



Snake River Salmon Recovery Board
109 South Second Street
Dayton, WA 99328
509-382-4115
Email: info@snakeriverboard.org

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Meeting Minutes March 23, 2004

Board Members Present: Don Scheibe, Jay Holzmilller, Dick Ducharme, Dick Jones, Eric Myers, Butch Klaveano, Cathy LaRoque, Yancey Reser, Stuart Durfee, Les Wigen, Emmit Taylor Jr.

Others: Steve Martin, Bradley Johnson (Asotin CD), Terry Bruegman (Columbia CD), Gary James (CTUIR), Scott Althouse (Nez Perce Tribe), Lisa Naylor (Blue Mountain RC & D), Betty Frost, Darrell Tate, Mark Grandstaff (WDFW), Pam Ray (Walla Walla County Commissioner), Mike Selivanoff (for Clay Barr), Del Groat (for Dick Hastings), Kat Brigham (for Jed Volkman), Juli Post

Steve verified the quorum, 11 members present at the time the quorum was reviewed.

Welcome

Steve Martin opened the meeting by welcoming the Board members and others present.

Action Items

Legislative Update and Letter of Support for Capital Bill

Steve provided an overview of the history of Salmon/Steelhead Restoration in Washington State. He mentioned that federal government wrote an initial salmon recovery plan for the Snake River a decade ago but that implementation of that plan has largely not occurred. The Federal government looked to the state of Washington to develop a state wide strategy to recover salmon. In 1999 the state of Washington developed the document Extinction Is Not An Option. This document was the catalyst for the start of regional based recovery planning in the state of Washington. The governor's panel worked with a suite of agencies, Tribes and interest groups to describe the complexity of issues and how they were going to proceed with recovery efforts.

Steve then referred to Governor Locke's letter dated December 15, 2003 stating that NOAA endorses the State's approach to use regional boards as the organization to implement the State's strategy. Steve also showed the response letter from Bob Lohn to Governor Locke which affirmed that conceptual model of regional recovery.

Steve described this as a new paradigm where the planning and implementation goes back to the individuals of a particular region to set their goals and strategies for Salmon Recovery.

In 2002 the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board was organized after soliciting participation from more than 100 groups across the region. Many of the Board members are active participants in Watershed Planning, the Walla Walla Watershed Alliance, the Lead Entity

process and subbasin planning. This board has been provided with an operating budget of almost \$1 million dollars to prepare the Salmon recovery plan.

The board is a committee at this time; it has continued to research ways to improve the way that it has done business by examining models of non-profits, quasi-governmental and other organizations to decide how to continue to “do business”. Steve explained that the discussion started last summer to determine a model the board wanted to follow. Based on the board’s desire to hire and fire staff, exist beyond 2005, administer the plan that the board is developing, receive and disburse funds; the quasi-governmental model was chosen as the preferred route. Non-profit was the other choice and the board felt there were problems and difficulties associated with this model. Also there was the idea of continuity that if new science brought new plans to the table there would be the single, long term organization that has experience in this arena of work.

Another reason for the board to request the legislation was to provide the state with accountability, continuity, and a source the state government could become familiar with. Steve then explained how the Interlocal agreement was routed around.

Concurrent with the Interlocal routing a bill was submitted to the State Legislature to provide a law that would support the board’s existence in statute. Dave Mastin attended tonight’s meeting to provide background history for his involvement with Salmon Recovery. Representative Mastin said this locally led, collaborative approach to salmon recovery started in 1998 with house bill 2496 and the lead entity process. Rep Mastin has been following the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board with interest as it progresses forward in this new design. Rep Mastin characterized a shift in thinking where the local groups doing the sub-basin and watershed planning would be rolled-up in regional planning units. This has been born out with the same model being used and successful in sub-basin planning. His understanding was that the board chose to implement the state’s model. Rep Mastin made the recommendation to move on the legislation. Rep Mastin also explained that the language our Board has prepared mirrors the language of the Southwest District Salmon Recovery region and the Lower Columbia Board has been successful.

He went on to explain that it passed in the senate but in the house went to the Fisheries, Ecology & Parks. In that committee one of the members who has a lot of sway opposed the legislation.

Rep. Mastin articulated that because our language appears in a budget amendment, we essentially have until June of 2005 to enact the legislation or develop replacement legislation. (To read the actual budget bill go to: http://www.leg.wa.gov/pub/billinfo/2003-04/House/2550-2574/2573-s_e_ams_hewi_s5267_1_03242004.txt)

Kat Brigham then took the floor, providing the board with some historical background on the Tribal efforts to preserve sustainable harvests. She explained how the Tribal counsel felt their only recourse was to sue the federal government into action to preserve and protect the salmon and the salmon’s continuity. She mentioned *US vs Oregon* and the *Boldt* decision as examples of what they finally decided to do to protect the Tribal fisheries. She described how as a planning unit the Tribal fisheries are planning for 7 generations. She explained that the federal government promised sustainable harvest years ago and the Tribes did not see that harvest coming to fruition.

