

UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, October 28, 2004

1:00 am – 5:00 pm

Chelan Fire Station Conference Room

232 E Wapato - Chelan, WA 98816

Board Members Present: Ron Walter, Chelan County
Craig Vejraska, Okanogan County
Chuck Jones on behalf of 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; Dennis Beich, WDFW; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Elizabeth Gaar, NOAA; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County;

Action Items

1. **Bob Bugert** will double check the contractual obligations that the UCSRB has towards Crab Creek

Suggested Action Items

1. **Dick** suggested that the Board consider having more than one meeting a month sometime near the end of January through June 2005
2. **Dick** suggested that the Board use January 27, 2005 as a day for presentations from contractors – by the end of the day the Board would be knowledgeable about the decisions that they need to make and every one would be up to speed and on the same page with what work has been done and needs to be done
3. **Julie** proposed that Staff develop this process and have it ready for the Board meeting on November 19, 2004
4. Regarding HCC updates – It was suggested that the last presentation that **Chip** gave would be beneficial for the Board to hear
5. **Bill** suggested that the Board/Staff create a designated representative and an alternate – **Bill** thought that when LEAG is making decisions there needs to be a UC representative at the table and someone their to monitor and track their activities
6. **Julie** suggested that the Board decide on how they want to handle Crab Creek
7. **Keith** suggested that the Board determine how they can support the RTT

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

Ron moved to have Bill Towey chair the Board Meeting until Paul arrives. Julie seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

- II. **Meeting Agenda Review** (Ward)
It was agreed that the agenda items should be rearranged to accommodate Elizabeth's attendance so that she could begin her discussion

- III. **Review/Approval Meeting Minutes** (Ward)
A. September 23, 2004 Board Meeting

Julie moved to approve the September 23, 2004 Board Meeting minutes with amendments, Ron seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

- IV. **Review of Outstanding Action Items** (Rohr)

- V. **Budget Review/Update** (Rohr)

BOARD ACTION

- (Open at this time) (Ward)

BOARD DISCUSSION

- VII. **State Recovery Plan** (Ward)

- A. General Update (Nason)
 - B. Update/Report by Contractors (Nason)
 - C. Habitat Coordinating Committee Update (Wolf)
 - D. Report of October 20th IAC Quarterly Review (Nason)
- It was reported that the sections currently out for review are very readable
 - There was some discussion on comments received thus far, and it was suggested that there needs to be some structure created for processing those comments
 - Regarding comments received, If the HCC cannot rectify the comments then those comments will be brought to the BOARD for solution
 - **Bob Bugert** reported that the State is feeling comfortable with the review process
 - **Dick** reminded everyone about one of the concerns 2 quarterly reviews ago, was the public involvement – currently each of the counties have submitted outreach plans and implemented those plans
 - **Bob Bugert** also reported that the State is comfortable with the technical as well as the public outreach that is being done
 - **Mike** mentioned his conversation with **Chuck Peven** in which they discussed how much of **Tracy's** time and budget is being eaten up with the review and disposition of comments
 - **Dick** said that the HCC had set up a specific internal review process
 - **Dick** noted that there will be comments that will be received along the way, but some of those may change as more of the document is revealed
 - **Keith** stated that there will be a line by line review of the plan done by the HCC
 - **Keith** reported that the HCC, during it's next meeting, will also be defining the rest of the process as far as meetings, deadlines and milestones
 - **Dick** voiced his concerns about **Alison Squier's** lack of response for submitting her SOW etc
 - **Keith** mentioned Action effectiveness planning

- **Keith** talked about the benefit cost matrix – **Robert McDonald** will be assisting with that (low cost/high benefit to high cost / low benefit)
- **Mike** voiced a suggestion that we need to have a discussion regarding policy
- **Dick** suggested that the Board consider having more than one meeting a month sometime near the end of January through June 2005 ☒
- **Dick** suggested that the Board use January 27, 2005 as a day for presentations from contractors – by the end of the day the Board would be knowledgeable about the decisions that they need to make and every one would be up to speed and on the same page with what work has been done and needs to be done ☒
- The management plan will be the section least completed in January 2005 – but all the other work needs to be done prior to that anyway
- **Julie's** issues voice the following concerns:
 - The HCC addressing all the technical comments – she proposed that the comments go to the Recovery Staff not the HCC - Doesn't want the technical body making the decisions for the whole plan
 - **Keith** concurred that there is not a clear process defined for the handling and processing of all of the comments
 - **Keith** felt that we need to show what our process are – why we choose what we choose and why we don't choose some
 - **Julie** thought that it may be appropriate to have the Staff review the comments and have the Staff disperse those comments to the appropriate groups to take care of those comments
 - **Julie** proposed that Staff develop this process and have it ready for the Board meeting on November 19, 2004 ☒
 - **Dick** stated that there is a process for state and federal comments but there is not a process for public comments – this will be discussed at the next staff meeting
 - Regarding HCC updates – It was suggested that the last presentation that **Chip** gave would be beneficial for the Board to hear ☒
 - Julie brought up **Chuck Peven's** idea about a diagram regarding costs and benefits
 - **Keith** stated that it is necessary to monitor and evaluate the costs and benefits
 - **Keith** mentioned that on the whole this discussion gets couched as only creating negative impacts and he suggested that this angle needed to be rethought on how to change it to a positive angle
 - **Chuck** mentioned the cost effectiveness discussion that took place at the TRT and there is help

