

National Fish Habitat Action Plan Reservoir Partnership Planning Workshop

September 16, 2007
Louisville, KY



Facilitated and Prepared by
Brett Boston and Vern Herr
Group Solutions, Inc.
Box 940
Alpharetta, GA 30009

770.757.9828 (voice)
770-446.9382 (fax)
Vherr@groupsolutions.us
www.group-solutions.com



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
PRESENTATION HIGHLIGHTS:	
OPPORTUNITY, CHALLENGE & COMMITMENT HANNIBAL BOLTON, USFWS.....	6
THE TABLE ROCK EXPERIENCE: MARTIN McDONALD, BASSPRO SHOPS.....	8
THE IOWA EXPERIENCE: DON BONNEAU, IOWA DNR	9
TEAM COMMENTS ON PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE	
CHAPTER I: PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES	10
CHAPTER II MEMBERSHIP.....	17
CHAPTER IV: RULES OF ENGAGEMENT	24
AFTERNOON DISCUSSION NOTES.....	32
FINAL THOUGHTS	34
APPENDIX	
PARTICIPANTS.....	36
THE BASS PRO-NFWF CONSERVATION GRANTS PROGRAM	37



Executive Summary

The absolute importance of maintaining healthy habitat that protects water quality in America's reservoirs is under-appreciated, widely neglected and economically essential.

The absence of an organized group to advocate the unique aquatic health requirements of reservoirs has led to an impression no one is interested. This changed in June 2007 with the creation of the National Fish Habitat Reservoir Partnership, a core team of fisheries managers dedicated to supporting the National Fish Habitat Initiative through the development of reservoir-focused joint ventures to improve aquatic habitat.

Members of the NFHAP Reservoir partnership met in Louisville on 9/16 for their second meeting to develop and refine a national action plan. So what happened?

1. The working team reaffirmed their belief that no existing pilot partnership has greater potential for mobilizing significant national funding and stakeholder diversity as one devoted to improving reservoir habitat.
2. The team endorsed immediate preparation and submission of an application to the National Fish Habitat Initiative Board for a Reservoir Partnership. Texas Parks & Wildlife will coordinate writing this document. An online wiki version of this document will be posted to

http://wiki.groupsolutions.us/mediawiki/index.php/GSWiki_talk:Community_Portal

This is an online, editable document using the same functionality as wikipedia, the online Encyclopedia. Team members and interested stakeholders may view and edit the draft document freely.

3. Team members plan to attend the NFHAP Board Meeting in October. The Board's ability and timeline for considering applications for new partnerships is understood to be uncertain. While this picture is being clarified the team will solicit funding, expand agency and industry stakeholders and consult with NFHAP existing pilot programs.
4. The team discussed the challenge of providing a document that can scope so large a habitat initiative and the complexities of a national effort of this magnitude. Producing an overview handout describing the initiative and its scope was felt to be an important first step.
5. Opportunities and lessons learned Iowa's Lakes Program were presented. Key learnings that should be part of a national approach should include:
 - a. Everything can't be saved. Iowa will only devote resources to projects that can document progress with observable and measurable data. This "triage" directs resources to where they can be most effective and has offered an objective justification for not squandering resources on popular, but lower-impact projects.
 - b. Grassroots support will be the key to success. When private landowners understand the economics and the costs of inaction, they have expressed overwhelming supportive for Iowa's clean lakes efforts. Constituent expectations for action have led to broad-based financial support from the State legislature. Funding is not the problem in Iowa. This success must be duplicated at the national level



- c. Don't duplicate the successful work of others. Parallel efforts like the EPA Clean Lakes and organizations like the National Association of Lake Managers have contributed to success in Iowa. Linkages between fish managers and clean water specialists need to be strengthened nationally. This will take time, but ultimately lead to a much broad base of agency stakeholders.
 - d. All reservoir systems are different. There is no one-size-fits all solution to problems that have a multitude of origins, but the knowledge of what needs to be done to address them is widely available. Education and popular will are the missing ingredients.
6. A significant success story is unfolding on Table Rock Lake. \$500,000 per year for 5 years has been committed for a reservoir joint venture of BassPro, MO Department of Fish & Wildlife, Arkansas Fish & Game Commission, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and other stakeholders.
 7. A 3-year Eastern Brook Trout NFHAP application cycle, not yet approved by the Board stood in stark contrast to the funded BassPro project at Table Rock Lake. Stakeholders are looking for clear direction from the NFHAP Board on a go/no go signal. The North American Waterfowl Plan was offered as a practical, action-oriented guidance blueprint for moving forward. The BassPro experience clearly indicates that ad-hoc projects are one possible model for proceeding.
 8. Many great suggestions were made for better defining the scope of the effort and great suggestions were offered for improvement.
 9. The team reviewed the governance model established in June and offered a series of recommendations and refinements.
 10. TXPWD will develop a summary NFHAP Reservoir Partnership document for education, recruiting and fund-raising. A clear, compelling case for reservoir partnership will be circulated to the team for edits and amendments.
 11. A low-overhead foundation will be established enabling the Reservoir Partnership to accept and disburse funds for partnership activities. NFWF will present a plan for managing these funds. Other alternatives will be considered.



12. Outstanding Issues & Next Steps

- a. The team needs to coordinate and define a role for SARP and other groups that present overlap issues. This will become clearer pending decisions on several grant applications.
- b. Rapid follow-up with stakeholders and agencies that have committed resources to the effort is needed. Coordination with allied Federal Agencies and NGOs is needed.
- c. Geographic definition of a reservoir partnership was discussed at length. Hannibal Bolton expressed confidence that this perceived barrier is can be overcome.
- d. Coordinate and communicate with EPA and Clean Water Initiatives from Don Bonneau. Is an index of fish health available for EPA? Could it be easily developed?
- e. A central reservoir data and research inventory of needs to be established and maintained. There is lots of data on our hard drives. Stakeholders need to be able to share it effectively. NFHAP staff committed to assist with this research effort.



Presentation Highlights: Opportunity, Challenge & Commitment

Hannibal Bolton, Chief USFWS

OUR OPPORTUNITY

A National Reservoir Partnership under the National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP) offers its partners unprecedented opportunity to address the needs of America's reservoirs in a way that is holistic, comprehensive, effective, strategic and, most critically, transparent and readily communicated to the public and public policy makers. This partnership offers opportunity to:

- Frame Reservoir Management in Watershed Context
- Define a National Reservoir Systems' Strategy
- Focus on Habitat/Water Quality for Res. System Health
- Catalyze Conservation Across Broad Landscape Areas
- Build Expansive and Diverse Partnership
- Raise Visibility/Resources for Reservoir System Mgmt
- Forge a National Partnership that Works Locally

		<i>Resource Issues</i>	<i>Information Systems</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>
Scale	National	Fish are depleted, listed, or lost due to habitat conditions. Need to know: How many? Status & trends?	Need linkage and increased use of large-scale systems (National Biological Information Infrastructure-Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Node, Fish Passage Decision Support System)	National Fish Habitat Action Plan
	Regional (1,000 to 100,000 miles ²)	Habitat degradation and loss are common issues at regional scale (coastal, Great Lakes, large river systems)	Many data sources (ACCSP, StreamNet, state resource agency databases)	Fish Habitat Partnerships Eastern Brook Trout, Western Native Trout, Midwest Driftless, SARP, Mat-Su Basin partnerships
	Local (less than 1,000 miles ²)	Habitat conditions largely result from local scale resource issues (artificial barriers, poor land use practices)	Assessment of habitats and populations. Need to know: What info is needed to answer relevant questions?)	On-the-ground habitat projects Local resources managers, watershed groups, etc.



