



**Draft Meeting Minutes
Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee
Drafting Team Meeting
Minneapolis, Minnesota**

September 25 and 26, 2007

Contents

Summary	1
Meeting Minutes	3
Day One: Tuesday, September 25, 2007	3
Meeting Opening and Introductions	3
Federal Working Group Presentations	3
Drafting Team Discussion.....	4
Adoption of August Meeting Minutes and Summary.....	4
DRAFT Charter Language Review	5
Membership.....	5
Science	5
Logistics.....	5
Roles and Responsibilities	6
Federal Working Group Update.....	6
Public Comment	6
Wrap Up.....	7
Day Two: Wednesday, September 26, 2007	8
Meeting Opening	8
DRAFT Charter Language Review	8
Membership.....	8
Federal Agency Participation	8
States	9
Stakeholder Membership	9
Membership Selection Process.....	9
Quorum Determination	10
Membership Responsibilities.....	10
Membership Terms of Office.....	10
Alternates.....	10
Attendance.....	11
Charter Update.....	11
Logistics.....	11
Other DRAFT Charter Components	11
Presentation By USFWS	11
October Meeting.....	11
October Meeting Evening Activities	12
Federal Working Group Update.....	12
Public Input	13
Wrap Up.....	13
Appendix A Meeting Attendance on 9/25/07	14
Appendix B Meeting Attendance on 9/26/07	16

Summary

The Drafting Team of the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (MRRIC) Planning Group met in Minneapolis, Minnesota on Tuesday and Wednesday, September 25 and 26, 2007, to continue work on developing a recommended charter for the MRRIC.

The meeting was co-chaired by Cheryl Chapman and John Thorson and facilitated by Ruth Siguenza, CPF, and Steve Miller. Notes were taken by Douglas Huston.

The Drafting Team worked on proposed DRAFT Charter language in the areas of membership, science, logistics, and roles and responsibilities.

In the membership area, the Drafting Team developed a proposed protocol for federal agency participation which involves two agencies: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), as lead agencies who would sit at the MRRIC table. The other Federal Working Group agencies would be designated as participating agencies providing input as appropriate and necessary. The team also developed a list of stakeholder membership interest groups, terms of office for members, and attendance requirements. The Drafting Team continued to work on quorum requirements and the MRRIC membership selection process. These questions will continue to be addressed between the September and October meetings with the goal of having proposed DRAFT Charter language for the full Planning Group to review in October.

With respect to the science area, the Drafting Team streamlined the previously proposed language on the formation of panels and sub-committees and developed a new DRAFT Charter section titled "Reports, Work Plans, and Proposals." This section contains detailed information on content and proposed schedules for reports from federal agencies to the MRRIC. The team also added language to this section allowing non-governmental agencies to submit proposals to the MRRIC for review.

In the logistics area, the Drafting Team revised the convening authority statement in the DRAFT Charter to remove references to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and worked on refining the language dealing with the governance of the MRRIC. Due to time constraints, the team was unable to finish this task and flagged this language as not yet having complete agreement. The intent is to finish this task at the October meeting.

The Drafting Team revised the roles and responsibilities language to deal with the selection process for the MRRIC chair and vice-chair and the situation in which the chair is unable to complete his/her term.

In addition to working on DRAFT Charter language, the Drafting Team heard from the Federal Working Group who provided an update on its latest conference call, feedback on DRAFT Charter language, and responded to the question the Team asked at the August meeting on federal agency participation. At the August meeting the Drafting Team had asked the federal agencies to determine if they would be comfortable participating in the decision making process if an abstention option was available. The Federal Working Group reported to the Drafting Team that interested federal agencies would like to participate fully in the discussion of issues but not in the decision process.

In addition to responding to the agency participation question, the Federal Working Group presented information on the groups currently working on Missouri River recovery and restoration efforts and details of current Corps species restoration programs. This was also in response to a previous request made by the Drafting Team.

