



# Contents

Summary .....	1
Meeting Minutes .....	3
Day One: Monday, August 27, 2007 .....	3
Meeting Opening and Introductions .....	3
Adoption of July Meeting Minutes and Summary.....	4
Charter Language Committee Reports .....	4
Scope and Purpose Committee.....	4
Membership Committee .....	5
Logistics Committee.....	5
Convening Authority Committee .....	6
Decision Making Committee .....	6
Science Committee .....	7
Review Panel Input.....	7
Federal Working Group Update.....	7
Public Comment .....	8
Public Workshop Proposal .....	8
Meeting Schedule.....	9
Wrap Up.....	9
Feedback on Today’s Meeting .....	9
Day Two: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 .....	10
Meeting Opening .....	10
Proposed DRAFT Charter Language.....	10
Scope and Purpose Committee.....	10
Agency Response to MRRIC Recommendations .....	10
Membership Committee .....	10
Logistics Committee.....	12
Public Workshops.....	12
Meeting Schedule.....	12
Review Panel Input.....	13
Public Comment .....	13
Discussion Following Public Comment.....	13
Wrap Up.....	14
Feedback on How the Meeting Went .....	14
Appendix A      Meeting Attendance on 8/27/07 .....	15
Appendix B      Meeting Attendance on 8/28/07 .....	17

## Summary

The Drafting Team for the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (MRRIC) Planning Group met in Billings, Montana on Monday and Tuesday, August 27 and 28, 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.

Between the July meeting in Omaha, Nebraska and the Billings meeting, the Drafting Team formed several committees to work on proposed charter language via conference call and e-mail. These committees were Science, Membership, Decision Making, Scope and Purpose, Convening Authority, and Logistics. The meeting in Billings was devoted to reviewing committee work, reaching consensus on the proposed language, and continuing to work on language that was not yet complete.

The Drafting Team reached consensus on the DRAFT Charter language regarding MRRIC scope and purpose, decision making, and agency response to MRRIC recommendations.

With respect to decision making, the MRRIC will make decisions by consensus. Some issues with decision making remain outstanding. The method for determining a quorum has not been finalized, and whether the federal agencies will be a part of the decision making process or not has also not been decided yet. The Drafting Team asked the federal agency representatives present at the Billings meetings to return to their agencies and attempt to gauge how they would feel about being part of the decision making process if an abstention option was available.

In the process of discussing MRRIC decision making, the Drafting Team determined that it needed to include language explaining the MRRIC's expectations regarding federal agency response to recommendations. This language was developed the evening of the first day and accepted by the Drafting Team on day two. The MRRIC requests that entities receiving recommendations from the Committee report within a certain time frame on their intentions and plans for those recommendations and make regular reports on the status of implementing any recommendations.

With respect to the MRRIC's scope and purpose, the Drafting Team determined that the Committee would provide recommendations to the Secretary of the Army and affected governmental entities on mitigation, recovery, and restoration issues along the Missouri River and its tributaries.

The Membership Committee did not bring language to the Drafting Team meeting but developed a list of affected interests, issues, and concerns with membership. However, a member of the committee did develop a membership proposal just prior to the meeting which was discussed at the meeting, and another member developed proposed language during the meeting which was also discussed by the Drafting Team.

The Drafting Team's concerns with regard to membership include ensuring all affected interests have a voice in the process; determining whether federal agencies will be involved in the MRRIC decision making process; developing a method for determining whether a quorum is present; and developing a fair, open membership selection process. The Drafting Team decided to continue to work on resolving these issues and developing proposed DRAFT Charter language via conference call between the August and September meetings.

The Logistics, Convening Authority, and Science Committees brought proposed language to the Billings meeting, but due to time constraints, the Drafting Team was unable to consider their proposals in detail. The Logistics committee proposed that the MRRIC should have a governance structure composed of a chair, vice-chair, an executive committee, and an executive secretary. It proposed terms of office for members, the chair, and the vice-chair. The Convening Authority Committee suggested that the MRRIC should conduct periodic self-evaluations to determine whether there was still a need for the Committee and make annual reports on its activities to congress, the administration, and the public. The Science Committee proposed language on the formation and operation of sub-committees, working groups, and independent panels.

