

**Final Meeting Minutes  
Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee  
Drafting Team Meeting  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
June 19 and 20, 2007**

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Day One - Meeting Opening .....	1
Introduction Exercise - What's At Stake for You? .....	1
Facilitation Team Selection .....	1
Context of the Project - Federal Panel Interview .....	1
Water Resources Development Act (WRDA).....	2
Ground Rules and Operating Procedures Round-robin Discussion .....	2
Group and Operating Procedures Drafting .....	2
Day Two - Meeting Opening .....	3
Operating Procedures and Ground Rules .....	3
Roles and Responsibilities .....	3
Co-Chairs.....	3
Drafting Team.....	3
Review Panel.....	3
Federal Working Group .....	4
Facilitation Team .....	4
U.S. Institute .....	4
Dispute Resolution .....	4
Consensus and Decision Making.....	5
Process .....	5
Decision Making .....	5
Definition of Consensus.....	5
Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities.....	5
Scheduling.....	6
Agenda Items for the July meeting .....	6
Group Feedback.....	6
Adjourn .....	6
Meeting Minutes .....	7
Day One - Meeting Opening .....	7
Introduction Exercise: What's At Stake for You? .....	8
Facilitation Team Selection .....	8
Context of the Project - Federal Working Group Panel .....	8
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	9
Water Resources Development Act .....	13
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	13
Ground Rules and Operating Procedures .....	15
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments: .....	16
Draft Operating Procedures and Ground Rules.....	18
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	18
Representation of Interests .....	18
Preparation and Attendance .....	19
Sharing and Considering Information .....	19
Members and Alternates .....	19
Procedural Guidance .....	19
Adjourn .....	20

## Contents

Day Two - Meeting Opening .....	21
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	22
Operating Procedures and Ground Rules .....	23
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	23
Roles and Responsibilities .....	23
Co-Chairs.....	23
Drafting Team.....	24
Review Panel.....	24
Federal Working Group .....	25
Facilitation Team .....	25
U.S. Institute .....	26
Dispute Resolution .....	26
Consensus and Decision Making.....	27
Process .....	27
Decision Making .....	27
Definition of Consensus.....	28
Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities.....	28
Scheduling Of Future Meetings .....	29
Agenda Items for the July meeting .....	29
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	30
Next Steps.....	30
Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments .....	31
Feedback from the Drafting Team Members.....	31
Adjourn.....	31
Appendix A     Meeting Attendance on 6/19/07 .....	32
Appendix B     Meeting Attendance on 6/20/07 .....	34
Appendix C     Introduction Exercise .....	36

## Executive Summary

The Drafting Team for the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (MRRIC) Planning Group met in Minneapolis, Minnesota on Tuesday and Wednesday, June 19 and 20, 2007, to begin the process of developing a charter for the future of MRRIC.

The meeting was co-chaired by Cheryl Chapman of Rapid City, South Dakota and John Thorson of San Francisco, California. The meeting was facilitated by Ruth Siguenza, CPF, of Ruth Siguenza, LLC, and Steve Miller of Olsson Associates. Notes were taken by Doug Huston of AccuEdit Writing Services, LLC. Administrative support and contracting services were provided by the U.S Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute).

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

### **Day One - Meeting Opening**

The meeting was opened with introductions of the Co-Chairs, facilitation team, and opening remarks by the Co-Chairs.

### **Introduction Exercise - What's At Stake for You?**

Drafting Team members were asked to write what's at stake for them in this effort. See Appendix C for a compilation of their responses.

### **Facilitation Team Selection**

The Drafting Team's preferences for the four teams of finalists following the facilitation team interviews conducted on March 28, 2007, in Omaha were reviewed

### **Context of the Project - Federal Panel Interview**

The Drafting Team discussed with the Federal Working Group Panel:

- a. The history of the MRRIC Planning Group process - droughts in the 1980s raised citizen awareness of river issues and increased their desire to participate.
- b. Endangered species recovery - pallid sturgeon, least tern, and piping plover are major species of concern.

- c. Charter content - the Charter should require MRRIC to make recommendations to the federal government on what federal agencies should do for recovery on Missouri River.
- d. The relationship between Missouri River Natural Resources Committee(MRNRC), and Missouri River Association of States and Tribes(MoRAST). MRNRC is a group of state agencies with conservation duties on the river; MoRAST is a new group whose focus is not yet clear.

## **Water Resources Development Act (WRDA)**

Members of the Federal Working Group presented the Drafting Team with an update on WRDA. The senate version has some language on MRRIC, the house version does not. The bill is currently stalled.

## **Ground Rules and Operating Procedures Round-robin Discussion**

Individual Drafting Team members provided their input on what they consider important characteristics for the Planning Group's operating procedures.

## **Group and Operating Procedures Drafting**

The Drafting Team began working through the draft operating procedures and ground rules. They successfully reached consensus on the contents of the following sections:

- a. Individual Responsibilities
- b. Representation of Interests
- c. Preparation and Attendance
- d. Sharing and Considering Information
- e. Members and Alternates
- f. Procedural Guidance

Co-Chair John Thorson thanked the group for their efforts and adjourned the meeting for the day at 6:00 pm.

## Day Two - Meeting Opening

Co-Chair John Thorson called the meeting to order at 8:04 am. Mike Catches Enemy led the group in an opening invocation at John's invitation.

Ruth Siguenza reviewed the parking lot issues from the previous day.

## Operating Procedures and Ground Rules

The Drafting Team proceeded to work its way through the draft operating procedures and ground rules.

## Roles and Responsibilities

### Co-Chairs

The Drafting Team was quite concerned about transparency in the Co-Chairs' dealings with group members. Changes were suggested and adopted to address this concern.

### Drafting Team

The Drafting Team discussed the development and ultimate approval process for the MRRIC Charter. Understanding the approval process was added to the Parking Lot for future discussion

There was also concern about changes being made to the Recommended Charter once it got into the approval process.

Consensus was reached on changes to this section to require the Drafting Team to develop a work plan and submit a Recommended Charter to the appropriate federal decision makers.

### Review Panel

The Drafting Team discussions on this item were administrative in nature and dealt with defining the Review Panel's duties. These duties include:

1. Review materials developed by the Drafting Team
2. Provide feedback to the Drafting Team
3. Meet with the Drafting Team at designated times

## **Federal Working Group**

The Drafting Team again discussed how to deal with changes to the Recommended Charter after it had been submitted to the appropriate federal agencies for adoption.