OUR CHALLENGE

Establishing a National Reservoir Partnership under NFHAP presents challenges that are both similar to and distinct from the challenges faced by other pilot and candidate Fish Habitat Partnerships. To be successful, we will have to ask and answer important questions, such as:

- National Partnership and What Is Its Purpose?
- Is a National Assessment of Reservoir Threats Needed?
- What Are the Conservation Fixes to Reservoir Threats?
- Do We Need a Conservation Strategy, and What Kind?
- Does Our Conservation Strategy Link to NFHAP Goals?
- Is Our Partnership Inclusive and Diverse as It Can Be?
- Is Our Partnership Consistent with NFHAP Guidance?
- How Do We Coordinate with Overlapping Partnerships?
- Do We Have the Funds and Staff Support for Start-Up?

FWS COMMITMENT

A National Reservoir Partnership is a collaborative effort. The States and local jurisdictions are pivotal in moving the partnership forward. Landowners, communities, and conservation NGOs are essential. Tribal partners in some areas will be critical. Federal partners are no less key. Implementing NFHAP with partners is a top priority of FWS, and we are committed to being a dedicated partner in the National Reservoir Partnership in multiple ways.

We will:

- Support Reservoir Partnership with Funds and Staff
- Participate in Partnership Governance
- Participate in Assessment and Strategic Planning
- Coordinate ID & Ranking of Reservoir System Projects
- Support Habitat Restoration with Existing FWS Programs
- Support and Participate in Accomplishment Reporting
- Coordinate Federal Involvement in Res. Partnership
- Foster Tribal Involvement in Reservoir Partnership



The Table Rock Experience: Martin McDonald, BassPro Shops

- \$500,000/year over 5 years has been committed by BassPro and other partners to support restoration at Table Rock Lake bordering MO/AR. This will be announced at a kickoff 10/12.
- Emphasis is exploring the potential to have major impact on a single reservoir with concentrated emphasis
- Not an easy process to coordinate between MODNR/NFWF/BASSPro
- Action-oriented: focused on action...not theory
- A potential model for addressing nonpoint sources for national (work is underway)
- Measures/metrics on habitat will compare treatment and nontreatment coves

NFWF is a matching funds partner on the 5-year plan

- Examining the health of the entire watershed...not just the reservoir (holistic view takes time)
- 10/12 summit being planned to assess performance of 1st 3 grants. Plan next 4 years
- Need more partners/visibility: apply lessons learned to other partnerships across country
- Looking for other funding partners on a national basis
- What are they key factors a national partnership will need: today's big question
- A 2-page summary is included in this document's appendix



The Iowa Experience: Don Bonneau, Iowa DNR

- North American Lake Management Society (NALMS): Should establish dialogue with this group. A lot could be accomplished by coordinating with the Group
- EPA/Fishable Waters Act friction. Didn't coordinated/cooperate well on this effort and consequently caused unnecessary misunderstandings. Clean Lakes Program needs to be considered/coordinated in the Reservoir Partnership. Ben Grumbles, Acting Director of Water needs to be contacted by this Group.
- Consider participating on the spring agenda for NALMS
- Maine/NH have established data on the economic value of lakes
- We need to link recreational interests and fish managers in establishing the economic value of lakes and return on investment for each dollar spent on improving reservoir habitat
- Grass roots support is where success and support will be driven
- Assume the money is there. A lot will be needed to have an impact (\$250k to \$2MM for small Iowa projects)
- Be able to prioritize, target and show a return on investment projects. For \$1 invested how many dollars can we project will come out? ROI in Iowa has been compelling.
- How many people swim, fish or boat on watersheds & wetlands? Yet this is where the lion's share of EPA funding is directed.
- Establish the value to reservoir landowners and users. Lakes are a slam-dunk for this.
- Draft a strategic Plan. Eastern Brook Trout 2004-07. Expectations and timeline are inconsistent with expectations from the private sector. We must find a way to make this happen faster
- Get National Wildfowl Management Plan Model and use as an approach.
- Environmental Returns on Investment should address:
 - Purpose
 - Assessment of the threat
 - Fixes
 - Conservation strategy
 - Links to NF Habitat
- Lakes are perhaps America's most used and lowest valued resource. The partnership needs to take a lead raising awareness of their value, the problems reservoirs face and the costs of inaction. 40% of America's lakes are not fishable/swimmable. Why is this acceptable?
- Local involvement from landowners is the key to addressing nutrients and sediment
- An index of fish health is missing from EPA's data. This has been long sought.
- We only take action where observable/measurable results can be assured. Some sites must be "triaged." Some can't be fixed. Apply the learnings from IA's experience
- Water/Fish linkages could be the key to growing this partnership
- All lake systems are different.
- Other agencies have redirected their dollars to support the Iowa effort once the program gained political steam



- Need to assemble trends on available state data

Team Comments on Partnership Governance

All comments are team generated. *Facilitator discussion summaries are indicated in italics*

Recommended Reservoir Partnership Governance

Native/nonnative issue will include the existing community

We may have the option to choose species on a future impoundment, but will work under the assumption that we work with what's there.

We may need to address tradeoffs between river flow habitat issues vs. reservoir success metrics.

Reservoir vs. homeowners vs. power production may be tricky balancing acts

Chapter I: Purposes and Principles

The 5 goals below are all good, but don't really define the community of interest, i.e. what is the organizing principle that brings this partnership together? If it's better fishing on reservoirs, we need to say so.

Article 1

1.1 To promote the protection and improvement of healthy aquatic habitat in reservoir systems.

For the benefit of the fish and the anglers.

A good description but it would be also useful to use the goal language in the action plan or indicate why it isn't the same... or why only some of the language is used versus all

For example goals of action plan are to protect, restore and enhance.. Would this group be interested in restoring a system that is unhealthy today.

and the public in general

Need to clearly define "reservoir system" as different folks conjure up different images

Use terminology consistent with NHFAP: "protect, restore, enhance" habitat

How much of this effort should be focused on sport fishing versus improvement generally of aquatic systems, which could include threatened and endangered species.

Conservation of (restoration, protection, and management) of habitat for the benefit of fish, wildlife, and people....

I suggest separating up protection from rehabilitation in this goal. I strongly support protecting healthy habitat and one should not have to improve healthy habitat. I would add another objective to address rehabilitation of degraded reservoir habitat.



Is "healthy" an adequate descriptor? This could be interpreted in different ways, for example, for a system to be healthy does it need to be managed for native species only, or is it ok to manage for non-natives as well?

How will we measure success? (This should be part of our up-front goal statement)

Whatever we find in manipulated environments our assumptions is we'll be moving fwd. The communities that are present are the ones we'll work with.

Excepting invasive/exotics

The definition of reservoir is important is it the entire system, does it include downstream areas, or just the impounded water body?

Decision: It's Impoundment

A systems approach was discussed in ATL. We have not defined how far the surrounding impacts will go

Getting FISH into our mission statement is important. Let's not overlook this.

Form a Bass Habitat partnership

1.2 To promote the protection and improvement of healthy aquatic habitat in reservoir systems.

For the benefit of the fish and the anglers.

