

# UCSRB Board Conference Call Minutes

Thursday, April 14 2005  
2:00 – 3:45 PM

**Board Members Present:** Paul Ward, Yakama Nation  
Ron Walter, Chelan County  
Mary Hunt, Douglas County  
Bill Towey, Colville Confederated Tribes  
Bud Hover, Okanogan County

**Others present:** Denny Rohr, UCSRB Facilitator; Dick Nason, UCSRB Staff Coordinator;  
Sandy Cox, Okanogan County;

## Action Items

1. **Bud** will re-draft the wording for the Mission Statement and get it out to the Board so that they can give it some thought prior to the next Board meeting on April 28, 2005
2. **Sandy** to distribute the Mission Statement re-draft to the Board as soon as it is received from **Bud**
3. Board members to review the re-draft of the Mission Statement
4. **Mary** to call and talk to **Mike Eng** prior to talking to **Rob Walton** so that she can get Mike's perspective
5. If possible **Mary** will request **Mike Eng's** list of questions that he sent to **Rob Walton** and **Lynn Hatcher**
6. **Mary** to call **Rob Walton** and ask the direct question "Are you or are you not going to participate in the policy forum"
7. **Denny** to arrange the Executive Session meeting for the Board for an all day retreat
8. **Mary** and **Bill** will create the agenda for the Executive Session
9. **Dick** will follow up with the HCC on the deadlines for the Habitat section
10. **Sandy** to distribute HCC deadlines to the Board asap

## MEETING AGENDA

Mary called the meeting to order at 2:12PM

### AGENDA: BOARD DISCUSSION

#### A. Review/discuss Okanogan Counties 3 questions

1. Extend current public review process from April 29th to May 4, 2005
  - **Bud** updated everyone that stakeholders in Okanogan County have requested that a few days be added since the plan came out later.
  - There were no objections to this extension
2. Additional discussion of Definition of Recovery
  - **Bud** presented background on this request and explained that he had been working on gathering an historical account in order to document the changes made to the Mission Statement

- **Bud** also mentioned that NMFS, **Lynn Hatcher** has said that they have already figured in harvestable numbers in their calculations
- **Bud** stated that he would like to see the definition of Recovery be stated without the word harvestable and then add a separate paragraph that states the Board's goal of harvestable for tribal and recreational fisheries
- **Mary** suggested that **Bud** put together a draft of the wording that he would like to see the Board adopt and email it out to the Board so that they can give it some thought prior to the next Board meeting on April 28, 2005☑
- **Ron** proposed that since this statement is being revisited that the separate paragraph regarding the goal of harvestable should elevate all fisheries
- **Paul** stated that he was hesitant to list tribal and nontribal fisheries since he could only support a statement that was in accordance with the case law and the preference of tribal fisheries
- **Paul** also stated that if the verbiage didn't draw attention to tribal or non tribal it probably wouldn't raise any flags
- **Bud** will send his proposed wording to **Sandy** and she will distribute to the Board for review☑

### 3. Discussion of the timeframe for review of the Recovery Plan).

#### B. Discussion/Update of Policy Forum

- **Denny** briefed the Board on his discussion with **Mike Eng**
- **Mike Eng** told **Denny** that everything was positive in regards to working with the UCSRB
- After the UCSRB Board that **Mike Eng** attended he sent 7 or 8 questions to NMFS requesting clarity on their intent and position on proceeding with the Policy Forum – they were directed to **Rob Walton** and **Lynn Hatcher** – to date there has been no response
  - **Mike** told **Denny** that he was in a holding pattern until NMFS answered those questions.
- **Dick** reported that he and **Denny's** 15 minute meeting with **Rob Walton** lasted an hour and a half last Thursday.
- **Following is a list of questions that Dick had created for Rob**
  - An update from NMFS on their interest in the Policy Forum
  - Comments for Draft
  - Request that NMFS supply language for the current Draft that would change it from a regional plan to a federal plan that we could include in our 3<sup>rd</sup> draft prior to the May release.
- **Dick** suggested to **Rob** that the final draft could come out the end of June for a July review, the facilitator could be brought on Board in June, the facilitator could be used through the July draft review in preparation for the August GSRO review
  - At this point in the conversation **Rob Walton** got **Lynn Hatcher** and **Elizabeth Gaar** on the phone
  - The NMFS staff was reluctant to commit to the above suggestions
  - **Lynn** suggested that the UC?

