

UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 23, 2004

1:00 am – 5:00 pm

Wenatchee Red Lion Hotel
Cascade Room
1225 N Wenatchee Ave
Wenatchee, WA
(509) 663.0711

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; Bob Bugert, GSRO; Keith Wolf, KWA/Colville Confederated Tribes; KWA; Bob Rose, Yakama Nation; Britt Dudek, Foster Creek Conservation District; Kate Terrell, US Fish & Wildlife; Dennis Beich, WDFW; Mark Cookson, WDFW, Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW; Rick Klinge, Douglas County PUD; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County;

Action Items :

1. Regarding the budget, **Mary** will talk with **Wendell** and check into the whole payment issue
2. **Sandy** to send out the Straw man to every one (Staff and Board)
3. Implementation plan to be completed ideally by October 10th or by the required date of October 20, 2004
4. **Paul** to talk to **Steve Parker** regarding the Hatchery/Harvest Workshop
5. **Sandy** to send time and location of Harvest/Hatchery Workshop to **Chuck**
6. **Chuck** to create press release and send out to Board and Staff prior to his vacation departure
7. Entities to send out Hatchery/Harvest press release to their respective stakeholders
8. Staff to hold a one day workshop to address any comments received that are unresolved – perhaps December 9th, regularly scheduled HCC meeting day

Regular Meeting Call to Order: Paul called the meeting to order at 1:10pm.

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

II. Meeting Agenda Review (Ward)

- Add discussion of November and December Board meeting dates
 - Combine the November and December meetings
 - November 19, 2004 (9-2)
- Board agreed to the rest of the agenda as is

III. Review/Approval Meeting Minutes (Ward)

- A. July 22, 2004
- B. August 26, 2004

Ron moved to approve both the July 22, 2004 and the August 26, 2004 meeting minutes, Mary seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

IV. Review of Outstanding Action Items (Rohr)

- August 26, 2004
- Outstanding List
- **Bill** suggested that we table making a decision about a special meeting or not when meeting with **Elizabeth Gaar** until the end of today's meeting to assess what other needs there are
- **Bob Bugert** also suggested that the Implementation plan be given a time consideration for a special meeting
- Colville Hatchery presentation was discussed – want to check in about when this could be done – would be a great opportunity to combine it into the same timeframe with the hot spots workshop
- **Dennis Beich** suggested that the meeting with **Elizabeth** be a workshop rather than a question answer session
- **Chuck** suggested that the **Jeff Breckl** meeting would fit in nicely with the **Elizabeth Gaar's** meeting
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that **Jeff Breckl** is very busy at this time in preparation for the Governor's presentation

V. Budget Review / Update (Rohr)

- A copy of **Carol's** email dated 9/21/04 was handed out
- **Dick** mentioned the following:
 - **Peter Morrison** called **Dick** today and PBI has not been paid since June
 - **Dick** has not been paid since May
 - **Dick** talked to **Wendell Black** this morning
 - **Dick** has talked to **Jay Kehne** as well
- **Mary** mentioned that she has signing ability too and is close in proximity to **Carol**
- **Paul** asked if we should check in with our contractors to see what the status of each contract and payments are
- **Mary** will talk with **Wendell** and check into the whole payment issue
- **Denny** spoke with **Wendell** yesterday about this issue

BOARD ACTION

VI. Several BOARD DISCUSSION items below may result in a need for BOARD ACTION)
(Rohr)

BOARD DISCUSSION

VII. State Recovery Plan

(Rohr)

A. General Update (Nason)

- Sections 1,2 & 3 are all out and will be discussed prior to the October 20th meeting
- Entering into contracts with Mobrands and Tech Writer
- Had a conference call with Tech Writer
- Feel that we are on track with all of the above
- Jones & Stokes work is progressing

B. Status of Contracts with Contractors (Nason)

C. Habitat Coordinating Committee Update (Wolf)

- The HCC is working well together – the technical and county staff
- The mornings are being used as a “global” issues type of meeting timeframe and the afternoons are used for the more technical type discussions

