
**Meeting Notes March 24th, 2009
WWCC Campus Walla Walla & Clarkston**

Board Members Present:

Clarkston: Dick Isaac (AC), Jay Holzmilller (AC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Del Groat (GC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Bob Johnson (GC), Bill Bowles (GC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC)

Others: Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Jason Schlee (ACC), Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Nelle Murray (ACWeed)

Walla Walla: Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Stuart Durfee (WWC), Richard Jones (CC), Roland Schirman (CC), Gary James (CTUIR)

Others: Clarkston - Steve Martin (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Larry Hooker (WWCCD),

Vice Chairman Cathy Schaeffer called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (13 board members present)

Welcome:

Cathy Schaeffer welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

Approval of February 24th, 2009 meeting notes:

Discussion: Dick Isaacs was concerned about the Head gate Dam section. He stated that the he wanted to remove the words "not a dam removal" from the second to last sentence in that section.

Action 1: Dick Isaacs moved to approve the February 24th, 2009 meeting notes amending under the Head gate dam fish passage assessment section the 2nd to the last sentence to just say "He stated that this is a fish passage project". Del Groat seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Approve February Expenses:

WDFW \$4,390.75, RCO \$28,120.25

Action 2: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$28,120.25 expended in February 2009 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$4,390.75 expended in February 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat and Cathy Schaeffer abstained.

8% Budget Cut Discussion:

Discussion: Vice Chair Cathy stated during the executive committee phone meeting last Tuesday night the people who had called in discussed the possibility of the Strategic Planning committee getting together to discuss and help plan out next grant rounds biennial budget 2009-2011. Steve reported that in anticipation for the next budget round. Each region should expect an 8% budget cut. He would like to see the Strategic Planning Committee get together to discuss what the budget will look like. He reported that if you assume that the employees, financial agent, office rent, etc all stay the same (fixed costs), then the discretionary piece of the pie would be the red piece of the budget. Steve further explained that on the WDFW Pie Chart the Yellow piece of the pie is a mandatory license cost for the Habitat Work Schedule. So as the board can see the budget cuts affect the partnership & professional support area of the pie chart.

Steve asked if anyone on the Strategic Planning Budget Committee or any other board member then followed concerning whether or not anyone would like to volunteer to meet and discuss budgeting issues for next biennium (no volunteers).

Cathy stated that it is going to take some time to go through the budget and come up with some appropriate strategies for the next biennium. She wondered if there was anyone from the committee or anyone else that would like to do this in the next 3 weeks. Steve stated that his schedule would prefer the week of April 6th – 9th or the day before the board meeting were possible dates for budget meetings for him. Steve could also send out an email when he is available and then those available could reply and have a meeting. Roland asked if Del and Cathy could get together and recruit board members to participate in this, as they are Chair and Vice Chair of the board. There were no comments. After Steve heard no comments or volunteers he then suggested that the board approve going forward with the 8% cut. Steve also stated that the details can be looked into later. Cathy suggested that since she was not hearing any input from board members, she would suggest that we go together with the 8% cut and after the cut is made meet to go through the details of exactly what that cut means in the budget. Del asked if the percentage rate had been 12% for the last 3 years or if it had changed. 12% has been the fee since we have been with WWCC.

Cathy then stated that maybe the approach was to have staff come up with exactly what this 8% cut means to this board. Cathy stated that there are two ways to go about this: 1). Staff could ask the co-leads and the watershed planning units to provide staff with an outline of what they can provide to the board for the next two years, or 2). The board can say, this is how much money we have can you use it. If you use scenario #1, it puts the onus back on the co-leads and watershed planning units to say this is what we can do for you and then the board can pick and choose what tasks they would like to contract for. Cathy stated that she would be willing to help work on this, knowing that she is a recipient of these funds and does not want to overstep.

Anne Chapman stated that it would be real helpful if staff could get a couple board members to meet with them, it would help the board members understand exactly why the monies in the fixed areas were what they are and also what needs to be done in planning for our partnership and professional services contracts in the next biennium.

