



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 |
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 www.cbfwa.org

DATE: March 5, 2007
TO: Members Advisory Group
FROM: Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA
SUBJECT: Final Action Notes from 2/20/07 MAG Meeting

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

MAG Meeting

Tuesday, 2/20/07

9:00am - 12:00pm

@ CBFWA Office, Portland OR

The support material and reference documents for the 2/20/07 MAG meeting are posted at <http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/Meetings.cfm?CommShort=MAG&meeting=all>

Final Action Notes

Attendees: Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Michele DeHart, FPC; Brian Lipscomb, Jann Eckman, Trina Gerlack, Tom Iverson, Tana Klum, Ken MacDonald, Neil Ward, Dave Ward, Pat Burgess, CBFWA

By Phone: Lawrence Schwabe, BPT; Dale W. Chess, Cd'AT; Laura Gephart, CRITFC; Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Chris Hunter, MFWP; Brian Marotz, MFWP; Dave Statler, NPT; Tony Nigro, ODFW; Tom Rien, ODFW; Doug Taki, SBT; Doug Taki, SBT; Nate Pamplin, WDFW; Gwen Lankford, Sapphire Strategies; Joe Mentor, Mentor Law Group, PLLC

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

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Lynn DuCharme added the installation of the new Chair and Vice-chair. Brian Lipscomb requested that Item #8 be moved to follow the approval of the agenda.

Action:

- Mark Bagdovitz moved to accept the agenda with modifications as requested. Nate Pamplin seconded. No objections.

ADDED ITEM: Installation of Chair and Vice-chair

Brian Lipscomb confirmed that US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (MFWP) will assume Chair/Vice-chair roles for 2007. Mark Bagdovitz will serve for USFWS and Brian Marotz/Chris Hunter for MFWP.

Action:

- Tony Nigro, ODFW, moved to install US Fish and Wild Service as Chair and Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks as Vice-Chair. Lynn Ducharme seconded. No objections.

Chair - Incoming Remarks: Mark Bagdovitz expressed his thanks to Lynn DuCharme and Ron Trahan, CSKT, for their great job over the last year. Mark also expressed his appreciation to Brian Lipscomb and CBFWA staff for their work coordinating the well attended February Members meeting. Mark stated that he thought it was one of the best Members meetings he has attended and added that he has received the same feedback from other Members.

Mark Bagdovitz also advised that he will take part in the USFWS Leadership Development Program and is assigned to Anchorage AK from February 28 through May 1, 2007. His replacement is not yet known. Mark suggested that CBFWA rely on the

Vice-chair, Brian Marotz/Chris Hunter, to chair the upcoming meetings.

ITEM 2: Review the 1/25/07 MAG Meeting Draft Action Notes and approve as Final

- Action:**
- Mark Bagdovitz moved to accept the 1/25/07 MAG draft Action Notes as Final. Dave Statler seconded. No objections.

NOTE: *The agenda items are listed in the order discussed.*

ITEM 8: Review and Discuss BPA's Project Funding Decision

<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/budget/2007/bpa/Default.htm>

Discussion: Tuesday, 2/13/07, BPA issued their response and action to the NPCC's recommendation for 07-09 projects under the NPCC Fish and Wildlife Program.

Brian Lipscomb stated that BPA's action was quite significant in that there were a lot of changes to the funding recommendations: projects were removed, added, reduced, and some projects increased.

Included in the BPA release were two enclosures: "BPA Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation Fiscal Years 2007-2009" and "History and Synopsis of BPA's Fish & Wildlife Mitigation." However, this past Friday, 2/16/07, BPA retracted the enclosures. Please see BPA Recall Document:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0220/BPA-FY07-09RecallLetterFeb07.pdf.

Brian Lipscomb referenced Greg Delwiche's December MAG presentation regarding the in lieu issue in contemplation of the BPA release of actions and Greg's statement that BPA is open to discussion on these issues. Brian added that if we don't respond, their actions may be final but if we do respond, then the discussion remains open.

Mark Bagdovitz commented that he is of the opinion that the in lieu issues should be done in an amendment process, in a public manner, and as part of Council's Program.