On behalf of the Federal Working Group, the USFWS presented Drafting Team members with framed photographs of the Missouri River that cited the Federal Agencies appreciation for the Drafting Team's efforts.

The Drafting Team also heard from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), who provided feedback on the Drafting Team's proposed protocols for federal agency participation on the MRRIC.

Meeting Minutes

The Drafting Team of the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (MRRIC) Planning Group met in Minneapolis, Minnesota on Tuesday and Wednesday, September 25 and 26, 2007, to continue work on developing a charter for the MRRIC.

The meeting was co-chaired by Cheryl Chapman and John Thorson and facilitated by Ruth Siguenza, CPF, and Steve Miller. Notes were taken by Douglas Huston.

Day One: Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Meeting Opening and Introductions

Co-Chair John Thorson called the meeting to order at 8:32 am and led those assembled in a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Following the opening, John discussed a similar gathering of individuals at Bishop's Lodge in Santa Fe, New Mexico celebrating the eighty-fifth (85th) anniversary of the Colorado River Compact. He informed the group that he had been invited there, but chose to come here instead. He read from a dialogue titled *Community of Drought*, written by Gregg Hobbs and Gary Weatherford and performed at the Bishop's Lodge gathering.

John and Ruth reviewed the agenda and goals for the meeting and asked for comments. The Drafting Team asked if Mary Roth, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) representative on the Federal Working Group, was ready to give her presentation on the restoration plans and activities in the Missouri River basin and the agencies involved in recovery and restoration efforts on day one rather than day two of the meeting. Mary commented that her research was not complete yet, but she could present what she had completed at this time to the Drafting Team. The team decided to modify the agenda to move Mary's talk up.

Following the review of the agenda, Ruth conducted the roll call in accordance with the Drafting Team's *Final Ground Rules and Operating Procedures*. Drafting Team alternates, Federal Working Group members, observers, and other audience members also introduced themselves. The presence of a quorum was verified per Drafting Team request.

Federal Working Group Presentations

Mary led off with her presentation. It was divided into two sections: organizations and plans. The organizations section listed groups associated with recovery and restoration efforts on the Missouri River and consisted of seventeen (17) pages of information, including data such as the organization's name and purpose, contact information, and Web site address.

The plans section broke down the recovery plans currently in place by the three species of concern: pallid sturgeon, piping plover, and least tern. These were in turn broken down further by Work Breakdown System (WBS) code and included budget information and a description of the project's purpose. A copy of these presentations will be posted at <http://missouririver.ecr.gov/>

Mike George, of the Corps, recapped a presentation he had delivered to the National Academy of Sciences at Wood's Hole Oceanographic Institute which dealt primarily with the history of the MRRIC process. He made the point that values integration was a critical aspect of the adaptive management process. The MRRIC could help the overall restoration planning process by providing this input. He also discussed the guiding principles for the Missouri River Recovery process: use science, be as transparent as the law allows, consensus building, inclusiveness, accountability, and adaptive management. A copy of Mike's presentation will also be posted on the MRRIC Planning Group Web site. <http://missouririver.ecr.gov/>

Drafting Team Discussion

The Drafting Team was appreciative of the work Mary put into her presentation and found it very useful. They had some suggestions for future versions such as including river mile and bank information for locations. The Drafting Team requested that it receive copies of this presentation and that it be made available on the MRRIC Web site.

The Drafting Team also expressed concerns about being aware, in an integrated fashion, of all the various programs and projects in progress on the Missouri River, and where the MRRIC would fit in. The team commented that it hoped the MRRIC process move would move away from the old "decide, announce, defend" program for recovery and restoration and instead have the opportunity to make recommendations at the beginning of project activities. Mike George pointed out that since the MRRIC would be a consensus group including states, tribes, and stakeholders, its recommendations would have significant power and authority and would be very valuable to him. The team also had some questions about budget and work flow which Mike discussed.

