

---

**Meeting Notes May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009  
USFS Building, 71 W Main, Pomeroy, WA 99347**

**Board Members Present:**

**Pomeroy:** Del Groat (GC), Bob Johnson (GC), Bill Bowles (GC), Richard Jones (CC), Roland Schirman (CC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Michael Largent (WC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC),

**On Phone:** Gary James (CTUIR), Yancey Reser (WW)

**Others:** Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Jason Schlee (ACC), Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Mike Delarm.

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (11 board members present)

**Welcome:**

Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. Due to a wreck on the Alpowa grade some members did show up a few minutes late. A quorum of 8 was present at start of the meeting.

**Approval of April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting notes:**

**Action 1:** Roland Schirman moved to approve the April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

**Approve April Expenses & RCO Budget Adjustment Contingency to Fixed Assets \$2182.22**

**WDFW \$8,338.27, RCO \$38,735.16:**

**Action 2:** Dick Jones made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$38,735.16 expended in April 2009 in the RCO Budget and the RCO Budget Adjustment from contingency to fixed assets in the amount of \$2,182.22 for Steve's new laptop. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$8,338.27 expended in April 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

**Additions to Agenda:**

- Economic Stimulus update – Steve reported that there has been no new news on the projects submitted.
- Biop/MOA update – Basically no new news. Gary James stated that it is the Judges opinion that the habitat is inadequate and there was no fall back for the plans added into it. The judge just didn't want alternative planning to not be in progress. The tribes have plans in place for at least the next 10 years.  
Questions about the PAC SRF funding and it being reduced were then discussed. Steve reported that the funding will actually be increased. He also stated that when new administrations are in place, it is important to convey that we just need to stay the course.
- ESU Roll up – No updates.
- RM 42.5 – Steve reported that Alex Amonette's Spring Rise Organization is not large enough to encumber the liability insurance for the assessment project and it has been agreed that the Walla Walla Conservation district will inherit this project and it will move forward.

**Briefing on pre-proposal project review and next steps/schedule:**

Del stated that Kris has a list of 20 pre-applications for this year's lead entity funding cycle that were submitted earlier this month. There may be additional applications which are due June 2 so the information Kris is providing is very preliminary. If you want to engage in the process the next formal review will be July 20. Kris is the lead on this process so contact him if you want more information.

Kris directed the board to the meeting booklet, behind the light blue page. He quickly went over the 20 projects submitted. He then went to the Lead Entity Calendar for the 10<sup>th</sup> grant round and reminded everyone of the timeline for the 10<sup>th</sup> project round. The board was reminded that they are welcome to participate in the tours or scoring/review

meetings. RTT/LE/SRSRB/Sponsors will comment on submitted projects and prescore them on July 20<sup>th</sup>. A few additional projects are expected to be submitted. Some of the projects will probably drop out of the list in the booklet due to the comments of the RTT/LE/SRSRB/Sponsors at their last meeting.

### **Board Restructure – nomination of new officers for election in June:**

Discussion: Del stated that our bylaws call for annual election of officers so tonight he would like to take nominations then in June vote on those nominations. Anne commented that she didn't want to speak for Cathy, but she thought that Cathy will need to be replaced due to the fact that she may not be on the board much longer. Steve confirmed Anne's statement.

**Action 3:** Dick Jones moved to nominate/elect Del Groat for chair, and Del Groat moved to nominate/elect Roland Schirman for Vice Chair. Doug Mattoon seconded both nominations. The motions carried by consensus.

### **Budget status update:**

- **Negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC & alternate fiscal agent discussion**

Del stated that at the request of the Board, Steve and he (By phone) met with Dr. VanAusdale and his financial assistant to discuss reducing the business services fee charged by WWCC. He also stated that the Asotin PUD's offer was still there, but the timing is not good, due to the fact this change would need to have to happen next week.

Steve stated that Dr. VanAusdale agreed to reduce the fee from 12% to 6% for all contracts except our base operating contract because our "additional" contracts are easier to manage as they are typically one-time agreements. We expect to manage \$866,000 dollars over a 12-month period of which \$333,000 is our base operating budget. In a nut shell the revised business services fee results in a \$27,000 savings. Steve quickly broke down the WWCC base contract and the additional ones at 6%.

- \$333,588 – Base operating budget (12%)
- \$65,000 – Lead Entity program budget plus \$10385 for HWS license fee (6%)
- \$377,910 – IMW budget (6%)
- \$80,000 – plan revisions (6%)

Dick Jones asked about Health insurance for the employees. Concerns about computer software, etc were then discussed. Timeline was discussed and not having enough time to make a change at this time.

