



**COLUMBIA  
BASIN  
FISH & WILDLIFE  
AUTHORITY**

**DRAFT**

DATE: February 10, 2005  
TO: CBFWA Members  
FROM: Rod Sando, Executive Director  
SUBJECT: Draft 1/31/05 Executive Session Action Notes

**Emergency Members Meeting  
Executive Session  
January 31, 2005  
10:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.**

@

**Red Lion Hotel at the Park  
Spokane WA 99201**

**Conference Line (503) 229-0191 x 7099**

**Draft Action Notes**

**Attendees:** Warren Seyler, STI; D.R. Michel, CCT; Deb Louie, CCT; Garry Hendrick, CdAT; Alfred M. Nomee, CdAT; Larry Peterman, MTFWP; Gary Aitken Sr., KTI; Dick Stone, WDFW; Tim Dykstra, SPT; Bill Hutchinson, IDFG; Pete Hassemmer, IDFG; Doug Taki, SBT; Dean Osterman, KT; Darren Holmes, KT; Ray Entz, KT; John Palensky, NOAA; Mark Bagdovitz, USFWS; Lynn DuCharme, CSKT; Ron Trahan, CSKT; Kelly Singer, STI; Matt Berger, CCT; Cam Heviser, CDAT, Mary Verner, UCUT; Bill Towey CCT; Ron Peters, CdAT; Rod Sandy, CBFWA; Jann Eckman, CBFWA

**By Phone:** Carl Scheeler, CTUIR; Dave Ward, ODFW; Claudio Broncho, SBT; Lawrence Schwabe, BPT; Scott Soultis, KTI; Paul Ward, YN; Gerald Vanzuka, CTWSR

**Time Allocation:** 2005 Objectives:  
Objective 1. Project/Budget Recommendations %  
Objective 2. Fish and Wildlife Regional Issues 100%  
Objective 3. Annual Report %  
Objective 4. RM&E %  
Objective 5. Other Business %

**ITEM 1: UCUT Policy Letter – Warren Seyler, UCUT Chair**

- Provide historical context of the letter
- Summarize the issues
- Discuss UCUT's ideas on next steps

**Discussion:** Warren Seyler said the UCUT letter involves all five tribes' opinion. The Organization isn't representing the UCUT. Examples are the Annual Report. Wildlife is not given equity – the UCUT does not receive the 1-1 ratio. The fish decisions are being made in Portland by a smaller group. The UCUT's do not agree with the consent mail process.

D.R. Michel stated that the meeting notifications are too quick and there is no communication. The Tribes feel like the organization has lost its' intent. The decisions are not being made at the policy level. The basin is salmon driven. There is a lack of equity, not 1-1 for every tribe.

The CdAT stated that there is a lack of communication. All the tribes are serious about withdrawing. Equity is an issue, decision making and not getting support from downriver issues.

It was also mentioned that there was a lack of contact. Not all the members are equally represented. There are end runs around the process. It is the staff responsibility to ensure that the decisions of the Members Management Group are communicated to the Members. The MMG is not policy. The Policy members don't know what the MMG is doing and need more personal attention.

The members noted that these issues surface and are endemic in an organization of diverse interest and geographical locations. So the question is how do the members address the issue and how do we make the organization function better.

**ITEM 2: Review Current Decision Making Process – Jann Eckman, CBFWA**

- Review the consensus decision making process as described in the Charter

**Discussion:** Jann reviewed the consensus decision making process in the current Charter. She reviewed the role of the MMG and the Members. The MMG member is responsible for keeping their policy member informed of the issues and actions and CBFWA staff work to support all members equally, provide information and assist as requested. Several UCUT members felt that the MMG made policy decisions and CBFWA took positions that did not have Member approval.

**ITEM 3: Determine Action Plan for Resolving Issues – Open Discussion**

**Discussion:** The UCUT's felt that the organization should have an "affirmative" decision making process and the role of the MMG needs to be revised. Need to clarify their role from the Members role. It was mentioned that "staff" needs to understand the tribe's sovereign rights and goals. That

equity was still an issue for each of the members, communication (lack of), and policy role of the members.

Some Members felt that the “affirmative decision making” process can work within the existing framework to make affirmative action.

**ITEM 4: How to Conduct Business in the Interim – Open Discussion**

**Discussion:** UCUT members want staff to call them on each issue needing member approval to get an affirmative approval in writing from each individual UCUT member before the final action can be taken by CBFWA. CBFWA is to consider that the UCUT objects to each consent mail issue unless an affirmative approval is received.

**ITEM 5: February 23 & 24, 2005 Members Meeting**

- Discuss agenda topics for that meeting

**Action:** The members felt the agenda should include the following decision topics:

- Charter – decision making process (consent mail vs. affirmative action); role of the Members, MMG/committee, staff;
- Communication
- Equity (there was some discussion as to what this means and not all members agreed that this should be a topic)