

# UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 22, 2004

10:00 am to 3:00 pm

@ City of East Wenatchee Council Chambers

271 Ninth Street NE

East Wenatchee, WA 98802

(509) 884-9515

**Board Members Present:** Paul Ward, Yakama Nation  
Ron Walter, Chelan County  
Julie Dagnon on behalf of Craig Vejraska, Okanogan County  
Mary Hunt, Douglas County  
Bill Towey on behalf of Joe Peone, Colville Confederated Tribes

**Others present:** Denny Rohr, UCSRB Facilitator; Chuck Jones, Douglas County; Dick Nason, UCSRB Staff Coordinator; Julie Dagnon, Okanogan County; Heather Bartlett, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Bob Bugert, GSRO; Keith Wolf, KWA/Colville Confederated Tribes; Bob Rose, Yakama Nation; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County (joined meeting mid-morning)

## Action Items:

1. Each person listed with outstanding action items from prior Board Meetings to review them and get status to **Sandy** prior to the next Board meeting
2. **Sandy** to update the bylaws; any reference to the RRA or **Teresa Ryan** to be removed and the board meeting dates and times should be updated
3. **Sandy** to send **Denny** draft of modified bylaws for review, once reviewed draft will be emailed to the Board and Staff for their review
4. Updated / modified Bylaws draft to be put on August's Board meeting agenda for a vote of acceptance
5. **Dick** to consider putting the BEF discussion on the next Staff meeting agenda
6. **Denny** to schedule **Angus Duncan** to speak to the Board at the ?? Board meeting
7. Through emails and phone conversations **Bob Rose** will take the lead and try to define some next Steps on the topic of the UCSRB's involvement with BEF
8. **Denny** to put **Jeff Breckel**, LCSRB Exec\_Director, on a future visit to a Board Meeting to speak on the Inclusion of Socio/Economic/Policy planning into the Recovery Plan
9. Staff to make budget and workplan available to the Board by ??
10. **Julie** to share her public outreach plan with the other (2) counties to be used as a model/example
11. Board to convene on a conference call Tuesday, July 27, 2004 at 4:00 pm
12. **Sandy** to send out email requesting everyone's phone number where they can be reached
13. **Julie** to conference everyone in for 7/27/04 conference call
14. **Julie, Chuck** and **Mike** will meet on a conference call tomorrow (7/23/04) at 1:30pm to discuss the Jones & Stokes contract and ways to reduce the cost.
15. Counties and tribes to submit their response loop budgets to **Sandy** and **Dick** by 7/26/04

16. **Sandy** to compile response loop budgets and send to **Sharon Ossman** by 7/26/04.
17. **Sandy** to change start time with City of East Wenatchee for use of their council chambers on July 29, 2004 for the Quarterly Review
18. **Dick** to send the Quarterly review agenda to **Sandy**
19. **Sandy** to send out the Quarterly review agenda to **Britt**
20. **Keith** volunteered **Sammi** to attend the Quarterly review meeting in East Wenatchee on 7/29/04 and the Lead Entity meetings immediately following the review
21. **Dick** to attend the Council of Regions meeting, listen to what others have to say and collect highlights of the meeting He will send those observation out to the Board and Staff
22. BOD meeting to begin at 9:00am on August 26, 2004
23. **Sandy** to contact City of East Wenatchee to change start time from 10am to 9am with City of East Wenatchee for the August Board meeting
24. Staff/Board to provide GSRO with their requested cost estimate of near term projects
25. Counties to invite their respective legislators to the next Board meeting for the time between 10:00am and – 12:00 Noon to discuss Lead Entity integration
26. **Julie** to contact Mortenson's assistant to coordinate the 3 parties schedules for attending the next Board meeting
27. **Bob Bugert** will look into writing a letter to NOAA for the purpose of ??
28. **Bob Bugert** to get back to NOAA and begin to work on a Board representative introducing NOAA at these public meetings supporting the concept of public input
29. **Dick** to contact **Jay Kehne** with decision to not move forward with website, so that **Jay** can contact **Jennifer** at Earth and Sky Studios