These Drafting Team committees will continue to work and refine these proposals via conference calls between the August and September meetings, and the Drafting Team will discuss this language for possible approval at the September meeting.

In response to a request from the Drafting Team at the July meeting, the facilitation team presented a proposal for a series of public workshops to be conducted in November to gather public input on the proposed MRRIC DRAFT Charter. The initial proposal involved three workshops in three cities in the basin. The Drafting Team modified this proposal such that it now includes one face-to-face workshop on November 8, 2007, in Omaha, Nebraska, and a PowerPoint/Flash Media presentation to be placed on the MRRIC Web site. The public will be able to submit comments via the MRRIC Web site, and will be notified of the November meeting and the existence of the PowerPoint presentation via e-mail using various agencies' distribution lists.

The Drafting Team also developed a time line and meeting schedule for the remainder of the project. The next Drafting Team meeting will be held September 27 and 28, 2007, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. A full Planning Group meeting will be held on October 17 and 18, 2007, in Kansas City, Missouri prior to the November public workshop and again on November 28 and 29, 2007, in Denver, Colorado to review public feedback on the proposed DRAFT Charter. The public comment period for the DRAFT MRRIC Charter will run from October 22 until November 21, 2007. The Drafting Team will hold a final meeting on January 23 and 24 in St. Louis, Missouri.

# Meeting Minutes

The Drafting Team for the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (MRRIC) Planning Group met in Billings, Montana on Monday and Tuesday, August 27 and 28, 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.

A summary of the agenda items covered and the results of these discussions follows.

## Day One: Monday, August 27, 2007

### Meeting Opening and Introductions

Co-Chair John Thorson called the meeting to order at 8:30 am and shared with Team members the parallels between the meeting of William Pick and Edward Sloan in Billings in the fall of 1954 and this meeting of the MRRIC Drafting Team in Billings.

Following John's opening remarks, Steve Miller of the facilitation team conducted the roll call as required by the Planning Group's *Final Operating Procedures and Ground Rules*. The Federal Working Group members, Review Panel members, and other observers seated along the wall introduced themselves.

Following the roll call and introductions, Co-Chair Cheryl Chapman welcomed Liz Ching from Senator Baucus's office.

Also present at the meeting at various times and recognized by John Thorson were Rachel Stagg of U. S. Senator Jon Tester's office and Seth Broesder from Congressman Dennis Rehberg's office.

Nick Stas, of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), informed the Drafting Team that the WAPA's Upper Great Plains Regional Office was located in Billings and that Robert Harris, the regional manager, was present if team members would like to meet him.

Cheryl introduced the agenda for the meeting. She reviewed the goals of the meeting and discussed the amount of time allotted to working on various sections of the charter. The Drafting Team requested that Decision Making be moved up on the agenda to one of the first items to be discussed. The agenda was adopted by the Drafting Team with that change incorporated.

## **Adoption of July Meeting Minutes and Summary**

Doug Huston reviewed the comments he had received from Planning Group members on the draft July minutes and summary. The Drafting Team discussed the length of the summary and decided that future summaries should be no longer than two (2) pages. The July meeting minutes and summary were approved as modified by the previously received Planning Group comments.

## **Charter Language Committee Reports**

The project lead facilitator, Ruth Siguenza, opened the discussion of the draft charter outline by reviewing the structure and contents of the outline and laid out a suggested path for working through the proposed charter language contained in the outline. She then asked the various committees to report on their work.

### **Scope and Purpose Committee**

Steve Miller, who facilitated the Scope and Purpose Committee conference calls, asked Jason Skold, who had been involved in the development of the language, to brief the Drafting Team.

