

# UCSRB BOARD MEETING

## UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 21, 2005  
10:00 am – 3:00 pm  
Douglas County Fire District No. 2  
377 North Eastmont Ave  
East Wenatchee, WA  
(1-509-884-6671 for directions)

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

**Others present:** Dick Nason, UCSRB Staff Coordinator; Bob Bugert, RTT; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Kate Terrell, USFW; Dennis Beich, WDFW; Chuck Jones, for Douglas County; Lynn Hatcher, NMFS; Chris Drivdahl, GSRO; Britt Dudek, Foster Creek Conservation District; Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County

**Guests:** Krystyna Wolniakowski, NFWF; Autumn Salamack, NFWF/Evergreen; Nick Pearson, NFWF/Evergreen; Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair, Washington State Salmon Recovery Funding Board

**Bill** called the meeting to order at 10:08 am

### MEETING AGENDA

- I. Welcome/Introductions (Bill Towey, ViceChair, UCSRB)

#### Action Items

- **Mike** and **Bud** to draft an article to announce the change in the comment period
- **Mike** will have a draft to **Bud** by Monday, July 25th
- **Sandy** to check BOCC Hearing Room for availability for Board and Staff Workshop for 8/4/05 from (10 – 4)

### BOARD ACTION

- II. Meeting Minutes
  - A. April 28, 2005
  - B. June 1 & 2, 2005
  - C. June 23, 2005

**Ron** made the motion to approve the June 23, 2005 Board meeting minutes. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

- III. **10:10 am** - National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)
- **Autumn Salamack**, Community Salmon Fund Grant Program, NFWF
  - **Krystyna Wolmiakowski**, Regional Director, NFWF
  - **Nick Pearson** – Evergreen Funding Consultants

NFWF has teamed up with the Lead Entities on small grant

- **Krystyna**

- 1<sup>st</sup> round for the grant reviews in the Upper Columbia region, the first in the state
- 21 years ago created by the federal government
- Nonprofit organization
- Grant making foundation
- Federal funding and partner with all kinds of agencies across the state to work on projects conservation
- stewardships
- **Krystyna's** coordinates a 6 state region (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Alaska, and ?)
- Newest program - water conservation, partner with BPA
- Receive 2 mil per year from USFWS – coordinate with SRFB but are independent
- Partnered with King County and used NFWF's federal funds as the match to fund projects less than \$50,000
- Also repeated this process with Pierce County
- NFWF handles federal appropriations as well as private donations
- Regarding proposals – NFWF agreed that agencies could submit multiple proposals, but a cap of \$60,000 was set as a limit for any one agency to receive
- \$120,000 per lead entity available for funding

- **Autumn**

- Met with RTT and Citizen Committees
- Salmon benefit, strengths & weaknesses
- Foster Creek Conservation District
  - RTT felt that this was a well thought out proposal
  - 2 issues – Foster Creek is not a high priority & issues about the gabions outlined to be used
  - RTT stated that they had reviewed this project before and it had evolved since earlier submissions
- **Britt** provided more details on the FCCD project
- **Bill** asked for clarification on the goal of this session
- **Krystyna** clarified that decisions needed to be made today regarding the awarding of funding
- The score is a combination of the RTT's score and the Citizens Committee Groups
- Omak Creek Proposal
- **Dennis** interjected that the two Douglas County projects which are asking for their match funds from the Tributary Fund are not going to be funded by the Tributary Fund. The Trib Fund is recommending that this be a phased project
- **Chuck** provided details on the design of the projects

- 3 Chelan County Projects – very similar in scope of each project, locations were different, engaged citizens in each project
  - On 3 proposals, Chelan County is partnering with WSU Cooperative Extension & Land Trust
  - **Krystyna** stated that since the County was taking the lead for these other partners that the \$60,000 limit should not apply
- **Mike** provided background on their capacity issues, and that many groups look to the County for assistance and leadership
- 3 Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation proposals
  - Respect the River Program
  - NFWF has awarded a grant to the second two projects already that compliments the work already done by WDFW
  - The Forest Service is highly interested projects 8 & 9
  - Fencing proposed is to keep people out of the riparian plantings and surroundings
- **Bud** voiced his concern and confusion about all these different groups vying for funds for projects – how does this Board and the BOCC in the implementation phase keep track and coordinate these efforts? – He wants to be involved and aware of the activities going on in his county
- The Board discussed projects 1 – 9, and felt that they should defer their decision on project 10 and await additional business plan information
- **Paul** suggested that the Board defer its decision/discussion until after the portion of the meeting with Chairman Ruckelshaus was complete.
- **Paul** asked how much money is available to fund projects
- **Krystyna** answered that between NFWF and SRFB there is about 1.94 million available / \$120,000 per Lead Entity
- Whatever is left over in the \$\$ (pot) available to fund will go into the state fund
- **Britt** mentioned that the Lead Entities had to ensure that the projects met standards that promote the Lead Entity Strategy
- **Kate** mentioned that there are projects on this list that have a low technical merit
- **Krystyna** mentioned that yes, there are projects on the list that do not have high technical merit however it is possible that they have a high appeal to the citizens and have the possibility of raising citizen awareness – which may lead to better/additional stewardship actions and would be directly related to salmon recovery projects
- **Paul** stated that he was willing to support projects 2, 3 and 9.
- **Krystyna** mentioned that the monies left over will be available for a solicitation process
- **Paul** said that he would be willing to make a site visit to the Douglas County project site to assess for himself the value of this project
- **Ron** reminded everyone that Douglas County has yet to have a project funded and this is something that needs to be addressed
- **Ron** mentioned that the Staff supports the projects and is advocating the funding of 1 – 9. These projects have gone through a sufficient process and that is a decision that we should support
- **Keith** mentioned that Council is going to start putting out RFP type guidance for project funding requirements

