

## **Snake River Salmon Recovery Board**

### **Meeting Notes September 11, 2007**

**Board Members Present:** Dick Jones, Eric Myers, Dick Isaac, Doug Mattoon, Jay Holzmiller, Yancey Reser, Cathy Schaeffer

**Board Members Present By Phone:** Gary James, Del Groat, Michael Largent, Stuart Durfee

**Others:** Steve Martin, Anne Chapman, Terry Bruegman (CCD), Bradley Johnson (WRIA 35), Cheryl Sonnen (ACD), Glen Mendel (WDFW)

Steve verified the quorum, 8 members present at the time the quorum was reviewed which met the quorum requirements.

#### **Welcome**

Steve introduced Anne Chapman as his new Administrative Assistant. He also announced that Walla Walla Community College was officially our Fiscal Agent. He explained that Anne was appointed by him due to the fact that you can appoint someone when they work ½ time. He also stated that he has taken the job description for the Project Coordinator to WWCC, they will be advertising in the local newspaper in the next few weeks for that position.

#### **Approval of August 28th Board Minutes**

**Action 1:** Steve asked for a motion to approve the August 28th board meeting notes.

Gary wanted to make sure that under the Lead Entity Project List, there was mention of 14 projects submitted totaling approximately \$1.9 million and that the regional allocation was \$2.25 million and about \$400,000 that was not going to be used. He also stated that he didn't see where there was a recommendation from the board of the board putting a project together for a regional barrier inventory and assessment project, whereby WWCC would be the project sponsor and the board would be the project coordinator and provide oversight. It was found that this was stated in the meeting minutes on the bottom of page 2/top of page 3, first paragraph and also under Discussion Item 3. It was also stated that that project was submitted. The Lead Entity scored but did not rank that project because the proposal was turned in after the deadline and it would not be fair to all the other sponsors who have worked long and hard on their projects. It is listed at the bottom of the Project Review Sheet. **Action 1: Dick Jones made a motion to approve the board minutes and Eric Myers seconded. The board approved the motion.**

#### **Agenda Additions:**

**Action 2:** Steve wanted to talk about the need of development of a 3 year Capital Improvement Plan to get projects teed up and ready for project sponsor consideration in the future grant rounds. We need to review our 18 month and 5 year implementation plans. Brad, Matt and Steve met today. They reviewed the existing implementation plans and found that about 1/3 of the projects have been done, 1/3 are ongoing/long term projects, and 1/3 are yet to be done. The implementation plan needs updated and add to that list any new projects that fit the Program Plan. Steve, Brad and Matt would like to propose that the projects be broke down into 6 categories: Capital, Monitoring, Assessments,

Policy and Regulatory Requirements, Artificial Production and Agency Commitment. Within those categories, each project would be categorized as Identified/Completed, Ongoing or New. This would allow the board to identify new projects for sponsors to go after. Steve wanted to be very clear that this list would not limit sponsors to just these projects. That this list would serve as a set of guidelines, a wish list, things to do list, in the absence of sponsors having other projects. This item should be added and he would like to see it discussed in the next 6-8 months.

### **Approve 2007-08 Annual Operating Budget**

**Action 3:** Steve explained the Budget. Since WWCC is now our fiscal agent, we have two grants the RCO (Resource Conservation Office) and the WDFW (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife). He explained the Staff, Contractors and Operations categories, which the board has previously approved. He explained that there is a new item called Contingency in the Operations categories. This line item comes from having a significant reduction in some expenses, now that we have WWCC as our fiscal agent: (reduction in Rent, Telephone expenses, employees of college, etc). The college uses a fund called contingency for monies that are unaccounted for. Steve stated that WWCC charges 12% for being our fiscal agent. Audits are included in the Business Services (12%) cost and are conducted through the college.

**Action 3: Yancy Reser made a motion to approve the 2007-08 Annual Operating Budget, Doug Matoon seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

### **Revise By-Laws to authorize Director to approve monthly reimbursement requests to WWCC**

**Action 4:** Steve explained that now that WWCC is the fiscal agent, there is a significant amount of paperwork to go along with the reimbursement requests/purchase requisitions that needs to be signed by an authorized member of the board. This would not mean budget amendments or contract approval, just voucher approval.