Jason reviewed the process the committee had used to develop the proposed language in the charter outline. The Scope and Purpose Committee initially developed a set of questions relating to scope and purpose, and members of the committee volunteered to research the answers to those questions. Based on these answers, the requirements of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), and input from individual members of the Scope and Purpose Committee, the committee developed a blanket statement of purpose and scope for the MRRIC.

The Drafting Team discussed its concerns with ensuring that human issues were considered during restoration and recovery activities. There was discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of broad vs. specific charter language. There was also concern about the possibility of the MRRIC getting involved in work on the tributaries.

Tribal representatives were interested in adding language to this section regarding tribal sovereignty and government to government consultation. Tony Provost offered to develop this language in consultation with the other tribal members on the Drafting Team.

Following review of the proposed language presented by the Scope and Purpose Committee, Jason Skold, Lynn Muench, Vicki Marquis, Larry Mires, Fred Ryckman, Lanny Meng, Bill Lay, and Tom Graves volunteered to meet that evening (Monday, 9/27) and draft revised, proposed language.

## Membership Committee

Ruth facilitated the discussion on membership. The Membership Committee did not develop specific language on its phone calls. Instead, it developed a proposed list of membership categories and a list of issues that needed to be addressed in determining MRRIC membership.

Following the conference calls, a proposal to adopt the current Drafting Team membership as the founding members of the MRRIC was made. Some concerns with this proposal were whether this group adequately represented the stakeholders of the basin and what it would appear like to outsiders if this proposal was accepted. There was also a concern that WRDA has some specific language regarding membership and if the MRRIC charter did not reflect the WRDA language it might be ineffective.

Other membership issues discussed by the Drafting Team on day one of the August meeting included expanding the federal agency representation to include the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the possible effects on the committee of the loss of travel compensation under WRDA, whether the charter membership language should be closely based on WRDA or not, and the fact that there are many stakeholders not currently represented on the Drafting Team.

The Drafting Team decided that a group of people would meet that evening and work on proposed membership language. Lanny Meng, Larry Mires, Tom Schrempp, Jack Majeres, and Joe Gibbs volunteered to be that group.

## Logistics Committee

The Logistics Committee reported that it had reviewed charters developed for other, similar groups and developed language based on those charters. This language proposes that the MRRIC have a chair and vice-chair selected from the committee, an executive committee with members selected from the MRRIC, and an executive secretary who would be an employee of the MRRIC. In developing the language, the committee's major concerns were that the MRRIC was going to need funding and administrative support to accomplish its tasks.

The Drafting Team was concerned that selecting the chair and co-chair from the committee would result in an interest group losing its representative, and if the executive secretary was from a federal agency there was a potential for a conflict of interest. The point was made that the chair's alternate could step in and represent that specific interest, and the executive secretary was strictly an administrative position.

## Convening Authority Committee

The Drafting Team discussed the self-evaluation process language proposed by the Convening Authority Committee. The Team was concerned about who this report was intended for and that a self-evaluation might paint too rosy a picture of the MRRIC's work. There was agreement that the MRRIC needed to periodically evaluate its need for continued existence.

## Decision Making Committee

The Drafting Team discussed the proposed language on how to handle the situation where consensus could not be reached and whether the federal agencies would be part of the decision making process. Some concerns about not reaching consensus involved how this would be recorded in the minutes and whether dissenting opinions would be forwarded to the federal agencies. It was pointed out that the proposed language allows the MRRIC to forward recommendations only if consensus is reached, so dissenting opinions would not be forwarded. With respect to how a situation where consensus was not reached would be documented in the minutes, the Drafting Team restored language to the proposed DRAFT Charter which requires that the meeting minutes not characterize or quantify the level of support for differing views. With respect to federal agency participation in the decision making process, no decision was reached.

The Team also had a lengthy discussion of the requirement to take two meetings to reach consensus. The concern was, for some issues, the two meeting requirement seemed excessive and might prevent the MRRIC from providing timely advice. The other perspective was that the two meeting requirement had been added to allow team members to consult with their constituents before approving a recommendation. The team decided to modify the language to allow the two step process to be waived by consensus except for recommendations to federal or other agencies. A decision was made that a definition of meeting was needed to ensure it was clear to everyone what the two step process involved.