Consensus was reached on changes to the operating procedures to make it clear that if the Charter is changed in the review process it can no longer be considered the Drafting Team's product.

## **Facilitation Team**

The Drafting Team had two major concerns with this section:

1. Transparency
2. Timeliness of information

There was also discussion of the development of the MRRIC Web site and its content.

The group reached consensus on changes surrounding timely distribution of meeting materials and collaboration between the facilitation team and the Planning Group.

## **U.S. Institute**

The Drafting Team's primary concern with this section was a potential loss of transparency if the U.S. Institute acted as a liaison between the Federal Working Group, the facilitation team, and the Co-Chairs. Ultimately, no changes were made to this section.

## **Dispute Resolution**

The Drafting Team's main concern with this section was its ability to enforce any dispute resolution process. The group was also concerned about involving the federal agencies in disputes among the Drafting Team members.

The Drafting Team reached consensus on changes to this section which created two different processes: one for Planning Group members and one for the Co-Chairs, facilitation team, and U.S. Institute staff.

## Consensus and Decision Making

### Process

The group discussed at length the process to be followed if consensus was not reached and the two-day requirement for reaching consensus.

They decided to change the section to allow the two-day requirement to be waived by agreement of the entire group.

### Decision Making

The Drafting Team had three concerns on this section:

- a. What do we do if consensus is not reached?
- b. If we allow a Charter to go forward without complete consensus what is the motivation to work for consensus?
- c. The level of consensus must not be characterized numerically.

The Drafting Team decided, in the event consensus wasn't reached, to let the Charter go forward with differing viewpoints documented and without characterizing the level of consensus that was achieved for any of the viewpoints.

### Definition of Consensus

Despite some continuing concerns about the consensus process, the group agreed that the process and language added to the procedures was good as is.

This section defined consensus as, "For the purpose of the MRRIC Planning Group process, consensus means that all members of the Drafting Team can support or live with an action or recommendation."

### Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities

The Drafting Team was concerned about how potential abstentions would be handled. The group decided that abstentions would not be quantified in the meeting records.

## **Scheduling**

The Drafting Team decided on the following future meeting dates:

### **July:**

Dates: 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> with the long day being the 19<sup>th</sup>  
Location: Omaha, Nebraska

### **August:**

Dates: 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> with the long day on the 28<sup>th</sup>  
Location: Billings, Montana

### **September:**

Dates: 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup>, both days being full days  
Location: Minneapolis, Minnesota

Further scheduling for October, November, and December was deferred to the July Drafting Team meeting.

## **Agenda Items for the July meeting**

The Facilitation Team reviewed the parking lot items and the topics identified for the July agenda.

## **Group Feedback**

Feedback on the meeting from the Drafting Team included:

- Meetings may need to be longer
- The group needs to use its time more efficiently
- Materials need to get to the group as soon as possible to allow for adequate preparation.

## **Adjourn**

The co-chairs thanked the group, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:03 pm.

# Meeting Minutes

## Day One - Meeting Opening

Planning Group Co-Chair Cheryl Chapman opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and reminding them that only Drafting Team members should be seated at the table with alternates and other parties in the room but not around the table. She complimented the Drafting Team members on their dedication. She mentioned that there was a sign-up sheet outside the meeting room for meeting attendees and for public comment. She also introduced John Thorson, Co-Chair, and Ruth Siguenza, the meeting facilitator.

Cheryl commented that the group had a lot of work ahead of it and discussed several agenda items: reviewing the facilitation team selection criteria, hearing from a federal agency panel, adopting Planning Group operating procedures and ground rules, establishing a meeting schedule, and beginning to think about what should be in a charter for MRRIC.

Cheryl reviewed the specifics of Tuesday's and Wednesday's agenda with the group and asked for questions and comments. There were none. At that time she turned the time over to Co-Chair John Thorson.

John discussed his experiences dealing with the severe drought in California and the impact endangered species issues had on the distribution of water in the state. He pointed out this effort would have a profound effect on the future of the Missouri River Basin, culturally and economically, and encouraged the team to work together.

Ruth Siguenza introduced the other members of the facilitation team at the meeting: Steve Miller, her co-facilitator, and Doug Huston, the team's note taker and technical editor. She then asked Mike Eng to discuss the reception which would follow the meeting. Mike provided information on the reception's location and time and discussed the challenges that federal agencies have in supplying food for a get-together like this. He asked for additional contributors for this event and acknowledged those who had already contributed. He also mentioned that he would be taking pictures of Planning Group members and would need those who had not already signed release forms to see Pat Lewis.

Ruth then discussed the meeting management charts on the wall and explained what each one was for. She reminded people that this was a chartering effort. She then discussed the scheduling charts and

explained to the team how to indicate on them the dates they could attend meetings in the months to come.

Ruth then asked for questions on the wall charts. There were questions as to how the dates on the charts were determined. Ruth explained that these dates were determined by the availability of the Co-Chairs and the facilitation team. Some members of the Drafting Team then explained that during the application process they had filled out a questionnaire indicating what dates were best for them for meetings and requested that this information be used in the meeting scheduling process. Ruth asked group members to add sticky notes on dates they could not attend meetings. She also promised to present a revised meeting schedule the following day that reflected the input from the wall charts and from the application questionnaires.

### **Introduction Exercise: What's At Stake for You?**

Following the discussion on scheduling, Ruth explained the introduction exercise. The Drafting Team discussed possibly skipping this exercise as there was a lot of work to do on this agenda and not much time. Other suggestions for saving time on the agenda included doing away with the federal panel presentation or dealing with some items on the agenda by providing handouts outside the meeting. The Drafting Team decided they would continue per the agenda.

See Appendix C for a compilation of the group's responses to this exercise.

### **Facilitation Team Selection**

Following the introduction exercise, the facilitation team was excused from the room while Mike Eng from the U.S. Institute explained the facilitation team selection process.

### **Context of the Project - Federal Working Group Panel**

Cheryl and John introduced the Federal Working Group Panel portion of the agenda and invited the members of the panel to introduce themselves. They then asked the panel to provide some background on the formation of this Planning Group.