Dick Jones and Del Groat then asked if Negotiations with Walla Walla Community College concerning their 12% fee for Financial Services had ever occurred. Is there cause for revisiting this fee? What services do they actually perform for us. Discussion then followed concerning what those services are. (ITV set up for board meetings, RFP's, Finance handling etc....) Steve stated that there are too many things to actually say exactly what WWCC does for us.

Cathy stated that she had recognized 3 points: 1.) Staff saying that it sure helps when the board helps with budgeting; 2.) Commissioner Jones asked is there cause for looking into the decision in working with the college; and 3.) Del Groat asked if we can renegotiate the WWCC Financial Services rate of 12%.

Cathy suggested that a letter to the College from the Board saying that we are facing a budget cut and asking for a reduction in the 12% fee be drafted. Roland Schirman commented that when our budget is cut they essentially are taking a budget cut and that on any grant that he has been involved in the financial services fee has been more like 20% or higher. Del stated that grants that he works with now are 4% to 8% and that maybe this % is not out of line, but he would like to see some negotiation because this rate is what we are stuck with for the next biennium.

Task 1: Draft a letter to Walla Walla Community College stating that the board is facing a budget cut and proposing negotiations for percentage rate reduction. The board approved empowering Steve with a board member to sit down with college and negotiate. Del stated that he will go with Steve and represent the board.

Task 2: Steve will work with staff to bring back an 8% budget cut to propose to the executive committee (Since there were no volunteers for Strategic Budget Planning) for consideration. This will be on the 3rd Tuesday of April (April 21st) @ 6pm.

Agenda Additions:

Additions to Agenda –

REMINDER Executive Committee Meeting: Vice Chairmen Cathy Schaeffer reminded the board that all board members are invited to call in on the 3rd Tuesday of the Month @ 6pm to participate in the Executive Committee meeting. This helps set the agenda for the next week's board meeting. The call in number is our AT Conference Account: 1-866-866-2244 Participant Code: 2166159 followed by the # key.

WRIA35 Contract Adjustments: Steve stated that we have anticipated unspent funds in this current RCO Budget. The guidance from the SRFB is to not spend it just because you have it, because they are providing incentive to be disciplined in our spending. These unspent funds are being negotiated so that they may be able to be applied to the next grant rounds budget. However new tasks have emerged for our Partners requiring their assistance with the emergence of the Economic Stimulus Packages (Additional tasks: Development, Review, Application and Follow through) and engaging in the Hatchery Review Team process in WRIA35 as we do our Snake River ESU Rollup to ensure that our goals

in the recovery plan are aligned with them. Brad and Steve have talked quite a bit about this. Steve then discussed different scenarios that could happen for this additional funding to happen. Brad reported that they are currently under contract with what is called Watershed support funds; these funds will be ending July of 2010. All other funds are ending July 2009. Whatever additional funds are received, the Watershed support funds will be able to be moved forward into the FY2010. Brad stated that it would be nice to have these new tasks identified and funded. Terry Bruegman asked what tasks would come off of his plate if funds were going to be swapped around. Brad stated that meetings will be held to determine that. Doug Mattoon stated that what he heard was basically a Flip Flop of funds to take advantage of funds that will be available in the future for other tasks from DOE. Roland Schirman asked if we will be in jeopardy of having a bigger cut than 8% if we do not turn back the projected unspent funds. Steve stated that it would basically be the 8% cut. However our unspent funds would be less, so that would mean we would have fewer monies to carry over. (Add to the next budget). Gary James asked if the CTUIR contract does not use all of its funds, could their contract be amended to apply those monies to Brad's (WRIA 35's). Dick Jones asked if there was a point of time that the board will know if they will get our hands slapped in dealing with these budget issues before we have answers from the RCO / Governors office, which tasks actually are going to happen before the RCO/Governors decision and which will be after? Steve stated that HRT tasks would happen after decisions are made concerning the budget and the RCO's position on it. Discussion about Brad using the current budgeted amount that he has in the WRIA 35 contract, changing the scope of work to work on the economic stimulus and then making decisions about amending the WRIA 35 contract after the decisions are made from the Governor's office, then ensued. Steve pointed out that the risks would be that if this is not supported by RCO, then Brad (WRIA 35) could potentially then be out of funding. Del Groat stated that this is not going out and buying office furniture or anything like that that the Governor's office was discouraging, this is real work. Terry Bruegman stated that if every region takes this approach then all regions will be looking at a 20% cut. Steve stated that it is really a policy decision by the board on whether or not we provide funding for Brad (WRIA 35) for the two additional tasks. Terry asked about the Stimulus Package and whether or not Brad and Jason had had a chance to talk about exactly what might be needed as far as support from Brad to the Asotin County PUD to put together the IMW stimulus package. Vice Chair Cathy stated that she felt like we needed to make a decision tonight on whether the board takes action on this matter without input from the RCO/Governor's office or we wait for their input, risking Brad's (WRIA 35) contract running out of funds.

