

UCSRB BOARD MEETING

UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 23, 2005

10:00 – 3:00 pm

Douglas County Public Services Building
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: Dick Nason, UCSRB Staff Coordinator; Julie Pyper, Okanogan County; Nick Christoph, Okanogan County; Bob Bugert, GSRO; Mary Lou Peterson, Okanogan County Commissioner; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Kate Terrell, USFW; Dennis Beich, WDFW; Chuck Jones, Douglas County; Ken Stanton, Douglas County Commissioner; Lynn Hatcher, NMFS; Britt Dudek, Foster Creek Conservation District, Sandy Cox, Okanogan County;

Guests: Chuck Peven, Rob Walton, Bill Stroud, Lynn Heminger

Action Items :

1. **Lynn** to contact **Bob Lohn** and apprise him of the potential July 13, 2005 meeting with the Legislators in Okanogan County
2. **Sandy** to check with the Legislators for their availability and to compare schedules
3. **Sandy** to call the Agri-Plex for availability
4. **Sandy** to research when the Board agreed to move the final date and add a July comment period
5. **Mary** will work on rewriting the Press release for the Wenatchee World

Suggested Action Items :

1. Bill suggested that prior to holding the meeting with the Legislators the Board should create a game plan/agenda
2. Bill suggested that prior to holding the meeting with the Legislators the Board should schedule a good facilitator for that meeting
3. Bill suggested that a similar presentation which was presented today by Bob Bugert, Dick Nason and Lynn Hatcher be presented at the evening meeting with the Legislators
4. Dennis suggested that the Board present what a recovery plan is and is not
5. Dennis also suggested mentioning the smolts per redd benefit
6. Dick suggested that Lynn present the "what a recovery plan is and is not" portion
7. **Paul** suggested that part of the presentation should include an outline of what would happen if there was no recovery plan in place (what are the hazards of no action)
8. **Mary** suggested that **Bob Bugert** present what the hazards of no action would be
9. **Chuck Jones** suggested that **Tracy** or **Chuck Peven** attend the meeting with the Legislators – one of them would be the best to answer how the comments were incorporated into the plan or how were they handled

10. **Chuck Jones** suggested that the Board give some thought to the extent of public involvement and outreach process and what they would like to see happen
11. **Julie** suggested that the Board could look to the Policy Forum participants for direction on public involvement and outreach

I. Welcome/Introductions (Mary Hunt, Chair/Denny Rohr, Facilitator)

Mary presented **Paul Ward** with a plaque in appreciation for his time as Chairman during 2004.

Mary also recognized **Sandy Cox** and thanked her for her efforts in supporting the Board during the past 18 months.

II. Meeting with State Legislators (approx. 11:00 am) (Mary Hunt)

- **Mary** introduced **Senator Linda Evans Parlette**, Representative **Cary Condotta** **Mary Lou Peterson**, Okanogan County Commissioner and **Ken Stanton**, Douglas County Commissioner
- **Dick** presented a brief history on the UCSRB:
 - **Get Dick's outline**
 - **Bob Bugert** presented background on the Habitat Coordinating Committee – the take home message that **Bob** wanted to emphasize was that the UCSRB has met the GSRO and the SRFB requirements regarding public outreach. And the GSRO is comfortable with that area of completion of the contract.
 - **Bob** reported that there is a contract requirement that a cost estimate of implementation be included in the plan – this portion will not be completed by June 30, 2005 but will be worked on during the implementation phase. The GSRO has approved the modification of that element
 - **Bob Bugert** reported that the UCSRB is on track and the contractors have done a good job in getting the plan where it needs to be. The SRFB confirmed their confidence in this Board and their by fully funding the transition period for the amount requested by the UCSRB
 - **Dick** reported that NOAA approached the Board earlier in the year and wanted to change this plan from a state plan to a federal plan
 - **Lynn** reported that **Bob Lohn's** two requirements of any plan are that it is 1) scientifically defensible 2) adoptable by local governments 3) acceptable to local landowners
 - **Lynn** praised the UCSRB for doing a great job with their public outreach efforts
 - **Lynn** explained the reason for the Policy Forum and how it came about (**details**)
 - **Lynn** described who would make up the Policy Forum – NOAA is providing the funding (but that is where their input stops) All who attend the policy forum will have equal opportunity to speak and participate
 - **Lynn** reported that **Mike Eng** of ECR is very adamant that the Policy Forum will include all who want to participate (the bigger the better)
 - Additional information will be incorporated into the plan as a result of the Policy Forum
 - **Dennis** asked if and how changes would be made to the plan that came about as a result of discussions during the Policy Forum (**outline that process**)

