

## **Snake River Salmon Recovery Board**

### **Meeting Notes February 26th, 2008**

#### **Board Members Present:**

WWCC (Walla Walla) - Stuart Durfee, Cathy Schaeffer, Yancey Reser, Dick Ducharme, Gary James, Michael Largent

WWCC (Clarkston) – Jay Holzmilller, Butch Klaveano, Ed Schultz, Dick Isaacs

#### **Others:**

WWCC (Clarkston) Brad Johnson , Anne Chapman SRSRB, Cheryl Sonnen, Terry Bruegman, Duane Bartels

WWCC (Walla Walla) Steve Martin, Todd Shaw (Anderson Perry), Larry Hooker

Vice Chair, Cathy Schaeffer called the meeting to order and turned it over to Steve.

Cathy verified a quorum: 10 members present

#### **Welcome –**

Steve explained the agenda and stated that the By-laws and the Approval of the RFP person are critical for this evenings meeting.

#### **Approval of January 22nd, 2007 - Board Minutes**

**Action 1:** Steve asked for a motion to approve the January 22nd board meeting notes. The motion was made by Ed Schultz and was seconded by Butch Klaveano. There being no discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

#### **Agenda Additions:**

Cathy asked Steve to update the board on the status of the state/federal agency biennial budgets and actions.

Steve stated that the regional Technical team advanced about 12 items for state and federal agencies to include in their current biennial work plan and budget. It is hard to ask those agencies to change already established budgets. We were mainly identifying those things we thought those agencies to be working on and mainly were asking for confirmation. There was a meeting last week in Olympia and it was reported that the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Fisheries Agencies were just about to complete the BiOp on the Mill Creek channel, as well as the other items identified in the agency priorities table.

DOT, Ecology, WDFW, and Forest Service were all in attendance. It was a very encouraging meeting.

The end of March there will be another meeting with the same people.

The monies are coming from the USACOE for implementing the Mill Creek BiOp. A question was raised as to whether the SRFB can approve the expenditure of funds once a project becomes a BiOp requirement or if the actions in the BiOp are agreed to but voluntary. Steve is waiting clarification on that. We can fund cooperative compliance, willing land owner, non regulatory, (Loose on non regulatory) projects. It was stated that once you are in the position where you have to comply with a federal action, that that is different than a regular agreement.

The agencies and GSRO want to know what we want for the next 09-11 budget.

Dick Ducharme stated that he is on the planning commission in Columbia County and has a problem with the Planning Commission never discussing the Watershed Plan or the recovery plan. Columbia County is redoing the comprehensive plan and he would like to see someone show up to represent the Watershed and Salmon recovery plans. Columbia County does have a new planner. Steve will commit to attending the next open houses in Columbia County and represent the Watershed and Salmon Recovery plans. Cathy Schaeffer stated that this is good idea to follow up and make sure that the planning commissions are aware of the plans and are involved. Steve will report back on the conversations he has.

### **Approve January 2008 Expenditures:**

**Discussion:** Anne drew the boards' attention to the SRSRB/RCO and WDFW/LE tabs in the meeting booklet. She explained that there were some new sample formats for them to look at that are "Canned" reports that come directly off of the WWCC Server. So it would be less likely errors would happen in the reporting of expenditures. She also reported that she is now able to connect remotely to the server to get these reports. After review by the board, it was decided to continue with the current summary spreadsheet prepared by Anne and to also have available the detail at meetings if there are questions about current monthly expenditures..

**Action 2:** Stuart Durfee made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$20,745.01 expended in January 2008 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$3655.52 expended in January 2008 in the WDFW Budget. Yancey Reser seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

### **Review of administrative roles of the Board, which include both the Salmon Recovery Plan Implementation but also the Lead Entity; discuss relationships between the two grants and the various committees that support the functions of the Board.**

**Discussion:** Cathy reminded the board that the SRSRB actually administers to or is responsible for two grants. The SRSRB handles both the RCO and WDFW Grant monies. These Grant monies are known as the SRSRB and Lead Entity. She then asked Steve to clarify this further.

Steve presented a PowerPoint presentation to the board explaining Roles, Composition and Relationships between SRSRB, Lead Entity and Lead Entity Committee. This Power point along with a list of Lead Entity Committee Membership was also available for the boards review in the meeting booklet under the lead entity tab. Steve made it clear the SRSRB is both the SRSRB and the Lead Entity. The Lead Entity Committee has been established by the SRSRB/LE to carry out the duties/responsibilities of the WDFW Grant monies.