Adoption of August Meeting Minutes and Summary

Doug Huston discussed the comments on the August meeting minutes he had received from Randy Asbury. Randy was concerned that it be made clear that the charter language that had been agreed upon thus far was still draft language. Pursuant to this concern, Doug had reviewed the August minutes and summary and added the word DRAFT to the description of the MRRIC charter outline wherever appropriate. Randy had some additional comments concerning quantifying the level of agreement and several other Drafting Team members had comments on various sections of the minutes. With these changes made, the minutes and summary were approved.

DRAFT Charter Language Review

Membership

The Drafting Team began its discussions of membership language by hearing from Larry Cieslik, of the Corps, on the results of the Federal Working Group consideration of the question asked by the Drafting Team at the August meeting. The Federal Working Group was asked to determine if the federal agencies would be comfortable being part of the MRRIC decision making process if an abstention option was available. Larry reported that the federal agencies would like to be able to express a single, federal position on a subject but not be a part of the decision making process.

The Drafting Team had a lengthy discussion about the appropriate level of representation the federal agencies should provide. There was concern that the federal agency participant be at the policy making level so that the position expressed by the federal agencies would not be likely to change. On the other hand, there was concern that a person at that level would not have detailed, specific knowledge of the matters under discussion and this might affect the quality of the decision. It might also be difficult to get a policy level person to attend meetings regularly.

Based on the discussion, the Co-Chairs offered a proposal for federal agency participation and asked the Drafting Team members to consider it over lunch and be prepared to discuss it when the meeting reconvened.

The Drafting Team discussed again, in detail, the question of whether or not to include the federal agencies in the decision making process. No decision was reached, and the team decided to table the question for further discussion on day two of the meeting.

Science

The Drafting Team streamlined the language concerning the formation of panels and subcommittees and created a new charter section: "Reports, Work Plans, and Proposals." This new section contains detailed information and schedules for reports from federal agencies to the MRRIC. The language for this section was actually developed the evening of day one by Pat Cassidy and discussed and approved the afternoon of day two. A provision was also added to this section to allow non-governmental organizations to submit proposals to the MRRIC for review.

Logistics

The Drafting Team removed the reference to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in the convening authority statement since the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) makes reference to ESA and revised the language dealing with possible amendments to WRDA.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Drafting Team discussed in detail the proposed chair and vice-chair positions for the MRRIC. The team was concerned that selecting a chair from the body of the Committee would effectively eliminate representation of that seat. There was discussion that the chair's alternate could take his/her place on the Committee or that he/she could continue to represent his/her interest from the chair's position. The latter option was not considered viable. Term limits for the chair and vice-chair were discussed and the selection process and time-table were decided on. Language was added to the section to deal with the situation where either the chair or vice-chair positions became vacant for a lengthy period.

Federal Working Group Update

Margot Zallen, of the U.S Department of the Interior, had some comments on wording in the DRAFT Charter. In particular she was concerned with some ambiguities in various sections and with the use of *shall* and *will* vs. *agreed to*, *requested*, etc. in reference to the federal agencies. Margot also introduced the federal agency plan to develop an intergovernmental agreement between the states, tribes, and federal agencies involved in the MRRIC process. This agreement would specify what these groups are committing to with respect to the MRRIC Charter and would be the mechanism for letting the Secretary of the Army know these groups agree to the charter. She asked for volunteers from among the sovereigns on the Drafting Team to develop this document.

John Seeronen, of the Corps, provided the Drafting Team with a response to the questions it had asked at the August meeting concerning the Corps' process for submitting notices to the *Federal Register* and notifying interested parties. He informed the Team that actual publication of the *Federal Register* needed about two (2) to three (3) days notice. John also expressed concern over the membership selection process. He informed the Drafting Team that the MRRIC could review and make recommendations on membership applications, but all applications needed to be forwarded to the secretary.

Rose Hargrave, of the Corps, informed the Drafting Team that WRDA had passed the senate the day before, and the Federal Working Group was still working on developing the formal DRAFT Charter approval process.