The panel discussed the history of the Missouri main stem system. Nineteen eighty seven was a dry year, and 1988 was similar. When local citizens questioned why reservoir levels were dropping, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers responded that they were following the *Missouri*

*River Mainstem System Master Water Control Manual (Master Manual).* Few people outside the Corps were familiar with the Master Manual. After reviewing it, many stakeholders decided they did not like what was in the Master Manual and wanted it changed. During the 15 year change process, many issues came up including citizen displeasure with how threatened and endangered species were being managed. The Corps decided it needed a way to get stakeholders involved in this process as they felt they needed that to ensure a good job was done and to gain congressional support for their efforts. Thus, the Recovery Implementation Committee idea was developed.

## **Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments**

*What species are being recovered in this basin?*

The Federal Working Group panel members responded that the pallid sturgeon, the least tern, and the piping plover were the three main species of concern. The panel explained that one of the main reasons MRRIC was being formed was to implement an adaptive management approach to recovery, which places great importance on stakeholder involvement.

*How will the Drafting Team's work be used and what effect will it have?*

The panel explained that they wanted to break away from the old habit of having the federal government decide what actions to take before involving the stakeholders. In this case, they wanted stakeholder input first. They viewed the Drafting Team as the stakeholder's group, not the federal agencies' group.

*What should go into the Charter for MRRIC?*

Generally, it should require MRRIC to make recommendations to the federal government on what federal agencies should do towards recovery on the Missouri River. There was also discussion on how the charter will be approved. The Drafting Team product will be called the Recommended Charter and will go back to the Federal Working Group. From there, the agency(or agencies) with lead responsibility will formally adopt a Charter for MRRIC. The lead agency has not yet been determined. The panel stated that whatever the Drafting Team consensus recommendation is will very likely go forward as recommended.

*Why is the Department of the Interior involved?*

The panel responded that Title 18 of the U.S. Code mandates protection of endangered species by all federal agencies. The panel also discussed other agencies and groups that were involved and affected by this. They commented that several federal laws encourage this type of collaborative effort and cited an example from the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The panel also commented that public consultation is very important to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process as well.

*Is there anything about the MRRIC process that will change the relationship between the various federal agencies? Would this be a positive influence on them?*

The panel responded that they didn't think it would make any changes to the relationships between various agencies; however, many agencies were stepping up with funds for this process. One panel member mentioned that having a collaborative group of stakeholders working on these issues might facilitate cooperation between the agencies.

*Will MRRIC have any impact on tribal or state authority?*

The panel responded that the federal government has a very special relationship with the tribes including the requirement for government to government consultations. MRRIC will not replace these government to government requirements. The panel commented that the states and tribes would not give up any of their rights or sovereignty in this process. The federal government is just asking for a good faith effort to develop consensus on these issues in the basin.

Cheryl pointed out to the group that everyone received an Appendix A document that compiled the regulations, executive orders, and policies associated with MRRIC.

Members of the Drafting Team pointed out that Appendix A did not contain any information on tribal treaties and offered to help revise it. There was a suggestion to change the terms tribal consultation in the appendix to government-to-government consultation. The panel responded that this appendix was a work in progress and that it will be updated. It currently is not comprehensive and they would appreciate any feedback on it.

Cheryl informed the group that if they had feedback on Appendix A, they should give it to the facilitation team who will ensure it gets to the Federal Working Group.

Members of the Drafting Team also asked if a list could be made of the legal court decisions that affect this group. Another team member cautioned people to avoid the use of acronyms and other jargon since many people are not familiar with these terms.

*Where does your authority come from, and how does your process work?*

The panel explained that initially, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers began discussing the possibility of forming a stakeholder advisory group as part of their consultations on endangered species recovery. Other federal agencies also supported this idea. A situation assessment was conducted to determine the feasibility of establishing a stakeholder advisory committee. Based on the recommendations of this situation assessment, the Federal Working Group was formed about a year ago by the Missouri River Interagency Roundtable and tasked with coming up with a framework for bringing stakeholders into the process.

*The Drafting Team noted that a couple federal agencies weren't represented on the panel and asked why?*

The panel explained that they did not want to overwhelm the Drafting Team with people so they chose six individuals to represent the Federal Working Group at Planning Group meetings.

Members of the Drafting Team also asked to be provided with a chart of all the various agencies on the Federal Working Group and how they relate to each other. Another point of confusion was the difference between the Missouri River Natural Resources Committee (MRNRC) and the Federal Working Group. The panel explained the Federal Working Group was created specifically to get the MRRIC process in place; MRNRC, on the other hand, is an association of various state agencies with fish and wildlife responsibilities for the river.

The Drafting Team was very interested in the depth of commitment of the Federal Working Group to implement the recommended charter. The panel replied there was a commitment to implement the charter as received. If the Federal Working Group cannot implement the recommended charter as

received, they must come back and explain why they cannot to the Drafting Team. The panel commented that since everyone, including the Federal Working Group, was involved in this process this should not happen since the Federal Working Group representatives could bring problematic areas to the Drafting Team's attention during the drafting process.

The Drafting Team was also interested in the relationship between the MRNRC and the Missouri River Association of States and Tribes (MoRAST). The panel pointed out that there is no formal agreement between MRNRC and MoRAST. MoRAST was just recently formed (2006) and what their focus will be is not yet clear. One panel member pointed out that MoRAST could be viewed as the states' equivalent of the Federal Working Group.

The Drafting Team stated they hoped this effort would be a true stakeholder opportunity and different from the previous decide, announce, and defend approach when all stakeholders felt they could do was rubber stamp decisions that had already been made.

*When will we know the Charter has been adopted and which agency will adopt it?*

The panel explained it would vary depending on what legal umbrella MRRIC ultimately falls under. The panel discussed the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and possibilities for exceptions to this act under the ESA. Under the ESA the Department of the Interior would adopt the Charter. MRRIC could also be established under the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) which might also provide an exemption to FACA.

*Almost all the major decisions associated with Missouri River recovery have already been made by the courts, and WRDA might change the whole process. What is the incentive for us to do this work before congress makes some decisions?*

What are left are recovery actions. A panel member suggested recovery work in the basin could be considered like a train, with various cars of the train representing different recovery programs. MRRIC can decide where to lay the tracks for this train. MRRIC can answer the question, "What is the future of this basin going to look like?"

Cheryl thanked the panel members for coming to the meeting and speaking to the Drafting Team. There will be additional opportunities for representatives from the Federal Working Group to share information with the Drafting Team at future meetings.

## **Water Resources Development Act**

John introduced the next section on WRDA, but before the team could get started discussing this, some additional questions for the Federal Working Group came up.