D. October 20th IAC Quarterly Review (Board)

- **Dick** relayed the discussion that Staff had this morning during their Staff meeting about how staff can resolve the public’s comments
- Staff will have a one day workshop in December to discuss any and all comments that have not been resolved up to that point – any comments that cannot be resolved in that forum will be elevated to the Board
- **Keith** suggested that the December 9th HCC meeting be used as this forum for Staff
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that the statewide monitoring meeting set by the governor has been set for October 20th and it conflicts with the Quarterly review date already set (**Drivdahl, Fox** etc are the ones that have the conflict) – Wanted to know if the review date could be changed by one day one way or the other to accommodate the conflict
- **Dick** and WDFW cannot reschedule the quarterly review date – schedules have been built around the 20th of October for too long

VIII. Regional Structure(s), Funding, et al

(Rohr)

A. Status, Discussion, Direction (All)

B. (was D in Section VII moved to this section) Implementation / Board Structure Post June, 05 (Board)

- **Dick** read **Bob Bugert’s** email (handout)
 - What will the board look like
 - How will the board and projects be funded
 - Rule making processes and timeframe at local level
 - Rule making processes and timeframe at state and federal levels

VIII. Regional Structure(s), Funding, et al (Rohr) (continued)

- **Ron** stated that he thought the county planning process would answer this (the variable is the time frame) – **Ron** proposed that we estimate an annual cost
- **Chuck** sees a slightly different twist to **Ron's** idea
- **Bob Bugert** stated that the difference between now and a year or so ago is the Legislature – they are taking a good hard look at redundancy and feels that item # 1 is something that we need to be involved in
- **Paul** reminded everyone of the Senate hearing committee that he presented at last year and feels that item 1 is a step back for the Legislature
- **Chuck** mentioned that we have a couple of choices, be involved and influence the decisions being made or what until those choices are made for us and feels that there can not be 3, 4, 5 suggested options – it needs to be one united board decision
- **Bob Nichols** put together a white paper dated August and sent out in September that was sent out to all Watersheds, RFEs etc
- **Chris Drivdahl** and **Bob Bugert** spoke yesterday and **Bob Nichols** has not put together any legislation but some legislators have
- Next council of regions meeting is in Wenatchee on October 9
- LEAG is discussing this issue too
- **Dick Wallace** is working with the Planning units for their input
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that the Regions solicit input from the watersheds and lead entities
- **Bill** liked the paper that **Chuck** put together and suggested that each board member put together something similar for the next time that we meet on this topic so that we have specifics to discuss
- **Ron** surmised that many of the decisions the Board has to make depends on how we see the board looking after June 2005
- **Ron** envisions a state role, a regional role and a local role and feels that putting together a broad picture would be great but getting into specifics might not be a good use of time and there needs to be flexibility built into what ever model we choose to come up with
- **Mary** thought that flexibility would allow for it to fit well in individual counties not just within the east west issues
- **Keith** thought that if there were a set of guiding principles developed it would allow the flexibility
- **Keith** suggested that they will want to know who they go to (centralized coordination)
- **Ron** repeated what **Britt** had to say and that is everything hinges on what the board's decision is about their existence and role after June 2005
- **Dick** reminded everyone that prior to recovery planning the role of this board was coordination and suggested that we look at this board again for the board's role – coordination

VIII. Regional Structure(s), Funding, et al (Rohr) (continued)

- **Ron** thought that the benefits of this board would be
 - Gain political clout
 - Coordination
 - Planning
 - Implementation
 - Monitoring
- **Paul** reintroduced **Bob Rose's** Adaptive Management diagram
- **Bob Bugert**
 - Applauded **Chuck** for his efforts on the Implementation Plan ideas
 - **Bob Bugert** outlined his thoughts about how the plan might look
 - 2-½ time FTEs
 - 5-6 Watershed Council (morphed from watersheds and Lead Entities) (Implementation Councils)
 - ½ time FTE for each
 - RFEG – 1 FTE (permitting of projects) (revive the RFEGs)
 - This would be about \$100,000 per FTE
 - \$1million for projects
 - Budget about \$1.6 million a year
- **Julie** felt that 1 FTE for the RFEG would not be adequate
- **Chuck** felt that the rule making element is missing – **Ron** felt that this would be where the counties come in
- **Ron** suggested separating project money from infrastructure money
- **Julie** asked how the SRFB feels about this – what are their thoughts and opinions since they are one of our biggest sources of funds
- **Bob Bugert** – SRFB was going to use these estimates by **Ruckelshaus** to confirm the use of the funds
 - The federal funding will stop if we do not get the recovery plans done – this includes the implementation
- **Julie** has asked **Brenda McMurray, Dick Wallace, Steve Tharinger** and **Tim Smith** if they were going to use the recovery plan as part of the implementation plan
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that near term plans could be defined as watershed plans, recovery plans, subbasin plans etc in the next 5 years
- **Ron** suggested that we could/should put together a list of projects
- **Dick** outlined the major funding sources plus with the SRFB could be at least a million per year and we would be hard pressed to spend all of that money on a yearly basis indefinitely
- **Keith** mentioned that all of those agencies are interested in aligning the processes

