



410 B East Main
Dayton, WA 99328

phone: 509.382.4115
fax: 509.382.4116

www.snakeriverboard.org

Meeting Notes October 28th, 2008
ITV – Walla Walla Communtiy College
Walla Walla WEC & Clarkston Room #164

Board Members Present:

Walla Walla: Roland Schirman (CC), Stuart Durfee (WWC), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Dick Ducharme (CC), Richard Jones (CC) Yancey Reser (WWC)

Clarkston: Dick Isaac (AC), Doug Mattoon, (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Del Groat (GC), Michael Largent (WC)

Via Phone: Gary James (CTUIR)

Others:

Clarkston: Steve Martin (SRSRB), Brad Johnson (WRIA35)

Walla Walla: Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Terry Bruegman (CCD)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (12 board members present)

Welcome:

Chairman Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting.

Approval of September 28th, 2008 meeting notes:

Discussion: Doug Mattoon stated that his name is spelled with two t's. Anne will be certain to correct this in the future.

Action 1: Doug Mattoon moved to approve the September 28th, 2008 meeting notes. Dick Isaac seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Agenda Additions:

Discussion – Conflict of Interest

Del Groat stated that upon occasion decisions made by the board involve monies affecting a board member or staff. We should develop and require disclosures from Board members and staff when there is any association, real or perceived, between Board decisions and individual Board members or Board staff. Del Groat stated that the Martin Project has been mentioned as being of concern. He stated that this project was not brought forward through Steve (Even though this project does involve Steve's brother). Further Steve's brother was approached by an independent contractor and so the concern for a conflict of interest in this project is not an issue in this instance. There are no provisions in the bylaws for staff at this time. Dick Isaac stated that it is real important to keep all issues of Conflict of Interest as clean as can be. In the case that a conflict of interest is questioned, the board and staff need to hold them to the highest standard possible. Dick Jones questioned a quorum issue if a board member excused themselves from a vote because of a conflict of interest does this then make the quorum not valid. He asked if there was something in the bylaws that handled this situation. Doug Mattoon stated that we need to make sure that our Bylaws protect all of us. Doug Mattoon asked if the bylaws need to be reviewed to see if they need to be amended to include staff in the conflict of interest. Brad Johnson stated that RTT Members may also need to be included in the bylaws.

Task 1: Roland Schirman, Steve Martin and Anne Chapman will work on amendments to the bylaws to be presented to the board for the November meeting.

Approve September 2008 RCO & WDFW expenditures

RCO \$32,953.10

WDFW \$4,698.26

Action 2: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$32,953.10 expended in September 2008 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$4,698.26 expended in September 2008 in the WDFW Budget. Stuart Durfee seconded the motion. Del Groat Abstained. The motion carried by consensus.

9th Grant Round Project Report and SRFB Review Process:

Briefly, this year's grant round started in March and through a series of project reviews and site tours we ended up with 9 projects plus 2 alternates that the Board approved on September 4. Those 9 projects and 2 alternate projects were forwarded to the SRFB technical review panel who had comments/questions on a few projects and a strong concern about one (Tucannon River Instream Habitat Enhancement Project), if the review panel attaches the label "project of concern" to a project and the determination is not reversed, the SRFB seldom funds such a project. Steve and Kris represented the projects at a meeting in Olympia on October 15th and succeeded at changing the review panel decision. Steve explained that the reason the project was listed as a project of concern, was because the SRFB does not fund bank stabilization projects, there are areas of grey, and this project was one of them that needed clarification as a salmon recovery project, not a bank stabilization project. Kris directed the board to the project list in the meeting packet and then walked the board through the process as we prepare for next year's cycle.

10th Grant Round Lead Entity Calendar Discussion: When Does Board/Lead Entity want to receive final applications?

Kris stated that the executive committee suggested that the Board recommend to the Lead Entity Committee that the process begin earlier than last year so that there is more time at the end of the process to make revisions to projects to maximize their potential and to make certain that the applications are as complete as possible before staff submits them to the SRFB. He stated that in the meeting packet there is a staff version of a proposed schedule. Kris reminded the board that the Lead Entity Committee, per our bylaws, sets the calendar and other Lead Entity procedural policies so all we are doing here is providing a recommendation to our Lead Entity committee for their consideration.