Good description but it would be also useful to use the goal language in the action plan or indicate why it isn't the same... or why only some of the language is used versus all

For example goals of action plan are to protect, restore and enhance.. would this group be interested in restoring a system that is unhealthy today.

and the public in general

Need to clearly define "reservoir system" as different folks conjure up different images

Use terminology consistent with NHFAP: "protect, restore, enhance" habitat

How much of this effort should be focused on sport fishing versus improvement generally of aquatic systems, which could include threatened and endangered species.

Conservation of (restoration, protection, and management) of habitat for the benefit of fish, wildlife, and people....

I suggest separating up protection from rehabilitation in this goal. I strongly support protecting healthy habitat and one should not have to improve healthy habitat. I would add another objective to address rehabilitation of degraded reservoir habitat.



Is "healthy" an adequate descriptor? This could be interpreted in different ways, for example, for a system to be healthy does it need to be managed for native species only, or is it ok to manage for non-natives as well?

Healthy may be relative to regions but should give us something to start with. Healthy should resonate well with public.

1. To partner with key stakeholders to identify issues negatively impacting the quality of fish and fishing supported by lakes and reservoirs

Good fisheries are products of healthy systems. So, promoting a healthy system will benefit all users and benefit fisheries. If we focus too closely on fisheries we'll lose the greater public support.

To work with key stakeholders so that critical issues are assessed on a holistic, watershed basis

To work with stakeholders to identify lakes and reservoirs of special interest and prioritize those in need of protection and improvement

To work with key stakeholders to identify funding sources and implement management plans

PROTECTION and IMPROVEMENT are very different (you don't improve healthy systems)

1.3 To establish stakeholder partnerships that will develop and implement science-based action

The statement on science goals link applies to number 5 too

The four interim science goals for action plan implementation include protection, restoration and enhancement of sufficient amounts for water volume and flow (Noreen strongly supported this) in both lakes and reservoirs in addition to sufficient flow in rivers. Seems to me this should be tied to that goal. The other three are connectivity, water quality and protection of intact habitat. Tying this partnership and how they accomplish those 4 interim goals seems intuitive and should be built upon.

Actions based on strategic priorities should address root causes of habitat decline. Bring partners to the table who are now part of the problem -- get them to be part of the solution.

Non-traditional partners can bring new resources and technical expertise to the table. Especially important since most states are strapped for matching funds.

I suggest having a good definition of science-based.

Local knowledge is a critical part of a science-based approach, and access to it is fostered by a broad, diverse and collaborative partnership

A better definition for science-based: state of the art?



1.4 To ensure adequate resources are available to support implementation of action plans

This is a critical role for a national group - should focus efforts on this

Can this partnership take a lead in funding the Clean Lakes Program again?

Does National Partnership ensure adequate resources or does it better enable local partnerships to acquire resources as the result of its strategic focus, message, and outreach?

Why wouldn't existing and other new emerging partnerships not include reservoirs and lake habitat management to sustain their species of interest if those species are dependent on reservoir habitat? e.g. why is this needed as different partnership versus making sure all partnerships make this one of their 4 habitat priorities when applicable based on the science goals already established??

Rather than creating a national reservoir partnership, would it be better to develop a national reservoir advisory group that would be able to work through the recognized regional fish habitat partnerships with reservoirs identified as priorities, and serve as a network of information. For example, if within SARP--they identify Table Rock as one of the high priority reservoirs, then it becomes eligible for funding thru SARP. If each FHP has reservoirs of high importance for fish habitat, they can incorporate actions into their strategic plans to address the issues.

Which action plans? Maybe the goal is to make sure that whenever reservoir habitats are needed to sustain a species that resides in a reservoir that we maximize the management of the reservoir conditions to sustain productivity of that species or life phases but not harm other species that may be downstream and upstream

1.5 To support management decision-making through long-term, continual examination of issues, results and impacts of plan implementation.

Are we talking about adaptive management, here?

Should be adaptive management, assessment, monitoring and evaluation, and achieving success with a set of defined benchmarks

Need methods for setting strategic priorities for conservation action. Like Iowa has.

1.6 Increase public awareness, knowledge of, and support for, the importance and role of healthy reservoir systems

Important role for national partnership - this is where a national group could offer real value-added assistance to the process

Effective, non-traditional communication strategy should be developed as part of the overall strategic plan.

Develop a web site that can be used for internal and external information on the status of the effort.

Develop important and visible outreach communication tools for public users and residents at reservoirs participating in the partnership.



This must be tied to outcomes valued by key constituents. We must be able to answer the "why?" question

Engaging school-age youth in reservoir education and hands-on management offers opportunity to further awareness.

It will be imperative to make production of a particular fish species and the ability to fish at the reservoir a priority, especially if the reservoir was built for another purpose.

1.7 Additional Goals and Metrics needed for application.

How will we measure success of our efforts?

The action plan looks at intact habitat versus modified habitat. Why not group partnerships so some focus on regulated rivers/reservoirs versus unregulated rivers and unregulated lakes?

We need congressional support & possibly legislation. Don from Iowa brought up a good point that fish metrics need to be included.

To coordinate separate efforts across geographical regions

General assessment of major issues/problems/limitations to reservoir fisheries (sedimentation, erosion, lack of cover, nutrient problems - too many/too few) for the purpose of the application and strategic plan. This can probably be gathered from existing data. However, a comprehensive assessment will be necessary for meaningful prioritization of impaired reservoirs, which will take many years.

Don't focus on the application. If we have a diverse partnership, strategic priorities, and the means to measure progress, the application will practically write itself.

Should one goal be "more fish, faster, cheaper?"

Indicators of success:

- increase in fish biomass
- increase in angler success rates
- increase in public use

Have to first address legislative regulatory limitations as to why a reservoir was created and how it can be managed. Need to define if those limitations prevent better fish habitat or any fish habitat based management of reservoir

Increases in traditional measures such as increased catch rates and improved growth may not be detectable at the largest scales. It will be important to use creel survey results such as angler success and use to measure success. Even that may not capture subtle successes at the largest scales, so we'll need to be creative in our measurement of success.

To insure existing pilots and other new partnerships form integrate the significance of reservoir habitat management into their strategic planning.

Why should this be a separate initiative?



I don't think the angling community would feel comfortable relying on the WNTI or EBTJV to take care of their reservoir fisheries. SARP is about the only other partnership that could effectively handle reservoirs, but what about the other 3/4's of the country?

Why isn't reservoir habitat treated like any type of habitat management that is needed to sustain a targeted fish species or fish community? And why would you want to isolate it from consideration of flow, water quality and other habitat management scenarios needed for production of those targeted species and communities?

Metrics will be beyond just individual species. Need community-based metrics focused on defined state

We need to clarify if we are satisfied if it produces fish even if we can't access it or harvest the fish

We need a very clear, specific definition of the problem(s) we are trying to solve

These are artificial environments built for the benefit of large segments of our population. These may not be COMPLETELY fishery related. Goals must address constituent satisfaction to be effective

Include the broad spectrum of recreational users (boaters, homeowners) not exclusively anglers

Multi-layers of outcomes, metrics and metrics can make this partnership more powerful, but will also make it more complex

We've got to identify common denominators between all of these communities. Where we can find cross-cutting priorities the partnership will be successful. Consider 3 plans (1 that highlights the key marketing messages, the top line big motivators), a second plan that addresses the real strategic plan (for those who will implement the plan) and a 3rd plan targeted to legislators and other decision makers (focused on economic and ROI messages).

Maybe we should have a Bass Habitat partnership???

Do we need a focused (e.g. a fish species or group), centrarchid partnership a centrarchic reservoir partnership?

