



July 22, 2004

TO: Members and Members Management Group  
 FROM: Rudy Peone, STI  
 SUBJECT: July 8-9, 2004 Draft MMG Retreat Meeting/Board Notes

MMG Retreat  
 July 8 & 9, 2004  
 Pendleton, Oregon

**Attendees:** **07/08/04** - Rudy Peone, STI; Tony Nigro, ODFW; Amos First Raised & Christine Harty, BPT; Laura Gephart, CRITFC; Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Carl Scheeler & Gary James, CTUIR; Peter Hassemmer, IDFG; Dave Statler, NPT; Doug Taki, SBT; Mark Bagdovitz & Maureen Smith, USFWS; Dick Stone & Bill Tweit, WDFW; and Trina Gerlack, Tom Giese, Tom Iverson, Tana Klum, Rod Sando, Kathie Titzler, & Neil Ward, CBFWA

**07/09/04** - Rudy Peone, STI; Tony Nigro, ODFW; Laura Gephart, CRITFC; Carl Scheeler & Gary James, CTUIR; Peter Hassemmer, IDFG; Dave Statler, NPT; Mark Bagdovitz & Maureen Smith, USFWS; Dick Stone & Bill Tweit, WDFW; and Trina Gerlack, Tom Giese, Tom Iverson, Tana Klum, Rod Sando, Kathie Titzler, & Neil Ward, CBFWA

**Time Allocation:** 2004-2005 Objectives:

1. Project/Budget Recommendations	0%
2. Fish and Wildlife Regional Issues	77%
3. Annual Report	05%
4. RM&E	0%
5. Other Business	18%

**Purpose:** **To discuss the direction of CBFWA and potential issues confronting the fish and wildlife managers in the future and strategies to address them, and set the August 2004 Members Meeting agenda and support material.**

**Draft Meeting/Board Notes**

**Day One – July 8, 2004**

The Members Management Group (MMG) started the Retreat with introductions and open discussions regarding potential future issues, past accomplishments, the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority's (CBFWA) reputation in the region, and developing the draft agenda and support materials for the August 4&5, 2004 Summer Members Meeting scheduled in Coeur d' Alene, Idaho. Some of the important issues that came up were funding for the F&W Program in the next rate case, the value of the subbasins plans, the spill issue and the political realities, CBFWA's policy and technical leadership roles and opportunities, F&W program implementation, outcome of the 2004 presidential election, two governors changing in the region and possible Members changing on the Northwest Power & Conservation Council.

The MMG agreed that the CBFWA Members and Managers needed to publicize their fish and wildlife technical expertise in a leadership position, collectively as a unified body in the region and prevent others

from dividing the common goal of the membership to advocate for fish and wildlife in the basin. Some felt that CBFWA has lost its credibility and respect in the region, while others defined credibility as being trustworthy and pointed out the accomplishments (e.g., the 2003 Annual Work Plan, the managers' role in the Subbasins Plans, Spill Issue, BPA's business practices, and BiOp Remand).

The MMG discussed the value of declaring the F&W managers role and influencing the policy makers' decisions in the region. The MMG agreed that the membership needs to remain united and collectively support each others priorities in the region and produce an updated direction plan together for the future. The MMG's board notes/issue paper and staff's meeting notes below attempts to capture the results of the retreat.

**What's next for the CBFWA?  
Updating the CBFWA New Directions Work Plan:  
An Issue Paper for the Members**

In May, 2003, the Members of the CBFWA adopted a work plan for the organization that pointed in some new directions. One year later, it is appropriate to review the organizations accomplishments and to adjust the work plan, as appropriate.

The MMG Retreat participants believe that the goal of this effort should be:

**To be effective, regaining the ability to influence decisions while maintaining credibility.**

The MMG Retreat participants' determined three questions to identify the steps that they intend to complete in preparation for the Members' meeting.