Terry Bruegman stated that he was concerned about asking for project proposals before guidelines are set. Kris stated that in general there would be more time to review each project and make sure that they met criteria and also get a general feel as to whether or not a certain project was worth pursuing at that time. There were some cases where if the projects could have been reviewed, it would have been beneficial. Larry Hooker stated that he felt that Sponsors would not need to spend so much unnecessary time. Presented timeline would give staff/sponsors time to correct project issues in the month of August. Steve stated that this timeline where if the Board approved the project list by July, it would give sponsors more time to expand, combine, and fine tune their projects; Making our project more presentable to the SRFB.

Discussion then pursued concerning Conservation Easement – Buying vs. Regulating

Doug Mattoon stated that he has real concerns over Conservation Easements. Dick Ducharme stated that conservation easements were an alternative from buying the whole property. He stated that these Land Use Restrictions need to be looked at and conservation easements need to be handled on a case by case basis. They are not always the best answer, but they need to not be ruled out. They are just one tool in many. Critical Use Ordinances would be another.

Brad Johnson stated that the board, RTT and Lead Entity have already lost valuable people such as – Skip Mead, Jay Holzmilller, Pomeroy citizens and others due to conservation easements and these issues. This needs to be taken care of before we lose many more. Dick Ducharme stated that the board needs to be aware of cases whereby individuals may be getting a double payment for easements because of various sources. (Permanent easements, CREP, etc....).

Dick Isaac asked who determines how much money is paid for these easements. Steve stated that Independent appraisers do. Usually it is something like no more than Fair Market Value plus 5% (Approximately).

Yancey Reser stated that the board should know who is doing the appraising. His understanding is that it has been someone from Salem OR. He finds that disturbing. The board has never seen how these appraisers are coming to these

values. Doug Mattoon asked how easements are working in the Walla Walla area. Cathy Schaeffer replied that each easement is dependent on property values, market, location, etc.... She stated that if this is an Easement in Perpetuity that we need to make sure there will be an entity that is still going to be here 50 years from now. She asked if we had a report back from Cascadia?

Task 2: Steve stated that we do have the report back from Cascadia and we will be posting it to the web shortly.

Cathy stated that this is always going to be a hot topic, that the real topic should be the calendar and that we probably need to put this on November agenda.

Calendar Discussion:

Dick Ducharme asked if projects have been prioritized in relationship to the Salmon recovery plan so that project sponsors know which projects to present first? Or are the project sponsors just presenting projects and then the board is trying to decide if the project fits in the plan. Are there some guidelines to set some priorities for the sponsors?

Kris Buelow stated that yes there is the 3 year work plan. He also stated that it is really hard to have specific projects. At this point the general categories need to be refined. At the last RTT Meeting Kris had presented a new outline/look to the 3 year plan that breaks it down in each stream reach. He is planning to have the RTT review it. This information will be in the funding booklet to hand out in January. Any specific projects that are valid will also be put in the booklet.

Task 3: RTT Agenda Item – Calendar, recommendation to board.

Review Preliminary Comments on NWPCC Fish and Wildlife Program (Date extended to Dec 1):

Steve has prepared a memo that includes the key points we should consider regarding our comments to the Council on their fish and wildlife program. These comments reinforce the requests we had in our March letter to the Council. Steve is working with the other Columbia Basin regional organizations to develop a letter that is coordinated and consistent where possible. He will present the final letter to us at our next board meeting but as a starting point he wanted confirmation that the four key points remain important to the Board. The 4 key points are: Coordination, Implementation, Main stem effects, and Research Monitoring and Evaluation.

Review Preliminary Comments on NOAA's Mid Columbia Recovery Plan (comments due Dec 23):

Also included on the goldenrod page are the key points that Steve suggests we request to be included or addressed in the NOAA Middle Columbia ESU-wide recovery plan.