The group discussed the definition of a quorum included in this section. The concern was the potential effect of non-attendance of members on the quorum requirements. Several possible solutions to this problem were proposed including determining a quorum based on a rolling average of the attendance at the most recent two meetings or basing a quorum on a percentage of the interest groups represented, not actual members. The Drafting Team decided to remove the quorum definition language from this section and have the decision making section state "In no instance shall the Committee convey consensus recommendations without a quorum."

The team also decided it needed a step in this section to state its expectations on how federal agencies should respond to the MRRIC's advice. Lynn Muench volunteered to draft this language.



## Science Committee

The Drafting Team discussed at length the doctrine of "first, do no harm," as defined in Appendix A of Draft MRRIC Charter Outline v12. There was discussion that this doctrine applied to both wildlife and humans. There was concern expressed that this doctrine meant "do no harm," which is not realistic. Some of the proponents of this doctrine indicated that it was about looking for alternatives if an action causes negative impacts, to avoid harm. In place of "first, do no harm," the Drafting Team suggested that the MRRIC identify negative impacts of proposed actions, avoid these impacts if possible, minimize the impacts, and recommend actions to mitigate them.

The Drafting Team also discussed requesting or requiring federal agencies to report to the MRRIC on recovery and restoration plans and activities. There was discussion of which agencies should provide reports. Some suggestions were the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

## Review Panel Input

Members of the Review Panel introduced themselves to the Planning Group

Dick Iverson, representing the general public, discussed his interest in irrigation issues along the Missouri River. He pointed out that there were about 150 irrigators that rely on individual pump sites. He also brought along a poster which depicted scenes from a successful irrigation effort that involved three different agencies working together.

Deb Madison, representing the Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes, pointed out that the Missouri River is the southern boundary of the reservation and is a very important resource to the tribes. She is very interested in the membership of the MRRIC. In particular, she is interested in ensuring the river tribes and other basin tribes are adequately represented.

Tim Bryggman, of the State of Montana, pointed out that Montana has many interests along the Missouri River and also has fish and wildlife responsibilities along the river.

## Federal Working Group Update

The Federal Working Group reported on its last conference call on August 15, 2007. The group is pleased with the progress the Drafting Team is making and is appreciative of its work. The Federal Working Group requested that the meeting summary be shortened in order to give federal executives an incentive to read it.

The Federal Working Group commented that the MRRIC Web site should have a statement of purpose on the first page. This concern was echoed by members of the Drafting Team.

The next Missouri River Basin Interagency Roundtable (MRBIR) meeting will be September 27, 2007, to enable federal executives to observe the Drafting Team meeting the day before.

Additionally, pursuant to requests from the Drafting Team, the Federal Working Group had compiled definitions of the terms restoration, recovery, and adaptive management and offered them to the Drafting Team. It also asked for Drafting Team input on a schedule to present the list of all activities presently in progress in the basin. The Drafting Team discussed whether it wanted this information as a read-ahead for the next meeting and/or as a presentation at the next meeting. The Drafting Team decided it wanted both a read-ahead and a presentation at the next meeting. The Federal Working Group made the point that there are many plans and asked the Drafting Team members for assistance in narrowing down which plans they were interested in.

The Drafting Team returned to the question of what does "plan in existence on the date of enactment of this act" mean? The Federal Working Group reported that there was no comprehensive plan in existence right now. There is the Biological Opinion and money available from the Missouri River Recovery and Restoration Program. The Drafting Team was also concerned that the MRRIC have the ability to comment on recovery and restoration plans developed in the future.

### **Public Comment**

Margo Zallen, U.S. Department of the Interior, commented that the first sentence in the Decision Making section was unclear. She thinks the Drafting Team means to say that the MRRIC makes recommendations on substantive issues. The Drafting Team decided to add definitions for "recommendations" and "substantive issue" to the DRAFT Charter.