The amendment would read:

*The Board authorizes its executive director to approve monthly payments/reimbursement requests to the Board's fiscal agent. Such authority does not extend to making budget amendments or approving contracts as these authorities are retained by the Board. [Approved 09-11-07]*

Doug Matoon moved to accept the By-Law Revision, Yancy Reser Seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Dick Jones wanted to know where the checks and balances were. Who is going to sign off on these expenses to make sure that they are not being paid to an inappropriate expense. Anne stated that a report will be given to the board monthly from WWCC and that Sue Willis at the college also reviews these expense requests. A list of the vouchers paid will be submitted to the board for approval (after the fact) at the board meetings. Cathy Schaeffer also stated that in the By-Laws it already states in the paragraph above the amendment that: The fiscal agent of the board shall make payments based upon the direction of the Board.

**Action 4: The motion was made by Doug Matoon, and seconded by Yancy Reser. Motion carried.**

## **Approve letter to Bob Lohn, NOAA regarding FCRPS BiOp Remand**

**Action 5 - Discussion:** Steve explained the yellow highlighted part of his letter, stating that it simply states that we do not want to see the action agencies moving away from populations that are showing improvement and moving the monies to populations that are in dire straits. We would rather see the funding remain in the improving population areas. Don't make bad investments by going to population areas that are unlikely to achieve recovery. Steve wanted some fixed data or habitat improvements that would validate that there are improvements in the Tucannon, Asotin and in Walla Walla areas. He was looking for some empirical data to support his claim that Asotin has been improving in the last 20 years. Glen Mendel stated that it would take time to find the data to back up those statements. It would be better to delete that area and state that empirical data could be supplied upon request.

The letter that was sent back in May pertaining to the 6 primary issues the board had with the perspective of the action agencies had on this was that we wanted them to implement their funding consistent with the priorities in our recoveries plan, and that we want them to include Asotin Spring Chinook. In the action agencies analysis the state departments' recovery technical teams' conclusion was that the Asotin Spring Chinook are extirpated (gone). Our recovery plan and the TRT requires that both the Asotin and Tucannon Spring Chinook population be viable in order for the MPG to be delisted which makes the action agencies able to walk away from it. Glen Mendel stated that the restored populations need to be the appropriate stock in these areas. One of the things that we have to do is Genetic Analysis on the Spring Chinook that are coming into these areas if they are rapid river (inappropriate stock), we may want to exclude them and introduce appropriate stock in these areas. It is very coincidental to him that for many years they were getting 0 reds and as soon as they introduce Rapid River Spring Chinook in the Clearwater, we start seeing Spring Chinook in Asotin.

The third and fourth point is the gap between current productivity and current adult abundance. What it means to be viable and that gap analysis is what is driving their funding. The bigger the gap, the more funding goes that way.

Point five was to avoid the use of low productivity in making funding decisions.

Point six we need to insure that monitoring occurs to validate the responses that were predicted in providing the action agencies in their use of the credits.

Steve's understanding is that the BiOp is supposed to be coming out at the end of October issued by NOAA. It will be their Biological opinion on the continued operation of the Federal Hydro Power system, largely driven by the commitments of the action agencies. The Board discussed re-emphasizing our position that we can do all this tributary work, but if there is not substantial improvement in the smolt to adult survival, then we really don't get to our goals. We fully expect that as part of the recovery plan they follow through with substantial improvement. It is key in our total success. .

Steve will add a reference to the recovery plan and the section on the Hydro system Operation improval. He will delete the empirical data usage and comment that empirical data can be supplied.

**Action 5: Doug Matoon moved that we approve the letter to Bob Lohn, deleting reference to imperial data in Asotin, and include the reference to Hydro Power in our Recovery Plan. Eric Myers seconded. Motion Carried.**

## Finalize the Lead Entity Ranked Project List

**Action 6 - Discussion:** Steve reviewed the finalized LE Ranked Project list, which included the 14 projects plus 1 (Barrier Assessment) that was not ranked. Conversation followed about specific projects. Steve explained there was more explanation about the individual projects in the meeting packet under Lead Entity Projects. Budget revisions due to math errors, inclusion of ineligible costs and other issues will be addressed prior to final entry by sponsors to PRISM. The barrier assessment request will be reduced if the budgetary amount is over the allocated amount. It would not be fair to ask the other projects to reduce their amounts since the barrier assessment was introduced after the deadline and not ranked.