- **Dick** mentioned that the Policy Forum would be designed to make decisions by consensus
- **Dick** reported that the Recovery plan will be going to NOAA's Science Center for review during the time frame of ?
- **Lynn** (what is the potential for achieving recovery)
- **Senator Parlette** asked what the negative consequences are knowing that we are located in a region where we are handicapped by our habitat and what it has or doesn't have to offer
- **Senator Parlette** also asked about what could be done to calm the waters and the fears of folks who look upon this plan with misgivings and distrust
- **Dick** relayed **Bob Lohn's** commitment to making the call of when recovery efforts are adequate and enough has been done in any given area is enough regardless of what the scientists might say. This information would be in the Federal Caucus meeting minutes.
- **Commissioner Mary Lou Peterson** presented her concerns and observations about the process and voiced her disappointment that **Representative Joel Kretz**, **Representative Bob Sump** and **Senator Bob Morton** did not attend this meeting today. She also voiced her confusion and identified that there is conflicting information coming from both sides.
- **Commissioner Mary Lou Peterson** also voiced her concern about this issue and the potential of negative consequences and doesn't want it to create a wedge between the Commissioners and the Legislators – they have worked together on so many things in the past and will need to do so again in the future
- **Senator Parlette** asked if a meeting of this group could be arranged in the Okanogan area prior to July 14, 2005 (that is the meeting date set to interview the potential facilitators)
- **Ron** emphasized that one of the ways to build trust is to participate....not wait for the product to come out so that it can be torn apart.
- **Senator Parlette** said that it was time to find a solution to this issue and not let it continue to go unsolved any longer. She referenced the R-Map situation from the past and did not want it repeated
- **Representative Condotta** mentioned that perhaps he and **Senator Parlette** could contact the 7th district Legislators and promote an evening meeting up north
- **Bob Bugert** reminded everyone of the GSRO memo dated May 10, 2005 that was distributed statewide deferring the adoption date to August and outlining some of the next steps for the Recovery Plan
- July 13th was discussed and tentatively scheduled as the date for the evening meeting in Okanogan – participants to be polled as to their availability
- This meeting to be called by Okanogan County Commissioners on behalf of the UCSRB
- **Bill** asked for clarification on the Board's goal in holding this meeting
- **Britt** voiced his opinion about the difference between public involvement and public outreach
- **Lynn** suggested that perhaps **Bob Lohn** or **Rob Walton** could attend the evening meeting depending on what Okanogan County Commissioners would like to have happen
- **Lynn** will contact **Bob Lohn** and apprise him of this meeting
- **Paul** agreed with **Mary Lou** and **Chuck** on dealing with this issue head on and eye to eye.

- **Paul** agreed with **Lynn** too that it would be beneficial to have NOAA there at the July 13th meeting
- **Bill** suggested that prior to holding this meeting the Board should create a game plan/agenda☒ and a good facilitator should be scheduled☒. It was his concern that the meeting had the potential to make matters worse instead of improve them
- **Bill** suggested that a similar presentation which was presented today by **Bob Bugert, Dick Nason** and **Lynn Hatcher** be presented at the evening meeting as well☒
- **Dennis** suggested that the Board present what a recovery plan is and is not☒
- **Dennis** also suggested mentioning the smolts per redd benefit☒
- **Dick** suggested that **Lynn** present the “what a recovery plan is and is not” portion☒
- **Paul** suggested that part of the presentation should include an outline of what would happen if there was no recovery plan in place (what are the hazards of no action)☒
- **Mary** suggested that **Bob Bugert** present what the hazards of no action would be☒
- **Dick** suggested that we check with the Legislators prior to setting the date
- **Sandy** to check with the Legislators for their availability and to compare schedules☑
- **Sandy** to call the Agri-Plex for availability☑
- **Sandy** to research when the Board agreed to move the final date and add a July comment period☑
 - Reference the May 10, 2005 GSRO Memo
 - **Chuck Jones** suggested that **Tracy** or **Chuck Peven** attend this meeting – one of them would be the best to answer how the comments were incorporated into the plan or how were they handled☒