The technical committees provided their reports in follow up to the 12/19/06 MAG direction that the technical committees review the in lieu decisions upon receipt, verify BPA's assertions of in lieu projects, and discuss how to proceed toward pursuing cost share that BPA articulated to rectify their in lieu concerns.

Dave Ward/Anadromous Fish Perspective: Overall 46 projects were increased or added and 31 were reduced or cut.

- 14 projects, previously recommended by the Council, were not funded at all. These were all new projects without clear significance as to why they were recommended.
- 17 projects were reduced significantly (using 10% as a cutoff). Many of these were reduced because of O&M budget concerns and in lieu concerns reflecting 3rd yr budget cuts.
- 20 projects increased by 10% - increases appear to be for a number of reasons.
- 26 projects were added that were not recommended at all. BPA indicated that these projects were added because they were BiOp related and were Habitat projects in areas where productivity was low.
- There are a number of projects that were not recommended for funding by the Council but BPA did recommend one year of funding as a close-out.

Dave stated that for expense purposes, excluding data management and coordination, about 75% of the funding is directed toward Anadromous fish, 18% for Resident fish, and approximately 7% for Wildlife. Net project total is probably higher than what the Council recommended; however, there are a few important projects that got drastically reduced by BPA.

Ken MacDonald/Wildlife Perspective:

- 13 projects funded as recommended.
- Four projects were reduced for all three funding years.

- Five projects funded as recommended for 07, but reduced for 08/09.
- The Western Pond Turtle Recovery Project was not recommended by the Council but funded by BPA for years 07-09 at the FY06 funding level.
- One WDFW project funded for 07 that were previously not recommended for 07 funding.
- Three WDFW projects were increased with reasoning stated as necessary O&M on previous owned WDFW properties.
- Almost all wildlife projects had the footnote that funds were considered interim, pending regional O&M discussions. The WAC is currently working on the issue of O&M funding with the IEAB.
- RM&E – several projects funded at 2006 level; previously not recommended because BPA thought they were priority for close-out. A number of projects were not funded; reason stated that they were not FCRPS priority - there were Lamprey, Bull Trout, and Coho projects that were included in that category; however, another Lamprey project was funded per negotiations relative to FCRPS.
- A number of projects added were stated as priorities for FCRPS or the 2000 BiOp.

Ken stated that overall wildlife funding for 2007 is up from what the Council recommended - research is up slightly.

Neil Ward/Resident Fish Perspective:

Reviewing past years 70/15/15 breakdown, we are above 15% in the Resident Fish portion of the program.

- BPA will not fund new Bull Trout projects.
- BPA stated that it may not be an FCRPS responsibility to mitigate above Hells Canyon Dam if not affected by construction or operation of Black Canyon, Anderson Ranch, Boise Diversion, Minidoka, or Palisades Reservoirs. As a result, this affects many of the resident fish projects.
- One IDFG project will only receive one year funding to complete their final report.
- Some Kokanee funding is in limbo pending ISRP review and a white paper to be released in the fall relative to the Roosevelt projects.
- Most resident fish projects were comparable with what Council recommended for 2007 but with subsequent years suffering a decrease. White Sturgeon projects are fairly stable.

Discussion:

Brian Lipscomb commented that Council's recommendations reflected 20M spread over three years for the FCRPS BiOp settlement and about 10M carried forward from the previous rate case. BPA spent both of those allotments plus added an additional 3M. The result of their decision is an increase over the Council's recommendations by at least these stated amounts. Dave Ward added that the overall level of funding for all three categories that BPA recommends decreases each year. It starts high but then decreases.

The Coordination projects were funded as Council recommended in FY 07 but for 2008/09 the overall funding for the five projects was reduced to the FY 06 levels plus 210K which includes the three new coordination projects added this fiscal year.

CSMEP was funded at the Council recommended level at FY07 but not funded for 2008/09.

Joe Mentor:

Brian asked Joe Mentor to analyze the BPA white paper and provide an analysis of their policies from a standpoint of current case law but Joe delayed the requested review until BPA reissues the document. Joe stated that his initial conclusion is that he does not believe there's a distinction between program measures, projects, and any other way they wish to describe the elements of the F&W program; there's deference owed to the managers regardless.

