



## **Snake River Salmon Recovery Board**

### **Meeting Minutes June 7, 2005**

**Board Members Present:** Doug Mattoon, Dick Isaac, Jay Holzmilller, Dick Ducharme, Dick Jones, Eric Myers, Gary James, Del Groat, Gary Cole, Yancey Reser, Stuart Durfee, Ed Schultz

**Board Members Present By Phone:** Cathy LaRoque

**Others:** Dave Karl (WDFW), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Bradley Johnson (ACCD), Glen Mendel (WDFW), Mark Wachtel (WDFW), John Andrews (WDFW), Steve Martin, Juli Post

Steve verified the quorum, 12 members present at the time the quorum was reviewed.

### **Welcome**

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

### **Approval of April 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

### **Approval of May 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting Notes**

Steve requested the board review the meeting minutes and asked if there were any changes or corrections.

Action 1: Steve asked for a motion to approve the April 26<sup>th</sup> board meeting minutes and the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting notes. Ed Schultz made a motion and Dick Isaac seconded. The board approved the motion by consensus.

### **Discussion Items**

#### **1. Status of Recovery Plan – comments will be received tonight and through Monday June 15<sup>th</sup> from Board members only**

The recovery plan is scheduled to be released on June 22<sup>nd</sup> and again will be mailed out to the board. The board will then be asked to approve the plan at the June 28<sup>th</sup> board meeting.

#### **2. Transition Period Functions – incorporate public and agency comments approved by the board; threats criteria; implementation framework and 2-year Workplan; NMFS modules; coordinate/communication with local, state federal and Tribal entities**

Steve provided an overview of plan work and revisions that will occur during the transition period. These revision include addressing the public and agency comments that have not yet been addressed, development of the threats criteria that NMFS has requested to be added to the SRSRP, a detailed 18-month work plan and the 15 year implementation plan. Steve also explained that as of the start of the board meeting tonight none of the NFMS modules have been received.

#### **3. Note from the Director**


Steve shared with the board that the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office has offered him a job working for them in Bob Bugert's former capacity as the eastern Washington representative for the Governor on

salmon recovery planning. Steve explained how he turned down the fulltime position as he wanted to see the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board plan through to the conclusion. So then the Governor's Salmon Recovery office offered him a part time position so that he could complete his work with the SRSRB. Steve expressed that it would be ½ time for the SRSRB and ½ time for the GSRO.

Doug Mattoon thanked Steve for his effort and said the great progress that the board had made was attributable to Steve. Steve stated that several of the tasks he was planning on doing for the Board during the transition period will need to be contracted out. Ed Schultz questioned if we had enough money for contractor services. Gary Cole doesn't like a contractor to quit in the middle of a job; Cathy reminded the Board that Steve's contract expires June 30 and that he will have completed the work the Board contacted with him to do. Jay Holzmilller sees value in Steve being in the GSRO and that the region will benefit from this relationship.


#### **4. Report on the response to public and agency comments**

Kevin Malone reported to the board that about ½ of the public and agency comments have been added to the summary document. Parametrix will send out the technical document on June 23<sup>rd</sup>.

 Deadline was set for board comments on summary plan on June 13<sup>th</sup> at noon.

These are the comments provided by board members at the meeting:


Section 1.2 Columbia County doesn't see value in mentioning an economic effect from this plan. Page 38 Columbia County will not support purchase of land as a mechanism for salmon recovery. Dick also thought there would be a smolt to adult ratio section and adult to smolt, requesting that a better analysis be done of the fish that leave the Snake Region. Kevin mentioned that this information is located in the area of the technical document where the viability curves are located, section 4.5 within region and 4.6 out of the region effects. The results of smolt production in the technical document, listing the Casey Baldwin study.

 We don't define the smolt numbers in the technical document, there was a request that we do that, both SAR and the smolt to adult numbers. Also on the bottom of page 57 it states the out of basin regional effects. There was also mention of the Caspian Terns and the desire to include their effects on salmonid production. Kevin Malone reminded the group that this is just the summary document. Dick Ducharme would like to see percent numbers. Kevin Malone made a note of this comment.