**Regular Meeting Call to Order:** Paul called the meeting to order at 10:13am.

#### **I. Welcome and Introductions (Paul Ward, Chair, and Denny Rohr, Facilitator)**

- **Julie** mentioned that **Craig** would not attend today's meeting because of a previous meeting commitment and that he had given **Julie** his vote for today's meeting.
- **Denny** announced and congratulated **Bob Bugert** on his pending new position as the chair of the PUDs' HCP Tributary Committee. In this position **Bob** will be implementing the off-site habitat efforts as mitigation for Chelan and Douglas PUD hydro projects. He will be leaving the GSRO at some future date yet to be decided. **Bob** felt that this new position would complement the SRFB and the UCSRB processes.
- **Bill Towey** introduced himself as the new policy manager for the Colville Confederated Tribes and attended the meeting sitting in for Joe Peone

#### **II. Meeting Agenda Review (Ward)**

- **Bob Bugert** requested the addition of a **Lynn Hatcher** report to be added to the agenda

#### **III. Review/Approval Meeting Minutes (Ward)**

- A. June 17, 2004 Board Meeting

*Ron moved to approve the June 17, 2004 meeting minutes. Julie (on Craig's behalf) seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

#### **IV. Review of Outstanding Action Items (Rohr)**

- **Denny** discussed new individualized format

- It was decided that each person listed with outstanding action items would review them and get status to **Sandy** prior to the next Board meeting
- Some discussion on specific outstanding action items ensued:
  - **Denny** brought up the bylaw action item on his list – Requested that any reference to the RRA or **Teresa Ryan** (Salmon Recovery Coordinator) be removed and the board meeting dates and times should be updated
    - **Sandy** to update the bylaws, send **Denny** a draft and then send out draft to the Board and Staff with track changes visible – this is to be voted on at the August board meeting
  - **Bob Rose** brought up the topic of the Bonneville Environmental Foundation – as discussed in meetings past **Bob Rose** still feels that this is a good opportunity and wants to bring it to the forefront of the boards attention
    - **Keith** said that the Colvilles have been in conversations with BEF and are interested in this discussion as well
    - **Bob Rose** again relayed the last meeting that he **Denny** and **Bob Bugert** had with **Tim Reeves** and **Angus Duncan**
    - **Julie** asked what specifically would we want to have them fund
    - **Bob Rose** answered that there were many things that were discussed: longer term commitment (10 years) less interested in Upper Columbia region at this time but were interested in the Wenatchee or one subbasin on a year's basis as a trial run that could lead into a yearly extension and broader land area coverage – no decisions were made at the last meeting
    - **Bob Rose** mentioned that it was his sense after the meeting that about \$25,000 – \$40,000 of a contribution range might be available– although this is a fairly small amount it may act as a money magnet from other environmental organizations – and they have some very impressive technical resources (consortium)
    - **Bob Bugert** reiterated that BEF has a very strong technical/scientific group, and that it would help to have peer review of some of our technical documents.
    - **Keith** mentioned that **Bill Towey** is on the Board of BEF and could probably offer some insight
    - **Ron** asked how BEF might integrate into the current groups involved already – how would they help with public outreach - what is their sensitivity level on the policy side as to private property etc
    - **Bob Rose** thought that the first two of Ron's questions could be answered by saying that the possibilities are wide open
    - **Bill Towey** felt that **Bob Rose** accurately defined BEF and suggests that action should be taken soon, now may be a good time to send a letter of inquiry to BEF, **Bill** recommends that we keep the ball rolling and send a letter to **Todd Reeves**, funding opportunities are ripe right now
    - **Bob Bugert** reminded everyone that **Angus Duncan** volunteered to come up and speak to the Board
    - **Denny** suggested that we check in and make sure that this Board is invested in the process before we bring **Angus** up here to speak
    - **Ron** suggested that the Board figure out if the timing is right to proceed
    - **Bob Rose** suggested that the Board have more than just a discussion with **Angus** if it is decided to bring him up – **Bob Rose** also suggested that we start with the Entiat because it is at a stage that is close to ready for implementation and suggested that the Board do something this summer