VIII. Regional Structure / Implementation

(Ward)

- A. Council of Regions Discussion (Jones)
 - Next meeting is on December 16, 2005
 - December 15, 2005 is when the governor hands over the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Plan to NOAA
- B. LEAG Discussion (Towey, Dagnon)
 - **Bill** attended the last LEAG meeting – he reported that the topic of biggest concern was the lack of Upper Columbia representation
 - **Bill** also reported that there was good information and discussion regarding the combining of 2514 and 2496

- **Bill** suggested that the Board/Staff create a designated representative and an alternate – **Bill** thought that when LEAG is making decisions there needs to be a UC representative at the table and someone their to monitor and track their activities ☒
 - **Mike** mentioned that the LEAG has always struggled with why they are in existence and what they should be doing
- C. Board Discussion / Strawman Proposal (Rohr, Nason)

IX. Subbasin Planning (Ward)

- A. Update
- It was reported that for last night's meeting only two citizens showed up and they left because they were from Crab Creek and their plan was not being reviewed
- B. October 27th Public Comment Hearing in Wenatchee
- C. Next Steps/Update (Fixit Loop) re: Remaining Subbasins
- **Keith** mentioned that they are about ready to share the working drafts with tribes, counties etc – next Tuesday
 - **Chuck** suggested that if there is anything that we have done in the recovery planning arena that we want to add to the SBP it needs to get it in during the comment period
 - **Dick** reported that RC&D has received a signed contract from NPCC and all of the entities need to get their own contract into RC&D – should look similar in verbiage etc to the last contract with RC&D
 - Please note that **Wendell Black** will be vacationing in Arizona – he departs November 12, 2004 – will need to get contracts and amendments to him prior to that for signature
 - We all have 90 days after completion date to get invoice in and to receive payment
 - **Dick** mentioned the deliverable dates and approval dates for the response loop
 - **Julie** suggested that the Board decide on how they want to handle Crab Creek. ☒
 - **Dennis** will be having a meeting with the East Columbia and Quincy Irrigation Districts
 - **Dennis** said that it appears that with all the opposition to suggestions that Crab Creek will be added to the Upper Columbia
 - **Keith** mentioned that it is going to have to be addressed
 - **Bob Bugert** mentioned that Crab Creek was not included in the Upper Columbia's contract and therefore not required to take that on
 - **Bob Bugert** will double check the contractual obligations that the UCSRB has towards Crab Creek ☒
 - **Mike** said that for the Wenatchee and the Entiat they are trying to coordinate the work that **Chuck Peven** is doing to enhance each

X. Bonneville Environmental Foundation September 23, 2004 Meeting (Ward)

- **Bill** felt that the meeting with **Todd** and **Angus** was very beneficial
- There are field trips planned on November 4, 2004 in the Entiat, November 5, 2004 in the Wenatchee and December in the Okanogan
- **Denny** mentioned that **Sarah** and **MaryJo** did an excellent job and deserve a thank you

XI. Staff Report (Nason)

XII. RTT Report (Bugert)

- 2-day workshop two weeks ago – went through all the monitoring efforts and reviewed all of the 2004 ? and
- Lots of trouble with BPA initially
- Tributary Fund for ? looking for someone to do a technical review of the projects – The RTT has said that they will do the technical review so now it goes back to ? for approval – should streamline the process
- **Mike** asked about the funding for the RTT since Bob will in the future not be with the GSRO
- **Bob Bugert** answered that there continues to be a need for a coordinator
- **Dick** mentioned that there is money for that type of project
- **Keith** suggested that the Board determine how they can support the RTT ☒
- **Keith** also suggested that we may need to address this in our budget discussion
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned that **Chris Jordan**, NOAA could fund the RTT but that would be a last resort sort of effort
- RTT is funded by LE efforts
- **Mike** feels that we as a Board and Staff need to support the ongoing role of the RTT and suggests that the Board decide on this
- **Dick** thought that one of the things this board could do is put some pressure on the ? committee to provide some funding

