



**COLUMBIA  
BASIN  
FISH & WILDLIFE  
AUTHORITY**

**DRAFT**

DATE: November 10, 2004  
TO: Wildlife Committee  
FROM: Maureen Smith, Acting Chair  
SUBJECT: Action Notes for October 19-21, 2004 Wildlife Committee Retreat

**If there are no objections within five days these actions will considered final.**

Wildlife Committee Retreat  
October 19-21, 2004  
Sandpoint, Idaho

Draft Action Notes

**Attendees:** Kathy Cousins and Bob Martin (IDFG), Beth Chase and Scott Soultz (KTOI), Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), Greg Sieglitz (ODFW), Angela Sondenaar (NPT), Terry Luther (CTWSRO), Ray Entz (KT), Kelly Singer and B.J. Kiefer (STOI), Dick Stone (WDFW), Matt Berger (CCT), Maureen Smith (USFWS), Anders Mikkelsen (Cd'AT) and Rod Sando and Frank Young (CBFWA)

<b>Time</b>	Objective 1. Project Recommendations	0%
<b>Allocation:</b>	Objective 2. Regional Issues	100 %
	Objective 3. Annual Report	0%

**ITEM 1: Celebration of Accomplishments and Discussion of the Collaborative Process Using an Interest-based Model**

**Discussion:** The retreat began with the recognition of the substantial habitat gains accomplished for wildlife throughout the Columbia Basin since the inception of the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program and a discussion of the changes that have occurred in the Regional processes that have lead to the current reduction in funding for wildlife projects and the Wildlife Committee's ability to function effectively. The concept of using a truly collaborative process and the benefits of achieving sustainable outcomes was introduced. A discussion of interest-based vs. power-based decision making followed with the group concurring that past decision-making within CBFWA and the FWP had traditionally been transactional or Power/Rights-Based and that the WC would operate more effectively by adopting the transformational or Interest-Based approach for future decision making. A set of Ground Rules were presented and adopted (attached).

**ITEM 2: Identification of Overarching Problem**

**Discussion:** Retreat participants listed the following as current problems to be used as the basis for further development of one overarching problem statement. Maureen and Frank agreed to draft a “strawman” problem statement for WC consideration at next meeting:

1. Ecology of bureaucracy is dysfunctional
2. BPA administrator
3. Inadequate funding
4. Competition for funds
5. Disagreement over crediting ratio
6. Current administration
7. Mitigation for wildlife losses has been marginalized by anadromous fish priorities and ESA obligations
8. NPCC is dysfunctional
9. Wildlife Committee is dysfunctional

**ITEM 3: Development of WC Goals**

**Discussion:** The following draft goals were suggested for further development at next WC meeting:

1. Mitigate for all wildlife losses associated with the construction and operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System – (Frank)
2. Develop an effective organization that allows for adequate funding for wildlife mitigation. (Define “adequate” and an effective rate of mitigation.)
3. Full mitigation for the impact of the FCRPS

*NOTE: The need to develop biological objectives, strategies, and actions was recognized, e.g. development of trust funding agreement, was recognized as a priority follow-up action to implement any adopted goal(s).*

**ITEM 4: Issue Identification**

**Discussion:** Retreat Participants developed a comprehensive list of the issues influencing WC effectiveness:

1. WC ineffective in achieving objectives
2. Meeting frequency
3. lack of communications
4. Need to develop objectives
5. WC not functioning effectively
6. Lack of trust
7. Past interactions with WC members has eroded trust
8. WC lacks value for all members
9. Have not established each objective for each member
10. Lack of credibility
11. Inability to move on from issue that we cannot change
12. Perceived inequity between upriver and downriver (project funding)
13. WC allows outside interests to divide them
14. Have not continued project reviews
15. Lost influence over project prioritization

**ITEM 5: Development of Working Issues Statements for each Problem**

**Discussion:** Retreat participants converted the identified issues into a specific description of individual problems, described what they desired as a future outcome without suggesting solutions, and identified the importance of each issue relative to each participant's interest, and what constraints posed obstacles in achieving their desired outcomes. Each participant thought that each of the eleven identified problems was amenable to a collaborative solution.

**Problem 1: WC allows outside interests to divide them**

Desired outcome: WC unified on common interests

Why important: Consistent articulation of common Committee positions to outside interests

- reduces misunderstandings and confusion between members
- maintains integrity/trust within/without Committee
- limits effectiveness of outside interests

Key constraints:

- Lack of integrity of individual members (agency/tribes)
- Poor communication
- Clarity of common interests
- Changing outside forces
- Lack of perceived value in Committee

**Problem 2: Committee members have not defined their individual interests to the other members and other members have not attempted to understand/respect those interests**

Desired outcome: Clearly defined common interests understood by all

Why important: Critical for effective collaborative function and important to build new relationships and trust. Focus on development of effective strategies.

