

Columbia River Basin Transboundary Cooperation Interview Questions

Date: July 14th, 2015

Name: Rick Allen

Title: Columbia Basin Trust, Environment Program Manager

Contact Information: 250 417 3665, Rallen@cbt.org

1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?

- Environment Program Manager –manages a number of programs
 - Ecosystems – work that will enhance, protect, conserve ecosystems for species of conservation concern
 - Water (Tim)
 - Climate
 - Land conservation – have an initiative that engages with land trust organizations – acquire private land for land conservation purposes - protect ecosystem species impacted primarily by development
 - Environmental education program – provide education to basin residents of any age to help foster a stewardship ethic and more informed understanding of the natural world and how it operates
- His mission ^ under the CBT mission, which is to empower basin residents to build a sustainable lifestyle

2. What are the 3 most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the Columbia River Basin?

- Invasive species aquatic and terrestrial (probably number one focus) – Tim's focus
- Species of conservation concern (Ecosystem Program) – blue or red listed species
- Environmental education – key to reducing invasive species is through education

3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?

- Invasive species of any kind don't recognize boundaries
- Species of concern – fund a program called the Upper Kootenay Ecosystem Enhancement Program (UKEEP)
 - Provide funding to another agency – because they already have a process in place – save money and get some operational work done without administration
 - 2 initiatives in the works
 - Kokanee - working with the Montana Fish and Game Dept. in the koocanusa reservoir – abundance and distribution
 - Burbot (lingcod) - Cultural and heritage ties to the local first nations – historically a population of fish that not a lot is known about - looking at abundance and distribution – don't recognize borders so working with counterparts in Montana – a program has provided supplies (passive integrated transponder PIT tags) – documents/tracks fish
- In the past provided funding for projects that work across the border with grizzly bears
 - Dr Michael Proctor?
 - Primarily in the Selkirk mountains – range down into Idaho
- Also funded projects on wolverines
 - Cross boundary with Idaho Fish and Game and some consultants up here
- Just starting into work around energy and utilization of biomass – from the education perspective – had people go down and look and review what is being done in Montana (a lot of their schools use biomass to provide heat and electricity)

- Also doing some work cross boundary with NWPCC and CBT and other about salmon
 - Working hand in hand with groups across the line – FN and Tribes as well

4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?

- Working well – desire on both sides to look at any of these issues and work together
 - Able to cooperate and ignore the boundary
 - Resource managers at any level – recognize that the business they're in doesn't know political boundaries
 - Approached by Montana group when first started Burbot project with an offer – very proactive
 - When developed the UKEEP –leaned heavily on people like Brian Marotz (Montana FWP?) to help provide input into the plan and develop the plan – a number of his counterparts helped
 - Talking about Upper Kootenay – the river doesn't stop at the 49th parallel
 - Really important that people on both sides of the border recognize that – and that is what he has seen
- Rick has lived in the area for 50 years and thinks CBT is one of the best things to happen to the area
 - Couldn't do it by themselves though
 - CBT has been able to build basin strength

5. How are your existing initiatives funded?

- Very much a collaborative organization
- Like others to come with whatever resources they can bring
- CBT by in large brings cash
- But if you don't have cash bring sweat equity - lots of groups and organizations that do that
- Some of their major initiatives like the UKEEP Plan – FWCP has had an in kind donation
- the local FLNRO (forest lands natural resources operations) = forestry and environment end of government business have come to the table with cash, expert technical recommendations and review
- number of different entities that come to the table
- CBT also partners with HCTF (habitat conservation trust foundation) – they get money from fishing and hunting licenses – so does freshwater fisheries
- Work is not sustainable if CBT is the only funder and that is why the collaborative process is so important
- Need other people to come to the table for a lot of reasons – support community initiated and community supported projects
- Volunteer time, in kind contribution, or cash
- Because of difference in funding between US and Canada a lot of the time saw US funding coming into Canada – but now CBT is an entity that can return that in kind

6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?

- Done a good job in nurturing relationships between CBT and NWPCC and Montana fish and Game, Idaho Fish and Game, Washington, and to some degree the federal government
- Like to see more of a formal arrangement (like an MOU)
- Some do exist (for e.g. with NWPCC and BPA)
- But where they don't exist – formalizing that working relationship is important because it is a lot easier as a manager of resources to coordinate and plan etc.
- Money always appreciated but believes it is managed well and there is enough to do what needs to be done
- Entering into relationships and having a formal recognition of that relationship on both sides – a commitment

- When lose that corporate memory, have to keep momentum - but when you have something on paper the people that come after can pick that paper up and pick up where you left off

7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?

- Nothing at the moment that he is aware of
- But so much out there that is specific to a species etc.
- But at his level he is more operational
- Invasive aquatic mussels – started in the US – as became an issue for them became an issue for us up here
 - Being made aware – helps lead us to action
 - Happier to be proactive than reactive
- “The second biggest threat to biodiversity is invasive species”
- Just learning now about American Bullfrog (Jen Vogel passionate about needing to be addressed)
- Another partner would like to see more of is the Federal Government
 - Miss having them there (in the basin)
 - Still a partner at the border crossings obviously
 - DFO has some responsibility in the basin but they don’t have an office there – closest office is in Kamloops, closest operation people in Nanaimo
 - Engaging more with own federal government and the resources they bring is really important especially with transboundary issues

Interview Format		
Date: 7/24/15		
Name: Andy Dunau		
Title: Executive Director, Lake Roosevelt Forum		
Contact Information: 509.535.7084		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		We are a clearinghouse for dialogue about Lake Roosevelt and the upper Columbia river. Since the only regulatory authority over the Columbia belongs to federal agencies, we provide a place for the local communities, tribes and governments to have their voice heard and contribute to the management of the reservoir and the river.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		The biggest thing we do is our Lake Roosevelt conference, which happens every 18 months (last one was in April 2015). This brings together people from all over the region, including Canada, to discuss issues related to the lake, the communities, and the local ecosystem. We also send out a monthly electronic newsletter as well as a bi-annual mailed newsletter that has over 2,500 subscribers. Finally, we also conduct tours of the lake and do outreach in schools, community centers, etc. Our work is centered around this communications component.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Yes, the conferences are helping make connections across the border and we now have Canadians participating in those. We have also been coordinating with a local provincial government group in B.C. for 3-4 years now so those relationships have just begun to take root and we are now asking "what will cross-border collaboration look like?" We don't want to do coordination for coordination's sake so we're trying to take the time to answer that question, to get a more precise sense of what work is needed / wanted.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>All of our initiatives are solid - our activities are / were determined in consultation with the users and members of the forum. A recent poll found that people get a majority of their information about Lake Roosevelt from the LRF and so that's a good indicator that we are reaching people. We also have strong, longstanding relationships with the Feds, the tribes and our local communities so that is also a success - we have been able to maintain support for our efforts and continue to grow</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Our biggest source of funding for baseline operations of the LRF comes from Federal, tribal and county support. Secondly, we do get funding from EPA and USFW for the conference and we have also been the recipient of Public Participation grants from the Department of Ecology.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Andy's belief is that people tend to focus better and work harder when there is a clear initiative or goal in front of them. For example, the Columbia River Treaty review process served as a very useful organizing tool for conversations about the river, what we'd like to see, what's currently happening and where there could be changes made. It spurred a lot of work and conversations that probably would not have happened otherwise. Now that process is over and so the momentum has stalled. So in terms of thinking about how to approach our work collaboratively, with multiple domestic stakeholders as well as international partners, we should be thinking about what initiative options are out there that could provide a useful (virtual) structure for organizing cooperation around specific issues. There's little appetite for another brick-and-mortar institution, so we have to think creatively about how to organize and operate these transboundary initiatives and alliances.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Not that Andy's aware of - LRF meetings do a great job of bringing issues to the fore that might not otherwise get discussed. So if there's a big issue out there that Andy doesn't know about, he'd be surprised. As the communications hub, LRF tries to stay apprised and we are generally aware of most of the issues going on and are working to address them in ways that make sense for forum participants and their wider communities.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/8/2015		
Name: Yvette Converse		
Title: Coordinator, Great Northern LCC		
Contact Information: 406.994.7486		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?	To create and move towards a collective vision for the landscape that is science-based and community oriented by funding partner projects across the region. Everyone out there working within this landscape is a potential partner. Our job is to provide the context and make the case for why landscape-level conservation and coordination is important.	
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?	<p>1) The Washington Connected Landscapes Project (2010-now) - Under this project, the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group (WWHCWG) was formed as a science-based partnership that champions and seeks to improve habitat connectivity within the Columbia Plateau. Uses science-based tools to provide spatially-explicit data to stakeholders in order to understand existing and potential future landscape conditions. Planning tools. This is mostly landscape level, but there is also some aquatic work being done under this project as well. 2) Nor-West Stream Temperature Regional Database - real-time temp. database taking temperature data from across the region and making it widely available. Also being used in project future temps. based on climate change predictions. The primary objective of this project is an accurate assessment and description of historical and future stream temperatures and thermal habitat distributions for sensitive aquatic species so that planning efforts can be undertaken more efficiently and with greater confidence across the landscape. Our objective is not to make recommendations regarding specific management activities in different locales, only to provide accurate information that is fundamental to an informed discussion about prioritizing those activities. 3) aquatic invasives - the GNLCC is funding a workshop this year with Portland State U. and others to bring scientists on both sides of the border together to identify and try to fill gaps in research on the invasive quagga mussels. 4) Integrated monitoring project - Federal, state, tribal, local, and private aquatic monitoring programs in the Pacific Northwest evolved independently in response to different organizational and jurisdictional mandates and needs. To enhance efficiency and effectiveness of their monitoring efforts, the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) provides a forum that supports collaboration and coordination among organizations and across jurisdictions. PNAMP supports organizations' monitoring objectives and facilitates integration of monitoring results, largely by focusing on best practices for data management and exchange.</p>	

<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<p>The GNLCC Is itself a transboundary organization, but given that it is a U.S. Fish & Wildlife project, there is more U.S. participation, historically. However, BC came in early on, thanks in part to the BC-MT 2010 MOU, as an outspoken advocate of the LCC model. Instead of having to go to 6, 7, or 8 other jurisdictions, it's preferable to just work things out through the LCC. Because of BC's early involvement, Alberta has also come along. However, participation waxes and wanes depending on who's in charge of the BC/Alberta government, funding levels, etc.</p>
<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>There's lots of momentum, esp. on the connectivity work. People are seeing more and more that working at the landscape level is necessary for functional ecosystem management. The Arid Lands Initiative has also been a big success (More info at: http://greatnorthernlcc.org/supported-science/317).</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Funded by the U.S. Gov't through Fish & Wildlife. Funding has been up and down due to changes in administration, congress, etc. Under under secretary Hays, the LCC program was expanded to also be a climate program; this has caused problems in Washington due to the controversial nature of funding climate change work (even though that is only a portion of what the LCCs do). The LCC is now co-coordinated with the U.S. Parks Dept. but they have significantly less funding.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>The biggest roadblock is achieving collective agreement on a shared vision for the great northern ecoregion. People are too busy or don't yet get why it's important to integrate data collection across the region. It's hard to make time but ideally, we could get together more often to discuss these issues and define and work towards shared values. Additionally, working across various government bureaucracies and differing organizational cultures is a challenge.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	

Interview Format		
Date: 7/28/15		
Name: Will Warnock		
Title: Aquatic Biologist, Canadian Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CCRIFC)		
Contact Information:wwarnock@ccrifc.org 250-417-3474		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCRIFC is a non-profit organization that provides scientific and technical support to the Ktunaxa Nation as well as 5 bands of the Swecwepemc/Secwepemc Nation which have interests in the CRB - Quite a large nation. There are 5 that are signatories to CCRIFC – have interests in the CRB

<p>2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?</p>	<p>1) The reason CCRIFC was originally formed (it has grown significantly since then) but one they still work on is the reintroduction of salmon the Canadian Columbia River Basin. Anadromous salmon (not resident kokanee salmon). Something they have been working on since inception. Have several avenues that they approach reintroduction: 1. Their own scientific research program that looks at reintroduction feasibility and approaches they would use, 2. Engage in a lot of political advocacy for reintroduction, 3. Do a lot to create awareness and education about the loss of salmon and prospects for restorations – both to the First Nations that they support but also to the general public through initiatives such as the annual salmon festival that they host in the East Kootenays</p> <p>4. Protect aquatic ecosystems in the CRB. Geographically focused on the CRB. Through project referral, industry regulation, policy advice to the nations they provide support to. The 2 primary industries in the basin are large coal mine in the Elk Valley and large hydro dams on the Columbia, Kootenay, and Pend Oreille River? (obviously a lot more going on in the basin but those are two major ones). CCRIFC will participate in consultation activities with respect to regulation and development and then provide a review what is happening and recommendations to FN leadership so FN leadership can stay abreast with what's happening in the basin, what developments or activities are taking place, and manage aquatic resources more effectively in their traditional territories</p> <p>3) Minimizing and characterizing impacts of the large hydrodams in the CRB. Do have quite a few research projects that they lead or take part in. Large projects that BC Hydro is required to do as conditions of their water license requirements...Water use planning monitoring activities. So CCRIFC has several of those projects that they participate in or lead. Also engage extensively in consultation around hydrodam operations. One of which (talking about transboundary issues) is that they are certainly involved in consultations with the province regarding the CRT</p>
--	---

