

UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 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
Craig Vejraska, Okanogan County

Others present: Denny Rohr, UCSRB Facilitator; Chuck Jones, Douglas County; Britt Dudek, Foster Creek C.D.; Julie Dagnon, Okanogan County; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Jennifer Jerabek, Chelan County; Bob Bugert, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office; Dennis Beich, WDFW; John Hunter, WDFW Commission; Carolyn Pearson, ECOAim Inc.; Lynn Heminger, Douglas County PUD; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County

Action Items:

1. Put budget number presentation discussion on Board's June agenda
2. **Denny** set up a conference call with the BOD sometime in the next 2 weeks to revisit the discussion of changing the Board meetings from the 3rd Thursday to the 4th Thursday of the month and finalize the decision
3. **Sandy** not to take action on changing venues and schedules until final discussion takes place
4. **Jennifer** to send draft letter for SRFB Coordinated L.E. Strategy out to Board and Staff
5. **Sandy** to email the letter to Paul and he will sign and send it out
6. **Sandy** to distribute the SRFB Coordinated L.E. Strategy letter to BOD and Staff once **Paul** has sent it out as confirmation of mailing
7. Add **Joe Peone** to the May Board Meeting agenda to present his Colville Hatchery Management Plan
8. **Denny** to add the Hot Spots Hatchery/Harvest presentation to the BOD agenda for May
9. **Denny** to follow up on the response loop letter sent to Judy Danielson at NPCC on February 19, 2004 in the next 2 weeks
10. **Paul** to be responsible for inviting Steve Parker and Tom Scribner to come up for the May BOD meeting Hot Spots education session
11. Mike to report back to Board at next BOD meeting regarding Review Criteria re RFQ for Roster of Consultants and what RC&D's requirements might be
12. **Denny** to SET UP meeting on MAY 20, 2004 with **Dick, Denny, Bob Bugert** and Staff to resolve ongoing issues
13. **Denny** to add to the May 20 meeting agenda: **Julie's** concern about sending out the initial deliverables to the public without relativity etc (add this to the Staff meeting discussion)
14. **Bob Bugert** will do some research and recommend a method of contacting Bonneville and will draft a letter as well, for the Board's review

Regular Meeting Call to Order: Paul called the meeting to order at 10:20am.

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

II. Review/Approval Meeting Minutes (Ward)

- A. February 19th Board Meeting
- B. February 23rd Board Conference Call
- C. March 25th Board Conference Call

Paul asked for comments on the 3 set of minutes listed above.

Outstanding questions on the February 19, 2004 meeting minutes were left until **Bob Bugert** could join in the meeting.

Craig moved to approve the February 23, 2004 and March 25, 2004 meeting minutes. Ron seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Later in the meeting Craig moved to approve (with minor updates) the February 19, 2004 meeting minutes. Ron seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

III. Review of February 19, 2004 and March 25, 2004 Action Items (Rohr)

- Action items were reviewed, updated and some items were left on list to keep them active for discussions at a later date – [please see February 19, 2004 Action Item list for updates](#)

Budget Review (Ward, Rohr)

- Discussion ensued regarding the presentation of budget numbers and wondering if it was in a format that was useful
- **Ron** felt that what was needed was a way to relate the deliverables and the dollar amounts that correlate with them
- **Ron** and **Craig** both felt that addressing this at a later date would be beneficial since the work load right now is high
- **Britt** asked if the way that this budget is presented will it prevent what happened during the last go-round, will we have excess money left over or not enough
- **Ron** felt that the fewer documents he has to look at the better – as long as they provide the information that is needed
- **Ron** doesn't want to create a totally different method of presenting the budget numbers and wonders if the current document can be modified to better present what is needed
- **Ron** and **Britt** requested that the numbers be ?

BOARD ACTION ITEMS

V. Consideration of Amendment to Bylaws Regarding - Regular Board Meetings (Ward)

- **Dennis** requested that the new BOD Meeting schedule be phased in since calendars have been built around the current meeting schedule
- Chelan Planning meetings are all on the 4th Thursday so **Mike/Jennifer** may not be available for Board meetings with the new schedule

V. Consideration of Amendment to Bylaws Regarding - Regular Board Meetings (Ward)

- Bylaws 6.1 will need to be amended for the change to the 4th Thursday (10-3)
- **Mike** voiced a concern about the new dates conflicting with his regularly scheduled watershed meetings especially now since the watershed members are voicing an interest in being more involved with the UCSRB
- **Craig** moved to table this issue and have **Denny** set up a conference call with the BOD in the next 2 weeks to revisit the discussion and finalize the decision
- **Sandy** not to take action on changing venues and schedules until final discussion takes place