1.8 Research and data needs for the application. (what we know,...what we DON'T know & where it is).

Water quality to fishery trends and how this relationship affects anglers, boaters, water supplies, etc.

Data may be available from state resource agencies, state health agencies, USCOE, BOR etc.

We need a national inventory of reservoirs identifying habitat issues limiting fish production and/or angler participation

We need to review documentation as to why reservoirs created initially lots of information in various state, tribal, local and federal permitting licensing databases and file drawers



Lots of symposiums in past on reservoir management by a variety of professional organizations, AFS, ASCE, AWRA

We also need to tie to regulation of rivers downstream and upstream

How does this fit with existing pilot and other new emerging partnerships?

I suggest developing and using a robust reservoir classification system that will allow vertical and horizontal uses of the habitat quality information. Vertical uses will include summing habitat quality geographically. Horizontal uses includes allowing the habitat quality, information and habitat manipulation techniques to be used between reservoirs of simple types.

What about simply identifying all the various types of reservoirs that exist throughout the country and which management schemes are the best for the fish species that inhabit those reservoirs...

How about making sure that water laws in all the states allow for reservation of water to sustain the stage management and water quality conditions in a reservoir or lake...Only 4 states allow for establishing water rights or reservation of water in lakes and reservoirs for fish or recreation

Need to look at the variety of existing reservoirs in different geologic, geographic areas, different sizes, different ambient water quality etc and various species and communities to see which management practices work and which ones don't -- also need to compare with lake systems

Why not include lake or lentic habitat which includes manmade and natural (e.g. no human manipulation other than perhaps water withdrawals but no control structure.

National reservoir research program has a valuable starting point, augmented by a lot of State learning. Power companies and other partners may be able to supplement this inventory.

National Inventory of Dams may be a good starting place for an inventory, unless the old National Reservoir Research Program assembled one in the 1970s. If they did, it should still be valid, because few reservoirs have been built since then.



Chapter II Membership

Article 2

2.1 In pursuit of the purposes of the partnership, members shall act in accordance to the following principles

Should they have to agree that the goal of the reservoir should be to produce fish as highest priority?

2.2 Membership in the partnership will not preclude the ability of members to exercise their rights individually, or on behalf of their represented group.

Very important for a partnership of this size

2.3 Established and newly created agreements will be respected and incorporated into discussions and decisions.

How will transboundary international waters bordering Canada and Mexico be treated? Will they be included?

YES

Start small (north american WF) plan may offer a model

2.4 Rigorous peer-reviewed science must underpin partnership recommendations and decisions. This will be dynamic over time as new information becomes available.

There is some risk of losing partners here if we are TOO rigorous in detail. Don't risk losing the support of the general public with nth degree review

Make this more internally focused?

Expert opinion belongs here. We have an abundance of practitioners of this science

Decision making model will have to address data gaps that will have to rely on expert opinion for some choices

In a collaborative effort there is room for brining in the general public in comment and direction-setting

*Best available science (accepted term many understand)
Structured decision -making processes is another*

2.5 Partnership activities will be long-term and continuing; members of the partnership will make commitments accordingly.



2.6 Partnership members will seek to communicate openly and honestly about the needs of their interest groups.

2.7 Members of the partnership will strive for candid discussion of difficult issues in face-to-face situations. Confrontational public approaches will be discouraged as unproductive to the process.

2.8 Partnership members will make every effort to be flexible and open to new ideas and to the input of fellow members.

2.9 Extreme positions that would result in dramatic win/lose proposals for partnership members will not be introduced.

Partnerships must be realistic in goal setting and compromises will be necessary. Some limitations will be necessary to "manage" partnerships w perhaps an oversight and "technical working group" approach. Sharing of information will be key but also present issues with time and interpretation of the information shared.

This is an important point. NFHAP is all about identifying common interests and moving forward on that basis. Partners will disagree on some issues, but the partnership should be based on what they have in common.



Chapter III Membership

We want to collaborate with like-minded people. Fish do not to be explicit priorities, but they certainly will be helpful

Formalize a minority report (but set this at some set level i.e. 20% to avoid capturing too much background static)

Minority positions should include actual positions; not just contrary perspectives

In IA FISH and DUCKS are never mentioned; the HEALTH OF THE SYSTEM works very well.

Care must be taken to link health of the system to both objectives
It's not in there, but its in there has to be the message to these groups

If there is a conflict, fish should get the highest priority in the Reservoir partnership

Fish has to be the focus, but this is a voluntary effort.

Multiple marketing messages are the way to address both sides of these concerns. Goals won't change, but specific messages will need to be developed for targeted audiences

Keep fish in the equation

Article 3

Is there a group of reservoir homeowner associations we may be able to address?

3.1 The Members of the Partnership shall be appointed, elected, or clearly identified spokespersons for their respective interest groups.

3.2 We will seek consensus where possible, but where consensus can't be reached, decisions will be reached by majority if 2/3rds of membership are present.

One of the things we identified in Atlanta was the need to view "meetings" in a way that includes an opportunity for "attendance" remotely -- there will be a need for a capability for partners to interact in a meeting session that they are not able to physically attend due to travel and/or time constraints. Not only will there be a need to allow partners to attend via phone or web access, but there will likely be a need to give partners some time after a particular meeting to review the archived discussion and comment --possible even to vote for some time afterwards.

The above comment was from John Taylor (TPWD) on 9-16-2007

3.3 Different levels of membership are anticipated. Different decisions will be made by Executive Committees, partners and general members

Depending on the type of reservoir and species that use the reservoir you will need expertise in the partnership to correctly select the best management scenarios and apply the appropriate science..



3.4 There shall be one spokesperson per interest group.

Some interest groups are very "decentralized" or fractured - such as landowners (through various associations) and lake residents etc. Would they be represented by more than one spokesperson?

3.5 Designated alternatives may vote if they come prepared to the meeting.

3.6 Each organization may designate up to 2 alternatives to attend meetings. Each alternative must be identified IN ADVANCE.

3.7 No single person may represent more than 2 organizations in any capacity.

A representative may be a member of two organizations but should really just represent one at the meetings.

Article 4

4.1 Membership in the reservoir partnership will be open to all groups who have a direct interest in NFHAP reservoir system management issues. (i.e. specific recreational, economic, ecological, or other watershed-based interests)

State Fish Administrators
Management authorities (regulatory, dam operators)
Lake/Home Owners Associations
Conservation Groups
Watershed groups
Fishing & Tackle Manufacturers
Sportsmen's groups
BASS
Boaters
Rec users
Marina Operators
Marina Associations
Boating Manufacturers
Landowners
Chambers of Commerce

Tourism Associations
Other Federal & State Agencies
Universities
Counties & Townships
Commercial fisheries?
Tribes
Water Management Districts

Water Consumers
o Agriculture



- o Irrigation
- o Drinking Water

Several categories were discussed as potential exclusions. Elected officials, the media and individuals or organizations with obvious conflicts probably are not appropriate for membership in the partnership.

***** Above Notes from Atlanta Session *****

International commissions for transboundary waters

Need to include USDA because the Farm Bill will be a key in both current & future habitat work.

There might be legal limitations as to how and why a reservoir can be managed and those entities that have ultimate jurisdiction should have automatic seat even if they choose not to participate

Need limnologists (early warning system for breakdowns)

4.2 The process will not regress due to the entry of new members. New members will familiarize themselves with the process-to-date and contribute to the discussion from their time joining.

This will require a well-considered system for archiving activities and background information, which will also require a great deal of administrative effort.