Del stated the last quote from the Asotin PUD was \$35,000 on the first \$400,000 and then 6% after the first \$400,000. Del stated also that for the future he has talked with Steve about the possibility that the SRSRB staff meet with the PUD staff. He stated that there would be only two people that Anne would work with at the PUD. He stated that Tim at the PUD would like to do this because they would like to bank the money and it would help to defray costs.

Discussion then turned to the budget and Steve's testimony in Olympia resulting in our RCO/WDFW budgets not being cut this next year as projected. Steve reported that he had testified earlier this month to the SRFB regarding the importance of the human infrastructure necessary for salmon recovery implementation and that the SRFB should award the maximum amount it has authority over for projects. In a nutshell he signaled that now is not the time to slow the rate of progress or to suggest that reductions in people will not impair our ability to implement salmon recovery. He also noted that the Snake River board has been very disciplined in its spending and once again will be returning unspent funds which he then followed up with a request that the SRFB acknowledge the efficiencies gained and the discipline demonstrated in the Snake by awarding us \$80,000 to update our plan. Due to his testimony, the SRFB decided to not cut the RCO/WDFW budget for 2009-2010. This has helped to keep our partners whole for this next year.

Del then asked Anne to explain the IMW budget and administration costs that were being taken out of that budget to help also keep the SRSRB partners whole. Anne explained that WWCC had advised staff to budget for administrative costs in the IMW Budget. The proposed IMW budget has administration fees of 20% of Steve, Kris and Anne's salaries and 25% of office costs for 6 months. Due to the fact that work for the IMW would be coming out of the SRSRB office.

Dick Jones stated that if we look at another fiscal agent we really need to study this for 6 months. Take our time, etc.... before we make any big decisions. Del agreed, he stated that just on the IMW contract alone we had saved \$21,000 by doing these negotiations with WWCC.

Steve stated that when he thinks of WWCC he thinks of the Verizon commercial with all the people standing behind the Verizon guy. There are so many people who are working for us. Whether it be software, technical, billing, travel, retirement, health insurance, etc there is always someone there to answer staff's questions.

Dick Jones stated that if we pass a contract tonight we should stick with that contract for the year. We need to honor our commitments and our contracts. If we want to look into switching fiscal agents, then we need to take our time and compare apples to apples before making any switch.

Doug Mattoon stated that he thought that WWCC had done an excellent job for us and that there really is no reason in his eyes to change. If you start changing contracts all the time you are just looking for trouble. He also stated that Steve and Del should be proud of their negotiations with Dr. VanAusdle.

### **Approve negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC:**

**Action 4:** Dick Jones moved to approve the negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC and contract with them for one year, Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

### **Hatchery management plan (HSRG/HRT) updates – Mike Delarm and NOAA:**

Steve stated that Brad had invited Mike Delarm of NOAA to provide an overview of the context, process and recommendations pertaining to hatchery reform so that we can understand them and revise our recovery plan as warranted to address the recommendations. Steve thanked Mike Delarm for coming.

Mike stated that it was his understanding that we wanted updates on Hatchery actions and big picture items. The 3 items he will report on are USD Oregon Process, HRT report Schedule, and the HSRG report.

**HRT** - Fish and wildlife (hatchery review report) are in the process of meeting with co managers in the next couple of months to make sure they have the data correct. They expect a Stake holders meeting in September or early October and at the same time they expect their draft report to go out for public comment.

**USV Oregon** – is essentially where the Federal Government intervened on the behalf of Columbia River tribes to protect their fishing rights and resulted in a Columbia River fishing plan in 1988. Another agreement was negotiated and is current through 2017. Hatchery plan got implemented into this plan as a settlement agreement. It was Court ordered. This was partly due to the tribes acknowledgement that given the limitations on endangered species they would be unable to obtain their fishing quotas, so the hatchery element was brought in. Plan does not address tributaries. (5 tribes, 3 states and 3 federal agencies all part of the agreement) This case is still under the jurisdiction of Judge Keen in Portland, OR. This case will be open for as long term as Mike can see. The agreement has the abundance base element. This Agreement was made so that the tribes will balance catch with each other. It looks like States are catching more than tribes right now, so Mike felt that the agreement will be adjusted to even out the catches between tribes and states.

Bill Bowles asked about 17,000 fish catch in the lower snake vs. the 3,000 in our upper snake area. Asking is that fair? Mike stated that you needed to understand that that is only the main stem and not the tributaries. Mike explained that this is totally a state within state decision on how the harvest is allocated. More discussion followed.