XIII General Report/Discussion (Rohr)

- A. Hatchery/Harvest Workshop/Panel Presentation
October 28th, 6:30 – 9:00 pm
Chelan Firehall

XV. Assurances Discussion (handouts) (Ward)

- **Elizabeth Gaar**, NOAA (confirmed) and **Mark Miller**, USFWS (invited)
- Stages of assurances (**Elizabeth Gaar** would like to get an idea of where the UCSRB is at)
- Early development Stages– TRT policy, her presence here today,
- Assurances are regulatory assurances,
- B Stage - Interim Local Plans – Subbasin, regional plan – adopted by
- Technical Guide, State’s Salmon Recovery Model
- **Chuck** asked about the “adoption” factor – how does it happen, who adopts it?
- **Ron** stated that we don’t adopt things we can endorse them and let the groups discuss and adopt as appropriate
- **Elizabeth** was appreciative of this discussion – she will take back recommendations to amend the draft as discussed
- **Ron/Julie** mentioned that even if the county adopts a plan it will still need to provide a mechanism to implement it into the codes and ordinances
- **Elizabeth Gaar** would like to take back with her the suggested changes, reword the draft and get it back in front of this group for them to re-review it
- **Keith** asked how the endorsement process – happens. **Elizabeth Gaar** – knows that documents won’t be complete but can still endorse even though not all the parts aren’t fully developed
- Common science assessment – would save a lot of time and money
- **Keith** mentioned the out of basin effects
- **Lynn Hatcher** is the chair for the domain teams

- **Elizabeth Gaar** mentioned the domain teams – endorsed by **Bob Lohn** (?)
- **Keith** mentioned section equity
- **Mike** asked if there was a way to coordinate and streamline permitting/permitting issues – if there is, that would be very helpful
- **Bob Bugert** mentioned the Enhanced role of the Permitting Department
- **Julie** asked about the verbiage surrounding the common science portion – what does that mean – that the individuals have to take on a common science perspective
- **Elizabeth Gaar** stated that it would be a common science per plan not a regional one
- **Elizabeth Gaar** said that this also brings up the need for discussion on common science for the ESU
- Needs to be an analysis of can we get there from here....science risk assessment
- **Elizabeth Gaar** confirmed that NOAA doesn't have any additional resources to embark on any other directions
- ESU wide plan needs to
 - Different levels of risk across the populations will exist
 - Policy issues exist
- **Keith** mentioned VSP
- Persistence – definition of
- Regulatory assurances tools
 - Actions need to be fairly specific (approvals, changes to codes, fixing of barriers etc) Contractual agreements (commitment to implement, there's a take, and there is ?)
 - Actions or programs with the primary intent to restore or protect
 - (assurances for this set should be easier than the next one)
 - Enhancement of survival permits, 4D rule – limit 8 (not applicable because of the endangered species in our area)
 - (more complicated because of land owner etc)
 - **Keith** asked how land use issues were separated from ?
 - SalmonRecovery.gov – website
 - The Army Corp of Engineers has these posted too
 - NOAA's website should be up and running within a month – an announcement will be sent out
 - **Mike** asked about RBA's – is there a way to comment on them?
 - Looking for an example that is ripe or will be ripen soon so that we can demonstrate how it works
 - **Keith** asked about monitoring assurances – how are assurances monitored (performance and metrics)
 - **Elizabeth Gaar** described where we are headed, (resource limitations) – get programmatic ? - get strategic and efficient
 - **Bill** suggested that **Mike** and **Julie** might be good resources for the discussions about examples ?
 - **Bill** also mentioned that he and **Ron** have been appointed as point of contacts for the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
 - **Elizabeth Gaar** does have some follow-up notes and perhaps another meeting could be arranged to discuss specific examples at that time
 - **Ron** asked about the bullet that states complete or draft plan.....internal deadline of NOAA

GENERAL DISCUSSION

XVI. Public Comment (Ward)

- none

XVII. Next Regular Board Meeting (Ward)

- A. November 19, 2004
- B. 9:00 – 2:00
- C. Douglas County Public Services Building, East Wenatchee

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm

Summary of Motions

Julie moved to approve the September 23, 2004 Board Meeting minutes with amendments, **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Ron moved to have Bill Towey chair the Board Meeting until **Paul** arrives. **Julie** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.