The above comment was from John Taylor (TPWD) on 9-16-2007

Could existing members serve as facilitators to bring new members up to speed?

4.3 A balance of Partnership members will be sought.

This suggests that certain partners will be accepted, while others will not. What is the process for allowing new partners in, and who will decide?

What does balance mean? Equal mix of business, conservation etc interests?

Balance is not as important as having the right partners at the table, including industry, landowners, local governments -- those that make decisions that affect the condition of habitat.

This should not mean that some aspiring partners are excluded. It should mean that key non-traditional partners will be actively recruited.

Should include instream flow related folks too

This implies there will be some sort of selection process for who is included. May include a national segment to focus on broad national priorities (specifically for funding). This group may define and prioritize measures and metrics and priorities

At a regional/local level this mix will be defined by the water body. These partnerships will be more opportunistic



Do we really need to define who can be a member of the partnership or would it be better to let the focus of the partnership determine it's membership?

4.4 It was noted that in some cases success might involve simply maintaining. We may not always be able to improve situations. Sometimes preventing loss is the best that can be done.

Does this belong in the section about membership?

This does not belong here. Maintenance of existing state should be addressed if necessary in set of principles

Article 5

5.1 Active electronic options (conference calls, email and other collaborative web tools) will be used to maximize participation options. A member (or designee) of the Partnership who has missed two consecutive meetings, and who has not provided an adequate Alternate, will be asked to relinquish voting privileges.

It is understood that there is an existing entity currently works with reservoir proposals in the Southeast and resolution is essential.

Role of Regional

1. Geographic/Regional administration by AFS regions
2. Some minor changes will be necessary to address a few SARP overlaps (e.g.,MO)

Role of National

1. Advocacy will be the primary role (industry/lobbying/influence)
2. Determines a final prioritization of recommended projects
3. Guiding Principles
 - * Broad distribution of regional representation on National Committee
 - * Ensure an equitable balance of perspective and projects across the nation within a strategic framework
 - * Provide strategic oversight for prioritization of investment

- * Legal/funding structures will be handled by the Executive Committee
- * A stakeholder group will handle larger policy issues
- * Keep this flexible to enable a maximum amount of participation
- * Let it be self-selecting according to who wants to participate.
- * Another option: leave it looser

Executive Committee should be a small number of people

Stakeholder membership will be self-selecting and stakeholders can join at any point in time.

Assumption: we will rely on a majority of meetings being held in virtual mode: email/conf calls. Face-to-face Executive Committee meetings will be held in



conjunction with events to economize on travel time and expenses. Few, if any, dedicated meetings are envisioned.

Regional science teams will prioritize local partnership alternatives. Regions will provide alternatives to NFHAP Science Team via the National Executive Committee.

Regions come together to see how decisions fit together

The plan must accommodate reviewing overlap and duplication. A process for avoiding duplications of project submittals must be developed.

Workshop participants believe they are not receiving the right kind of direction from the NFHAP. There are really 2 options:

1. They embrace us and we become a partner
2. We create our own structure that provides for our own representation

*****Above Notes from Atlanta Session *****

5.2 Two groups will be necessary:

Other groups may be needed, for example, technical committee (science & data), communications, development (funding). Membership on these committees is another way for partners to participate and contribute.

Why wouldn't this mimic WNTI board?

WNTI idea is good since they have five FWS regions, plus NOAA, BLM multiple states, BLM, NGOs maybe use SARP as model too

Does NOAA have a role in this?

5.2.1 An Executive Committee

How many members, how many states? Need to be limited to allow work to be done effectively.

5.2.2 A stakeholder group who wants/needs to be involved and informed of developments

5.3 Regional options will be less formal. Too much rigidity will discourage participation.

5.3.1 Option A: Regional science review teams (up to 6) will evaluate/prioritize alternatives (with national guidance).

Coordination with SARP will need to be defined. Not a bad thing...just need to be careful to avoid duplicating the successful work of others

SARP will probably be easy...coordinating with 35 other states will be the challenge



5.3.2 Option B: A national stakeholder group makes the call with broader perspective. Both options need to be incorporated for effective decision-making.

Chapter IV: Rules of Engagement

6 AFS Divisions vs. Associations discussed. To be determined as to how the best regional perspectives can be included

Article 6

6.1 Members of the partnership will make at least a 1-2 year commitment to stay engaged in the process.

We might want to adjust and point out they need to participate majority of meetings and or have a surrogate with same authority to make decisions

6.2 Partnership members agree to commit some level of time, talent or treasure (resources) to the effort.

Article 7

7.1 Regional Science Teams (Technical Advisory Groups) will be established. Each TAG will consist of model builders, biologists, economists and other technical experts required by the partnership.

I recommend that the partnership have at least one individual as a liaison with the Board Science and Data Committee to improve information flow and ensure the Board provides products the Partnership needs.

Add limnologists and people that work with regulated and unregulated rivers and lakes

What about systems that are brackish but support fish?

Hydraulic engineers, hydrologists too... might want riparian and terrestrial specialists too if other species use system. In cold climates have to take into account that reservoir management can lead to drowning of migrating large game if management leads to break in ice cover or its thickness for important animal migration routes... ice management can also be important to ice fisherman..

We need to take into account temperature and other downstream water quality changes not just downstream flow

7.2 TAGs will solely serve an advisory role to the partnership.

Need to take issue of how to link with SARP WNTI, EBT seriously

Need to look at existing partnerships and the other 10 or 20 that are forming



7.3 Inventory existing research activities and link to website

Is there an inventory of existing research? If so, where? How to we collect and manage this data?

Potential national level participation: NMMA (may also want to participate at the regional level via marina operator associations.)

Decisions needed:

- * National Executive Committee -- Open or appointed?
- * Since most of the work will be framed by the Executive Committee, should they be elected?
- * Agreement on how National Committee gets put together is needed.

***** Above Notes from the Atlanta Session *****

How will those projects that have impacts to anglers i.e. brush pile? construction be considered vs. those that have more of an ecological benefit? Since reservoirs are artificial the habitat projects may not link as clearly from an ecological standpoint as well as natural water bodies.

Reservoirs built for different purposes (hydropower, navigation, cooling reservoirs etc) may pose unique problems and opportunities to get those entities buy-in to the program early on.

Article 8

8.1 A facilitator will be used to guide the early stages of development

Hire (or designate by SFC) a project manager who will coordinate partnership activities for at least the first 90 days.

An Preliminary Executive Committee will provide initial guidance for the partnership (Durocher, Martel, Nygren, and Hannibal Bolton)

8.2 A partnership chairperson may be elected in the future if the partnership deems it necessary

Begin with the Executive Committee and a develop a draft governance and draft application submittal while building the partnership.

It will be necessary to have a chair or co-chairs to effectively run the partnership.

Article 9

9.1 Regular agendas and times for partnership teleconferences and meetings will be planned and posted in advance to enable maximum participation.

9.2 The partnership will avoid creating a new meeting track. As much as possible, the partnership will piggyback with



existing meetings and rely on virtual collaboration (teleconferences, web and email) to transact business.

9.3 Before being considered by the partnership. Scientific findings, proposed by-laws, and updates will distributed well in advance (30 day min) of partnership meetings to enable adequate technical member preparation.



10. Other Stuff: Parking Lot

Need to make sure we are able to maintain work that is already happening. In some places we have good systems, it is often easier to maintain & protect than to restore or create.

Is FACA an issue here?