- **Rob** committed to **Dick** and **Denny** that he would get back to them either that afternoon or the next day after conferring more with his staff - to date neither **Dick** nor **Denny** have heard from him
- **Bud** asked if the Board was just spending money and throwing it out the window.
- In answer to **Bud's** question **Dick** answered that he felt all that we are doing now is moving the UCSRB far beyond where we could have been regardless of what NMFS is doing
- **Bud** stated that he doesn't want to continue to chase a moving target. He wants to improve for all fisheries. Is NMFS going to make everyone else step up to the plate? **Bud** also stated that he wants to know where the bar is.
- **Dick** also felt that the work being done here, since it is moving the UCSRB plan forward puts us ahead of many regions around us
- **Ron** stated that the UCSRB seemed to be in a difficult position – we have committed to the policy forum and have requested NMFS to be at the table
- **Bill** stated that the UCSRB has already agreed to the policy forum concept and sent a letter confirming that commitment
- **Bill** mentioned that he has heard both **Rob** and **Lynn** describe the policy forum, the facilitator role and the value of the process - they both have agreed that the Policy Forum should not be put off until June and have in fact suggested that a small subset of folks proceed
- **Bill** voiced his disappointment regarding **Dick** and **Denny's** meeting with **Rob Walton** – he had been hopeful that **Rob** would have given them a yes or no answer
- **Bill** suggested that **Mary** or he call up **Rob** directly, asking him for his commitment and request it in writing
- **Paul** mentioned that he was hopeful that the facilitator would further the discussions on (OOSE) out of subbasin effects
- **Paul** mentioned that after a discussion with **Elizabeth** his feeling was that NMFS was/is keeping the UCSRB at arms length so that it is our plan and not theirs – they want a facilitated process but not a combined effort.
- **Denny** suggested that the Board contact **Rob** and request that he attend the next Board meeting and discuss these issues face to face
- **Mary** asked how a face to face meeting would provide any additional proof that the Board is committed to this process
- **Mary** suggested that the Board use April 21 and schedule a conference call with **Rob Walton**
- **Bud** voiced his frustration with the lack of movement from NMFS
- **Bill** suggested that a simple call be made by **Mary** to **Rob** and ask the direct question “Are you or are you not going to participate in the policy forum”
- **Denny** stated that **Mike Eng** is doing his best to gain clarification from NMFS so that he can evaluate how best to proceed
- **Bud** felt that it would be most effective if **Mary** alone made the call to **Rob**. **Ron** agreed with that opinion
- **Paul** mentioned that he would like to see **Mike Eng's** questions to NMFS

- **Denny** suggested that **Mary** call and talk to **Mike Eng** prior to talking to **Rob** so that she can get Mike's perspective ✓
- **Mike Eng's** contact info: 520.670.5299 office 520.940.2320 cell
- **Rob Walton's** contact info: 503.231.2285 office 503.803.4594 cell

**C. Discussion of contractors Tracy Hillman and Chuck Peven meeting with the Board on April 28th at regular board meeting.**

- **Bill** voiced some concerns and asked why the Board was requesting that **Tracy** and **Chuck** attend?
- **Bill** didn't think that the Board should get in the habit of bringing our contractors in separately from Staff – He has full confidence in the Staff and doesn't want to set a precedence – This method may disturb some Staff members
- **Bill** suggested that the Staff bring any issues or information to the Board and the Board request needed information from the Staff when it is required
- It was **Mary's** recollection that the Board wanted to reiterate to **Tracy** and **Chuck** that ?
- **Dick** mentioned that **Tracy** and **Chuck Peven** were at times being put in the middle since there had been some lobbying going on and different Staff were asking that an item or slant to an item be added to the draft
- **Dick** has directed **Tracy** and **Chuck** to listen to Staff but to not act on anything unless it goes through the HCC first
- Board agreed that there was no need to bring **Tracy** or **Chuck** in for the April 28, 2005 Board Meeting

**D. Some money (approximately \$50,000) is remaining in the current budget.**

- **Dick** reviewed some of the more recent budget changes
  - Douglas and Okanogan Counties returned funds totally over \$30K
  - The Jones & Stokes contract was cancelled leaving about \$48K available
  - Earlier there was an increase added to the BioAnalysts contract for \$27K
- The current budget recommendations/request from Staff are as follows:
  - \$ 5000 – Increase Okanogan's budget to cover work to be done on Threats assessment by Highlands & Associates (finishes J&S work)
  - \$ 5000 – Increase Colville Tribes' budget to cover economic work being completed at Eastern (EWU) [this item fell through the cracks and should have been requested earlier]
  - \$ 8760 - **Dick's** contract to be increased to cover his salary through June 2005
  - \$ 3800 – Increase **Laura Berg's** contract to cover expenses so that she can attend the (2) 2-day HCC workshops in May for comment response work
  - \$ 25,500 – to be added to BioAnalysts Contract to cover them through May 2005
    - **Keith** talked to BioAnalysts about their funding and found out that they were getting short on cash and reported this to **Dick**