***Craig** moved to accept the change in the Board meeting date from the 3rd to the 4th Thursday of each month. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS

VI. SRFB Coordinated L.E. Strategy (Jerabek)

- 3 prioritized lists are going to be sent in as opposed to the previous method of one list
- How does the Board wish to handle the endorsement of the this method –
 - Endorsing the process
 - Endorsing the 3 lists collectively
 - Endorsing the 3 lists separately
- **Ron** – As a Chelan County Commissioner they can't endorse anything that deals with acquisition projects – so it might be better if the UCSRB endorsed the process
- **Jennifer** mentioned as a reminder that the Citizens Committee has the last say on the order/ranking of the lists
- **Julie** mentioned that the endorsement letter is well received on the State level but not required
- **Ron** stated that he liked the draft letter that endorses the process and all 3 entities
- **Jennifer** mentioned that the change in the process has been to change from just a Biological Strategy to a Lead Entity Strategy that is amended individually for each Lead Entity
- **Britt** state that the RTT acts as our Technical committee and looks at the lists and gives the lists a technical rating that is provided back to the Citizens committee so that they can rank the lists having been given that information
- **Britt** also mentioned that LEs are working with **Bob Bugert** to update the RTT's assessments data because of all of the changes and additions to the process
- **Britt** stated that the Prsim submittal deadline is July 16th (drop dead date)
- **Jennifer** gave a rundown on the following dates:
 - May 10, 2004 RTT Ranking meetings
 - May 24, 2004 Applicants deadline
 - Late June early July Citizens meetings
 - July 16, 2004 Lists will be sent to SRFB
- **Ron** suggested that the Board make a decision on the draft letters and take care of them today
- **Jennifer** to send draft letter for SRFB Coordinated L.E. Strategy out to Board and Staff
- **Sandy** to email the letter to **Paul** and he will sign and send it out

VI. SRFB Coordinated L.E. Strategy (Jerabek) (continued)

- **Sandy** to distribute the SRFB Coordinated L.E. Strategy letter to BOD and Staff once **Paul** has sent it out as confirmation of mailing

Craig moved to accept the draft letter to the SRFB for the Coordinated LE Strategy endorsement that *Jennifer* proposed as is. *Ron* seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

VII. Bonneville Environmental Foundation (Rose, Bugert, Rohr)

- **Denny, Bob Bugert** and **Bob Rose** – met with **Todd Reeves** and **Angus Duncan** Director of Watershed programs, after Todd attended an RTT meeting
- Good discussion regarding what they are about and what the Upper Columbia is all about
- They have a long term approach to habitat/watershed programs
- They require a minimum commitment of 10 years per program
- BEF needs to see some level of commitment from the group that they are dealing with (reasonable assurance)
- In the past they have not dealt with regions just watersheds
- Now working with the Chinook and Flathead?
 - Helping to fund monitoring, water management, public outreach
- They wanted to hear more about our interest in them
- **Denny, Bob Bugert** and **Bob Rose** were comfortable with working with them, but not speaking on behalf of this Board
- **Denny, Bob Bugert** and **Bob Rose** wanted to come back to the Upper Columbia Board and develop specifics and get back to BEF with them
- **Todd** recently sent out an email with some specific ideas
- **Denny, Bob Bugert** and **Bob Rose** all recommended that **Angus Duncan** be scheduled to come up here to speak to the Board
- The regional process is something that they are interested in
- **Angus** was on the NWPPC
- **Todd** came up with some of these ideas:
 - Have access to Scientific Review Panel
 - Could pay for additional public outreach (public outreach consultants)
 - Data management – funding for a repository
 - Money for process, probably not projects
- **Bob Rose** had thoughts about a schedule for the next couple of months regarding working with BEF – maybe by August the Board/Staff can decide what is good for each of us and by the end of the year we can decide on how to proceed
- **Julie** thought it would be a good idea to meet with BEF, but we have SBP issues, Hot Spots issues etc that are more pressing than meeting with BEF right now

VIII. Discussion of “Hot Spot” Presentation to Board (Beich, Bugert)

- **Julie** and **Chuck** both reminded Staff of their recommendation that the Board be briefed on the Hot Spots issues prior to any public meetings
- **Bob Bugert** suggests that we lock in the June public meeting and then put Dennis and himself on the agenda for May to educate the Board
- **Bob Bugert** also suggested that we role the harvest and hatchery topics together