Rose Hargrave, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, pointed out that WRDA Section 2304 involves the independent review of projects and what is mandatory or discretionary. Projects over \$45 million require mandatory, independent review. She also pointed out that the federal agencies still have to fulfill their responsibilities to do government-to-government consultation with the tribes.

### **Public Workshop Proposal**

The Drafting Team discussed the public workshop proposal developed by the facilitation team. It asked if it was possible to develop a DVD to be mailed to a distribution list, provide a Web cast or video-tape of the public workshops, and reduce the number of actual face-to-face meetings to one. Ruth responded that the development of a video-tape or a web cast was currently out of scope, but she would research the feasibility of a number of options that evening.

There was some concern among Drafting Team members about travel expenses for attending the workshops. Mike Eng, of the U.S. Institute, informed the Drafting Team that the U.S. Institute would work with Drafting Team members on travel expenses if they wanted to attend the public workshops.

## **Meeting Schedule**

The Drafting Team discussed the schedule for the team's remaining meetings. The possibility of a three-day meeting in December and a meeting in January was discussed. Final decisions on the meeting schedule were deferred to day two.

## **Wrap Up**

Ruth reviewed the plans for the evening. Two groups will be meeting to work on Scope and Purpose, and Membership; Tony Provost will develop tribal sovereignty and consultation language to be included in the scope and purpose section; and Lynn Muench will develop language on agency response to MRRIC recommendations. The facilitation team will research the possibility of having a video component to the public feedback process.

### **Feedback on Today's Meeting**

Slower than expected but progress was made.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

## Day Two: Tuesday, August 28, 2007

### Meeting Opening

Co-Chair John Thorson called the meeting to order at 8:32 am.

Co-Chair Cheryl Chapman opened the meeting. She reported on the meeting she and John had with Mike Black, the incoming chair of MRBIR. A protocol for Drafting Team attendance at the September MRBIR is being developed. She thanked the Team members for their work the night before and reviewed the plan for the day. She thanked Vicki Marquis for the reception and dinner hosted by the Missouri River Conservation Districts Council Monday night.

### Proposed DRAFT Charter Language

#### Scope and Purpose Committee

The Drafting Team made some grammatical changes to the proposed tribal language and added language to the proposed Scope and Purpose section to require the MRRIC to identify actions that will benefit multiple uses of the river; avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts; and prevent further declines of other native species. They also added language to this section referring to WRDA and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as the legislative bases for the MRRIC's work. The Drafting Team accepted this language with these changes.

#### Agency Response to MRRIC Recommendations

The Drafting Team had a lengthy debate over the use of will and shall vs. requested and recommended. The concerns were that the MRRIC did not have the authority to mandate an action by a federal agency and to try to do so might result in difficulty getting the charter approved. The team decided to use requested and recommended in this section and changed the proposed language accordingly. There was also discussion as to where in the charter this language should appear. No final decision was made on this question although the Decision Making section was suggested. The Drafting Team accepted this proposed language as modified by the suggested changes.

#### Membership Committee

The Drafting Team had a lengthy discussion on the evening group's proposed language. The team was concerned about membership numbers, both total and how they would be distributed among various interests. There was concern that the interest groups identified in the previous evening's work did not adequately represent all the affected stakeholders. The problem of defining a quorum came up again without a resolution.

There was considerable discussion on the membership selection process. In particular, there was concern that the proposed membership selection process might be too exclusive and/or might present a negative appearance to others. The discussion on federal agency representation revolved around the still unanswered question of whether the MRRIC would be an integrated committee with the federal agencies participating in decision making and consensus or an advisory committee.

During the discussion on the language developed the previous evening, a Drafting Team member offered alternative language on membership.

The bulk of the discussion on this proposal revolved around the integration of the federal agencies into the decision making process. The Drafting Team was in favor of this, while several of the federal agencies expressed concerns over possible conflicts that could arise in this situation. Some of the concerns included being involved in discussions about actions they would then have to implement (conflict of interest) and conflicts with the regulatory responsibilities of some agencies.