<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • People they have regular and open dialogue with is the Tribes within the US CRB: Inter-Tribal Aquatic Resource Management Organizations like CRITFC and the Upper Columbia United Tribes. Kind of counterparts with similar mandates. Do engage extensively with them. Very open dialogue. No specific projects that they are collaborating on – but an open conversation • Also work with now and have in the past retained expertise of scientific consultants in the US <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Subcontract to do work. Also subcontract scientific expertise in Canada as well. But when it comes to salmon restoration there is a lot of expertise in the US CRB that has local expertise with projects on that side of the border. Far more expertise on that side of the border compared to up here
<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back in 2007 in collaboration with the Okanagan Nation = CCRIFC hosted a workshop that brought together a working group of academic, industry, government, and NGO experts on salmon from both sides of the border. The discussions and recommendations of that working group were distilled into a document which has been used as a guiding document for salmon restoration discussion since then. • Following up from that – last year (2014) was a fairly active year for further discussions around that. Canadian FN and US Tribes co-hosted/jointly organized a series of technical workshops and conferences scoping socio-political-cultural aspects of fish passage. Spring of 2014 in Spokane and Portland. “Future of our Salmon” • Following up from that – the 15 Tribes in the US CRB and the 3 Nations in Canada jointly released a “common position” paper on fish passage restoration. The justification, background, scope and approach of how they would go about salmon restoration in the Upper CRB. That paper was in advance of the “Transboundary Conference” last fall – final staff document
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core funding comes from Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) – federal level: 2 funds: Aboriginal fisheries strategy and Aboriginal aquatic resource and oceans management fund? • On top of that for specific project funding its really difficult to get funding for a lot of these transboundary initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o But for their feasibility research they have done within the Canadian side they have received project funding from CBT o Certainly support a lot

<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither side is really ready to commit to forming a collaborative transboundary working group on ecosystem function related to the CRT, or fish passage • A possible in the future but as it stands Canada and the US are too divided and narrowly focused on their stance on how to coordinate and manage the hydropower system to really form a truly collaborative working group • Something CCRIFC has always advocated for is some sort of lasting institution or mechanism that will allow all the stakeholders within Canada and the US to come together and reach a consensus on fish passage restoration or ecosystem function
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What we were previously discussion in terms of ecosystem function and salmon restoration. A lot of people are addressing it with their own funding and interests. But maybe not being addressed as fully as we think it should be. Particularly by the federal and provincial governments • Invasive species management...Some gains to be made there. CBT has definitely initiated a strong strategy within the basin. But definitely cross border initiatives that would help support that • Absolutely interested in partnering with people across the border. Anyone they can get the table. Maybe something more formal – like a roundtable or annual discussion

Interview Format		
Date: 7/21/15		
Name: Tino Tafoya (Karl Tarbet on behalf of Tino)		
Title: Special Assistant, US Bureau of Reclamation, Pacific Northwest		
Contact Information: ctafoya@usbr.gov		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<p>1) The Columbia River Treaty The Columbia River Treaty involves operation of Reservoirs, on both sides of the U.S./Canadian border, for flood control and power generation. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Bonneville Power Administration are the primary representatives for the United States. BC-Hydro represents the Canadian Government. Two of Reclamation's projects involve cross-boundary operations: Grand Coulee project receives water from the Columbia River which originates in Canada; Hungry Horse releases flow into the Flathead River which eventually ends up into the Pend Oreille River. The Pend Oreille River enters Canada before joining up with the Columbia River, 0.2 miles north of the border.</p> <p>2) Federal Columbia River Power Systems (FCRPS) The Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Bonneville Power Administration operate the FCRPS. The projects in the FCRPS were constructed and operated for multiple purposes, including hydropower generation, flood control, irrigation, navigation, fish, wildlife, water quality, municipal and industrial water, and recreation.</p> <p>3) Upper Columbia River/ Lake Roosevelt contamination efforts Over many years contaminants, have entered the Upper Columbia River and Lake Roosevelt. The Environmental Protection Agency and a Canadian mining company have entered into an agreement to conduct remedial investigations and a feasibility study to determine the extent of the contamination. Scientific Research with environmental sampling is being performed by Federal agencies, the State of Washington, the private mining company, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Spokane Tribe of Indians.</p>

3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?	FCRPS water operations involve working with the Canadian organization BC-Hydro. The Columbia River Treaty involves the Canadian Government and BC-Hydro. The Upper Columbia River/ Lake Roosevelt contamination efforts involve a private Canadian mining company.
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?	The United States was successful in setting up a sovereign review team to work on modernizing the Columbia River Treaty.
5. How are your existing initiatives funded?	Federal funding and funds from the private Canadian mining company for the contamination efforts.
6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?	While more time, resources/funding, information and partners could be useful, it may not necessarily equate to improvement. At this point in time, improvements to the initiatives are not readily apparent.
7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?	not at this time

Interview Format		
Date: 7/20/15		
Name: Tom Laurie		
Title: Sr. Advisor, Tribal & Environmental Affairs, WA Dept. of Ecology		
Contact Information: 360.407.7071		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your department, and specifically your role within it?		Dept. of Ecology serves as the environmental managers and also deals with water quantity issues, which is somewhat unique. We are the delegate authority for all Federal programs (EPA, NEPA, CWA, etc). Tom's job specifically is as a policy advisor. He works closely with the Tribes on forest and water management
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		The Office of the Columbia River: a new water quantity program with lots of tribal coordination. Getting water where it's needed efficiently and effectively. It's now hard-wired into the law that for every 3 buckets of water reserved for out-of-stream uses, you need to allocate 1 bucket to instream use. Which is great because there's no equivocation or horse-trading. That's the law. 2) Washington Forest Practices Act (look this up).
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		WA Dept of ecology is involved with the Environment Canada / EPA Puget Sound MOU coordination, which is explicitly transboundary. Additionally, within the BC Enviro Office, there's an Environmental Assessment Office which has a communication protocol agreement with WA for info sharing and public comment over mining/energy project expansion in BC that is within 50-100 mi. of the border. If BC wants to expand these projects, the EAO office notifies WA of its plans and gives them time to respond and allows public comment. There is also coordination with BC on the Teck/Cominco slag cleanup on multiple rivers within the Basin. Working closely with Colville tribes as well. WA sued BC and there has been implications for International Law coming out of this case - Federal superfund laws can now apply to Int'l companies working in Canada that have impacts downstream in the US.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>we have good communication with BC and Environment Canada on the spill issues and this new communications protocol has been positive as well. Tom has been a part of the BC/WA Environmental Cooperation Council which still exists but is not active primarily because several of the issues it covered have been spun off into their own working groups (dissolved gas group, Salish Sea science coordination) and have really taken on a life of their own. So that is an example of where there was successful coordination that lead to independent initiatives.</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Our work is primarily state funded, with some federal funding. But we have no specific funding for cross-border work</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>The initiatives I mentioned are working pretty well, but there are other issues, like the issue of raw sewage from Victoria being dumped into the Straights, that are not going so well. WA has sued BC to require BC to treat the sewage, but that hasn't happened yet. Also, our work on the Nooksack as well the Abbotsford/Sumas Rivers on nitrate pollution dropped off for a bit, but we have now been tasked with picking that up again. But it's hard due to the different regulatory authorities between WA and BC (WA has more legal authority to intervene) as well as the fact that farm pollution is NPS and we don't have strong authority under the Fed. gov't or the State to regulate NPS pollution. Instead we are trying to come up with farming best practices and guidelines, etc. But work has been slow and uneven - on both sides of the border. Also, WA is considering a no-discharge zone in Puget Sound (currently petitioning EPA for this) but the problems is that it would cover only Puget Sound; once you cross into the Georgia Straights, the restrictions go away. So there is a lot of concern that ships will just head up to Canada to dock, so WA will take an environmental hit AND the water will remain polluted. The same thing goes for cruise ships.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>The stuff that Tom mentioned about the no-discharge zone; that should be addressed at some point. Additionally, there is little coordination on climate adaptation / resilience. Tom is hearing a lot of concern from the Tribes on these issues. WA is addressing resilience in some of its river restoration projects where they are working to create more resilient, varied habitat for a variety of species, while at the same time address flood concerns by residents. But would like to see more thought going into and coordination on climate change adaptation.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/14/15		
Name: Tim Hicks		
Title: CBT Water and Environment Manager		
Contact Information:thicks@cbt.org 250 304 1666		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support environmental, social, and economic well-being within the region • look at website's mandate and mission http://www.cbt.org/About_Us/ • Tim is responsible for the water and environment initiative
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All in the "Environment Strategic Plan" • Take their lead from residents and communities in the region on setting their priorities. Ensure the priorities are set via residents. Enviro Strategic Plan reflects that – has 5 goals (3 are issues and 2 are goals) • 3 are: Water, Ecosystem, Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation), 4th = environmental education (more of a tool). Embedded in each of those are many detailed projects that they deliver
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of them have transboundary relevance. In terms of working in a transboundary way Kindy does most of the work for the CBT • One strategic issue working on now that has done a little bit of transboundary work on is the aquatic invasive species side of things. Done simply by learning what folks across the border are doing so that when they are coming up with initiatives at CBT they can consider what is already taking place etc. Invasive Mussels issue – recognizing that the province (ministry of environment) is coordinating on the ground protection efforts with other jurisdictions (Alberta and Washington/Idaho/Montana). CBT facilitated dialogue in a transboundary nature and put a strategy together to address aquatic invasive species in the region and invited folks from the states and Alberta to be part of the conversation to coordinate activities. Now that they are into the implementation phase they have realized its largely the Ministry of Environment's responsibility for coordinating – at least in terms of on the ground action (inspecting and decontaminating boats that are coming across) • Education and outreach activities support organizations like Jen Vogel's – there is coordination and communication across the line – CBT helps facilitate that collaboration

4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One thing that works well with the many initiatives is that CBT is really good at catalyzing collaboration between a wide range of organizations. People they work with generally respect them – CBT brings a certain cache to the conversations involved in because they are very diligent in ensuring whatever they do is credible in terms of knowledge, expertise, etc. Because of the cache they bring – able to spur on good collaborative efforts • Recent major accomplishment – work around invasive muscles. Supporting ministry of environment to get 3 more invasive muscles boat inspection and wash stations set up in the region. Pretty big win – particularly because there are 8 different organizations involved in that - CBT helped bring that partnership together
5. How are your existing initiatives funded?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBT brings the cash • Like to fund things in partnership with other organizations • For example the Invasive Mussels project – able to bring two other funders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Not so much because needed them to contribute – but because things are better when there are partnerships
6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of issues – spread very thin. Keen and don't want to say no to big opportunities to make a difference in the region so tend to take a lot of things on • Things are working well right now – always making continuous improvements • One thing that comes up sometimes especially with the not-for-profits they support is volunteerism. Seems to be the perception that volunteerism is waning. More volunteers for those groups
7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always interested in working with folks across the border on shared issues • Not something he does a lot of at this time though. Part of that is because the mandate is so focused within their region. But are people like Kindy who lead the way for the CBT on transboundary collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A lot of benefits from that • Maybe more work around ecosystem and looking at movement corridors for migratory species and their seasonal routes • Restoration and fish passage – anadromous ones • Water issues in general – CRT prime example... In the face of climate change. Water supply issues. Other transboundary water governance issues will come to the fore even more than they are now. Including CRT and other transboundary needs around water supply and use. Water temperatures rising...Probably why there is so much reintroduction of salmon in Upper Columbia – cool waters north

Interview Format		
Date: 7/21/15		
Name: Tom Boos		
Title: Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator, MT FWP		
Contact Information: 406.444.1267		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your department and your role specifically?		To protect fish and wildlife while allowing citizens to safely recreate within the state. Our department is in charge of maintaining and improving stream quality, preventing aquatic invasives from entering or spreading within the state, monitoring all waterways, checking watercraft for the presence of aquatic invasives and conducting outreach with waterway users on the risk, prevention measures and regulations surrounding aquatic invasives.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		The most important initiative we are working on now revolves around communication and outreach among the public. We do presentations with both small and large groups on our programs to reduce and prevent aquatic invasives. We've also invested in TV, radio and print ads to help get our message out to people.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Yes, our communication outreach project is being used by Alberta now because they got started later and saw the positive effect it has been having here, so have been working with them on that. Also we coordinate with them about boats headed their way from our border monitoring stations. There is a network of AIS coordinators and we do talk with each other to coordinate our efforts - certainly not all the time but regularly.
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		Our work is going well - the ads have been quite successful in getting more traffic on our website and Tom thinks they are doing a pretty good job on informing the public about aquatic invasives and what recreators need to know/do in response to these threats. Monitoring is also going well, but is limited by funding and staff availability.