When we get the money rolling in it will be a challenge to prioritize projects nationally. One fix will be to divide up regionally using AFS regions (western, southern, etc.) & allocate a certain percentage to each region & then to keep a portion held back for the steering committee to fund that maybe didn't make the first cut but are important.

Need to categorize reservoirs based on size species competing uses geological origin, water quality,

This will not be a federally-lead effort (if we do this right)

It seems like those that want a reservoir partnership will benefit by talking to all the other partnerships

This could be a huge initiative (\$billions) but we shouldn't be afraid of that. Because of the return on investment everyone associated will benefit. If we don't pursue this & don't go big we'll wish we had.

If we have an overall nation-wide reservoir partnership you benefit from the synergism

Important to be make sure clarification provided how a reservoir partnership management scenario for managing a reservoir would be balanced with other portions of watershed based fish production dependent on upstream flows and downstream flows that would be impacted by the reservoir or whether this is targeted to only benefit the reservoir fishery

Some chiefs have suggested WNTI should morph into a larger umbrella through WAFWA similar to SARP. Or at least it was discussed as an idea at last WAFWA meeting... so even though the current WNTI set doesn't have a reservoir focus it may not be the case in the future. and there might be conflict between some reservoir-based efforts in other parts of the WNTI geographic area.

There are also other partnerships being formed in the WAFWA area that merit this discussion about WAFWA having a more regional approach for partnerships in its area. This addresses the fact someone will have to referee competition among partnerships... and some think that a set up like SARP may be better to reconcile and prioritize when there are multiple partnerships in the same geographic area that overlap..

Might be a lot of political resistance in NW due to energy production and barge issues

How about danger of not maintaining a reservoir for human safety esp. downstream

11. Atlanta: Discussion and Next Steps

11.1 Assume the level of sophistication is pretty high for our potential stakeholders



11.2 Distinguish between partners and stakeholders. They are 2 distinct groups

* **Partners contribute resources: Time, Talent and Treasure: the 3-Ts**

* **Partners will include States/Federal agents/Industry agents/NGOs**

* **Stakeholders provide input and perspective. They are contributing opinions and influence**

Shouldn't private landowners be listed as a potential partners?

12. Next Steps

12.1 Finalize Any Agreements needed by the Group

Send all of this information and an email survey to all the existing pilot and candidate partnerships and federal caucus to obtain their views on whether this needs to be an independent partnership or integrated into other efforts. Better to learn now than later on

Ask each state fish and wildlife agency instream flow council member for their views of this including their federal counterparts in federal agencies and tribal entities...

Ask AFS membership if they think reservoir habitat merits its own category versus being a type of habitat needed to sustain a particular species or variety of species.

Wait to see if multistate grant (SARP) approved this week.. if it is broaden this survey before starting to expend money.. then have large workshop similar to this after doing an online similar survey and bring representatives for all existing or other emerging partnerships together to make sure this is integrated and not competing..

Should we start centrarchid partnership as a test case?

Need to be explicit why this type of partnership needed versus link to others including how to deal with multi jurisdictional complexity of individual state federal tribal jurisdictions for fish and water management not like NAWCA.. unlike NAWCA ,states primarily manage the water but reservoir management of water varies from state to state.

12.2 Finalize Executive Committee

The Team

=====

Phil Durocher, TX

Gary Martel, VA

Doug Nygren, KS

Chris Horton, ESPN/BASS

Karl Hess, USFWS

See if representatives from existing pilots and candidates want to participate either at this or another level

Distribute the new/improved list of emails to all attendees



dougn@wp.state.ks.us

12.3 Collect Partner Contact Information

Example: Chris Horton/ESPN-BASS: 555-1212

Call Vern Herr @ 770.757.9828...for contact coordination (to make the call)

Bureau of Reclamation should be brought to the table.

Watershed organizations (water quality/sedimentation i.e. Don B's "Water People") need to be solicited.

What about FERC, Bureau of Rec, Tribes, state water allocation agencies, Western States Water Council, COE, NW POWER PLANNING, EPA, TVA, ETC.????

Names/numbers/specifics?

Who are these guys? (and gals?)

12.4 Resource Contributions: Where will they come from....who should be approached?

Jim Martin: Pure Fishing has committed resources to this effort. Need to clarify commitments. Chris Horton to handle

Texas Parks & Wildlife: Phil Durocher has committed staff time to write the application. They will work with ALL interested parties to refine this

Ask Moberly for input from AFS

Other partnerships especially if we don't know how this fits yet???

Hannibal has committed staff and resources too.

Gary/Michigan welcomes any/all science data questions

Can we get EPA Water Division/Clean Lakes Program more involved on the Executive Team.

Names? Don/IA can help us locate this POC

NFWF Venture Grants (regionally/nationally) should be explored for high risk, potentially high return projects. Reservoir partnership should aggressively pursue these

Bureau of Reclamation is a potential partner (resource contributor?)

Contact Krystyna by email: wolniakowski@nfwf.org for NFWF fisheries grant program availability to support seed funds for these initiatives.

12.5 Interested parties that would like to actively participate in drafting the application

Note: The drafts of the applications and the governance model will be shared with all parties. This is for individuals that would like to actively assist in gathering background information and data needed to complete the application.



Kansas has asked Tom Mosher to assist.

12.6 Immediate Next Steps and Follow-up to Meeting

1. Phil's team will build a 2-pager setting out the case for a reservoir partnership. This will also be developed as a positioning. Marketing, recruitment tool
2. Pull together financial partners to define next action items
3. Durocher will attend Board meeting to offer perspective
4. GS will distributed meeting notes and ppts
4. Wiki site to TX draft plan will be distributed for comment to session participants

12.7 Outstanding Issues that Need Resolution

How do we coordinate with SARP?

National Board guidelines require geographic boundaries. How does reservoir partnership address this? Ask that the guidelines be changed?

What is the timeline? Set clear expectations of time for both partners and stakeholder groups in the meetings / participation and when they might see a habitat project be constructed.

How will this be integrated with all watershed elements related to connectivity upstream and downstream flows, other reservoirs and lakes in the same watershed etc...?

Based on the science goals and 4 interim NFHAP science goals established and the fact there is already existing recognition of reservoirs in the action plan, it still isn't clear why this type of partnership is needed or appropriate and wouldn't already be integrated as a habitat type that will among those addressed in existing fish species based habitat partnerships. E.g. why wouldn't EBT or WNTI automatically include reservoir habitats among other habitat types if needed to protect, restore or enhance those targeted fish species??.

Seems like maybe the question is instead whether other fish species based partnerships are needed in parts of the country where there are reservoirs that aren't covered by the existing fish habitat partnerships in order to focus on reservoir management to improve or retain productivity of those species not already covered by existing partnerships/ this seems more logical...

What do the existing partnerships think about the idea of a reservoir habitat partnership?

Integrate this discussion of lotic and lentic habitats and regulated and unregulated habitat types in the big science workshop that USGS offered to sponsor and to fund at the June 2007 National Fish Habitat Board meeting...Also make sure all parts of USGS participate not just brd nbii need to include their water section staff too those that gage and water quality specialists.

Participate in Flow 2008 meeting in San Antonio...



Linking with other organizations efforts that Don announced.

To help us understand and identify the common interest that bring us together as a partnership, perhaps we should first identify the primary stakeholders, then identify and rank their interests, then look at the intersection of the collective interests and then see what pops up as the commonality --- and then build around that.

Is quality of life the common denominator that brings us together whether measured as good fishing, economic prosperity, clean water, pleasing water environment, boating etc.

