Snake River Salmon Recovery

Meeting Minutes

January 2009 through December 2009

Contents

Meeting Notes January 13th, 2009 6
Approval of November 25th, 2008 meeting notes. 6
Recognition of Board Member Virgil (Butch) Klaveano for his service to SRSRB. 6
Agenda Additions: 6
Approve November/December 2008 RCO & WDFW expenditures : 6
Budget Revisions to RCO Budget 7
Information about process to set recreational fishing quotas for steelhead and salmon in the Columbia Basin and Board's interest in engaging in the process: 7
Predatory game fish regulations and Board's interest in engaging in the process: 7
Strategic Planning Committee update: 8
Discussion concerning contracting with the WDFW: 9
Lead Entity Committee (easements, calendar, scorecard, etc) Discussion 9
Letter of Support for WRIA 32 Partnership/Water Management Initiatives: 10
Approve Cascadia Consulting Land use policies/conservation easements report: 10
Meeting Notes January 27th, 2009 13
Welcome: 13
Approval of January 13th, 2009 meeting notes: 13
Agenda Additions: 13
Budget announcement from Steve: 13
GOVERNORS ECONOMIC STIMULUS LIST: 13
Approve $8,000 subcontract to WDFW for technical support, March 1, 2009 thru June 30, 2009: 14
Notice of Co-Leads meeting Friday, January 30th, 2009 in Clarkston (ACCD) at 10am. 15
House Bill Discussion 15
Meeting Notes February 24th, 2009 17
Approval of January 27th, 2009 meeting notes: 17
Approve January Expenses: 17
Agenda Additions: 17
April 15-16 Projects Conference 17
Lead Entity Calendar 18
WWCC regional fish passage barrier assessment update: 18
Head gate Dam fish passage assessment: 18
Predation rates by non-native species on listed species: 19
Approve Community Salmon Fund Projects: 19
Nature Conservancy, Public Broadcasting Service Salmon documentary movie outreach: 19
SRFB funding forecast: 19
Legislative update – Bills to integrate Salmon Recovery Act activities: 20
Introduction and over-view of staff job descriptions: 20
Allocation of SRSRB funds – projects vs. operations: 20
Upcoming Agenda March 24th: 20
Confirm March 24th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting 20
Meeting Notes March 24th, 2009 23
Approval of February 24th, 2009 meeting notes: 23
Approve February Expenses: 23
8% Budget Cut Discussion: 23
Agenda Additions: 24

REMINDER Executive Committee Meeting: 24
WRIA35 Contract Adjustments: 24
Lead Entity Bylaws – suggested changes appear in red font: 25
Approve 3 year work plan: 26
IMW implementation contractor selection: 26
NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list: 26
USACOE WW basin feasibility study report: 27
Hells Canyon Temperature Analysis and Temperature Control Structure (TCS): 27
RCO Administration changes and budget status for planning purposes: 28
Legislative update (Salmon Act, WW Basin Partnership, etc): 28
Discuss staff job descriptions: 28
Snake River ESU rollup status report – 10am, April 10 @ Clarkston WWCC: 28
April 28th & 29th Floods, Farms, Families and Fish meetings: 28
Confirm April 28th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting 28
Meeting Notes April 28th, 2009 31
Approval of March 28th, 2009 meeting notes: 31
Approve March Expenses: 31
Additions to Agenda: 31
Dr. Janine Castro and Brian Bair's Touchet River Assessment and discussion of "Floods, Families, Farms and Fish": 31
Economic Stimulus Funding update: 32
General Updates: 32
Draft partner contract deliverables July 09 - June 11 32
WRIA 35 Amendment Update Apr 09 – Jun 09 ($4,450.00) 32
09-11 Budget Update 32
Update on Fiscal Agent Percentage Rate Negotiations: 32
Regional Road Maintenance BMP program update: 33
IMW Update: 33
Snake River ESU Update: 33
Additions to May Agenda: 33
Confirm May 26th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting 33
Meeting Notes May 26th, 2009 35
Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. Due to a wreck on the Alpowa grade some members did show up a few minutes late. A quorum of 8 was present at start of the meeting. 35
Approval of April 28th, 2009 meeting notes: 35
Approve April Expenses & RCO Budget Adjustment 35
Additions to Agenda: 35
Economic Stimulus update 35
Biop/MOA update 35
Pac SRF Funding 35
ESU Roll up 35
RM 42.5 36
Briefing on pre-proposal project review and next steps/schedule: 36
Board Restructure – nomination of new officers for election in June: 36
Budget status update: 36
Approve negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC: 37
Hatchery management plan (HSRG/HRT) updates – Mike Delarm and NOAA: 37
WRIA 35 Update – Phase IV, year 2; Hydrogeo Briefing; Habitat Assessment: 39
Approve budgets for July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 as presented in meeting booklet: 39
$333,588 – Base operating budget 39

$65,000 – Lead Entity program budget plus $10385.00 for HWS license fee 39
$377,910 – IMW budget 39
$80,000 – plan revisions 39
Approve partner (PU/CTUIR/CD) deliverables and budgets; contracts to be presented in June: 39
Confirm June 23rd, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting and location: 40
Meeting Notes June 23rd, 2009 43
Approval of May 26th, 2009 meeting notes: 43
Approve May Expenses: 43
Additions to Agenda: 43
WDFW re: Harvest Allocation 43
Economic Stimulus Update: 44
Letter to Governor Gregoire requesting southeastern Washington representation on Fish and Wildlife Commission: 44
Perspective from NOAA and the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office: 44
2004 Inter-local agreement: 45
Round 10 Project Submittal update & SRFB Tours report June 18th & 19th (Kris): 45
Dayton Senior High School Student Project and Travel Expense Approval – David Frame: 46
IMW Update: 46
Approve 09-11 master contract and partner (PU/CTUIR/CD) contracts: 46
Confirm July 28th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting and location: 47
MEETING NOTES – July 28th, 2009 49
Approval of June 23rd, 2009 meeting notes: 49
Approve June & 13th Month Expenses: 49
Additions to the Agenda: 50
Pacific Lamprey Conservation Management Plan overview: 50
IMW Watershed Update 50
NOAA economic stimulus funding decisions: 50
Inter-local agreement status: 50
Nominations of Del Groat and Steve Martin to the new Sport Fishing Panel: 50
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: 51
Confirm August 25th 2009 Board meeting and location: 52
MEETING NOTES – August 25th, 2009 55
Public Comment: 55
Additions to the Agenda: 55
Approval of July 28th, 2009 meeting notes: 55
Approve July Monthly Expenses: 56
Send letter to DOE regional director requesting appointment of staff person to RTT: 56
Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program – CREP Discussion: 56
Del Groat - Apology: 56
Salmon Recovery Funding Board – recent and emerging policy updates: 56
Update of the Community Salmon Fund: 56
Project Amendments: 57
Appointment of SRSRB member, staff or partner to the Walla Walla Watershed Management Partnership – Policy Advisory Group: 57
WDFW Columbia River Salmon & Steelhead Recreational Angler Board – Member Appointment Update: 57
Review of Lead Entity Committee ranked project list for this grant round of SRFB funding: 58
Approve final ranked list of approved projects and alternate projects: 58
Confirm September 22nd, 2009 Board meeting and location: 59
MEETING NOTES – September 22nd, 2009 62

Public Comment: 62
Additions to the Agenda: 62
Approval of August 25th, 2009 meeting notes: 62
Approve August Monthly Expenses: 62
Approve WWWCD contract amendment to include GIS mapping ($2500): 63
Sport Fishing Panel Update: 63
Review of High Level Indicators for Salmon Recovery approved by the Monitoring Forum and draft watershed health indicators: 63
CREP Conservation Easement and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Discussion: 64
Review of meeting with Governor's Salmon Office and the Resource and Conservation Office held September 2nd: 64
I-5 mitigation funding request from Oregon DOT: 65
Bull trout planning "interest": 65
Project cost amendments – continued discussion from previous Board meeting: 65
Announcements: 66
Confirm October 27th, 2009 Board meeting and location: 66
MEETING NOTES – October 27th, 2009 68
Public Comment: 68
Approval of September 22nd, 2009 meeting notes: 68
Approve September Monthly Expenses: 68
Additions to the Agenda: 69
HRT Meeting Update 69
Consider Requiring Board approval of project cost increase requests; Revise Lead Entity Bylaws if necessary: 69
Update re: SRFB Review Panel's remarks and subsequent project proposal revisions 69
Reforming Natural resource agencies: 69
BPA Anadromous monitoring RME framework: 70
WDFW Sport Fishing Regulations – Major Cycle Rule Proposals: 70
Context and notice of letter sent to the Honorable Patty Murray, United States Senate in support of continued PCSRF Funding: 70
HRT Meeting Update: 70
Confirm November 24th, 2009 Board meeting 70
MEETING NOTES – November 24, 2009 73
Recognition of Cathy Schaeffer's Membership on the SRSRB Board: 73
Additions to the Agenda: 73
IMW Update and possible action to support a project proposal: 73
Approval of October 27, 2009 meeting notes: 75
Approve October Monthly Expenses: 75
Appointment of Board Member(s) to assist in selection of contractor to Update/Revise SRSR Plan: 75
Review and Approve comment letter on Hatchery Reform Recommendations: 75
Letter of Support to Congressman Dicks and House delegation for continued PCSRF Funding: 75
Columbia County Levee Roundtable: 76
Review comment letter on WDFW Sport Fishing Regulation Proposals: 76
The support of the SRSRB for the nomination of Billy Bowles to the RCO Land and Water Conservation Flood advisory Committee: 76
Confirm December 22, 2009 Board meeting & location: 76

Meeting Notes January 13th, 2009

Walla Walla Community College Campus'
Walla Walla WEC Room #2017, Clarkston WWCC Room #164 @ 6pm

Board Members Present:
Walla Walla: Roland Schirman (CC), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Dick Ducharme (CC), Richard Jones (CC), Yancey Reser (WWC)
Others: Steve Martin (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Dave Karl (WDFW)
Clarkston: Dick Isaac (AC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Bob Johnson (GC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Michael Largent (WC)
Others: Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Butch Klaveano (GC)
Via Phone: Gary James (CTUIR)

Vice Chair Cathy Schaeffer called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (12 board members present)

Welcome:

Vice Chair Cathy welcomed all to the meeting.

Approval of November 25th, 2008 meeting notes.

Action 1: Doug Mattoon moved to approve the November 25th, 2008 meeting notes. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Recognition of Board Member Virgil (Butch) Klaveano for his service to SRSRB.

Cathy announced that Virgil (Butch) Klaveano was one of the founding members of the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board back in 2002 and has dedicated one night a month for the last 7 years. She stated that his commitment to this process and his wisdom expressed from a commissioner's perspective through the years has really helped shape where we are and as Vice Chair, she wanted to take a moment to thank Butch. Butch thanked everyone for the kind words.

Agenda Additions:

None

Approve November/December 2008 RCO & WDFW expenditures :

*RCO November - $25,793.34 / December - $25,471.27
*WDFW November - $5,991.01 / December - $4,621.55

Discussion: Dick Jones questioned the lateness of WWCC Financial Charges, Anne stated that the college charges for financial services happen at no particular time that she was aware of. Dick Ducharme asked to clarify the $8,089.35 WDFW expense in October, asking what that expense was. Steve stated that most of the expense went towards tagging fish for the IMW (Pit tags and that process). It was noted that the Mastin and Mastin Contract also had monies left. The Mastin and Mastin contract is not complete and he is still working through that process. The weather has contributed to this. Cathy stated that on the Budget sheet the WRIA 32 and WRIA 35 December Expenses might be switched, Anne will check. Doug Mattoon asked just to clarify that any unused monies will be turned back? The answer was yes.

Action 2: Doug Mattoon made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $25,793.34 expended in November 2008 and the invoices/vouchers totaling $25,471.27 in December 2008 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $5,991.01 expended in November 2008 and the invoices/vouchers totaling $4,621.55 in December 2008 in the WDFW Budget. Jay Holzmiller seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Budget Revisions to RCO Budget

Move the following amounts from Goods and Services to:
*$6,000 to travel due to unanticipated travel costs
*$3,821.82 to equipment for two computers
*$6,929.06 to Contractors for Cascadia last of contracted amounts billed.

Discussion: Steve stated that we are over spent in the three line items listed above and a budget revision would be appropriate to reconcile the RCO budget. If you have questions Anne can help us understand. Discussion then continued about the Travel amendment and monies needed to finish out the year. It was then suggested that $10,000 be moved to travel instead of $6,000.

Action 3: Dick Ducharme moved to approve the RCO Budget Revisions presented with an amendment to the travel amount being $10,000 instead of $6,000. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Task 1: Anne, Contact Janet Snell (WWCC) to amend Budget Revision to travel to $10,000 instead of $6,000.

Information about process to set recreational fishing quotas for steelhead and salmon in the Columbia Basin and Board's interest in engaging in the process:

Discussion: Cathy stated that the executive committee discussed this topic last Tuesday and suggested that Steve evaluate the return on investment of engaging in this process. Steve stated that he was glad that Gary James was present on the phone. He also stated he had talked with Glen Mendel today about this subject. But as a reminder, Steve stated that we acknowledged that as a Board we have no authority or ability to influence the US v Oregon or North of Falcon process where the overall commercial and recreational harvest levels are set across the Columbia basin. However, once the recreational harvest level is established for the State of Washington the Board may want to engage in setting the quotas for recreational fishing in our state. In other words Steve stated that the board may want to weigh in on what percentage of the fish quota that is set for recreational fishing is allocated to our region. The quotas affect the public, local economies and the real-time ability to manage fisheries and escapement. In a nut shell our recovery plan not only addresses ESA recovery but also addresses restoration levels to support the economic benefits of recreational fisheries.

Dick Ducharme stated that the board doesn't want to get involved in the allocation process, but after the allocation processes it is more "where" those fish are taken. The reason the other regions (Lower regions) are not involved in this is because they are getting all the fish. In terms of the overall recreational fisheries, the fish are all being caught in the lower Columbia. The communities on the upper end are being unfairly treated. More escapements need to happen on the lower end of the allotted fisheries. Gary James stated that he was now seeing what the board was saying. That it is a general/equitable distribution of the allocation from the mouth to headwaters. He stated that the tribes are also affected by this and feel the same way. Doug Mattoon stated that the Clarkston faction was also in agreement. Gary stated that the letter should state that an equitable distribution of the allocation of fisheries would be desirable, to show recovery where habitat and restoration efforts are being done to show improvements.

Task 2: Dick Jones and Dick Ducharme suggested that Steve with Glen Mendel's and Gary James input draft a letter to present to the board. It was also suggested that the Nez Perce may be interested in contributing also.

Predatory game fish regulations and Board's interest in engaging in the process:

Discussion: The Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission sets game fish regulations and will be asking for input this spring for the 2009-2010 season. The executive committee asked Steve to evaluate the return on investment and workload for this process. The most direct and cost effective approach is the one we used last year where he worked with the RTT to identify recommendations and rationale and then presented those to the Board. A letter from this Board is influential in the state's process and is not burdensome on staff or the Board. Does the Board want staff to work with the RTT on recommendations for fishing regulations pertaining to predatory game fish?

