

UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 23, 2005

9:30 – 5:00 pm

East Wenatchee Council Chambers

East Wenatchee, WA

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; Julie Pyper, Okanogan County; Bob Bugert, GSRO; Keith Wolf, KWA/Colville Confederated Tribes; KWA; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Kate Terrell, USFW; Bob Foster, WDFW; Dennis Beich, WDFW; Chuck Jones, Douglas County; Lynn Hatcher, NMFS; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County;

Guests: Mike Eng, ECR

Action Items☑:

1. **Ron** and **Mary** to attend the SRFB meeting on April 14, 2005 when budgets are presented
2. **Keith** requested that any comments discussed on Chapter 5 be sent to him so that he can compile and meld them into the list
3. **Dick** will check with **Tracy** to see if he was able to compile any comments that can be added to the Colvilles' comments
4. **Denny** to make arrangements for a Board meeting and BBQ to be held at **Denny's** on the evening of April 14, 2005 at Fox Island
5. **Bob Bugert** to send out an email to Board and Staff with detailed information on his tours for July 28 & 29 (one day in the Okanogan and one day in Chelan and Douglas)
6. **Denny** will work with **Dick** to get **Tracy** and **Chuck** to the April 28, 2005 meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Mary called the meeting to order at 9:35am

- I. Welcome and Introductions (Mary Hunt, Chair)
- II. **Mike Eng**, Environmental Conflict Resolution Institute (Mary Hunt)
 - A. ECR Facilitation
 - Powerpoint presentation was presented (copy accompanies these meeting minutes)
 - Standing agreement with the Portland Office of NMFS to be available
 - SOW remains a draft for discussion purposes

- **Mike Eng** hoped that today's meeting would be an opportunity to exchange information
 - ECR was established in 1998 – sponsored by senator **John McCain**
 - ECR is an independent agency of the Executive Branch
 - So far NMFS is sole source of funding – but it is in question as to whether or not there will be sufficient funding for that may be required to accomplish
 - **Mary** asked about a possible conflict of interest – **Mike Eng** explained that ECR provides a buffer between the funder and the mediators (this is one of the benefits provided by ECR)
 - **Mike Eng** mentioned that taking the process one step at a time is very beneficial. It allows for step by step decisions.
- B. Core Planning Group Meeting, April 21st, 9:00 – 2:00
- Will need to cancel this meeting – not far enough along in the process yet

BOARD ACTION

- III. Meeting Minutes (Mary Hunt)
- A. February 24, 2005

***Ron** made the motion to approve the meeting minutes with the changes discussed. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

- IV. Review/Approval: July, 2005–June, 2007 UCSRB Budget (Mary Hunt)
- **Dick** reviewed the purpose of creating and reviewing this budget
 - As instructed by the Board the funding of the RTT Chairman has also been included in the budget.
 - **Mike** asked about the budget discussion at the Council of Regions
 - **Steve Martin's** budget was going to be put through to their Board last night. Other than that we are the only other region
 - **Dick** has been asked to send out the elements that we have built our budget around – he said that he needed Board approval before doing that
 - **Bob Bugert** said that we need to get this information to **Chris Drivdahl** by April 6th and be sure to present it in the format that she has requested.
 - **Dick** mentioned that **Chuck Jones** is working on transferring this budget information into **Chris Drivdahl's** format
 - April 14 & 15, 2005 in Tacoma one of the Board will need to be available to attend to present our ball park budget.
 - **Dick** gave an update on HB 5610 and HB 4406? (which is dead on arrival)
 - **Mary** sent a letter on the Board's behalf to ? in support of the HB 5610
 - **Bob Bugert** mentioned the transition period for 1 July to 31 December 2005 (6 month time frame) should be listed as separate from the implementation period (1 January 2006 to 30 June 2007).
 - **Mike Kaputa** mentioned that much of the budget was speculation
 - **Julie** reminded everyone that the 8 elements came from the boards recommendation last month
 - **Ron** finds this budget disconcerting