Also, the Drafting Team expressed some concern over the number of at-large seats in the proposal. Some members were worried that with this large a single block of seats, a single group could be formed, which would dominate the discussions. The original intent behind having this many at-large seats in the proposal was to use them to balance the MRRIC representation between the upper and lower basin. An important aspect of the at-large seats discussed by the Drafting Team was its flexibility. It could allow a way for stakeholders not associated with organized groups a chance to participate. Conversely, at-large members could also be members of an identified interest group.

Another concern with this proposal included separating the power supply category into thermal and hydro-power and possibly even upper and lower basin groups.

The Drafting Team discussed the membership selection process proposed with this new language. Members were concerned that it was not their place to be de-selecting potential members. The group felt that the MRRIC could review applications for qualifications and submit them with recommendations to the convening authority, but all applications needed to be forwarded.

The Drafting Team decided to continue working on this proposal via teleconference following the meeting. The facilitation team was tasked with sending an e-mail by Thursday, August 30, 2007, to the Drafting Team with a proposal for a series of conference calls the week of September 3, 2007.

Dan Fuhman, Joe Gibbs, Randy Asbury, Larry Mires, Lanny Meng, Bill Beacom, Fred Ryckman, and Skip Meisner volunteered to work on the membership language over the phone.

## Logistics Committee

The Drafting Team reviewed the proposed language from the Logistics Committee and had concerns on the length of time for public notification of the meetings. Sixty days was suggested. There was also discussion of the frequency of meetings, but no decision was made.

The Drafting Team discussed having the MRRIC develop its own operating procedures and ground rules and placing the detailed information on meeting frequencies and notification timelines in these documents. The charter would contain only high-level statements of requirements.

The Drafting Team decided that a group would continue working on logistics language via conference call following the meeting. Tom Schrempp, Lanny Meng, Dave Johnson, Lynn Muench, and Tom Graves volunteered to be this group.

There was still some question as to who will receive the proposed charter when it is completed. John Thorson asked the Drafting Team if it would authorize the co-chairs to start drafting a transmittal letter and identifying issues that need to be addressed for that letter. The Drafting Team authorized the co-chairs to take that action. The team also commissioned the facilitation team to develop and draft the list of definitions that it had determined was necessary to include in the MRRIC DRAFT Charter.

## Public Workshops

Steve reported back to the Drafting Team on the question of having a video component to the public workshops. The facilitation team proposed that a PowerPoint/Flash Media presentation be developed and added to the MRRIC Web site. The public would be able to view this presentation and offer comments on the DRAFT Charter from the Web site. The existence of this presentation would be announced via a press release to local news media and an e-mailing to various interest lists such as that maintained by the Corps of Engineers. Finally, a face-to-face public workshop would be conducted in Omaha, Nebraska on November 8, 2007.

Stan Schwellenbach, Tom Schrempp, Jason Skold, Pat Cassidy, Skip Meisner, Joe Gibbs, Vicki Marquis, Bill Beacom, and Mike Wells volunteered to attend the November 8, 2007, workshop. Lynn Muench, Jack Majeres, and Tom Graves indicated they might be able to attend.

## Meeting Schedule

Ruth pointed out that there would be another Army Corps of Engineers Annual Operating Plan meeting the evening of October 18 in Kansas City to coincide with the Drafting Team meeting.

The Drafting Team worked on developing a meeting schedule for the rest of the project. It was concerned about timing. Once the DRAFT Charter is complete it will be sent out to numerous groups and agencies for review, including the public. It would be most efficient if the Drafting Team received all the feedback from these groups before meeting again. There was also concern about when the public comment period would start and how long it would last. Finally, there was some concern about being snowed in if the November meeting was held in Denver. The facilitation team was tasked with coming up with a proposed timeline and bringing it back to the team after the afternoon break.

Following the break, Ruth presented the new, proposed timeline. The public comment period would start Monday, October 22, 2007, and run for thirty (30) days, ending November 21, 2007. On November 13, 2007, the facilitation team would send out the comments it had received by that date. On November 20, 2007, comments received after November 13 would be sent out. On November 26, 2007, any remaining comments received would be sent out to the Planning Group.