Dick Ducharme suggested limiting to Non-native species. Dick Jones supports addressing this issue also. Gary James stated that it seems that the board is interested in any activities that take away from Salmon to escape. (Escapement, Estuary, Hydro, Predatory Fish, etc…) It seems that the board should monitor in general to keep

responsible parties active in doing their part. Roland stated that when the board talks about these issues, it helps him to respond properly to the general public when questions are asked. Brad Johnson stated that these issues on non native fish are going to be very political. There are others/organizations that will oppose the taking of bass for example, or non native fish due to their activities and interests. Dick Ducharme stated that when they set limits on Non Native Predatory fish that are preying on endangered native fish that is wrong. Gary James stated that the board had better have some science to back up the position that the board may take on this subject. The Sea Lion problem may be more of an issue. Dick Ducharme stated that we are using millions of dollars, changing agricultural and personal properties, etc…. to fix the salmon problem and we need to address these issues because of this.

Native Predatory Fish: Bull trout, Northern Pike Non Native Predatory: Bass(Small mouth, Walleyes), Channel Cats, Crawfish

Task 3: Steve will work with the RTT to evaluate the science and level of impact on salmon/steelhead by non-native predatory fish and present the findings to the Board for consideration.

Strategic Planning Committee update:

*Current (2007-2009) Operating Budget Review
*Forecasted (2009-2011) Operating Budget

- *Current (2007-2009) Operating Budget Review*

This is an update to describe where funds are being used as well as to discuss our predicted year-end unspent fund balance of roughly $29,000. The strategic planning committee reviewed this information when it met last Friday as a starting point for the next two years but did not evaluate scenarios regarding the unspent balance. Two general observations – the Board has relatively fixed costs or base costs (staff, fiscal service, office expenses) and discretionary costs (contractors and partners). With respect to the unspent funds there are a couple of things to consider (1) if we don't spend these dollars we illustrate disciplined spending to SRFB but all this approach has gotten us in the past is thank you but no real incentive and (2) we depend on technical support and project sponsorship from WDFW and with near-term staff reductions and/or re-assignment of tasks to existing staff we are in jeopardy of losing support from WDFW. Steve asked if there are any comments/questions of this near-term budget report.

- *Forecasted (2009-2011) Operating Budget*

At our last meeting we decided to create a strategic planning committee to evaluate our current work plan and budget and begin developing work plans and budgets for 2009-2011. Steve reported to the committee last Friday that the Governor's budget shows an $8 million reduction from $18 million down to $10 million for the upcoming biennium. The federal budget is anticipated to be similar to 07-09 which was about $67 million annually to the eligible states of which about $24 million has been allocated to Washington. It is important to remember that the Board's operating budget is federal in origin. The committee recognized that the current budget and anticipated 2009-2011 budget contains base operational expenses (office expense, fiscal service, staff and travel) and expanded or discretionary expenses (contract services and partner support). They were also mindful of the state budget situation and acknowledged that the 09-11 budget and work plan should present a conservative budget and another one that represents the level of funding needed to complete what really needs to be done. It was recommended that the conservative scenario represent a 10% reduction from the current level of $338,000 per year. Anne put this together for you to see and from the pie chart you can see the impacts to partners and/or contract services. The financial hit to partners/contractors is because the other slices of the pie are somewhat fixed expenses. Steve is working on the deliverables and tasks that are doable with a 10% reduction and with 0% reduction and will present these two scenarios for the Board at its next meeting. He will work with the committee to review and recommend before then. The committee also requested that Steve provide the Board a list of staff work priorities for the Board to review.

Dick Ducharme asked if the current IMW pit tagging activities that we contracted would be needed in the next budget? Steve stated that we may choose to contract with them, but it will most likely be funded through a different grant source next time.

Cathy stated that the Budget Strategic Planning committee talked about in planning for the future budget, the committee discussed being good partners; But also that the strategy might be to sit down and identify the things that need to be done vs. what we would like to do and basically starting a $0 based budget. It was explained that due to Kris Buelow not coming on board until January of 2008, the pie charts between the current Staff, Benefits & Travel is really disportionate between the current pie chart and the projected 2009-2011 pie chart.

Dick Ducharme stated that he would like to see a pie chart that encompasses project costs. He stated that this pie chart basically only shows the administrative costs and there needs to be one that shows also the monies that go to the actual projects. The pie chart needs to show monies that are on the ground also…. It is important for PR to show the whole picture. Steve stated that these pies were really meant for the board to understand what the operational costs are.

Discussion concerning contracting with the WDFW:

The WDFW Budget (Governors Decision) needs to be looked at; If they are not going to cut the monies that support the SRSRB, then we would not need to contract for these field technical services. If they are going to cut the department that participates in the RTT/SRSRB, then we may want to step up and look at contracting with WDFW for the Technical services we require. It was stated that we need to preserve the field technical services that we have now, however the board as a whole is hesitant because they do not want to set a precedence/or be dictated to that we pay for these field technical services no matter what. Steve stated that the contract/if we elected to do it in this Operating budget would be a few months that would be a pilot program, so to speak, to see if contracting with them is feasible in the future. Contracting with the WDFW now for approximately March through June 2009 also allows us to test the waters, see what the Governors budget in terms of real cuts is and evaluate the effectiveness of a contract with the WDFW such as this without a long term commitment.

Steve stated that the Watershed steward has brought to the table many projects and he wanted to reflect with the board these projects: The Touchet Consolidation, The large wood placement in the upper Tucannon, the Curl Lake barrier, the Gose Street, the Mill Creek Assessment. Steve thanked Dave Karl for all of his and Glenn Mendel's support.

The contract would require the WDFW to invoice us for the deliverables that they deliver to us according to the contract and the services/tasks that would be set out in the contract and agreed upon by both parties. The invoices would be submitted to the SRSRB office, Anne prepares the paperwork, Steve reviews and okay's, and Anne submits them to WWCC for payment.

Steve stated that the projected monies are calculated at approximately 160 hrs for the contracted deliverables @ $50 per hour = approximately $8000. Steve stated that a contract if needed for this fiscal budget would need to be moved ahead asap, to get through the contract process.

Task 4: Make a pie chart encompassing all entities and monies to show accomplishments (RCO, WDFW, Project Monies, etc…)

Task 5: Steve and Anne should bring back to the board some deliverables that would be expected/needed of the WDFW technical support in contract format. Roland suggested that we give the director the authority to move ahead with contract process for this fiscal period with WDFW as a pilot program in the amount of $8000. The executive committee should review the deliverables expected.

Lead Entity Committee (easements, calendar, scorecard, etc) Discussion

Discussion: The Co-Leads (county conservation districts) were scheduled to meet in December to develop recommendations for the Board/Lead Entity but weather precluded safe travel. The Co-Leads will meet the last week of January to finalize their recommendations for the board but the important thing to remember is that these recommendations and the decisions of the Board will serve as the basis for the 2009 grant round for projects.

Task 6: Steve will send out a notice to the board about exactly when this meeting will happen. So that those who want to participate may.

Letter of Support for WRIA 32 Partnership/Water Management Initiatives:

Discussion: Cathy stated that the partnership completed its report to the legislature and is now looking for partner support for this legislation to pass. The Board has acknowledged the importance of local water management and recognizes that managing water has been the authority of ecology so new legislation will be required. This initiative is in the best interest of salmon as it will increase stream flow and provide flexibility for water users in WRIA 32. Cathy stated that a draft letter of support was in the meeting packet for the boards review.

Upon review of the draft letter by the board members, discussion pertaining to editing the letter and taking out the house bill references and other minor edits followed.

Edits:

- Strike the "as identified in house/senate bill #" reference in the first sentence, putting a period after program.
- Change the word "scale" to "level" in the first sentence of the second paragraph.
- Change "the proposed legislation" to "this shared governance" in the first sentence in the third paragraph
- Strike the "as described in house/senate bill #" reference in the third paragraph.

Action 4: Dick Ducharme moved that we allow Cathy Schaeffer to send this letter with the discussed edits to the local Watershed Initiative group in Walla Walla County. Dick Jones seconded the motion. Yancey Opposed sending letter of support. The motion carried by a vote of the majority.

Approve Cascadia Consulting Land use policies/conservation easements report:

Discussion: Cathy stated that the board received this report last fall but never approved it. There have been opportunities to review this report on the website. People have been requesting the report and we need to approve it, or not. She then asked for discussion.

Action 5: Roland Schirman moved to approve the evaluation of land use policies and conservation easements final report prepared by Cascadia Consulting. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Task 7: Doug Mattoon stated that there has been talk about having a session about how we should be implement the findings of this report in our counties. Dick Ducharme stated that the January 30th meeting was meant for this.

Set/Cancel January 27th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting; confirm February 24th board meeting.

Action 6: Roland Schirman moved to have a teleconference meeting January 27th, 2009 board meeting in Dayton to discuss the WDFW Contract. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:23 pm.

Review of Tasks

Task Title

Task 1: Anne, Contact Janet Snell (WWCC) to amend Budget Revision to travel to $10,000 instead of $6,000.
Task 2: Dick Jones and Dick Ducharme suggested that Steve with Glen Mendel's and Gary James input draft a letter to present to the board. It was also suggested that the Nez Perce may be interested in contributing also.
Task 3: Steve will work with the RTT to evaluate the appropriateness of the board addressing fishing regulations pertaining to predatory game fish. And then draft a letter if needed to present to the board.
Task 4: Make a pie chart encompassing all entities and monies to show accomplishments (RCO, WDFW, Project Monies, etc…)
Task 5: Steve and Anne should bring back to the board some deliverables that would be expected/needed of the WDFW technical support in contract format. Roland suggested that we give the director the authority to move ahead with contract process for this fiscal period with WDFW as a pilot program in the amount of $8000. The executive committee should review the deliverables expected.
Task 6: Steve will send out a notice to the board about exactly when this meeting will happen. So that those who want to participate may.
Task 7: Doug Mattoon stated that there has been talk about having a session about how we should be implement the findings of this report in our counties. Dick Ducharme stated that the January 30th meeting was meant for this.

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
ACTION 1: Approve November 25th Meeting Minutes	**Doug Mattoon**	**Roland Schirman**	**Yes**		
ACTION 2: Approve Dec/Nov RCO/WDFW Expenditures	**Doug Mattoon**	**Jay Holzmiller**	**Yes**		
ACTION 3: Approve Budget Revisions: Amendment to travel $10,000.00	**Dick Ducharme**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
ACTION 4: Approve letter of support to WRIA 32 Partnership/Watershed Initiative with edits	**Dick Ducharme**	**Dick Jones**		**11 yea-1 nea**	**Yancey opposed**
ACTION 5: Approve Cascadia Consulting Land use policies/conservation easements report	**Roland Schirman**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
ACTION 6: Set/Cancel January 27th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting	**Roland Schirman**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	September 4th	September 23rd	October	November	January 13th, 2009
Doug Mattoon	Yes			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dick Isaac		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jay Holzmiller	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes						Yes	Yes
Dick Ducharme	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes
Dick Jones	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Roland Schirman				*Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gary James	Yes	Yes						Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Del Groat	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Michael Largent		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes		Yes
Gary Thorgaard						*Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Mike Cassetto											*Yes	
Bob Johnson											*Yes	Yes

No meeting was conducted this month.

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

Meeting Notes January 27th, 2009

Dayton WA - TELECONFERENCE @ 6pm

Board Members Present:
Dayton: Richard Jones (CC)
Via Phone: Roland Schirman (CC), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Dick Ducharme (CC), Yancey Reser (WWC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Michael Largent (WC), Gary James (CTUIR), Del Groat (GC), Stuart Durfee (WWC)
Others: Steve Martin (SRSRB), Anne Chapman (SRSRB)
Via Phone: Brad Johnson (WRIA35)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (11 board members present or on the phone)

Welcome:

Chairman Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting.

Approval of January 13th, 2009 meeting notes:

Action 1: Richard Jones moved to approve the January 13th, 2009 meeting notes. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Agenda Additions:

Additions to Agenda –

Budget announcement from Steve:

Nothing definitive but Steve is receiving information that we should plan for a 20% reduction for both RCO & WDFW Grants. If so, and assuming existing staff remain in place, the partner dollars (planning units and CTUIR) and contract services will be significantly reduced. The project dollars will also likely decrease 20%. The good news is that the State of Wa is working on an MOA with BPA, as well as other efforts to secure funding. Steve did not have anything real definitive to report as of now, but he reported that there are several opportunities out there for alternative funding.

GOVERNORS ECONOMIC STIMULUS LIST:

Dick Ducharme stated that it may be a good idea to get those projects that are ready to go on the Governors Economic Stimulus lists (Culvert projects, etc…) and also to find out the timeline for getting those projects on this list.

Task 1: for Steve – Talk to RTT, to prepare projects for adding to the Governors Economic Stimulus list and find out timelines for getting on these lists.

Projects already engineered and ready to go need to be addressed. Dick Jones stated that the feeling in Olympia as he was there last week, is that the monies will be going through the DOT, so culvert projects etc, will be given high priority. Brad Johnson stated that he has seen a list that lists specific projects in specific cities and that there were only a couple projects close to our areas. (State agency projects exclusively). He will forward the list to Steve, so that Steve may forward to the board. Steve will work with the Governors Salmon office (Phil Miller) in using the 3 year work plan to get projects included on the Governors Economic Stimulus list.

Doug Mattoon stated that these are Federal Dollars and the projects have to be under contract by July 1st, he also stated that there are several reasons why that is nearly impossible.

Dick asked Del if they had any Road Decommissioning Projects ready to go. Del answered yes. Del stated that he could be ready to go by Monday if he had the dollars to do some of these road decommission projects. Dick Jones stated that Cathy McMorris and Company are looking at long term projects (Long term Employments). What long term employment is defined as he was not sure.

It was agreed by all that the board needs to be active in finding out the timelines and how tos on getting these projects on the Governors Economic Stimulus list for funding opportunities as soon as possible.

Approve $8,000 subcontract to WDFW for technical support, March 1, 2009 thru June 30, 2009:

Discussion: Steve reported that we have about $38,000 of uncommitted funds for this grant period (2007-2009). If we contract with the WDFW for $8,000 we will return about $30,000. He reminded the board that the intent of this subcontract is to serve two purposes (1) "pilot program" to test how this contracting with them for their services would work and (2) ensure continued technical support from WDFW. Steve then answered questions about the tasks listed on the WDFW proposed draft. Dick Ducharme stated that just 150 hrs with all tasks listed is an awful lot to expect. Del stated that they will most likely complete the tasks with our funding but also donate some of their time because these tasks will require more than 150 hours but they are tasks consistent with their existing jobs.

Dick Jones asked if it would be appropriate for Steve to negotiate with WDFW on behalf of the board and get tasks agreed upon by both for this contract.

