

Technical Advisory Group Charter

Group Title:

Columbia River Basin Water Management Program Technical Advisory Group (CR-TAG).

Purpose:

To create a forum for technical experts to evaluate water supply projects proposed for funding from the Columbia River Water Resources Account. Participants include, but are not limited to, biological, irrigated-agriculture, hydrogeological, operational, and engineering experts.

Specific Objectives / Charge:

Evaluate project proposals, apply the Columbia River Water Resources Account funding criteria, and make recommendations to the Department of Ecology (Ecology) on project eligibility and priority ranking.

Governance and Decision Making:

1. All parties have equal representation and equal participation.
2. The group will be chaired by a representative of the Washington State Conservation Commission. The chair will help Ecology coordinate meetings and assist with setting meeting agendas and leading meeting discussions.
3. Consensus outcomes are preferred, but not required; where the group does not reach consensus, the full range of perspectives will be carried forward as input to Ecology. Consensus is defined as an outcome everyone on the Group can live with and support, acknowledging that it may not be everyone's first choice.
4. Summary discussion points, recommendations and action items from meetings will be documented by the Chair with review by CR-TAG members.

Relationship to the Policy Advisory Group (CR-PAG):

The Policy Advisory Group is responsible for providing Ecology with a full range of perspectives on policy choices and priorities related to the Columbia River Basin Water Resources Management Program. The PAG will be briefed on the specific project rankings recommended by the CR-TAG and provided an opportunity to offer their perspective on the proposed projects.

Determination of Which Projects to Propose for Funding:

Ecology is responsible for making final decisions about which projects to propose to the Legislature, in consideration of the CR-TAG recommendations on project rankings, input from the CR-PAG, and other relevant information such as funding capabilities, geographic determinations, pending water rights applications, project diversity, etc.

Expectations of Participants:

1. Participants or approved alternates will make every effort to attend meetings. Participants and approved alternates for the CR-TAG have been selected based on technical expertise in areas required for the scoring of applications, with input from the CR-PAG and other sources. Participants shall designate an alternate with the same or similar technical expertise as the participant, subject to approval by Ecology and the Conservation Commission. Alternates shall have the same voting and scoring rights and be subject to the same expectations as set forth in this Charter as participants when they are substituting for the participant. If an alternate is needed, the alternate will be briefed prior to meetings and able to participate fully in decision making for the area of expertise represented by the participant. Field visits will generally be limited to staff directly responsible for scoring portions of the application.
2. Participants will represent their own professional views and expertise, irregardless of CR-TAG members' employers' internal policies. To the extent that participants represent an organization

that will assist the participant in scoring an application, the participants are responsible for coordinating the technical evaluations of the organization and bringing that information to the CR-TAG.

3. Collaborative problem solving depends on mutual respect and careful listening among participants and on active participation by all. Meetings will be conducted in a respectful atmosphere where all parties seek to foster trust and understanding.
4. Participants will strive for honest and direct communication and a focus on technical issues rather than policy positions. Participants will allow for open discussion and the right to disagree, and will look for opportunities to find common interests, agreements, and solutions.
5. Participants will focus on clarifying their own views and interests; they will refrain from characterizing the views of other participants especially in conversations with the press.
6. The ranking criteria will be segregated into areas of expertise. Each participant will be expected to focus their ranking efforts to that portion of the ranking criteria relevant to their field of expertise. Ecology will work to delineate the criteria appropriately to meet this goal. Participants will not be asked to rank those criteria outside of their respective areas of expertise. Example: A fish biologist will not be expected to rank criteria dealing with water rights. Areas of expertise and scoring responsibilities will be determined at the outset of each funding season, and the Chair will coordinate distribution of materials to the relevant CR-TAG members.
7. If a Participant or the Participant's employer is a proponent of a potential project and a conflict of interest is thereby created, that Participant must disclose the Participant's or the Participant's employer's involvement in the potential project. A Participant who has such a conflict of interest may make technical recommendations on the potential project, but must also be recused from scoring and voting on a potential project.

Meeting Frequency:

8. First meeting – August 30, 2007.
9. Subsequent meetings will be based on project submittals and will occur approximately bi-weekly during April and May and as necessary thereafter.

Who Sets the Agenda:

Ecology in consultation with the CR-TAG chair will set the agenda. Input from the membership will also be considered.

Participation:

All CR-TAG participants listed below are voting and scoring members:

1. Jon Culp, Conservation Commission, TAG Chair
2. Dan Haller, Ecology, Irrigation and Municipal Engineering
3. David Cummings, Ecology, Dam Safety Program
4. Peggy Miller, WDFW, State Fisheries Interest
5. Mark Nielson, Franklin Conservation District, WACD Irrigated Agriculture Expertise
6. Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, Salmon Recovery Expertise
7. Tom Ring, Yakima Nation, Hydrogeology and Water Resources
8. Onni Perala, Roza Irrigation District, BOR (retired), Civil Engineering and Water Delivery Infrastructure
9. Bruce Beauchene, City of Kennewick, Municipal Water Supply Management Expertise

Alternates:

10. Paul LaRiviere, WDFW, for Peggy Miller
11. Mike Tobin, North Yakima Conservation District, for Mark Nielson
12. Steve Hays, Chelan PUD, for Steve Martin