*What happens if this group doesn't develop a Charter for MRRIC?*

If it becomes evident that this group will not reach consensus on a Charter, the committee will still be formed under the ESA. The Federal Working Group is very optimistic that this group will succeed. They pointed out that this was the best avenue to get stakeholder input on the group Charter.

*Does the phrase "best recommendations of this group" mean a majority?*

No, it would be the issues on which the group reaches consensus.

The Federal Working Group presented the team with an update on WRDA. The senate version has some language on MRRIC, the house version does not. The senate has appointed a conference committee for the bill. The team asked that they receive updates on the status of the bill.

The Federal Working Group reported that there has been no recent action on the bill.

## **Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments**

Ruth pointed out that the Planning Group had received copies of the MRRIC portion of the senate version of the WRDA bill along with copies of letters to congress containing suggested revisions to the wording of the bill concerning MRRIC.

*Is there language in the house version on MRRIC, and what is the Federal Working Group's understanding of the differences between the house and senate versions?*

The house version has no MRRIC language; the senate version has a short section on MRRIC.

*What is the Federal Working Group doing given that the WRDA legislation is stalled?*

The Federal Working Group is proceeding. The federal agencies feel they cannot wait for the legislation and are proceeding on the recovery program. They do not believe that anything they are doing is contrary to either version of the proposed new wording. MRRIC will still need a charter; the federal agencies still need to put the committee together. What is done in the Drafting Team won't be wasted if some version of this is passed, and the federal government will still look to MRRIC for input and advice.

*How much opportunity will this group have to influence spending?*

This type of input is one of the things the federal agencies will be looking for from MRRIC. Congress will still appropriate the funds, but MRRIC will help prioritize how this money is spent.

At this point, a Drafting Team member reminded the group that they are here to draft a charter. MRRIC itself will be dealing with budgeting priorities and other issues.

*Is the Corps of Engineers in contact with congress about the WRDA language?*

The federal agency representatives at the meeting were not aware of any contact. However, some contact may be happening above their levels of work and influence.

One Drafting Team member was concerned that the amendment was written to be attractive to environmentalists. Given this language, he believed that no one will sign on to the bill. The suggestion was made that even at this early stage of the game if this group sent a consensus letter to the conference committee it would have a lot of impact.

Representatives of the Federal Working Group pointed out that federal agencies are prohibited from lobbying congress and this

prohibition also applies to any committees established by federal agencies. This doesn't prevent individuals and groups from writing to congress. Other members of the Drafting Team concurred that individuals could write to their congressional representatives.

*Can we see the federal agency comments to congress on WRDA?*

The panel responded that they were not sure how many comments had been provided to congress and whether or not they could be shared. The team asked if it was possible to find this information out.

The representatives of the Federal Working Group also pointed out that the senate version of the bill included direction to develop a comprehensive recovery plan in concert with MRRIC. This bill also gives the Corps authority to assist with recovery efforts in the Yellowstone River.

Several members of the Drafting Team commented they felt this bill would pass given the current makeup of congress and the fact that a WRDA bill hasn't passed since 2000. Members talked about the impact of WRDA on the operations of the Corps on the tributaries.

## **Ground Rules and Operating Procedures**

Cheryl introduced the ground rules and operating procedures discussion. She suggested the Drafting Team consider the rough draft it had in front of it as proposed ground rules and asked the group to consider three broad categories of ground rules: rules for individuals, rules for group interactions, and rules for external communications. She then asked for a round-robin discussion of what the group considers as essential elements of ground rules. These would be captured in the three categories listed above.

During the discussion, the Drafting Team suggested that they consider Missouri's suggested revisions to the proposed operating procedures. The group requested the facilitation team distribute the Missouri suggested revisions by e-mail that evening and provide hard copies for the group the next day.

## Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments:

At this point, the members of the Drafting Team, in turn, went round the table and offered the following points:

- *Where would the composition of MRRIC fit in these ground rules?* It was decided this would be part of the MRRIC charter, not of the operating rules for the Planning Group.
- *We need to include in these rules what we ended up with in Kansas City - they need to be adopted by consensus.*
- *Less is best. All the ground rules should fit on two pieces of paper.* The concept of brevity was mentioned several times.
- *The rules should provide for transparency between all groups involved in the process and everyone should feel like their voice was heard.*
- *We need to keep in mind what we are here to do and not get sidetracked.*
- *The Drafting Team needs to be empowered; it needs to make its own decisions, set its own agenda. The Drafting Team needs to become a team, work together, from the bottom up.*
- *The team needs to be able to look at the agenda ahead of time and comment.*
- *It's important that when a person rejects a proposal they offer a counter proposal.*
- *Individual members need to represent group discussions and behavior accurately outside the group.* It was mentioned that this would be hard to monitor.
- *The group needs to have a process defined to document different positions and represent different levels of consensus.*
- *The group needs to define a quorum.*

- *The group should start with a prayer or have some other activity prior to starting work to bring everyone together.*
- *The team needs a procedure or process to deal with getting expert help and adding new members.*
- *Every member of the team should agree to avoid the use of personal attacks and the techniques of intimidation. It was suggested that any member of the group who feels attacked could call a time out.*
- *The group needs a document management system. One suggestion was having a set of binders in which the information could be looked up. There was a suggestion that the record of the meeting be actual notes, not summaries of the notes.*
- *It was suggested that to indicate agreement, team members should indicate thumbs up if they support a proposal, thumbs sideways if they can live with it, and thumbs down if they cannot live with it.*
- *The group needs to have a process to accurately record decisions.*
- *The group needs to avoid comments about individuals.*
- *Old members need to bury their biases.*
- *The information provided to constituents needs to be consistent among groups. It was suggested that possibly the facilitation team could ensure this.*
- *The group needs to stick to the agenda - no last minute surprises.*
- *There needs to be a definition of who is on the Drafting Team and we need to ensure they are actually at the table.*
- *Members of the team need to be mindful of what they say. Mean what you say, say what you mean, and be respectful.*
- *There was an admonition to the facilitation team to be facilitators, not the group's friend.*

- *Materials need to be distributed to the team in a timely fashion.* This was mentioned as important by several people.
- *There was a suggestion that the news media be invited to the meetings.*
- *The group needs an additional space so that small sub-groups of the main group have a place to meet.*
- *The group needs a method of dealing with those who do not conform to the rules. It needs to be strictly a group process.*
- *If consensus can not be reached, there should be no head counting of how many were for or against a proposal.*

## Draft Operating Procedures and Ground Rules

Drafting Team members asked to see the revisions to the operating procedures submitted by Missouri to the facilitation team. It was decided that these proposals would be e-mailed to everyone over-night, and hard copies would be provided the following day.

### Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments

*Are we going to step through what the facilitation team provided to the group, or are we going to develop our own rules and procedures from scratch?*

After some discussion, the group decided that it could still make the original draft operating procedures and ground rules theirs by stepping through each section and making the changes they wanted. The group began by working through the section regarding individuals.

### Representation of Interests

The Drafting Team discussed deleting the whole section, but some members felt it was important to keep the section to document that they represent larger groups.

## **Preparation and Attendance**

The Drafting Team had a discussion about how to deal with absences. Some important points in this discussion involved the possibility of allowing alternates to sit at the table if the primary member was not available. Some members objected that they did not have an alternate and asked if the process for designating alternates could be re-opened. The U.S. Institute responded that the application process for the Drafting Team was closed, but they might consider re-opening it to accommodate those members who did not have alternates. Applications to serve on the Review Panel will remain open through August. Further discussion of alternates was tabled until the next day.

The Drafting Team decided to make changes to this section to require members to make every effort to attend meetings, to notify the U.S. Institute if they were going to be absent, and inform members that agendas will not contain time to recap past discussions for members who missed meetings.

## **Sharing and Considering Information**

The Drafting Team discussed the need for a provision to prevent people from talking on their cell phones during a meeting. Another team member was interested in defining what a personal attack was.

## **Members and Alternates**

The Drafting Team initially discussed deleting this section altogether but decided to keep it and require that the facilitation team conduct a roll call at the start of each meeting to ensure that the people seated at the table were actually those appointed by the tribes and states or selected by the U.S. Institute. A provision was also added that each designated team member could designate a member of the Review Panel as his or her alternate. The member will notify the facilitation team or the U.S. Institute of his or her designated alternate. The team also added a provision that only the seated member could participate in Drafting Team discussions or decision making.

## **Procedural Guidance**

The Drafting Team began the discussion of this section with a proposal to delete the section. Some Drafting Team members

strongly felt that it was important to have this section to provide for a dispute resolution process and to prevent someone from coming in at the last minute and destroying consensus on an issue. The group decided to move the substance of the procedural guidance section to the dispute resolution section and work on it on day two.

A copy of the Federal Working Group roster was handed out.

The discussion of scheduling future meetings was tabled until day two.

Ruth asked for feedback on how the meeting had gone for the Drafting Team. A Drafting Team member asked if it was possible to get a graphic display of the Missouri River Basin to display during the meetings. Another member noted that he had a copy of the protocols for the Spring Rise Plenary with him.

## **Adjourn**

John Thorson thanked the group for their work and reminded them that a reception followed the meeting at 6:30 in the Calhoun Room. He also reminded the group that the next day's meeting would start at 8:00 am.

The first day's meeting was adjourned at 6:03 pm.

## Day Two - Meeting Opening

John Thorson, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:04 am. He informed the group of the handouts that had been placed at their seats overnight and discussed the major purpose of the day, which was to continue the discussion of the operating procedures. He then called on Mike Catches Enemy of the Oglala Sioux Tribe to lead the group in an opening invocation.

Once the invocation was completed, Ruth reviewed the items in the parking lot from the previous day:

- Request for water for observers - Pat Lewis of the U.S. Institute is working on that.
- Reopen the application process for alternates - This will be discussed later today during the meeting.
- Questions for Federal Working Group: How is the Federal Working Group related to this process? The Federal Working Group responded that they were asked to get this process rolling. They do have coordination groups involved with the recovery effort. The group was reminded that there will be a public process associated with the recovery effort as required by NEPA.
- Provide a list and description of federal agencies and related groups that are part of the recovery effort - This was put on the Next Steps and Actions board for follow up.
- Need electricity for laptops - Pat Lewis will work on this for the next meeting.
- List of applicable court decisions and implications - This was incorporated into the Next Steps and Actions board for follow up in the revisions to Appendix A.
- What happens if we fail to get consensus - The group agreed this question was answered the previous day.

Ruth also introduced Leroy Stokes, the federal representative from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, who had flight trouble and arrived after introductions had been completed on day one.

## Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments

*It appears we are doing recovery right now further north on the Yellowstone River which is not guided by the MRRIC process. How will this process affect those projects?*

There are decades of recovery ahead. The recovery effort is proceeding under the biological opinion. As soon as a functioning MRRIC is in place, it will be fit into the process immediately.

*We are at various levels of knowledge associated with this effort. Would it be worth while to do a little education each meeting?*

The Federal Working Group suggested that the Drafting Team might want to take thirty minutes out of each meeting and cover one facet of the recovery program each time the Drafting Team meets. This suggestion was met with mixed reviews as members were concerned about the time available to develop the Charter for MRRIC.

*Some members noted that it is important they keep focused on what this group is here for and separate the chartering process from the actual MRRIC process.*

*Others noted that training sessions could help remind them that the group is here to draft a Charter and that the Drafting Team is not MRRIC. However, the training would have to fit into the schedule as time permits. Others thought that it would be redundant to do training now because many of the people on the Drafting Team will not necessarily be on the actual MRRIC, so the training would have to be done over again.*

The facilitation team put the suggestion for education and training on recovery efforts in the Parking Lot for the time being.

*The MRRIC process has been piecemeal in the past, maybe this group can help tie it all together.*

*What is the difference between the Planning Group and the Drafting Team?*

Ruth explained that the Planning Group contained the Drafting Team and the Review Panel as well as the Co-Chairs. She also pointed out that a list of definitions is attached to the draft operating procedures and ground rules that defines these terms.

## Operating Procedures and Ground Rules

Ruth reviewed the different handouts the Drafting Team had received that morning and asked if there were any questions. She then suggested that the group begin where they left off the previous day with the group operations section.

### Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments

#### Roles and Responsibilities

The Drafting Team added a statement to this section that actions and communications from all participants will be transparent and open.

#### Co-Chairs

The Drafting Team was worried about the transparency of the process presented in the draft procedures. Members were concerned that “deals” would be made with the Co-Chairs and facilitation team by a small group of members. Some suggestions were made to improve transparency and prevent these deals by requiring the Co-Chairs to report back to the Drafting Team on discussions held outside regular Drafting Team meetings. Several suggestions on language for this section were made by various members. There was also a desire to prevent groups holding a minority opinion from being excluded from any planning or decision making process.