Doug Mattoon stated that he and other members of Asotin County are concerned about contracting with WDFW to basically do what they are already doing for us at no expense to the Board. He asked if this was going to set a precedent - if we start doing this, will we ever be able to get out of it? Doug feels strongly that this will promote them using these contracted monies for the bureaucrats sitting in the offices in Olympia and the monies will not be used for field staff. Roland wanted to know what would prevent other agencies from expecting these same kinds of contracts. Jay Holzmiller stated that he is also in agreement with Doug. Dick Ducharme stated that this is the same as our previous stance with NOAA (Tim Beechie), which the board stated no, we would not supplement them, because they did not want this kind of a precedence set. Steve stated that he followed up with NOAA (Lynn Hatcher) and Lynn reported that NOAA is working on securing funds ($30,000) for WDFW participation in the Snake River ESU rollup; the funds will not be available until July of 2009.

Del Groat stated that contracting with WDFW may be something that we may not be able to get out of, due to the economic times. Dick Ducharme asked if the tasks that they have been performing for us are part of their regular tasks or if they really do perform tasks for the RTT/Lead Entity that are beyond their regular tasks. Steve and Del both stated that the WDFW really are assets to the RTT/Lead Entity and do provide technical assistance beyond their regular tasks.

Discussion then turned to going over the tasks listed on the handout:

Dick Ducharme stated that task 3 and 4 (Snake River ESU roll up) really bothered him and that he felt that those tasks were really NOAA related tasks. He stated that the top two and bottom 3 tasks seemed to be appropriate. Gary James agreed, and stated that WDFW participation critical. It was reiterated that this is a small period of time and we really should go ahead and contract with the WDFW to see how this works as a sort of "pilot program".

Dick Jones stated that he has been staunch in not supporting these State agencies, but he thinks we should go ahead with this "pilot program". He did not believe that this will set precedence since we have already contracted to agencies for specific tasks in the past.

Roland asked if the document presented at the meeting will be seen by others. Steve answered no, this is an internal document. Roland does not want this contract to be misconstrued as a bailout and wanted to make sure that wording in the final contract did not imply that and also that the contract was clear that this is a "pilot program" and that there is no guarantee for future contracts.

Action 2: Dick Jones moved approve a contract with WDFW in the amount of $8000 for the following five tasks

This contract would include 5 tasks:

1. Participate in monthly RTT meetings
2. Review/Prepare materials for RTT
3. Present technical information to the SRSRB as requested by the SRSRB
4. Participate in Lead Entity Co-Leads and committee meetings
5. Assist SRSRB Project Manager and project sponsors with project grant applications.

Michael Largent seconded. The motion carried by consensus.

Notice of Co-Leads meeting Friday, January 30th, 2009 in Clarkston (ACCD) at 10am.

Steve announced the above meeting in case any board member would like to participate and staff will send out a map of the meeting location.

Task 3: Provide map to ACCD office in Clarkston to Board members by Thursday of this week.

House Bill Discussion

There was a short discussion about proposed House bill #1497. Brad Johnson stated that under this bill he had read that the SRFB, regional boards and most every over commission and board are being looked at being eliminated. Cathy Schaeffer commented that it would affect hundreds of boards if adopted and is 30 pages long. Steve will look into it.

Set/Cancel February 24th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting

The February regularly scheduled meeting was scheduled to be in our usual format. (ITV) To be held at the Walla Walla Community College Campus' in Walla Walla and Clarkston.

Task 3: Include report on operations implications with 20% budget cuts for next Board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:48 pm.

Review of Tasks					
Task Title					
Task 1: for Steve – Talk to RTT, to prepare projects for adding to the Governors Economic Stimulus list and find out timelines for getting on these lists. *Task 3: Anne - Prepare Budget reports for forecasted cuts for 2009-2011 for February 24th, 2009 meeting.*					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
ACTION 1: Approve January 13th, 2009 Meeting Minutes	**Dick Jones**	**Roland Schirman**	**Yes**		
ACTION 2: Dick Jones moved to forming a contract with WDFW in the amount of $8000.	**Dick Jones**	**Michael Largent**	**Yes**		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13th, 2009	January 27th, 2009	February	March	April	May	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Dick Isaac	**Yes**											
Jay Holzmiller	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Dick Ducharme	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Dick Jones	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Roland Schirman	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Gary James	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Del Groat		**Yes**										
Cathy Schaeffer	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Yancey Reser	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Stuart Durfee		**Yes**										
Michael Largent	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Gary Thorgaard	**Yes**											
Mike Cassetto												
Bob Johnson	**Yes**											

No meeting was conducted this month.

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

Meeting Notes February 24th, 2009

WWCC Campus Walla Walla & Clarkston - Teleconference (Dayton) 6pm

Board Members Present:

Via Phone Dayton: Richard Jones (CC), Roland Schirman (CC), Dick Ducharme (CC)

Clarkston: Dick Isaac (AC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Michael Largent (WC), Del Groat (GC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Bob Johnson (GC), Bill Bowles (GC)

Walla Walla: Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Stuart Durfee (WWC)

Others: Clarkston - Steve Martin (SRSRB), Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Bruce Heiner (WDFW), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Dave Karl (WDFW), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Jason Schlee (ACCD)

Walla Walla - Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Gerald J Anhorn (WWCC), Jay Peninjer (WWCC)

Dayton - Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Larry Fairchild (CC Landowner)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (13 board members present or on the phone)

Welcome:

Chairman Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting. Del welcomed the new members, Bob Johnson the new county commissioner replacing Butch Klaveano and Bill Bowles a new county citizen. Michael Largent introduced Kelly Farnsworth, equine surgeon at WSU, as a prospective new board member.

Approval of January 27th, 2009 meeting notes:

Action 1: Doug Mattoon moved to approve the January 27th, 2009 meeting notes. Cathy Schaeffer seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Approve January Expenses:

WDFW $2,211.53 RCO $32,304.61

Action 2: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $32,304.61 expended in January 2009 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $2,211.53 expended in January 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Stuart Durfee seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat and Cathy Schaeffer abstained.

Agenda Additions:

Additions to Agenda –

Roland's treats explained; Cathy Schaeffer asked Roland to explain the treats for tonight. Roland stated that last month he had expected Butch Klaveano to be at his last meeting and wanted to pay tribute to him for his years of service on the board, but there was a communication mix up and he was told Butch was not going to be there, so Roland put the cake in freezer, he got it out today and brought it to this month's meeting instead.

April 15-16 Projects Conference

Steve announced that we have 3 featured projects that will be presented at the Projects Conference in Shelton. (The Mill Creek Passage Assessment, the Curl Lake Passage Project and the Urban Riparian Buffers Project in Walla Walla) These are innovative creative projects from our region. Others will present their innovative Projects. Steve will send out a email notice on how to register in the near future.

Lead Entity Calendar

Steve announced that the Co-leads met and set the 10th Grant Rnd Calendar. Kris has purple starred the meeting dates located in the meeting booklet that the board members might be interested in attending.

ACTION 3: Dick Ducharme moved to approve the Lead Entity Calendar. Doug Mattoon Seconded the motion. Explanations from Steve about Scoring and Ranking meetings and the benefits of board members attending then followed. The motion carried by consensus.

WWCC regional fish passage barrier assessment update:

Discussion: Del introduced Jerry Anhorn of WWCC. Jerry stated that he is here to provide preliminary information on their project (The assessment of fish passage barriers on public roads and road right of ways) that the board approved funding for one of the previous grant rounds. Jerry explained the project saying that it was used to identify culverts and bridges that have barriers in the SR Region. They used 3 students through the summer; this work has been going on for approximately a year (Most work in Mid Sep through May). He introduced Jay Peninjer as a student who had participated in the work on this project in Walla Walla. Jerry turned the discussion over to Jay for explanation of the project. Jay explained that they have trained with the WDFW using their criteria to identify fish passibility issues in the 5 county regions. There were 695 crossings identified (Public & Private), 260 of these are culverts, 409 are bridges and 26 are unknown due to being on private areas and there being no access/vision to the crossing. 129 of these crossings have been identified as barriers, 460 have no barriers, 17 are level b evaluations and 89 are unfinished. The data will be available throughout the state through the WDFW Database. The data was broken into 5 areas (Asotin Drainage, Grand Ronde Drainage, The Lower Snake, Tucannon and Walla Walla Drainages.) Every crossing will be identified in arc view on a map visually. Jerry stated that because they have gone the WDFW Shear criteria training, they have an actual WDFW # which is 150 or 151. That # will identify this team as the ones doing the work on this project in the data. Total expenditures to date are $34950, total match $5150.00. Jerry reported that this grant was really loaded with grant monies ($265,000) and they will not even get close to using all the monies. They still will be designing culverts following the WDFW criteria hopefully this summer. They will not design road compaction or material.

Dick Ducharme asked what kind of interface they had with the county engineers and the road departments. Jerry stated that as of now there had been no contacts with the Dept of transportation. Jerry stated that they have worked with WDFW and their criteria and to their understanding it is WDFW responsibility to fix these identified barriers. They will then hand the information to the counties. Dick stated that it might be a good idea to give the engineers of each of these counties a heads up. So they can budget for these issues. Particularly if these are findings that are going to mandate fixes. Dick Jones concurred. Jerry stated that all they are doing is identifying, evaluating and assessing. Jerry stated that they will be handing this data to the SRSRB and they can do what they see fit with these results. Jerry agreed that all parties involved should be notified so that duplicate works does not happen. Dave Karl stated that WDFW has a contract with WSDOT to do all this work statewide. The work being done will not be replicated because Jerry and his team have gone through the training and it will be used by WDFW. Doug along with Dick Ducharme stated that it would be a simple meeting to get the 5 county engineers together and just let them know what they are doing and what the findings are. Doug also asked about the 129 barriers and where most were located. Jerry reported that most barriers are on public county roads in the Forest Service areas.

Head gate Dam fish passage assessment:

Bruce Heiner - There is a concrete dam about 15 miles up Asotin Creek that is a partial barrier especially to juvenile salmon. It is critical that juvenile fish are able to move to and from the Intensively Monitored Watershed project site to ensure that our results/conclusions are not jeopardized by this structure. Steve, Kris, Jason Schlee, and Dave Karl met with Bruce Heiner last fall at this site and asked if he would develop some preliminary conceptual designs to provide passage. Bruce is an engineer for WDFW and designed the Curl Lake passage project we funded two years ago, as well as many other projects in our region. Bruce presented a power point presentation discussing 4 different options pros/cons to each for providing fish passage in this area. He stated that this is a fish passage project. Roland asked if he could provide the Power point to Steve so that Anne could post on website for those who could not see to review.

Predation rates by non-native species on listed species:

Discussion: Del stated that we asked that the Watershed Steward and Kris work with the RTT to help us better understand this issue and to take a stab at quantifying the actual impact because we wanted scientific information to help us decide how far to press on this issue. Dave Karl (WDFW) presented the information that he and Kris had found. He stated that the findings were all over the board. He stated that the research states that there is predation occurring. There are areas that do protect some of these species. Washington state is one of the first states to put together a unit to start dealing with non native species. Prevention is key to fixing some of these issues.

Approve Community Salmon Fund Projects:

Discussion: Del stated that the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation has a program called the Community Salmon Fund that funds salmon projects that have a strong community visibility/support element to them and that are also technically sound and consistent with salmon recovery plans. This year they have $100,000 for the Snake Region. We received 6 applications that were reviewed by members of the Lead Entity committee and Kris has the results of that meeting in the booklet. The Board needs to approve the final project list. Dick Ducharme questioned the 6th project. Del stated that the 6th project due to available monies would not be funded anyway.

Action 4: Dick Ducharme moved to take the 6 project off of the list and any monies leftover be obligated equally to projects 4 & 5. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus with no further discussion.

Nature Conservancy, Public Broadcasting Service Salmon documentary movie outreach:

Discussion: Steve was contacted last month by a broadcast affiliate working on a salmon documentary for the Columbia basin that was funded by the Natural Conservancy. The affiliate requested funding for expanding the documentary to include two elements (1) local input and (2) produce outreach materials. They want to work with regions on the Columbia basin and requested $50,000 for these two items. Steve has contacted the other regional boards and the RCO to seek input and support. Steve has a conference call tomorrow morning with the RCO to discuss how to fund this work because of the conflict with SRFB and RCO direction not to spend out our budget, i.e., use it or lose it. The RCO has committed to carrying our unspent funds to next biennium so there is strong incentive not to spend it. Steve is hopeful that the RCO and other regions can contribute funding. Discussion then followed as to the pros/cons of funding such a project. If the documentary message came out unsupportive, the monies would not be well spent. Discussion about the fact that they will do this film with or without the boards' financial support then followed. If they want to convey the information accurately, they will do research without the boards' financial support and will come to us for information anyway. A proactive approach from the board should happen in making sure they have accurate information about our region and what is really happening.

Action 5: Doug Mattoon moved that we do not financially contribute to the Nature Conservancy, PBS salmon documentary. Dick Isaacs seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. The board instructed the staff to offer information to PBS if asked for. Any information that is offered should be with a guarantee that the board gets to review the final product before production and before we endorse anything. Steve will carry this perspective to the teleconference tomorrow.

SRFB funding forecast:

Discussion: Steve reported that there is likely to be a 20% reduction in SRFB funding for the four programs they fund – Lead Entity-Regional Boards-Monitoring Forum-Projects. Steve testified earlier this month and received SRFB decision to only cut the Lead Entity and Regional Board funding by 8%. For now the understanding is that the 7 regions will work to achieve an average 8% reduction and that lead entities within a region will collectively work to achieve a 8% reduction. This is easy for the Snake because there is only one lead entity program. Steve and Anne are working on budget scenarios for Board discussion in March. Additional funding sources will be being looked at to fund the projects in our 3 year work plan. It will be May before we know exactly what this 8% cut will mean to us. Steve reported that in working with others in the region, it may mean a 9% cut for us. Jay Holzmiller stated that he did not believe that we should have to take any more than 8%. We have been out front in all of this and we should not have to suffer because others were not organized or whatever.

Discussion about WRIA 35 – and funding needs then followed. Del stated that in the WRIA meeting that he attended recently the unspent funds were discussed. The WRIA's have donated a lot of time and to turn back monies, it was not favored by them. Compensating some of these supporting entities might be an option that the board needs to look at between now and June. Steve stated that he needs to get together with people like Brad and see exactly what is needed and put a proposal together to present to the board.

Legislative update – Bills to integrate Salmon Recovery Act activities:

Discussion: Under the Governors' initiative to increase efficiencies and reduce cost there was a bill introduced to close the Governor's Salmon Office, move the Salmon Act out of RCW 77 and into 79a (public recreation lands) and the lead entities to the RCO. Steve commented, with the assistance of Dick Ducharme, to the chairs of the committees that this would contradict the intent of the act by fracturing or splitting it into various agencies and RCW's, not result in cost savings and introduce confusion and minimize cohesion. The final bill that moved out of the senate to rules maintains the intent of the act = is stays under RCW 77, but moves the GSRO and lead entity program under the RCO for administrative purposes. The GSRO also retains its current name. A companion House bill did not get amended and will be heard in appropriations on Thursday. Steve will keep the board informed on the status of this issue.