ACTION 3: Dick Isaac moved that we amend WRIA 35's contract, adding up to \$8000. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. Cathy Abstained. Roland Schirman made a motion to table the motion for further discussion. He suggested that staff evaluate contracts and see what funds may be unused, contact those contractors and see if they would be willing to amend their contracts and use those unspent funds. Dick Isaac amended the motion to say that staff should contact all current contractors, see if there are any projected unspent funds and if they would be willing to amend their contracts by that amount to amend WRIA35's contract adding up to \$8000 to its contract. Del Seconded. Cathy Abstained. Motion carried by consensus.

TASK 3: Get anticipated unspent funds report from current contractors to board members within a week.

Lead Entity Bylaws – suggested changes appear in red font:

Discussion: Discussion concerning Section 10: Item (a) then followed: Stuart Durfee suggested that we change the wording The Co-leads may upon behalf to The Co-leads on behalf at the first of the sentence. Steve then explained Section 10, Item (a) using several funded projects as examples and stating that when these changes come, they are immediate changes and there usually is no time to wait for the next SRSRB Board meeting. Funded project monies do not get reallocated to other projects in these examples. Discussion then followed concerning adding Scope, worksites and timelines to the wording.

Steve explained Section 10 Items (b) & (c) to the board and then also stated that the code of ethics section was lifted out of our code of ethics section in the SRSRB bylaws and modified it to fit the Lead Entity.

Bob Johnson stated that he strongly felt that these changes were giving more and more authority to the co-leads and he was opposed to doing so. It was also stated that any funded project requesting a Budget adjustment of more monies needs to be brought to the board. Funded projects and any modifications asked for concerning scope, worksites, timelines could be made by the co-leads and those decisions made by the co-leads need to be reported by Steve to the board at the next meeting. Consensus of the board was that the decisions could be made by the co-leads with the exception of budget increases. It was stated that asking the Project Sponsors to come before the board for Budget increases helps keep them honest and also keeps our standards high. Wording discussion for Section 10 Item (a) followed.

Action 4: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the proposed bylaws with Section 10 Item (a) revised to state: "The co-leads on behalf of the Committee authorize funded project amendments that do not increase net costs." Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Approve 3 year work plan:

Discussion: The proposed 3 year work plan found in the meeting booklet behind the purple page was presented for approval to the board. Steve stated that the 3 year work plan now consists of several sections (Habitat; Assessments & Design; Research, Monitoring and Evaluation; Hatchery Actions; Information and Education (Outreach)) all included by Kris. He reported that the RTT was in complete agreement of the hatchery actions and so it was decided that we include this section in the 3 yr plan. Steve then turned it over to Kris, who then went over the 3 yr work plan briefly with the board. Kris reminded the board that the RTT has reviewed this entire plan. The only change at the last RTT meeting was to revise the title to state that it is a provisional plan, so that the 3 yr plan will always be a "working plan" and always be able to be amended/updated. Jay Holzmilller asked about where we are on the HSRG and the public section that never was made public. Steve stated that the final recommendations will be presented to congress on Friday. The next step is that the Hatchery Review Team will go to the co-managers to refine the HSRG recommendations. Jay Holzmilller asked if the Public will have any input. Steve did not have all the answers to this issue. Gary James stated that it might be hard to approve the Hatchery Part tonight. He needs to talk to WA Fish and Wildlife, the plan is talking about preventing hatchery fish from entering the upper Touchet totally and he thought that they were moving to the endemic brood stock. Steve stated that in talking with Glen Mendel he had made the comment that it should state to remove non endemic or non desired fish, because we do want some fish up there. Gary stated that the second thing is that the Tribe has proposed through their BPA/MOA to work with the co-managers to look into supplementing Mill Creek. That is not included in the plan yet. Steve recommends approving all but the hatchery section.