- **Krystyna** mentioned that perhaps in the future there will be more time to reach more of the public and citizen groups, but for this round (trial run) we wanted to move the process along since the UCSRB stepped up to the plate and voiced their interest in taking advantage of this process
- **Paul's** issues regarding the Foster Creek project include:
  - The dollar amount (largest on the list for funding)
  - 9 miles from the (**Britt** said it was 8 miles from the salmon bearing area and 9 miles from the mouth)
- **Britt** suggested that **Paul** review the entire project proposal to gain more details about the project
- **Nick** mentioned that the RTT did validate the technical merits of the Foster Creek project
- **Bud** suggested that we wait on the vote until **Paul** has had a chance to evaluate the printed documentation and make a site visit.
- The Board suggested that project 10 be revised and resubmitted later in the year for the secondary funding round
- **Krystyna** stated that she is comfortable with the decision by the Board on the approval of 2 – 9.
- **Chuck** suggested that the Board make decisions on the remaining two projects prior to the next Board meeting. He suggested that during one of the Monday morning conference calls that these two projects be approved
- Communities & Salmon publication

*Ron made the motion to accept projects 2 – 9 for funding awards. **Bud** seconded the motion and the motion was passed*

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

- IV. **11:10 am** – Meeting with **Bill Ruckelshaus**, Chair, Washington State Salmon Recovery Funding Board
- **Keith** mentioned that a more in-depth version of the presentation given today was provided to **Chairman Ruckelshaus** last week
  - **Kate** stated that the work done on the Salmon Recovery Plan assisted in the writing of the Bull Trout Recovery Plan
  - **Keith** stated that the Bull Trout Recovery Plan in turn helped to inform the Salmon Recovery Plan
  - **Keith** facilitated the review of the presentation
  - **Dennis** stated that since we do have endangered species as well as threatened in this region the tools that we have are much more limited in this area as well as our permitting limitations
  - **Dennis** also mentioned the smolts per redd benefits
  - **Bud** mentioned that this benefit needs to directly relate to relieving the endangered species obligations
  - **Chairman Ruckelshaus**
    - stressed that local buy-in is essential in this process and the implementation of these plans
    - these documents have to accommodate changes, include the adaptive management process

- not having a plan like this has its risks and consequences
- need a road map to show beginning and ending points (progress)
- need to accommodate human economics and growth as well as fish species
- stated that he has read through the plan and feels that it is a good plan
- this plan should take the place of the strategies – the projects will begin to address the issues in the plan and the plan will somewhat dictate the direction that the funding goes
- Governor’s Monitoring Forum met yesterday – he is co-chairman along with Jeff Koenings
- Those of you at the regional level need to make the state pay attention to the monitoring requirements
- We need a monitoring system where data collected can be compiled and used to it fullest capacity
- The process needs to be transparent to ensure that all of the components of the process are visible and communicated to all
- Mentioned the Council of Regions – need to keep this group going to that information can be exchanged and everyone can learn from each other
- **Paul** thanked **Chairman Ruckelshaus** for attending today and relayed his experience at the meeting last night in Omak. It was his opinion that it was the best attended public meeting that he had attended.
- **Paul** also reiterated his suggestion from last night and that was to hold more public meetings like last night in all areas of the Upper Columbia
- **Paul** also suggested that **Chairman Ruckelshaus** attend the next public meeting that this board might hold
- **Bud** mentioned that one of the biggest issues in Okanogan County is uncertainty. – He asked **Chairman Ruckelshaus** if there is money available from the SRFB to provide assessments – these assessments would allow us to quantify our direction and create benchmarks. This would provide a step by step approach instead of having a huge nebulous black hole staring at us
- **Chairman Ruckelshaus** said that funding from the SRFB shouldn’t be a problem if a Citizen Committee (and the Lead Entity) ranked it high enough to be funded – He mentioned that it was very rare that the SRFB ever changed the rankings of project lists.
- **Ron** readdressed the issue that **Paul** raised earlier about revisiting Okanogan County, he mentioned that the UCSRB has to go back up there – He can’t sign on to a plan that his neighboring county can’t live with. We need to work with the spokes-group and address the parts of the plan that those folks have issues with
- **Chairman Ruckelshaus** mentioned that the implementation of the plan is not mandated – it is somewhat self implementing
- **Paul** mentioned that one of the obstacles he saw with the Stakeholder Forum is that there are only 4 meetings scheduled and the region is big enough that it will pose a problem getting to all of those 4 meetings – and are 4 meetings enough to actually make progress
- **Dick** mentioned the issues that the Okanogan County constituents had with the HCC and the lack of access to that forum to participate
- Getting people to the table and convincing them/ proving to them that they are going to be listened to and heard is important