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Primarily state funded through the MT FWP and through a bi-annual legislative allocation. But also get some funding from U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Primary limitation is funding and time. We just don't have the budget to do everything we need. On the BC side, there was one border station that is now actually being operated on both sides by Canada because they had the funding to do it, so that was a big savings for us, but still, we use every dollar we get. We could definitely use more staff. Also, more support from the MT legislature in the form of stronger regulation and authority for us to prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic invasives. There's more we'd like to do, but we just don't have the authority.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Most concerns are being addressed, but it's hard to bring so many different divisions, jurisdictions, levels of funding, landscape scales, etc together to come up with integrated plans. There are lots of regional networks such as WRP and PNWER but it's hard to know where to put the energy. There seems to be some duplication of work so it would be nice to have a database or list serve for technical people and managers working on specific issues to go to and maybe say "hey, I'm having an issue with X. Has anyone else dealt with this before?" Or collaborate on monitoring, or share data. Would also hopefully help reduce duplicate efforts since everyone's time and funding is limited as is.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/31/15		
Name: Steve Waste		
Title: Director, Columbia River Research Lab, USGS WFRC		
Contact Information: 503.505.1755		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?	We do all of the western fisheries field research on fish habitat, species, and environmental stressors. We report up to the USGS Seattle Office which has much greater responsibility and capacity for dealing with all manner of fisheries issues.	
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?	Steve mostly talked about his team's work getting ready for post-treaty review process conversations and work around the 3 key components of ecosystem function in the basin, namely: restoration of anadromous fish above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee, restoring critical habitat in the mainstem Columbia, and reconnection of the floodplain in the lower Columbia estuary (getting rid of aging levees, etc) in order to improve Pacific salmonid habitat. His team of scientists are working hard on all of these issues and he acknowledges that all of their efforts might not work, but he is adamant that we have to at least try - so far the Feds have done nothing and the Tribes are understandably angry. Steve also talked about his work with the GNLCC's Columbia Basin Partnership Forum on the Columbia Basin Integrated Monitoring Plan. This has been done in conjunction with PNAMP (Jen Bayer and co.) using their monitoring tools. In the future, Steve would like to look more at landscape level stressors as he believes those will be the big issues going forward.	
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?	Not at the moment. On the ecosystem function work, all of the federal agencies have been told explicitly not to interact or work with their Canadian counterparts while the treaty renegotiation is going on. They tribes have been told the same thing but they just ignore those edicts and work together anyway, so good for them. On the Columbia Basin Partner Forum, there are a few Canadians who attend their meetings, but for the most part it's only a U.S. project at this point.	

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>(didn't really get to this)</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>The Partner Forum is all in-kind support at this point. Everyone is salaried at their respective jobs and come to our meetings because they want to be involved in the project / think it's useful work. But at this point there is no paid support. His position at USGS is funded by the Fed.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Right now we are not actually working on those 3 key objectives of ecosystem function in the basin because we're waiting to hear about the next phase on negotiation. So far, all we get is radio silence from the State Department. This is unfortunate because we would like to get working NOW. We are capable of working on these issues now but are stuck in a holding pattern. With formal negotiations, they can go on for 10-15 years due to disagreements over facts on the ground, which is unfortunate because we are wasting time that we could be working together. As for the Partner Fund, there are funding and momentum challenges we are dealing with. We could use better support from the Council for PNAMP's monitoring tools. These tools are being used in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program but seem to have had lukewarm reception from the Council thus far.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>In the sense that we're not currently collaborating on any of these ecosystem function challenges, yes. Steve is eager, willing and ready to work with his Canadian counterparts on this stuff - many of them already know each other and would jump at the opportunity to work together. But it's currently tied up in treaty politics. For example, if and when we start working on fish passage over Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee, the Canadians are required to implement fish passage on their three dams as well. But since we haven't started, the Canadians have also done nothing, so we're seemingly stuck.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/14/15		
Name: Robert Naiman		
Title: Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB)		
Contact Information:naiman@uw.edu (360) 370 5900		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Independent Scientific Advisory Board: Chief advisors to the NWPCC on scientific issues related to the Fish and Wildlife Program. Also advice NOAA and the Columbian River Indian Tribes • The Independent Science Review Panel: Review on a regular basis all of the projects taking place in the US portion of the Columbia Basin. At any one time there's about 300 or more projects related to the restoration of fish and wildlife. NWPCC – largest restoration program in NA – maybe world = Annual budget cost is about \$300 million • Serve on board and panel and receive direction from council on what sort of activities they'd like to see them involved in

<p>2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only work on the US side of the Columbia Basin. Encouraged the council for years to have more cooperation with Canada, but they don't feel that's in the legal mandate at this time 1) Identifying "critical uncertainties" (CUs) for the fish and wildlife program. In place to mitigate for loss of fish and wildlife from hydropower. CUs are research areas that have been over looked or haven't been done well in terms of a scientific program for the restoration of the Columbia 2) Estimating the carrying capacity of the contemporary basin for salmon (as well as resident fish too but mostly salmon). Just completed those reports – rather startling. Seeing even though the abundance of the salmon are low compared to historical levels, the fish are still too crowded. Not enough food or habitat to actually support viable populations (also combination of dams). Only way keeping populations going at the moment is supplementing them with hatchery fish, which causes additional problems. For example, density dependence (DD) is widespread and severe enough that from a science perspective that DD calls into question the ability of these programs to actually recover ESA-listed fish. Think most likely going the other way – continue to decline – causing a lot of consternation on US side. Much of his time has been spent going out the last couple months and giving briefings on this 3) Encouraged the council to do more social engagement; trying to develop public and local responsibility for maintaining restoration projects. Fortunately over the last couple of years they have started to be more cognizant of the importance of engaging the public in more positive ways and shifting responsibility to public and local entities. Many issues are a hard sell for ISAB – 10 or 15 years of continuous talking to NWPCC and others. A lot of more meetings, conferences etc. happening now. Public engagement is a lot more proactive on Canadian side than US side – hopefully balance out in the next couple years
<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a few projects that do have cooperation within BC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Largely in the Kootenai drainage – mostly on a local scale with groups on the US side cooperating actively with other entities in BC o Been a very good thing o NWPCC (through Bonneville Power Admin) have even funded occasionally some of the projects and they pass money through to the Canadian side on sub-contracts o Certainly not extensive transboundary work

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WELL: In the past almost all of these projects were individual projects (100s of them all doing their own thing). In the last decade the ISAB has encouraged more networking and cooperative activities that brought together people and projects and ideas. See this happening in the Kootenai, Columbia River Estuary, Upper Columbia, and Grand Ronde. Done extremely well in pulling together all of the various individuals in these places. Great step in right direction. But other places it still hasn't happened yet • NOT SO WELL: Been trying for years to improve hatchery practices – in his mind that has not gone as well as hoped. Been able to encourage on the US side the hatcheries to be more cognizant of the kinds of fish they are putting out and how many they are putting out – with the federal and state hatcheries this has been successful. But the Tribes have started building their own hatcheries – filling the river with way too many fish (his personal view)
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From NWPCC via Bonneville Power Administration • Council will make recommendations to BPA – who releases the money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Extremely rare BPA says no – so the council really has control over how those moneys are spent o But BPA has final say because they sign off and deliver cheques
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is not an issue – in some ways there is too much money. Sometimes it attracts groups and people for not the best reasons • Need the Council and all the various groups the ISAB advises to actually pay attention to the advice. Very slow on uptake of advice. Political reasons, ideological reasons. Strategy as long as he has been chair of committee is to not send too many messages to the council and the others. Basically stuck with 3 themes – keep repeating them in every report they put out, with the hope that the themes gain some traction with the council. Done for years and finally starting to get some traction. So many things they should be doing but takes 5 or 6 years before start to see the attitudes within the council shift and change and start going in these mega directions. Hard to sit and watch. How can it speed up??

<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, always interested in working with other people (they do informally at this stage). A lot of people the ISAB know on both sides of the border in various groups that constantly in contact with • Issues that are not being fully addressed at this time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Water temperature: Thinking about the basin as a whole – what is really going to be the Canadian role in helping control temperatures throughout the basin. Has not been given the emphasis it should – water temperature is absolutely critical going forward o Feasibility of returning fish into Canada (reintroduction): Sinking feeling that everyone is going get really excited about it and pour a tremendous amount of money into trying to make it happen over the next decade or two and it may not work very well. Another “Feel Good Project”. The ISAB should be taking a really hard look at this from a biological perspective. If you can even get fish over the dams, once in Canadian water how are they actually going to make it to any of the tributaries and spawn in any numbers. After conference in Spokane you can see that everybody wants it – he would love to see it happen too And yet on the other hand he worries about all the technological and biological aspects of it. Are we going to be spending a billion dollars trying to do this and not get much in return for that effort OR should we take that billion dollars and put it into conservation on salmon strongholds in Canada and really protect those runs where we know they’re strong and can help protect them into the future. Going forward with the reintroduction project means we could lose those strongholds and runs that are already there. A real trade off. A much bigger picture - no one seems to want to tackle (wrapped up in the hopes and desires of people?)
---	--

Interview Format		
Date: 6 July 2015		
Name: Robert Cromwell		
Title: Director, Seattle City Light		
Contact Information: 206.684.3856		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?	We manage all of the long term power supply contracts (over 2 years) for the city. As part of that, we manage the relationship with BPA and BC Hydro over the CRT	
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?	1. What is the Dept. of State going to do WRT revising the CRT? Unclear at the moment but it is a big deal and it is something we are very focused on. What are going to be the new rules re: fish passage, tribal rights, etc. 2. Creating a sub-hourly energy market in the Basin between all the regional power utilities (BC Hydro, BPA, etc). This would provide for more reliable electricity, the addition of more and diverse renewables, allow for additional tools to provide better, cost-efficient service to clients	
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?	We are working with the other utility companies - in Canada we work directly with BC Hydro since they are the Canadian entity for the CRT. Other than that, the city itself has a treaty directly with BC (High Ross) and we deal with our Canadian counterparts on that as well, but there is no negotiation or anything like that at this point. The treaty was signed back in the 80's and runs at least 65 years.	
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?	Coordination with Canada over the CRT isn't really up to us. Our coordination with BC Hydro is fine, but there is uncertainty about the future since we don't know what State Dept. is going to do. As for the Markets work, the utility CEOs will vote on whether or not to go forward with the idea at their meeting in November so "ask me again in December if coordination is going well or not."	

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>The Markets work is funded by the participating utilities - the utilities also "donate" staff to this project</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>As far as our relationship with the Canadian CRT entity, BC Hydro, our relationship is fine. But within the basin, I've observed that there are lots of strongly held opinions and that people in general are not hearing what the others are saying. The Spokane conference was useful, in my view, for bringing all of the stakeholders together to listen to one another. There is still a lot of work to do on cross-border collaboration but it was a good start. What is needed is good facilitation for future multi-stakeholder meetings. Need to continue the dialogue, but need to make sure it's done in a way that is useful and proactive.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>The biggest issue is that the State Dept. is just not coordinating with the utilities and others in the basin on the Treaty. No one knows what is going to happen so there is a lot of uncertainty over future power levels, allocation, etc. We have sent letters asking for a response from State and have not yet received a response. Washington-Washington tensions. (personal view: the financial benefit to BC - \$160M - from the U.S. is nothing in comparison to the financial cost to satisfying the claims of First Nations Rights to the water. B.C. is not prepared to deal with the water rights they owe the First Nations, and that has potentially massive implications for the future of the Treaty and the power generated downstream).</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 8/3/15		
Name: Paul Lumley		
Title: Executive Director, CRITFIC		
Contact Information:		
1. Could you give me an overview of how your organizations collaborates / works with your Canadian counterparts (CCRIFC, etc.)?		We have an open and ongoing dialogue with the ONA as well as CCRIFC. We did a lot of work with them on the Treaty review process and we recently did a tour up there near the headwaters. We have really good interaction around fish passage issues. We have made a commitment to continue the dialogue with each other and we are doing that.
2. Are there two or three initiatives that you're currently working on that you are particularly proud of or would like to highlight?		Fish passage restoration - UCUT is now taking the lead on this issue - but we work together very closely. As part of that work we sponsor an annual conference for the coalition of tribes and First Nations. Last year we had two - a technical conference on our fish passage work and a larger conference on "the future of our salmon." Next year's conference will be about floodplain risk management because people aren't really talking about those issues and we can play a lead role in addressing the imbalances in flood risk between the upper and lower basin.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		N/A (see question 1)
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		We get a lot of support from the public and other tribal organizations, so that has been great.

