

Columbia Basin Collaborative Organizational Workshop  
 Thursday, June 10th, 2021  
 Question and Answer Box Responses

<i>Question</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>For the Tribal nation group, will the decisions coming to this group be policy decisions?            Would like to understand if elected leaders, or technical or policy staff are the right people for the Tribal nations group.</p>	<p>There are several opportunities for Tribal engagement, including the Integration/Recommendations Group (for policy level representatives); workgroups (for technical experts); and coordination with other tribes.</p>
<p>In the nominations process how do we know who to nominate for which groups?</p>	<p>We have provided additional guidance and information on the Integration/Recommendations Group and the working group participation on our <a href="#">website</a>. Our priority is to convene the Integration/Recommendations Group first. Once established, the I/RG will discuss which working groups are needed and put out a second call for membership..</p>
<p>What plans are there for publishing this process so others not usually at this table, but clearly are concerned, will know of actions/suggestions in a timely manner so they can provide input or at least be aware?</p>	<p>The CBC will maintain a website for notices and information relating to its work at <a href="https://species.idaho.gov/columbia-basin-collaborative/">https://species.idaho.gov/columbia-basin-collaborative/</a>. The CBC will also coordinate with various regional processes and forums to seek their input and expertise. The CBC does not intend to duplicate existing process or their work.</p>
<p>How does the Columbia Basin Collaborative differ from the Northwest Power and Conservation Council?</p>	<p>The Northwest Power and Conservation Council program guides the funding from Bonneville Power Administration to protect, enhance, and mitigate fish and wildlife affected by the Columbia River federal hydroelectric system. The CBC process will address all sources of impacts to salmon and steelhead across all pertinent responsibilities, authorities, forums and funding sources that make decisions that affect the recovery of Columbia basin salmon and steelhead.</p>

<i>Question</i>	<i>Response</i>
Does consensus mean that a single member can block meaningful action?	The Integration/Recommendation Group is set-up to make recommendations to existing authorities to consider for implementation. I/RG Members will strive for consensus on recommendations whenever possible. Consensus is reached when it becomes evident through deliberation that every Member, at the very least, does not oppose a decision. In its deliberations, the Integration/Recommendations Group and Topic Specific Working Groups shall use appropriate tools for developing consensus and shall seek to exhaust every reasonable and practicable effort to reach consensus.
What will be the forcing function for the integration panel to make the hard decisions when there isn't consensus?	The work of the CBC will be accomplished collaboratively. Members will endeavor to engage in dialogue using a collaborative, interest-based approach to seek common ground, support shared interests, address differences, and strive to seek alignment on recommendations and other decisions of the CBC.  The CBC will create an opportunity for a powerful, collective voice to promote important actions for a better future for all.
How/where will the integration of hydro, habitat, harvest, hatchery and predation control actions happen in this process?	These deliberations would take place at the Integration/Recommendations Group with support and input from the Working Groups, existing forms, and regional technical expertise.
In the chart entitled Biologic Criteria for Priority Action, it distinguishes between stocks that "need attention now" versus those that are less of a priority. In the Partnership process, we set numeric goals for 27 stocks, but did we ever make a policy decision that the weakest stocks should be prioritized? Was that implicit in the numeric goals that were set?	The proposed biological criteria for priority actions uses both level of impact and stock status to provide a general direction for more focused work to be conducted in the subject-specific Working Groups. We expect this approach to be discussed in the Integration/Recommendation Group prior to assigning work to the subject-specific Working Groups. Within the CBP, the focus was development of the vision and goals for the stocks, and no policy stance was made explicitly regarding how to prioritize actions.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Response</i>
In some parts of the basin, decisions by counties and cities will ultimately determine whether our watersheds will be able to sustain healthy and harvestable populations of salmon and steelhead. How would local governments be engaged in the proposed organizational structure?	Likely an outreach effort would be needed. Possibly best practices can be outlined and recommended much like model legislation is drafted and shared among states. We expect local Government staff can participate in Working Groups or contribute to the process as existing forums.
Please describe how you will identify and implement actions in this process that lie solely within state authority, such as limiting sport harvest of ESA listed stocks, enforcing water quality standards and water rights, and complying with federal environmental laws?	Recommendations for priority actions would go from the CBC to the appropriate implementing authority, whether state, federal, tribal or local.
How will potential impacts to communities as a result of specific and recommended recovery actions be considered and addressed in the CBC process?	The intended feasibility analysis on priority actions would include considerations about community impacts and benefits, costs, and other social, economic and cultural considerations.
Almost any action of this group requires federal authority and/or funding. What commitment do we have from the Northwest delegation to implement any agreed upon measures? Who and how do we obtain this commitment?	The power of the CBC lies in the collective voice and regional alignment for actions to implement. This includes funding needs. We hope that the Northwest delegation would be responsive to funding and authorization requests that are broadly supported through the CBC process.
Has there been a comprehensive look at how irrigation withdrawals are currently made from each reservoir? That is, are we removing cold water from the bottoms of each reservoir for irrigation rather than using warm surface water to meet irrigation withdrawal needs?	This question is beyond the scope of the CBC organizational workshop but could be addressed by a future working group.
What are your plans for ensuring safety of all participants/stakeholders? I'm referring to what is happening in the Klamath Basin with militia members there now advocating violence?	The states are committed to a safe, transparent, and fair process and there will be no tolerance for violence.