Steve stated that the bullets in the hand out under the Mid Columbia Steelhead ESU Recovery Plan are the main issues that he suggests that the board should comment on. Steve plans to present a final letter to the board for approval at the November meeting. Cathy had a Point of Clarification – Mill Creek issues in the Walla Walla Basin. Cathy suggested that the board might want to have an update on the status of Mill Creek issue. Dick Jones stated that if the WDFW changes its position, the board may want to change its stance. Steve stated that early information from the report suggests that improvement to some level of passage is not going to be that expensive/complicated and will actually increase flood capacity. He agreed that since the board funded the assessment the sponsor should come report the results to the board. Steve stated that if we do not have occupancy in the Mill Creek area, we cannot achieve spatial structure criteria for the Walla Walla Population. Delisting criteria may not be met if Mill Creek is not accessible. Cathy went on record saying that she supports putting it in the letter and moving forward to investigate it. She feels that the board needs to have a broader discussion at the November meeting. Steve will ask for a status report to be presented to the board at the November meeting.

Task 4: Letters of support NWPCC and NOAA Mid C recovery Plan

Task 5: Status report to board – Mill Creek

RTT Updates

Steve reported that the RTT met on Monday the 20th of October and discussed the Mid C recovery plan and approach to commenting, approach to revising the 3-year work plan, affirming changes to priority reaches (7 changes made), the hatchery scientific review group recommendations and next step, and recommendations pertaining to harvest regulations. The HSRG Report just came out last night. Steve has not had a chance to review.

Steve reported on the Harvest Regulations and recommendations that may need to be made pertaining to policies in respect to the harvest quota, he asked the board if they would like him to make recommendations on the boards behalf.

Doug Mattoon asked why we would not want to pursue a higher quota for our region. Gary James stated that he does not think that this group should get into harvest management. He does not think the group has the expertise to handle harvest management. This should be left in the hands of the state. Doug stated that he did not disagree, but that if we do not weigh in, they will ignore us. Del stated that they did ask our opinion. Brad Johnson stated that Glenn Mendel has said that he is always being told that he does not have any input from groups such as this one. Richard Jones stated from the PR stand point we need to have more fish harvest up in our area. If the sportsman does not see fish here, then they will not think that we are doing our job in the recovery of fish. Thereby wondering what we are accomplishing. Dick Ducharme stated that in talking with Glenn Mendel in the past, he has really had the feeling that the allocation of fish harvest for our region is not equitable/fair. He stated that he too feels that we (the board) should not spend a lot of time on this other than to state that we support what the local people (WDFW-Glenn Mendel, etc..) are recommending for fish harvest in this area. It was agreed that most on the board feel the same way.

Office Sign – Review Proposal

Del stated that for some time staff has been receiving comments on the poor signage at the office. Staff contacted sign development companies and have some proposals for Board review. Two of the proposals are in the booklet.

Doug suggested that the director put up a sign that is appropriate and that meets the City of Dayton's approval.

Action 3: Doug Mattoon made a motion that the Director spend no more than \$200 for signage for the office in Dayton making sure it meets the City of Dayton's sign requirements. Cathy Schaeffer seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Task 6: Order sign and hang up.

Upcoming Meetings:

- **Mill Creek Fish Passage Assessment Report – Nov 6th at WWCC**
- **USACOE Lower Snake River Sediment Management Meeting – Nov 6th in Clarkston**
- **RTT Meeting – Rescheduled Nov 11th (Veterans day) Send out note to board what date this meeting is to be rescheduled to.**
- **Mid Columbia ESU Recovery Plan Open House – Nov 20th at WWCC**
- **Touchet River Assessment Report – April 2009 in Dayton & Waitsburg**

Steve reported that the Mill Creek fish passage assessment and the results are now complete and will be presented on November 6th. This has already been discussed and he will pursue them presenting to the board at the next November Meeting. Kris is planning on attending this meeting.