- **Ron** also felt that the Entiat group was very well put together and a good candidate
- **Bob Rose** volunteered to take the time to prepare the Entiat group and to put together a few different scenarios
- **Ron** suggested that he get with **Mike** and go to the Entiat group and speak to them about it – falls into the pattern of how we proceed with watershed groups
- **Ron** said that this might be the role that this board begins to take, bringing these types of resources to groups like the watersheds
- **Mary** asked if this was something that we will want to make available to a large group of folks
- **Bob Rose** – yes it is
- **Ron** said yes, but perhaps we would want to bring the larger group in after the Entiat group
- **Keith** concurred that the Entiat was the place to start, but would like to keep the conversation board enough so that they can continue to work on the topic of work in Canada
- **Bob Rose** suggested that the Board put this on the next Staff agenda and discuss what a logical sequence might look like, learn the vocabulary
- **Bill** suggested that the Board keep it open because the program is so wide open, don't need to necessarily look at what has been done in the past, wouldn't narrowly focus on one watershed or subbasin, go for something bigger
- **Dick** asked if it is strictly fishing, or can it be related to wildlife
- **Bill** again said that it's wide open, wetlands issues, wildlife components, find commonalities that the BEF board is comfortable with
- **Bob Bugert** said that right now BEF supports two watersheds, the Kootenay (in Montana) and the Chinook (in southwest Washington).
- **Bob Rose** will take the lead and try to define some next Steps (emails etc)
- **Dick** will keep it in mind for Staff meeting
- **Denny** asked if Staff and Board all felt comfortable with BEF? Is it a yes to become involved? Want to be deliberate and careful of how we proceed

#### V. Budget Review (See BOARD DISCUSSION below) (Ward)

#### BOARD ACTION (to be reviewed)

#### BOARD DISCUSSION

#### VI. (Postponed to future date) (Rohr)

- **Jeff Breckel**, LCSRB Exec\_Director Inclusion of Socio/Economic/Policy planning into the Recovery Plan
- **Paul** mentioned that the Board would probably reschedule this meeting in the next couple of months
- **Keith** alerted the Board that Staff will probably be meeting with some of the Lower Columbia Staff

#### VII. UCSRB Budget Review (Staff)

- **Dick** reviewed the history of the contract that RCD signed with IAC in September of 2003

- There are two attachments, one is the quarterly reviews and what things that this Board doesn't have any control over, the second one is the list of deliverables which has been incorporated into the contract
- The due dates listed for the deliverables were revamped by the UCSRB in collaboration with **Bob Bugert** and the IAC.
- Staff hired contractors to do some base work – and did meet all of the deliverables from September to January 2004 which produced a 400 page technical document.
- During the quarterly review it was deemed that the 400 pages was too big and NOAA fisheries made recommendations that the best plan would be a small document created by a large group.
- **Dick** said that it was then that we as a Staff stopped the direction that we were headed and are in the process of regrouping and looking at things differently
- BioAnalysts has developed a TOC that most here attending the Board meeting have seen
- The Staff has asked BioAnalysts to take the lead on taking care of the items that we have no control over (the other 3 H's – hatchery, hydro, harvest)
- BioAnalysts' – 145K – SOW and budget
- Jones & Stokes – 111K – SOW and budget
- In addition to the 2 contractors above Staff feels that it needs additional work from Mobrand and we need to hire a tech writer
- **Dick explained that once we identified the above needs we realized that we were over allocated by 148,xxx**
- Since there were questions about what people have been spending and how much has been spent **Dick** spoke with **Carol Cowling** and she put together the spreadsheet (see Spread sheet hand out)
- SBP plans are to be the foundation for the recovery planning
- **Dick** has asked each of the Staff to take a look at the TOC and allocate how much money they are going to need to finish the recovery process
- “One Solution to Solve the Budget Problem” (see hand out) **Dick** mentioned that these are his thoughts and this has not been reviewed and is not endorsed by Staff)
  - Yakamas have put together a proposed expenditure list totally \$78k and are willing to turn back \$35k
  - Douglas County can turn back about \$10K depending upon the Jones & Stokes contract
  - RCD could return \$10K – \$15k depending on whether we go ahead with the website (**Dick** talked to **Jay** this morning)
    - **Jay** has estimated that the website will cost about \$7K-\$10k to develop with about \$14k to maintain the website
    - **Mike** said that he thought that we could live without the website
    - **Keith** thought that we should have the website
- BioAnalysts has reduced their budget by \$20k without reducing the scope of work
- **Dick** estimated that there is roughly a \$58k – \$68k deficit depending on whether we proceed with the website
- The counties have provided comments on the SOW from Jones & Stokes and the budget went from \$111k to 129k based on those comments– this may be reduced with a reduced SOW