In the approach to amend the program, Joe encouraged describing the individual

activities in programmatic terms.

Joe referenced that the draft white paper he prepared for CBFWA Members at the February meeting and advised that the document is undergoing revisions. The draft provided at the meeting can be reviewed at:

http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2007_0207/JoeMentorAuthorityWhitePaper02-08-07.pdf.

Joe stated that the FPC case was about the relationship between BPA and the Council. The Council owes deference to the F&W Managers and BPA owes deference to the Council. If the recommendations from the Council are not acceptable, then CBFWA needs to work toward strengthening Council deference.

Joe continued stating that this round of project decisions might represent BPA's resistance toward more project specific recommendations from us in the future, if this is true and the facts support this, the decision could certainly be an example or justification cited by the Members in the Amendment Process as the reason for more specificity. At this juncture, the place to take issue is with BPA and expect for the Council to take a similar position. Joe suggested that CBFWA should initiate dialogue with the Council to determine their position and he offered his assistance toward that end.

Conclusion: Throughout the discussion, there was considerable deliberation and expression of concerns about the approach and results of responding to BPA's initial, retracted, and anticipated follow-up documents, release of Joe Mentor's white paper, and technical staff analysis of the actions. In conclusion, more analysis is required to establish the appropriate course to move forward.

Brian finalized the discussion by stating that based on the final analysis gained as a result of the motion today, he anticipates further discussion on how to proceed, focusing on: 1) do we need to take actions to try to immediately change the situation, if there are resource considerations along those lines, and 2) putting our amendments into context as we proceed down the Amendment path, with Joe Mentor's assistance.

Action:

- Tony Nigro moved that CBFWA staff work with the technical committees to provide an analysis of BPA's decision document in the context of the Council's recommendations and in the context of the Authorities priorities. In the provinces those priorities would be defined by the managers who put together the subbasin plans for that province, and in the systemwide and mainstem the teams who worked together on what was crafted from the Council's recommendations. Seconded by Lawrence Schwabe. No objections.

Action:

- Nate Pamplin moved to request that CBFWA ask Joe Mentor to review the BPA History and Synopsis paper once it is made available and formulate a response for an internal audience. Seconded by Tony Nigro.

Motion Discussion – Legal review of BPA Document: Mark Bagdovitz suggested that CBFWA may want to wait until the document is issued to finalize the decision on how to approach this subject. Brian added that if and when BPA reissues the document, he will ask Joe Mentor to review it for MAG consideration.

Mark Bagdovitz stated that within the federal caucus he will ask Dan Diggs to request that BPA route the document through some of the federal agencies before it is finalized.

Despite some brief discussion as to whether a motion was necessary, the motion stayed on record and proceeded without objection.

ITEM 3: Fish Passage Center's Oversight Discussion

Discussion: Brian Lipscomb advised that the issue of FPC oversight was first raised several months ago within the MAG. In response to the recent FPC court decision, the Council is in the process of re-establishing their Oversight Board pursuant to the language within the 2003 Mainstem Amendments. Brian provided a summary of the current language:

- The Council will establish an oversight board and it will be the only oversight board with responsibilities to develop FPC guiding operating policies.

- A technical advisory committee will be created with the role of developing protocols and review, from a scientific perspective, the results that the FPC produces.
- The technical committee will be assigned from a list of names that come from CBFWA Executive Director in consultation with the CBFWA Members.
- The performance of the FPC will be reviewed by the Council Oversight Board and the performance evaluation of the FPC director will be collaboration between the Power Council Chairman, or a delegate, and the CBFWA Executive Director.

Brian advised that the Council is in the process of moving forward with that language and will consider adoption at their March meeting. In light of the proposed adoption: What strategic action does the MAG want to take toward a CBFWA response?