Action 5: Cathy Schaeffer made a motion to approve the proposed 3 yr work plan with the exception of the Hatchery Section. The Hatchery Section should be reviewed at a future meeting. Dick Isaac seconded the motion. No Discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

IMW implementation contractor selection:

Discussion: Steve updated the board that we were approved for \$377,000 from the RCO to implement the IMW. There are 3 components to the contract, Tagging Fish, an interagency agreement with F&W, and buying the equipment. Steve reported that the contract is still being negotiated with the College. So that discussion is pretty much tabled. Imbedded with this contact there will be a sub contract, there is currently a RFP out asking for applications to use a contractor to do the work. The RFP has needed to be re-advertised due to complaints from State that there was not enough advertising and no state applications received. Steve asked that the board give staff direction on how to approve / or authority to approve contract with applicants. Cathy asked if RTT would be a help in reviewing the applications and selecting a contractor. Steve stated that the time frame makes it really hard.

Action 6: Dick Jones moved to authorize the chair of the board to review applications and contract with applicant with help of staff and the RTT. The motion was seconded by Roland Schirman. No discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list:

Discussion: Steve reported on the process that was used to select the projects that originally made it to the list. He reported that he used the 3 yr work plan and came up with 16 projects that met the criteria (Consistent with the recovery plan, can be implemented in the next 180 days and was at least 1/2 a million dollars). RTT then narrowed those down to the list presented in the meeting booklet (6 projects). Steve stated that because of timelines, it was done this way. These will be contracts between NOAA fisheries and the project sponsors listed. There is a tremendous amount of work that the project sponsors will be doing in the next couple of weeks. (Duns #'s, CRC Numbers, etc will all need to be acquired). He reported that we are the only region that had all of their projects approved for application and that we have a Governors letter of support. Most regions just submitted all of their projects without prioritizing. Letters of support stating that they believe their project has all the permits in place and that they have a design complete enough that they can develop a construction budget in 180 days are due with Applications by April 6th, 2009. There is \$8 million worth of projects. Kris Buelow and Dave Karl are the primary support team. Brad Johnson and Tom Schirm have all dedicated their time to these opportunities for the next two weeks. Gary James stated that these are great projects and stated that he thought the total cost monies in the Mill Creek Channel and the 4 consolidation could be reported as much more (Cost share monies), due to their BPA monies are kicking in monies. There is another \$3 million that will go into the Mill Creek Channel in the next couple years and Rick Jones is also working on this.

Jay Holzmilller commented about the project on Headgate Damn. That he had talked with at least 1/2 dozen people and he would not want to repeat what some had said about this project. Steve stated that the problem of addressing that this is not a DAM REMOVAL PROJECT is being discussed. Kris stated that Brad had brought up using weirs to provide FISH PASSAGE. Jason stated that when they went with the state engineer to the site, there was a lot of conversation. He felt that when Brad brought up the weirs, he felt a lot more comfortable. They will be scheduling meetings with County Commissioners and others to show all the options and also showing this newer option, this will be done to address all people's issues. Brad stated that it is a Juvenile Passage Barrier this is the real issue.

ACTION 7: Moved by Dick Jones to approve NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list. The motion was seconded by Stuart Durfee. The motion was Amended by Gary James to include cost share updates. There being no discussion the Motion carried by consensus.

