

FISH PASSAGE CENTER OVERSIGHT BOARD NOTES

September 22, 2003, 1:00 p.m.-4 p.m.

**COLUMBIA BASIN FISH & WILDLIFE AUTHORITY OFFICES
PORTLAND, OREGON**

DRAFT

I. Greetings, Introductions and Review of the Agenda.

The September 22, 2003 Fish Passage Center Oversight Board meeting, held at the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority's offices in Portland, Oregon, was chaired by Frank L. "Larry" Cassidy of the Northwest Power Planning Council.

The following is a distillation (not a verbatim transcript) of items discussed during the call, 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 the Council by calling 503/222-5161.

Cassidy welcomed everyone to today's meeting, led a round of introductions, then reviewed today's agenda.

II. Review and Discussion of Current Bylaws Draft.

Cassidy said he had asked John Shurts and John Ogan of the Council staff to review the most recent draft of the FPCOB bylaws document. They felt that it simply didn't have a lot of applicability to what the Council has done in the mainstem amendment, said Cassidy. They then agreed to take a stab at something that would be more applicable, and this document (distributed at today's meeting) is the result, Cassidy said. He added that he is reluctant to discuss this new draft in great detail, or to attempt to approve it, at today's meeting, with several key members absent. Cassidy said Joe Peone had called him to say he was comfortable with these bylaws.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed to table a decision on the bylaws until the next FPCOB meeting. Cassidy said he will distribute this document to the FPCOB membership electronically in the next few days. Cassidy added that it would behoove the FPCOB to elect an official chairman soon, something that has not yet been done.

III. Discussion of FPC Flow/Survival Report.

Shauna McReynolds said her thinking, in requesting the flow/survival report, was to approach the FPC's work from an analytical perspective, to reacquaint herself and the rest of FPCOB with everything the FPC does. Michele DeHart explained the historical background for this report, noting that it also has its roots in a request from Bill Tweit of Washington. In August, said DeHart, Rod Sando asked us to put together a supplemental report focusing on 2002-2003 adult returns. Essentially, this is a compilation of all of the flow/survival information being

generated by various agencies throughout the region, DeHart said.

The group devoted a few minutes of discussion to the methods by which the FPC flow/survival report was prepared and reviewed prior to release. John Ferguson noted that it would be worthwhile, given the controversy in FPC credibility attendant on the establishment of the Oversight Board, to consider whether major informational presentations, such as the flow/survival report, should be presented and released by CBFWA, not the FPC.

The discussion turned to the fundamental question of scientific disagreement and debate, with Ferguson noting that there are many who believe, in the Northwest and around the world, that debate over what a piece of information truly means is the very essence of healthy science. To others, of course, the level of disagreement and debate we see here in the Northwest is no more than a pain that makes it difficult to make rational decisions, Ferguson said. I'm in the latter camp, said Cassidy – I see science as the means to a goal, a tool that should be able to point us in the proper decision-making direction, and it is frustrating when it seems to muddy, rather than clarify, the debate.

The group then discussed which group would most effectively function as the technical review group for future FPC reports; Cassidy suggested that the to-be-created FPC technical advisory committee might well find that task within the scope of their duties, while Sando suggested that the Council request that the Independent Scientific Review Panel fill that role. It was also suggested that the Independent Scientific Advisory Board might fill that role. Cassidy said he will discuss this matter with Council staff; the FPCOB will then discuss this issue further at an upcoming meeting.

IV. Set Annual Meeting Date.

Pete Hassemer suggested that it may make sense, at all future meetings, to ask the FPCOB to request that the FPC or CBFWA executive director provide an update at the beginning of each FPCOB meeting on recent FPC activities – just to bring the group up to speed, not to allow an opportunity for FPCOB criticism, Hassemer said. In response to a question, DeHart said one of the main projects the FPC is working on at the moment is an Implementation Team request to pull together all of the available smolt passage data in the region.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed to schedule the FPCOB annual meeting for some time in the month of December. Otherwise, the group will meet quarterly. FPC staff will prepare an annual “shareholders’ report” for FPCOB review by November 15.

V. Finalize Current FPCOB Membership List.

In response to a question from Cassidy, Sando said he has not yet heard whether CRITFC plans to submit a nomination for the last remaining open FPCOB membership position, scientist-at-large.

VI. Process for Developing Statement of Work.

Cassidy said that, in his view, it makes sense to defer this topic until more FPCOB members are present. After a brief discussion, it was agreed to revisit this topic at FPCOB’s December meeting

VII. List of Prospective Members for FPCOB Technical Advisory Committee.

Sando said this list is not yet available.

VIII. Next FPCOB Meeting Date.

The next meeting of the Fish Passage Center Oversight Board was set for December 4, 9-noon. Meeting summary prepared by Jeff Kuechle, NPPC contractor.