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>We get support from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>We really need more support from federal agencies for fish passage. The excuse they use is that we are waiting on the State Dept. to decide what to do about renegotiating the Treaty, but domestic fish passage is not entirely related to transboundary fish passage. We can work on the domestic side now. We also need a basin-wide approach to dealing with climate change. There is superficial support for acknowledging climate change as an issue, but what are we actually going to do about it? So far there is no plan. People are working on it within their individual departments or agencies, but there is no comprehensive approach and that is a problem. The regional recommendations to the Treaty review process only mentioned climate change, but it didn't focus enough on climate issues, especially at a basin level.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Flood risk management at the basin level, not just downstream. Canada has sacrificed a lot to ensure Portland/ Vancouver's safety and a lot of people Paul talked to up there are still pretty bitter about the Treaty and what it's done to their land/water/ecosystem. But the U.S. Feds aren't interested in having a conversation about this; there's no recognition of what the upper basin wants/needs. The Treaty is focused on downstream needs only.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/14/15		
Name: Marylou Soscia		
Title: Columbia Ri. Coordinator, US EPA		
Contact Information: 503.326.5873		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your department (w/in EPA)?		Everything we do has to fit within the regulatory authority of the EPA. My department is specifically water & watersheds and within that, the Columbia River. So my work is around implementing the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Ocean Dumping Act. Although, me personally, I only work on CWA programs such as the CWA 404 wetlands regulation, compromised stream TMDLs, etc.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		We work primarily on safe fish consumption, Columbia tributary stream water quality, TMDL's, non-point source pollution, NPDES permitting, and wetlands regulation
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		There is not a lot of coordination currently - Canada and BC do not have a Clean Water Act so we don't have similar regulations on which to coordinate. We used to meet more regularly, but due in part to budget cuts over the past decade and the change in the BC government ministry (from Ministry of Environment to Ministry of Mines, Environment, etc) there has been a change in priorities on their side which has led to less coordination between the two of us.
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>EPA is funded directly by the government; they also coordinate with some of the mining and hydro companies (Teck, BPA) for additional water quality monitoring work</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>We would need more funding and more staff - our staff is currently completely booked with work and simply does not have the time. Also, in comparison to other watersheds, such as Puget Sound/Georgia Straights, the Columbia Ri basin is simply not a priority for the EPA. Marylou has been working to change that, but needs better support from Washington, both in EPA HQ and Congress. Currently there is a lack of congressional leadership. Sen. Merkely and Rep. Blumenauer have introduced legislation (Columbia Ri. Restoration Act), but given the current climate in D.C., it is unlikely to pass. So there needs to be more awareness and interest in restoring water quality in the Basin, both in the U.S. and in Canada.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>There needs to be more emphasis on water quality as it relates to fish passage - currently there is no cross-border monitoring of water quality in the upper Columbia. So as we're talking about restoring fish passage, we also need to address water quality in the basin because without minimum water quality standards, successful reintroduction will not work.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/7/2015		
Name: Mary Sexton		
Title: Coordinator, Roundtable on the Crown of the Continent		
Contact Information: 406.590.2751		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		The roundtable is a network connecting people and organizations within the Crown around community, culture and conservation. We've been around for 7 years now.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		1. Adaptive management within the Crown focused on climate adaptation. We've had 3 rounds (supported by the Kresgie Foundation), but are now out of funding. Would like to continue this program. 2. Our annual conference brings together 150-200 people every year from all over the Crown to discuss a wide variety of issues and forge deeper connections. This year is focused on emerging leaders as well as the Tribes. 3. Communication efforts - we publish a newsletter that disseminates information about a variety of projects and initiatives going on in the Crown. We are not an advocacy group, we are focused on connecting residents to the larger landscape and so communication is a major part of what we do.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Yes, all of them are explicitly transboundary - we have good representation at our annual meeting from Alberta, though less so from B.C. and the Tribes are almost all transboundary (Blackfoot Confederacy, CSKT, Ktunaxa, etc). Our leadership is made up of 15 people, representing stakeholders on both sides of the border.
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		Residents have reported having a much greater awareness about forest projects, tribal governance, conservation initiatives and conference participation is growing. Mary believes the reason they've been so successful is because they don't just focus on conservation - they are an initiative built around communities and culture - they embrace all aspects of community life including economics, business development, and the health, safety and welfare of their communities, as well as the landscape. Additionally they have made a great effort of reaching out to the tribes and including their voices. They do a lot of education work with non-native communities on Tribal culture and heritage. This has been very helpful for the Roundtable in achieving its goals. We've also had great support from the GNLCC.

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>A wide variety of funding - Lincoln Institute, Kresgie Foundation, agency support from MT and from EPA, corporate support from BNSF, TECK, etc. But it's a challenge. Looking at making the leadership team a pay-to-play operation, also looking to expand corporate funding as a lot of companies are very interested in getting involved. And looking to diversify foundation funding as well.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>What we really need is greater recognition of the need to broaden communication and understanding within the Crown region; "more people need to understand that what happens in Poulson also has an effect in Browning." So really, that is our challenge. How do we reach more people about the interconnectedness of this landscape and its inhabitants. Funding is also a challenge but Mary believes that this recognition gap is the biggest challenge to the Roundtable</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Water issues - the Elk River and St. Mary's especially. There was some coordination and involvement by the IJC awhile back but that has mostly dried up. We're working with watershed groups and that has been helpful, but at the cross-border scale, there is not a lot of coordination or cooperation. Another issue we've been working on, with support from the Crown Management Partners, is the issue of aquatic invasives. Montana put a plan in a few years ago and now Alberta has adopted Montana's protocols for dealing with invasives. So that's another example of the importance of increased recognition and acceptance of the fact that we do need to coordinate on this issues, because if we have these invasives here in MT, they will affect Alberta and so we have to work collaboratively.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/14/15		
Name: Jen Vogel		
Title: Central Kootenay Invasive Species Society (Central Kootenay Invasive Plant Committee), Executive Director		
Contact Information: jvogel@ckipc.ca 1-844-352-1160 ext. 205		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To control and manage invasive species on behalf of their stakeholders and the public • “The Central Kootenay Invasive Plant Committee is a non-profit society that was formed by a group of residents and company/agency representatives who were interested in promoting collaborative approaches to invasive plant management in 2005. The Committee includes representatives from non-profit societies, utility companies, government agencies, and regional companies.” • Operates within the geographic area of the Regional District of the Central Kootenay and Areas A & B of the Regional District of the Kootenay Boundary
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Provincial partnership on the zebra and quagga mussels monitoring and sampling ii. Working with their action team on American Bullfrog surveillance iii. The general invasive species management
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All transboundary in nature • Work currently with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forest Service, WA o 100th Meridian Initiative (all of US Columbia Basin) o Idaho Fish and Game o Idaho Department of Agriculture o Government of Alberta o Work with all of the counties below as well – regional level

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that there is even communication established – not the case for all the committees across the province • all kind of working on the same thing(s) and towards the same goal(s) – which is helpful when dealing with transboundary issues • However, communication is still in the early stages – so still a challenge – trying to build up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o So can know when something is coming across the line and inform others
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution Agreements • Purchase Orders • Grants
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stable Funding: Always a challenge. Spend a lot of time getting money. CBT has really stepped up and helped with providing more stable funding. So can focus on doing the work • Time: Try and set up meetings and cross border gatherings in the winter. Because once summer comes – the season is short and you have to move fast with working directly in the field. Can't have hands tied
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Bullfrog eradication/management • Yellow Flag Iris: Know their partners in the south are not actively treating and it is causing infestation and entering the water bodies to the north. Need more coordination with south of the border. Treating is on the Canadian side but it is coming from the south • More diligence from border agencies: Federal government looking at currently. Border agencies need to actually stop these things from even coming across the border. People bring in accidently and intentionally – even though illegal

Interview Format		
Date: 8/6/15		
Name: Jessica Pfeffer (email response)		
Title: Intergovernmental and External Relations, Environmental Sustainability and Strategic Policy Division, BC Ministry of Environment		
Contact Information: 250.356.2191 jessica.pfeffer@gov.bc.ca		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		The Pacific Coast Collaborative addresses issues with regional applicability. There may be cross over between the work of the PCC on energy and climate change issues, and other environmental work going on within the Columbia River Basin, but at this time we are not aware of any direct PCC activities that are specific to the region of interest.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * States of California, Oregon and Washington. * Ross Strategic (facilitate PCC work) * Pembina, Clean Energy Canada; Better World Group; Climate Solutions; Oregon Environmental Council; Washington Environmental Council; Fraser Basin Council; Clean Cities Coalition.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>Accomplishments include: moving forward on commitments w.r.t low carbon fuel standards, ZEVs, energy efficiency standards for products, and net zero buildings; engaging with major west coast Cities through the PCC Cities initiative; and agreeing to update the analysis of west coast green jobs growth. See the 2014 Progress Report for further details: http://www.pacificcoastcollaborative.org/Documents/PCC%202014%20Annual%20Progress%20Summary.pdf</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>PCC Jurisdictions jointly fund the operation of the PCC itself, with some support from external partners. Each jurisdiction is responsible for funding its own specific programs under the PCC Action Plan.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	

Interview Format		
Date: 7/29/15		
Name: Jason McLellan		
Title: Fish Biologist, Confederated Tribes of Colville (Sits on the Upper Columbia White Sturgeon Recovery Initiative)		
Contact Information: Jason.McLellan@colvilletribes.com		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UCWSRI began in 2000 with an agreement signed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada, BC Environment, BC Fisheries, and BC Hydro. UCWSRI has a technical working group with members made up of state/provincial and federal government agencies from both Canada and the US, Canadian FN, US Tribes, and industrial stakeholders • Recovery plan for white sturgeon – the goal of the recovery effort is to restore white sturgeon natural recruitment to a level that sustains a population that provides beneficial uses. A collaborative effort – expert process and committee review as well as contracted out review • White Sturgeon listed as endangered under the SARA in Canada but not listed as endangered (in fact have no federal designation) under the Endangered Species Act in US
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Diagnosing and reversing natural recruitment failure 2) Preventing further declines in the population 3) Implementation of conservation aquaculture to restore population demographics and preserve genetic diversity within the white sturgeon population
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All transboundary • Agreement signed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada, BC Environment, BC Fisheries, and BC Hydro. • Technical working group: state/provincial and federal government agencies from both Canada and the US, Canadian FN, US Tribes, industrial stakeholders

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thinks all of it is working well – not that there are no challenges • Conservation Aquaculture Program – have released close to 150,000 juvenile white sturgeon both in the CA and WA regions of the UCR between Revelstoke and grand coulee dam • Done a lot to control mortality – cooperatively under recommendation of the technical working group the government agencies responsible for regulating fishing opportunities (catch and release and harvest fisheries) those have been closed or prohibited • Driving factors in decline of white sturgeon: Hydropower operations – changed the way the river is operated which may affect their survival during their early life stages. Habitat changes that are associated with development of the hydro system as well as other anthropogenic influences such as deposition of slag from the smelter in Trail. Associated with industrial impacts and contaminant issues. Development of reservoirs there have been major changes in the species composition within the river. Introduction of non-native predators. Changes in the food base –speculation with the ability of early life stages of sturgeon to find food. Probably a combination thereof or interaction
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially through funds from the BPA who fund projects that are part of NWPCC's Fish and Wildlife Program. Share costs to implement aspects of the recovery plan to address each of the major objectives (conservation aquaculture, the reducing or eliminating current threats to survival, and the recruitment failure research and diagnosis) • Combination of on the WA side primarily NWPCC FWP projects funded by BPA and some additional limited state funds here and there that are achieved from WA state and federal funds and then on the CA side it's a combination of funding from some of the hydro operators so large portion of the money from BC Hydro, but also from partially Columbia Power Corp, Teck Metals Limited, also Fortis occasionally, and some limited provincial funds and the occasional funds from DFO • Basically the way the group works is individual programs doing different aspects of it try and achieve their own funding through the various processes to address certain problems/issues/research questions • The technical working group is more of an advisory and coordination group. So for example if working on one thing in the US in the WA reach try and coordinate with researchers with their own source of funds to do collaborative or complementary work on the Canadian side. Also makes sure no overlap / or multiple entities doing the same thing • Efficient with the funds they receive

<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A lot of questions that still need to be answered. Would benefit from information and participation from experts in areas that aren't currently represented within the group. Sometimes there are projects that entities sub-contract out to entities or individuals with certain expertise – have that available to them at those times but not on a regular basis o How can entities/individuals join? = Have a terms of reference and official entity list – anyone can join just have to make a statement (what value they bring) and then there is a committee vote. Also have an observer list – interested parties that get updated and informed and have the ability to participate
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not that he can think of at this time • Most of the information sharing is pretty good. Working on developing a database for all the efforts on the white sturgeon recovery initiative done by partners - so they have access to data that's collected by the numerous entities collecting data in the program. So a transboundary shared database would be valuable • Also trying to get historical data on flows and temperatures at the gauge station at Birchbank but not available without requesting it directly from BC Hydro. More publicly accessible databases/data needed as well

Interview Format		
Date: 7/30/15		
Name: Joe Maroney		
Title: Fisheries Director, Kalispel Tribe of Indians		
Contact Information: 509.447.7272		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your department and your role within it?	Joe manages a staff of 22 people and they work on anything related to fish and water all the way from Lake Pend Oreille through Priest River in ID and up to Thompson Falls in MT. There are three main "divisions" within his dept - water quality, fisheries conservation research and the fish management program which deals with habitat restoration and invasive species suppression/eradication. Broadly speaking, most of his work deals with hydropower mitigation for fish species. Have in recent years expanded to do more work in Idaho and Montana (outside the reservation in WA).	
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?	Biggest work they do is fish passage issues. This comes through BPA for the work they do above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams, but the Kalispel Tribe is also party to several settlement agreements (as part of their FECR licensing obligations) with Seattle Power and Light, Avista and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District), who own and operate dams in the region. Over the next 3-15 years they are starting fish passage construction on all of these dams (non-BPA). The other major project that is now taking more and more of his dept's time is non-native fish suppression and eradication (primarily Northern Pike but also brook(?) trout).	
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?	Currently coordinating some with Canada on invasives (BC Hydro) and also with Lake Roosevelt folks on both sides of the border. Additionally, Joe is a part of a Salmo River watershed group that collaborates on transboundary water issues related to the Salmo River (mostly in BC but the river dips into WA for awhile). On that work he's working with the B.C.-based Salmo Watershed Streamkeepers NGO.	
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?	The Salmo River cooperation is going really well - the B.C. lead on that is Gerry Nellestijn and he's been a great leader and initiator of work in the basin. Also, we're getting to the point where we're introducing fish passage above all of these dams so it's a success in the sense that we've even got this far.	