NPCC's Fish Passage Center Oversight Board document links:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0220/FPCOB%20Bylaws.pdf

<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/fpcob/Default.htm>

FPC Personnel Oversight

The MAG discussed and questioned the legalities and appropriateness of the collaborative personnel evaluation of the FPC Manager. Tony Nigro recalled that at the time this wording was established, it was intended for the CBFWA Executive Director to be responsible for assessing the FPC Manager's performance but Council Chair would be given an opportunity to review the draft performance evaluation, as a courtesy.

Action:

- Tony moved to direct Brian Lipscomb to work with Joe Mentor to identify issues relative to the Program language directing the Executive Director to work with the Council Chair on the FPC Manager's performance evaluation. Seconded by Dave Statler. No objections.

Brian will report back to the MAG at the 3/20/07 meeting after his review with Joe Mentor.

Discussion:

FPC Programmatic Oversight

Brian explained that the Oversight Board has the responsibility to develop programmatic policy. The responsibility of a technical advisory committee is to develop technical protocols and review scientific output of the FPC. The technical committee is assigned from a list of names provided by CBFWA.

- The Oversight Board adopted the by-laws at their meeting in April 2004. Within those by-laws the Oversight Board articulated the process for change. Brian stated that it is his understanding that the Oversight Board is bound by the current by-laws.
- At the March 2007 Council meeting, the Council will review and discuss formal endorsement of the Oversight Board's by-laws and will consider reopening nominations for membership on the Oversight Board.

Brian suggested articulating to the Council that CBFWA interpretation of the language states that the Council should appoint the members of the Oversight Board and let the Board address the content of the by-laws.

Dave Statler raised concern about the Program language that the Council's established oversight board will be the only oversight board. Tony Nigro recalled the language was added to eliminate a possibility that CBFWA would promote and advocate a competing regional board.

Dave Statler referred to the (CBFWA) Roles and Responsibilities, established 12/96, of the FPC Board of Directors item #2,

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0220/BdMbrsRolesResp.pdf: *the CBFWA FPC Board appointed chairman will serve as the primary point of contact in the day-to-day supervision of the FPC Manager. . . who will delegate the day-to-day supervision of the FPC to the Executive Director of CBFWA.* Dave stressed that although the two boards are set up for slightly different purposes, this may set up an untenable situation in which

the responsibility of FPC direction responsibility lies with two different boards.

Brian Lipscomb prompted discussion with questions/comments: From an oversight standpoint, how should CBFWA interact in that process as it continues to materialize? Will CBFWA embrace the 2003 amendment language from the standpoint of programmatic oversight? CBFWA needs to talk about how to engage, or if we are going to engage, in response to the due process relative to filling the board seats, not just the technical committee seats. If CBFWA does engage, do we preference it with whether or not we are going to embrace the amendment language?

Tony Nigro recalled that in the past, CBFWA did not engage because the Members were not in consensus as to whether the Board should be acknowledged; instead, CBFWA facilitated discussions among the Members. The four states decided that two would sit on the board on a rotating basis. The lower tribes attended the meetings but declined sitting on the board, the upper tribes debated but eventually joined. The federal chair was filled by NOAA.

Michele DeHart added that the lower tribe decision was a result of a Commission action based on the fact that the language was counter to the recommendations they had made to the Council.

Action:

A formal motion was not called but Tony Nigro summarized and Brian Lipscomb concurred, that Brian will bring back to the next MAG Meeting, for Members' recommended action, a draft proposal formulated within the context of today's discussion containing the following elements:

- 1) A recommendation as to whether CBFWA should reconstitute CBFWA's FPC Board and what that Board of Directors' responsibilities should be relative to working with the CBFWA Executive Director.
- 2) Provide the MAG with a draft proposal to the Council as to how we believe the personnel management of the program should be handled and challenge the language in the Program that the Chair of the Council has any role in the FPC Manager's performance evaluation.
- 3) Determine what the issues are with respect to the draft by-laws that we need to specifically challenge or request clarification on from the Council before they act to endorse the by-laws.
- 4) If Council proceeds to reconstitute its Oversight board, how does CBFWA want to engage given the language in the program? Brian will then pursue the question with the all the Members, not just lower river tribes, as to whether they will endorse the current language.