Quality of life for both humans and aquatic species (including upstream through habitat restoration etc).

Most of the other partnerships focus on streams/rivers not reservoirs for instance WNTI has little or no reservoir habitat work

National Reservoir Partnership: Enhancing America's Quality of Life

This should be an opportunity to grow the NFHAP by addressing reservoir issues

How does SARP fit into this National Reservoir Fish Habitat Partnership?

Parallel process with Clean Water Act/Fishable-swimmable waters. This partnership needs to be developed. Identify some of the issues we can help with. The Fishable Waters Act resulted in some unintended effects. We aren't the only game in town. Look for ways to link greens and rec interests. This would be an unbeatable combination. No point pollutions may be the next frontier where they need help. This partnership can help provide prioritization and perspective for expanding everyone's horizons.



Afternoon Discussion Notes

Next steps and action that will be needed to develop a compelling NFHAP proposal:

- At a national level we haven't talked to a lot of the partners we'll need to include to make this successful
- Coordinating overlap with existing pilot partnerships needs to be considered and addressed.
- What will our strategic focal point be to gather stakeholders and partners and to assist in prioritizing our efforts?
- Addressing challenges on the political side
- Let's be sure not to duplicate the successful work of others. Setting aside egos and hurt feelings will be central to success.
- We'll pass the hat for resources for people and dollars.
- The focus of the partnership will be impoundments; not natural lakes
- Jaime Geiger: I have the same question. Will the partnership be inclusive or Exclusive?
- Christopher Estes: focus is on any lentic system with human manipulation (any modified lentic system)
- Don: size? No restrictions on size. Addressed

How will we measure success? This needs to be in our upfront goal statement

Is the Board willing to consider geographic guidelines?

Hannibal: consider this fixed.

KW: The NFHAP Board must understand the compelling reason for a Reservoir Partnership and why reservoir needs get increased awareness of need. This plan needs to underscore the need. Board is not so rigid it will not consider options

NA Waterfowl mgmt got launched with getting folks together to do the right thing.

Jaime Geiger: Board is comprised of reasonable folks who will understand a systems approach. Recognize, identify and celebrate this, but let's not hold off on moving forward.

Stewart Jacks: Don's IA presentation should be multiplied 50 times to make this point and demonstrate what's needed.

Gary Whelan: The core team knew this was a possibility. We wanted to encourage this. Individual system partnerships was discussed. We don't see encumbrances or opposition. Sedimentation, water quality.

Water quality/quantity problems are cross-cutting. The intent is to let folks learn from each other. Continuity and common problems should be emphasized.

Phil Durocher: The latest hunting & fishing survey should be underscored. A high percentage of the revenue that enables management and conservation programs to keep going comes from the revenue reservoirs produces.



Jaime Geiger: No existing partnership has the potential to mobilize the same level of funding sources and diversity as this one.

Gary Whelan: The biggest impediment is demonstrating how you're going to coordinate among partnership.

Counterpoint: The National Waterfowl Compact did NOT specifically address this issue: It identified needs and encouraged people to apply for these. A bottom up approach might pertain here.

A key element is that the national resource pie has to get a LOT bigger to make it attractive for partners to get interested. The current pain to reward ration is pretty low for most state agencies.

Don Bonneau: there will be huge challenges to do this right with water partners. This is the ultimate connector of landscape, fish and people. These are easy economic justifications for showing the consequences of a no action plan.

Jaime Geiger: shorebird and migratory plans are looking hard at joint ventures with existing bird partnerships that would make our efforts more relevant.

Stewart Jacks: this fits with apache trout at the top of the watershed. If we're taking care of this into Roosevelt Lake all benefits get shared. We don't need to see partnerships as disconnected, competitive issues. Both of the projects can share priorities.

Bret summarizes

We see some connections across pilots

Will be challenged to get the board to understand

Great potential to understand potential

Jaime Geiger: have we considered the largest obstacles to what we're trying to accomplish?

Chris Horton: I see these as salmon restoration/recovery and potentially western water regulators. We need to think through some strategies for thinking through "we can live with it strategies" for these groups.

Doug Nygren: can we still go on record as writing a letter to the Board on consideration for the Board.

Can we line up participation at the Board for a Reservoir mtg 10/2-3?

The key is being very specific about the needs. The Board is not going to oppose anything that will benefit the progress of this action plan. **We need to state a compelling case. The burden is on us to demonstrate clearly why a partnership is needed and why existing partnerships can't address the habitat challenges we have identified.**

Economic values need to be highlighted. Reservoirs are something that are valuable. If we lose them all habitat initiatives will lose.



Phil/John will build a case summary on issues and economics (2 page) for the recruiting partners. Will send to committee for review and comment. It will be ready for Oct. meeting.

Chris Horton: We need to be further along than we are to be able to approach industry and manufacturers. Nothing has been focused on these groups to show who is working on this issues.

Jaime Geiger: Consider NFWF Venture grants. These are high risk/high return grants for emerging projects. The Reservoir partnership is a potential candidate.

Include Mike Smart as a technical resource for the Corps. He can link us to the right POCs who may be able help. Colonel is who you need to be able to link in. And they move every 18 months

Final Thoughts

Chris Horton: Thanks. The reservoir partnership is the single most important issue to our membership

Phil Durocher: Thanks to Chris, Hannibal and Karl for hosting this session for hosting this session. It is very much appreciated

Mike Wood: This is a big partnership with benefits for many agencies. They'll help us if we can show them we can help them.

Scott Robinson: If SARP gets funded we can start working out some of these questions in Jan. If not, we'll still work to maximize the effectiveness of this effort.

Tom Busian: I am the USFWS liaison to help interpret NFHAP guidelines and help move this forward. Look forward to continuing to assist with this effort.

Jaime Geiger: This partnership has the greatest potential to make a difference. This has all the cross-programmatic dimensions to win the day. I'm eager to help in any way I can.

Norm Stucky: BassPro has added significant dollars to this initiative. There is no question reservoirs contribute a lot. 70% of angling and boating takes place on reservoirs. We can't overlook these. These numbers pale in comparison to the real estate along the shorelines.

Krystyna Wolniakowski: Thanks for a great day. We want to expand the good work at Table Rock. NFWF deserves a lot of credit for reservoir habitat work.

Gary Whelan: We're at the team's disposal for technical & data questions. Our assistance is offered anywhere we can be helpful. Interactions with other partnerships will be the biggest hurdle to getting this approved by the Board.

Steve Miranda: I'm excited. In the last 20 years reservoir work has been in the doldrums. It's coming back. MS State cant' contribute monetarily, but we CAN contribute data. Reservoir database needs might help with a starting point. Steve will be lead reviewer for Phil's documents.



Ron Dent: We need to focus on the future in our communications. Billions of Dollars are at stake. We won't have the quality of life we're used to unless we take action now. Being at a critical point in time will be a key marketing messaging for the partnership.

John Engbring: This is the first opportunity I've had to sit in on this discussion. We haven't focused much on reservoirs in CA due to our priority on salmon. There may be an opportunity for us to get involved here. Our greatest interest is in growing the pie nationally vs. shifting/cannibalizing existing resources.

Don Bonneau: Thanks for the invitation to share Iowa's experience. All reservoirs face the same issues regardless of where they're located.

Christopher Estes: I'm here to help any way I can in this effort

Doug Nygren: This is the partnership we're most interested in. At the national level, the SARP message and Table Rock messages need to be highlighted. Not just about restoring natural spring systems. It would help us sell this message to a lot of stakeholders. Where this can be highlighted in releases it would be great.