Mike Mac, of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), commented that the USGS wanted to be involved in science and leadership roles in the MRRIC process but was a little concerned about this since the agency did not have management responsibilities along the Missouri River.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Wrap Up

Ruth reviewed the to-do list for day two of the meeting:

- Pat Cassidy will develop language on agency reporting for the Reports, Work Plans, and Proposals section over night.
- There are still four (4) logistics sections that need to be reviewed:
 - Executive Committee
 - Staffing
 - General Operations
 - Budget and Finance
- There are six (6) other DRAFT Charter components that still need to be reviewed:
 - Definitions
 - Updates and Revisions
 - Outside Interactions
 - Federal Representation Issue
 - Stakeholders
 - Selection Process

Margot asked that the Drafting Team address providing volunteers for the Intergovernmental Agreement Sub-committee on day two.

Cheryl asked volunteers to convene an informal meeting to discuss the federal representation issue immediately following the day one meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Day Two: Wednesday, September 26, 2007

Meeting Opening

Cheryl called the meeting to order at 8:30 am. She and John thanked everyone who had worked on language the night before. Cheryl then called on Joe Cothem, of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), to introduce John Askew, EPA Region 7 Regional Administrator.

Ruth reviewed the new agenda for the day. The plan was to start with the membership discussion.

DRAFT Charter Language Review

Membership

Federal Agency Participation

Vicki Marquis outlined the proposal the group had developed at an informal meeting the night before. There would be two federal agencies active in the discussion at all times: the Corps of Engineers and the USFWS. These agencies would be represented on the MRRIC. Representatives from these agencies would be at the senior executive service level, specifically, the regional director of USFWS, and the director of programs management for the Corps of Engineers. The remainder of the federal agencies would be present in an advisory capacity as “cooperating agencies” and would be provided designated times for their input. Decision making would be by consensus without the federal agencies. Once a proposal was approved by the MRRIC, the USFWS and Corps would have the opportunity to endorse the proposal. Lack of endorsement will not prevent a consensus recommendation from being forwarded to the appropriate action agency or agencies.

The Drafting Team was concerned about using the term cooperating agency since it already has a specific meaning in National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes; whether the federal agency representatives would count towards quorum requirements; and if a federal agency member could be selected chair or vice-chair of the MRRIC. The Team replaced the term cooperating agency with participating agency, decided federal agencies would not count toward quorum requirements, and federal agency representatives would not be eligible to be chair or vice-chair.

The Team returned to its concern about striking the right balance between knowledge level and decision making authority for the federal agency representatives. The decision was to trust the agencies to appoint the appropriate person to represent them.

A concern was raised that the USFWS and the Corps would not always be the lead agency for an action. In this case, would the actual lead agency for a given project be at the table? The Team decided that this situation was covered by the existing participation language but also changed the language in the endorsement section to require the chair to seek endorsement from the lead agencies.

The facilitation team was tasked with adding the terms lead agency, participating agency, and action agency to the Definitions section of the DRAFT Charter outline.

States

The Drafting Team discussed which states should be represented on the MRRIC and how these states would choose their representatives. The team decided to list the eight (8) states named in WRDA and require the governor of each state to appoint one member and one alternate should that state choose to participate.

Stakeholder Membership

The Drafting Team expressed concerns that there were too many other-interest seats, that the current list of stakeholder interest groups was incomplete, and that there should be both a maximum number of representatives per group and a maximum total number of representatives. The Team expanded the list of stakeholder interest groups to include agriculture, waterway industries, conservation districts, major tributaries and local governments. Each group was allotted a maximum of two representatives with a limit of twenty-eight (28) stakeholder members overall.

Membership Selection Process

The Drafting Team discussed developing membership selection criteria and decided to develop this between the September and October meetings via an e-mail exchange. The facilitation team was tasked with compiling the examples of the membership criteria in WRDA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), and the criteria used by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) and providing them to the Membership Committee for further discussion and recommendation to the Drafting Team.