Gary Thorgaard asked about the higher return of Jacks. Mike stated that there has been speculation that the conditions in the ocean for the last 2 years has been really good conditions not being as good since the 50's, growth rates have been good so they are seeing higher returns of Jacks. Other factors may be run times seeming to be later due to water temperatures and/or Sea Lions. Many people are looking at it and scratching their heads. There is a court order on the amount of spill that has to occur at a certain time of year right now. Steve stated that that USV Oregon is very tight and it is set. He also stated that the board needs to remember that in conversations in past meetings it has agreed that it wants to advocate for a more equitable distribution of catch when the sport allocation comes out. This is good for the economics of this area.

**Task 1: Steve:** *Dick Jones stated that he felt that the board needs to advocate filling the 3 vacant seats in the Fish and Wildlife commission that are vacant with the Governor. We as a board need to promote filling the seats with someone from our area to represent our position.*

**HSRG Recommendations** – all the reports are readily accessible on their webpage. There are many different sections. Congress set up the Hatchery Review group to basically review all the basins in the Columbia River Region.

The mission was to review each and every hatchery program. Look at the program to see if they were compatible with conservation objectives in place and also to consider and find programs that would maintain harvest opportunities.

Discussion then followed. Genetics and Hatchery fish vs wild fish were some of the topics.

One recommendation from the HSRG review was that the release of the Lyons Ferry Stock into the Tucannon was recommended to stop.

**Task 2: Anne:** *Link to reports on the SRSRB website to HSRG reports.*

## **WRIA 35 Update – Phase IV, year 2; Hydrogeo Briefing; Habitat Assessment:**

Del stated that Brad is here to provide information about where the planning unit is with respect to Phase 4, a recently completed hydrogeology study and a habitat assessment.

Brad reported that July 1<sup>st</sup> they will be starting Phase IV, Year 2. They will be setting stream flows at Pataha Creek, Almota, and others yet to be determined. Brad wanted to give a heads up to the County Commissioners hoping they will participate in the meetings. It will be a very interesting year.

\*Hydrogeo Study – Brad reported that the Hydrogeo Study was completed & it is on the WRIA 35 website. Brad had draft copies of it here on CDs. Brad asked for the board to support their report. Comments are due on June 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> on the draft report. They looked at the wells within the Asotin and Alpowa watershed and also looked at a seepage run at the same time. They were trying to come up with a connection between ground water and surface water within the Alpowa and Asotin. The consultants did not come up with any connections or concerns. Ecology is not real satisfied with this report. Discussion concerning wells and the effect of them on the water levels then ensued.

Doug Mattoon asked if it would be appropriate for the RTT to review and provide their comments to the SRSRB on the report. The deadline would not be met, but at least the board would have their perspective.

\*WSU did a stream flow habitat assessment and the draft report is just now out. Basically the report says that where there is flow, there is fish.

***Task 3: Ask RTT to comment on Hydrogeo Report and provide comments to SRSRB.***

## **Approve budgets for July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 as presented in meeting booklet:**

- **\$333,588 – Base operating budget**
- **\$65,000 – Lead Entity program budget plus \$10385.00 for HWS license fee**
- **\$377,910 – IMW budget**
- **\$80,000 – plan revisions**

**Discussion:** Steve explained the proposed budget presented in the meeting booklet for the next action item. The individual line items are based on last year's expenses for each item except partner contracts. The partner contracts (Planning Units, CTUIR and Conservation Districts) appear in grey to illustrate how much the Board funded these organizations last year. He again explained the administrative cost coming out of the IMW budget. (Twenty percent of staff payroll and twenty five percent of office costs for 6 months) This helped keep our partner contract amounts whole for the coming grant round. Fiscal agent calculations were also discussed. WWCC does not charge 12% on the 12% they charge, so they have a unique formula to figure out the fiscal amount charged. (Contact Anne if questions)

Steve explained that the action item is to approve the overall budgets in the following amounts: Base operating of \$333,588, Lead entity of \$65,000 plus \$10,385 for HWS license (\$408,973.00), \$377,910 for the IMW with expenses as shown in the table in your booklet, and \$80,000 for plan revisions with details forthcoming.