Section 6.2: are the EDT statistics for the mortality number on hydro recent? Yes it is recent and they go down to 1%.

On page 27 would like to see a positive paragraph under hatchery. Also add an integrated hatchery definition 10%. We don't have to sign up to NOAA criteria. A long term goal of hatchery's is to get to that goal of 10% hatchery fish with the wild fish. Someone asked the question: "shouldn't we take the numbers out and just make a general statement about trend?" Kevin said that NOAA/Cooney was pretty clear on the hatchery module and the long term goal. Jay Holzmilller made statement that this is a locally driven plan. We should try to influence NOAA with the goals we set forth that may diverge from what NOAA's plan states. That if we don't at least try to tell them what we are thinking they won't be aware of it, including telling them what we want as a hatchery goal. Gary James doesn't want us to limit ourselves to this goal he would like us to generally have more flexibility. Steve made the comment that he is excited that the board is discussing hatchery objectives and strategies. The suggestion was

made to report what is happening now and make a statement that we support as a long term goal to reduce dependence on hatchery fish.

 Steve asked Kevin to write a paragraph on current hatchery facilities and production for the summary document (it is currently in the Technical document but a synopsis of the information needs to appear in the summary document).

On page 27 Dick Ducharme had a concern about fall Chinook spawning. Majority of the spawning habitat was between the mouth and Washington boarder with Idaho. Ned to give a percentage of the area that is in Washington of the total.

Page 46 Yancey has concern about the Little Walla Walla. Yancey will provide materials on the exact wording he wants to use to express his concern about the loss of alluvial function in the Walla Walla basin. Capture the concepts of between the states of Washington and Oregon, the environment of the basin, the alluvial property of the basin and the fish and wildlife. Editor's Note: John Marsh captured that the statement that Yancey Reser made at the last meeting and his statement read, "Develop a fair and equitable sharing agreement so that the West Little Walla Walla river does not dry up in summer." Dick Ducharme commented that he would like to see much more monitoring and comparison of yearly flows.

#### **5. Other discussion items by the Board**

None

### **Action Items**

- 1. Consideration of NMFS Modules (estuary, hydro, harvest, hatcheries assessments) – options:**
  - a. Include them as submitted by NMFS in the June document**
  - b. Summarize them in the text and reference them as attachments/addenda**
  - c. Defer the discussion until the Transition period (after June)**

Action 1: No modules have been received. No action.
---

- 2. Consideration of 11 unresolved USFSW comments – options:**
  - a. Include them as submitted**
  - b. Defer the discussion and review to Transition period (after June)**

Steve would like to revisit the eleven USFWS comments. It was decided that the board will include commentary 1 through 4 in the June 2005 document. The comments five through eleven will be deferred until the transition period.

Action 2: Steve asked for a motion to approve the inclusion of the first four comments made by USFWS in the June document. The motion was made by Yancey Reser and 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Del Groat. The board approved the motion by consensus.
--

**3. Board approval of the final edits to the June 2005 Version of the SRSRP including revised maps and the 15-page Lead Entity write up intended for the Recovery Plan technical document.**

The board discussed the maps produced by EES at length. Listed here are the requests for change. Add more of Couse Creek to the priority area. Have RTT revisit Pintle and lower Mill Creek. Defer until after June to RTT. It was questioned why the Mill Creek flood channel is a protection area. Steve responded that the Mill Creek working group is resolving the age-old question of what to do with Mill Creek and that at this time it is identified as a protection area for salmon recovery planning because we do not want it to get any worse. Steve expressed that we are going to enlarge the individual MSA maps to provide greater definition/detail.

Dick Ducharme would like to see the inclusion of urban areas in priority protection areas. Cathy LaRoque said that it's a little late in the game to try to add this material. It would be better to plan this for the transition period so that it can be vetted through the public process. Dick Ducharme made the comment of what type of message do you send when you don't include urban areas in a protection category?

Steve shared the Lead Entity strategy with the board. A strategic approach to salmon recovery. He would like to receive comments back on this material. It was decided that final comments on all this presented material need to come to Steve by June 15<sup>th</sup>, these include final edits, the map and the lead entity write up.