Introduction and over-view of staff job descriptions:

Discussion: At our request, Steve, Anne and Kris put together description of the tasks they are performing so we can better understand their work loads and to consider prioritization if budget reductions warranted such discussions. This is just an introductory document that we can think about and discuss in greater detail at the next meeting.

TABLED: Dick Ducharme moved that this be tabled until next meeting so that all can review. It was agreed.

Allocation of SRSRB funds – projects vs. operations:

Discussion: We asked staff to provide a chart showing our operations and project expenses. Anne and Kris put these together for us and they are very understandable. Further, Kris broke out the project funding into the three categories so that we can evaluate how we are allocating our annual lead entity project dollars. Over the last four years you can see that we spend a little more than half on on-the-ground projects, a quarter on assessments/designs and a quarter on conservation easements. We should use this information as the basis for any policy decision we may want to make regarding the upcoming grant round. Doug stated that he really appreciated these charts and that this is the kind of information that needs to be shared with funding sources.

Dick Ducharme commended Kris for the Habitat Restoration and Protection Tables. He will appreciate looking over and reviewing it.

Upcoming Agenda March 24th:

Steve commented that if the Board has any items that they want on the agenda it would be helpful if they would call in to the ex comm. Meeting one week before the meeting (3/17/09 @ 6pm). Already on the next agenda LE Bylaws, 3 yr work plan, comment letter to EPA (temp control structure on Brownly dam). Dick Ducharme stated he would like to see a report from the COR about the WEIR they put in around little Goose Dam. Cathy stated that Larry, Stuart, Roland and she had all participated in the pine creek presentation at different times. She stated that Gary James may be a source and may know what is going on there.

Confirm March 24th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting

The March regularly scheduled meeting was scheduled to be in our usual format. (ITV) To be held at the Walla Walla Community College Campus' in Walla Walla and Clarkston.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 pm.

Review of Tasks					
Task Title					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
ACTION 1: Approve January 27th, 2009 Meeting Minutes	**Doug Mattoon**	**Cathy Schaeffer**	**Yes**		
ACTION 2: Approve January Expenses: WDFW $2,211.53 – RCO $32,304.61	**Roland Schirman**	**Stuart Durfee**	**Yes**		**Cathy Schaeffer, Del Groat Abstained**
ACTION 3: Dick Ducharme moved to approve the Lead Entity Calendar.	**Dick Ducharme**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
Action 4: Approve the Community Salmon Fund Project list, taking the 6th project off of the list and any monies leftover be obligated equally to projects 4 & 5.	**Dick Ducharme**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
Action 5: Do not financially contribute to the Nature Conservancy, PBS salmon documentary.	**Doug Mattoon**	**Dick Isaac**	**Yes**		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13th, 2009	January 27th, 2009	February 24th, 2009	March	April	May	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Dick Isaac	**Yes**		**Yes**									
Jay Holzmiller	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Dick Ducharme	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Dick Jones	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Roland Schirman	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Gary James	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Del Groat		**Yes**	**Yes**									
Cathy Schaeffer	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Yancey Reser	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Stuart Durfee		**Yes**	**Yes**									
Michael Largent	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Gary Thorgaard	**Yes**		**Yes**									
Kelly Farnsworth			***Guest***									
Bob Johnson	**Yes**		**Yes**									
Billy Bowles			***Yes***									

No meeting was conducted this month.

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

Meeting Notes March 24th, 2009

WWCC Campus Walla Walla & Clarkston

Board Members Present:

Clarkston: Dick Isaac (AC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Del Groat (GC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Bob Johnson (GC), Bill Bowles (GC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC)
Others: Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Jason Schlee (ACC), Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Nelle Murray (ACWeed)
Walla Walla: Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Stuart Durfee (WWC), Richard Jones (CC), Roland Schirman (CC), Gary James (CTUIR)
Others: Clarkston - Steve Martin (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Larry Hooker (WWCCD

Vice Chairman Cathy Schaeffer called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (13 board members present)

Welcome:

Cathy Schaeffer welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

Approval of February 24th, 2009 meeting notes:

Discussion: Dick Isaacs was concerned about the Head gate Dam section. He stated that the he wanted to remove the words "not a dam removal" from the second to last sentence in that section.

Action 1: Dick Isaacs moved to approve the February 24th, 2009 meeting notes amending under the Head gate dam fish passage assessment section the 2nd to the last sentence to just say "He stated that this is a fish passage project". Del Groat seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Approve February Expenses:

WDFW $4,390.75, RCO $28,120.25

Action 2: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $28,120.25 expended in February 2009 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $4,390.75 expended in February 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat and Cathy Schaeffer abstained.

8% Budget Cut Discussion:

Discussion: Vice Chair Cathy stated during the executive committee phone meeting last Tuesday night the people who had called in discussed the possibility of the Strategic Planning committee getting together to discuss and help plan out next grant rounds biennial budget 2009-2011. Steve reported that in anticipation for the next budget round. Each region should expect an 8% budget cut. He would like to see the Strategic Planning Committee get together to discuss what the budget will look like. He reported that if you assume that the employees, financial agent, office rent, etc all stay the same (fixed costs), then the discretionary piece of the pie would be the red piece of the budget. Steve further explained that on the WDFW Pie Chart the Yellow piece of the pie is a mandatory license cost for the Habitat Work Schedule. So as the board can see the budget cuts affect the partnership & professional support area of the pie chart.

Steve asked if anyone on the Strategic Planning Budget Committee or any other board member then followed concerning whether or not anyone would like to volunteer to meet and discuss budgeting issues for next biennium (no volunteers).

Cathy stated that it is going to take some time to go through the budget and come up with some appropriate strategies for the next biennium. She wondered if there was anyone from the committee or anyone else that would like to do this in the next 3 weeks. Steve stated that his schedule would prefer the week of April 6th – 9th or the day before the board meetings were possible dates for budget meetings for him. Steve could also send out an email when he is available and then those available could reply and have a meeting. Roland asked if Del and Cathy could get together and recruit board members to participate in this, as they are Chair and Vice Chair of the board. There were no comments. After Steve heard no comments or volunteers he then suggested that the board approve going forward with the 8% cut. Steve also stated that the details can be looked into later. Cathy suggested that since she was not hearing any input from board

members, she would suggest that we go together with the 8% cut and after the cut is made meet to go through the details of exactly what that cut means in the budget. Del asked if the percentage rate had been 12% for the last 3 years or if it had changed. 12% has been the fee since we have been with WWCC.

Cathy then stated that maybe the approach was to have staff come up with exactly what this 8% cut means to this board. Cathy stated that there are two ways to go about this: 1). Staff could ask the co-leads and the watershed planning units to provide staff with an outline of what they can provide to the board for the next two years, or 2). The board can say, this is how much money we have can you use it. If you use scenario #1, it puts the onus back on the co-leads and watershed planning units to say this is what we can do for you and then the board can pick and choose what tasks they would like to contract for. Cathy stated that she would be willing to help work on this, knowing that she is a recipient of these funds and does not want to overstep.

Anne Chapman stated that it would be real helpful if staff could get a couple board members to meet with them, it would help the board members understand exactly why the monies in the fixed areas were what they are and also what needs to be done in planning for our partnership and professional services contracts in the next biennium.

Dick Jones and Del Groat then asked if Negotiations with Walla Walla Community College concerning their 12% fee for Financial Services had ever occurred. Is there cause for revisiting this fee? What services do they actually perform for us. Discussion then followed concerning what those services are. (ITV set up for board meetings, RFP's, Finance handling etc….) Steve stated that there are too many things to actually say exactly what WWCC does for us.

Cathy stated that she had recognized 3 points: 1.) Staff saying that it sure helps when the board helps with budgeting; 2.) Commissioner Jones asked is there cause for looking into the decision in working with the college; and 3.) Del Groat asked if we can renegotiate the WWCC Financial Services rate of 12%.

Cathy suggested that a letter to the College from the Board saying that we are facing a budget cut and asking for a reduction in the 12% fee be drafted. Roland Schirman commented that when our budget is cut they essentially are taking a budget cut and that on any grant that he has been involved in the financial services fee has been more like 20% or higher. Del stated that grants that he works with now are 4% to 8% and that maybe this % is not out of line, but he would like to see some negotiation because this rate is what we are stuck with for the next biennium.

Task 1: Draft a letter to Walla Walla Community College stating that the board is facing a budget cut and proposing negotiations for percentage rate reduction. The board approved empowering Steve with a board member to sit down with college and negotiate. Del stated that he will go with Steve and represent the board.

Task 2: Steve will work with staff to bring back an 8% budget cut to propose to the executive committee (Since there were no volunteers for Strategic Budget Planning) for consideration. This will be on the 3rd Tuesday of April (April 21st) @ 6pm.

Agenda Additions:

Additions to Agenda –

REMINDER Executive Committee Meeting:

Vice Chairmen Cathy Schaeffer reminded the board that all board members are invited to call in on the 3rd Tuesday of the Month @ 6pm to participate in the Executive Committee meeting. This helps set the agenda for the next week's board meeting. The call in number is our AT Conference Account: 1-866-866-2244 Participant Code: 2166159 followed by the # key.

WRIA35 Contract Adjustments:

Steve stated that we have anticipated unspent funds in this current RCO Budget. The guidance from the SRFB is to not spend it just because you have it, because they are providing incentive to be disciplined in our spending. These unspent funds are being negotiated so that they may be able to be applied to the next grant rounds budget. However new tasks have emerged for our Partners requiring their assistance with the emergence of the Economic Stimulus Packages (Additional tasks: Development, Review, Application and Follow through) and engaging in the Hatchery Review Team process in WRIA35 as we do our Snake River ESU Rollup to ensure that our goals in the recovery plan are aligned with them. Brad and Steve have talked quite a bit about this. Steve then discussed different scenarios that could happen for this additional funding to happen. Brad reported that they are currently under contract with what is called Watershed support funds; these funds will be ending July of 2010. All other funds are ending July 2009. Whatever additional funds are received, the Watershed support funds will be able to be moved forward into the FY2010. Brad stated that it would

be nice to have these new tasks identified and funded. Terry Bruegman asked what tasks would come off of his plate if funds were going to be swapped around. Brad stated that meetings will be held to determine that. Doug Mattoon stated that what he heard was basically a Flip Flop of funds to take advantage of funds that will be available in the future for other tasks from DOE. Roland Schirman asked if we will be in jeopardy of having a bigger cut then 8%if we do not turn back the projected unspent funds. Steve stated that it would basically be the 8% cut. However our unspent funds would be less, so that would mean we would have fewer monies to carry over. (Add to the next budget). Gary James asked if the CTUIR contract does not use all of its funds, could their contract be amended to apply those monies to Brad's (WRIA 35's). Dick Jones asked if there was a point of time that the board will know if they will get our hands slapped in dealing with these budget issues before we have answers from the RCO / Governors office, which tasks actually are going to happen before the RCO/Governors decision and which will be after? Steve stated that HRT tasks would happen after decisions are made concerning the budget and the RCO's position on it. Discussion about Brad using the current budgeted amount that he has in the WRIA 35 contract, changing the scope of work to work on the economic stimulus and then making decisions about amending the WRIA 35 contract after the decisions are made from the Governor's office, then ensued. Steve pointed out that the risks would be that if this is not supported by RCO, then Brad (WRIA 35) could potentially then be out of funding. Del Groat stated that this is not going out and buying office furniture or anything like that that the Governor's office was discouraging, this is real work. Terry Bruegman stated that if every region takes this approach then all regions will be looking at a 20% cut. Steve stated that it is really a policy decision by the board on whether or not we provide funding for Brad (WRIA 35) for the two additional tasks. Terry asked about the Stimulus Package and whether or not Brad and Jason had had a chance to talk about exactly what might be needed as far as support from Brad to the Asotin County PUD to put together the IMW stimulus package. Vice Chair Cathy stated that she felt like we needed to make a decision tonight on whether the board takes action on this matter without input from the RCO/Governor's office or we wait for their input, risking Brad's (WRIA 35) contract running out of funds.

ACTION 3: Dick Isaac moved that we amend WRIA 35's contract, adding up to $8000. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. Cathy Abstained. Roland Schirman made a motion to table the motion for further discussion. He suggested that staff evaluate contracts and see what funds may be unused, contact those contractors and see if they would be willing to amend their contracts and use those unspent funds. Dick Isaac amended the motion to say that staff should contact all current contractors, see if there are any projected unspent funds and if they would be willing to amend their contracts by that amount to amend WRIA35's contract adding up to $8000 to its contract. Del Seconded. Cathy Abstained. Motion carried by consensus.

TASK 3: Get anticipated unspent funds report from current contractors to board members within a week.

Lead Entity Bylaws – suggested changes appear in red font:

Discussion: Discussion concerning Section 10: Item (a) then followed: Stuart Durfee suggested that we change the wording The Co-leads may upon behalf to The Co-leads on behalf at the first of the sentence. Steve then explained Section 10, Item (a) using several funded projects as examples and stating that when these changes come, they are immediate changes and there usually is no time to wait for the next SRSRB Board meeting. Funded project monies do not get reallocated to other projects in these examples. Discussion then followed concerning adding Scope, worksites and timelines to the wording.

Steve explained Section 10 Items (b) & (c) to the board and then also stated that the code of ethics section was lifted out of our code of ethics section in the SRSRB bylaws and modified it to fit the Lead Entity.

Bob Johnson stated that he strongly felt that these changes were giving more and more authority to the co-leads and he was opposed to doing so. It was also stated that any funded project requesting a Budget adjustment of more monies needs to be brought to the board. Funded projects and any modifications asked for concerning scope, worksites, timelines could be made by the co-leads and those decisions made by the co-leads need to be reported by Steve to the board at the next meeting. Consensus of the board was that the decisions could be made by the co-leads with the exception of budget increases. It was stated that asking the Project Sponsors to come before the board for Budget increases helps keep them honest and also keeps our standards high. Wording discussion for Section 10 Item (a) followed.

Action 4: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the proposed bylaws with Section 10 Item (a) revised to state: "The co-leads on behalf of the Committee authorize funded project amendments that do not increase net costs." Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Approve 3 year work plan:

Discussion: The proposed 3 year work plan found in the meeting booklet behind the purple page was presented for approval to the board. Steve stated that the 3 year work plan now consists of several sections (Habitat; Assessments & Design; Research, Monitoring and Evaluation; Hatchery Actions; Information and Education (Outreach)) all included by Kris. He reported that the RTT was in complete agreement of the hatchery actions and so it was decided that we include this section in the 3 yr plan. Steve then turned it over to Kris, who then went over the 3 yr work plan briefly with the board. Kris reminded the board that the RTT has reviewed this entire plan. The only change at the last RTT meeting was to revise the title to state that it is a provisional plan, so that the 3 yr plan will always be a "working plan" and always be able to be amended/updated. Jay Holzmiller asked about where we are on the HSRG and the public section that never was made public. Steve stated that the final recommendations will be presented to congress on Friday. The next step is that the Hatchery Review Team will go to the co-managers to refine the HSRG recommendations. Jay Holzmiller asked if the Public will have any input. Steve did not have all the answers to this issue. Gary James stated that it might be hard to approve the Hatchery Part tonight. He needs to talk to WA Fish and Wildlife, the plan is talking about preventing hatchery fish from entering the upper Touchet totally and he thought that they were moving to the endemic brood stock. Steve stated that in talking with Glen Mendel he had made the comment that it should state to remove non endemic or non desired fish, because we do want some fish up there. Gary stated that the second thing is that the Tribe has proposed through their BPA/MOA to work with the co-managers to look into supplementing Mill Creek. That is not included in the plan yet. Steve recommends approving all but the hatchery section.