VIII. Regional Structure(s), Funding, et al (Rohr) (continued)

- **Dick** suggested that we make an action item for all
 - List of projects and dollars
 - List of board structure and dollars
 - Each person's interpretation of the (4) steps that **Bob Bugert** outlined in his email
 - The things that each want and don't want
 - Board Members complete this exercise and get it to **Dick** and **Denny**
 - **Dick** and **Denny** will compile the commonalities and differences for discussion
- **Bob Rose** suggested that we not limit ourselves to a dollar amount or specific projects – there are more than just salmon recovery projects that require funding and time
- **Paul** thought that subbasin plans would provide ideas for projects
- **Dick** suggested that we could caveat our projects list with the statement that the list(s) are not inclusive, this list would be the initial first 5 years
- **Keith** felt that structure needed to be discussed and decided before we move onto projects
- The deadline for this is October 20, 2004 but **Bob Bugert** would like to have them ahead of time if at all possible – October 10, 2004
- **Julie** stated that the County is hesitant to get involved in recovery when watershed planning is not complete
- **Paul** reread **Bob Bugert's** email and reminded everyone that the appropriate partners need to be contacted also
 - RFEGs
 - US Fish & Wildlife Services
 - NOAA
 - Co-managers: Colvilles, Yakamas, DOE, WDFW
 - 2514 Planning Units
 - Lead Entities
 - BOR
 - Municipalities
- **Dick** suggested that each county (board member) (entity) may have a somewhat different list of "appropriate partners"
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that due to the time constraint - plan on a 1 page white paper and meet with the planning units, RFEGs and the RC&D
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that a draft plan for the implementation portion be created, which will move us ahead and it can be modified as we move along
- **Bob Bugert** suggested that everyone could start with **Chuck's** paper and modify it and customize it to fit their needs
- **Bill** thought that a special meeting would be critical to complete this task
- **Dick** recapped the opinions in the room and asked **Bob Bugert** what he felt was absolutely necessary – specific project list, specific dollar amount – both or just one
- **Bob Bugert** felt that the more credible documentation the better

VIII. Regional Structure(s), Funding, et al (Rohr) (continued)

- **Keith** has a concern about creating a specific list that would then take on a life of its own
- **Dick** and **Denny** will coordinate the special meeting effort
- **Mary** confirmed with the group that the Board and Staff members will work together to create the white paper
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that the SRFB has set a deadline of two weeks before (October 10) in order to get it in the SRFB packet
- **Dick** stated that he thought that this was a good way to establish this board as a viable board
- **Dennis** brought up Grant and Kittitas counties
- **Paul** felt that it would take a huge piece of legislation to change all of this
- **Ron** felt that there needed to be a discussion (assumption that we will be combining the 3 processes) and wants to hear from those this would effect and get their views
- **Paul** – 2514 Yakamas walked out of the process early on so they don't see the processes as being integratable and see this as a derailing of the 2496 process
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that if you are satisfied with the structure then that needs to be stated and not just assumed
- **Chuck** stressed that there are two separate issues – the look of the board and the integration of the processes
- **Chuck** suggested that maybe the process could be left alone but change the structure
- **Ron** stated that the structure of the board is independent on the fate of the 2514 and 2496 processes
- **Chuck** felt that the board would be busy the first year meeting on a regular basis and the involvement time would taper down from there
- **Dennis** felt that implementation would be done on a county by county basis (MOU, etc) and the regional overview could be handled on a quarterly Forum basis

Bill moved to hold a special meeting to discuss the commonalities and differences in each entity's white paper – Mary seconded the motion – the motion was not passed.