- **Paul** suggested that the transition funding could be used to focus on providing the forum to work with the citizens of Okanogan County
- **Dick** suggested that workshops be established during this new 60 day comment period and not wait until the end of the 60 day period to address issues
- **Bill** raised the question of how we develop a collaborative, adaptive approach that happens on a long term basis
- **Bill** suggested that perhaps this be a day-long workshop topic for the Board
- **Ron** mentioned that we have to address timelines – but do we want to provide a quality product or meet a deadline
  - We have to work with the State and NOAA to adjust the timeline
- **Chris Drivdahl** will advocate to NOAA on behalf of the Upper Columbia if they can come to **Chris** with a list of issues that remain to be addressed and how they are going to be addressed and in what window of time
- **Paul** stressed the adaptive management approach and building the trust needed to accomplish the changes in the document and gaining local support
- **Chuck** mentioned that the Stakeholder Forum tasks and responsibilities have not been established yet but will be during the August 5, 2005 meeting
- **Kate** confirmed that **Todd Peterson** and **Chris Hoffman** were chosen as the facilitators for the Stakeholder Forum
- **Bud** stressed that he wants to move forward constructively and not dwell on the past
- **Dick** suggested that having another meeting soon should be scheduled and from that meeting develop workgroups that can go forward with a specific direction
- **Bud** mentioned that he plans on setting up a meeting with Bob Lohn, **Senator Morton** and **Representative Kretz**. **Ron Walter** voiced interest in attending
- **Mike** mentioned that early on in the process Chelan County recognized that they were not having any luck with groups/representatives from groups attend their meetings so they began to attend these other groups' meetings
- **Britt** suggested that if we truly have the desire to work with stakeholders we need to gear the process to their schedules and obtain their consensus on the schedule of the process
- **Ron** reiterated that he is going to do everything he can to assist **Bud** in getting his citizens on board so that he can sign off on the plan
- **Bill** voiced his support as well
- **Chris** asked **Steve Martin** what his experience has been in the Lower Snake and creating board citizen support
- **Steve** agreed that “taking the show on the road” is very beneficial – it gave the citizens a forum to speak. Perhaps the plan is less technical but it is more widely supported
- **Keith** relayed his experience about taking the “show on the road” in Okanogan County – it was not well met. **Keith** suggested that a meeting would need to take place to assess the method on how to proceed
- **Dick** relayed his understanding of the Stakeholder Forum Facilitator and suggested that perhaps we modify that direction to include working with the Okanogan County folks

- **Bill** thanked **Chairman Ruckelshaus** for his time and attendance today and invited him to continue in dialogue with the UCSRB and perhaps attending a future public meeting in Okanogan County
- **Chairman Ruckelshaus** stated that he is committed to assisting in anyway he can to help

**Notes taken by Keith Wolf during this portion of the meeting:**

*GARNERING A HIGHER DEGREE OF PUBLIC SUPPORT WHILE PRODUCING A CREDIBLE AND EFFECTIVE PLAN.*

**Bill Ruckelshaus (BR) opening comments**

- *All planning groups having difficult with local support to some degree*
- *Essential to get as much support at local level*
- *Never quit*
- *Multiple uses confound—water is needed by everyone for many uses including fish*
- *Plans must be seen as a living document (implement, monitor and adapt)*
- *No plan comes with significant risks (local plans or agency regulation or adjudicated outcomes). Consequences of ESA (etc.) are real.*
- *Congressional support is dependent upon outcomes. High level indicators and base level criteria are needed to secure support. Balance between biological and socio-economic issues is essential.*
- *SRFB administers funds based on local priorities (state statute). Project proposal “fit” will be the criteria for SRFB funding*
- *Coordinated monitoring, state, federal integration.*
- *Transparency/Information about what is happening across the H’s to the local stakeholder*
- *Council of Regions—coordination is important.*
- *All plans will have supporters and detractors*