- **Dick** has checked in with **Tracy** to find out what additional funds he needs to cover him through May
- **\$ 48,060** is the total for the above (5) budget requests
- \$ 4961 - 5000 (approximately) remains
- **Dick** reported that Staff had received an \$ 8000 proposal from KWA to complete GIS work for the plan
  - This proposal was discussed at the 4/14/05 HCC meeting – it was decided by the HCC members that extensive GIS/map products were not needed for the recovery plan or appendices
  - It was also discussed and decided at the 4/14/05 HCC meeting by the members that **Chuck Jones** could and will provide whatever minor GIS/map products were deemed necessary
- **Dick** requested approval on the first 4 items and contingent approval on the \$ 25,500 for BioAnalysts since he has talked to **Mike, Julie** and **Chuck** about BioAnalysts and still needs to talk to **Lee** and **Keith**. – He will circulate **Tracy's** spreadsheet prior to requesting official approval of this request
- **Paul** brought up workload, roles and responsibilities, who is attending what meetings and would like to have a discussion about these topics prior to approving these budget requests
- **Paul** reminded the Board that they have not yet had the executive session to discuss the above issues and it needs to take place
- **Ron** mentioned that his recollection of the executive session was that it was decided by the Board to meet the June deadline and then take a look at the re-distribution of responsibilities and the above mentioned issues
- **Bill** asked why at this point in time are there extra expenditures to cover?...are the burn rates higher than expected? – what is the cause driving these additional expenditures?
- **Bud** echoed **Bill's** questions regarding these new budget requests
- **Dick** answered **Bill's** questions with the following information:
  - \$ 5000 for Highlands & Associates covers work unfinished by Jones & Stokes
  - \$ 5000 for work being completed by EWU that the Staff felt was valuable to continue and complete
  - \$ 3800 for **Laura Berg** – Staff felt that this would be a huge efficiency benefit for dealing with the comments and making changes as they are reviewed during the (2) 2-day HCC workshops
  - \$ 8760 for **Dick** – covers his salary through June 2005 – he explained that his contract was a 21 month contract which began during subbasin planning – he had not planned to attend COR meetings etc thus the added costs
  - \$ 25,500 for BioAnalysts covers the extra time that they have spent dealing with the immense quantity of comments and attending more meetings than was originally envisioned by Staff
- **Mary** raised the issue that some of the comments coming into **Tracy** are changing the actual direction of the plan
- **Mary** suggested that any comments changing the direction of the plan be set aside, compiled and sent to **Dick**. From there if they cannot be resolved they should be elevated to the Board in written form

- **Ron** recalled that 18 or 19 months ago the Board and Staff was doing the best it could to take a shot in the dark to create the budget since it was all uncharted territory
- **Bud** stated that he would have preferred to have more time to consider the changes in budgeting and reallocating the funds
- **Dick** reminded the Board that last September both the Board and Staff knew that there was not going to be enough dollars to complete this project with the budget the way that it was and it was decided to review the budget later on in the process and address the changes that would need to be made at the appropriate times
- **Paul** reiterated his reminder/request that the Board hold their Executive session that will evaluate his above outlined issues regarding anyone being paid under the state contract – duties etc.
- **Bud** supported **Paul's** request and stated that it will be necessary to know these things in the implementation phase
- **Bill** stated that he would support the budget recommendations and agrees with **Paul's** request regarding the Executive session requested that a full day meeting be arranged for this discussion - (for Staff, contractors and Board members) Need to create efficiencies.

***Bud** made the motion to accept the budget recommendations that the Staff has suggested. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

- **Mary** asked **Denny** to arrange a meeting for a Board only all day retreat 
  - Budget
  - Roles & responsibilities
  - **Mary** and **Bill** will create the agenda

#### **ADDITIONAL TOPICS:**

- **Bill** has also requested that the agenda for tomorrow include a discussion of the 2005-07 budget submittal to the State and events re same.
  - It was agreed by the Board that this could be discussed at the Executive session.
- **Ron** brought up the Habitat portion of the plan and asked when that would be available from the HCC
  - **Dick** will follow up with the HCC on the deadlines
  - **Sandy** suggested that those deadlines might be available to distribute tomorrow
- **Ron** mentioned that he was hopeful that the budget for the 05-07 could be discussed at the executive session (roles and responsibilities)
- **Ron** also would like to talk about tying recovery in the Entiat, Wenatchee and Methow with the recovery in the Okanogan.
  - Are we going to have to meet 100% of NMFS's number in this ESU – will it be possible to do that with the Okanogan?
  - **Paul** felt that this was going to be part of the ongoing dialog with NMFS
  - **Ron** asked if it going to be an all or nothing deal. Some discussion ensued.

**Paul** notified everyone on the call that he had emailed out the current version of 5610

Meeting ended at 3:45 PM

### **Summary of Motions**

***Bud** made the motion to accept the budget recommendations that the Staff has suggested. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

DRAFT