Action 5: Cathy Schaeffer made a motion to approve the proposed 3 yr work plan with the exception of the Hatchery Section. The Hatchery Section should be reviewed at a future meeting. Dick Isaac seconded the motion. No Discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

IMW implementation contractor selection:

Discussion: Steve updated the board that we were approved for $377,000 from the RCO to implement the IMW. There are 3 components to the contract, Tagging Fish, an interagency agreement with F&W, and buying the equipment. Steve reported that the contract is still being negotiated with the College. So that discussion is pretty much tabled. Imbedded with this contact there will be a sub contract, there is currently a RFP out asking for applications to use a contractor to do the work. The RFP has needed to be re-advertised due to complaints from State that there was not enough advertising and no state applications received. Steve asked that the board give staff direction on how to approve / or authority to approve contract with applicants. Cathy asked if RTT would be a help in reviewing the applications and selecting a contractor. Steve stated that the time frame makes it really hard.

Action 6: Dick Jones moved to authorize the chair of the board to review applications and contract with applicant with help of staff and the RTT. The motion was seconded by Roland Schirman. No discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list:

Discussion: Steve reported on the process that was used to select the projects that originally made it to the list. He reported that he used the 3 yr work plan and came up with 16 projects that met the criteria (Consistent with the recovery plan, can be implemented in the next 180 days and was at least ½ a million dollars). RTT then narrowed those down to the list presented in the meeting booklet (6 projects). Steve stated that because of timelines, it was done this way. These will be contracts between NOAA fisheries and the project sponsors listed. There is a tremendous amount of work that the project sponsors will be doing in the next couple of weeks. (Duns #'s, CRC Numbers, etc will all need to be acquired). He reported that we are the only region that had all of their projects approved for application and that we have a Governors letter of support. Most regions just submitted all of their projects without prioritizing. Letters of support stating that they believe their project has all the permits in place and that they have a design complete enough that they can develop a construction budget in 180 days are due with Applications by April 6th, 2009. There is $8 million worth of projects. Kris Buelow and Dave Karl are the primary support team. Brad Johnson and Tom Schirm have all dedicated their time to these opportunities for the next two weeks. Gary James stated that these are great projects and stated that he thought the total cost monies in the Mill Creek Channel and the 4 consolidation could be reported as much more (Cost share monies), due to their BPA monies are kicking in monies. There is another $3 million that will go into the Mill Creek Channel in the next couple years and Rick Jones is also working on this.

Jay Holzmiller commented about the project on Headgate Damn. That he had talked with at least ½ dozen people and he would not want to repeat what some had said about this project. Steve stated that the problem of addressing that this is not a DAM REMOVAL PROJECT is being discussed. Kris stated that Brad had brought up using weirs to provide FISH PASSAGE. Jason stated that when they went with the state engineer to the site, there was a lot of conversation. He felt that when Brad brought up the weirs, he felt a lot more comfortable. They will be scheduling meetings with County Commissioners and others to show all the options and also showing this newer option, this will be done to address all people's issues. Brad stated that it is a Juvenile Passage Barrier this is the real issue.

ACTION 7: Moved by Dick Jones to approve NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list. The motion was seconded by Stuart Durfee. The motion was Amended by Gary James to include cost share updates. There being no discussion the Motion carried by consensus.

USACOE WW basin feasibility study report:

Vice Chair Cathy Schaeffer reported that Marge who was going to present was sick and could not make it tonight. She asked if Gary James had any information on this. Dick Jones stated that the board needs to have more information to make informed decisions on this and he thought that the board should defer this until all can have the same information in front of them. Gary stated that they were down to basically reservoir storage or Columbia pumping to provide major flow argumentation and that the COR wants them to provide some preference on that so that they could proceed with the process. Gary James stated this is a fairly complicated subject. Cathy stated that this topic needs at least 1 ½ hrs to discuss, in her experience. It would be nice to have the boards' perspective and that there are some pre-input opportunities, he will talk with Marge to see if this topic would still be good for the board next month. Del asked if the presentation would be better to be presented to the RTT, and then the RTT make a recommendation to the board? It was stated that when there are other meetings about this subject, it would be nice if the board was notified about them and then those that are interested can participate in them. Is there some other way to do these presentations, such as a couple hrs before the meeting online through Power Point with the support of phone access? Gary announced that Thursday afternoon they will be meeting with the COR. It is at the Walla Walla COR of Engineers at 1pm.

Hells Canyon Temperature Analysis and Temperature Control Structure (TCS):

Discussion: Steve stated that the Idaho Power Hells Canyon Complex is up for relicensing and when the EPA reviewed the conditions of relicensing it suggested putting a sub surface outlet structure to decrease the Snake River by 3 degrees in the time period of September through November. This is real important for Snake River listed Fall Chinook, (which is one of our most critical populations) as well as improves Steelhead survival that is holding there. The applicant offered 2 scenarios: (1) to do watershed restoration up in the tributaries – EPA found that this was a really good idea but it would not decrease water temperature in the snake river (2) If we start spilling water off of the bottom of the reservoir we are going to be stirring up silts, etc that may be a worse condition for the salmon in the Snake River area. EPA would like a position from the SRSRB. If you have a position then we can engage the Governors Salmon Recovery office and the Dept of Ecology under the clean water act and an ESA. Steve stated that he again knows that this is too big of a paper to discuss at this board meeting. Dick Jones asked if the board wanted the RTT to review and then make a recommendation to the board. Del's reaction is that this is politics that we may not want to get into. Steve asked if it is a simple letter to EPA stating that in their consideration of the relicensing, that any improvements to fall Chinook would be supported by the Snake River Salmon Recovery board. Del stated if the temperature change truly worked, it would be great but there are a lot of ifs. He also stated that we in the beginning we wanted to stay out of damn politics. Gary Thorgaard thought this would be a great idea. Dick Jones stated that he would not support anything that would open the door to removal of damns on the Snake River. Consensus was observed as not being possible on this subject. Brad suggested inviting someone from Idaho Power to discuss this. Both EPA and Idaho Power have recently presented to all the co-managers and none of them took a stance on this. Gary James stated that there is no damn removal proposed here not even a passage of fish, the only thing considered here is some late summer/fall temperatures. He believes that this board can get into these huge political issues as long as we state that we operate on defined limiting factors from plans and we try to implement projects to address them. That temperature is a limiting factor and that if there is a way to reduce temperature and as long as it does not affect water quality, etc., the board would support that. That the SRSRB should not be afraid of stating following the guidelines and addressing a limiting factor as long as there are no negative repercussions. There were again concerns about addressing Dam Removal and not wanting to support this. Language would be real crucial.

RCO Administration changes and budget status for planning purposes:

Discussion: Steve reported that the SRFB boards recommendation is moving the WDFW contract over to the RCO and having only one set of funds (one contract). No Comments, No Discussion.

Legislative update (Salmon Act, WW Basin Partnership, etc):

Discussion: Steve reported again that Dick Ducharme was real helpful in putting together a statement on revising the house bill. The house under this new initiative to consolidate and streamline government stated that they were going to consolidate the Lead Entity, the Governors Salmon office and the Salmon Recovery act and put them all under RCO. In the past the board has stated that we really value the independent Governors Salmon office. Steve reported that the house bill died in committee. Senator Jacobsen in the senate introduced a bill to integrate Lead Entity and RCO, but keep an independent Governors Salmon office. Steve and Dick contacted Senator Jacobson and asked that he ensure that the house bill had the same wording as the Senate bill he introduced. So the Governor Salmon office will be retained.

Cathy Schaeffer reported that the Walla Walla Basin – House Bill is #1580 now; it is in the rules committee and is moving through the Senate Floor. It should soon be in the Governors' office soon.

Discuss staff job descriptions:

Cathy asked if there should be a committee set up to review staff job descriptions, she also commented that these job descriptions were presented to the board at last meeting for review. Dick Jones supports taking no action which states that the board supports the current job descriptions. All agreed.

Snake River ESU rollup status report – 10am, April 10 @ Clarkston WWCC:

Steve stated the purpose of this meeting, Steve commented that he can work with WWCC Staff to get ITV setup at campus if needed. Del stated that ITV capability is at their office in Pomeroy also. The meeting would be in the same room as where the Clarkston meeting is tonight.

April 28th & 29th Floods, Farms, Families and Fish meetings:

Cathy Schaeffer announced that Alex Ammonette and the Conservation district will be presenting their results of the assessments that were funded a 1 ½ ago by the board with the community of Waitsburg. This is the Touchet from Waitsburg down to Bowles Junction. The contractor will come to the board meeting on the 28th and do approx a 20 minute overview and then do a follow-up meeting in Waitsburg at the Waitsburg Elementary on the 29th, 7-9pm. Janine Castro and Brian Bair, Anthony Olagario, and Michael MacNamara will special guests.

Confirm April 28th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting

Discussion: Discussion concerning having our regularly scheduled meeting as usual or at the Seneca Building in Dayton to take advantage of the presentation during the board meeting then followed.

ACTION 8: Dick Jones moved to move the April 28th meeting to Seneca building in Dayton. Stuart Durfee seconded. Discussion then followed concerning exact location. Motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:26 pm.

Review of Tasks
Task Title
Task 1: Draft a letter to Walla Walla Community College stating that the board is facing a budget cut and proposing negotiations for percentage rate reduction. The board approved empowering Steve with a board member to sit down with college and negotiate. Del stated that he will go with Steve and represent the board. *Task 2: Steve will work with staff to bring back an 8% budget cut to propose to the executive committee (Since there were no volunteers for Strategic Budget Planning) for consideration. This will be on the 3rd Tuesday of April (April 21st) @ 6pm.* *TASK 3: Get anticipated unspent funds report from current contractors to board members within a week.*

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
ACTION 1: Approve February 24th , 2009 Meeting Minutes – with Amendment.	**Dick Isaac**	**Del Groat**	**Yes**		
ACTION 2: Approve February Expenses: WDFW $4,390.75 – RCO $28,120.25	**Roland Schirman**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		**Cathy Schaeffer, Del Groat Abstained**
ACTION 3: Motion to Amend WRIA35 contract up to $8000 with unspent funds from other contrats.	**Dick Isaac**	**Bob Johnson**	**Yes**		**Cathy Schaeffer Abstained.**
Action 4: Motion to approve Lead Entity Bylaws with Amendments	**Roland Schirman**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
Action 5: Motion to approve 3 yr work plan, except the hatchery section.	**Cathy Schaeffer**	**Dick Isaac**	**Yes**		
Action 6: Motion to authorize chairman to review RFP Applicants for IMW contract , make a selection and contract with selection with help of staff & RTT	**Dick Jones**	**Roland Schirman**	**Yes**		
Action 7: Motion approve NOAA Restoration Center Economic Stimulus project list with cost share updates	**Dick Jones**	**Stuart Durfee**	**Yes**		
Action 8: Motion to have regularly scheduled April meeting in Dayton at the Seneca building.	**Dick Jones**	**Stuart Durfee**	**Yes**		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13th, 2009	January 27th, 2009	February 24th, 2009	March 24th, 2009	April	May	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Dick Isaac	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**								
Jay Holzmiller	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Dick Ducharme	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Dick Jones	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Roland Schirman	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Gary James	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**								
Del Groat		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Cathy Schaeffer	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Yancey Reser	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Stuart Durfee		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**								
Michael Largent	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**									
Gary Thorgaard	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**								
Kelly Farnsworth			***Guest***	**Yes**								
Bob Johnson	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**								
Billy Bowles			***Yes***	**Yes**								

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

Meeting Notes April 28th, 2009

Senaca Building, Dayton, WA

Board Members Present:

Dayton:), Del Groat (GC), Bob Johnson (GC), Bill Bowles (GC), Richard Jones (CC), Roland Schirman (CC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Dick Ducharme (CC), Stuart Durfee (WWC)

On Phone: Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Michael Largent (WC)

Others: Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Jason Schlee (ACC), Jerry Hendrickson (AC), Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Dave Mastin, Brian Bair (USFS), Janine Castro (PSU), Craig George (Dayton Mayor)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (11 board members present)

Welcome:

Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

In remembrance of Dick Isaac, Del asked all before proceeding with the agenda to take a moment of silence to recognize the passing of Dick Isaac who was a friend, family man, member of our community and Snake River Salmon Recovery Board member.

Approval of March 28th, 2009 meeting notes:

Action 1: Stuart Durfee moved to approve the March 28th, 2009 meeting. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Approve March Expenses:

WDFW $3,632.05, RCO $35,709.80

Action 2: Stuart Durfee made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $35,709.80 expended in March 2009 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $3,632.05 expended in March 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Roland Schirman, Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat and Cathy Schaeffer abstained.

Additions to Agenda:

Additions to Agenda –

- Cathy wanted to note she will only be on the phone until 6:30pm.
- Kris stated that the Preposals are due on April 30th by the end of the business day for the 10th Project Round. Kris also stated that there will be a RTT Meeting on May 7th, 2009. Everybody is welcome to come.
- Steve showed a Touchet River assessment completed and proposed map on screen.

Dr. Janine Castro and Brian Bair's Touchet River Assessment and discussion of "Floods, Families, Farms and Fish":

Del reminded the board that we funded two assessments last year on the Touchet River from Waitsubrg downstream to Bolles Bridge. The assessments were led by Dr. Janine Castro of the Portland State University and Brian Bair of the USFS. Janine and Brian were invited to share their findings with us this evening. Del asked that all in attendance please join him in welcoming these two experts on stream properties as they share their recommendations with us. A power point presentation by Brian Bair was then done on the results of the Touchet River Assessment.

Economic Stimulus Funding update:

Discussion: In early March Steve received a request by the Governor's office to identify projects eligible for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding opportunity. Based on the 3-year work plan, 19 projects meeting the criteria were identified. The criteria were that the projects had to be (1) "shovel ready" within 180 days meaning that permits, designs and land owner support had to be in-hand or likely to be in-hand, (2) at least $500,000, (3) consistent with recovery plan, and (4) create jobs. The project list was quickly whittled down to seven on March 7 because some of the criteria could not be met. In the end three projects were submitted on April 6 in the amount of $4.8 million and they are (1) relocating and burying the overhead power line on the Tucannon River sponsored by the REA, (2) consolidating points of diversion and piping 11 miles of irrigation ditch in the middle Walla Walla River to save 6 cfs, and (3) implementing the McCaw channel restoration project (This project is very similar to the presentation we just heard from Janine and Brian). The list is included in your packet.

