



## MEETING NOTES – July 28th, 2009

**Place:** 410B E Main, Dayton, WA 99328 (Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Office)

**Format:** Regular

### Board Members Present

**Clarkston:** Del Groat (GC), Bob Johnson (GC), Roland Schirman (CC), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Stuart Durfee (WWC), Michael Largent (WC), Yancey Reser (WWC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Bill Bowles (GC)

**Others:** Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Dave Karl (WDFW), Larry Fairchild (CCC).

**On Phone:** Brad Johnson (WRIA 35)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and stated there was no quorum present at this time. A quorum was established at 6:16pm with Kelly Farnsworth joining the meeting. Bill Bowles also arrived shortly after at 6:20pm. (9 board members were present.)

### Welcome:

Del welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. At the time of the start of the meeting a quorum was not present. **A QUORUM WAS PRESENT at 6:16pm.** Motions were made in preparation for a quorum being present on the first 2 actions. Votes were cast after the quorum was established at 6:16pm.

### Approval of June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 meeting notes:

**Action 1:** Cathy Schaeffer moved to approve the June 23rd, 2009 meeting notes. Stuart Durfee seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

### Approve June & 13<sup>th</sup> Month Expenses:

**WDFW \$11,569.31 (June) \$2,480.11 (13<sup>th</sup> Month)**

**RCO \$33,838.84 (June) \$4,357.41 (13<sup>th</sup> Month)**

**IMW \$9,466.81 (June) \$67,551.20 (13<sup>th</sup> Month)**

**Discussion:** Roland asked for clarification on 13<sup>th</sup> Month. Anne explained that the 13<sup>th</sup> Month was a closeout month for the College. Their fiscal year ends in June and then they have a 13<sup>th</sup> Month for all entries that do not make the June deadline to balance and finish year end.

**Action 2:** Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$33,838.84 expended in June 2009 and \$4,357.41 in 13<sup>th</sup> Month 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling \$11,569.31 expended in June 2009 and \$2,480.11 in 13<sup>th</sup> Month 2009 in the WDFW Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling \$9,466.81 expended in June 2009 and \$67,551.20 in 13<sup>th</sup> Month 2009 in the IMW Budget. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. Del Groat Abstained.

### Additions to the Agenda:

**Pacific Lamprey Conservation Management Plan overview:** Steve reported that he had attended a meeting in Clarkston today with Del and Brad at the request of the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Pacific Lamprey population is severely depressed, is a species significant cultural value to Tribes and is a very important (historic) provider of marine-derived nutrients for salmon. The goal of the meeting was to get local fisheries folks together to discuss the extent of data and knowledge of the species to be used in development of a conservation plan throughout the Columbia basin, Oregon, California and Alaska. In the next few years there may be a petition for listing these fish under the ESA and this may be something the board may need to be aware of. Del stated that lamprey basically uses the same habitat as steelhead trout and that steelhead are a surrogate/indicator for where Pacific Lamprey would be

Voting Board Members: Cathy Schaeffer, Yancey Reser, Stuart Durfee, Dick Ducharme, Dick Jones, Roland Schirman, Doug Mattoon, Jay Holzmilller, Bob Johnson, Bill Bowles, Del Groat, Michael Largent, Gary Thorgaard, Kelly Farnsworth, Confederated Tribe of Umatilla Indian Reservation

expected to occur. Most of the habitat restoration work that this board has approved is also good for the Lamprey. The most significant threat is likely the mainstem hydrosystem as the species is largely unable to pass upstream through the fish ladders. Steve will keep the board apprised of new information.

**IMW Watershed Update** – The contractor (EcoLogical) is currently sampling fish, monitoring habitat and has deployed the PIT tag antennas.

#### **NOAA economic stimulus funding decisions:**

The economic stimulus projects that were submitted did not get funded; all of the NOAA ARARA dollars were allocated to coastal projects.

#### **Inter-local agreement status:**

Steve noted that he is awaiting response from the CTUIR regarding their signature of the “slightly revised” inter-local agreement that the Board approved in June. It was suggested that we engage the NPT but the conclusion was that we engage and request their participation after we have the document finalized by the current participants (CTUIR and five boards of county commissioners).