Quorum Determination

The group discussed seven (7) options for determining a quorum:

- A floating average of the attendance at the last two meetings
- Counting stakeholders only
- Counting stakeholders and tribes only
- Counting stakeholders plus the signatories to the intergovernmental agreement as the basis for a quorum
- Counting filled seats only
- Counting only filled, active seats
- Doing away with quorum requirements

Action on quorum determination was deferred until the October meeting. The facilitation team was tasked with compiling the list of quorum options and sending it out to the Membership Committee for further discussion and recommendation to the Drafting Team.

Membership Responsibilities

The Drafting Team decided this section was not needed in the DRAFT Charter and deleted it. It could be a section in the MRRIC Operating Procedures.

Membership Terms of Office

The Drafting Team discussed terms of office for stakeholder members and the process of initial and subsequent appointment of members to the MRRIC. Lanny Meng, Larry Mires, Dave Barfield, Lynn Muench and Randy Asbury volunteered to develop language on member terms of office over lunch.

Following lunch, this group presented language specifying that half the stakeholders would serve two year terms, and half three year terms for the initial term of the MRRIC. This is to stagger the reapplication process. The Drafting Team discussed the reapplication process and decided that an incumbent would need to reapply at the end of his/her term, but the application would be abbreviated.

Alternates

The Drafting Team discussed at length how alternates would be chosen, their relationship to a specific seat, and the situation where a member could not fill his/her seat for the whole term. The team decided that a member may recommend an alternate and the alternate will also submit an application in accordance through the Secretary of the Army. In the event a member could not fulfill his/her entire term, the alternate would fill the remainder of the member's term.

Attendance

The Drafting Team accepted the proposed language.

Charter Update

The Drafting Team decided to rename this section Charter Amendment, and require consensus of the MRRIC and Secretary of the Army approval for amendments to the Charter.

Logistics

The Drafting Team was uncomfortable with having an executive committee. There was concern that this would concentrate too much power in a small group of people and that the name was inconsistent with the intended function of the committee. The name of the committee was changed to Coordinating Committee and this section was flagged as not having complete agreement for purposes of the October full Planning Group Meeting.

Other DRAFT Charter Components

The facilitation team asked the Drafting Team to review the definitions section and provide them with feedback.

The facilitation team was tasked with drafting language for the remaining sections of the DRAFT Charter and bringing it to the October meeting.

Presentation By USFWS

On behalf of the Federal Working Group, the USFWS presented Drafting Team members with framed photographs of the Missouri River that cited the federal agencies' appreciation for the Drafting Team's efforts.

October Meeting

Ruth went over the current plans for the October meeting and the administrative schedule. She informed the Drafting Team that the seating would be different. Planning Group members would be seated in groups at round tables.

The Drafting Team asked if the DRAFT Charter would be ready for consideration by the the public following the October meeting. Ruth informed them the DRAFT Charter would be ready by the start of the public comment period on 22 October.

October Meeting Evening Activities

Pat Cassidy, Tom Schrempp, and Bob Williamson invited the Planning Group and Federal Working Group members and their guests to tour a coal fired power plant and visit the Steamship Arabia Museum the evening of October 17th. They requested the meeting that day start by 8:00am. They also requested that the Planning Group RSVP to Pat as soon as possible.

Mary Roth informed the Planning Group that she would be doing the Corps' Annual Operating Plan update the evening of October 16th. The venue has not been chosen yet.

Federal Working Group Update

Heather McSharry, of the USFWS, expressed concern that the request to have the federal agencies immediately decide whether to endorse consensus recommendations was a violation of the two meeting rule, and the federal agencies would not be able to comply because they did not have time to consult with their agency. The Drafting Team pointed out that this request would be made at the end of the two day meeting, after the federal representatives had already consulted with their agencies.