General Updates:

Draft partner contract deliverables July 09 - June 11

At our request, Steve worked with our partners (Conservation Districts and Planning units) to identify deliverables they can provide us to support our requirements back to the RCO and WDFW. Anne has included their deliverables in tonight's packet for your review. We can discuss these with an understanding that they or some variation of them, will form the basis for their contracts for July 1, 2009 thru June 30, 2010. We will see the contracts at our next Board meeting prior to approving them. Steve will not know absolute budget until May 14th.

WRIA 35 Amendment Update Apr 09 – Jun 09 ($4,450.00)

Just an update – as you recall the WRIA 35 Planning Unit was asked to assist staff with evaluating and advising the Board on hatchery reform progress in the Snake Region and assisting with the economic stimulus initiative. The economic stimulus work revealed no projects needing assistance in WRIA 35 but the hatchery reform efforts do warrant assistance. Anne reviewed our various contracts and asked if any of the contractees anticipate unspent funds. Three sources became available (1) WDFW, $1,450, (2) CTUIR $2,000 and (3) Mastin $1,000. The WRIA 35 contract was amended to include this monetary increase and an additional deliverable.

09-11 Budget Update

Steve has no new news on this –we anticipate an 8% reduction and that the reduction will primarily be absorbed by operating expenses and to a lesser extent partner contracts. However, Steve met with agency folks in Olympia yesterday and advocated the Governor's office to recommend "back-filling" those regions who demonstrated disciplined spending and that did not complete certain deliverables because of situations outside their control. The Governor's office is recommending that the snake be granted $80,000 to "back-fill" our cost-savings for the purpose of revising/updating our recovery plan to reflect new information learned/presented in the Mid C Steelhead ESU roll up and the yet-to-be-completed Snake River ESU roll up. Our plan is slowly becoming out-dated and needs revised to be up-to-date.

Update on Fiscal Agent Percentage Rate Negotiations:

Del stated that he and Steve has a request in to WWCC to discuss their 12% business services fee and is awaiting a meeting that will likely be scheduled next week. He announced that in the interim he had posed a scenario to the Asotin PUD where they might become our business service provider…. Del stated that unofficially, Tim gave numbers not based on a board decision, but talking with a few over phone. For the first $400,000 there would be a $35,000 charge and a 6% charge after that for monies above $400,000.

Steve stated that next years projections for budget are: $308,000 in RCO plus, approx $70,000 WDFW/Lead Entity, $80,000 for revising our plan, $377,000 IMW and tentatively $80,000 BPA.

Del also has 2 other entities that might be interested. Jerry Hendrickson stated that if there was a decision to go ahead with finding another fiscal agent, then this would need to be opened up for people to bid on.

Regional Road Maintenance BMP program update:

Discussion: Del stated that the last board meeting, questions about the status of this contract prompted Steve to ask Dave to come and provide us an update. Dave Mastin was welcomed to the meeting.

Dave then presented his power point presentation to the board. Discussion about presentation then proceeded. It was suggested that Steve draft a letter to the Road departments.

Task 1: Steve - Write letter to Road departments.

IMW Update:

Discussion: Del stated that the RTT reviewed 2 proposals and selected EcoLogical. Subsequently, the RCO asked that we re-advertise in an attempt to get broader participation. A third proposal was received. He reminded the board that they had authorized him to review the proposals and act on their behalf in selecting one. Del engaged Steve, the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and the RCO along with input from Gary Boone (WWCC) to compare the three proposals against our "bid items" and concluded with consensus from those three participants that EcoLogical is still the preferred contractor. EcoLogical and the other two contractors have been notified and next steps (contract development) and kick-off are being worked on now. ($125,000 range)

Snake River ESU Update:

Discussion: Members of the Board, Staff and Brad met with folks from Oregon, Idaho and NMFS on Monday, April 10th to evaluate where each state is at and next steps to develop the ESU roll up recovery plan. Two assignments emerged (1) Steve is to create a habitat work group and (2) NOAA will create a hatchery reform work group. Anne has included the meeting notes in tonight's packet (at the end).

Additions to May Agenda:

- Election of officers
- Mike Delarme from HSRG as a guest speaker (Brad Johnson will contact him and let staff know if he will be able to attend).

Confirm May 26th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting

Discussion: Del asked if the board wanted to meet at the two college campus' or in a central location such as Pomeroy or Dayton?

ACTION 3: Michael Largent moved to have the May 26th meeting in Pomeroy, at USFS Building. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:38pm.

Review of Tasks					
Task Title					
Task 1: Steve – Write letter to Road Departments.					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
ACTION 1: Approve March 28th , 2009 Meeting Minutes – with Amendment.	**Stuart Durfee**	**Bob Johnson**	**Yes**		
ACTION 2: Approve March Expenses: WDFW $3,632.05 – RCO $35,709.80	**Stuart Durfee**	**Roland Schirman Bill Bowles**	**Yes**		**Cathy Schaeffer, Del Groat Abstained**
ACTION 3: Move Meeting to May 26th, 2009 in Pomeroy at USFS Building	**Michael Largent**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13th, 2009	January 27th, 2009	February 24th, 2009	March 24th, 2009	April 28th, 2009	May	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Dick Isaac	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**								
Jay Holzmiller	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Dick Ducharme	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**							
Dick Jones	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Yes							
Roland Schirman	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Yes							
Gary James	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**								
Del Groat		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Cathy Schaeffer	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Yancey Reser	**Yes**	**Yes**										
Stuart Durfee		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Michael Largent	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**							
Gary Thorgaard	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**								
Kelly Farnsworth			***Guest***	**Yes**								
Bob Johnson	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Billy Bowles			***Yes***	**Yes**	**Yes**							

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

Meeting Notes May 26th, 2009

USFS Building, 71 W Main, Pomeroy, WA 99347

Board Members Present:

Pomeroy: Del Groat (GC), Bob Johnson (GC), Bill Bowles (GC), Richard Jones (CC), Roland Schirman (CC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Michael Largent (WC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC),
On Phone: Gary James (CTUIR), Yancey Reser (WW)
Others: Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Jason Schlee (ACC), Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Mike Delarm.

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (11 board members present)

Welcome:

Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. Due to a wreck on the Alpowa grade some members did show up a few minutes late. A quorum of 8 was present at start of the meeting.

Approval of April 28th, 2009 meeting notes:

Action 1: Roland Schirman moved to approve the April 28th, 2009 meeting. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Approve April Expenses & RCO Budget Adjustment

Contingency to Fixed Assets $2182.22

WDFW $8,338.27, RCO $38,735.16:

Action 2: Dick Jones made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $38,735.16 expended in April 2009 in the RCO Budget and the RCO Budget Adjustment from contingency to fixed assets in the amount of $2,182.22 for Steve's new laptop. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $8,338.27 expended in April 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

Additions to Agenda:

Economic Stimulus update

Steve reported that there has been no new news on the projects submitted.

Biop/MOA update

Basically no new news. Gary James stated that it is the Judges opinion that the habitat is inadequate and there was no fall back for the plans added into it. The judge just didn't want alternative planning to not be in progress. The tribes have plans in place for at least the next 10 years.

Pac SRF Funding

Questions about the PAC SRF funding and it being reduced were then discussed. Steve reported that the funding will actually be increased. He also stated that when new administrations are in place, it is important to convey that we just need to stay the course.

ESU Roll up

No updates.

RM 42.5

Steve reported that Alex Amonette's Spring Rise Organization is not large enough to encumber the liability insurance for the assessment project and it has been agreed that the Walla Walla Conservation district will inherit this project and it will move forward.

Briefing on pre-proposal project review and next steps/schedule:

Del stated that Kris has a list of 20 pre-applications for this year's lead entity funding cycle that were submitted earlier this month. There may be additional applications which are due June 2 so the information Kris is providing is very preliminary. If you want to engage in the process the next formal review will be July 20. Kris is the lead on this process so contact him if you want more information.

Kris directed the board to the meeting booklet, behind the light blue page. He quickly went over the 20 projects submitted. He then went to the Lead Entity Calendar for the 10th grant round and reminded everyone of the timeline for the 10th project round. The board was reminded that they are welcome to participate in the tours or scoring/review meetings. RTT/LE/SRSRB/Sponsors will comment on submitted projects and prescore them on July 20th. A few additional projects are expected to be submitted. Some of the projects will probably drop out of the list in the booklet due to the comments of the RTT/LE/SRSRB/Sponsors at their last meeting.

Board Restructure – nomination of new officers for election in June:

Discussion: Del stated that our bylaws call for annual election of officers so tonight he would like to take nominations then in June vote on those nominations. Anne commented that she didn't want to speak for Cathy, but she thought that Cathy will need to be replaced due to the fact that she may not be on the board much longer. Steve confirmed Anne's statement.

Action 3: Dick Jones moved to nominate/elect Del Groat for chair, and Del Groat moved to nominate/elect Roland Schirman for Vice Chair. Doug Mattoon seconded both nominations. The motions carried by consensus.

Budget status update:

- **Negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC & alternate fiscal agent discussion**

Del stated that at the request of the Board, Steve and he (By phone) met with Dr. VanAusdale and his financial assistant to discuss reducing the business services fee charged by WWCC. He also stated that the Asotin PUD's offer was still there, but the timing is not good, due to the fact this change would need to have to happen next week.

Steve stated that Dr. VanAusdale agreed to reduce the fee from 12% to 6% for all contracts except our base operating contract because our "additional" contracts are easier to manage as they are typically one-time agreements. We expect to manage $866,000 dollars over a 12-month period of which $333,000 is our base operating budget. In a nut shell the revised business services fee results in a $27,000 savings. Steve quickly broke down the WWCC base contract and the additional ones at 6%.

- $333,588 – Base operating budget (12%)
- $65,000 – Lead Entity program budget plus $10385 for HWS license fee (6%)
- $377,910 – IMW budget (6%)
- $80,000 – plan revisions (6%)

Dick Jones asked about Health insurance for the employees. Concerns about computer software, etc were then discussed. Timeline was discussed and not having enough time to make a change at this time.

Del stated the last quote from the Asotin PUD was $35,000 on the first $400,000 and then 6% after the first $400,000. Del stated also that for the future he has talked with Steve about the possibility that the SRSRB staff meet with the PUD staff. He stated that there would be only two people that Anne would work with at the PUD. He stated that Tim at the PUD would like to do this because they would like to bank the money and it would help to defray costs.

Discussion then turned to the budget and Steve's testimony in Olympia resulting in our RCO/WDFW budgets not being cut this next year as projected. Steve reported that he had testified earlier this month to the SRFB regarding the importance of the human infrastructure necessary for salmon recovery implementation and that the SRFB should award the maximum amount it has authority over for projects. In a nutshell he signaled that now is not the time to

slow the rate of progress or to suggest that reductions in people will not impair our ability to implement salmon recovery. He also noted that the Snake River board has been very disciplined in its spending and once again will be returning unspent funds which he then followed up with a request that the SRFB acknowledge the efficiencies gained and the discipline demonstrated in the Snake by awarding us $80,000 to update our plan. Due to his testimony, the SRFB decided to not cut the RCO/WDFW budget for 2009-2010. This has helped to keep our partners whole for this next year.

Del then asked Anne to explain the IMW budget and administration costs that were being taken out of that budget to help also keep the SRSRB partners whole. Anne explained that WWCC had advised staff to budget for administrative costs in the IMW Budget. The proposed IMW budget has administration fees of 20% of Steve, Kris and Anne's salaries and 25% of office costs for 6 months. Due to the fact that work for the IMW would be coming out of the SRSRB office.

Dick Jones stated that if we look at another fiscal agent we really need to study this for 6 months. Take our time, etc…. before we make any big decisions. Del agreed, he stated that just on the IMW contract alone we had saved $21,000 by doing these negotiations with WWCC.

Steve stated that when he thinks of WWCC he thinks of the Verizon commercial with all the people standing behind the Verizon guy. There are so many people who are working for us. Whether it be software, technical, billing, travel, retirement, health insurance, etc there is always someone there to answer staff's questions.

Dick Jones stated that if we pass a contract tonight we should stick with that contract for the year. We need to honor our commitments and our contracts. If we want to look into switching fiscal agents, then we need to take our time and compare apples to apples before making any switch.

Doug Mattoon stated that he thought that WWCC had done an excellent job for us and that there really is no reason in his eyes to change. If you start changing contracts all the time you are just looking for trouble. He also stated that Steve and Del should be proud of their negotiations with Dr. VanAusdle.

Approve negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC:

Action 4: Dick Jones moved to approve the negotiated fiscal agent fee for business services from WWCC and contract with them for one year, Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

Hatchery management plan (HSRG/HRT) updates – Mike Delarm and NOAA:

Steve stated that Brad had invited Mike Delarm of NOAA to provide an overview of the context, process and recommendations pertaining to hatchery reform so that we can understand them and revise our recovery plan as warranted to address the recommendations. Steve thanked Mike Delarm for coming.

Mike stated that it was his understanding that we wanted updates on Hatchery actions and big picture items. The 3 items he will report on are USD Oregon Process, HRT report Schedule, and the HSRG report.

HRT - Fish and wildlife (hatchery review report) are in the process of meeting with co managers in the next couple of months to make sure they have the data correct. They expect a Stake holders meeting in September or early October and at the same time they expect their draft report to go out for public comment.

USV Oregon – is essentially where the Federal Goverment intervened on the behalf of Columbia River tribes to protect their fishing rights and resulted in a Columbia River fishing plan in 1988. Another agreement was negotiated and is current through 2017. Hatchery plan got implemented into this plan as a settlement agreement. It was Court ordered. This was partly due to the tribes acknowledgement that given the limitations on endangered species they would be unable to obtain their fishing quotas, so the hatchery element was brought in. Plan does not address tributaries. (5 tribes, 3 states and 3 federal agencies all part of the agreement) This case is still under the jurisdiction of Judge Keen in Portland, OR. This case will be open for as long term as Mike can see. The agreement has the abundance base element. This Agreement was made so that the tribes will balance catch with each other. It looks like States are catching more than tribes right now, so Mike felt that the agreement will be adjusted to even out the catches between tribes and states.

Bill Bowles asked about 17,000 fish catch in the lower snake vs. the 3,000 in our upper snake area. Asking is that fair? Mike stated that you needed to understand that that is only the main stem and not the tributaries. Mike explained that this is totally a state within state decision on how the harvest is allocated. More dicussion followed.

Gary Thorgaard asked about the higher return of Jacks. Mike stated that there has been speculation that the conditions in the ocean for the last 2 years has been really good conditions not being as good since the 50's, growth rates

have been good so they are seeing higher returns of Jacks. Other factors may be run times seeming to be later due to water temperatures and/or Sea Lions. Many people are looking at it and scratching their heads. There is a court order on the amount of spill that has to occur at a certain time of year right now. Steve stated that that USV Oregon is very tight and it is set. He also stated that the board needs to remember that in conversations in past meetings it has agreed that it wants to advocate for a more equitable distribution of catch when the sport allocation comes out. This is good for the economics of this area.

Task 1: Steve: Dick Jones stated that he felt that the board needs to advocate filling the 3 vacant seats in the Fish and Wildlife commission that are vacant with the Governor. We as a board need to promote filing the seats with someone from our area to represent our position.