The USACOE sediment management plan concept was presented to us a year ago with the concept being that it is more effective to keep sediment on the hills than to dredge it. Recognizing that dredging will continue at some level, the USACOE is developing a plan to minimize sediment delivery while maintaining some level of dredging to ensure barge traffic. The meeting to discuss this plan will be November 6th in Clarkston. Steve is planning on attending this meeting. He stated that it would be a great meeting for board members/county commissioners to participate in. Doug Mattoon stated that he would really like to have this information; unfortunately he cannot participate on that day. Steve will plan on bringing a report to the next meeting.

RTT Meeting – Steve send out a notice to board members what date the RTT Meeting will be.

Task 7: Email RTT Meeting Date to board

Task 8: Report on USACOE Meeting to board

Staff has been working with Oregon and NOAA for over a year now to develop the Mid C recovery plan while maintaining consistency with our management unit plan for the WW and Touchet. The public open house is scheduled for Nov 20th and someone from the Board should be there to welcome folks and provide a comment or two. Del Groat will plan on attending this meeting.

Steve stated that the Board approved funding for the Touchet River Assessments; the results will be presented in a couple of open houses next April. Staff will facilitate organization of the meeting. These results will be coordinated with

meetings in Waitsburg and Dayton including the Janine Castro visit. One meeting should be scheduled on the 4th Tuesday of April to be a regularly scheduled board meeting.

Set/Cancel Nov 4th, 2008 as special Board meeting:

None Needed.

Set November 25th Board Meeting:

When asking for a show of hands of board members able to participate in the November 25th meeting, Del Groat, Dick Isaac, Cathy Schaeffer, Roland Schirman, Dick Ducharme, Stuart Durfee, and Yancey Reser raised their hands. Doug Mattoon stated that he would be able to call in which would create our quorum.

Action 4: Dick Jones made the motion that the next meeting will be on November 25th held in Dayton. Stuart Durfee/Dick Ducharme seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Roland Schirman volunteered to have Chili and Corn bread.

Not on Agenda: Discussion Quorum in November

Del stated that in the event that we fail a quorum in November we may need to have plan B in place to approve the letters of support.

Action 5: Cathy Schaeffer moved that in the absence of a quorum at the November 25th meeting, this board authorizes the Executive committee to approve letters of support that may be presented at the meeting. Stuart Durfee seconded the committee. The motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:56pm.

Review of Tasks

Task Title

- Task 1. Roland Schirman, Steve Martin and Anne Chapman will work on amendments to the bylaws concerning conflict of interest to be presented to the board for the November meeting.
- Task 2: Post Final Report from Cascadia to the web.
- Task 3: RTT Calendar Recommendation to the board.
- Task 4: Letters of support to NWPCC and NOAA Mid C Recovery Plan
- Task 5: Status Report - Mill Creek
- Task 6: Order sign and hang up.
- Task 7: Email RTT Meeting Date to board
- Task 8: Report on USACOE Meeting to board

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Action 1: Motion to approve Sept 28 th Meeting Notes.	Doug Mattoon	Dick Isaac	Yes		
Action 2: Motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$32,953.10 expended in September 2008 in the RCO Budget. Additionally to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$4,698.26 expended in September 2008 in the WDFW Budget.	Roland Schirman	Stuart Durfee	Yes		Del Groat - Abstained
Action 3: Motion that the Director spend no more than \$200 for signage for the office in Dayton making sure it meets the City of Dayton's sign requirements.	Doug Mattoon	Cathy Schaeffer	Yes		
Action 4: Motion that the next meeting will be on November 25 th held in Dayton.	Dick Jones	Stuart Durfee / Dick Ducharme	Yes		
Action 5: Motion that in the absence of a quorum at the November 25 th meeting, this board authorizes the Executive committee to approve letters of support that may be presented at the meeting.	Cathy Schaeffer	Stuart Durfee	Yes		

Name	Attendance for 2008											
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	September 4 th	September 23 rd	October	November	December
Doug Mattoon	Yes			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Dick Isaac		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Jay Holzmilller	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes							
Dick Ducharme	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes				Yes		
Dick Jones	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Roland Schirman				*Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Gary James	Yes	Yes						Yes	Yes	Yes		
Virgil Klaveano	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes			
Del Groat	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Michael Largent		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes		
Gary Thoorgard						*Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

No meeting was conducted this month.

* First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member