ago regarding response to requests. She indicated that if someone calls in a request to the FPC they record/write down every request on a form that includes the caller's name, the date, and the exact request. If a request is made by e-mail, they keep a copy of that. Everything else is downloaded from the Web. Michele indicated that she still didn't understand what specific complaints are being referred to.

Tony Nigro also responded to Bruce's inquiry by indicating that there is an FPC Charter that describes the relationship between the technical members of the CBFWA and the FPC and that it is very specific to system operations, requests, etc. That charter was revised and updated several years ago as there had been misunderstandings within CBFWA with respect to that relationship and so they very specifically clarified those relationships. The charter reinforces what Michele's summary says in terms of the FPC being technical staff to the authority.

Additionally, there was a document provided in the meeting packet entitled "Roles and Responsibilities of the Fish Passage Center Board of Directors" which is another place where the "Authority" specifically describes the relationship between its members and the FPC.

Bruce indicated that getting information regarding specific operations procedures would be helpful and would give this Board something to review. Michele noted that with the update in technology the phone requests and e-mail requests for information were fewer and fewer, as most people are now retrieving the information electronically from the FPC website themselves.

Randy Fisher suggested that it might be useful for the Board if Michele designed a flowchart showing the programs/projects, where the information comes from, where it goes, is there analysis done or is it strict "data dump" out of the dam, etc.?

There was some discussion as to whether an audit report that was done a few years ago would contain some of the above-requested information. Michele explained that back in 1996 some individuals had concerns that the FPC was somehow manipulating data. As a result of those concerns, they had an independent audit firm come in and do a data audit, whereby they looked at the raw data, the data on the website and the data being sent out and looked for differences. So, the audit report was primarily to address that issue. When asked, Michele responded that the report summarized the FPC data protocols, but that they do have a manual with data protocols that gets as technical as "what you multiply the sample rate by". Tony Nigro indicated that was why he was suggesting referring to the audit report as opposed to the manual, as he thought it may simplify/summarize that information for a larger audience. Michele indicated she could provide that report to the Board.

Rob Walton said that he read with interest the first paragraph in the February 28, 2002 memo from Michele Dehart to Bruce Suzumoto regarding the "FPC "Mission Statement" (included in

this meeting packet), whereby she referred to the FPC's statement of work, which was developed in 1996 in discussions with the Council, BPA, CBFWA, and the Public Power Council (PPC). He indicated that the document refreshed his memory regarding the fact that his organization, PPC, has in fact raised issues and has indeed been part of the "chorus of people" that have mentioned dissatisfaction, allegations of manipulation, delays, lack of responses. Rob wanted to offer his personal perspective on what that is and why that is.

He began by indicating that he went back and looked at the 1994 Plan and read the paragraphs the Council wrote regarding establishing the FPC. His understanding of what that says is that "the Council established the FPC, Bonneville is to fund it, the federal, state, and tribal fish managers are to choose the manager and the manager will provide assistance to the agencies and tribes, which is exactly what they've been saying all along." He indicated that he thought this is exactly the source of the problem because, to the extent that we have a polarized issue and the fish managers are on one side and the power users are on the other, it's an adversarial situation. The perceptions and the interpretations go something like this, "people have seen over the years material come out of the FPC that was perceived as something other than just data; it was perceptions, interpretations, editorial comments, and advocacy pieces and, therefore, the customers have seen the FPC as an advocacy office for the fish managers." Rob said that when he "read what the Council wrote about establishing the FPC, that's exactly what they said it should be." Rob went on to say that, "to the extent that we are in this advocacy piece, we don't trust them; because they are out to get our wallet; why not call for spill if your mission is to save fish, why wouldn't you call for more flow and spill? But, if your job is to keep rates low, it doesn't fit very well."

Rob indicated that he thought that "a fundamental question for this Board was "Should the FPC serve as an advocacy piece for the managers, who have legitimate authority to work for fish and, if so, then everybody can see it as that and it's clear that it's an advocacy piece and when they post, for instance, a March 2002 joint technical staff memorandum criticizing the Giorgi report, it will be clear that it fits in with the advocacy, as they didn't say anything about Giorgi, just the one that takes Giorgi on. So, that fits in with the advocacy and that's okay.

However, he questioned that "if the perception is that ratepayer dollars are paying for an office that has an enormous amount of expertise and they've got the biometricians and they know where the smolt are and they know all of the details, why don't we all use them? And so there's an alternative role, which would be, to coin a phrase Michele used earlier, "try to get maximum efficiency for minimum cost". Rob indicated "that's what the customer's are all about to the extent that they want fish and power rates" – why couldn't we use the FPC to inform us about spill efficiency, spring flow augmentation, and some of the our pet peeves that they've been whining about forever?

Rob continued to say, "if the old language (the Council's 1994 F&W Plan) stands and the FPC is perceived as an advocacy piece for fish managers, we can just be clear about that. If an alternative might be to inform everybody for purposes of cost effectiveness, that might be a different role." He said that he didn't know what the right answer was, but that it might have an effect on the whining and dissatisfaction we have been talking about.