- **Dick** has talked to Staff about the tech writer position and about the \$30k allocated to the tech writer – Staff felt that this should not be reduced to ensure a good shot at retaining some one good
- **Dick** mentioned that he has not had time to get numbers from Chelan and Okanogan counties
- **Julie** noted that her budget is done, she just needed to speak with Craig prior to submitting it (which she did just prior to the Board meeting)
- **Julie** requested comments from the Board on the budget information presented thus far
- **Keith** felt confident that Staff could whittle the deficit down and balance the books
- **Dick** stated that if the Staff is in agreement to this method then we can move ahead with out further discussion or a special Board meeting
- At last week's RC&D meeting the Board there approved the contracts with the caveat that the UCSRB Board gave it's approval
- **Dick** did reiterate that contracts will have to be amended
- **Keith** stated that Staff does understand that this is what we have to do to balance the books
- **Ron** said that he was very uncomfortable with the budget being over allocated – He would like to fix it now and not wait until later – **Ron** pointed out that **Chuck's** fix was a 12% cut, the Yakamas was a 30% cut,- but he didn't see anything from Colvilles, Okanogan County or Chelan county – **Ron** suggested that if we were to use a 12% turn back from each it would cover most of the deficit
- **Dick** talked to **Joe** this morning – **Joe** felt that all the money he has he has allocated to the biology for the recovery plan
- **Ron** asked what percentage across the partners could we reduce - Doesn't want to short change public participation at the sake of the biology
- **Paul** stated that he believes we need to ensure that our budgets meet what is needed to get to the GSRO what they want
- **Keith** stated that Staff chose to attack this differently than the way it was done in subbasin planning – the change and the mix
- **Bob Bugert** emphasized that the GSRO embraces what **Dick** previously mentioned and that was the opinion/perspective that came from NOAA fisheries.....many submitters, small document – need to build in buy-in from municipalities, watersheds etc.
- **Dick** one of the most important things that we heard that came out of the SBP process was that we needed to have public outreach and public review
- **Dick** lined out a few upcoming due dates:
  - September 1, 2004 is a 30% deliverable due date for BioAnalysts
  - December 1, 2004 is a 90% deliverable due date for the biology and socio-economic portions
  - December 31, 2004 there should be a draft available to refine, make more precise
  - Then there would be 6 months to finalize prior to the June 2005 deadline
- **Bob Bugert** reminded everyone that we will not have any money after June 30, 2005 for recovery plan development.
- **Dick** requested that the budgets be put together keeping in mind the above listed schedule and ask yourselves what will it take to do our job to get it done

- **Julie** passed along Okanogan county's (**Craig**) perspective / thinking which is that an across the board cut would be the way to go including current contracts as well – we are all working for the same end and that all should contribute to the shortfall and make it equitable
- **Bob Bugert** asked if the Staff could renegotiate with BioAnalysts to reduce their budget regarding the 3H's
- **Dick** answered that BioAnalysts already has reduced it by \$20k
- **Julie** felt that the Jones & Stokes SOW could be reduced, Douglas and Okanogan are similarly agreed but have not found common ground with Chelan county yet
- **Julie** said that the counties are trying to agree on common items and agree that each county pay for the items that they do not agree on
- **Keith** mentioned that Staff doesn't want to repeat the SBP "rush at the end" – we are trying to clean up the loose ends now
- **Mary** asked about the lack of budget turn back from the Colvilles
- **Mary** also asked how Staff over allocated by 148K
- **Julie** explained that the Yakamas reworked their budget and the Jones & Stokes and BioAnalysts budgets both came in higher than what was anticipated
- **Dick** said that one of the things that we had tried to do was to go through the deliverables and decide who was going to do what but, unfortunately that didn't happen and in hindsight we may have spent too much initially
- **Keith** felt that the 10% out of balance has been reduced to an out of balance amount of about 5%
- **Dick** felt that since this is the first time this has been done 5% overage is not so bad
- **Ron** asked again how did we go over on the budgeted line items
- **Ron** also asked when Staff was going to bring us a new list of deliverables and contractors within our budget constraints
- **Dick** stated that the contract(s) would probably need to be amended to reflect the TOC
- **Dick** has talked to **Bob Bugert** and **Bob** feels that at the next review on July 29, 2004 we need to explain to everyone the changes in direction we have made in relation to the TOC
- **Ron** clearly remembers that the BOD directed the Staff to bring to them the budget, and the work plan prior to the first quarter with the entire plan to have a budget and work plan submitted earlier this year
- **Ron** stated adamantly that until he sees the above information – he will not approve any future contracts
- **Mary** suggested that maybe we would be better off if we did as much as we can well, and consider not completing the entire plan
- **Bob Bugert** stated the bottom line and that is that the GSRO is looking for a habitat plan that is supported by the community – and they are looking for the habitat portion – **Bob** suggests going minimalistic on the other 3 h's, if it compromises the development and public support of the habitat component of the plan.
- **Bob Bugert** thought that the habitat group is a good idea and that we should use the watershed processes, and funding
- **Keith** acknowledged that the stakes are high for making this plan as complete as possible, biggest shot at making this an ESU ?– Habitat is the most important thing for the tribe and state with hatchery a second – we know that when we look at

recovery we don't get there with habitat alone – even though the other 3 h's are out of our control – they are not out of our influence