Kat then went on to say how she does not understand how this board will make getting fisheries projects accomplished easier. She described the CTUIR's work in the Umatilla basin and that they have worked in their local district to put water back in the river. Kat said they have worked to improve their partnerships with the other groups in the Walla Walla region.

At this point it was mentioned by some member of the board that the Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery Region has more clout with the state, more credibility. The model for funding projects is shifting from one that disperses funds based on limited-scope plans to one that disperses funding for strategic, comprehensive multi-jurisdictional plans at the geographic scale necessary for recovery. This includes the idea of a regional focus. Tara Galuska stated the Salmon Recovery Funding Board wants to see a single project list. Bob Bugert affirmed that the recovery plan will not supercede current authorities and commitments between the Tribes and the Federal Government.

Dick Ducharme stated that Kat Brigham makes a good point regarding the multiple planning efforts and complicated route to the implementation dollars. Dick then proceeded to list all the agencies involved with water, land use, habitat etc. Bi HCP, State Planning for WRIA 32 & 35, CDIMP, sub-basin, SRSRB, Tribe, Corp of Engineers, Counties, CRITC etc. He then said the reason this had occurred is we are running out of fish and water. With ESA it brought this issue to a head and involved the private landowners. That what it comes down to is politics and money either from the rate payer or appropriations. Dick also stated that politicians have recognized that the individual is important. Politicians pay attention to their constituents to help them make decisions.

Scott Althouse of Nez Perce Tribe commented that the NPT would send their own letter to Governor Locke. .

Gary James of the CTUIR then spoke:

1. Too much pre-project planning.
2. Too little money

The Tribes are concerned about a staff that is managing their projects. The Tribe is in favor of working with the group to build the plan but don't want the SRSRB to continue once the plan is complete as co-managers. He then stated how the Tribe has 20 years experience with the development process and project management. He is not comfortable with bringing another group to the table. He has plenty of success stories to relay and doesn't perceive how this could be improved by adding more clutter to the process. At this point the Nez Perce representatives stated they would abstain from voting on this. Steve felt strongly that this board could not go forward without consensus. Kat Brigham made a commitment to look at the Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Model. Bob Bugert was consulted as far as time frame for when Governor Locke would be signing the budget. Bob stated that it would probably be completed by March 31st.

Later Dick Ducharme, Kat Brigham and Scott Althouse rejoined the board after hammering out better wording for the letter to be sent to the governor's office. Dick read the revised letter to the board and the board with both tribes abstaining from the vote pasted the draft, revised letter. This revised letter will be presented to both Tribal policy councils on the morning on March 24th, 2004.

If both tribal policy committees agree to the revised language the letter in support of the Bill will be sent to the Governor. If either Tribe is opposed to sending the letter, then no letter

will be sent by the Board. It was agreed that only one letter would be sent (we are all in support of the Bill or we are all opposed to the Bill), as opposed to each individual or entity represented on the Board sending individual letters to the Governor.

Review, Comments and Approval of L. E. Habitat Protection & Restoration Strategy

Steve gave an overview of the monies available in the state of Washington for salmon recovery efforts through the states Salmon Recovery Funding Board; this grant cycle there is approximately \$26 million available for salmon protection and restoration projects. The Lower Columbia region has been very competitive for these funds in the past, receiving approximately \$4 million annually while the Snake River region has received about \$1 million. This is a competitive grant source and organizations that have a recovery plan or a comprehensive recovery strategy typically receive more funding than smaller, less organized areas. For this grant cycle, the Snake River Region will look to its recovery strategy developed by the Lead Entity and its committee of technical and citizens members. Steve then asked the board to approve this years' strategy.

Yancey Reser then voiced concern that there was no Strategy contained in this document for restoring water to streams that have been dewatered for bypass agreements. Tara Galuska mentioned to the board that the Strategy was for one year funding period, one funding cycle.

Don Scheibe motioned and Dick Jones seconded. The Strategy was approved unanimously.

1999 GSRO Funds Report & Request for Board to Administer Contracts

The Lead Entity had unspent project monies from a grant cycle back in 1999. The Lead Entity identified the need for a regional project database and regional reporting system for activities towards Recovery. The Lead Entity requested that these funds, in the amount of about \$50,000 be administered by the Board to fulfill a regional need. Columbia County would be the fiscal agent for the Board. The consensus of the board was unanimous to administer these funds.

Information Updates

Contractor Kick-Off Meetings

Steve provided a review of the work that he Juli have been doing with the contractors. He made copies available to the board of the process steps that we negotiated with Parametrix principle, John Marsh; EES principle Ben Floyd; Norton-Arnold principle, Chris Hoffman.

Web-Page Update

The board was then shown the design for the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board logo. The consensus was that the board didn't have a problem with the design but before they endorsed it they wanted to show it to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to see if they would have a problem. i.e. the board was concerned about being sued for copyright infringement. The board suggested that we approach the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to make sure they have no problem with our logo.

Trans-boundary Recovery Forum

No time for this agenda item. It will be discussed at the April Board meeting.