There was also a discussion of whether the Drafting Team preferred meeting minutes or summaries. The members decided they wanted both minutes and summaries.

The final version of the Co-Chairs section required that the Co-Chairs work with the facilitation team to develop draft agendas and review draft meeting minutes and summaries. The section on caucuses was deleted.

## Drafting Team

There was discussion of combining or eliminating several steps in this section. Ruth pointed out that the purpose of this section as originally written was to provide a step-by-step process for adopting a Charter, but another option would be for the Drafting Team to develop a work plan that could be used in place of this. The group decided to develop a work plan and simplify this section accordingly.

The Drafting Team also had a long discussion of the approval process for the Charter: to whom would it be delivered, how they would approve it, whether it had to be approved in its entirety or could be approved in part. There was also concern that it might be changed in the federal review process, perhaps without the group's consent. There was strong feeling that the Drafting Team should retain ownership of the Charter and if it were changed, it could not be presented as the Drafting Team's work.

A question as to who would approve the Charter was added to the Parking Lot.

The final changes to the Drafting Team section required the Planning Group to present a Charter for MRRIC to the appropriate federal decision makers, require the Drafting Team to complete and approve a work plan; approve meeting agendas; approve meeting minutes, notes, and summaries; and agree to act at all times in good faith.

## Review Panel

The Drafting Team had no substantive concerns on this section. The group discussion on this item was administrative in nature and involved clarifying the Review Panel's duties. The group's agreed upon final version of this section requires the Review Panel to review proposals, meeting notes, and agendas developed by the Drafting Team; provide feedback to the Drafting Team at designated times during a meeting; and participate in joint meetings with the Drafting Team.

## Federal Working Group

The Drafting Team discussed at length the approval process for the Charter and what to do if changes were made to the Charter by the reviewing and approving federal agencies. There was much concern about these agencies potentially claiming that the changed product was the Drafting Team's work. Some members wanted just an up or down vote by the federal agencies, others wanted them to be required to bring a changed Charter back to the Drafting Team for further review and approval by the Drafting Team. The group finally decided on modifying this section to require that the Federal Working Group play an advisory role to the Planning Group, provide feedback to the Drafting Team but not participate in decision making, and agree to recommend that federal agencies not attribute changes they may make to the Charter to the Drafting Team.

## Facilitation Team

The Drafting Team had two major concerns with this section: transparency and timeliness of information. With respect to transparency, the group was concerned about the facilitation team developing agendas and finalizing meeting summaries without group input. For timeliness of information delivery, various dates for distribution of information were discussed. Ruth proposed that she provide the group with an administrative schedule that would show dates that the facilitation team could distribute information to the group based on the meeting schedule. The Drafting Team agreed to this proposal.

There was also discussion of the status of the development of the MRRIC Web site and the content that would be on it. The Drafting Team is anxious for the Web site to be up and running.

The group made changes to this section to require that the facilitation team develop draft agendas in collaboration with the Planning Group, finalize meeting summaries and minutes following approval by the Drafting Team, ensure appropriate representation at the table, post draft records on the Web site before the next meeting, and provide an administrative schedule to the Drafting Team.

## U.S. Institute

The Drafting Team's concern with this section was a potential loss of transparency related to the U.S. Institute acting as a liaison between the Federal Working Group, the facilitation team, and the Co-Chairs. Mike Eng from the U.S. Institute explained that this provision was based on feedback from previous groups that they did not want the Federal Working Group interacting directly with the Co-Chairs and the facilitation team or the perception that the federal agencies were inappropriately influencing them. The Drafting Team ultimately agreed to retain the original liaison language. The only change made was to require the U.S. Institute to host the Web site.

## Dispute Resolution

The Drafting Team's main concern with this section was whether it actually had the ability to control and enforce any dispute resolution process. Members discussed the possibility of coming to consensus about the actions to take concerning a disruptive individual. They decided it might be possible to remove an individual but they could not take away the seat. They were also reluctant to get the Federal Working Group involved in a dispute involving appointed members of the Planning Group. The group decided that there needed to be two different processes: one for Planning Group members and another for the Co-Chairs, facilitation team, and the U.S. Institute. This resulted in adding a statement to section d that made it apply only to staff. They also changed the name of the section to "Resolving Compliance with Ground Rules and Operating Procedures."

A concern with the language in section two which requires that "Actions and communications from all participants will be transparent and open" was raised. The suggestion was made that this might be too broad a statement and might actually prohibit small groups from getting together for any purpose during this process. The Drafting Team decided to consider new language for this section.

## Consensus and Decision Making

### Process

The Drafting Team discussed taking the word strive out of the section since it is the group's goal to reach consensus. Another concern was being held to the two day requirement for making decisions. The group chose to modify this section to allow the two day requirement to be waived by consensus of the Drafting Team, if necessary. The group discussed the possibility of having proxy or absentee decision making. The final outcome of this discussion was to allow people to designate Review Panel members as alternates. There was also a lengthy discussion of what to do if consensus was not reached.

The final changes to this section involved adding words that made it clear that Drafting Team members are responsible for determining consensus; read ahead materials will be sent out with agenda items that are action items; consensus will be a two step process with actions no sooner than the second day, but this may be waived based on consensus of the Drafting Team.

### Decision Making

The Drafting Team had two major concerns in discussing this section. One was what to do if consensus was not reached on a Charter. The proposed solution in this case was to allow the Charter to go forward with the differing viewpoints documented. This concern was prompted by the fact that if the team decided it was an all or nothing process, it was possible for one person to completely stop the process after near consensus was reached. The other side of this discussion was that not requiring full consensus left a convenient out, and people would be less motivated to work for consensus. The idea of sending a document forward with the differing viewpoints documented also raised concerns in some individuals that the level of consensus would be characterized numerically. This also sparked a discussion about abstentions and how to handle them. This was rooted in the concern that if the meeting minutes listed abstentions, they would be, in effect, numerically characterizing the level of consensus.

After much discussion, the Drafting Team developed a two step process to deal with the situation where there was difficulty in reaching consensus. First, the Co-Chairs will designate a period of time to address the issue. Second, if consensus still cannot be reached, the differing views would be documented in the Charter as approved by the Drafting Team with no characterization or quantification of the differing views.

Language on handling an inability to reach consensus was added to the Process section.