Action 3: Steve asked for a motion to approve the final edits, map and lead entity document. The motion was made by Doug Mattoon and seconded by Dick Isaac. The board approved the motion by consensus.

**4. Decision on dispersing unspent funds in the amount of approximately \$9,000. Recommendation: Allocate \$5,000 to Parametrix for final maps and comments incorporation; retain the remaining approximately \$4,000 to be utilized at the discretion of Board staff for goods, supplies and services.**

Steve provided background on the remaining funds and using them to prepare better maps for the document. Also stated that the Asotin County Conservation District is going to provide \$2,500.00 for the maps and the total bill for the preparation of the maps from Parametrix will be about \$5,000.00.

Action 4: Steve asked for a motion to approve the budget revision. The motion was made by Dick Jones and seconded by Ed Schultz. The board approved the motion by consensus.

**5. Approval of revised transition budget**

Steve went over the transition budget with board members. Explained some of the budget items that he had presented. The board requested he change the Governor Gregoire Ceremony to Celebration of the release of the recovery plan to NMFS. Gary Cole doesn't see the value in having a party. Gary felt it was more appropriate to use that money on projects on the ground. The board asked how our budget compares with other recovery regions. Steve stated that it is on average \$50,000 less than the other region's requests.

Action 5: Steve asked for a motion to approve the transitional budget. The motion was made by Dick Jones and seconded by Doug Mattoon. The board approved the motion by consensus.




**6. Consideration of sending a letter of support for Hofer Dam implementation funding.**

Steve presented the request for a letter supporting the Hofer Dam project. The are funds available through Mike Hewitt to make this project happen.

Action 6: Steve asked for a motion to approve sending a letter of support to Governor Gregoir for the Hofer dam project. The motion was made by Dick Ducharme and then 2<sup>nd</sup> by Yancey Reser. Then Dick decided that he is in favor of this project but that he couldn't support the letter until such time that the project is approved by the Implementation Work Group. Dick Ducharme withdrew his motion. Steve asked that if the Hofer project went through the IWG, could the Board send the letter of support. Yancey Reser motioned and Gary James 2<sup>nd</sup>. No consensus. It went to a vote and passed providing it went through the IWG. Steve will send the letter after confirmation that the project is supported by the IWG.

## Review of Tasks

### Task Title

-  Deadline was set for board comments on summary plan on June 13<sup>th</sup> at noon.
  
-  We don't define the smolt numbers in the technical document, there was a request that we do that, both SAR and the smolt to adult numbers. Also on the bottom of page 57 it states the out of basin regional effects. There was also mention of the Caspian Terns and the desire to include their effects on salmonid production. Kevin Malone reminded the group that this is just the summary document. Dick Ducharme would like to see percent numbers.
  
-  Kevin will write paragraph on hatchery fish inclusion in the counts and the goal of the board.

## Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Meeting Minutes Meeting Notes	Ed Schultz	Dick Isaac	Yes		
1. No modules have been received. No action.					
2. Steve asked for a motion to approve the inclusion of the first four comments made by USFWS in the June document.	Yancey Reser	Del Groat	Yes		
3. Steve asked for a motion to approve the final edits, map and lead entity document.	Doug Mattoon	Dick Isaac	Yes		
4. Steve asked for a motion to approve the budget revision.	Dick Jones	Ed Schultz	Yes		
5. Steve asked for a motion to approve the transitional budget.	Dick Jones	Doug Mattoon	Yes		
6. Steve asked for a motion to approve sending a letter of support for the Hofer dam project. The motion was made by Dick Ducharme and then 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Yancey Reser. Then Dick decided that he couldn't support this project unless it was approved by the IWG. Dick Ducharme withdrew his motion. Steve asked if the Hofer project went through the IWG could the Board send the letter.	Yancey Reser	Gary James	No	Didn't get the vote tabulated.	Yes

Name	Attendance for 2005											
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Doug Mattoon	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Dick Isaac	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Jay Holzmiller	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes						
Dick Ducharme		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes						
Dick Jones	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Eric Myers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Gary James	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes						
Butch Klaveano	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes							
Del Groat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes						
Gary Cole		Yes	Yes			Yes						
Cathy LaRoque	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes						
Les Wigen	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes							
Ed Schultz	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						