VIII. Discussion of “Hot Spot” Presentation to Board (Beich, Bugert) (continued)

- **Paul** suggested that **Steve Parker** and **Tom Scribner** come up for the BOD meeting Hot Spots education in May
- **Bob Bugert** and **Dennis** will need 1 hour for the Hatchery/Harvest presentation
- **Dennis** requested that the sooner we have a schedule for the evening meeting the better – there are numerous folks that he will need to contact and schedule to be there
- **Denny** to add the Hot Spots Hatchery/Harvest presentation to the BOD agenda for May

IX. Review of Subbasin Planning (Staff)

- **Julie** reported on the Okanogan/Methow Subbasins’
 - the final draft is being released tomorrow
 - there has been 2 public meeting this past week
 - vision etc is completed, tentative acceptance by ?
 - 2 week comment period ends May 10, 2004
 - Wildlife section is not complete - Dennis is looking in to the reasons for that
- **Julie** suggested that the UCSRB BOD follow-up on the fixit loop extension request letter that was sent out in February, because no response has been received
- **Julie** stated that the SBP Budget only allows for \$1000 for copying and feels that it will be more like \$5000, she will be requesting a budget amendment from NPCC
- **Denny** – to follow up on the response loop letter (Council Staff and Members)
- **Craig** summed up: no wildlife, no public response, Colvilles-no public response seems its being set up for failure
- **Denny** asked about what happens if something is left out of the plan – **Julie** said that the ISRP will kick it back and point out that a specific area needs a lot of work then it could be fixed during the fixit period
- Public comment on plans – August 12th –
- Dates summarized by **Julie**:
 - May 28 – Submittal of Upper Columbia Subbasin plans into NPCC
 - June 9 – August 12 (45) day Public Comment / ISRP review
 - Address public comments – not known at present who will address public comments, hopefully current subbasin coordinators
 - August 12 to Mid Sept – Draft rules for (amendments)
 - December or January – NPCC accepts rule amendments to the fish and wildlife program
- **Julie** wasn’t sure what control if any the subbasin coordinators will have after the May 28th date
- **Ron** relayed details of a phone call he had with **Tony Grover** – subbasins in Montana underspent by \$800,000 and some subbasins in Washington will be underspent – so there should be money available for the fixit loop
- **Julie** also mentioned that **Chuck Peven’s** Hatchery portion is not complete and the wildlife portion is not complete – Inventory is done but not in the document
- **Ron** said that Chelan County will be sending a cover letter along with the plans to outline their concerns when the plan is submitted

IX. Review of Subbasin Planning (Staff) (continued)

- **Britt** asked when “THE” Final draft would be available so that it is no longer piecemealed and the citizens can review with the assurance that there will be no more changes
- **Chuck** mentioned the Middle Mainstem – it is 236 pages, with wildlife portion, and some maps, some management strategies, it is still not complete but the comments can mostly be addressed not necessary included in the document and something to keep in mind is that with the NEPA process if they go over 50 comments they have to extend the time period
- **Jennifer** said that Lake Chelan plan is on the FTP site, Wenatchee plan should be on the FTP site this weekend or next week (spent the most time on this plan), Entiat would be available soon after the Wenatchee, and the plans have been publicly developed but not publicly reviewed
- **Paul** mentioned that the 3rd of 3 meetings is being held tonight at the Yakamas’ – no comments that have been submitted have caused huge problems – attendees to meetings have consisted of ranchers, tribal members, local politicians
- **Craig** relayed the comments that he is hearing from the public about the Subbasin Plans: why did you get us into this, we are not being given enough time to comment on the plans etc
- **Paul** regarding the NWPCC meeting the 3rd week in May – **Paul** suggested that **Craig** and **Ron** go to the meeting and tell them directly whether in person or over the phone (**Denny** suggested that you may want to meet with them over lunch) and relay the comments and issues
- **Ron** prefers to give them a phone call directly
- **Julie** – Requested that Denny get a response regarding the response loop letter within the next 2 weeks

X. Colville Hatchery Management Plan (Peone)

- **Joe** unable to attend today’s Board meeting - Add to next month’s agenda

XI. Update of Review Criteria re RFQ for Roster of Consultants (Kaputa)

- Criteria for selecting contractors from roster – under 10K direct select from roster, over 10K then 3 requests for bid would be put out
- **Ron** suggested that whatever the criteria is that we follow what the RC&D policies are since we are under them
- **Mike** to report back to Board at next BOD meeting regarding Review Criteria - RFQ for Roster of Consultants and what RC&D’s requirements might be