- **Bob Bugert** asked about PBI - Can their contract be modified to reduce the amount.
- Need to ask PBI where they are status wise – monitoring may be expendible
- **Julie** mentioned that the Jones & Stokes is the only contract that provides economic & policy analysis etc
- **Keith** thought that Jones & Stokes may be able to look at who they use and the people hours it takes and modify their budget
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that the 5 parties divide the deficit up equitable and call it good
- **Ron** stated that there has to be a new way of doing public outreach – the old model just does not work – wants to make a point of the difference between public development and public review/comment – there isn't any buy-in with the old model
- **Keith's** diagram from last Staff meeting (discussed)
- **Ron** described the limiting factor for Chelan as the number of people that they have to complete this process or any other
- **Bob Rose** reported that the Wenatchee planning unit will have salmon recovery on every agenda from now on
- **Bob Rose** was interested in hearing what Chelan can do beyond the 2514 process – the Yakamas are looking to the counties for more direction on how they can be assisted
- **Keith** suggested that **Julie** share her public outreach plan with the other counties since it was a good example to model
- **Ron** stated that he doesn't want to see happen what happened in SBP – final draft received on May 24<sup>th</sup> and was due to NPCC on May 28<sup>th</sup> - there just wasn't enough time to review and provide public development and contracts were late in getting signed
- **Chuck** mentioned that there will be products coming out of the HCC that will not have to wait to be reviewed
- **Bob Bugert** said that the watersheds are doing a good job of public involvement – in June of 2005 the plan doesn't have to be complete – can refer to implementing a specific watershed plan etc
- **Mary** mentioned that one of the questions that was asked at her last ? meeting was "How do we get out of watershed planning" (Kettle, Kittitas and Okanogan)
- **Dick** strongly stated that in order to have 6 months available to work on the draft plan (in the refinement stage) we need to move forward on this budget issue asap
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that the Board will need to tell their staff that they will resolve this immediately and move forward
- **Dick** suggested that Okanogan & Chelan counties and the Colvilles identify what they need to complete the TOC – the numbers can then be compared, once that is done the remaining deficit can be identified (if there is one) and the board can then decide

Executive session took place from – 2:00pm to 3:10pm

- A Board conference call has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 27, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. to discuss the finalization of the correction of the deficit
- **Julie** to conference everyone in for the call on 7/27/04

- **Sandy** to send out email requesting everyone's phone number where they can be reached
- **Ron** will be at: 509.667.6218

**Julie, Chuck and Mike** will meet on a conference call tomorrow (7/23/04) at 1:30pm to discuss the Jones & Stokes contract and ways to reduce the cost.

### VIII. Subbasin Planning Review and Update (Staff)

- No discussion

#### A. Review of Karier Meeting, Spokane, July 12<sup>th</sup>

- No discussion

#### B. Response Loop discussion

- **Dick** mentioned that **Tony Grover** said that we need to get our requests in by July 26, 2004 (hours rates etc)
- **Sandy** to gather info from everyone, compile and send to **Sharon Ossman** via email
- **Dick** referenced two styles of reporting/request method that was sent out in an email last night
- Doesn't matter what style is used for the submittal in
- Deadline for info to **Sandy** July 26, 2004 – early in the day
- Reminder: Subbasin plans, NPCC comment period: August 12 – October 31, 2004
- Council meeting is in Portland in December
- Council meeting is in ? in November also

#### C. Review of Planning, Schedules and Budgets

- No discussion

### IX. Recovery Planning Review and Update (Staff)

#### A. Schedules and Planning

- No discussion

#### B. Quarterly Review (Bugert)

- **Bob Bugert** reminded everyone of the upcoming July 29<sup>th</sup> review (provided a draft agenda)
- **Sandy** to change start time with City of East Wenatchee for use of their council chambers on July 29
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned Implementation and that the Lead Entities are coming up for a contract renewal – WDFW would like to meet with them and talk about implementation and integration – good time to brainstorm
- **Julie** voiced her concern about WDFW's contracting process
- **Marnie, Jim Fox, Christy Lyman, Brian Walsh**, will be meeting on July 29<sup>th</sup> right after the quarterly review
- WDFW is looking for efficiencies
- They are having discussions with the Snake, Yakima, and Puget Sound
- They feel that some Lead Entities are doing better than others
- **Keith** committed **Sammi** to go to this meeting and perhaps **Bill Towey** can attend as well
- **Bob Bugert** said that they are looking at maybe short term contracts to get you through the 5<sup>th</sup> round, watching the legislation that is going to be presented regarding the combining of agencies