1. How do we identify and articulate the top 5-10 resource protection and management issues we will collectively advocate?
2. How do we identify and describe the top 5-10 resource management disagreements for discussion and resolution?

**Note:** The MMG decided they would need more Members participation to identify the "Products".

3. What are the top 5-10 "Products" CBFWA Members and staff will work on and what is the completion schedule - given in #1 and #2? (e.g., implementation plan, resource status report, political strategy, constituent involvement/information, etc).

The MMG proposed that these materials will be used to help the Members develop the following products:

- a. Set of principles to identify top 5-10 issues;
- b. Set of assignments – who, when and what for developing draft list of issues;
- c. Draft list of ranked issues/data that could be included [produced as a list?]; and,
- d. Set of revisions to the New Directions Work Plan.

The MMG brainstormed the following list of principles or criteria that should be used to evaluate issues and determine their importance for CBFWA action.

Is the issue:

- a. A threat to CBFWA collective effort to protect/restore resource?
- b. Technically defensible and clearly defined?
- c. An urgent and/or significant risk to protecting or restoring resource?
- d. Temporally urgent and will become moot if not addressed soon?
- e. One that falls in four H's relative to Members authorities and responsibilities?
- f. One that enjoys Member agreement/consensus or is likely to get agreement or consensus?
- g. Regionally significant?
- h. One that lends itself to our unique authorities and expertise?
- i. One that has a moderate to high probability of successful advocacy (i.e., favorable decision) -long term versus short term goals?

The retreat participants discussed issues confronting fish and wildlife management in the Columbia River Basin that might be appropriately dealt with through the CBFWA. The issues were divided into two categories: those already having manager consensus and are ready for CBFWA advocacy; and, those for which consensus might be sought, or the Members might agree to disagree and characterize the disagreement. See the Charter at <http://www.cbfwa.org/files/finalcharter102500.pdf> for consensus decision making process.

#### **ISSUES FOR CONSENSUS ADVOCACY**

1. Preserve non-ESA components of Fish and Wildlife Program (i.e., wildlife, resident fish mitigation).
2. Evaluate critical strategies (i.e., transportation, spill).
3. Implement critical programs and projects that are currently unfunded (i.e., land acquisition).
4. Develop implementation plan for Fish and Wildlife Program, with the following aspects.
  - tie into rate case
  - set priorities
  - rate of implementation
  - roll-up subbasin plans (organize Recovery Boards)
5. Water acquisition and management, including:
  - water withdrawals
  - managing hydrograph
  - minimum flows
6. Ensure rate case doesn't exclude critical measures for fish and wildlife, and assess effect on fish and wildlife – past and future.
7. Develop and maintain a RM&E Program in support of an annual report card on the effectiveness and success of implementation plan.
8. Recruit and inform constituents and others of efforts to protect and restore the resource.
  - reaction to real time versus long term
  - press releases
  - editorial boards
9. Protection of habitat on private lands.
10. Protection of habitat on public lands.
11. Ensure that forgone revenue estimates associated with fish and wildlife protection and restoration are transparent and accurate.
12. Ensure relationships between BPA, NPCC and fish and wildlife managers are constructive and positive, defining obligations and requirements.
13. Reestablish fish passage into blocked areas above Hells Canyon, Chief Joseph, etc.
14. Development of a “decision framework” defining regional roles and process for F&W decision-making.

#### **ISSUES FOR PURSUIT OF CONSENSUS OR AGREEING TO DISAGREE AND CHARACTERIZE OUR DISAGREEMENT**

1. Supplementation – role and use of hatchery fish for restoration of natural runs.
  - recovery tool
  - when, why, what to use
2. Mass marking and selective fisheries.
3. Use of spill, flow augmentation, and transportation for anadromous fish protection and recovery.
4. Managing storage reservoirs for resident and anadromous fish management.
5. When wildlife mitigation is achieved relative to loss assessments as they relate to FCRPS construction and inundation.
6. What constitutes equitable attention and treatment of resource management issues among anadromous, resident fish and wildlife issues and among geographic areas within the Columbia Basin (e.g., blocked versus unblocked, above versus below Bonneville, ESA versus non-ESA).