#### **Nominations of Del Groat and Steve Martin to the new Sport Fishing Panel:**

Steve mentioned the new sport fishing panel which was created by WDFW for the purpose of overseeing implementation of enhanced sport fishing for salmon and steelhead in the Columbia basin. WDFW has desired to enhance sport fishing for salmon and steelhead but has been cautious as has NOAA about increasing the opportunities because of the lack of monitoring and enforcement. To resolve the situation WDFW will begin charging \$7.50 for each salmon/steelhead fishing license for the purpose of ensuring sufficient fishery monitoring and enforcement. To oversee the program, WDFW is creating a sport fishing panel and they seek 5 to 8 members. Del and Steve nominated each other to the panel which is expected to meet quarterly. WDFW pays travel expenses.

#### **Review of \$2,903,000 worth of proposed projects for Board approval August 25 based on an allocation of \$1.6 million from the SRFB:**

Kris stated that all the potential projects for Round 10 were reviewed by the RTT/LE Committee on July 20<sup>th</sup> at the Pre-scoring Meeting in Dayton.

Kris discussed prior years (“Looking Back”) and then also reviewed the table showing ranking and score resulting from the Pre-score meeting. It was discussed that the board has final say and can move a 15<sup>th</sup> ranked project to the 1<sup>st</sup> ranked project if it so desires as long as re-ranking is not grossly different from the scores. Many of the projects scored very closely this year.

Discussion – Project Grant Round Issues:

- Del stated that use of the scorecard was inconsistent between project types and the process should be reviewed; the scorecard may need updated/revised for the next grant round. He stated that he and Roland had discussed this issue during the exec committee meeting last Tuesday. Roland questioned if a scorecard should be made for each type of project (Restoration, Easement, Assessment, etc.), instead of a generic scorecard being used.
- Del also stated that the board should revisit the concept of allocating a certain percentage of available monies per round to go to the different types of projects. He stated that he had brought this up to the Lead Entity/RTT after last year’s round, but it never had any action taken.
- Roland also mentioned the amount of time that citizens have donated to participate in the reviewing of submitted projects for a certain grant round needs to be reduced in the future. He felt we are asking a lot of our volunteer citizen members.

Kris then went over each project and briefly described sponsors, type, location and intent of project. Comments were also discussed where needed. Board members asked questions where appropriate.

Steve then went over the Staff Perspective Report – He stated that the summary of the projects were behind the pink sheet in the meeting booklet. Steve drew the board’s attention to the last two pages containing staff perspective tables project phasing vs. immediate benefits and asked for board feelings on which scenario they would support? Steve reported that sponsors are probably going to submit their projects as is or in full. Terry Bruegman explained the reasoning of this is that the scoring would probably be less if the project was revised. Therefore he felt as a sponsor he would shoot himself

in the foot if he submitted his proposed project in a phased version and received fewer points because the project changed from implementation to assessment.

Discussion then followed with Roland suggesting that the board evaluate all projects as presented and those that could be phased, the second phase would supercede any new project proposals for the next project Round 11 (Year 2010). He asked if the board has the authority to do this. Yancey Reser stated that he felt that the immediate benefit scenario is what the board has supported in the past. He also felt that the next round should be open to new submittals and sponsors may resubmit if they so chose. Dave Karl stated that if the lists are going to be manipulated by this board that it would be a hard pill to swallow for a sponsor. To ask them to resubmit a high scoring project next year because of a subjective decision by the board does not seem fair.

Steve asked if he should tell the sponsors to phase their projects if they so desire or submit as a complete project. He stated that a commitment from the board to fund the second phase of a project, if a sponsor so chose to phase the project might be appropriate. Cathy Schaeffer suggested bonus points for projects that agree to be phased to be used on the score card for the next project round.

The board continued to discuss the concept that if a project is above the cut line and if the sponsor agrees to phase their project that that project should be guaranteed to be above the cut line at the next grant round. It was stated that if a project is not above the cut line (\$1.6 million) and is phased, there should not be a guarantee for next round but if possible these lower-ranked projects, if possible, should be phased to stretch our resources. Roland asked where the cut line would be as it feasibly could change as each project is phased. Staff acknowledged this likelihood but until we see if any of the projects are phased there is no way to know for certain.