Tom Mosher. I'm glad I was here. This is a good follow-up to a good start.

Hannibal Bolton: Thanks to Brett and Vern and to all who gave up a Sunday to be with us. My personal commitment to move this hard and fast.



Participants

Hannibal Bolton	USFWS	Hannibal.bolton@fws.gov
Tom Mosher	KS Dept of Wildlife & Parks	tomm@wp.state.ks.us
Doug Nygren/KS	KS Dept of Wildlife & Parks	dougn@wp.state.ks.us
Christopher Estes	Alaska Dept of Fish & Game	Christopher.estes@alaska.gov cestes@fishwildlife.org
Don Bonneau	Iowa DNR	Don.bonneau@dnr.iow.gov
John Engbring	USFWS (CA/NV)	John.engbring@fws.gov
Steve Miranda	Mississippi State	smiranda@cfr.msstate.edu
Gary Wheeler	Michigan DFHAP (Data & Science)	Whelan@michigan.gov
Krystyna Wolniakowski	WFWF	wolniakowski@nfwf.org
Martin MacDonald	BassPro	mmacdonald@basspro.com
Norm Stuckey	BassPro	npstucky@aol.com
Steward Jacks	USFWS AZ Fishery Resources	Stewart_jacks@fws.gov
Bob Curry	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Robert.curry@ncwildlife.org
Scott Robinson	SARP	Scott_robinson@dnr.state.ga.us
Tom Busian	USFWS	Tom_busian@fws.gov
Karl Hess	USFWS	Karl_hess@fws.gov
Mike Wood	LA Dept of Wildlife & Fisheries	mwood@wlf.louisiana.gov
Gary Saul	TXPWD	Gary.saul@tpwd.state.tx.us
John Taylor	TXPWD	John.taylor@tpwd.state.tx.us
Neal Jackson	KY Fish & Wildlife Department	Neal.jackson@ky.gov
Jaime Geiger	USFWS	Jaime_geiger@fws.gov
Chris Horton	BASS	Christopher.m.horto@fws.gov
Brett Boston	Group Solutions	bostonbret@aol.com
Vern Herr	Group Solutions	vherr@groupsolutions.us
Ron Dent	MO Dept of Conservation	Ron.dent@ndc.mo.gov



The Bass Pro-NFWF Conservation Grants Program

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is continuing its partnership with Bass Pro Shops Inc. to support a conservation grants program for Table Rock Lake and watershed in Arkansas and Missouri. This program leverages Bass Pro funds raised through Evenings of Conservation and other donations with the Foundation's federal funds and grantee matching funds. Primarily, grants focus on the restoration and enhancement of the reservoir, Table Rock Lake and its tributary habitats for sport and native fish populations as well as for conservation education. The partnership with Bass Pro began in 2003 to give them an opportunity to have a positive conservation impact in the immediate region where each new store was opening through Evenings of Conservation, while at the same time raising the Foundation's profile at the local level. The partnership expanded in 2006 when Bass Pro Shops made a five-year commitment to contribute \$300,000 a year towards Table Rock projects, and an additional \$200,000 a year for operations to support the administration of all the Foundation's fish programs, with the Foundation and grantees matching an additional \$1 million per year to leverage Bass Pro funds 2:1. In fall 2006, the Foundation Board approved the first grant to the Missouri Department of Conservation for "Fish Habitat Improvement in Table Rock Lake (MO) I", which awarded \$300,000 of the Bass Pro funds, with \$50,000 of Foundation federal funds and \$100,000 grantee match. The Foundation then approved two more grants for Table Rock and the tributaries in spring 2007. Each year, the Foundation and grantees will need to contribute \$600,000 in match for Table Rock projects to be able to provide the required 2:1 match with Bass Pro.

Awarded Project Fall 2006:

Project	Organization	FWS	Bass Pro	Match	Total
Fish Habitat Improvement in Table Rock Lake (MO) - I	Missouri Department of Conservation	\$50,000	\$300,000	\$100,00	\$450,000

Awarded Projects Spring 2007:

Project	Organization	FWS	Bass Pro*	Match	Total
Fish Habitat Improvement in Table Rock Lake (MO) - II	Missouri Department of Conservation	\$200,000		\$117,000	\$317,000
Table Rock Lake and Tributary Habitat Improvement (AR) I	Arkansas Game and Fish Commission	\$50,000		\$83,000	\$133,000



Project Title: Fish Habitat Improvement in Table Rock Lake (MO) - I and II
Recipient: Missouri Department of Conservation

NFWF Federal Funds:	\$250,000	(FWS)
NFWF Nonfederal Funds:	\$300,000	(Bass Pro)
Matching Contributions:	\$217,000	
<hr/>		
Total Projects Costs	\$767,000	

Project Area: Southern Missouri

The Missouri Department of Conservation will continue to improve and restore fish habitat in Table Rock Lake and Lake Taney Como, located in the White River Hills Region of the Ozark Plateau along the Missouri-Arkansas border. Table Rock Lake is a 43,100 acre reservoir created by the Army Corps of Engineers and encompasses 745 miles of shoreline, and Lake Taneycomo covers just over 2000 acres. **Crappie, white and black bass, walleye and paddlefish** are found in Table Rock Lake, whereas **rainbow and brown trout** are found in the colder, waters of Lake Taneycomo. This area is one of the best for bass fishing, yet experts agree that habitat and water quality are limiting the lake's full potential for a productive and diverse fishery. Project staff will work with private landowners on cost-share projects to stabilize selected stream banks and expand/enhance riparian corridors within the Table Rock watershed in Missouri. In addition, staff will improve water quality within Table Rock Lake and its tributaries by monitoring watershed conditions and reducing nutrient loading, and using oxygen supplementation technology as needed. Structures designed to increase spawning and nursery habitats will be implemented and monitored to improve fish habitat within Table Rock Lake and to determine their effectiveness for use in other reservoir/lake systems. Outreach efforts will also be implemented to increase angler awareness and improve landowner stewardship through outreach and training workshops.

Project Title: Table Rock Lake and Tributary Habitat Improvement (AR) - I
Recipient: Arkansas Game and Fish Commission

NFWF Federal Funds:	\$ 50,000	(FWS)
Matching Contributions:	\$ 83,000	
<hr/>		

Total Project Costs: \$133,000

Project Area: Northern Arkansas

The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission will work closely with the Missouri Department of Conservation to continue to improve and restore fish habitat in southern reaches of Table Rock Lake where it crosses the border from Missouri to Arkansas and the Kings River, a tributary to the lake. Table Rock Lake is a 43,100 acre reservoir created by the Army Corps of Engineers and encompasses 745 miles of shoreline, of which more than 2000 acres is on the Arkansas side. **Crappie, white and black bass, walleye and paddlefish** are found in Table Rock Lake, whereas **rainbow and brown trout** are found in the colder, waters of the Kings River. Habitat and water quality are also limiting factors for the lake and tributaries, as on the Missouri side. The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission staff and members of the Kings River/James River Watershed Group will work together with private landowners on cost-share projects to reduce nutrient runoff and improve water quality through implementation of best management practices, stabilize stream banks through erosion control, and expand/enhance riparian corridors within the King River watershed. They will also add fish habitat structures within southern Table Rock Lake designed to increase spawning and nursery habitats, particularly focused on bass populations.

These first three pilot projects to be implemented will be part of a potential new national reservoir partnership under the **National Fish Habitat Action Plan**.