Yancy Reser would like to see the appraisals that are coming in for the conservation easements. It is the belief of many that some of the appraisals coming in are very over stated. How does an appraiser out of Salem know the proper appraisal amounts in this area? There are policy issues: How is the evaluation done and should we require an evaluation to be done before we approve a project?

Because if the evaluation is much less than the quoted amount, dollars are left on the table and if the evaluation is more than the quoted amount then project sponsors are probably going to walk away from the agreement. A lot of changes in County zoning laws and State Regulations in Walla Walla County are resulting in a lot of For Sale signs and property not moving. This is a place where the tax payer could get seriously hurt.

State policy is to not pay more than 10% of the appraised value of the property. (Example: If something is valued at \$100,000 then can not pay more than \$110,000)

The Appraisal/Easement issue can not be resolved for this project round, but the board needs to take a good look at the policies of easements and how the appraisals are done. (How do you really truly fairly appraise a property?). Doug Matoon stated that he has a real problem doing easements if it is not for Habitat Protection and Restoration. Yancy Reser: Appraisals may need to be required to be done before projects are proposed. Questions were raised about the cost of appraisals. This could vary greatly depending on where the appraiser would be from and whether or not you are paying lodging, per diem, etc.... Costs should not be more than \$2500-3000.

Steve stated that the land trust is aware of this issue and that they may propose a grant for the pre-appraisal of these easements before a project proposal is developed in the next year. Or another suggestion would be that they spend their own monies for appraisals.

Discussion about the current projects and how many of them are Conservation easements followed. Steve stated that Terry Bruegman, Cheryl Sonnen, and several others put together a Conservation Easement Criteria for the last round. (Can only be so far away from the creek, has to have a restoration component, etc...) The conclusion of the board was that the Conservation Offices did not want to draw to tight a box around conservation easements because they didn't want to limit the opportunities out there. They agreed to set some guidelines: They would like to see projects located in the channel migration zone/riparian area that to ensure that deed restrictions on the channel migration zones that prevent any other kind of land development. We asked the sponsors to follow the guidelines, which they largely did this year.

This year of the proposed Conservation easement projects, Steve and Others actually looked at the Wicher project, Coppei Project and then the Lower Mill Creek project.

**Action 6: Dick Jones moved to approve the LE Ranked project list including the unranked barrier assessment. Cathy Schaeffer seconded the motion. Del Groat & Doug Matoon Recused or Abstained from the vote. Motion Carried.**

## **Barrier Assessment and Project Priority List for Next Round**

**Discussion:** Discussion followed about the barrier assessment needs. The board concluded that they would work with the county commissioners, engineers, fish biologists, etc... to develop a priority list for willing sponsors in future as a guideline for projects that meet the plans guideline criteria. Projects such as The Grande Ronde River barrier, Cougar Creek, Grouse Creek are a few examples of ones that could be prioritized the college could help with designs on these projects also. By developing a priority list for these barrier projects on state highways locally, some of the projects that have not been ranked high enough on the State of Washington list could receive funding. By developing a list for all other roadways, county, private, forest service etc..... the board is being proactive and providing strategic guidance for implementation of the ruling.

**The meeting was adjourned.**

**Next Board Meeting: October 23rd, 2007 at 6pm. Location to be determined contingent on Teleconferencing capabilities through WWCC in Walla Walla and Clarkston. If not available, meeting will be in Dayton Office.**

## Review of Tasks

Task Title

Task 1:

Task 2:

## Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Meeting Minutes- August 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2007	Dick Jones	Eric Myers	Yes		
Approve 2007-08 Annual Operating Budget	Yancy Reser	Doug Matoon	Yes		
Revise By-Laws to authorize Director to approve monthly reimbursement requests to WWCC	Doug Matoon	Yancy Reser	Yes		
Approve letter to Bob Lohn, NOAA regarding FCRPS BiOp Remand	Doug Matoon	Eric Myers	Yes		
Finalize the Lead Entity Ranked project list	Dick Jones	Cathy Schaeffer	Yes Abstane: Del Groat, Doug Matoon		

Attendance for 2007												
Name	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Doug Mattoon		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Dick Isaac		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Jay Holzmilller	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes			
Dick Ducharme				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Dick Jones		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Eric Myers	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Gary James	Yes	Yes						Yes	Yes			
Virgil Klaveano	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes				
Del Groat	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			
Gary Cole												
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes			
Yancey Reser		Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes			
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes			
Michael Largent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes			
Ed Schultz			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes				

No meeting was conducted this month.