Last grant round Steve suggested appointing a couple board members to the LEC. He stated he would like to suggest that again. Dick asked that Steve keep the board aware of the LE calendar.

### **Approve 2008 Bylaws:**

**Discussion:** Cathy stated that she thought that the By-laws were a good revision. That she saw no changes in the major points of the by-laws. Board members stated that their email addresses were not correct. Cathy suggested that the board approve these new bylaws, with the understanding that they can be revised/amended in subsequent board meetings. Steve stated that to kick off the Lead Entity Grant round it is crucial to get a correct set of operating bylaws.

**Action 3:** Cathy Schaeffer moved to approve the presented bylaws with corrections to email addresses, Ed Schultz seconded. Gary James amended the motion to leave the by-laws open to amendments in future. Cathy stated that in the new bylaws (Article XVIII) it allows for amendments to them. The motion carried by consensus.

**Approve Contractor to develop land use evaluation and conservation easement assessment:**

**Discussion:** Steve reported that there were 8 total applicants which were reviewed by the selection committee that was appointed by the board at the January Meeting. Cascadia (Seattle), Brigham (Clarkston), Ross (Seattle) were the top picks of the selection committee of Brad, Cathy, Ed and Doug. They met at 5pm to go over the picks. Steve reviewed the reasons for these picks. Brigham and Many Waters Community Development have been involved in community development, Anderson Perry, Donna Erickson have all done work in this area. Yancey stated that he really thinks that there needs to be someone local selected. The board then discussed local vs. non local selection of this contractor. Ed stated that the selection committee made recommendations and that the board should take the recommendations of this committee. It was noted that Todd Shaw of Anderson Perry, who was one of the applicants, was in attendance. Cathy stated that Anderson Perry was very well prepared and what dropped them out of the selection was that their budget amount was well over the scope of work. Gary James asked how the board arrived at \$20,000.00 for the budgeted amount. Steve explained that there is a contingency item in our budget and then 6 months of Kris Buelows payroll that was not used because of his position being vacant.

**Action 4: Dick Isaacs made the motion to approve Cascadia, then Ross as an alternate recommended by the committee, Stuart Durfee seconded. Ed Schultz amended the motion to give Steve the authority to go ahead with contract approval and contracting. Motion carried by consensus.**

**Discuss preliminary recommendations to the NWPCC regarding fish and wildlife program amendments; contemplate level of involvement Board seeks regarding project review, prioritization, tracking and reporting:**

**Discussion:** Steve drew the boards' attention to the NWPCC tab in the meeting booklet handout. He stated that there are two unresolved items remaining. They are highlighted in yellow under the NWPCC Tab. Steve asked what level of involvement the board wants in the project review, ranking, prioritization, tracking and reporting? Gary James stated that he is not sure that he would support more money (BPA monies) and process being used when there are already local technical people (Land Managers and Fish and Wildlife) getting together and organizing project proposals. A better statement would be to partner with them. Dick Ducharme agreed, but is there a need for a formal relationship with the NWPCC so they will be obligated to continue projects if/when the monies get tight, for example. Cathy Schaeffer stated that if there is a need to do extra work then we need to ask for more resources so that we can do that extra work and that we need to state that. Dick Ducharme stated that monitoring of projects is in his opinion one of the most important things that the SRSRB has been able to accomplish since it has been in existence. He thinks we need to stay involved in this process.

Steve's notes state: The board and its partnering entities (i.e., tribes, Natural Resource agencies) will assist the council to coordinate/implementation of its programs. (Strike resources and incentives) and ask that a formal relationship between the council and the board be in the Program.

Steve went on to state that it is his understanding that the BPA does not pay O&M other than for hatchery and other facilities for habitat projects. A new idea has been brought forward that the BPA includes O&M for irrigators willing to transfer their surface water rights and go to the deep basalt aquifer. The problem is that the pumping costs are very expensive. Just today he had a conversation with Amanda Cronin of the water trust and she stated that the BPA is paying for some pumping costs over in Idaho.

Yancey stated that we should be supporting projects that restore the ground water or slow the water leaving our springs. Dick stated that he agreed that we need monies to keep the existing systems.