### **Definition of Consensus**

In this section, the group revisited its concerns over one person being able to sabotage consensus and the possibility of reducing the motivation to achieve consensus. There was some discussion of parking this issue until it became germane, but the group decided to address the issue at this time. Ultimately, the group agreed that the language already added to the procedures was good as is.

### **Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities**

The main point in this discussion involved not including any names in Drafting Team decisions, consensus, or actions. This was again rooted in the desire not to characterize the level of consensus.

The Drafting Team agreed to work on the remainder of the draft operating procedures and ground rules document at its next meeting. The facilitation team agreed to provide the Planning Group with a copy of the red-line/strike-out version of the document so people could see what changes had been made, as well as a clean copy of the document, prior to the July meeting.

## Scheduling Of Future Meetings

Ruth introduced the draft schedule and explained to the group that it had been revised overnight. She had reviewed the data on availability from the applications the U.S. Institute had as well as the data on the charts on the wall and the schedules of the Co-Chairs. The outcome of this discussion was as follows:

### July:

Dates: 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> with the long day being the 19<sup>th</sup>  
Location: Omaha, Nebraska

### August:

Dates: 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> with the long day on the 28<sup>th</sup>.  
Location: Billings, Montana

### September:

Dates: 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup>, both days being full days.  
Location: Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Further scheduling for the October, November, and December meetings was deferred to the July meeting.

## Agenda Items for the July meeting

Ruth went over the topics listed for the July agenda:

- Finish Drafting Team Operating Procedures(Thursday morning)
- Schedule meeting dates for October(Thursday morning)
- Presentation on information from other chartering efforts(Thursday afternoon)
- Prioritize an approach for developing the structure of the Charter for MRRIC

## Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments

*Handle contentious issues first such as MRRIC membership.*

*There was a suggestion to add an item to the July agenda to prioritize issues.*

*Need information on other chartering efforts to review before the meeting.*

Jen Johnson from the U.S. Institute described her work on the chartering issue and agreed to provide some read ahead material to the group.

Ruth then reviewed the Parking Lot for remaining questions and issues. These will be carried over to the July meeting:

- How will the Charter be offered to the federal Missouri River Basin Interagency Roundtable?
- All or none on consensus - still need to work on that.
- How do we document consensus and dissent?
- Water for observers and electricity for laptops.

## Next Steps

Ruth then reviewed the next steps chart:

- Get a list of all the federal agencies involved in this and descriptions of how they relate to each other.
- Develop a list of applicable federal statutes and policies (Update Appendix A).
- Research Corps of Engineers comments on WRDA.
- Ruth will develop and distribute an administrative schedule to the Planning Group.

## Drafting Team Questions, Discussion, and Comments

*When we get the list of laws, can we list the laws that apply to the Federal Working Group?*

They will try.

*Do we need an extra room off the main meeting room to caucus?*

This is a possibility for later meetings.

*Can we get a link on the Web site to the Appendix A legal stuff?*

## Feedback from the Drafting Team Members

Before the meeting adjourned, Ruth asked the Drafting Team for feedback on the meeting and suggestions for future meetings:

*Didn't follow the agenda.*

*Need two and one half day meetings to get everything done by December.*

*Suggest we run over on the first night for as long as we need.*

*The group needs to recognize that we are time limited and we need to move along as fast as we can.*

*Need stuff ahead of time to be prepared.*

*Preliminary comments were not distributed in advance this time. We need to try to send out materials sooner and get input.*

*We spend way too much time at the level of words. The group needs to think about sentences and ideas.*

## Adjourn

The Co-Chairs thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 4:03 pm.

## Appendix A

## Meeting Attendance on 6/19/07

<b>DRAFTING TEAM</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Asbury, Randy	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Barfield, David	State of Kansas, Division of Water Resources
Beacom, William	Missouri River Navigation Caucus
Cassidy, Patrick	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Catches Enemy, Mike (appointment pending)	Oglala Sioux
Erickson, Jack	State of South Dakota
Gibbs, Joseph B.	Missouri Levee Districts
Graves, Thomas	Mid-West Electric Consumers Association
Kidder, Rebecca	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Lay, William	Howard County Commission
Majeres, Jack	South Dakota Association of Conservation Districts
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	The American Waterways Operators/Mid-Continent Region
Nelson, Kirk	State of Nebraska
Provost, Tony	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Ryckman, Fred	State of North Dakota
Saul, EuGene	Santee Sioux Nation
Schrempp, Tom	WaterOne - Water District No. 1 of Johnson County, KS
Schwarz, David	Yellowstone River Conservation District Council
Schwellenbach, Stan	City of Pierre, South Dakota
Sieck, David	Iowa Corn Growers Association
Skold, Jason	The Nature Conservancy
Smith, Joe	Standing Rock Sioux
Snyder, Darwin (appointment pending)	Winnebago Tribe
Wakeman, Elizabeth	Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe
Wells Crowe, Wanda	Crow Creek Sioux Tribe
Wells, Michael D.	State of Missouri
Williamson, Bob	Water Services Department, Kansas City, MO
<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>	
Dorsey, Darrell	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Drew, John	State of Missouri
Thompson, Chairman Lester, Jr.	Crow Creek Sioux Tribe
Walker, Ida (appointment pending)	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska

## Appendix A

## Meeting Attendance on 6/19/07

<b>REVIEW PANEL</b>	
Jorgensen, Don	Missouri River Technical Group
<b>FEDERAL WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TEAM</b>	
Cothorn, Joe	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Olson, Mike	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Roth, Mary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Stokes, Leroy	Natural Resources Conservation Service
<b>OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL WORKING GROUP</b>	
Cieslik, Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hargrave, Rosemary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jennings, Sue	National Park Service
Kluck, Doug	National Weather Service, NOAA
Larson, Darin	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Seeronen, John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Zallen, Margo	Department of Interior
<b>MRRIC PLANNING GROUP FACILITATION TEAM</b>	
Huston, Douglas	Accuedit
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
Johnson, Jen	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Lewis, Pat	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
<b>OBSERVERS</b>	
Iveson, Todd	State of Missouri
Little, Matthew	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