**Action 5:** Dick Jones moved to approve the proposed IMW budget of \$377,910 & the proposed RCO/WDFW budget of \$408,973 at the sub total level for grant year July 2009- June 2010. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

## **Approve partner (PU/CTUIR/CD) deliverables and budgets; contracts to be presented in June:**

Del then explained the deliverables proposed by each partner are provided in your booklet and are the basis from which we need to develop budgets for these contracted services. He also explained that the Governor's office requires that they review each of our personal services contracts before we award them so we need to be prepared to approve them in June contingent upon meeting the accountability standards set by the Governor's office.

Steve explained the deliverables presented to the board (provided in the meeting booklet). He stated that the deliverables needed to be approved and then the contracted amounts needed to be approved. WRIA 32 (Cathy Schaeffer) has also provided her requested contracted scope of work and deliverables for 2009-2010. Anne reminded the board that when CTUIR agreed to amend their contract to help WRIA 35, it was with the request that their contract be renewed at the \$10,000 level. Dick Jones stated that it made more sense to him to have each partner build deliverables they could provide that would fit into the allotted budget they will have.

Discussion concerning the CD contracts and the WRIA contracts, the amount of work required and the contract amounts then followed. Terry Bruegman was concerned that contracts with the CD's vs contracts with the WRIA's were

out of date. Scopes of work required from both organizations are, in his opinion very similar and the amounts of monies are very different. He asked if this was appropriate.

**ACTION 6:** Dick Jones moved to not take any action on the partnership deliverables at this time and instructed staff to “wipe the slate clean” and then work with each partner to develop scope of work and budget within the combined amount of \$98,000 for partner services needed from the Board, Billy Bowles seconded it. The motion carried by consensus

***TASK 4: Steve - work with each of our partners to negotiate a scope of work within the \$98,000 total, looking at the differential deliverables and budgets based on the needs of the Board.***

### **Confirm June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting and location:**

**Discussion:** Del suggested we meet via video conference in June unless someone has a reason to meet in a single location. He also reminded the board that the executive committee call occurs the third Tuesday of each month and is a great opportunity to informally discuss the agenda and by doing so, should shorten the length of our business meetings.

**ACTION 7:** Doug Mattoon moved to have the June 23rd meeting at the WWCC Campus in Clarkston and Walla Walla, ITV format. Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45pm.**

## Review of Tasks

### Task Title

**Task 1: Steve:** *Dick Jones stated that he felt that the board needs to advocate to fill the 3 vacant seats in the Fish and Wildlife commission that are vacant with the Governor. We as a board need to advocate this, certainly with someone from our area to represent our position.*

**Task 2: Anne:** *Link to reports on the SRSRB website to HSRG reports.*

**Task 3: Ask RTT to comment on Hydrogeo Report and provide comments to SRSRB.**

**TASK 4: Steve - work with each of our partners to negotiate a scope of work within the \$98,000 total, looking at the differential between CD's, WRIA's and CTUIR's scope of work and their contracted amounts and determining whether they are equitable and fair.**

## Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
ACTION 1: Approve April 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2009 Meeting Minutes - with Amendment.	Roland Schirman	Bob Johnson	Yes		
ACTION 2: Approve April Expenses: WDFW \$8,338.27 - RCO \$38,735.16 and RCO Budget Amendment \$2,182.22	Dick Jones	Bill Bowles	Yes		Del Groat abstained
ACTION 3: Nomination/Election of new officers. Dick Jones nominated Del Groat for chair, Del Groat nominated Roland Schirman as Vice Chair.	Dick Jones Del Groat	Doug Mattoon	Yes		
ACTION 4: Approve negotiated fiscal agent fee with WWCC and approve contracting with them for one year.	Dick Jones	Doug Mattoon	Yes		Del Groat abstained.
ACTION 5: approve the proposed IMW budget of \$377,910 & the proposed RCO/WDFW budget of \$408,973 at the sub total level for grant year July 2009- June 2010	Dick Jones	Doug Mattoon	Yes		Del Groat abstained.
ACTION 6: not take any action on the partnership deliverables at this time	Dick Jones	Billy Bowles	Yes		
ACTION 7: Moved to have the June 23rd meeting at the WWCC Campus in Clarkston and Walla Walla, ITV format.	Doug Mattoon	Billy Bowles	Yes		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	January 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	February 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	March 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	April 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	May 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Jay Holzmilller	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Dick Ducharme	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes							
Dick Jones	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Gary James	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes						
Del Groat		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes				Yes						
Stuart Durfee		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Michael Largent	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes						
Gary Thorgaard	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes						
Kelly Farnsworth			<i>Guest</i>	Yes								
Bob Johnson	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Billy Bowles			<i>Yes</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes						

\* First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member