BOARD ACTION

- III. Meeting Minutes (Mary Hunt)
 - A. April 28th , June 1, 2
- IV. Budget Review (Mary Hunt)
 - A. 2003-05 UCSRB Budget Review, Amendment Affirmation
 - Douglas County returned \$13, 000.00
 - The Board authorized the reallocation of \$11,000.00 for the Colville Confederated Tribes during the last meeting
 - **Dick** reported that there was a miscommunication between he and **Tracy** when they last discussed whether or not any additional funds were needed by BioAnalyst to finish out the month of June and finish the plan
 - **Denny** polled the Board members and it was unanimous that BioAnalysts be given an additional (up to \$9000) – BioAnalysts came in with a final figure of needing \$ 8910.00
 - B. Review/Update July – December, 2005 Budget
 - The SRFB, during its June 10th meeting approved the UCSRB’s budget and all regions were approved for a collective \$ 293,000.00 for the region as transitional funding to cover July 1, 2005 through the end of December 2005.

- One of **Bob Bugert's** last tasks for the GSRO was to put together a SOW for the transitional period of July 1, 2005 through the end of December 2005 – the language in the SOW and the ECR SOW are very similar so that they co-exist and meld well
- **Dick** reported that this approach is very similar to the process that took place 2 years ago
- **Dick** stated that if the Board was comfortable with this SOW and could approve it today, the contract could be extended and it could then be signed by **Wendell Black** on June 30, 2005.
- **Bob Bugert's** "Attachment A Transition Scope of Work" was reviewed
- **Dick** reminded everyone that like the contract before, the Board will have the latitude to move dollars around to accommodate changes and needs as they arise
- October 27 & 28, 2005 will be the date that the SRFB will meet to decide the 18 month implementation phase budget.
- **Bud** asked what would happen if a county does not approve or adopt the plan – **Bob Bugert** said that there are similar situations in the Lower Snake and the ? – The plans will move forward with the agencies that adopt it
- **Bud** also asked what the consequences are to the Plan and to Okanogan County or any county if they do not accept/approve the plan
- **Bob Bugert** answered Bud's question by saying that it lessens the utility of the plan, but it will still be used as a guidance document
- **Bud** voiced his concern and described his background and history with these issues to better clarify his questions of why Okanogan County should adopt this plan and be involved in its implementation
- **Bob Bugert** reported that this is our best shot at involving local governments – there is a better likelihood than there has been in the past that this plan will be implemented and successful
- **Mary** reminded everyone that the plan will still move forward and be signed regardless of whether or not Okanogan County adopts it or not. **Mary** also said that by adopting and signing onto this plan it guarantees a seat at the table to discuss future issues and the opportunity to be involved in collective, collaborative efforts in the future.
- **Chuck Jones** encouraged everyone to read the Recovery Goals Statement again.
- **Ron** brought up the visit with **Bill Ruckelshaus** and stated that part of adopting this plan is not saying that everything in it is perfect but that there is a collective commitment to continue to work on the issues
- **Dennis** stated that if Okanogan County does not adopt this plan then it effects everyone else in the ESU
- **Dennis** also stated that the Recovery plan will provide one result and the HCP will provide yet another result
- **Dennis** also reminded everyone that if an agency does not adopt the plan one of the consequences is that the agency would more than likely not be able to take advantage of the benefits of smolts per redd monitoring
- **Kate** mentioned that adopting the plan provides more readily available funding sources
- **Kate** stated that the Plan does have an adaptive management portion – there will be assurances and flexibility

- An HCP can be done without a recovery plan but it is more difficult and a lot more time consuming.
- **Bud** asked if changes will be able to be made after the Policy Forum
- **Bob Bugert** answered that yes, the GSRO believes that this is all part of the adaptive management process.
- **Chuck Jones** suggested that the Board give some thought to the extent of public involvement and outreach process and what they would like to see happen ☒
- **Julie** suggested that the Board could look to the Policy Forum participants for direction on public involvement and outreach ☒
- **Julie** also raised concerns about the deadlines, the Board's structure and the work products and how they will all mesh together

Lay out as much of a scheduled as possible here:

July comment period

Agency meeting

Gsro – August 3

HCC meetings

Paul moved to accept the transition Statement of Work as written. **Bill** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

C. Post-Dec 2005 Budget

- (no discussion)

V. Recovery Planning (Mary Hunt)

A. Draft Recovery Plan

B. Policy Forum

C. Meeting with **Governor Gregoire**

- She can not meet with us on the July 21, 2005 – she wants to visit when all the recovery plans are complete
- **Al Fitzsimmons** is in charge of putting together her trip sometime in October