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Most of our fisheries funding comes from BPA mitigation funds. On the water management side we get funding from EPA and some other soft grant money. Always looking for funding for our work, it's a patchwork of sources.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>In the past Canada hasn't had the funding to engage with us on transboundary projects - they expressed willingness and a desire to work with us but they didn't have the funds and we don't have any to spare either, unfortunately. Our staff has been expanding, which is great, but so has the work we have to do; it seems like every year there's a new issue to deal with that eats up your time. Our workload at the moment is huge - so that's definitely a barrier to expanding collaboration in the basin. It's also interesting for us since we are working on fish passage/restoration with two different licensing programs - both FERC and BPA - and the regulations/requirements for each are different so that's been a unique challenge. Finally, we could use more support from WA state folks in funding a rapid response strategy for invasives so that we can deal with new issues as they come along. Right now WA state F&W people aren't doing much up in our neck of the woods so it would be very helpful to have more involvement and support for the work we're doing here for the benefit of the whole state, and region.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>The upper Columbia River basin is managed almost entirely for the flood control and hydro benefit of downstream communities. We need to manage our rivers for the upper basin fish as well. We also need a common voice when it comes to non-native fish management/eradication - esp. Northern Pike. It seems like WA and B.C. are on the same page with regard to the seriousness of the issue and getting them out of our streams, but ID and MT seem to be lagging behind on this issue.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/27/15		
Name: John Mankowski		
Title: Coordinator, North Pacific LCC		
Contact Information: 360.534.9330		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		We do a whole host of things around landscape consevation planning, decision support tools, monitoring and modeling, population & habitat assessment, and we work closely with Tribes & First Nations on our science-Traditionaal Ecological Knowledge (S-TEK).
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		Doing work on a whole host of things, but within the basin we're working on a Columbia River estuary monitoring and sea level rise project with USGS, we are just putting together a new landscape and climate design workshop with the BC Ministry of Forests, Lands & Natural Resources Operations, and we're working with / supporting Jen Watkins at Conservation Northwest on a set of transboundary Cascadia Climate Adaptation projects as well as the Cascadia Partner Forum (SEE LIST HE SENT IN EMAIL).
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Our LCC is explicitly transboundary in nature - one of our steering committee co-chairs is Canadian and we have great participation from our Canadian counterparts, they come to all of our meetings, help set the agenda, and are well connected with our work, especially those project explicitly transboundary in natures. We work primarily wiht the BC Ministry of Forests, Lands & Natural Resource Operations, as well as the Ministry of Aboriginal Relations and the Ministry of the Environment. We also collaborate with the U. Victoria Pacific Climate Impacts Consortium.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>One of the most successful projects is the Conservation Planning Atlas which is a large landscape data set that includes data from both U.S. and Canadian scientists. In order to create this transboundary information exchange, we held a series of data translation workshops in order to convert all the data into one standardized format that could be used by scientists and policy makers on both sides of the border. We host the data set on our servers and it is accessible to anyone.</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Primarily funded by U.S. Fish & Wildlife, with some matching funds from USGS and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Thus far, B.C. has supported our joint work with in-kind contributions or matching funds, but the money mostly flows north at this point. In the future it would be helpful to be able to secure additional funding from B.C. for our projects, but our partnerships are still relatively new, so that may change. Additionally, we need political support from the Premier, government ministries, governors, etc to encourage the continuation of transboundary cooperation. Again, these relationships are still relatively new, but as time goes on, they will deepen and hopefully there will be more political support for our work. Also there is a bit of a challenge in working with First Nations tribes because they are not organized the same way as here in the States; the tribes here in the states are pretty well organized but it's different in B.C. so we've had some trouble identifying which FNs are working on related issues and which are not.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Cross-boundary species management planning - currently the management plans on either side of the border tend to be working at cross purposes (caribou, grizzlies) and are not aligned with one another. We need more transboundary discussion and perhaps meetings to discuss and harmonize management objectives in these areas. Don't need to have the same plan, necessarily, just need to coordinate who's doing what and how are the populations being managed / conserved</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/29/15		
Name: Jim Dunnigan		
Title: Fisheries Biologist, Libby Dam Mitigation Project, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks		
Contact Information: 406.293.5590 Ext. 224		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your department and role within it?		Jim is the Project Biologist for the Libby Dam Mitigation Project (sponsored by BPA). They do trend status monitoring and research on species in the Kocanusa Reservior and on Kootenai River above and below Libby Dam.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		The most important thing Jim's team is working on is identifying limiting factors to native Kootenai River species such as rainbow trout due to hydropower operations (Libby and Hungry Horse Dam)
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Jim's role is split between his BPA hydropower mitigation work and management of Lake Kocanusa. On the management side, his team coordinates with BC colleagues to discuss and standardize lake regulations across the border, since it's a transboundary lake. His team also conducts fish tissue sampling on the Elk River as part of the ongoing monitoring of minerals/metals levels due to upsteram coal mining in BC. Their sampling data is shared with MT DEQ which coordinates with BC counterparts on this bioaccumulation issue.
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		Jim feels that all of this work is going pretty well.
5. How are your existing initiatives funded?		His work is fully funded through BPA mitigation funds.

<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Could be more meetings (currently meet 1-2 times a year) to talk about the Koocanusa and to help get a better understanding of each others needs and priorities; to identify areas of common ground and additional coordination activities. Management differs cross-border so it would help to meet more regularly in order to make sure we're on the same page, working towards the same goals and understanding each other better.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Not that Jim could think of - he thinks they're covering the big issues.</p>
<p>Jim is also on the board of the Kootenai River Network which is a transboundary river org. - one of the board members lives in B.C. Still an active org., but they're having funding issues which has limited their activity in recent times - also there is less engagement with and involvement by the community at this time than in the past. But they are working to expand the education component of that program. Realistically, however, they are currently primarily a MT organization as the BC portion split into a group called "headwaters" (look this up) - and they do a lot of good work on the B.C. side with regard to environmental and watershed education. Would like to be doing more, but there are time committment and funding issues at the present moment.</p>	

Interview Format		
Date: 7/21/15		
Name: Joe DosSantos		
Title: Environmental Affairs Department, Avista Utilities		
Contact Information: joe.dossantos@avistacorp.com 406-847-1284		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the lower Clark Fork Drainage =The river system is transboundary because it goes into BC and then comes back into the US before it joins Lake Roosevelt. In a headwater • A shareholder utility company • Main mission – is to provide low cost power to their customers • In the context of Joes role – works for the Environmental Affairs Department. His job to make sure Avista is abiding by the provisions in their Fork License. Mainly dealing with fisheries and water quality issues. And to assure those programs are being implemented not in a vacuum but in a collaborative, decision making setting. Their fundamental document is called the “Clark Fork Settlement Agreement”. 27 different signatories to that agreement: State and federal agencies, NGOs, 5 different Tribes. The document formed the basis of Avista’s Fork License
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a fish perspective (bull trout – because it’s a listed species/a keystone when it comes to activities, other native salmonids, and the westslope cutthroat trout).The biggest initiative is putting the system back together and all those nuances associated with that. Do also have some dissolved gas issues that they are currently addressing structurally to the satisfaction of Idaho ? and Idaho Fish and Game.Fish passage and reconnecting the system is the biggest challenge for a variety of reasons • I asked if Avista was involved in the Councils “reintroduction” above the Grand Coulee Dam = Not involved. 7 facilities below Avista’s before you get to Grand Coulee. But one of the concerns expressed at Avista regarding the “reintroduction” issue is the possible spread of pathogens that principally do not exist in this part of the basin • Avista has 12 different aquatic programs: Ranging from fish passage, to habitat, to water quality, to watershed councils, to enforcement activities

<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these programs/initiatives are working with Canada • The only border they deal with is the Idaho/Montana border <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Interstate issues not international issues
<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulltrout populations certainly aren't what they used to be, but they have been moving fish through active capture methods since 2001 • Now starting to see the progeny in the streams reflect those transported fish genetically • Miles of habitat work – addressing water quality issues in conjunction with other state agencies' initiatives. TMTL Process? Reduce sediment load in streams • Implementing the program now for 15 years
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funded by Avista's revenue • Do add to the bucket. Doesn't diminish Avistas financial responsibility. But especially in the habitat world –apply for federal and state available grants and foundation grants. Hired a grant writer – to date she's brought in over 10 million dollars worth of outside funding
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everybody wants instant results but "Population restoration is measured in inches not miles". When dealing with long lived fish like bulltrout, you have to go through multiple generations before you are even able to discern a change. Human expectations sometimes get in the way • Around "here" the big battle is native versus non-native fish. Half of the people want to restore native fish and the other half don't care and Just want to fish. Constant battle. Vocal minority • Human dimension of fisheries management is probably one of the most frustrating • Do have a very active partnership group – but do have to work at keeping people in engaged. What he has seen recently, not only with Avista but with many state agencies as well is all the baby boomers are retiring – so those people that were involved and had ownership in the programs – their replacements don't necessarily have that same agenda. You do have to spend time educating folks on where you have been and how you got to where you are now. If you don't put out that effort you can certainly lose that momentum. For example, bringing back salmon to above chief Joe and Grand Coulee – that's a decadal project. Need folks that are going to stick with it and educate the new folks etc.

<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joe has worked in Western Montana his entire career – this is his 38th year in the fish industry • Speak of Flathead System – the development wants and desires north of the border as far as resource extraction - when trying to work in an interconnected system get into the economics. One isn't necessarily good for the other • Not that close the details on the mainstem Columbia • In Joes role – he is professionally interested in subject/idea of transboundary work but has to decline working with other people
---	---

Interview Format		
Date: 7/8/2015		
Name: Julie DalSoglio		
Title: EPA director, Montana Office		
Contact Information: 406.457.5026		
1. What is the EPA's role on this issue?		Strong leadership role due to the EPA's responsibility for managing waterways under the Boundary Waters Treaty and the Clean Water Act. MT governor's office asked EPA to take the lead initially, but now, the state is taking more of a lead (coordinated by Eric Urban, MT DEQ) along with the BC provincial gov't.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		We are putting together a transboundary Koocanusa Lake management steering group chaired by the MT DEQ, EPA, Environment Canada, and BC gov't along with three Tribal reps from the Kootenai, Salish and Ktunaxa Nations. There will be two advisory committees, one made up of stakeholders (local governments, NGOs, Teck, etc) and one Monitoring Research Committee made up of scientific advisors from both countries. This group will monitor selenium levels in the lake which flow from the Elk Ri. in Canada below the coal mines.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		The technical people involved in the 2013-2014 advisory committee planning meetings were great. There is a willingness on the part of BC to avoid going to through the IJC, which we have now threatened several times over the increased selenium levels we've found, since 2008, south of the border

5. How are your existing initiatives funded?	EPA is funded by the government. We have come up with some limited funding to get the management steering committee off the ground, but we do not know where long-term funding will come from for this initiative. Teck is, we believe, required to contribute some to this group but we're not discussing that yet. Once the steering group is formed and begins its work, budgetary decisions will be pursued
6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?	We still need more sharing of mining plans cross-border. There was a meeting this past Jan. between BC, AK, ID, and MT (maybe WA, not sure) to discuss mining plans and their effect on transboundary waterways. But BC is ramping up coal mining operations so there is a lot that is still unknown.
7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?	Not within the Columbia, but the Missouri Ri. Basin (Milk & Poplar Rivers) have some problems. EPA only deals with water quality, not quantity issues.
This interview was a bit different as it focused on a single issue: the expansion of metallurgical coal mining by Teck adjacent to the Elk Ri., which flows into the US via Lake Koocanusa. Elevated levels of selenium have been recorded since at least 2008 and there have been many fish kills within the Elk and its tributaries. The EPA went to the State Dept. to make a recommendation to the IJC about this issue, and there was strong push-back from BC. BC then demanded (for the first time) that Teck submit a comprehensive watershed assessment and management plan for the Elk. Several technical advisory committee meetings were held in 2013-14 and US and Canadian representatives were involved with those meetings. EPA felt that Teck did a relatively good assessment of the Elk Ri. itself, but not of the Koocanusa Lake, which straddles the border. Since then, there has been a push to create a transboundary steering committee to address selenium issues in the lake. This interview just focused on these efforts.	