XII. Update of Assignments Worksheet (Staff)

- **Julie** reported that Staff has made some progress on this, but over the course of 3 Staff meetings Staff has still not been able to complete it – It was discussed at the last Staff meeting that we contact a consultant to complete the Assignments Worksheet
- **Mike** mentioned that there are differing opinions amongst Staff on who should complete specific tasks and what the flavor of the plan should be (biologically or socio-economic)
- **Craig** surmised that Staff doesn’t seem to be focused or able to make what needs to happen happen

XII. Update of Assignments Worksheet (Staff) (continued)

- **Chuck** stated that he doesn't feel that the issue is **Dick**, SBP has been a thorn in many of Staff's sides, Counties are not getting together often enough to figure out what and how we need to do things. In his opinion this is mostly a county issue. (economics, enforcement, depth of coverage)
- **Ron** stated that he remembered that the Board asked that the responsibilities be assigned by the end of last year, then this deadline was extended to April and now its still not done
- **Julie** mentioned that there had been some discussion on a SOW for BioAnalysts to complete the TOC/outline for \$1500 and develop the work assignments on the Assignments Worksheet for \$12,000+ but no agreement had been reached by Staff
- **Mike** is concerned that money could be thrown at this issue and it would solve the immediate problem, but that it doesn't solve the long term problem of working productively and cohesively together as a Staff - frustration can only rise
- **Paul** said that changing from an SBP process to a Regional process will require a unified game plan
- **Craig** – the sooner the better, sit down and hammer out the issues and the problems and develop a game plan
- **Mike** thought that what we haven't built into the deliverables are the reviews by other parties, not just the Staff and GSRO etc.
- **Ron** voiced his concern about the integrity and credibility of the product that we deliver, and what the community will have to live by down the road
- **Mike** – suggested that the Staff get with **Dick, Denny** and **Bob Bugert** to discuss a plan for this ongoing issue (**Craig, Paul** and **Ron** all agreed)
- **Denny** to SET UP meeting on MAY 20, 2004 with **Dick, Denny, Bob Bugert** and **Staff** to resolve ongoing issues
- Discussion ensued on just what to do with the Recovery plan at this point in time, table, postpone, abort etc
- **Bob Bugert** – suggested that the deliverable that we do have (prior to the review) be shipped out to the planning units (whoever is out there) etc for their review
- **Mike** thought that if we do send out the products we need to be very specific about what our expectations are with their participation
- **Mike** mentioned the Entiat group and their desire to become an advocacy group
- **Julie** voiced a concern about sending out the initial deliverables to the public without relativity etc (add this to the Staff meeting discussion)

XIII. Update re Large/Small Brochures: Printing, Distribution (Dagnon)

- **Julie** stated that no brochures have been printed, as it stood from the February Board Meeting "Strategy for printing, distributing & partnership – to be discussed at a later date" and was left up to the Counties, there is no budget for printing

XIV. Staff Report (Nason)

Dick was unable to attend this Board meeting so no Staff report was given

XV. RTT Report (Bugert)

- The monitoring protocol is now completed at the local level, yet Bonneville contract issues are bogging us down, so we may not implement some aspects this field season. We have yet to secure contracts for some work to proceed. The drop dead date for steelhead redd counts has passed, and our next concern is not having contracts in place for some smolt traps.
- **Roy Beatty** is the BPA contract officer. Bob inquired whether a Board member could contact him to help resolve the problem.
- **Bob Bugert** will do some research and recommend a method to contact them and will draft a letter for review.
- On another note, the RTT is getting geared up with the fix it loop for the Fifth Round SRFB projects. The RTT will provide recommendations to project sponsors on how to improve the pending grant applications. This meeting will be on April 29th at the Chelan Fire Station.

XVI. General Discussion (Rohr)

- Denny had nothing to report

OPEN DISCUSSION

XVII. Public Comment (Ward)

- None

XVIII. Next Regular Board Meeting

- Board to discuss

Paul adjourned the meeting at 3:00pm

Summary of Motions

Craig moved to approve the February 23, 2004 and March 25, 2004 meeting minutes. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Craig moved to approve (with minor updates) the February 19, 2004 meeting minutes. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Craig moved to accept the draft letter to the SRFB for the Coordinated LE Strategy endorsement (that Jennifer proposed) as is. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.