Gary James stated that perhaps in the letter it should be stated that the basin and this board have many partnerships and creative concepts and water projects already going on. BPA should set up a program measure to partner with local water projects in providing cost share O&M where direct in stream fish benefits can be demonstrated. That is the key to this Fish & Wildlife program.

The Clarkston people wanted to make sure that WRIA 35 is added and the focus is on all of the area, not just the Walla Walla Area, because the same problems are everywhere, including the Tucannon, WRIA 35 areas. It should be about the whole area, not specific to just one area.

Dick – Do we need to include a statement in the letter about non-native predators? To him it makes no sense to not address predators that are preying on endangered species. The board decided to add a statement in the letter that recommends that the council address the issue of predators (Fish, birds and mammals) to ESA Listed fish.

Steve then drew the boards' attention to Phil Millers recommended statement to include in the letter, this was found in the meeting booklet under NWPCC, last page. Gary James stated that he is concerned about the plan not being flexible enough to recover fish properly. When you get upstream, you need to be flexible to each situation, as each situation is different. He suggested that we need to wait and see what their recommendations might be. The key statement would be to incorporate the results to the extent those results are possible/consistent with recovery goals and plans. Clarkston group agreed.

Cathy asked if we should amend this statement, or just not include it in the letter.

Dick Ducharme recommended that we put a statement in asking that the Council consult with the SRSRB before adopting any HSRG recommendations.

Steve recommended that we just not put the statement in the letter. That Steve, Gary, Glen Mendel, etc will be involved. The board decided to scratch the statement.

### **Intensively Monitored Watershed Preliminary findings:**

**Discussion:** Steve stated that we have contracted with Ecological Research, Inc in Utah to develop an experimental design. First on the agenda was to decide which water basin to use for the research. The RTT and Stephen Bennett of Ecological Research have met several times to develop a selection process. The Asotin Watershed was selected as the first priority, and then the Upper Touchet Watershed as an alternate. The challenges with Asotin are Political and Biological. The Asotin is our fish reference watershed. There is no hatchery there and the steelheads are doing pretty well. So if we accelerate the rate of treatments there, the question would be; did the fish respond because we left them alone or because we accelerated the rate of treatments? So that could be a problem. The

other issue would be the Pilot grazing program allowed by Fish & Wildlife. Fish & Wildlife could end up in a negative light if they have to tell local landowners who have committed to these programs to get their cows out of the waters. If we want to preserve Asotin as a salmon/steelhead sanctuary or if we do not have willing landowners, there could be problems. If this occurs, we would then jump over to the Upper Touchet.

Steve asked Brad about the timeline on finding out politically if there is a problem. Brad stated that there is not a feeling from Cheryl, Jay and Brad that there will be a problem.

Biological concern: the RTT along with the Ecological Research team will be meeting soon in March and will decide/discuss if there is an issue biologically. A recommendation from the RTT will be made after their meeting.

Cathy recommended that that recommendation from the RTT be made available to the SRSRB as soon as it is available so that the board can take action at the March 25th Board meeting.

### **Salmon Recovery Funding Board updates: regional allocations, timeline, review panel, alternate projects and design-only projects:**

**Discussion:** The RCO included all the recommendations that the board advanced except the reduction in our budget. Listed below are the RCO recommendations.

Steve negotiated that our reduction be 8.88% of the state's allocation, which is the smallest reduction available.

The other negotiation made was to have alternate projects on the list. So that if projects fall through the cracks, because of landowners, etc..., then the alternate project may be used.

The RCO is recommending this to the SURF board. They agreed to the concept of no cost share on the design of projects.

The statewide review panel will always be available, instead of having to come out in August and review 15 projects at once for example.

The timeline will be shrunk this year one week for final application submittal. The Coleads and committee developed a calendar. This calendar starts in March. Dick suggested we keep the board apprised of this calendar.

Anne advised the board that there is a Lead Entity Button on the Snake River Website now. It will provide the calendar, funding booklet, easement criteria, pre application worksheets and other applicable documents in the future.

### **3-year work plan:**

**Discussion:** Steve stated that Kris Buelow is developing the 3 year work plan for the lead entity projects. These programs will be loaded into a statewide Habitat Work Schedule Program that is being developed. After the projects are completed they will appear on a map that you will be able to click on and get information about each project. A sample sheet for both WRIA 32 and WRIA 35 projects is in the meeting booklet. The whole file is in a sample on the table. Kris hopes to have the table completed by the end of March to synchronize with the WRIA 35 detailed implementation plan.