John Askew, EPA Region 7 Regional Administrator, commented that he was concerned that the DRAFT Charter was not as inclusive as it could be. In particular, he indicated that he heard an undertone in the meeting that the government is not our friend and he was concerned that the plan for federal agency participation was exclusive rather than inclusive. He advised the Drafting Team that it would not take much for governmental agencies to leave the process if they were not meaningfully involved. He commented that having alternates might be detrimental to developing trust between MRRIC members. He was very encouraged that the Drafting Team was still working together and commented that the MRRIC was going to be an example of what good people working hard could produce. He encouraged the team to think of the process holistically.

John also commented that it was important to have policy making individuals from the federal agencies at the MRRIC meetings.

Some Drafting Team members pointed out to John that they have not always had positive experiences with government agencies and that his comments were less than helpful at this point in time.

Margot commented that some of the federal agencies had been discussing the membership language and might have comments to offer at the October meeting. She asked for volunteers from the sovereigns for the committee to draft the intergovernmental agreement. Several Drafting Team members volunteered to serve on this committee, but Margot pointed out that she needed representatives from the sovereigns. There was discussion that instead of an intergovernmental agreement, letters from the various sovereigns might be as good and could possibly be more quickly obtained. The facilitation team was tasked with sending out an e-mail to the Planning Group on this subject and coordinating with Margot to help staff this committee.

Public Input

Todd Iveson, of the State of Missouri Attorney General's office, commented that the discussion about federal agency participation missed an important point. At the end of the day yesterday (9/25), the Drafting Team was stalemated on this question, but people were willing to work together and as a result this compromise position was developed. He also commented that the endorsement by the federal agencies of MRRIC consensus recommendations was an important facet of developing trust between the Committee and the agencies.

Wrap Up

John Thorson commented that the Missouri River Basin Interagency Roundtable (MRBIR) has requested a status report on MRRIC from the Co-Chairs and the facilitation team at its meeting on September 27^t.

Cheryl added that she been a requested to do an annual report in December to a group of executives from the electric utility industry.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.

Appendix A

Meeting Attendance on 9/25/07

DRAFTING TEAM	
Name	Affiliation
Asbury, Randy	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Barfield, David	State of Kansas
Beacom, William	Missouri River Navigation Caucus
Cassidy, Patrick	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Cookson, Dave	State of Nebraska
Drew, John	State of Missouri
Gibbs, Joseph	Missouri Levee Districts
Good Bird, Bonnie	Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nations
Graves, Thomas	Mid-West Electric Consumers Association
Hamilton, Elizabeth	Iowa Corn Growers Association
Horner, Gabrielle	The Nature Conservancy
Johnson, Dave	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District
Kitto, Felix	Santee Sioux Nation
Lay, William	Howard County Commission
Majeres, Jack	Moody County Conservation District
Marquis, Vicki	Missouri River Conservation Districts Council
Meisner, Don "Skip"	State of Iowa
Meng, Lanny	Missouri Levee and Drainage District Association
Mires, Larry	St. Mary Rehabilitation Working Group
Muench, Lynn	American Waterways Operators-Mid-Continent Region
Provost, Tony	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Rath, Mark	State of South Dakota
Ryckman, Fred	State of North Dakota
Schrempp, Tom	WaterOne
Schwarz, David	Yellowstone River Conservation District Council
Schwellenbach, Stan	City of Pierre
Smith, Joe	Standing Rock Sioux
Snyder, Darwin	Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska
Walters, Bob	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Williamson, Bob	City of Kansas City, Missouri
MRRIC PLANNING GROUP CO-CHAIRS	
Chapman, Cheryl	Matrix Consulting
Thorson, John	California Public Utilities Commission (Participation does not represent CPUC)
ALTERNATES (Attended in addition to Primary – not at the table)	
Donovan, Nate	State of Nebraska
Drew, John	State of Missouri
REVIEW PANEL	
N/A	