- Budget items number 7 and 8 – these are the only two items that don't amount to guesswork
- Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, - **Ron** felt that there is quite a bit of duplication in these 6 items
- There is no way that we as a Board are going to get \$684,000
- Knowing the state of the budget at the State and County levels **Ron** found the request for \$ 684,000 discomfoting
- **Ron** made the comparison that it would be like asking him to build a court house and give an estimate to build it without producing a plan first
- **Keith** suggested that we show that the administration of this Board is a minimal expense
- **Keith** also suggested that the Board/Staff show the specifics of what will be accomplished
- **Keith** also suggested that the Board/Staff put a work plan together and develop scopes of works that would outline what is intended to be accomplished
- **Bill** asked how we put in a placeholder so that we don't underfund ourselves
- **Bob Bugert** stated that this budget has more detail than what is needed at this time.
- **Mary** brought up the issue of credibility – and asking for more than what we might need may increase our changes of looking less credible
- **Mike** suggested that we put a range on different tasks and processes and scale back the detail
- **Julie** voiced a concern about completing this by April 9, 2005.
- **Julie** explained that she took the recommendation from the Board in October 2004 and melded it together with how she is doing business now
- **Julie** suggested that in order to complete this by the April due date we need to have a Board / Staff work day to accomplish this since we seem to be missing the mark
- **Ron** suggested that we take out the dollar amounts per detail, but leave the detail of tasks under each element for the 7 or 8 elements and have a one lump sump for each element – His concern was that the details of the budget the way they are now can't be justified
- **Bob Bugert** stated that with the exception of Douglas County it appears that this budget basically equals one FTE per entity.
- **Chuck** mentioned that Staff wanted to justify the details and show how Staff came up with the numbers.
- **Chuck** also suggested that we speak to other agencies about outside funding – (ie PUDs funding **Bob Bugert's** position as RTT Chair etc)
- **Keith** mentioned in-kind contributions
- **Bill** said that he could support deleting the dollar amounts to the details and present lump sums per element – agrees that we need to be careful on how we present this

***Bill** moved to keep the elements but do away with the sub-set information and retain this as our base document. (Keeping the same dollar amount) Then this would be submitted in the **Chris Drivdahl** format to the SRFB – **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

- **Julie** suggested that the Board consider recapturing the recommendations from October and including them with the budget.
- **Bud** asked who was going to present this to the SRFB.
- **Dick** suggested that he could be there
- **Ron** suggested that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board should be there to present it to the SRFB
- It was decided that **Ron** and **Mary** would be present at the SRFB meeting .
- **Denny** mentioned that the SRFB meeting was scheduled to be held on the afternoon of the 14th
- **Ron** said that it would be great to include the in-kind estimate also
- **Mary** agreed that this would be very beneficial – but don't include dollars, just the list of the contributors
- **Chuck** mentioned that he is creating a Staff use estimate.

BOARD DISCUSSION

V. HCC Report (Keith Wolf)

- Review # 2 – begins on March 31, 2005 (Sections 1 – 5) – 30 Day review
- Draft # 2 will be processed using the same process as Draft # 1 - comment gathering, review each comment by the HCC and then the comments will be classified in a spreadsheet with the disposition of each comment noted on the spreadsheet
- HCC will review and address all comments
- **Dick** reported that Habitat is the only “H” that is missing from Chapter 5
- There are monthly TRT interactions
- An internal review of Chapter 5 was recently held (the meat and potatoes section)
- Section 6 has been initiated (**Jones, Rose** and **?**) have begun to create cost analysis lists
- **Keith** and his staff are doing the majority of the work – and will consult with Eastern Washington University
- Just received a great document from NOAA regarding **?** – Author: **Russell Stanton (?)**
- **Dick** mentioned that the suggested policy statements created by Staff will be discussed at a later date
- Discussed Scenarios 1 and 2
- One table for entire ESU that lists **?** and the protection class table will be another separate table
- May is when the final technical work is to be done (June 1, 2005) – Will go to the Technical writer
- Collecting data for Scenario 2 – want done by end of April – providing to local stakeholders
- **Chuck** mentioned the website that shows all projects funded by the SRFB.
- **Kate** mentioned that on page 5 and page 7 there are some edits. (Rock Structures, Large Woody debris.....) some of the verbiage has been modified