Bugert Diagram:

- FORUM (can invite any one you want to participate in this forum) (Regional Board)
- (2) ½ time FTEs
- Policy, Coordination, Monitoring
- Chairman from each Council would sit on the Forum
- Quarterly Forum (come one come all) (Steering meeting could meet more often)
- (Dick asked where does the work [contracts, plan modifications, negotiations] get done and decisions get made)
- (6) Watershed Councils (Subbasins, Watersheds) (part of the forum)

Bugert Diagram (continued):

- (6) ½ time FTEs
 - (1 FTE per county)
- RFEG - Projects
- 1 FTE

What is the final assignment

This is how we see our participation and our role after June 2005

Theme and variation

Bob suggested that we submit 1 version with 5 comments (one from each entity)

Sandy to send out the Straw man to every one (Staff and Board)

IX. Subbasin Planning

(Ward)

A. Update (Nason)

- Council has approved the budget for the UCSRB and directed the staff to enter into contracts
- **Tony** stated that the contract would be available by the end of this week
- **Dick** has requested the dollar break down for the budget
- **Dennis** asked about how WDFWs money would be / should be set up – **Dick** answered that it should be handled just like the counties etc – through RC&D
- **Ron** reported that the contracts were already approved at the last RC&D board meeting.

X. Council of Regions Update

(Rohr)

- Monday Council of Regions meeting was cancelled
- Group was interested in the legislature
- Those that testified:
 - **Dave Sommers** of the Muckleshoot tribe
 - **Jim Fox** of the SRFB
 - **Marnie Tyler** of WDFW
- Proposed Council of Regions meeting has been set for October 19th in Wenatchee

XI. Bonneville Environmental Foundation

(Rohr)

A. Evening Meeting, 6:30 – 9:00 pm

Angus Duncan, President, BEF

B. Board Discussion / Review

- How does the Board and BEF work together in the future
- Relationship of BEF and watersheds
- **Dick** stated that the contract etc would be with BEF and the watersheds and the board would be there for coordination
- **Keith** thought that the assumption would be that the watersheds and subbasins are all kind of marching to the same tune and would fit well under the coordination of the board

- XI. Bonneville Environmental Foundation (Rohr) (continued)**
- **Paul** commented that after viewing the BEF website it looked like they fund not just on the ground projects, but projects that assist watersheds and the like to move to the next level
 - **Bill** stated that these are the 2 areas that BEF has operated in over the last 5 years: Leverages cost shares and limited opportunities (assessments etc)
- XII. Staff Report (Nason)**
- This report has pretty much been covered throughout today's meeting
- XIII. RTT Report (Bugert)**
- No report – the RTT has not met for a couple of months
 - Will be meeting with ? and going over the ?
 - Meeting with HCC and going through the deliverables
 - **Chuck** asked about the small tributaries
- XIV. General Report/Discussion (Rohr)**
- A. Hatchery/Harvest Workshop, October
- **Dennis** – Has not heard from the Colvilles, Yakamas or NOAA yet on their participation
 - **Denny** spoke to **Heather** and came up with these questions:
 - Where do we want to have it: Chelan – Campbells
 - Set up to hold the board meeting on the same day at the same place
 - Who are the panel people:
 - What are some of the questions that need to be put together
 - **Paul** to talk to **Steve Parker** regarding the Hatchery/Harvest Workshop
 - **Chuck** needs the info so that he can set up the press release etc since he will not be here during the workshop
 - **Sandy** to work on location and get details to **Chuck** so that he can include that info in the press release
 - **Chuck** to create press release and send it out to all for comment
- XV. Other (Ward)**
- **Keith** - Pacific Aquatic Meeting in Portland
 - The Upper Columbia is far ahead of monitoring efforts
 - Asking if we could facilitate a meeting discussing the Upper Columbia's Monitoring strategy in the off season (winter)
 - It was suggested that we mention this to BEF
 - Bruce Crawford

 - **Kate** - Bull Trout update:
 - Came out yesterday
 - Excludes federal land

GENERAL DISCUSSION

XVI. Public Comment

none

(Ward)

XVII. Next Regular Board Meeting

A. October 28, 2004

(Ward)

Paul adjourned the regular meeting at 5:02pm

Summary of Motions

Ron moved to approve both the July 22, 2004 and the August 26, 2004 meeting minutes, **Mary** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Bill moved to hold a special meeting to discuss the commonalities and differences in each entity's white paper – **Mary** seconded the motion – the motion was not passed.