



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

November 20, 2007

TO: MAG

FROM: Brian Lipscomb, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Distributed Funding Model to Support Fish and Wildlife Manager Coordination for the Fish and Wildlife Program

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 government 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

"As for the funding, distributive model should be explored, so that sovereign governments can choose to negotiate their contracts directly with BPA, or through membership organizations, at each government's discretion. UCUT and its member Tribes do not support a request for an increase in BPA coordination funding to fit a "needs-based" budget. Instead, UCUT supports a fixed budget, to which the fish and wildlife managers will have to manage."

October 12, 2007 letter from Mary Verner, UCUT, to Tom Karier, NPCC.

At the October 23, 2007 MAG meeting, the MAG tasked me to work with the members of CBFWA who are also members of UCUT to clarify what CBFWA should consider relative to the UCUT's communication to the NPCC. The questions for consideration:

-Is the current structure and funding mechanism consistent with what the UCUT's are contemplating? If yes, any recommendation CBFWA would make advocating funding of CBFWA as currently structured would then be consistent with the UCUT position.

-If the answer is no, if the current funding structure is inconsistent with this distributed model, then we would have to determine how it is inconsistent and what should be done about that inconsistency.

I have met with the Coordination Projects Workgroup on two occasions to assess and define the distributed funding principles and concepts. I have also met with the UCUT members of CBFWA. From these meetings it has become apparent that an **exploration** of a distributed funding model was requested by the UCUT members of CBFWA. The Kalispel Tribe is the proponent of this model. At this time there has not been a written articulation of a distributed funding model and its principles.

Our understanding of the Kalispel Tribe's model is as follows, BPA funding for coordination should be evenly distributed across the 19 fish and wildlife managers in the Columbia River Basin. The managers would then have the opportunity to redistribute a portion or all of the funding back to appropriate membership organizations of their choosing. In this way, the fish and wildlife managers would have more control over the funding of the projects intended to facilitate their coordination. The Kalispel Tribe's staff has also promoted the principle that

consensus decision making through a regional membership organization like CBFWA is not effective. Generally, the arguments for this concept are:

- CBFWA staff controls the agenda and action notes, therefore the outcomes of decision making;
- CBFWA staff represents policies that are not fully supported by all of the members;
- CBFWA decision making is controlled by entities closest to Portland (i.e., there is a direct relationship between the benefits of membership and the proximity to Portland);
- The deliverable for coordination is participation by the fish and wildlife managers in decision making and therefore BPA and Council should determine the appropriate funding level.

The UCUT communication requests that fish and wildlife managers fit the coordination funding within fixed budget targets established by BPA or Council. The CBFWA members developed a “needs based budget” for their FY 2008-09 work plan which allows any reductions in funding to be clearly linked with loss of specific deliverables. The budget fits within the Council’s budget target, by coincidence, and therefore may be consistent with the UCUT proposal.

The one place in the Northwest Power Act that explicitly calls for the fish and wildlife managers to develop funding recommendations is in Section 4(h)(2) which states *the Council shall request in writing...from the Federal and the region’s State fish and wildlife agencies and from the region’s appropriate Indian tribes, recommendations for - fish and wildlife management **coordination** and research and development (**including funding**) which, among other things, will assist protection, mitigation, and enhancement of anadromous fish at, and between, the region’s hydroelectric dams.* [Northwest Power Act, Section 4(h)(2)(C)]

At this time, CBFWA staff cannot determine if the CBFWA proposal is consistent with the UCUT communication or not.