- **Keith** requested that any comments discussed during the internal review of Chapter 5 be sent to him so that he can compile and meld them into the Colville's list of comments☑.
- **Keith** summarized that the comments in his document 54 total – 40 were dealt with at the HCC and 14 were policy issues
- **Dick** reminded everyone that this is still an UCSRB document not a joint fisheries committee document
- **Ron** asked how, if he has comments and requested changes, will he know if and when those comments get addressed and included
- **Bud** voiced his concern about not having enough time to review this draft
- **Julie** mentioned that they have been concerned that we don't know how these different documents are going to be used which will effect the comments
- **Mary** voiced her concern about only receiving the Colvilles comments today instead of a compiled list of comments that all involved contributed to
- **Dick** will check with **Tracy** to see if he was able to compile any comments that can be added to the Colvilles comments☑
- **Mike** suggested that the Board and Staff build in a review schedule – we have done it to some extent but needs more attention
- **Mike** also suggested that the Board talk to **Tracy** and **Chuck Peven** since they are the ones most closely associated with the document
- **Bud** emphasized that he wants to ensure that the components that go into this plan will be what we want since they will affect what legislation and policy is created in the future
- **Dennis Beich** asked about OOSE – is the Board going to address the document that NMFS put out.
- **Dennis** also suggested how the board was going to deal with the fact that the delisting criteria won't be available prior to the plan coming out
- **Chuck** reminded everyone that not all of the issues will be resolved. We can write a cover letter with the plan that states that the issues are not resolved
- **Bob Bugert** – all along you have stated that your recovery plan is based on the watershed plans (which are due in 2006 / 2007) – A strong statement conveying that this is a draft document would be appropriate. The UCSRB may use the 6 month transition period to integrate comments and revisions to the draft plan.
- **Ron** suggested that the June plan have a DRAFT watermark on every page
- **Julie** suggested that we reconsider our commemorative event
- **Mary** suggested that because of the issues raised in today's conversation that we have another Board meeting within the next 2 weeks
- Scheduled a second Board meeting on April 14, 2005 in Tacoma☑
- **Ron** suggested that there be a Board meeting and BBQ held at **Denny's** on the evening of April 14, 2005 at Fox Island☑
- **Dick** suggested that for those not attending the SRFB meeting that the Board establish a time so that everyone can convene at **Denny's** at the appropriate time
- **Mary** suggested that each Staff member take an office staff with them and alternately cover the note taking for the HCC
- **Mike** suggested that for consistency sake there needs to be one person taking notes for the HCC

- **Julie** suggested that Staff discuss the note taker issue for the HCC meetings at the next Staff meeting

VI. Staff Report (Dick Nason)

- Last board meeting the Board authorized an additional \$27,000 for BioAnalysts – amendments are on **Jay Kehne's** desk
- The board also authorized Staff to terminate the J&S contract and the remaining funds and their use will be discussed at the next Staff meeting

VII. RTT Report / HCP Tributary Committee Report (Bob Bugert)

- RTT - Set up to review the technical merits of the small grants program through the SRFB – Applications due April 29 2005
- The Tributary Fund – applications are due 30 September and RTT will be reviewing those in early October.
- Lining up tours for July 28 & 29 (one day in the Okanogan and one day in Chelan and Douglas)
- It was suggested that Board members attend these tours
- **Denny** requested that **Bob** send out an email outlining this
- The Tributary Committees to the PUD HCPs have adopted their policies and procedures for funding projects. They will formally release their requests for proposals on 29 March.

VIII. RC&D Legislation (Mary Hunt)

- **Ron** asked if it was known how much it would cost the UCSRB if they were to operate as if the RC&D was not in existence
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that the Institute for Rural Innovation and Stewardship (IRIS) looked into gaining their own (501)3c status and it was cost and time prohibitive. At this time they elected to remain under the non-profit status of the Wenatchee Valley College Foundation.

***Ron** made the motion that the chair develop a letter and send it out. **Bud** seconded the motion. The motion was passed.*

IX. OTHER (Mary Hunt)

- April 13 & 14 – Monitoring for the Future Workshop in Tacoma
- **Mary** asked if we want to invite **Tracy** and **Chuck Peven** to the next Board meeting
- **Denny** will work with **Dick** to get **Tracy** and **Chuck** to the April 28, 2005 meeting
- Sponsorship award – **Mary** polled the board and they were all in agreement to proceed with this. **Chuck** filled out the paperwork and submitted it on March 21, 2005

X. Board Executive Session (Mary Hunt)

GENERAL DISCUSSION

XI. Public Comment (Mary Hunt)

- XII. Upcoming Meetings of the Board (Mary Hunt)
 - A. April 21, 2005, Core Planning Group Meeting
 - B. April 28, 2005, Next Regular Board Meeting

Summary of Motions

***Ron** made the motion to approve the meeting minutes with the changes discussed. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

***Bill** moved to keep the elements but do away with the sub-set information and retain this as our base document. (Keeping the same dollar amount) Then this would be submitted in the **Chris Drivdahl** format to the SRFB – **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

***Ron** made the motion that the chair develop a letter and send it out. **Bud** seconded the motion. The motion was passed.*