

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

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe

Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks

National Marine Fisheries Service

Nez Perce Tribe Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Coordinating Agencies

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

Upper Columbia United Tribes

COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

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

		Final
DATE:	October 10, 2011	
TO:	Members Advisory Group (MAG)	
FROM:	Jann Eckman, Interim Executive Director	
SUBJECT:	Final Action Notes for the October 5, 2011 M	IAG Meeting
	Members Advisory Group (MAG) M Wednesday, October 5, 2011 1:30pm-3:30pm (pacific) @ CBFWA Office Portland, OR <u>MAG Webpage</u>	0
	Final Action Notes	
Attendees:	Doug Taki, SBT; Elmer Ward, CTWS; Dave Statler, NPT; Mike Faler, USFWS; Jann Eckman, Tom Iverson, Dave Ward, Neil Ward, Binh Quan, Patricia Burgess, CBFWA	
Phone/Webex:	Jason Kesling, BPT; John Platt, CRITFC; Gary James, CTUIR; Lance Hebdon, IDFG; Brian Marotz, MFWP; Edmond Murrell, SPT; Heather Ray, USRTF	
Time Allocation:	Objective 1: Participation Objective 2: Technical Review Objective 3: Presentation	100% 0% 0%
ITEM 1:	Introductions and Approve Agenda	
Action:	The MAG approved the draft agenda as presented. No objections.	
ITEM 2:	Draft Action Notes from the August 10, 2011 MAG Meeting	
Action:	The MAG approved the August 10, 2011 action notes as final. No objections.	
ITEM 3:	Briefing: August 23 MAG meeting; <u>Augu</u> September 12 Members' Executive Sessio	
	The MAG met the evening of August 23 in Coeur d'Alene to prepare for the Augus 24 Members' meeting. Tom Iverson provided the update about the Members' meeting stating that the Members broached the regional coordination topic. During the meeting, three Members acknowledged that they would be withdrawing their membership from CBFWA at the end of the contract period (effective March 31, 2012). The technical committee Chairs provided updates indicating substantial work underway and demonstrating the need for regional coordination to continue at least on a technical level.	
	There was discussion regarding the future of CBFWA given the loss of three Members, the ensuing 30% reduction in funds, and how that will limit what functions the central staff will be able to perform. The Members discussed re- establishing regional coordination, getting the full suite of co-managers, including non-members or former members, officially involved.	
	Tom reported that on September 12, the Mer discuss the next steps. The Members agreed & wildlife managers in the basin is necessar implementing regional coordination function and provide that direction to the Northwest I	I that a policy level workshop of all fish y to determine needs and functions for ns within the Fish and Wildlife Program

(NPCC) and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). The Members indicated that

	CBFWA staff cannot facilitate the conversation. Members' chairman, Nathan Small, SBT, agreed that he would approach the Upper Snake River Tribes (URST) at their next meeting to see if they would participate and he will contact the Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT) and ask if they would get involved as well. Kat Brigham, CTUIR, stated that she would go back to CRITFC to see if they would want to be involved in hosting a regional workshop with the idea that the three tribal coordination groups facilitate the conversation of what is needed for regional coordination. The Members directed that the fish & wildlife technical committees (that includes involvement by non-members) develop definitions of the functions for future
	regional coordination needs and have that information ready for review at the policy level workshop.
ITEM 4:	Regional Coordination Review Update
	 Member Reports (CRITFC and USRT Discussions) Review Coordination Function Descriptions Proposed Staff Approach for FY12
Member Reports:	Doug Taki asked Heather Ray, USRT/F, for an update on the regional coordination workshop. Heather stated that Monday, October 10 was slated for the coordination workshop, prior to the Columbia River Tribes (CRT) workshop scheduled for October 11-12. Heather stated that she has not heard back from CRITFC. Heather advised that a meeting room has been reserved but she has not received confirmations on attendance.
Coordination Function Description Review:	With regard to the Members' directive for the fish and wildlife technical committees to develop regional coordination definitions, CBFWA staff initiated the task by outlining functions that are coordinated-product focused over the next 3-5 years. Tom stated that the definitions received a brief review by some of the technical committee members or committee chairs. Tom reviewed the definitions with the MAG and asked for feedback.
	Edmond Murrell, SPT, asked if the goal of this is to be a "CBWA like" effort. Edmond stated that he is interested in how to further the tribes' independence under the Power Act but this document appears to read as though we are supposed to help with whatever the NPCC wants. He thinks that we may want to have additional broader goals that the Members want which is different than what the NPCC wants, and to have some autonomy as part of our goal.
	Tom responded that the document is written in a generic way with the intent that anyone could use it to talk about regional coordination in a non-CBFWA forum, such as what is planned for Oct 10 and beyond, and to capture why we need regional coordination and what it should provide. It is written to include but also reach outside of the fish and wildlife managers and to try to include NPCC and BPA as partners in regional coordination and make it a collaborative constructive process. The tribes have coordinating organizations to develop their unique goals and efforts and we always have the option of creating a fish and wildlife managers' caucus within a regional coordination group to address just the fish and wildlife manager's goals.
	Tom stated agreement with what Edmond was conveying but that the place for those broader thoughts is not in this document but instead at next week's meeting when all the fish and wildlife managers are together and talking about their common goals. The first step is to describe what the functions and products are which is what this document represents. Once the group gets together and decides who will do the work, they will decide the rules of operation and specific goals of

the coordinating parties and focus efforts toward building a regional coordination group. The CBFWA forum still exists with the very specific goals and interests of the fish and wildlife managers who are Members.