Interview Format		
Date: 8/6/15		
Name: Joe Caravetta (email response)		
Title: Inspector, Kootenay Boundary Region, Conservation Officer Service, BC Ministry of Environment (BC COS)		
Contact Information: 250.356.2191 jessica.pfeffer@gov.bc.ca		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes the BC COS occasionally work with the US border patrol (homeland security group) and the USA and State fish and wildlife officers – specifically USA fish wildlife service, Montana State fish and wildlife officers, Idaho state fish and wildlife officers and Washington state fish and wildlife officers. • Also occasionally work with the USA Environmental protection agency(EPA) as it relates to cross border pollution concerns on the Columbia and Kootenay rivers. • Work on issues such as relocation of problem grizzly bears (cross border movement), international poaching, information relayed to USA border patrol regarding illegal drug trafficking and illegal border crossing locations.

4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-operation is well received both in Canada and in USA with these interactive agencies. • Accomplishments include successfully assisting the USA with grizzly bear recovery along the transboundary through relocating some human wildlife conflict Grizzly bears from BC to the USA border • Also, a major accomplishment working with these agencies has resulted in several apprehension and convictions of illegal angling guides –USA residents illegally guiding clients from the USA in Canada • Accomplishments also include the illegal hunting of wildlife in BC by USA residents and the illegal transport of wildlife across the USA border • Although not environmental work- Apprehension of drug traffickers headed from Canada into the USA • Also joint field training has been undertaken, sharing of knowledge – i.e. predator attack training, snowmobile operation, avalanche rescue to name a few, with associated cost savings and learning new knowledge(i.e. Montana's approach to Aquatic invasive Species monitoring and prevention).
5. How are your existing initiatives funded?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within COS Regional budget

<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always room for improvement. Certainly increased working relationships/meetings/training etc. would benefit both the USA agencies and ours. Yes with increased time, and resources, working relationships and partnerships would be improved but would come at an increased costs to the COS. • Enhanced working relationships could result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o improved apprehension of illegal angling and hunting activities, o improved apprehension of illegal aquatic invasive species coming in to or leaving Canada, o Also with increased funding to the COS (similar to what these USA agencies have), there could be a consistent approach to dealing with some high profile problem wildlife issues along the border (i.e. grizzly bears). o As well with an increased funding to the COS, there could be greater attention focused on the environmental health of the transboundary rivers (Columbia/Kootenay).
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes we would be definitely interested in working with other agencies/people to improve our present working relationships to build partnerships and secure additional resources and funding for environmental work.

Interview Format		
Date: 7/16/15		
Name: Jen Bayer		
Title: Coordinator for Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP)		
Contact Information: jbayer@usgs.gov 503-201-4179		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<p>oJen works for the US Federal Government – US Geological Survey</p> <p>o Works for PNAMP but employed by US Geological Survey</p> <p>o PNAMP provides a forum where entities can collaborate voluntarily – the big goal is to improve effectiveness, efficiency and quality of monitoring programs in the NW to ultimately improve management decision making - voluntary forum that supports collaboration among willing partners</p>
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really trying to get agreement across jurisdictions on a short list of high level environmental indicators the agency and entities want to report. If they had a nice short list then they could focus their energies (they do a lot of work coordinating monitoring and data sharing) so if they knew what that short list of indicators was it would help them focus their energy on the monitoring and data collection and the data share • Coordinating monitoring efforts (data collection) • Access to monitoring results • Data discovery and accessibility

<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptually yes. But decision making with national boundaries is often not done transboundary. But the information needs are transboundary. People want to know about the CRB and about ecoregions that are not constrained by political jurisdictions • At the moment there are no initiatives where PNAMP is working transboundary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Had some conversations with the Great Northern LCC. They had asked for help working on a “Transboundary Data Compilation Exercise”. Didn’t get off the ground – but thinks it’s a good idea and happy to help with that o Long time ago also helped some folks from BC to teach them about what PNAMP does. They ended up forming a partnership called TAP (the aquatic partnership). Had big visions but don’t know what happened to it. Think it was called BC TAP WATER ALLIANCE (http://www.thinksalmon.com/fswp_project/item/the_aquatic_partnership/). Was hopeful that by helping them out they would get something going and could connect. Thinks it was coming out of some Fraser Partnership stuff • PNAMP is a NW regional activity – but has a lot of emphasis from the Columbia. BPA and NWPCC are their two strongest partners and/or Most influential partners
--	---

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built a set of online web tools called https://www.monitoringresources.org/ . “their biggest success”. its a functional, free, online tool set for monitoring practitioners to be able to document their protocols, methods, and sites. By doing that it creates opportunities for others to find that monitoring information - who is doing what, where, when, and how. Able to collaborate or get data later. BPA has funded most of the development and they are requiring projects in the Fish and Wildlife Program to use the tool set for documentation. That is significant. So any projects the BPA funds that collect and analyze data have to use the monitoring resources toolset – at least to document their protocols and methods. They aren’t all doing it yet because it is still a pretty new idea – but a lot of them are. It’s a huge bonus for BPA in terms of accountability because everything is publicly documented very thoroughly and consistently. Also a benefit to practitioners because they can see what other people are doing and learn what methods are commonly used etc. Really helps programmatically – and right now entering into conversation with USGS and VLM for them to use the tool set for some national programs • Some other successes – what PNAMP really does is support willing volunteers to collaborate. Look for ideas or problems people have in common and help them work together. • Working with state and tribal fish and wildlife managers to create a data sharing network for salmonid populations assessment data. Funded by BPA. That data will flow publicly through the EPA’s exchange network so anyone can get it. That’s a big success. At first the fish biologists were skeptical because it was a new idea for them – but they have come along with it and they are doing it – which makes the data accessible, transparent, and better backed in the long run. More efficient for NOAA (their regulatory entity) to actually get the data to do their work • A new project (that thinks/hopes is going to be successful) PNAMP is facilitating involves partners that are trying to come up with one integrated monitoring plan that brings storm water monitoring needs and fish habitat monitoring needs together. Efficient, cheap, data is accessible to all parties. Still under development. Just entered implementation and planning phase that is moving along.
--	--

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPA currently funds the majority. Significant funding from BPA for the monitoringresources.org Toolset. Toolset also has funding from Bureau of Reclamation and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. Significant software development costs over a number of years • Funding model = most of what PNAMP does is the facilitation role. So have a small staff. Most of what gets done is by partner agencies contributing their own staff time in kind. It's something they need to work on so they allow their staff to participate and the PNAMP crew are the facilitators and helpers – they make things happen through workshops, keeping track of documents, all that stuff in between meetings to make it easier for everyone else • PNAMP staff work for USGS and get funding from other agencies for their time. A little comes from USGS. A lot comes from BPA. Some from Bureau of Reclamation. Some from Washington Ecology. Over the years has been dollars from other federal agencies too: BLM and NOAA. BPA has been the big supporter though... They don't have a lot of staff to participate in things so it made sense that they would chip in more dollars for the facilitation part
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the above • PNAMP has been around 10 years. Have a soft charter. Would love to have additional partners join. They have a lot of participation and activity – big turnouts to workshops. But haven't had new entities/agencies join and participate to reinvigorate the board of directors. Been doing the same thing for a while. Getting harder to get that in-kind staff time from the partner entities because everybody's budgets are cut so people are busier and busier. • Really want that list of high level environmental indicators!!! What are the 5 things we should all be working on
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could do much better with sharing the data that is already being collected. Publicly accessible data and data products (turning raw data into things people can use to make decisions) • Especially in the Columbia – water travels a long way through a lot of jurisdictions • Yes would be interested in working with other people • Love to be invited to anything in the works/happening – willing participant!

Interview Format		
Date: 7/8/15		
Name: Howie Wright		
Title: Okanagan Nation Alliance Fisheries Program Manager (Okanagan Nation Alliance Fisheries Department - ONAFD)		
Contact Information: Heather.Matthews@bchydro.com 604-528-1898		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The conservation, protection, restoration and enhancement of indigenous fisheries (anadromous and resident) and aquatic resources within the Okanagan Nation Territory” • ONAFD works to provide technical fisheries assistance for the Nation and its 8 member communities and acts as a liaison with federal and provincial agencies. • 40 fulltime staff in department (Westbank Main office, field office in Penticton, field office in Castlegar) o 50-60 contracts
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<p>1) Upper Columbia River Salmon Restoration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Partnership between ONA and Colville Confederated Tribes (ONA and Colville are the SAME nation) – They are meeting on salmon leadership between FN and Tribes (Tribal Alliance). ONA & Colville Tribes as one group and Bill Green from the Canadian Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CCRITFC) as the second group are planning a Canadian meeting for salmon leadership and salmon restoration (like the one south of the border with Upper Columbia United Tribes and NWPCC) <p>2) Columbia River Treaty: Working with 15 tribes across the border in the US. On the Canadian side they are focusing on the economic/social/cultural perspective for ONA people. Scoping out impacts of Upper Columbia water. Specifically storage on Canadian side,</p>

	<p>also in discussion with federal government – big transboundary issue, sockeye salmon spawn in Canada and how well they do depends on how much water releases</p> <p>3) Harvest Negotiation with Canada and USA: As it stands there is no transboundary agreement for sharing the salmon harvest</p>
<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<p>ONA is transboundary by nature -> “Transboundary Tribe”. Have their own discussions with Coleville</p> <p>Yes all 3 are Trransboundary.... But also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Okanagan Salmon Restoration: Mid-Columbia Public Utility District need to mitigate sockeye that goes through. Send mitigation money up to Canada to fund program. Skaha Lake • OBMEP: Extension of US program (Colville) since 2005. Coleville program funding through Boneville. Work on common standards • Harmonizing Okanagan Chinook restoration: Working with Coleville (Bridgeport, Washington). ONA working with federal government up here in Canada Moving into recovery planning • Okanagan/Arrow Lakes: Adult sockeye mitigation is transboundary. Take adult sockeye on US side
<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From US: (majority of funding – 80%): Through Colville Tribes via Bonneville Power (for spring chinook and steelhead programs) and through Mid Columbia Public Utility • From Can: BC Hydro, Arrow Lakes, DFO, Province of BC

<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonneville Power Admin needs to mitigate for Okanagan Canadian Salmon. Fund projects up in Canada. Operate for lower dams in Columbia. Need money directly related to sockeye restoration. “Uncontrollable loss” should be mitigated for • No mechanism for BC Hydro to operate Upper Columbia dams to mitigate for Canadian salmon. Need to acknowledge no program to mitigate impact • Funding wise -> BC Hydro’s mitigation program for fish and wildlife (FWCP) in the Columbia River = Conflict of interest (crown corporation). Need an independent process to adequately set mitigation dollars -> away from BC province. Something wrong with BC Hydro/Provincial relationship. Mitigation amount only \$4 million annually? ... not enough. Bonneville spends closer to \$400 million. Need more trust in the US the Tribes operate the mitigation hatcheries. Not the case in Canada -> No FN priority
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not currently mitigating for Okanagan Canadian salmon • Answer blended into #6

Interview Format		
Date: 7/28/15		
Name: Heather Matthews		
Title: Energy Planning, BC Hydro		
Contact Information: Heather.Matthews@bchydro.com 604-528-1898		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC Hydro – OPERATIONAL IMPACT AND FOOTPRINT (ESSENTIALLY 2 PROGRAMS) • BC Hydro is the Canadian entity responsible for implementing the Columbia River Treaty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The entity includes up to the deputy CEO • BC Hydro owns the dams and is the group that manages the operational decisions of the reservoirs discharges
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		1) Support the government in the CRT Review 2) Water Use Plans: 2 groups (BC Hydro as a whole). One implements operational works. Another implements monitoring studies and physical work
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The water is transboundary • As the Canadian entity for the CRT work regularly with the US entity • Also operate the Kootenay system (tributary of Columbia) under the IJC order. Although it is Fortis' order – they answer the IJC order but BC Hydro dispatches the system and operate within the constraints of the IJC order ?? • Not transboundary but have worked with: Working with Bill Greens group CRIFC on ecosystem work. Working with ONA on Okanagan salmon
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way the entities have been able to adjust using supplemental agreements to meet some of the fish loads in both countries • Being able to resolve disputes

5. How are your existing initiatives funded?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC Hydro users who purchase electricity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Electrical customers
6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CRT review is very complex – but what they are doing to implement it is working • So – Nothing at the moment needed to improve
7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can't make comments about the future of the CRT and the CRB until get the go ahead of both countries sitting down to talk • Will say - The things that have been easier to do have already been done. The things that don't get a negative trade off. A lot of the things that have been looked at – it will be a trade-off between different ecosystem values. • People like to think its ecosystem vs. power vs. flood control but there's a lot of complexities of if we do things with the US and their salmon flows then that has impact on our reservoirs and environmental values (Where it gets difficult) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In terms of the treaty: BC Hydro works as the technical support to the province on the review. With them doing some work on “Stable Arrow Concept”? o Treaty Review – in a holding pattern. Waiting to hear what State Department wants to do. When they are ready to engage