ITEM 4:

CBFWA Draft Letter to NPCC and BPA Communicating Amendment Strategy

Discussion:

Brian Lipscomb explained that the draft letter, still in process, is to communicate to the Council and BPA the actions approved by the Members at the Boise meeting. Within the Charter, Brian advised that he can draft letters stating CBFWA policy positions but he wanted to review it with the MAG beforehand.

Brian recently met with Steve Wright and Greg Delwiche to review the Members' stance and their response was positive with regard to linking actions to objectives at the local level and linking the local level strategies and actions to overall programmatic objectives while articulating BPA's responsibility within that context.

Steve Wright, BPA, suggested that they are willing to draft a letter in response and support to a CBFWA letter articulating the direction of the Members' actions.

Link to the approved actions taken by the Members' at the February meeting with regard to the Amendment strategy:

http://www.cbfga.org/Committees/Members/meetings/2007_0207/CBFWAFeb7MbrsFeb2ACTIONS.ppt

- Action:**
- Tony Nigro moved to direct Brian to draft the letter summarizing our Amendment Strategy for review at the March MAG meeting. Seconded by Nate Pamplin. No objections.

ITEM 7: CBFWA's Message on Celilo Falls Inundation

Discussion: Tana Klum and Gwen Lankford developed a draft Celilo Falls Inundation Celebration press release for MAG review:
http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0220/CeliloCBFWAStatementVer1.doc

This release will also be used as a basis for any opportunity to address the participants of the Celilo Falls Memorial on March 10th. This was pursuant to the Members action at the Boise meeting.

Brian articulated that the release follows the outline of: 1) Paying tribute to Celilo as a location that has been inundated, 2) speaking to the other impacts around the region as a result of the FCRPS construction, 3) successes with regard to what is being done regarding the impacts, and 4) opportunities to continue making changes to the program to effect future changes.

Mark Bagdovitz made reference to the term "stakeholders" within the 4th paragraph as inappropriate. Tana and Gwen stated they will revise that paragraph.

- Action:**
- MAG members were asked to provide edits or comments to Tana at tana.klum@cbfwa.org by COB Monday, March 5, 2007. The plan is to issue the press release in sync with the inundation anniversary and celebration of March 10, 2007.

ITEM 5: Development of Biological Objectives and Feedback Process

At the February 7-8, 2007 Winter Meeting the CBFWA Members directed the MAG to link subbasin population objectives to regional Program goals and identify BPA's obligations. CBFWA Members should interact with the Council and regional communities to educate and develop an understanding of the linkages and obligations.

Discussion: Tom Iverson articulated that the task at hand is to figure out how to link the subbasin or population scale, and how we can establish biological objectives tied to limiting factors and develop strategies and action. The losses have been somewhat defined for the F&W program for BPA at a regional scale, but how do we connect that to a subbasin scale?

Pete Hassemer, IDFG, provided a presentation at the February NPCC meeting on run status updates, 2007 spring Chinook forecast, and a review of the 2006 Chinook salmon return. Tom stated that Pete's presentation did a very good job of showing how metrics at a scale larger than population could allow for tracking ESU or some major population status and trends relative to data we are already collecting and tracking and monitoring for harvest management.

Referencing Pete's presentation, Tom cited that one thing that Pete was able to do that has not been done before in a systematic manner is to start identifying mitigation losses that were to be replaced by construction of the lower Snake River Comp Hatcheries. Pete tied that with wild fish targets and goals to start clarifying how many fish we can expect to see pass above Lower Granite Dam, where we can expect them go, and where the management goals would come from. He started identifying goals, objectives, and fish counts.

- Brian suggested that the MAG members review Pete Hassemer's presentation at: http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0220/PeteHassemerPresentationReturnForecast.pdf and be prepared to come back to the MAG on March 20th to discuss how CBFWA can structure the amendments from a standpoint of bridging the gaps and linking the subbasin plan goals, objectives, and strategies to the regional programmatic goals and objectives. In reviewing the presentation, consider discussion of whether this is an appropriate way to proceed across the basin from an Anadromous fish perspective.