The MMG notes that the issues on which the Members agree far out-weigh those that are divided. The participants identified two issues that warrant discussion by the Members, as they have near-term relevance.

1. Should an independent entity replace BPA as the F&W fund administrator to remove potential conflict of interest in administering and managing Fish and Wildlife Program dollars?
2. After the election November 2004 and before January 2005, NW Governors may appoint new Northwest Power & Conservation Council members. Should the CBFWA Members provide the Governors with principles to consider when appointing Council members?

The MMG selected the audiences for the CBFWA's messages listed in no particular order:

- BPA & Executives
- NW Congressional Delegation
- Each other – as it relates to regulatory or other authorities
- Four Governors [and Tribes?]
- State and local governments
- Power, irrigation, navigation and agriculture interests
- Fish and Wildlife Constituents
  - -NGO's
  - -Recreational Fisheries
  - -Commercial Fisheries
  - -Trade Associations
- Salmon recovery boards
- Watershed councils
- USACE/BOR Executives
- PFMC/PST/PSMFC
- Canada/Alaska
- Academia
- "General" public
  - -schools, etc
- NPCC

**ISSUES for Member Consideration:**

1. Are the "principles" appropriate criteria for choosing the issues on which the CBFWA should focus?
2. What is the ranking of the "consensus" issues relative to their importance to the CBFWA?
3. Which issues should the CBFWA work to reach consensus or define the disagreement?
4. Does the CBFWA support administration of the F&W fund separate from BPA?
5. Will the CBFWA support the following list of factors, in order of their importance, as the basis on which to choose new members of the NPCC?

**Day Two – July 9, 2004**

On the following morning the MMG recapped the day before and assigned the staff to characterize the board notes to update the work plan, revise the Members meeting agenda, and distribute the drafts to the MMG Retreat participants for comment and approval for the August Members meeting. The MMG requested that staff prepare a detailed briefing packet for the August 4-5, 2004 Members Meeting describing each consideration and proposed action for MMG and Members review two weeks prior to the meeting date.

**Other open discussion items included:**

- Bill Tweit, WDFW, introduced Dick Stone, Wildlife Policy Coordinator to the MMG.
- Amos First Raised, BPT, introduced Christine Harty, Wildlife Program Manager.
- Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS, confirmed that Fred Olney retired July 2, 2004.
- How to improve USACE, BPA and NPCC's working relationships with the F&W managers?
- The CBFWA draft BPA Funding History white paper is out for review and Tom Iverson is accepting comments from the MMG.
- Hatchery and Hydro Impacts – Utilities Position - Letter to Delegation
- Bruce Suzumoto, NPCC - APRE Issue Paper out for public comment July 15, 2004. Go to <http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/releases/2004/0719.htm> for information.
- Rod Sando delivered Chairman Warren Seyler's, CBFWA, message to the membership – Get Aggressive in the Regional Issues.
- Kathie Titzler, CBFWA, is trained and certified to write grants for alternative funding sources.
- Engage as a voting member on local boards in your area who are deciding subbasin management and implementation. These local boards have funding available to hire staff and fish and wildlife consultants and are lacking experienced F&W managers' representation.
- Concerns about the strategy to decentralize the development of subbasin planning process and efforts into four states.
- A strong community involvement is good for Habitat on private lands and cost effective.
- The importance of defining a Decision Framework for the region.
- The NPCC will modify F&W Program and develop process in July 2004 – January 2005.
- The MMG requested more detailed information on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual AFC Project Implementation Review - September 21-24, 2004 Conference for the Project Sponsors and Members.
- Sovereign Managers Role
- Regional Roll-ups
- Rob Walton, NOAA Fisheries, would like to meet with the Members to discuss ESA Recovery Plans & Habitat Plans.