Larry commented that he hoped the two efforts, fish advocacy and low power rates could be achieved, but he thought that Rob should approach the FPC from the standpoint of whether it is performing a function? Who's it performing for? And, Michele seemed to outline that in her first response. He commented that it might be better if the FPC were proactive not reactive and maybe that needed to be talked about. He said that maybe the public power entities haven't been

approached or don't have the access they think they should and that is something that could be changed.

Tony Nigro indicated that a couple of the ways that Rob characterized things get to one of the fundamental challenges of this Board with respect to understanding the FPC. He said that he didn't think that a single wildlife manager that he knew of would say that the FPC was their advocate. For examples he cited that ODFW speaks for itself; he said he believed that the tribes speak for themselves, and what the FPC does specifically is that it responds to their requests for technical information that helps them advocate on behalf of the fish and wildlife in this basin. So he didn't think that the intent was that the Board should read the program language as the FPC being an advocate, but that it's a technical resource for us to allow us to be effective advocates.

The second point he wanted to address regarding Rob's comments was regarding the question he posed regarding "why is the FPC not available to all of us with respect to providing data or analysis?" He thought that was a legitimate question the Board could ask and answer with respect to the FPC's mission, the capacity of the FPC in terms of its staff and resources, with respect to what it can really do and whom it can serve. He indicated that, as Michele said, she gets many requests outside of the fish and wildlife managers, which she documents and it had been his experience that Michele did her utmost to respond objectively and in a timely manner to those requests. If there is some reason that the response mechanism they have in place is not meeting some specific set of expectations, then he thought that this Board would be in a position to facilitate the conversation, get those people to clearly articulate what their expectations are with respect to response and then work toward a solution.

Tony indicated that he wanted to be corrected if he misunderstood Rob's comments, but he reiterated that the FPC is not their advocate, but that they provide the technical basis for their advocacy and they do it under specific responses by us through the FPC Advisory Committee or through the Board of Directors.

Tony asked Rob Lothrop for his opinions regarding whether he misrepresented something and Rob commented that he thought that what Tony said was accurate. Rob L. said he wanted to comment on a couple of points in the evolution of the FPC. He said that, "when we went from two fish passage managers to a single fish passage manager, it was at that point that we got a little more serious about the CBFWA oversight and assuring all of the agencies and tribes had this oversight rule and so there are historical reasons that the current Board is set up the way it is." His other point was that he felt that Rob W.'s question is a legitimate one, regarding resources, how they are shared. The FPC was initially created in '83 by a contract with Bonneville and then picked up in the '84 program, while the '82 program had to two water budget managers in it. Along the way, the Center picked up some staffing resources. He indicated that "there is at least a 20-year evolution here and that, with apologies to Oregon, various institutions in the basin have made staffing decisions recognizing the existence of that capability at the FPC and he expected that if the FPC didn't exist that there would probably be a different staffing pattern at the ODFW. Tony agreed that was correct. Liz indicated that would be true all over the region. Rob said, "yes, probably in Washington and Idaho, too". He indicated that "changes could be made in those institutional arrangements, but that there are very real costs in making those kinds of changes" and "if the Board deliberates on a larger mission issue then that historical perspective is important because it will give the Board an understanding of the trade-offs and how we got to where we are."

Liz also expressed her concern regarding Rob Walton's use of the "advocacy word". She indicated that "looking at the difference between the customers they (Rob W. & herself) each served" that from her side "they would look at those who manage fish in the basin, who are



trying to do what's better for fish", which is what's better for the people she serves, "they'd love to see more advocacy, not less." She said "she had yet to see something that's effective enough to give us any kind of certainty in the way we run our businesses. So, they would look to management that would enhance that. In terms of cost-effectiveness, that's another word that is a "little bit offensive" in that it costs a lot of money when the externalities of the system are put upon the fish. It's just plain costly and you can't get around that."

Liz addressed Rob W. saying that "in terms of what your folks might desire out of the system and what the fish folks might say the fish need may be difficult to reconcile." She continued on to say that in order to facilitate that, "you have to try to get along, you talk, you communicate, you try to fix the things about sharing information. Those are real concerns. If the communication isn't happening, that's a concern that this Board can address and that they need to address. A board of directors is supposed to contribute to the health of an organization, that's the fundamental thing a board does."

Larry said that this Board needs to have a set of by-laws. He said that if the Board could define their mission to a point where people could get comfortable then maybe we could get to a point where we can get some sort of positive results out of what we are doing. Larry indicated that this task is very important.

Rob Walton said that the Board should keep in mind the fact that the Lower River Tribes weren't in attendance at this meeting and that if they didn't do anything on mission statement, purpose, by-laws, etc., they may not make their decision until we do. Rob reflected his own respect for the Lower River Tribes in their absence and indicated that he'd like to continue to work with Rob Lothrop to see what they want and if they want this Board to put a draft out, he felt it should be worked on and done.

In addition, Rob Walton indicated that he completely agreed with Tony Nigro that the Board should not now, if ever, burrow down into protocols and other things for which he felt that he too was not equipped. He acknowledged that there may be a couple of "experts on our Board, Greg and John, who might be able to add some insights", but once again indicated that he recognized that limitation for himself.