## Appendix B

## Meeting Attendance on 6/20/07

<b>DRAFTING TEAM</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Asbury, Randy	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Barfield, David	State of Kansas, Division of Water Resources
Beacom, William	Missouri River Navigation Caucus
Cassidy, Patrick	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Catches Enemy, Mike (appointment pending)	Oglala Sioux
Erickson, Jack	State of South Dakota
Gibbs, Joseph B.	Missouri Levee Districts
Graves, Thomas	Mid-West Electric Consumers Association
Kidder, Rebecca	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Lay, William	Howard County Commission
Majeres, Jack	South Dakota Association of Conservation Districts
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	The American Waterways Operators/Mid-Continent Region
Nelson, Kirk	State of Nebraska
Ryckman, Fred	State of North Dakota
Saul, EuGene	Santee Sioux Nation
Schrempp, Tom	WaterOne - Water District No. 1 of Johnson County, KS
Schwarz, David	Yellowstone River Conservation District Council
Schwellenbach, Stan	City of Pierre, South Dakota
Sieck, David	Iowa Corn Growers Association
Skold, Jason	The Nature Conservancy
Smith, Joe	Standing Rock Sioux
Wakeman, Elizabeth	Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe
Wells, Michael D.	State of Missouri
Williamson, Bob	Water Services Department, Kansas City, MO
<b>MRRIC PLANNING GROUP CO-CHAIRS</b>	
Chapman, Cheryl	Matrix Consulting Group
Thorson, John	California Public Utilities Commission (Participation does not represent CPUC)
<b>ALTERNATES</b> (Attended in addition to Primary - were not at the table)	
Dorsey, Darrell	Kansas City Board of Public Utilities
Drew, John	State of Missouri

## Appendix B

## Meeting Attendance on 6/20/07

<b>REVIEW PANEL</b>	
Jorgensen, Don	Missouri River Technical Group
<b>FEDERAL WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TEAM</b>	
Cothorn, Joe	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Olson, Mike	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Roth, Mary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Stokes, Leroy	Natural Resources Conservation Service
<b>OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL WORKING GROUP</b>	
Cieslik, Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hargrave, Rosemary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jennings, Sue	National Park Service
Kluck, Doug	National Weather Service, NOAA
Larson, Darin	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Seeronen, John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Zallen, Margo	Department of 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
Johnson, Jen	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Lewis, Pat	U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
<b>OBSERVERS</b>	
Iveson, Todd	State of Missouri
Little, Matthew	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

## Appendix C

## Introduction Exercise

### “What’s At Stake for You?”

- ❖ The Many Diverse and Competing Interests/Uses That Impact the Citizens of the State of Missouri
- ❖ Flood Protection for Seven Industrial Urbanized Areas
- ❖ Maintenance of Navigation and Flood Control as Primary Concerns of Operation of the River
- ❖ Flood Control - Don't Flood My Crops
- ❖ Farmer - Flood Plain Life as I Know It.
- ❖ Conservation and Wise Stewardship of Our Natural Resources (Soil, Water and Air). To Insure Conservation Districts Are Represented in This Process and Involved in the Recovery Process as the Local Leaders in Natural Resource Conservation Throughout the Basin.
- ❖ Your Interest - The Conservation of Biodiversity and Its Linkage to the People of the Basin
- ❖ Drinking Water System Within Reservation, Bank Stabilization
- ❖ Drinking Water Supply for One Million People
- ❖ Safe, Reliable Supply of Drinking Water
- ❖ Water Supply, Cultural Resource Protection
- ❖ Reliable Water Source in South Dakota for Drinking, Recreation, Fish Communities, Irrigation and Economic Development
- ❖ Flood Control, Navigation, Water Supply, Recreation
- ❖ Flood Control, Navigation, Power Generation, Domestic Water Use and Irrigation. Looking For a Way of Species Recovery Without Harming the Vast Economic Interest Along the Missouri River.
- ❖ Fort Peck Lake Fishing Industry - Average 110,000 Angling Days from 1997 to 2001 - 48,000 Angling Days in 2005
- ❖ The Potential for Early Stakeholder Involvement in Recovery of Endangered Species Recovery in the Missouri River.
- ❖ The Health, Safety, Cultural Integrity, and Economic Security of a Nation of 2.8 Million Acres. If We Do Not Have a Seat at This Table, the Concerns of the Nation Located On and Integrally Related To This River Will Not Be Considered. This We Have Learned From History. For Us, This Is the Beginning of True Recovery for a Nation Flooded In 1954 and Excluded Until 2006 From Consideration.

## Appendix C

## Introduction Exercise

### “What’s At Stake for You?”

- ❖ Future of the Tribe - Water Supply System, Farming, Endangered Species, Water Quality
- ❖ Representing the Interests of the Omaha Tribe and Their Natural Resources, Safe Drinking Water, Economic Development
- ❖ Valuable Property Rights to the Waters and Land Comprising the Missouri River and Its Tributaries Including Unquantified Winter’s Doctrine Water Rights, Hunting and Fishing Rights, Usufructury Rights to Human Remains and Cultural Items along the River.
- ❖ Healthy/ Sustainable Ecosystem
- ❖ Maintaining Life Style of the Milk River Basin and Fort Peck Reservoir - Water Supply, Irrigation, Agriculture, Rural Water Supplies, Hydro Power
- ❖ The Yellowstone River, Under Recent WRDA Legislation has the Potential to Play a Significant Role in the Recovery of the Missouri River. The Folks Along the Yellowstone Are Interested in How That Will Play Out.
- ❖ Equitable Representation with Respect to Operation of River. Agencies on a Par with Stakeholders.
- ❖ Working Together to Solve Problems on the Missouri River That Most of the People Can Live With.
- ❖ Basin Participation in the Formation of MRRIC
- ❖ Help in Establishing MRRIC
- ❖ The Faith That This Can Work
- ❖ Effective and Efficient Execution of Duties and Responsibilities.
- ❖ Environmental Compliance through Public Involvement
- ❖ Legitimacy of Joint Problem Solving Process
- ❖ That Certainty That Results Only From Solving Problems in the Basin
- ❖ Economic Impact
- ❖ 155 Irrigation Pump Sites Supporting 53,000 Acres
- ❖ The Future of One of Our State’s Major Natural Resources and Economic Engines
- ❖ Economic Impacts to Agriculture, Navigation and Utility Stakeholders Resulting From Recovery Actions
- ❖ Dependable, Secure, and Consistent Source of River Water for Down Stream Electricity Generation
- ❖ Input/Collaborative Mechanism
- ❖ Multiple Uses of the Missouri River. Improving Condition of Pallid Sturgeon Based On Good Science without Undue Politics and Without Undue Impairment to Other Users.
- ❖ Native Fish and Wildlife, Pallid Sturgeon, Least Tern, Piping Plover
- ❖ Sustainability