USACOE WW basin feasibility study report:

Vice Chair Cathy Schaeffer reported that Marge who was going to present was sick and could not make it tonight. She asked if Gary James had any information on this. Dick Jones stated that the board needs to have more information to make informed decisions on this and he thought that the board should defer this until all can have the same information in front of them. Gary stated that they were down to basically reservoir storage or Columbia pumping to provide major flow argumentation and that the COR wants them to provide some preference on that so that they could proceed with the process. Gary James stated this is a fairly complicated subject. Cathy stated that this topic needs at least 1 1/2 hrs to discuss, in her experience. It would be nice to have the boards' perspective and that there are some pre-input opportunities, he will talk with Marge to see if this topic would still be good for the board next month. Del asked if the presentation would be better to be presented to the RTT, and then the RTT make a recommendation to the board? It was stated that when there are other meetings about this subject, it would be nice if the board was notified about them and then those that are interested can participate in them. Is there some other way to do these presentations, such as a couple hrs before the meeting online through Power Point with the support of phone access? Gary announced that Thursday afternoon they will be meeting with the COR. It is at the Walla Walla COR of Engineers at 1pm.

Hells Canyon Temperature Analysis and Temperature Control Structure (TCS):

Discussion: Steve stated that the Idaho Power Hells Canyon Complex is up for relicensing and when the EPA reviewed the conditions of relicensing it suggested putting a sub surface outlet structure to decrease the Snake River by 3 degrees in the time period of September through November. This is real important for Snake River listed Fall Chinook, (which is one of our most critical populations) as well as improves Steelhead survival that is holding there. The applicant offered 2 scenarios: (1) to do watershed restoration up in the tributaries – EPA found that this was a really good idea but it would not decrease water temperature in the snake river (2) If we start spilling water off of the bottom of the reservoir we are going to be stirring up silts, etc that may be a worse condition for the salmon in the Snake River area. EPA would like a position from the SRSRB. If you have a position then we can engage the Governors Salmon Recovery office and the Dept of Ecology under the clean water act and an ESA. Steve stated that he again knows that this is too big of a paper to discuss at this board meeting. Dick Jones asked if the board wanted the RTT to review and then make a recommendation to the board. Del's reaction is that this is politics that we may not want to get into. Steve asked if it is a simple letter to EPA stating that in their consideration of the relicensing, that any improvements to fall Chinook would be supported by the Snake River Salmon Recovery board. Del stated if the temperature change truly worked, it would be great but there are a lot of ifs. He also stated that we in the beginning we wanted to stay out of damn politics. Gary Thorgaard thought this would be a great idea. Dick Jones stated that he would not support anything that would open the door to removal of damns on the Snake River. Consensus was observed as not being possible on this subject. Brad suggested inviting someone from Idaho Power to discuss this. Both EPA and Idaho Power have recently presented to all the co-managers and none of them took a stance on this. Gary James stated that there is no damn removal proposed here not even a passage of fish, the only thing considered here is some late summer/fall temperatures. He believes that this board can get into these huge political issues as long as we state that we operate on defined limiting factors from plans and we try to implement projects to address them. That temperature is a limiting factor and that if there is a way to reduce temperature and as long as it does not affect water quality, etc., the board would support that. That the SRSRB should not be afraid of stating following the guidelines and addressing a limiting factor as long as there are no negative repercussions. There were again concerns about addressing Dam Removal and not wanting to support this. Language would be real crucial.

RCO Administration changes and budget status for planning purposes:

Discussion: Steve reported that the SRFB boards recommendation is moving the WDFW contract over to the RCO and having only one set of funds (one contract). No Comments, No Discussion.

Legislative update (Salmon Act, WW Basin Partnership, etc):

Discussion: Steve reported again that Dick Ducharme was real helpful in putting together a statement on revising the house bill. The house under this new initiative to consolidate and streamline government stated that they were going to consolidate the Lead Entity, the Governors Salmon office and the Salmon Recovery act and put them all under RCO. In the past the board has stated that we really value the independent Governors Salmon office. Steve reported that the house bill died in committee. Senator Jacobsen in the senate introduced a bill to integrate Lead Entity and RCO, but keep an independent Governors Salmon office. Steve and Dick contacted Senator Jacobson and asked that he ensure that the house bill had the same wording as the Senate bill he introduced. So the Governor Salmon office will be retained.