Interview Format		
Date: 7/16/15		
Name: Erin Sexton		
Title: Research Scientist & Regulatory Affairs Manager, University of Montana, Institute on Ecosystems		
Contact Information: 406-250-8518 erin.sexton@umontana.edu		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent scientist - Doesn't belong to an organization • Her work with the University of Montana is focused on science and management in the transboundary Crown of the Continent landscape. Within the Institute of Ecosystems (U of Montana) she is the person that focuses on transboundary landscapes • Works with the Great Northern LCC on some of their transboundary work and has foundation funding that allows her to work on other transboundary work. • Also sits on the Roundtable for the Crown of the Continent
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<p>1) Implementation of the MOU between British Columbia and Montana on the transboundary flathead</p> <p>2) Climate Change adaptation</p> <p>3) Connectivity in the transboundary landscape – her focus within the CRB is the shared boundary between BC and Montana. Primarily the Kootenai watershed and the Flathead watershed</p>
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are all transboundary – her area of focus • Works with pretty much all of the stakeholders in the region: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Government – province of BC, state of Montana, federal governments, all of the federal agencies that have jurisdiction in the Elk, Kootenay, and Flathead o Tribes and FN = Confederated Salish and Kootenay Tribe, Ktunaxa Nation o NGOs = Wildsight in BC, National Parks Conservation Association in Montana o Lots of agency science partners – US Geological Survey, State of Montana Fish and Game, o North of the boundary working with industry – Teck Coal,

	Canfor Forest Products (major timber and mining industries)
4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of things that are working well • In the transboundary Flathead they have shared data and databases and working towards having more common databases – definitely sharing data across the border. Over the last 10 years – there has been transboundary work done on our native salmonids, bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout - Have transboundary mapping of those fish populations for showing where the population moves in terms of fulfilling their life history strategy, spawning areas (transboundary spawning maps) – maps don't stop at the border. That work has been led largely by the US Geological Survey, Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks and the Province of BC • Transboundary watershed maps for the Crown of the Continent region. Transboundary map for BC, Alberta, and Montana showing the Crown of the Continent. That work has been largely done by the Crown Managers Partnership (management entity that works together across the boundary on key issues). That work is supported by the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative (who are a strong partner working in a larger landscape), the Roundtable for the Crown of the Continent, and the Kresge Foundation • Have good transboundary partnerships – both government and non-government • Have good science and data sharing – certainly have a foundation which they are building upon • With some specific issues they are working on (all fall under “things that would be vulnerable to climate change or be resilient to climate change”): Native salmonid work – Crown Managers Partnership is working on a “transboundary management protocol” for dealing with aquatic invasive species – that focuses on prevention, early detection, and rapid response – preventing certain species of aquatic invasives from getting into the region – important from the watershed perspective. Bear managers and bear biologists doing good work in the flathead and kootenay and all the way across the BC/Montana boundary (more peripheral to the work Erin does – US Fish and Wildlife services a good contact for that)

<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative has provided funding to both her work helping implement the BC/Montana MOU and also to the Crown Managers Partnership to support work on their management priorities (eg. Native salmonids and invasive species) • Funding from Kresge Foundation to the Round Table for the Crown of the Continent • Other foundation funding • Crown Managers Partnership – agencies make small contributions collectively from their own budgets to fund transboundary cooperation
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always need more time and funding • Coordination is a big one – in terms of understanding what the right hand is saying to the left hand. Have a lot of initiatives in the part of the CRB she works in. Have a lot of collaboratives working together - like the Great Northern LCC, and the Crown Managers Partnership, and the Round Table – linking all the different parts. Would be nice to see some linkages/connections between the transboundary Flathead work and transboundary Elk and Kootenay work to the bigger picture of the CRB They are just a tiny corner of it and there is a lot of work going on in the bigger picture and they are not very well connected to the CBT and the NWPCC or with the Columbia River picture on the whole. Having a context of where they fit into that picture and where linkages could be made would be useful • One of the big challenges is the differences between governance and political cycles: The geopolitical landscape between BC/Montana (CAN/US). Across the international boundary governance is different <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The US side and states in the basin are subject to the US Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (a lot of federal legislation that guides the governance of their natural resources) but north of the boundary the provinces have far more authority over how natural resources are managed than the federal government o Example of a mismatch in governance ^ - basically different rules under which people are working on with respect to natural resource management

<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Two big ones on her radar that she has worked with a fair amount (related to the watersheds she is working on):</p> <p>1) Large scale open pit coal mining that is taking place in the Elk Valley of British Columbia. An area 100 years in the making – legacy mining impacts taking place in that watershed. The need for a watershed scale approach to that issue. Right now the assessment of impacts is limited to just the BC portion of the Elk River and the Kootenai watershed crosses the boundary and goes into Montana, travels into Idaho, and goes back up into BC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The scale of the impacts from the mining are big enough that they could be in Idaho and back up into BC. They have detected increases in some of the contaminants much further down the watershed o So it's a really big and good fit for the CRB perspective in that it crosses the boundary several times and affects multiple sub watersheds within the basin. Is something that has not received attention. There is a huge data collection need for the impacts to fish and water downstream and even wildlife and birds – poorly understood at this point once you get outside of the Elk River watershed <p>2) In the Flathead and Elk Valley there is a lot of heavy industrial use for forest and timber harvest right now. Those impacts with respect to sedimentation, fish habitat, and riparian corridors in general. Speaking about transboundary fish, water quality, and wildlife</p>
---	--

Interview Format		
Date: 7/8/15		
Name: DR Michele		
Title: Executive Director, Upper Columbia United Tribes		
Contact Information: 1-509-954-7631 dr@ucut-nsn.org		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “To unite Upper Columbia River Tribes for the protection, preservation, and enhancement of Treaty/Executive Order Rights, Sovereignty, Culture, Fish, Water, Wildlife, Habitat and other interests and issues of common concern in our respective territories through a structured process of cooperation and coordination for the benefit of all people.” • The organization was formed in 1982 by the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho and the Spokane Tribe of Indians with the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation joining in the mid 1990s. • In addition, the UCUT facilitates unified and effective communication with federal, state, and local agencies as well as other tribes and entities
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fish Passage and Reintroduction • Columbia River Treaty • Education and awareness within the region – keeping the region and its people up to speed

<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<p>Currently only working south of the border in terms of fish passage and reintroduction with the NWPCC Nov 2014 amendments. But long term the goal is to work north of the border as well – specifically with FN on fish passage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Recently finished a joint paper titled “Fish Passage and Reintroduction into the US and Canadian Upper Columbia Basin” (Jan 2015). This document is meant to inform the U.S. and Canadian governments and other regional sovereigns and stakeholders on how anadromous salmon and resident fish can be reintroduced into the upper Columbia River Basin. It provides a much-needed proposal for restoring fish passage and reintroducing anadromous fish as an essential element in modernizing the Columbia River Treaty o Paper was produced by the U.S. Columbia Basin Tribes (which includes the Upper Columbia United Tribes) and Canadian First Nations of the Columbia River Basin = Upper Columbia United Tribes, Canadian Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Okanagan Nation Alliance, Upper Snake River Tribes, Cowlitz Indian Tribe, and Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes o In October 2014, the Northwest Power and Conservation Council amended its Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program to investigate reintroducing anadromous fish back into the main stem Columbia River reaches and tributaries in the U.S. Upper Columbia River Basin Fish Passage and Reintroduction Project The UCUT have developed a revised draft work and coordination plan to initiate these investigations. UCUT’s phase 1 work plan proposes 11 objectives and 36 tasks to gather sufficient background information on scientific feasibility, possible cost, and habitat potential. (June 2015)
<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major accomplishment = The Columbia River Treaty. For years (the last 4 years?) have been trying to get ecosystem function and fish passage into the treaty and finally did . UCUT were instrumental in the CRT 2014 amendments
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o continued collaboration and more collaboration and coordination on both sides of the border between entities o funding o more/better education on the issues and what is happening o paradigm shift - hydro power and flood risk management are not the ONLY things that are important o Need a plan (Treaty? Project?) that is beneficial to the entire “system” o Need a more holistic approach - CRB as a region encompassing both sides of border o sharing of benefits (ecosystem and economic benefits)
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the areas of fish passage and ecosystem function these issues are not being addressed enough in terms of transboundary cooperation and coordination • Definitely interested in working with other people o These are not just Tribal issues; they are issues for everyone who lives along the river and within the basin o However Tribes are generally the first people out in front of the issues o Fish passage and restoration as well as ecosystem function are issues that need to be addressed for the sake of future generations

Interview Format		
Date: 10/8/15 (email response)		
Name: Crystal Klym		
Title: Program Manager, FWCP-Columbia (BC Hydro)		
Contact Information: crystal.klym@bchydro.com		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?	<p>Mission: The Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program (FWCP) compensates for the impacts to fish, wildlife and their supporting habitats affected by BC Hydro owned and operated generation facilities. Vision: Thriving fish and wildlife populations in watersheds that are functioning and sustainable.</p> <p>The Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program is a partnership between BC Hydro, the Province, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, First Nations and public stakeholders to conserve and enhance fish and wildlife impacted by the construction of BC Hydro dams.</p>	
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?	<p>To answer some of your questions below, three project examples have been selected: two core (ongoing) projects and one from our annual grant intake.</p> <p>1) Columbia River White Sturgeon (Core): The population of white sturgeon in the Canadian portion of the Upper Columbia River is undergoing recruitment failure, where eggs and larvae are not surviving through to young fish and maturing to contribute to the next generation. As a result, the population was listed as endangered under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) in 2006. A conservation aquaculture program, supported by the FWCP, was initiated in 2000 to address recovery while research into recruitment failure occurred. A total of 136,914 hatchery-reared juvenile white sturgeon have been released into the Canadian portion of the Columbia River from 2002 to 2014, and approximately 4,000 were released in 2015.</p> <p>2) Northern Leopard Frog (Core): The Northern Leopard Frog Project involves the inventory monitoring and stewardship of the Northern Leopard frog population at the Creston Valley Wildlife Management Area (CVWMA). This population hosts the majority of the remaining leopard frogs in B.C. and serves as the source population for re-introductions and a captive assurance population. Actions include calling surveys, songmeter deployment and analysis, egg mass surveys, egg mass caging and care until tadpoles are free-swimming, support for Columbia Marsh re-introductions and Bummers Flats tadpole release and monitoring (will occur if more than 10 egg masses are detected at CVWMA).</p> <p>3) Protecting Our Waters from Aquatic Invasive Species: Phase II (Grant): Project is being implemented by the Central Kootenay Invasive Species Society (CKISS). Project goals are to: protect habitat quality, biodiversity and overall ecological integrity of priority water bodies in West/Central Kootenay; protect the viability of basin fisheries from the impacts of highly invasive aquatic invasive species like zebra and quagga mussels; support cross-border, provincial and regional initiatives; and build local capacity to collaboratively prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic invasive species.</p>	

<p>3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?</p>	<p>Sturgeon: There is extensive cross-boundary work regarding the Columbia River sturgeon. The Technical Working Group of the Upper Columbia White Sturgeon Recovery Initiative deals with cross border communications. As mentioned, James Crossman good contact(james.crossman@bchydro.com).</p> <p>Northern Leopard Frog: American bull frogs are very close to the Canadian border, but not yet confirmed to occur in the wetlands of the Creston Valley where the main breeding area is for Northern Leopard Frogs. Representatives from north and south of the border are working together to determine the extent of American bull frogs, and if they have – in fact – crossed over to BC. For example, CKISS is sharing information with the Forest Service in Washington and others regarding this matter.</p> <p>Protecting Our Waters from Aquatic Invasive Species: Phase II : This project aims to support cross-border, provincial and regional initiatives such as the 100th Meridian Initiative, Idaho Invasive Species Program, Invasive Species Council of BC (Clean-Drain-Dry), Columbia Basin Aquatic Invasive Species Strategic Framework, and Inter-Ministry Invasive Species Working Group.</p>
<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>Sturgeon: Highlights include increased community awareness and participation, and excellent survival rate for those juveniles released to date (at least 25% since started 15 years ago).</p> <p>Northern Leopard frog: A record number of Northern Leopard Frog egg masses (39) were detected in the Creston Valley in 2014, which was almost double the previous record of 22 detected in 2012. In 2015, for a third year in a row, captive breeding at Vancouver Aquarium was successful allowing for the third release of tadpoles in the Columbia Marshes following the first release in 2013. In addition, breeding has been confirmed at two ponds at the upper Kootenay reintroduction site.</p> <p>Aquatic Invasive species: Stewardship groups and agencies have come a long way in the last five years in the joint effort to protect our native aquatic species and ecosystems from the relentless spread of invasive species. Regulations have been passed, billboard advertising sprung up, boat inspection stations set-up, cross-border collaboration organized, a Clean-Drain-Dry Program initiated, and aquatic invasive working groups established.</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>The FWCP receives nearly all of its funding from BC Hydro. However, in the spring of 2013, the FWCP and Columbia Basin Trust (CBT) partnered to develop the Upper Kootenay Ecosystem Enhancement Plan (UKEEP), which funds local fish and wildlife projects in the Upper Kootenay area. Substantial in-kind support is received from Board and Technical Committee members as well as Program partners, volunteers and others who assist in project delivery.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Not included in this survey – project specific.</p>