BOARD DISCUSSION

- VI. Board Workshop, July 6th (Mary Hunt)
- Board and Staff are to be expected to attend this meeting if their schedules allow
 - July 6, 2005 Staff meeting cancelled to provide adequate participation by Staff in the Board Workshop
 - This workshop has been set to discuss and establish what the UCSRB is going to look like 1) during the transition phase, Policy Forum (July 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 and 2) post December 2005 during the 18 month implementation phase
 - **Potluck** dinner at the **Walters'** home at 7pm on the evening of the 5th was also scheduled
 - **Keith** will be providing the salmon and the cooking expertise
 - Those able to attend the potluck are asked to bring a salad or a dessert
- VII. Updates (Mary Hunt)
- A. Meeting with **Bill Ruckelshaus**
- **Ron** and **Mary** met with **Bill Ruckelshaus** last week
 - Okanogan County issues were discussed
 - **(Chairman, Mr. ?) Ruckelshaus** suggested that if the Okanogan County issues are not resolved to state that in the plan
 - Topics discussed:
 - i. Implementing at the local level
 - ii. The role of the regional boards
 - iii. Emphasis was placed on the watershed groups
 1. He wants a watershed group representative on the UCSRB Board after December
 2. **Mary** had told him that each of the Commissioners that sit on the UCSRB are an active part of the watershed groups in their county
 - Keep in mind that **(Chairman, Mr. ?) Ruckelshaus** frame of reference is the Puget Sound Shared Strategy
 - **Bob Bugert** suggested that it may be difficult to find a watershed representative that is willing to sit on yet another board.
 - **Bob Bugert** mentioned that the July 21, 2005 visit with the UCSRB is still on **Bill Ruckelshaus'** calendar and asked the Board to decide if it still made good sense to continue with that date. He questioned the need for this and suggested that the UCSRB defer this meeting until the GSRO-sponsored meeting of the eastern regions in September.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

- VIII. Public Comment (Mary Hunt)
- A. none
- IX. Next Meeting (Mary Hunt)
- A. July 21, 2005
- X. Updates/Other:

- **Bob Bugert** reported that he spoke to the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation (NFWF).
 - i. **Krystyna Wolniakowski**, the Chair of that Board would like to come here and meet with this Board and have them vote on the projects within the block grant (small version of the grants by the SRFB)
 - ii. 10 projects were submitted, 4 by Okanogan County, 3 by Douglas County, and 3 by Chelan County.
 - iii. **Julie** reported that there are more dollars than projects, so if all of these projects were approved there would still be dollars available.
 - iv. **Britt** reported that the process for these projects and the awarding of the grants is being somewhat developed as it has progressed.
 - v. **Paul** felt that it would be good opportunity to learn about the process, increase exposure and strengthen relationships.
 - vi. **Dick** thought that it would be a great opportunity as well.
 - vii. July 21, 2005 would be the scheduled day to meet with her.

- JALARC. **Bob Bugert** said that the Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee is reviewing state funding to watershed and salmon efforts. **Linda Byers** from JLARC will be in contact with the UCSRB as part of that audit.
 - i. **Linda** has met with the Snake River Regional Board and some of the watershed planning units in that region and met individually and collectively with the Board and discussed how to cut costs
 - ii. **Linda** is one of JLARC's research analysts
 - iii. Her contact information is: Byers.Linda@leg.wa.gov and 360.786.5183

- **Mary** reminded the Board members that on June 23, 2005 they were to have their visions of what the Board is going to look like to her so that it can be compiled for the discussion on July 6, 2005

- Top three elements for July 21st
 - i. **Bill Ruckelshaus**' visit
 - ii. Approval of the Vision of the Board
 - iii. **Krystyna Wolniakowski**, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)

- **Mike** requested time after the July 6, 2005 workshop to discuss what the watershed groups roles would be so that he can go back to the groups and discuss it with them
 - i. The Board felt that it was very premature to even discuss the role of the watershed groups with the watershed groups at the current time

- **Chuck** reported that the Wenatchee World is still willing to run a feature article on the UCSRB and Salmon Recovery
 - i. **Mary** will work on rewriting the Press release

Bill moved to adjourn the meeting. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35pm

Summary of Motions

Paul moved to accept the transition Statement of Work as written. **Bill** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

APPROVED