Cathy Schaeffer reported that the Walla Walla Basin – House Bill is #1580 now; it is in the rules committee and is moving through the Senate Floor. It should soon be in the Governors' office soon.

Discuss staff job descriptions:

Cathy asked if there should be a committee set up to review staff job descriptions, she also commented that these job descriptions were presented to the board at last meeting for review. Dick Jones supports taking no action which states that the board supports the current job descriptions. All agreed.

Snake River ESU rollup status report – 10am, April 10 @ Clarkston WWCC:

Steve stated the purpose of this meeting, Steve commented that he can work with WWCC Staff to get ITV setup at campus if needed. Del stated that ITV capability is at their office in Pomeroy also. The meeting would be in the same room as where the Clarkston meeting is tonight.

April 28th & 29th Floods, Farms, Families and Fish meetings:

Cathy Schaeffer announced that Alex Ammonette and the Conservation district will be presenting their results of the assessments that were funded a 1 ½ ago by the board with the community of Waitsburg. This is the Touchet from Waitsburg down to Bowles Junction. The contractor will come to the board meeting on the 28th and do approx a 20 minute overview and then do a follow-up meeting in Waitsburg at the Waitsburg Elementary on the 29th, 7-9pm. Janine Castro and Brian Bair, Anthony Olagario, and Michael MacNamara will special guests.

Confirm April 28th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting

Discussion: Discussion concerning having our regularly scheduled meeting as usual or at the Seneca Building in Dayton to take advantage of the presentation during the board meeting then followed.

ACTION 8: Dick Jones moved to move the April 28th meeting to Seneca building in Dayton. Stuart Durfee seconded. Discussion then followed concerning exact location. Motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:26 pm.

Review of Tasks

Task Title

Task 1: Draft a letter to Walla Walla Community College stating that the board is facing a budget cut and proposing negotiations for percentage rate reduction. The board approved empowering Steve with a board member to sit down with college and negotiate. Del stated that he will go with Steve and represent the board.

Task 2: Steve will work with staff to bring back an 8% budget cut to propose to the executive committee (Since there were no volunteers for Strategic Budget Planning) for consideration. This will be on the 3rd Tuesday of April (April 21st) @ 6pm.

TASK 3: Get anticipated unspent funds report from current contractors to board members within a week.

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
ACTION 1: Approve February 24 th , 2009 Meeting Minutes - with Amendment.	Dick Isaac	Del Groat	Yes		
ACTION 2: Approve February Expenses: WDFW \$4,390.75 - RCO \$28,120.25	Roland Schirman	Doug Mattoon	Yes		Cathy Schaeffer, Del Groat Abstained
ACTION 3: Motion to Amend WRIA35 contract up to \$8000 with unspent funds from other contrats.	Dick Isaac	Bob Johnson	Yes		Cathy Schaeffer Abstained.
Action 4: Motion to approve Lead Entity Bylaws with Amendments	Roland Schirman	Doug Mattoon	Yes		
Action 5: Motion to approve 3 yr work plan, except the hatchery section.	Cathy Schaeffer	Dick Isaac	Yes		
Action 6: Motion to authorize chairman to review RFP Applicants for IMW contract , make a selection and contract with selection with help of staff & RTT	Dick Jones	Roland Schirman	Yes		
Action 7: Motion approve NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list with cost share updates	Dick Jones	Stuart Durfee	Yes		
Action 8: Motion to have regularly scheduled April meeting in Dayton at the Seneca building.	Dick Jones	Stuart Durfee	Yes		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13 th , 2009	January 27 th , 2009	February 24 th , 2009	March 24 th , 2009	April	May	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Dick Isaac	Yes		Yes	Yes								
Jay Holzmilller	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Dick Ducharme	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Dick Jones	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Gary James	Yes	Yes		Yes								
Del Groat		Yes	Yes	Yes								
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes										
Stuart Durfee		Yes	Yes	Yes								
Michael Largent	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Gary Thorgaard	Yes		Yes	Yes								
Kelly Farnsworth			<i>Guest</i>	Yes								
Bob Johnson	Yes		Yes	Yes								
Billy Bowles			<i>Yes</i>	Yes								

* First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member