<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>None that come to mind at the moment...</p>
---	--

Interview Format		
Date: 7/10/2015		
Name: Chip Corsi		
Title: Regional Dir., Panhandle Region, Idaho Fish & Game		
Contact Information: 208.769.1414		
1. What is your role within Idaho Fish & Game?		Chip is the administrative manager of the department (background as a biologist)
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		Pend Orielle basin restoration; restoring big game herds; Coeur d'Aline basin restoration (lots of mining issues), Kootenai Ri. restoration
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Kootenai Ri. restoration (funded primarily by BPA). Collaborative with BC & MT, working with both technical (biologists, ecologists) and with the relevant state and provincial ministries. Also working on Caribou restoration as well as grizzly bear restoration in the Yaak. Ongoing coordination with BC scientists as well as the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho on these efforts.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>Relationships are good - we've been at it for 20+ years, we co-author papers together on the Kootenai Ri. and generally agree on most things; where there are disagreements we tend to resolve them quickly because of the good working relationship. For the grizzly bear work, we invite BC staff to the intergovernmental task force meetings and there is ongoing information exchanges. We also just wrapped up a very successful multi-species baseline initiative, looking at all sorts of species at risk in NE Washington, southern BC, northern Idaho and NW Montana. Additionally, we just received Rainbow trout eggs from Lake Kootenai to stock Pend Orielle Lake and that has been successful.</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>About 50% comes from sales of hunting & fishing licenses and permits, the other 50% comes from BPA, Avista, Federal Aid (from an excise tax on hunting and fishing sales), and other grants. Small funding under EPA for their work on grizzlies. They get no funding from state tax dollars.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Chip thinks the relationship is good and the level of coordination with B.C. counterparts is at a good level. Maybe could use an annual coordination meeting for all the regional managers, but that's about it.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Not that he could think of.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/15/15		
Name: Bruce Suzumoto		
Title: Chief of hydropower operations for NOAA Fisheries		
Contact Information: 503-230-5415 Bruce.Suzumoto@noaa.gov		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily work with Columbia River issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lower river and upper river in the US o Primarily anadromous species of fish o Also have a great interest in treaty discussions o They have 13 listed species of salmon and steelhead that responsible for under the endangered species act
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		<p>1) Very large hydropower system in the US called the Federal Columbia River Power System that drives much of the power in the US in the NW. So deal with that issue and how the operation of those damns affect listed salmon and steelhead</p> <p>2) Federal representative for his group on the CRT discussions</p> <p>3) Beginning a process where going to try and set goals for Columbia River salmon and steelhead. How many fish they want to escape, how many to harvest in the US. Working with NWPCC on that.</p>
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are all transboundary in nature because if working on the main stem of the Columbia a lot of that water comes out of Canada. But not personally working with anyone in Canada per say • But they have agreements under the current CRT on the amount of water that comes out of Canada for the benefit of salmon and steelhead in the US • Very large interest in possibly reintroducing fish above the blocked areas in the Columbia (above Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph damns). Discussions with NWPCC, also part of the US regional recommendations to the state department. Sent a set of recommendations from the NW Region to the state department

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The operation of the hydro system and the work we do on that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Developed a “biological opinion” - working well and an accomplishment . A document (set of actions) that NOAA Fisheries produced that the “Action Agencies” are to follow to protect salmon and steelhead o The operation of the dams , to a large extent are operated not only to produce power and for flood risk management but also to protect salmon and steelhead as they migrate down and up the system
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All funded through the federal government - through Congress • Don’t take money • BPA – self funded and pay for many of the actions that the action agencies follow
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big initiatives and big activities • In a lot of litigation with how the hydro system is operated in the US • Important to be as collaborative as you can • Try and cover as many interests as you can but you never can satisfy everyone. For the most part thinks they have done a good job with that (satisfying people). There is less litigation than has been but always people that are not happy
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not at this time • A lot of things still in play: like The CRT discussions (separate discussion between CA and US) and the reintroduction issue above Grand Coulee (could affect things in CA and US). Don’t know where these discussions are going to land • Maybe in the future

GAUGING CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL
COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN: SUMMER SURVEY 2015

QUESTIONS

1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks' mission is to provide for the stewardship of the fish, wildlife, parks and recreation resources of Montana, while contributing to the quality of life for present and future generations. FWP's purpose is to use innovation and technology to maintain the long-term viability of Montana's natural, cultural, and recreational resources; manage fish and wildlife resources; partner with the public in resource management decisions; and advocate for responsible use of the limited natural resources.

2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River basin?

Future of the Columbia River Treaty, improving the Libby Coordination Agreement, and better coordination of federal dam operations (Hungry Horse and Libby Dams) with storage projects in Canada (e.g. Mica, Arrow, Corra Linn, Duncan).

Managing transboundary fish species in the Kootenai and Flathead Subbasins. Focal species include: Kootenai white sturgeon, burbot, redband trout, bull trout, and westslope cutthroat trout. Research is also underway on mountain whitefish and sculpin species.

Water quality impacts from mining (i.e. Flathead basin coal mines, Kootenay Basin mines releasing selenium and macro-nutrients).

3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?

All the above are transboundary in nature. We collaborate with BC Ministries, Columbia Basin Trust (CBT), BC Hydro, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Crown of the Continent Partnership.

4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?

System-wide analyses for the Columbia River Treaty Review, showed that the current operating strategy at Hungry Horse and Libby dams (called the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's mainstem amendment operation, or "Montana Operation") successfully balanced power generation, effective flood management and ecosystem

functions. Model results for these two Montana dams indicated that the final alternatives studied did not differ from the Current Condition.

The Columbia Basin Trust is collaborating with MFWP on a transboundary study of burbot in the headwaters of Koocanusa, and bull trout redd counts in Wigwam Creek, a major bull trout spawning tributary. BC Ministries and Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans are collaborating with U.S. agencies, states and tribes to restore Kootenai white sturgeon that range from Kootenai Falls in Montana, through Idaho and Kootenay Lake BC. BC Ministries are collaborating with MFWP to monitor transboundary bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout in the Flathead Subbasin.

BC Ministries is collaborating with Montana (MFWP and DEQ) to monitor elevated concentrations of selenium and nitrogen to help Tek Coal design water treatment facilities for mine runoff. MFWP funded water sampling throughout the headwaters of the Flathead Subbasin to establish a baseline for water quality in the system.

5. How are your existing initiatives funded?

Bonneville Power Administration funded much of our work in Montana and the Kootenay watershed in British Columbia, in cooperation with CBT and BC Ministries. MFWP provides additional state funding for managing transboundary fisheries and monitoring sources of water pollution.

6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc.?

BPA-funded bull trout monitoring of bull trout in the Wigwam watershed has a long period of record. Our collaboration with CBT to monitor burbot in the Kootenai/Kootenay began only recently, and will hopefully expand to include other transboundary fish species. Unfortunately, CBT funding does not extend into the Flathead Subbasin. While MFWP's collaboration with BC Ministries continues to be favorable in the Flathead and Kootenai, there is no mechanism to fund cooperative transboundary projects in the Flathead Subbasin.

7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?

Information is still needed on bull trout spawning in other Canadian tributaries that aren't currently being monitored. Also, we need map locations for all pure populations of westslope cutthroat, redband trout and sources of genetic introgression with introduced strains of rainbow. These data sets would be valuable to fisheries agencies in both countries. MFWP's mitigation programs in the Flathead and Kootenai subbasins are interested in transboundary collaborations.

Interview Format		
Date: 7/22/15		
Name: William (Billy) Barquin		
Title: Legal Dept, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho		
Contact Information: 503.719.4496		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your organization?		Protecting tribal sovereign lands and ensuring proper ecosystem function within those landscapes
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		All of the issues we work on are important because we have a covenant with the Creator which demands that we protect the whole of the environment, so all issues are equally important. We can't pick and choose. We are currently working on fishery habitat recovery along the Kootenai River. We also have a sturgeon hatchery as well as a burbot fishery that is cutting-edge and is co-managed with the Dept. of Forest Lands & Natural Resources. We also have an MOU with Idaho, Montana, the Kootenai Tribes and BC that coordinates all of our data and management activities. We also have a Caribou restoration project (Caribou is a sacred animal in the Ktunaxa tradition). The Ktunaxa Nation Council manages this work. Canada Parks has recently come up with a caribou management plan, but on the ground we work more closely with our provincial partners.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		All of them are transboundary - the forests and rivers have no political boundaries - we have multiple provincial partners in Canada, as well as the International Kootenai Tribes, and other tribal federations such as the Ktunaxa Nation Alliance, CTSK, etc. We have an International Kootenai Ecosystem Restoration Team (IKERT) that is currently addressing white sturgeon habitat recovery and restoration issues in the Kootenai River - and we coordinate closely with IDFG, MTFWP on monitoring and evaluation. We have a joint database where new data about stream conditions can be posted and shared. Additionally, we coordinate with our BC partners on getting stronger fish stock from their lakes above the dams into the Kootenai River below the dams.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>Our coordination efforts are all working well - we have strong relationships on both sides of the border and have been working collaboratively for quite some time. It did take time when these initiatives started because we did not have good relations beforehand, but now the trust has built up over time and when I need something from BC, I can just call up my counterpart and we'll work together. That doesn't mean we always agree, but there is mutual trust and respect on both sides. The shared database system is also helpful and has worked well.</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Primarily federally funded from BPA through the Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Program as well as through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We do have some tribal funds as well, and an odd grant here or there. But our projects are mostly federally funded.</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>Our coordination efforts are going quite well - but when the cities get involved (Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, WA, and Boise) it gets complicated and we run into roadblocks. All of the Treaty dams are in Kootenai territory and we should be operating our reservoirs for our citizens - not only for the flood-risk benefit of the downstream cities. They need to take more responsibility for the flood risk of their cities - right now in the upper regions, we're bearing all the costs of this and it's hard for us to achieve our goals when we can't operate in a way that makes the most sense for the environment and the citizens who live in northern ID, MT and northeast WA.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Not really any issues not being addressed that Billy could think of - we have such close partnerships as it is. We have a very good system with trust and respect built in, so if there's ever a transboundary issue that someone feels is not being addressed, we can bring it to our partners on the other side of the border and work to address it.</p>

Interview Format		
Date: 7/20/15		
Name: Amy Windrope		
Title: Columbia Basin Policy Team Lead, WA Department of Fish & Wildlife		
Contact Information: 360.298.2278		
1. What is the mission or purpose of your team (within WA Fish & Wildlife)?		Amy is the lead for the Columbia Basin Policy Team. In this role she works with policy directors and coordinates their directives with BPA. Lots of mitigation work.
2. What are the three most important issues or initiatives that you are currently working on within the International Columbia River Basin?		There are three main 2015-2016 policy goals that Amy is currently coordinating 1) Wildlife settlement with BPA 2) Fish reintroduction above the Chief Joseph & Grand Coulee dams and 3) working with the Power Council to set biological objectives for their reintroduction work.
3. Are any of these issues or initiatives transboundary in nature? If yes, what other individuals and organizations are you working with across the border?		Not currently - Amy works closely with the Tribes, BPA and the Feds but her work is not currently coordinated with Canada. She would welcome greater coordination and has discussed with Kindy perhaps doing a field trip with U.S. technical and policy folks up to the headwaters of the Columbia to see what the conditions are like for fish and wildlife on the northern side of the border.

<p>4. What is working well with respect to each of these issues or initiatives? What are your major accomplishments?</p>	<p>Because these initiatives are just getting started, they have not yet been successful.</p>
<p>5. How are your existing initiatives funded?</p>	<p>Most mitigation funding come sthrough the Feds via BPA, but the department gets funding from a patchwork of sources including the NPLCC, state funds and other grants for specific projects</p>
<p>6. How could these initiatives be improved? Do you need more time, resources/funding, information, partners, etc?</p>	<p>On reintroduction, the Councili needs to show greater leadership, they really need to own the issue. Amy feels like this has not happened yet. As for the creation of biological objectives, there needs to be more deference to the state agencies since they are the technical staff; also the policy people, including the Council, need to better define what they really want to achieve in greater detail. The stated goals are not necessarily the correct ones, scientifically speaking, so work needs to be done there.</p>
<p>7. Are there any transboundary issues or concerns that you are aware of that are not being addressed at this time? If yes, would you be interested in working with other people on these issues?</p>	<p>Amy would like to see a transboundary techincal working group that meets regularly to discuss reintroduction issues - if fish are reintroduced above Grand Coulee, they will make their way to Canada and there will be implications of that and there ought to be closer coordination with Canadian counterparts on those issues. She would also like to see greater coordination on invasives - WA is currently having a problem with Northern Pike but she doesn't know if this is also an issue in BC - so this is another area that could use greater coordination, or at least information sharing, between technical counterparts on either side of the border.</p>