HSRG Recommendations – all the reports are readily accessible on their webpage. There are many different sections. Congress set up the Hatchery Review group to basically review all the basins in the Columbia River Region.

The mission was to review each and every hatchery program. Look at the program to see if they were compatible with conservation objectives in place and also to consider and find programs that would maintain harvest opportunities.

Discussion then followed. Genetics and Hatchery fish vs wild fish were some of the topics.

One recommendation from the HSRG review was that the release of the Lyons Ferry Stock into the Tucannon was recommended to stop.

Task 2: Anne: Link to reports on the SRSRB website to HSRG reports.

WRIA 35 Update – Phase IV, year 2; Hydrogeo Briefing; Habitat Assessment:

Del stated that Brad is here to provide information about where the planning unit is with respect to Phase 4, a recently completed hydrogeology study and a habitat assessment.

Brad reported that July 1st they will be starting Phase IV, Year 2. They will be setting stream flows at Pataha Creek, Almota, and others yet to be determined. Brad wanted to give a heads up to the County Commissioners hoping they will participate in the meetings. It will be a very interesting year.

*Hydrogeo Study – Brad reported that the Hydrogeo Study was completed & it is on the WRIA 35 website. Brad had draft copies of it here on CDs. Brad asked for the board to support their report. Comments are due on June 5th-6th on the draft report. They looked at the wells within the Asotin and Alpowa watershed and also looked at a seapage run at the same time. They were trying to come up with a connection between ground water and surface water within the Alpowa and Asotin. The consultants did not come up with any connections or concerns. Ecology is not real satisfied with this report. Discussion concerning wells and the effect of them on the water levels then ensued.

Doug Mattoon asked if it would be appropriate for the RTT to review and provide their comments to the SRSRB on the report. The deadline would not be met, but at least the board would have their perspective.

*WSU did a stream flow habitat assessment and the draft report is just now out. Basically the report says that where there is flow, there is fish.

Task 3: **Ask** ***RTT to comment on Hydrogeo Report and provide comments to SRSRB.***

Approve budgets for July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 as presented in meeting booklet:

$333,588 – Base operating budget

$65,000 – Lead Entity program budget plus $10385.00 for HWS license fee

$377,910 – IMW budget

$80,000 – plan revisions

Discussion: Steve explained the proposed budget presented in the meeting booklet for the next action item. The individual line items are based on last year's expenses for each item except partner contracts. The partner contracts (Planning Units, CTUIR and Conservation Districts) appear in grey to illustrate how much the Board funded these organizations last year. He again explained the administrative cost coming out of the IMW budget. (Twenty percent of staff payroll and twenty five percent of office costs for 6 months) This helped keep our partner contract amounts whole for the coming grant round. Fiscal agent calculations were also discussed. WWCC does not charge 12% on the 12% they charge, so they have a unique formula to figure out the fiscal amount charged. (Contact Anne if questions)

Steve explained that the action item is to approve the overall budgets in the following amounts: Base operating of $333,588, Lead entity of $65,000 plus $10,385 for HWS license ($408,973.00), $377,910 for the IMW with expenses as shown in the table in your booklet, and $80,000 for plan revisions with details forthcoming.

Action 5: Dick Jones moved to approve the proposed IMW budget of $377,910 & the proposed RCO/WDFW budget of $408,973 at the sub total level for grant year July 2009- June 2010. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

Approve partner (PU/CTUIR/CD) deliverables and budgets; contracts to be presented in June:

Del then explained the deliverables proposed by each partner are provided in your booklet and are the basis from which we need to develop budgets for these contracted services. He also explained that the Governor's office requires that they review each of our personal services contracts before we award them so we need to be prepared to approve them in June contingent upon meeting the accountability standards set by the Governor's office.

Steve explained the deliverables presented to the board (provided in the meeting booklet). He stated that the deliverables needed to be approved and then the contracted amounts needed to be approved. WRIA 32 (Cathy

Schaeffer) has also provided her requested contracted scope of work and deliverables for 2009-2010. Anne reminded the board that when CTUIR agreed to amend their contract to help WRIA 35, it was with the request that their contract be renewed at the $10,000 level. Dick Jones stated that it made more sense to him to have each partner build deliverables they could provide that would fit into the allotted budget they will have.

Discussion concerning the CD contracts and the WRIA contracts, the amount of work required and the contract amounts then followed. Terry Bruegman was concerned that contracts with the CD's vs contracts with the WRIA's were out of date. Scopes of work required from both organizations are, in his opinion very similar and the amounts of monies are very different. He asked if this was appropriate.

ACTION 6: Dick Jones moved to not take any action on the partnership deliverables at this time and instructed staff to "wipe the slate clean" and then work with each partner to develop scope of work and budget within the combined amount of $98,000 for partner services needed from the Board, Billy Bowles seconded it. The motion carried by consensus

TASK 4: Steve - work with each of our partners to negotiate a scope of work within the $98,000 total, looking at the differential deliverables and budgets based on the needs of the Board.

Confirm June 23rd, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting and location:

Discussion: Del suggested we meet via video conference in June unless someone has a reason to meet in a single location. He also reminded the board that the executive committee call occurs the third Tuesday of each month and is a great opportunity to informally discuss the agenda and by doing so, should shorten the length of our business meetings.

ACTION 7: Doug Mattoon moved to have the June 23rd meeting at the WWCC Campus in Clarkston and Walla Walla, ITV format. Billy Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45pm.

Review of Tasks

Task Title
Task 1: Steve: Dick Jones stated that he felt that the board needs to advocate to fill the 3 vacant seats in the Fish and Wildlife commission that are vacant with the Governor. We as a board need to advocate this, certainly with someone from our area to represent our position.
Task 2: Anne: Link to reports on the SRSRB website to HSRG reports.
Task 3:* Ask *RTT to comment on Hydrogeo Report and provide comments to SRSRB.
TASK 4: Steve - work with each of our partners to negotiate a scope of work within the $98,000 total, looking at the differential between CD's, WRIA's and CTUIR's scope of work and their contracted amounts and determining whether they are equitable and fair.

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
ACTION 1: Approve April 28th , 2009 Meeting Minutes – with Amendment.	**Roland Schirman**	**Bob Johnson**	**Yes**		
ACTION 2: Approve April Expenses: WDFW $8,338.27 – RCO $38,735.16 and RCO Budget Amendment $2,182.22	**Dick Jones**	**Bill Bowles**	**Yes**		**Del Groat abstained**
ACTION 3: Nomination/Election of new officers. Dick Jones nominated Del Groat for chair, Del Groat nominated Roland Schirman as Vice Chair.	**Dick Jones Del Groat**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
ACTION 4: Approve negotiated fiscal agent fee with WWCC and approve contracting with them for one year.	**Dick Jones**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		**Del Groat abstained.**
ACTION 5: approve the proposed IMW budget of $377,910 & the proposed RCO/WDFW budget of $408,973 at the sub total level for grant year July 2009- June 2010	**Dick Jones**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		**Del Groat abstained.**
ACTION 6: not take any action on the partnership deliverables at this time	**Dick Jones**	**Billy Bowles**	**Yes**		
ACTION 7: Moved to have the June 23rd meeting at the WWCC Campus in Clarkston and Walla Walla,	**Doug Mattoon**	**Billy Bowles**	**Yes**		

ITV format.					

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13th, 2009	January 27th, 2009	February 24th, 2009	March 24th, 2009	April 28th, 2009	May 26th, 2009	June	July				
Doug Mattoon	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**						
Jay Holzmiller	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**						
Dick Ducharme	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**							
Dick Jones	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Yes	**Yes**						
Roland Schirman	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Yes	**Yes**						
Gary James	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**		**Yes**						
Del Groat		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**						
Cathy Schaeffer	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Yancey Reser	**Yes**	**Yes**				**Yes**						
Stuart Durfee		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**							
Michael Largent	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**						
Gary Thorgaard	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**						
Kelly Farnsworth			***Guest***	**Yes**								
Bob Johnson	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**						
Billy Bowles			***Yes***	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**						

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

Meeting Notes June 23rd, 2009

(ITV) Walla Walla Community College Campus
Walla Walla (WEC) and Clarkston

Board Members Present:

Clarkston: Del Groat (GC), Bob Johnson (GC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Doug Mattoon (ACC), Jay Holzmiller (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC),

Others: Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Jason Schlee (ACCD), Sandy Cunningham (ACCD) Duane Bartels (PCD) Anne Chapman (SRSRB)

Walla Walla: Richard Jones (CCC), Dick Ducharme (CC), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Stuart Durfee (WWC)

Others: Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Greg Farrens (LEC-WWC), Dave Karl (WDFW)

On Phone: Roland Schirman (CC), Lynn Hatcher (NOAA) Phil Miller (GSRO)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum present. (11 board members present)

Welcome:

Del Groat welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

Approval of May 26th, 2009 meeting notes:

Action 1: Dick Jones moved to approve the May 26th, 2009 meeting notes. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Approve May Expenses:

WDFW $16,729.53, RCO $40,220.84:

Action 2: Doug Mattoon made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $40,220.84 expended in May 2009 in the RCO Budget. Additionally he moved to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $16,729.53 expended in May 2009 in the WDFW Budget. Gary Thorgaard seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. Del Groat abstained.

Additions to Agenda:

WDFW re: Harvest Allocation

Del asked that we approve a Letter to WDFW interim Director Phil Anderson requesting a more conservative recreational fishing harvest allocation in the lower Columbia for salmon. Take a look at the letter behind the pink page and I will entertain a motion to approve. Doug Mattoon suggested that after tribal governments, first line, second paragraph, the words "and citizens" be added. Dick Ducharme stated that we should add something about keeping public support throughout the state, and by giving disportionate harvest allocations it's hard to do that. Steve stated that the Yakima Recovery Board has submitted the same kind of letter last week. Dick Jones suggested taking out in 3rd paragraph the first couple of sentences and insert Dick's wording. Steve stated he would add the wording: To maintain public support for salmon recovery efforts in watersheds upstream from Bonneville we believe it critical to provide balanced salmon harvest opportunities.

Action 3: Dick Ducharme moved to send letter with changes discussed. Dick Jones seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Economic Stimulus Update:

Del asked Steve to update us on our projects submitted. Steve reported that as the board should recall we approved 3 projects that were supported by the Governor but we have not heard anything back from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act program. Del asked Lynn Hatcher of NOAA if he had any news. Lynn had nothing new to report.

Letter to Governor Gregoire requesting southeastern Washington representation on Fish and Wildlife Commission:

Del stated that the board asked Steve to prepare a letter to the Governor seeking appointment of a vacant seat on the Fish and Wildlife Commission. The draft letter in your booklet is located behind the blue page. Dick Jones commented on the letter stating that he was concerned about the Governors initiative to eliminate boards/commissions. Dick Ducharme stated that they will have a hard time eliminating this board without a statutory change. Roland Schirman stated that he needed to clarify in his mind what the board is trying to do. Are we trying to state that the board is ineffective and that we need to have representatives from all corners of the state. Or are we trying to fill the board to further our own objectives? Jay Holzmiller stated that he has interviewed for this position several times and has turned it down. Del asked if there needed to be wording changes. Roland stated that he wanted to go forward with the letter, but felt that some of the wording probably might make the Governor feel we are trying to move forward with our own objectives. Steve will work with Roland to rewrite the letter. Dick Ducharme stated that we need to point out in the letter that the Snake River is a major salmon producing area in the state and representation is missing from the Snake River region – there needs to be balance on the board. Cathy Schaeffer stated that maybe a more indirect way is to point out that there is no appointee from southeast Washington. Dick Jones stated that we need to emphasize the importance of filling the position with someone from southeast Washington who has knowledge of salmon, steelhead, bull trout, etc., in this area. Doug Mattoon suggested using wording stating from the Snake River Watershed area instead of Southeast Washington.

Action 4: Doug Mattoon moved that we authorize our chairmen to send the letter asking to provide balance to the commission by filling the seat with representation from the Snake River watershed area and using other suggestions discussed. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Perspective from NOAA and the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office:

Both NOAA and the GSRO have been on travel restrictions and unable to attend our meetings recently but wanted the opportunity to share their perspectives on the importance of regional salmon recovery boards. Phil Miller (GSRO) and Lynn Hatcher (NOAA) are on the phone.

Lynn Hatcher of NOAA stated that he basically wanted to review NOAA's and the states perspective of the purpose and need for the local recovery boards. NOAA is responsible for conducting several legal mandates of the endangered species act throughout the state. Building recovery plans, evaluating them every 5 years and implementing them are some of NOAA's responsibilities. Supporting the funding of local regional recovery boards is part of NOAA's plan to accomplish these objectives. This did not happen in Oregon and Idaho, however in Washington there is an incredibly strong network of recovery boards throughout the state. These recovery boards are still meeting monthly, lobbying regularly in Olympia and staying active in overseeing the implementation of projects in their areas. Having local county commissioners and local citizen members on these local recovery boards are key to coordinating and implementing projects for NOAA.

Phil Miller (GSRO) wanted to second everything that Lynn Hatcher had stated. He stated that we have something really special happening in the individual areas across Washington state. The Recovery Boards are the key ingredient. The Snake River Region has a unique relationship with NOAA. A lot of interesting things are going on in the Walla Walla region with water flows, in the tucannon with habitat improvement (Power System Biop), infact significant habitat restoration in our whole region. Our region is starting to look more and more at hatchery improvement and harvest relationships. A relationship with state/federal agencies is prevalent and very important and that relationship needs to be continued in our region. It takes work to maintain these relationships/partnerships. Phil wanted to applaud our efforts for the past 8 -10 years.

Steve thanked both Lynn and Phil for calling in and touching base with us. Phil apologized for not being here in person. He thinks that one on one is important. Travel restrictions are in effect and he promised that they will get here sooner or later.

2004 Inter-local agreement:

Steve explained that he had reviewed our 2004 Interlocal Agreement and noticed that the term has expired. It was located behind the yellow page in the meeting booklet. He is looking for two things (1) review the yellow sections that he added that seems to more accurately reflect our work and (2) approve the document so he can schedule meetings with the boards of county commissioners and CTUIR for signature. The Nez Perce did not sign, they wanted to maintain their independence.

Discussion of having WWCC as a signer included was because of Page 4, Section 7.

- On Page 2, last paragraph. All agreed to switch the first paragraph on page 3 with the last on page two.
- On page 3, second paragraph change protection and restoration to management.
- On page 4, Section 111. Duration. A 5 year term was suggested, making this agreement expire in 2014.

Action 5: Kelly Farnsworth moved to approve the interlocal agreement with the previously stated changes. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

Round 10 Project Submittal update & SRFB Tours report June 18th & 19th (Kris):

Del stated that the SRFB visited several of the proposed projects for this year's lead entity/SRFB grant round last week and Kris has a summary of the projects and the tours behind the purple page in the meeting booklet for us tonight.