Brian added that we also have the perspective of Resident Fish and Wildlife to build into the process as well.

Tony Nigro stated that US vs Oregon is specifically talking about setting biological objectives in the context of production and harvest that will inform this CBFWA exercise. He stated that he will try to work with individuals from CBFWA and US vs Oregon to attempt to link the goal setting process as part of the long term fish management plan development. Michele suggested giving thought to performance standards.

Brian posed the question: *What can the MAG do to help account for those discussions from the aspect of hatchery and harvest within US vs Oregon, and context of All-H recovery discussion within the Remand process and bring them into fruition in the direction of where the Members want to go?*

Formulation of a MAG subcommittee was suggested by Tony Nigro.

Dave Ward stated that a previous MAG assignment, the technical committees were directed to come up lists of appropriate metrics at appropriate geographic scales. This assignment is currently a work in progress. The technical committees could benefit from further MAG direction via a sub-group to fine tune the direction of the technical committees. The AFAC is also meeting on 3/8/07 and will provide data to the MAG on 3/20.

Neil Ward advised that the RFAC will be discussing this at their meeting on 3/8/07 and will report back to the MAG on March 20th with results from that discussion.

Brian referenced the Members action directing the technical committees to evaluate the existing program:

- Define & Clarify terms (i.e., focal populations, objectives, how to express limiting factors, etc.)
- Confirm population level biological objectives
- Ensure that priorities of all plans affecting fish and wildlife are captured in this process
- Validate current limiting factors including out-of-basin affects
- Review and build on strategies and actions necessary to reduce the limiting factors

Action:

Tony Nigro moved to ask the technical committees to prepare reports to the MAG at the 3/20/07 meeting on their progress toward developing performance metrics and standards that would frame this biological objective assignment. Seconded by Dave Statler. No objections.

Motion Discussion:

Dave Statler reminded the MAG that the AFAC did report some initial strategy thoughts in the 1/24/07 MAG meeting as how to approach the provincial level biological objectives and how to display them within the context of the various subbasins within the province. Dave Statler referenced a handout previously provided to the MAG which relates to this discussion:

http://www.cbfgwa.org/Committees/AFAC/meetings/2007_0124/FlowChartAmendmentAFAC-07Jan29Draft.pdf

- Mark Bagdovitz suggested that when planning the meeting for March 20th that we allow ample time for this discussion and added that we may need to consider an all day meeting.
- Brian Lipscomb will contact Tony Nigro to flesh out the timing and the linkages between US vs Oregon and the Remand process and will bring that back to the MAG for the next meeting on 3/20/07.

ITEM 6:

Coordination Issue Element of Amendment Recommendation –Tom Iverson, CBFWA

At the February 7-8, 2007 Winter Meeting the CBFWA Members directed the Members Advisory Group to work with the Spokane and Kalispel Tribes to:

- Develop a comprehensive management coordination strategy
- Integrate all coordination initiatives into the strategy

Deferred

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the March 2007 MAG meeting.

ITEM 9:

Data Management Framework Subcommittee (DMFS) Update - Tom Iverson, CBFWA

Deferred

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the March 2007 MAG meeting.

ITEM 10:

CBFWA Technical Committee Updates

See discussion of Item 8 for up-to-date information on the activity of the technical committees.

ITEM 11:

CBFWA Office Move Update

Deferred

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the March 2007 MAG meeting.

ITEM 12:

Next MAG and Members' Meeting Dates

- The next MAG meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 2007.
- The next Members' Teleconference is scheduled for Wednesday, March 7, 2007.

Discussion:

With regard to the Members Teleconference scheduled for Wednesday, March 7, 2007, Brian Lipscomb suggested that the MAG recommend to the Members that they cancel their March meeting unless pertinent issues arise requiring their attention.

Action:

- Tony Nigro moved that the MAG recommend to the Members that they cancel their March 7, 2007 teleconference. The motion was seconded. No objections.

Mark Bagdovitz stated that if BPA reissues their recalled documents, that may prompt Members discussion, but at this time he did not object to canceling the meeting.

12:30 pm

Meeting adjourned.