Cathy stated that they are trying to amend their plan to be compatible with this file being developed by Kris.

### **Status of vacant seats:**

**Discussion:** Steve stated that we have vacant seats in Garfield, Whitman and Columbia counties.

- Columbia County: Since Dick Jones is not present tonight; there is not a report on the Columbia County Seat.
- Garfield County: Butch stated that Mike Kasseto still says he is going to be a board member, but has not showed up yet. He wants to come to one meeting and see what it is about before he fully commits. After he commits Garfield County will appoint him.
- Whitman County: Michael Largent – stated that they are talking about advertising for the position. Ed stated that he has been on the board for approximately 6-7 years and he is beginning to think about resigning his position. Michael stated he will start soliciting for a member in light of what Ed stated.

Steve stated that on other Salmon Recovery boards there are basically only two members from each county. Maybe this board should consider two members from each county instead of 3. We are by far the largest board.

### **Regional Board's policy summit, May 16 in Vancouver – review policy paper outlines:**

**Discussion:** Steve is developing a policy paper to present at the summit. Steve has been asked to convene a committee on integration of lead entity, Salmon recovery, watershed planning, statewide Approaches to natural resources improvement. The other 3 sessions will be on Monitoring , Implementation/Financing of these organizations and a potential legislative strategy coming out of this statewide policy summit as to the future of these efforts look like as they pertain to authority, integration and monitoring. The board has been asked to participate in this summit as well as all the other salmon recovery boards across the state. Steve asked the board members to reserve this date and try to participate May 16<sup>th</sup> in Vancouver.

### **Special meeting March 4 – set or cancel:**

Cathy moved that we cancel. Yancey Seconded. The motion carried by consensus.

### **Next Board Meeting March 25<sup>th</sup> in Dayton**

**Next Board Meeting will be March 25th, 2008 at 6pm in Dayton**

Ability to call in will be available.

Next agenda:

Brian Mahoney Umatilla Tribe – Spring Chinook Program Presentation.

Update from Tribe on feasibility study on flow.

Draft 09-11 Agency actions.

Finalize Power and Conservation Council Letter

Present policy letter Steve is developing for the May 16<sup>th</sup> summit in Vancouver.

Watershed Update– Which one for IMW.

Cathy made the motion that the next meeting be in Dayton at the DHS Library, Yancey Seconded.

Motion carried by consensus.

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:30pm.**

## Review of Tasks

### Task Title

- Task 1: Attend Planning Commission Meeting report back to board on conversations.
- Task 2: Proceed with Contract Approval for Contractor to develop land use evaluation and easement assessment. Contract with Cascadia.
- Task 3: Finalize NWPCC letter and present to board at March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting
- Task 4: Advise board on RTT recommendation of IMW (Asotin) be prepared to take action at the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Task 5: Complete 3 year work plan (end of March)
- Task 6: Vacant Columbia, Garfield and Whitman county seats.
- Task 7: May 16<sup>th</sup> Policy Summit status
- Task 8:

## Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Meeting Minutes January 22nd, 2008	Ed Schultz	Butch Klaveano	Yes		
Approve January 2008 Expenditures RCO and WDFW Budgets	Stuart Durfee	Yancey Reser	Yes		
Approve 2008 Bylaws	Cathy Schaeffer	Ed Schultz	Yes		
Approve Contractor to develop land use evaluation and conservation easement assessment	Dick Isaacs	Stuart Durfee	Yes		
Cancel March 4 Special Meeting	Cathy Schaeffer	Yancey Reser	Yes		
Set Next Board Meeting: March 25 <sup>th</sup> , Dayton High School Library, 6pm	Cathy Schaeffer	Yancey Reser	Yes		

Name	Attendance for 2008											
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Doug Mattoon	Yes											
Dick Isaac		Yes										
Jay Holzmilller	Yes	Yes										
Dick Ducharme	Yes	Yes										
Dick Jones	Yes											
Gary James	Yes	Yes										
Virgil Klaveano	Yes	Yes										
Del Groat	Yes											
Gary Cole												
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes										
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes										
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes										
Michael Largent		Yes										
Ed Schultz	Yes	Yes										

No meeting was conducted this month.