Key constraints:

- Lack of participation
- Lack of trust
- Conflicting interests
- Poor guidance/support from agency/tribe

**Problem 3: The working relationships within the WC have not changed/evolved to reflect change in focus**

Desired outcome: Work together in collaborative fashion to address common issues

Why important:

- Greater benefits for all members
- Permit us to operate from position of greater power and influence with common voice

Key constraints:

- Personalities
- Baggage from past
- Conflicting interests that limit or undermine collaboration
- Effectively defining our common interests
- Time and investments and individual capacity

**Problem 4: Committee lacks value for all members**

Future outcome: Committee provides value for all members proactively engaged in wildlife issues in all spheres of influence.

Why important: Synergistic approach – sum of parts greater than whole

Key constraints:

- Policy issues inside and outside
- Time constraints
- Staff time to participate
- Information dissemination and transfer in and out (WC, RFC & AFC = CBFWA)

**Problem 5: Inability to move from issues that we cannot change**

Desired outcome: Re-craft approach to resolve issues

Why important: Need to move on and break free of funding impasse

Key constraints:

- Inflexibility
- Old school vs. new school
- Ingrained behavior

**Problem 6: Past interactions with WC members has eroded trust**

Desired outcome: Trust is reconstructed with WC members

Why important: To be functional in obtaining WC group objectives and regaining credibility

Key constraints: Old wounds and time and energy to rebuild trust

**Problem 7: Inequity between upriver and downriver (project funding)**

Desired outcome: Meet same level of mitigation upriver as has occurred downriver

Why important:

- to meet Power Act
- balance level of mitigation that has occurred to date
- decrease level of angst for all WC entities

Key constraints:

- Acknowledge disparity
- Continued lack of trust
- Lack of funding

**Problem 8: No clear objectives for group**

Desired outcome: Clear objectives for group that are supported by all

Why important:

- establishes priorities
- provides consensus
- establishes time lines and work plan
- strategic approach functioning of the group
- focus on limited resources

Key constraints:

- limited time
- unknown conflicting interests

**Problem 9: Lack of constructive approach when dealing with stakeholders**

Desired outcome: Better support (financial and political) and understanding of what we are trying to achieve

Why important: New approaches are needed to affect the changing roles and environment.

- Stakeholders will have more influence in the current process
- Stakeholders' support is necessary

Key constraints:

- Conflicting interests between stakeholders internal and external
- Ability and authority to engage some stakeholders

**Problem 10: Lack of creditability within the WC (defined as technical, follow-through on commitments, team)**

Desired outcome:

- Follow-through on commitments
- Establishment of better trust
- More external credibility
- Effectiveness and strength as an organization

Why important:

- For support and effectiveness
- Will establish better relationships

Key constraints:

- Individual agendas subvert team efforts
- Lack of clear definition of roles and objectives

**Problem 11: Lost influence over project prioritization**

Desired outcome: Greater influence in selection of projects

Why important: Will provide equity across region and proceed with full mitigation

Key constraints:

- Political policy
- ESA/BiOp implementation
- "Financial crisis"

**ITEM 6: Characterization of Working Issues for Future Problem-Solving Sessions/Workshops**

**Discussion:** Issues were prioritized by urgency as follows:

**Higher Priority Needs**

1. Elect new Chair and Vice-chair
2. Summarize retreat outcomes/decisions
3. MOA/Rate Case
4. Trust Fund Proposal Discussion (basin, state, province?) (Nov. meeting as part of negotiations for Rate Case/MOA)
5. Expense vs. Capital budgets for long-term funding for protection, restoration and enhancement, O&M and RME. (related to #3 & 4) (Nov. & Dec. meetings)
6. Capitalization issue
7. Develop mitigation goals – goal setting objectives, criteria for funding. (Nov. & Dec. meetings.) (related to #9)
8. Proposals for modifying capitalization rules (Trust Fund)

9. BPA capitalization policy briefing. (BPA presentation) (Nov. meeting)
10. Allocation Subcommittee wildlife resource characterization.
11. Subbasin Plan implementation (measures vs. strategies and BPA obligation to fund “measures”) (related to #10)
12. CBFWA policy relative to staff representing CBFWA positions to outside forums.

#### **Lower Priority Needs**

1. Create a blueprint for WC structure and CBFWA structure
2. Approve wildlife management plans (Tualatin)
3. Presentation of case-study precedents (YN, UCUTs, Willamette, et al.)
4. Funding equity across Basin (related to #3)
5. Secondary and operational impacts as basis for future mitigation
6. Wildlife crediting for fish habitat projects
7. HU “stacking” issue
8. Site visits and host member presentations
9. Status of funding for completed management plans
10. Regional RME Plan (expand on Albeni Falls model)

#### **ITEM 7: Future of the Wildlife Committee**

**Discussion:** Retreat participants determined that the Wildlife Committee would function at a more pro-active level and develop a comprehensive work plan and schedule for 2005. By adopting the interest-based model for decision making, participants agreed to become more engaged in WC activities and commit to the extra time and effort necessary for collaborative problem-solving. Participants agreed that it was in their best, long-term interest to engage in collective decision-making that truly addressed each of their interests. A meeting was set for 8 a.m. November 9, 2004 at CBFWA to begin to address some of the High Priority needs identified during the Retreat. A follow-up Workshop on December 1-2, 2004 in Spokane, WA, (UCUT office?) was approved to develop a work plan for the next year.