Appendix A

FEDERAL WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TEAM	
Fritz, Dan	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
McSharry, Heather	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Roth, Mary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Stas, Nick	Western Area Power Administration
Stokes, Leroy	Natural Resources Conservation Services
OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL WORKING GROUP	
Ames, Joel	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Cieslik, Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
George, Mike	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hargrave, Rose	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jennings, Sue	National Park Service
Kluck, Doug	National Weather Service/NOAA
Larson, Darin	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Mac, Mike	U.S. Geological Survey
Reinig, Teresa	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Seeronen, John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Switzer, Jennifer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Zallen, Margot	U.S. Department of the Interior
MRRIC PLANNING GROUP FACILITATION TEAM	
Huston, Douglas	AccuEdit Writing Services, LLC
Miller, Steve	Olsson Associates
Siguenza, Ruth	Ruth Siguenza, LLC
U.S. INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION	
Eng, Mike	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Lewis, Pat	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
OBSERVERS	
Iveson, Todd	State of Missouri, Attorney General's Office
Pope, David	Missouri River Association of States and Tribes
Sellers, Randy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Appendix B

Meeting Attendance on 9/26/07

DRAFTING TEAM	
Name	Affiliation
Asbury, Randy	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Barfield, David	State of Kansas
Beacom, William	Missouri River Navigation Caucus
Cassidy, Patrick	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Cookson, Dave	State of Nebraska
Drew, John	State of Missouri
Gibbs, Joseph	Missouri Levee Districts
Good Bird, Bonnie	Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nations
Graves, Thomas	Mid-West Electric Consumers Association
Hamilton, Elizabeth	Iowa Corn Growers Association
Horner, Gabrielle	The Nature Conservancy
Johnson, Dave	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District
Kitto, Felix	Santee Sioux Nation
Lay, William	Howard County Commission
Majeres, Jack	Moody County Conservation District
Marquis, Vicki	Missouri River Conservation Districts Council
Meisner, Don "Skip"	State of Iowa
Meng, Lanny	Missouri Levee and Drainage District Association
Mires, Larry	St. Mary Rehabilitation Working Group
Muench, Lynn	American Waterways Operators-Mid-Continent Region
Provost, Tony	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Rath, Mark	State of South Dakota
Ryckman, Fred	State of North Dakota
Schrempp, Tom	WaterOne
Schwarz, David	Yellowstone River Conservation District Council
Schwellenbach, Stan	City of Pierre
Smith, Joe	Standing Rock Sioux
Walters, Bob	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Williamson, Bob	City of Kansas City, Missouri
MRRIC PLANNING GROUP CO-CHAIRS	
Chapman, Cheryl	Matrix Consulting
Thorson, John	California Public Utilities Commission (Participation does not represent CPUC)
ALTERNATES (Attended in addition to Primary – not at the table)	
Donovan, Nate	State of Nebraska
Drew, John	State of Missouri
REVIEW PANEL	
N/A	

Appendix B

FEDERAL WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TEAM	
Cothorn, Joe	Environmental Protection Agency
Fritz, Dan	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
McSharry, Heather	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Olson, Mike	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Roth, Mary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Stas, Nick	Western Area Power Administration
Stokes, Leroy	Natural Resources Conservation Services
OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL WORKING GROUP	
Ames, Joel	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Cieslik, Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
George, Mike	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hargrave, Rose	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jennings, Sue	National Park Service
Kluck, Doug	National Weather Service/NOAA
Larson, Darin	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Mac, Mike	U.S. Geological Survey
Reinig, Teresa	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Seeronen, John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Switzer, Jennifer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Zallen, Margot	U.S. Department of the Interior
MRRIC PLANNING GROUP FACILITATION TEAM	
Huston, Douglas	AccuEdit Writing Services, LLC
Miller, Steve	Olsson Associates
Siguenza, Ruth	Ruth Siguenza, LLC
U.S. INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION	
Eng, Mike	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Lewis, Pat	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
OBSERVERS	
Askew, John	Region 7, Environmental Protection Agency
Iveson, Todd	State of Missouri, Attorney General's Office
Pope, David	Missouri River Association of States and Tribes