Kelly Farnsworth asked for clarification on phasing of projects. Kelly stated that for example if the board was talking about the two big projects for this round. (Mill Creek Flume Transitions / Tucannon River Off-Set Dike) if phased, these two projects would be funded as stated below:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Budget Request</b>	<b>Phase 1</b>	<b>Phase 2</b>
Mill Creek Flume Transitions	\$511,617	\$200,000	\$311,617
Tucannon River Off Set Dike	\$564,498	\$ 90,000	\$474,498
Rnd Total Monies		\$290,000	\$786,115

In this scenario \$290,000 of the \$1.6 million available monies would be requested for current Round 10 and for next Round 11, \$786,115 monies would be requested for the estimated \$1.6 million monies available to complete these projects. This would leave approximately \$813,885 monies available for Round 11 for new projects.

**Action 3:** Kelly Farnsworth made a motion to accept and score full applications from sponsors. After scoring of all projects a cut line at \$1.6 million will be established and those sponsors at or above the cut line will have the option to phase their project. If they agree to phase their project their second phase will automatically be put above the cut line for next year's funding. Projects scoring below the cut line will be encouraged to phase if possible. Cathy Schaeffer seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by consensus.

**TASK 1:** (Steve) A clarification on Easement Projects and whether or not they can be phased needs to be reviewed with Kay Caromile at the RCO.

#### **Confirm August 25<sup>th</sup> 2009 Board meeting and location:**

**Discussion:** Steve recommended that the Board meet in Starbuck at a historical building that has been restored. On August 11<sup>th</sup> the projects will be presented again by the sponsors at the last scoring meeting. If the board members want to review the projects more, they should attend that meeting.

**Action 4:** Cathy Schaeffer moved to have the August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting in Starbuck at 1pm. Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Yancey Reser was opposed.

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 pm.**

## Tasks & Actions

Review of Tasks					
<b>TASK 1:</b> (Steve) A clarification on Easement Projects and whether or not they can be phased needs to be reviewed with Kay Caromile at the RCO.					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
<b>Action 1:</b> Approve the June 23rd, 2009 meeting notes	Cathy Schaeffer	Stuart Durfee	Yes		
<b>Action 2:</b> Approve the invoices/vouchers totaling \$33,838.84 expended in June 2009 and \$4,357.41 in 13 <sup>th</sup> Month 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling \$11,569.31 expended in June 2009 and \$2,480.11 in 13 <sup>th</sup> Month 2009 in the WDFW Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling \$9,466.81 expended in June 2009 and \$67,551.20 in 13 <sup>th</sup> Month 2009 in the IMW Budget.	Roland Schirman	Bob Johnson	Yes (Del Groat Abstained)		
<b>Action 3:</b> Accept and score full applications from sponsors. After scoring of all projects a cut line at \$1.6 million will be established and those sponsors at or above the cut line will have the option to phase their project. If they agree to phase their project their second phase will automatically be put above the cut line for next year's funding. Projects scoring below the cut line will be encouraged to phase if possible.	Kelly Farnsworth	Cathy Schaeffer	Yes		
<b>Action 4:</b> Cathy Schaeffer moved to have the August 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2009 meeting in Starbuck at 1pm. Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Yancey Reser was opposed.	Cathy Schaeffer	Billy Bowles			Yes, Yancey Opposed

## Attendance

Name	Attendance for 2009-2010											
	Jun 09	Jul 09	Aug 09	Sep 09	Oct 09	Nov 09	Dec 09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10
Doug Mattoon	Yes											
Jay Holzmilller	Yes											
Dick Ducharme	Yes											
Dick Jones	Yes											
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes										
Gary James												
Del Groat	Yes	Yes										
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes										
Yancey Reser		Yes										
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes										
Michael Largent		Yes										
Gary Thorgaard	Yes											
Kelly Farnsworth	Yes	Yes										
Bob Johnson	Yes	Yes										
Billy Bowles		Yes										

\*First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member