Title: Fish Habitat Partnership Membership on the National Fish Habitat Board

Desired outcome: Board action on establishing a representative of Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHPs) as a Board member.

Background: The Board has had several discussions about expanding its membership to include corporate/business representatives. The concept of providing FHPs with formal representation on the Board arose after the July 2012 Board Meeting discussions, as they represent diverse groups of public and private partners that are focused on conserving important fish habitat, and as primary work units, FHPs play an essential role in implementing the National Fish Habitat Action Plan.

Board Charter amendment options: If the Board votes to approve having a representative of Fish Habitat Partnerships as a member of the National Fish Habitat Board, there are several amendments to consider with regards to the Board's Charter.

Amendment Proposal 1

Amend Section III B 5 to read as follows: The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation**,** ~~and~~ the American Fisheries Society**, and the Fish Habitat Partnerships** each shall nominate a representative for approval by the ELT.

Board adoption of amendment proposal 1 would then require a second amendment consisting of one of the following two options (2a or 2b)

Amendment Proposal 2a

Amend Section III B 1 to read as follows: Members--The Board shall consist of up to ~~22~~ **23** members.

OR

Amendment Proposal 2b

Amend Section III B 3 to read as follows: Federal Government Representatives--The Board shall include up to ~~five~~ **four** representatives. (Note: There are currently three federal government representatives on the Board.)

Partnership Committee Feedback

The concept of having a representative of FHPs as a Board member and possibly establishing a FHP Network that could undertake the nomination process (as well as possibly provide a forum for facilitating stronger cooperation and collaboration among FHPs; serve as a conduit for providing strategic guidance towards achieving common FHP objectives; and, address issues of mutual FHP concern) was put forward to the Partnership Committee for initial feedback, which resulted in the following comments from its members:

- I like the idea of having a FHP Board member. But would they be voting or non-voting Board member?

- The idea of a FHP Network seems redundant to having a Partnerships Committee which ostensibly is around to accomplish implementing the Action Plan and some "administrative" tasks at the request of the Board. If you expand the committee to include all partnerships and parse the work into sub-committees, it would be less confusing to the outside world than having a FHP Network and a Partnership Committee. The Partnership Committee seems to be already slated to address the issues of FHP coordination, common FHP objectives and other issues of concern as they come up.

- Since there is a mix of individual FHP leadership amongst state, federal and private persons, and some of those have restrictions on how they can sit on a policy-making Board, it may limit the pool of applicants so to speak, for the FHP Board representative.

- The FHP Network and having a board member from FHPs seems like a good approach. I agree that we probably do not need a Partnership Committee and an FHP Network. In addition to the limited pool of applicants, another challenge is it could be difficult for one person to represent all FHPs due to the differences in their size and scope. However, I think having someone participate on the Board who is engaged with day-to-day operations of an FHP would be valuable.

- One item that I would like to hear others thoughts on is adding another seat to an already large Board. There has been discussion in the past about adding industry members to the Board, and I would not want the FHP seat to displace a possible industry representative. FHPs have opportunities to communicate with Board members, and most FHPs have at least one Board member who has a relationship with the FHP. I think it would be valuable for an FHP representative to be included in the Board deliberations from a seat at the Board table, as opposed to commenting from the audience. That is more important to me than having a

voting Board member. A designated FHP representative or non-voting member (in lieu of a voting member) could help bring the FHP perspective to the Board without adding another member or displacing a potential industry seat.

- ACFHP leadership agree with having an FHP seat on the Board, and suggest that the Board consider having an eastern seat and a western seat to help address the unique perspectives/challenges of each FHP. ACFHP considers anything to facilitate interaction between FHPs and the Board a good thing, including having more FHP representatives at meetings and participating in the discussions, even if they are not voting members.

- ACFHP has some concern with the time, resources, and travel that would be expected of the FHP network and recommends linking it to existing infrastructure such as the existing bimonthly calls with all of the FHPs or having it supplant existing groups (such as the Partnership Committee, as you suggested in an earlier email).

- ACFHP also agrees with the suggestion that a designated FHP representative or non-voting member (in lieu of a voting member) could help bring the FHP perspective to the Board without adding another member or displacing a potential industry seat (and think it could also apply for two FHP seats, eastern and western).

- It's unclear what outcome or deliverable the Board seeks to achieve by providing one FHP seat on the Board;

- For one FHP coordinator/representative to truly represent the interests of all FHPs, a great deal of coordination and communication will need to occur. Given the lack of resources that currently exist to fund either FHP coordinators or FHP programs/projects, it doesn't seem feasible to add this type of workload to one FHP representative.

- If the goal is to engage the FHPs more directly into the operations of NFHP, a more effective approach might be quarterly conference calls with 4 FHPs and the Board to more directly interface with the Board to share information, and discuss challenges, opportunities, and perspectives.