Rob went on to say that regarding the Board's responses to him regarding his earlier comments "strike to the whole heart of what we're about" and indicated that he took the rebuttals as friendly conversation to which he looked forward to continuing. He said that he believed that the fish managers deserved good data that they can use. Rob said he believes that it is advocacy and he said he didn't believe that was bad, but if that creates a perception on the part of customers, then the Board should take a look at that and see if there is anything we can or should do about that.

Larry Cassidy asked Rob to define "customers", as he "didn't perceive that there was any direct connection between the guy who turns his light switch on in Kettle Falls, WA and what the FPC does." Rob responded by saying that he used that word to usually mean the utility customers of Bonneville. He went on to say that he's "had utilities call him to come and talk to them about fish, who have never asked before; their rates are up, some of them are SLICE customers, and they're waking up to the issues and they are going to get more interested." Rob said that "the guy in Kettle Falls may see his bill go up and he may ask why. If he reads in the paper that last year the price of spill could have been some great big huge number and the number of fish that would have resulted would have been some tiny little number, he's interested. If the FPC is saying 'spill, no matter what the cost because the fish are a higher priority' that's a perspective

that's defensible, but it's not necessarily the one that our guys would say is the right one for them to fund."

Tony Nigro offered in summary that he agreed with Rob in that the Board needs to "clearly set the table so that Rob Lothrop can bring back to his commission what this Board is all about and facilitate their decision as to how they want to participate in this effort in the future.

Tony thought that there were a couple of items that he heard at today's meeting that he considered "live and on the table" that should inform what the Board does the next time they get together. Item #1 being to separate the fact from the myth in terms of exactly what it is the FPC is all about, what they do, what their purpose and function is, how they operate, etc. because, based on the earlier exchange between himself and Rob, it was apparent that there wasn't a common understanding even among this Board with respect to what the relationship between the FPC and the fish and wildlife managers are, let alone the relationship of the FPC to the rest of the region. He said that it would be wise for this Board to at least entertain the idea of creating a summary so that anyone who was interested would know exactly what the FPC does.

The second item Tony thought was "live for discussion" was, given the above-noted, determining what the FPC is all about, how does that compare to what people's expectations of what the FPC should be? The Board can then determine if the 'what should be' expectations fall within the present scope of the Center, as it's defined in the Program, etc."

There was general consensus from other Board members when Tony asked if they felt that the above-noted was basically an accurate summary as to the nature of what they've discussed at this meeting.

Randy Fisher voiced his thought that the Board members would come prepared to say, "here are the kinds of decisions I expect this Board should make because when you read between the lines here, somebody wants to decide how much spill should be happening and whether that's this Board, or whether that's Michele, or the fish agencies, or whether it's Rob, that's what this is all about."

Board members disagreed with Randy's perception.

Tony Nigro went on to reiterate his earlier comments regarding the Board's needing to separate myth from fact regarding what the FPC IS about and then facilitating a good regional discussion, involving everybody who's interested in it, to determine what the FPC SHOULD be about. He said he thought that in the near-term this task alone was a full plate for this Board; sorting out "who we are" as well as sorting out how we help the region to better understand what the FPC is and what we should do as a result of that understanding."

Rob Walton voiced his thought that spill decisions were at least two or three times removed from this Board and that he didn't have any expectations that they would be deciding spill.

Larry Cassidy indicated that the Board needed to decide when they'd like to meet again and indicated that his timeframe, subject to the group's feedback, was that this needed to be wrapped up by October or November because funding decisions for the new contract is in January or February.

John Ferguson indicated some confusion to Larry's statement regarding "wrapped up" and went on to say that "unless he misunderstood, he saw this Board as an ongoing involvement, overseeing the FPC for perhaps years."

Whereby, Larry explained that he thought that for the Board's ongoing involvement to occur, he felt that the above-noted tasks of determining that "this is what the FPC, as we perceive it today needs and the component of this Board as an additional oversight board might well be part of that decision and, if that is the case, the Board will need to bring that before the Council to make that decision because technically it really hasn't yet. Larry felt that he needed to give some idea to the Council by late 2002 that the Board has a process going and that they've found that it's very good, not good, etc. John agreed that the Board certainly should be able to frame up the issues and the differences and pass those along to the Council.

Larry's suggestion was that for the time being that this Board meet on a monthly basis. July 9<sup>th</sup> was chosen as the date for the next meeting.

Keith Underwood announced his appreciation for being allowed to serve on the Board, except that he is moving into the world of consulting beginning June 7<sup>th</sup>. He indicated that the UCUT, in cooperation with CBFWA would be coming up with a new name for his replacement.

John Ferguson said he wanted to briefly discuss an earlier item regarding the chairman role for this Board and indicated that he'd like "to offer up that, since this is a Council-driven program, that at least in the beginning until we have a chance to address it, someone from the Council should act as Chair for a while." The Board agreed that Larry Cassidy would be "acting temporary chair" until the Board has bylaws in place and that process can be formalized.

The Board decided to meet for a longer period at their next meeting and determined that they would meet from 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. on July 9, 2002 in the conference room at CBFWA.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.