Dave Statler, NPT, stated that the premise of this is set up pursuant to the NPCC Fish and Wildlife Program and the vision of coordination to most effectively satisfy the Program. This also connects with the upcoming project review in the coordination arena because if it is not related to the Program or the focused areas then you are less inclined to get support for those activities; that is the catch 22. The big question for the upcoming policy meeting is that the broad arena of regional coordination is certainly broader than the Program. There are issues outside of the Program that policy people deal with routinely so in that sense regional coordination needs are perhaps more broadly defined.

Tom concluded the discussion by stating that this is defined according to the Program, but by BPA's definition right now, Dave is right, the regional coordination needs goes well beyond the Program. People are collecting regional coordination funds and spending them well beyond the Program objectives. If the Program is designed to direct BPA expenditures and that is going beyond the Program, is that appropriate? That is the conundrum. That could perhaps be one of the big questions in the upcoming category review process but it is hard to say if that conversation will happen.

Proposed Staff Tom Iverson stated that the FY13-15 proposal is due in November 2011. The FY12 work plan is due January 2012. For the FY 12 contract, effective April 1, 2012, we will submit whatever we need to transition to the FY 13.

We know that three Members are going to leave at the end of this contract year and we know for sure we have a 30% reduction in our budget for next year based on the draft work plan we circulated in August.

Jann Eckman announced that Dave Ward has given his notice and will be leaving CBFWA. Dave Ward confirmed that he has accepted a position with HDR, Inc. as Senior Fisheries Biologist, and his last day will be October 21, 2011.

Jann stated that this change will affect the technical support that CBFWA can provide on some of the functions just outlined. Tom added that with the uncertainty ahead, filling the position at this time is not feasible.

Tom explained that the regional coordination definitions reviewed today align with the Members Policy Directive #1) Participate in and support ongoing assessments, Policy Directive #2) Status of the Resources (SOTR), and Policy Directive #3) Regional Activity/Eyes and Ears. Tom outlined the current structure of CBFWA/CBFWF with the Members overseeing the committees and the employees working under the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation (CBFWF), the administrative arm of CBWFA.

Staff proposed to the MAG that the CBFWF submit a proposal to facilitate CBFWA with its current membership (11 members) to implement Policy Directive #3: Regional Activity/Eyes and Ears.

Creating a work plan to implement Directive #3 would provide ongoing support to CBFWA Members in technical and policy issues as they are needed and facilitate participation in regional meetings and help with any Program related issues. We propose that we would submit separate individual proposals based on these definitions to facilitate regional coordination. If the meeting next week with all the co-managers presents a different solution, we would not submit the proposals or would submit them in a different way. The proposals would be submitted as a

restructure under the current CBFWA project number.

Policy Directive #3 would be governed by the CBFWA Charter but the other six would be proposed as Program forums. The rules of governance for the forums would have to be worked out if they were accepted. For Policy Directive #3, we would put together the most cost effective proposal with a specific statement of work for Members' consideration along with a funding proposal for how much each of the Members will have to contribute to make it work.

Action: The MAG directed CBFWA staff to develop seven proposals under CBFWF for FY13-15 and focus CBFWA efforts for FY12 on Policy Directive #3. No objections.

The MAG will review the proposals before they are submitted in a meeting arranged for the first week of November. Tom asked the MAG members to communicate any conflicts to this plan when the meetings are held next week.

Chairman Taki asked CBFWA staff for a quick write-up that can be shared with participants in the regional coordination meetings.

Follow-up: On Thursday, October 6, CBFWA staff sent an email to the MAG providing a document with <u>expanded regional coordination functions</u> and a description of the CBFWF strategy.

ITEM 5: FY 2011 CBFWA Work Plan Implementation Updates

Policy Directive 1: Participate in and support ongoing assessments.

• Coordinated Assessments: Review Basin-wide Data Sharing Strategy

Tom presented the draft <u>Basin-wide Data Sharing Strategy</u> for MAG feedback. Tom stated that the data sharing strategy was a byproduct of the workshop held in Portland September 21-22. The workshop went well and was well-attended. Tom stated that they are working on the data exchange template (DET) to get agreement on what data needs to be shared and what information needs to go along with that data. Dave Statler explained that the DET is basically a form that does not contain data but instead provides standardized protocol, definitions, etc., to make it possible for various entities to submit their data in a regionally compatible and useful basis.

Policy Directive 2: Status of the Resources (SOTR)

Neil Ward advised that they are in process of making updates for the third quarter. The updates should be on the website in early November 2011.

Policy Directive 3: Regional Activity

Fish and Wildlife Program Implementation Update

Tom Iverson advised that proposals are due November 22 for the NPCC Fish and Wildlife Program Project Reviews (Resident Fish, Data Management and Program Coordination Review). The Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) will complete a preliminary review of proposals on February 2, 2012. The ISRP's preliminary report will provide written recommendations. If the proposal does not contain sufficient information or issues need to be clarified, the ISRP will request a response from the project proponent by March 1, 2012. The ISRP will review these responses and complete a final report by March 28, 2012. The NPCC will start discussing and making decisions on those proposals. It is possible that it will be June 2012 before any decisions are communicated.

ITEM 6: Next MAG Meeting

The MAG will meet via teleconference the first week of November to review the proposals. Chairman Taki stated that the MAG will also meet the first or second

	week in December for a regular MAG meeting.
Update:	The November MAG teleconference is scheduled for Fri, Nov 4, 9am-12pm. The date for the December MAG meeting is to be determined.
	Elmer Ward, CTWS, acknowledged that this would be the last MAG meeting that Dave Ward would be attending. Elmer and fellow MAG members congratulated Dave and stated appreciation for his work.
Upcoming Meetings:	Northwest Power and Conservation Council Meeting(s): Nov 8-9, 2011, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Dec 6-7, 2011, Webinar and Council meeting.
H:\work\MAG\2011_10	05\MAGActionNotes2011_1005_Final