The group discussed and agreed on a final meeting schedule:

- October 17 and 18 in Kansas City, Missouri. This will be a full Planning Group meeting.
- November 28 and 29 in Denver, Colorado. This will be a full Planning Group meeting.
- January 23 and 24 in St. Louis, Missouri. This will be a Drafting Team meeting.

## **Review Panel Input**

There were two Review Panel comments. One pointed out that a federal agency involved in the decision making process would be best equipped to take a recommendation up the ladder for approval. The other review panel member felt that this process should be strictly a stakeholder process and not involve the federal agencies in the decision making.

## **Public Comment**

Public representatives pointed out that an historic opportunity to change how things have been done in the basin could be missed if federal agencies chose not to serve on the MRRIC in an integrated, decision-making capacity. Having federal agencies at the table would force the issue being discussed to be a priority for them and make it easier to get recommendations to the levels they need to reach.

### **Discussion Following Public Comment**

A Drafting Team member pointed out that John Thorson had written a book concerning the Missouri River and asked if he would share his insights. John asked if there were any objections to this from the team. There being none, he pointed out that his recommendations remain essentially unchanged. The model would be a gang of four: a state caucus, a set of federal representatives, a set of tribal representatives, and a group of stakeholders. This group would

come together in a governing board for the basin. Beyond this group, there would be a larger Missouri River Assembly. John stated that he feels the integrated approach is the best approach for a complex problem. He closed his remarks by stating that the work the Drafting Team had done so far was phenomenal, and he was very encouraged by the efforts he has seen by members to set aside upper and lower basin labels and anticipate the needs of fellow team members.

Co-chair Cheryl Chapman voiced a concern on how the MRRIC would handle the situation where a federal agency stood between the Committee and consensus on an issue, assuming an integrated group in which federal agency representatives had a voice in the decision making and consensus process.

Mike Eng discussed a recent workshop he attended on the Klamath negotiations. He pointed out to the team that the workshop showed processes like this work best when federal agencies speak with one voice. Having an integrated MRRIC might make them a large, single block all with one position.

The Drafting Team asked Federal Working Group members to ask their agencies if they could live with being at the MRRIC table and being part of the consensus process if there was an abstention option.

## **Wrap Up**

Ruth reviewed the items to be covered in the September meeting:

DRAFT Charter language developed between August and September meetings

- Review of transmittal letter developed by the co-chairs
- Definitions
- Mary Roth presentation on recovery efforts and relationships between agencies and organizations involved in recovery
- Report back from the federal agencies on integrated vs. advisory question
- Federal agency review of timeline information in terms of providing the Drafting Team feedback on the draft charter

## **Feedback on How the Meeting Went**

Pat Cassidy invited the Planning Group to tour a coal fired plant the evening of October 17, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.



## Appendix A

## Meeting Attendance on 8/27/07

<b>DRAFTING TEAM</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Asbury, Randy	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Barfield, David	State of Kansas
Beacom, Bill	Missouri River Navigation Caucus
Cassidy, Patrick	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Catches Enemy, Michael	Oglala Sioux
Collins, Gary	Northern Arapaho Tribe
Donovan, Nate	State of Nebraska
Gibbs, Joseph	Missouri Levee Districts
Good Bird, Bonnie	Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nations
Graves, Thomas	Mid-West Electric Consumers Association
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
Sieck, David	Iowa Corn Growers Association
Skold, Jason	The Nature Conservancy
Wakeman, Elizabeth	Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe
Walters, Bob	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Wells, Mike	State of Missouri
Williamson, Bob	City of Kansas City, Missouri
<b>MRRIC PLANNING GROUP CO-CHAIRS</b>	
Chapman, Cheryl	Matrix Consulting
Thorson, John	California Public Utilities Commission (Participation does not represent CPUC)
<b>ALTERNATES (Attended in addition to Primary – not at the table)</b>	
Drew, John	State of Missouri
Parker, Mitchell	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Saul, Eugene	Santee Sioux Nation
<b>REVIEW PANEL</b>	
Bryggman, Tim	State of Montana
Iverson, Richard	Conservation Districts of Montana
Madison, Deb	Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes

## Appendix A

<b>FEDERAL WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TEAM</b>	
Cothorn, Joe	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
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
<b>OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL WORKING GROUP</b>	
Cieslik, Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hargrave, Rose	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Harris, Bob	Western Area Power Administration
Jennings, Sue	National Park Service
Larson, Darin	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Maddux, Henry	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Meyer, Jerry	U.S. Forest Service
Olson, Mike	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Reinig, Teresa	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Seeronen, John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Zallen, Margot	U.S. Department of the Interior
<b>MRRIC PLANNING GROUP FACILITATION TEAM</b>	
Huston, Douglas	AccuEdit Writing Services, LLC
Miller, Steve	Olsson Associates
Siguenza, Ruth	Ruth Siguenza, LLC
<b>U.S. INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION</b>	
Eng, Mike	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Lewis, Pat	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
<b>OBSERVERS</b>	
Bryan, Bill	State of Missouri
Cayou, Orville	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Ching, Liz	U.S. Senator Max Baucus's Office (MT)
Maddux, Max	St. Mary's Working Group & Chinook Division Irrigation Association
Stagg, Rachel	U.S. Senator Jon Tester's Office (MT)

## Appendix B

## Meeting Attendance on 8/28/07

<b>DRAFTING TEAM</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Asbury, Randy	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Barfield, David	State of Kansas
Beacom, Bill	Missouri River Navigation Caucus
Cassidy, Patrick	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Catches Enemy, Michael	Oglala Sioux
Collins, Gary	Northern Arapaho Tribe
Donovan, Nate	State of Nebraska
Gibbs, Joseph	Missouri Levee Districts
Good Bird, Bonnie	Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nations
Graves, Thomas	Mid-West Electric Consumers Association
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
Sieck, David	Iowa Corn Growers Association
Skold, Jason	The Nature Conservancy
Wakeman, Elizabeth	Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe
Walters, Bob	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Wells, Mike	State of Missouri
Williamson, Bob	City of Kansas City, Missouri
<b>MRRIC PLANNING GROUP CO-CHAIRS</b>	
Chapman, Cheryl	Matrix Consulting
Thorson, John	California Public Utilities Commission (Participation does not represent CPUC)
<b>ALTERNATES (Attended in addition to Primary – not at the table)</b>	
Drew, John	State of Missouri
Parker, Mitchell	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Saul, Eugene	Santee Sioux Nation
<b>REVIEW PANEL</b>	
Bryggman, Tim	State of Montana
Iverson, Richard	Conservation Districts of Montana
Madison, Deb	Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes

## Appendix B

<b>FEDERAL WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TEAM</b>	
Cothorn, Joe	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
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
<b>OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL WORKING GROUP</b>	
Cieslik, Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hargrave, Rose	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jennings, Sue	National Park Service
Larson, Darin	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Maddux, Henry	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Meyer, Jerry	U.S. Forest Service
Olson, Mike	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Reinig, Teresa	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Seeronen, John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Zallen, Margot	U.S. Department of the Interior
<b>MRRIC PLANNING GROUP FACILITATION TEAM</b>	
Huston, Douglas	AccuEdit Writing Services, LLC
Miller, Steve	Olsson Associates
Siguenza, Ruth	Ruth Siguenza, LLC
<b>U.S. INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION</b>	
Eng, Mike	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Lewis, Pat	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
<b>OBSERVERS</b>	
Broesder, Seth	U.S. Congressman Dennis Rehberg's Office
Bryan, Bill	State of Missouri
Carlson, Sarah	Montana Association of Conservation Districts
Cayou, Orville	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Christians, Karl	Montana Department of Natural Resources & Conservation
Maddux, Max	St. Mary's Working Group & Chinook Division Irrigation Association