**Paul Ward (PW)**

- *Meeting in Okanogan was very well attended by public*
- *Comment period extended 60-days, UCSRB should host a couple of public meetings during this time.*

**Bud Hover (BH)**

- *Problem is Okanogan is uncertainty of what is enough and when is enough*
- *Benchmarks*
- *More specificity*
- *No control out of basin*
- ***BR:** Shared Strategy (Development Group is UCSRB analog). Dissenters also. All folks use a collaborative process (broad representation). Where this occurred, plans are better and have much better support. Entiat is UC example.*
- ***Ron:** ID parts of plan in Okanogan that need “reworking.”*
- *Development of plan is required, implementation is not (tribal trust??).*
- ***PW:** not enough time to address all constituents issues*
- ***BR:** have HCC and stakeholders meet in workshops*

- **BR:** work closely with NOAA to help get the agreements
- **PW:** funding?
- **KW:** Integrated process decoupled subbasin contact
- **RW:** Timelines?
- **Chris Drivdahl:** Oct. 17 agreement and process to address

**BR:** Get a good product, broadly supported is better than a better product not supported Snohomish County farmers. Alternative is development (economics?). Four alternatives. Farmers found they can do it. Use Udal process?

**BR:** Nisqually Process worked because everyone was involved (Billy Frank led)

**BR/PW:** “signing off” does not actually mean enforcement or that the plan won’t change.

**Chuck Jones:** Policy (Stakeholder) Forum meeting on August 5—Brewster

**BH:** Move forward, learn from past but don’t dwell.

**BR:** There is help to set up for success

**Britt Dudek:** Accommodate stakeholder schedules to the extent possible. When is the most appropriate schedule time.

**Steve Martin:** “Take the show on the road.” Use moderator. Info **MUST** get to HCC however.

**Bill Towey(BT):** Colville are committed to supporting Okanogan County

**BT:** BR invited to attend one “special community meetings.

**BR:** Common to write a good plan but then discover the need to adapt. Agreement on science? Hard to do as broad participation as possible. Agreement on actions? Hard to do without

- V. Recovery Planning Review
  - A. Draft Recovery Plan Update
  - B. Stakeholders Forum Update
  
- VI. UCSRB Budget Review
  - A. 2003-05 UCSRB Budget Review
  - B. Review/Update July – December, 2005 Budget
    - i. The IAC and RC& D have both signed the extension amendments
    - ii. **Dick** requested that the Board approve an extension of BioAnalysts contract
  - C. Post-Dec 2005 Budget

## **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

- VII. Public Comment
  
- VIII. Next Meeting
  - A. August 25<sup>th</sup> (Douglas County Public Services Building 10 – 3)

### Added Topics of Discussion:

- GSRO meeting changed from 8/3 to 8/10 – Agency meeting will be held on 8/9
- How do we proceed with this two meetings in regards to the Okanogan County meeting that took place
- **Bill** stated that he felt that the Board needed more time to deliberate on this issue prior to making a rushed decision
- **Ron** brought up the issue of this Board considering meeting more than once a year

- **Chuck** stated that he felt that the GSRO meeting will still provide good information
- **Chuck** suggested that the facilitator attend the GSRO meeting on 8/5
- **Mike** and **Bud** will draft an article to announce the change in the comment period
  - **Mike** will have a draft to **Bud** by Monday
- Board and Staff workshop
  - Omak 8/4 (10-4)
  - **Sandy** to check BOCC Hearing Room for availability
  - HCC meetings – dates already established
- **Keith** suggested that **Julie, Bob Bugert** and **Chuck** be recognized for their efforts as senior staff
- **Chris Drivdahl** talked about co-hosting the workshop in September
  - They invited **Chairman Ruckelshaus**
  - **Commissioner Betty Sue Morris** from Lower Columbia will be in attendance
  - Suggested the last week in harvest 30<sup>th</sup> or 31st or Sept 1
  - **Bill** has volunteered to poll the board for a suitable day
  - The Board suggested the Wednesday August 31, 2005 as the preferred date
  - Agenda items will include keynote from **Chairman Ruckelshaus**
    - **Commissioner Morris**
    - Provide ideas
    - Agenda items are welcome
    - Please note: we were unable to schedule the workshop on the Board's preferred date.
    - It is now scheduled for September 2 from 9:30-12:30 in Yakima.

### Summary of Motions

**Ron** made the motion to approve the June 23, 2005 Board meeting minutes. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Ron** made the motion to accept projects 2 – 9 for funding awards. **Bud** seconded the motion and the motion was passed