- **Julie** mentioned that right now we have no contract and no scope
- **Sandy** to send out the Quarterly review agenda to **Britt**
- **Dick** to send the agenda to **Sandy**

### C. Implementation Planning, Schedules, and Budgets

- No discussion

### X. Staff Report (Nason)

- **Dick** wants to discuss Implementation of Salmon Recovery plans
- Council of Regions Meeting – August 3rd - 10-3 @ Issaquah Hatchery– want an integration paper done by the end of August
- **Bob Bugert** reported that there are several versions out for legislation regarding integration of lead entities, watershed planning units, RFEs, and perhaps other processes related to salmon recovery. There may be draft language available for the Council of Regions meeting.
- **Bob Bugert** said this is similar to what GSRO asks that we do in Attachment B of the SRFB contract– (**Bob** read and referred to the contract), yet is directed more at legislature. The Snake and Lower Columbia have provided some initial recommendations – those regions are asking their boards to lead the implementation.
- **Dick** felt that he is going to be asked about what structure we prefer, recovery board would stay in place to accomplish what? Not so much a dollar discussion as a structure preference discussion
- **Ron** is encouraged that there is talk out there to merge all of these groups and combine efforts – there is a definite coordination value
- **Keith** asked how all that would play out for the local groups that feel that they have a Grassroots group and local control
- **Ron** felt that this would allow this board to coordinate efforts and resources
- **Julie** felt that current Staffs given the current work loads could not accomplish this now
- **Ron** felt that it would require broader board representation
- **Keith** thought that if merged, there might be a single funding support funding a single group and it may put this board in a position to hand out monies etc
- **Julie** wondered if we will lose some of the local control – RFG though it is not operating how we would want it to it is a non governmental body
- **Dick** will attend the Council of Regions meeting, listen to what others have to say and collect highlights of the meeting He will send those observation out to the Board and Staff
- **Mary** asked if it was necessary to meet with ?, ? and to see what direction they are going in
- **Mary** also asked if it was necessary to schedule a meeting with our legislators
- **Dick** and **Mary** both suggested that we slate this for the August 26th BOD meeting
- BOD meeting to begin at 9:00am on August 26, 2004
- **Bob Bugert** referenced bill for the Snake River Region.
- Counties to invite their respective legislators to the next Board meeting for the time between 10:00am and – 12:00 Noon
- **Julie** to contact Mortenson's assistant to coordinate the 3 parties schedules

### XI. RTT Report (Bugert)

- **Bob Bugert** reported that the RTT is just coming back from a hiatus – nothing current to report

### **XIII. Lynn Hatcher Report (Bugert)**

- Because of staffing changes **Lynn** is getting over burdened with tasks and responsibilities, and
- He noted that NOAA-F is releasing its draft status reviews and policies on artificial propagation and critical habitat. The agency is required to have one public meeting for the entire Pacific Northwest, yet they would like to have several, and preferably within each salmon recovery region. They would like to partner with the board in these meetings. They will likely have one in the day and one in the evening.
- **Dick** mentioned that Crtfc is looking at their policies
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that NOAA would like a Board representative to introduce them at these public meetings.
- **Julie** stated that she doesn't think it appropriate for the Board to say that we support the hatchery but we could say that we support the concept of public input
- **Bob Bugert** asked the Board if he could get back to NOAA, so they can begin to work on this.

### **XII. General Report/Discussion (Rohr)**

- Handed out UCSRB letter Ruckelshaus supporting the Tri-County process letter from July 15, 2004

### **XIII. Other (Ward)**

- None

### **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

#### **XIV. Public Comment (Ward)**

- None

#### **XV. Next Regular Board Meeting (Ward)**

- A. August 26, 2004 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM East Wenatchee Council Chambers

**Paul** adjourned the regular meeting at 3:45pm

### **Summary of Motions**

**Ron** moved to approve the June 17, 2004 meeting minutes. **Julie (on Craig's behalf)** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.