ROUND 10 PROJECT SUBMITTAL: Kris reported that there were approximately 17 projects submitted by June 2nd, 2009 deadline for the 10th Grant Round. The projects totaled $3.6 million in SRFB Requested Monies of which there is $1.6 million available, $1.4 in match monies. He directed the board members attention to the pie chart and the map to show type and locations of projects in the meeting booklet.

SRFB TOURS: Kris reported that the SRFB toured 2 projects in Asotin county and 2 in the tucannon with 15 participants on June 18th. On June 19th there were approximately 10 people touring projects in Columbia County on the Touchet (5 projects) and 2 projects in Walla Walla. Del asked about the SRFB Review panels comments. Kris reported that comments from the review panel are due to come out on July 2nd. More complex/bigger projects are being seen and the review panel understands the need for assessments. Dave Karl reported that there were a lot of nice comments from the review board. Steve stated that it is note-worthy that the quality and amounts of the projects is way over the limit of our allotted project monies. He thanked the sponsors for their work on these projects and their submittals. Steve also stated that July 20th is an important pre-scoring meeting date for these projects. A 10 minute presentation will be done by the project sponsors at that time. All projects applications are on the SRSRB website under the lead entity tab, follow the 10th grant round links. Del strongly recommended that all board members go to the website and review the projects as we are going to have to turn down many of these projects. August 11th is the final scoring/ranking date and August 25th, 2009 is the date that we will have a board meeting and finalize the prioritized list.

COMMENTS: Dick Ducharme asked if the easement agreements were on the website. Kris stated that they were not at this time, but that they will be for the final application. Dick commented that the cost per acre in these easement applications were varied. He stated he thought that the board needs to know what is going to be allowed and not allowed on these easements, so that the board knows what they are buying. (zoning, CREP, Farming, etc….)

Tucannon Ranch – restore property loss to function? (Is it partly CREP – how much more restoration necessary???)

On the Tucannon River Offset Dike – 130 acres - what are we paying for- CREP outside of a dike - why would we pay for CREP outside of a dike? Normal River function has already been restored there.

Dick would like to also know how Blue Mt Land Trust functions and if they benefit from these projects.

A project should get approved on what it does for the recovery of salmonids, not who the sponsor is.

Del thanked Dick for his comments, he advised Kris to go back and review his comments, because he felt that the board is in agreement with Dick.

Dave Karl – The WDFW perspective is that they should not be competing with local sponsors. Dick Ducharme stated that there are pretty definitive guidelines as to the type of projects the board likes. Dick Jones stated that projects that really benefit fish if brought forward by WDFW should be looked at or the board would be recalcitrant to not look at them.

Dick Jones stated that as much as Dick Ducharme supports easements, Dick Jones does not.

Dick Ducharme wants to see the agreements on the easements and costs per acre before scoring rounds. He stated that he will not approve any of them, if he does not see those.

KRIS TASK 1: Pull out easements agreement information.

STEVE: Do you want all of the monies, donated monies, or SRFB requested monies? Doug Mattoon what is the current zoning or land use restrictions on that property. Are we paying for a conservation easement on land that they can't develop anyway?

Dayton Senior High School Student Project and Travel Expense Approval – David Frame:

We were asked by the high school senior advisor if we would benefit from a senior high school student in the context of an "internship". Steve suggested that a photo journal of our region would be useful and the advisor suggested David Frame. If the Board approves this request, David will travel around the region generally with staff or as part of a tour like last week's project tour and take photographs and video with the final project being a coffee table book with photos and captions of activities in our region.

Steve stated that this is a requirement of a Dayton Junior High School student for graduation. Steve will occasionally ask David to use his personal vehicle to travel to an event so Steve is asking us to approve travel expense reimbursement for David not to exceed $1,000. The student will remain under the schools liability policy as far as insurance.

Action 6: Dick Jones moved to approve Dayton Senior High School Student (David Frames) Project and travel expenses not to exceed $1000 travel expenses. Dick Ducharme seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the motion carried by consensus.

IMW Update:

Steve reported that EcoLogical is now under contract through February 2010 for collecting fish and habitat data in upper Asotin Creek. One change to their study plan was reviewed by the RTT which was to use ground-based surveying as opposed to LiDAR. LiDAR is great for evaluating topography, riparian width, channel sinuosity etc but is not detailed enough to detect micro-changes in habitat conditions. It was stated that the cost of LIDAR is mobilization and demobilization of the aircraft, once in the air you might as well do more area because it is not that much more expensive.

Approve 09-11 master contract and partner (PU/CTUIR/CD) contracts:

Steve worked with the Governor's Salmon Office to put together the master contract based on direction we provided him in May which was to "keep our partners whole and negotiate the tasks we ask of them", continue with existing staff levels and operating expenses. The Master Contract is behind the green inserted page and has three scopes of work which are (1) base operations, (2) lead entity program and (3) plan revisions. There is no budget detail in the plan revisions SOW as this task will be contracted out to a firm this fall that does this type of work. This is a biennial contract so staff took the annual budget amounts and doubled them but noted in the contract that the partner contracts are one-year contracts subject to change next fiscal year. Also noteworthy is that while this is a biennial contract, the RCO contract with WDFW contains language allowing for termination at any time. Last month it was agreed we would not change fiscal agents in this fiscal year.

Also included are the partner contracts behind the pink and then purple inserted pages for approval in the following amounts for a one-year period.

- WRIA 32 - $22,200 which is an increase of $2,000 from the 08-09 period
- WRIA 35 - $34,500 which is a $4,500 increase from the 08-09 period
- CTUIR - $7,500 which is a $2,500 decrease from the 08-09 period
- ACCD - $12,000 which is a $2,000 increase from the 08-09 period
- CCD - $10,000 which is no change from 08-09
- WWCCD – $10,000 which is no change from 08-09
- PCD - $5,000 which is a $2,000 increase from 08-09

Del asked for a motion to approve the 2009-2011 Plan Implementation Contract with its three scopes of work and budgets as well as the 7 partner contracts and budgets.

ACTION 6: Doug Mattoon made a motion to approve the 2009-2011 Plan Implementation Contract with its three scopes of work and budgets as well as the 7 partner contracts and budgets. Gary Thorgaard seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Report on Terry Bruegman *– Steve stated that Terry had a perforated colon and had been released from the hospital he believed that afternoon. Cathy asked if they kicked Terry out of the hospital!!!*

JULY 20th MEETING Explanation: Kris explained that all sponsors will be coming to the meeting and have approximately 10 minutes to present their projects, starting @ 8am.

Confirm July 28th, 2009 SRSRB Board Meeting and location:

ACTION 7: Stuart Durfee moved to have the July 28th, 2009 meeting in Dayton at 6pm. Cathy Schaeffer seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:36 pm.

Review of Tasks					
Task Title					
KRIS TASK 1: Pull out easements agreement information.					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
Action 1: Approval of May 26th, 2009 Meeting Minutes	**Dick Jones**	**Doug Mattoon**	**Yes**		
Action 2: Approve May Expenses: WDFW $16,729.53, RCO $40,220.84	**Doug Mattoon**	**Gary Thorgaard**	**Yes Del Groat Abstained**		
Action 3: Letter to WDFW interim Director Phil Anderson send with changes	**Dick Ducharme**	**Dick Jones**	**Yes**		
Action 4: Authorize our chairmen to send letter to Governor Greegoire asking to provide balance to the Fish & Wildlife commission by filling the seat with representation from the Snake River watershed area and using other suggestions discussed.	**Doug Mattoon**	**Roland Schirman**	**Yes**		
Action 5: Approve the 2004 interlocal agreement with stated changes.	**Kelly Farnsworth**	**Roland Schirman**	**Yes**		
Action 6: Approve the 2009-2011 Plan Implementation Contract with its three scopes of work and budgets as well as the 7 partner contracts and budgets.	**Doug Mattoon**	**Gary Thorgaard**	**Yes**		
Action 7: **Moved to have the next SRSRB, July 28th, 2009 meeting in Dayton at 6pm.**	**Stuart Durfee**	**Cathy Schaeffer**	**Yes**		

Name	Attendance for 2008-2009											
	January 13th, 2009	January 27th, 2009	February 24th, 2009	March 24th, 2009	April 28th, 2009	May 26th, 2009	June 23rd, 2009	July				
Doug Mattoon	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**					
Jay Holzmiller	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**					
Dick Ducharme	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**		**Yes**					
Dick Jones	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Yes	**Yes**	**Yes**					
Roland Schirman	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Yes	**Yes**	**Yes**					
Gary James	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**		**Yes**						
Del Groat		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**					
Cathy Schaeffer	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**					
Yancey Reser	**Yes**	**Yes**				**Yes**						
Stuart Durfee		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**					
Michael Largent	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**						
Gary Thorgaard	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**					
Kelly Farnsworth			***Guest***	**Yes**			**Yes**					
Bob Johnson	**Yes**		**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**					
Billy Bowles			***Yes***	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**						

*** First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member**

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 23rd, 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 & 13th Month Expenses:

WDFW $11,569.31 (June) $2,480.11 (13th Month)
RCO $33,838.84 (June) $4,357.41 (13th Month)
IMW $9,466.81 (June) $67,551.20 (13th Month)

Discussion: Roland asked for clarification on 13th Month. Anne explained that the 13th Month was a closeout month for the College. Their fiscal year ends in June and then they have a 13th 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 13th Month 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $11,569.31 expended in June 2009 and $2,480.11 in 13th Month 2009 in the WDFW Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling $9,466.81 expended in June 2009 and $67,551.20 in 13th 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 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 hydrosytem 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 over-seeing implementation of enhanced sport fishing for salmon and steelhead it he 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 20th 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 15th ranked project to the 1st 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 boards 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:

Project	Budget Request	Phase 1	Phase 2
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 25th 2009 Board meeting and location:

Discussion: Steve recommended that the Board meet in Starbuck at a historical building that has been restored. On August 11th 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 25th, 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					
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.					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
Action 1: Approve the June 23rd, 2009 meeting notes	Cathy Schaeffer	Stuart Durfee	Yes		
Action 2: Approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $33,838.84 expended in June 2009 and $4,357.41 in 13th Month 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $11,569.31 expended in June 2009 and $2,480.11 in 13th Month 2009 in the WDFW Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling $9,466.81 expended in June 2009 and $67,551.20 in 13th Month 2009 in the IMW Budget.	Roland Schirman	Bob Johnson	Yes (Del Groat Abstained)		
Action 3: 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		
Action 4: Cathy Schaeffer moved to have the August 25th, 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 Holzmiller	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

MEETING NOTES – August 25th, 2009

Place: 207 Front Street, Starbuck (Old Zink Building)
Format: Regular

Board Members Present
Starbuck: Del Groat (GC), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Michael Largent (WC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Bill Bowles (GC), Dick Ducharme (CC)
On Phone: Stuart Durfee (WWC), Gary James (CTUIR), Bob Johnson (GC – during project rnd vote)
Others: Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Sandy Cunningham (ACCD), Alan Schroeder (Anderson Perry), Jill Wood (Citizen).
On Phone:

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order a quorum not present at time of start of meeting. (7 board members were present or on the phone.)

Welcome:

Del welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

Public Comment:

Del stated that he would like to report to the Board that Terry Bruegman's condition has stabilized and he is showing signs of improvement although he remains in ICU. Anne has sent all of you an address by email so that you can use it to mail him cards but for now we have a card for all of us to sign to send to him.

Additions to the Agenda:

1. Send letter to DOE regional director requesting appointment of staff person to RTT
2. Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program – Parks Trails and boating facilities. The legislature approved a new project category to the program, which is conversion of CREP contracts into permanent or semi-permanent conservation easements. Considering adding CREP as part as their funding. They allocate about $40 million dollars biennially for projects submitted to the WWRP board that must then be approved by the legislature. Steve and Mike Denny are two of the policy group advisors for this new element of the WWRP program.

Approval of July 28th, 2009 meeting notes:

Gary James joined the meeting via phone, establishing a quorum and allowing the board to take action on the below items.

Action 1: Kelly Farnsworth moved to approve the July 28th, 2009 meeting notes. Michael Largent seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

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

Approve July Monthly Expenses:

WDFW $1,714.23
RCO $13,503.78
IMW $1,691.37

Action 2: Kelly Farnsworth made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $13,503.78 expended in July 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $1,714.23 expended in July 2009 in the WDFW Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling $1,691.37 expended in July 2009 in the IMW Budget. Michael Largent seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. Del Groat Abstained.

Send letter to DOE regional director requesting appointment of staff person to RTT:

Action 3: Dick Ducharme moved to send a letter to DOE regional director requesting appointment of a staff person to the RTT, Billy Bowles Seconded the motion. Cathy asked for clarification. Discussion followed. Larry Hooker suggested talking to Greg Kinsinger for his recommendation of a person who would be qualified. Steve will follow up on a qualified person. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program – CREP Discussion:

Dick Ducharme stated that he would like to make sure that flexibility remains in this program meaning that it not be limited to just one sponsoring entity and that the terms of the easement be negotiable. . Steve stated that this would only be specific to CREP contracts and there is on-going policy discussion regarding how the program would be administered (who can sponsor the projects, who holds title to the deed restrictions, how stewardship is negotiated, etc). The Board discussed perspectives and provided Steve direction that he will present at the next WWRP – CREP program meeting.

Del Groat - Apology:

Del stated that if anyone was not welcomed correctly by him as a guest speaker in the past meetings, he was sorry. It had been pointed out to him that things may not have been done properly and he wanted to express his regrets for not welcoming and thanking guests.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board – recent and emerging policy updates:

Steve updated everyone on the status of the community salmon fund program and progress to date regarding our ability to retain unspent funds from a grant round and carry it forward to the next grant round.

Update of the Community Salmon Fund:

The Funds for Community Salmon are being cut in ½ from approximately $3 million to $1.5 million for the next round. Steve stated that the program is asking if it is better to run a lottery to select 13 of the 27 lead entities in one year then the remaining 14 the next year in order to keep the funding level similar to previous rounds or if it would be better to follow the regional allocation framework the SRFB uses. Steve advocated the regional allocation approach would actually result in an increase for the Snake because we receive 8.88% of the state SRFB funding

allocation compared to a significant reduction if we followed the every-other year approach because as a single lead entity our allocation would be 1/27 of $1.5 million or about $50,000. Steve testified to the SRFB that the regional approach is much more predictable, stable and ensures an annual grant round as opposed to alternate years.

Unspent funds:

Project Amendments:

It is common for projects to cost more than anticipated or to require other revisions. Currently, the co-leads (conservation districts) have authority to approve or deny such requests. The board discussed the possibility of setting policy concerning cost overruns and the request for adjustments of projects that have been funded by the SRFB. Possibilities ranged from setting amounts to a discussion of aligning with SRFB policy where staff have authority to approve up to 20% cost increase requests. If the costs are more than 20% then the request requires SRFB approval only after their review panel approves is. It was decided to discuss this issue in a future meeting.

Appointment of SRSRB member, staff or partner to the Walla Walla Watershed Management Partnership – Policy Advisory Group:

The Partnership sent Steve a letter requesting appointment of a representative from our organization to serve on the policy advisory group for the Walla Walla Watershed Partnership. This letter is on page 21 of our meeting packet.

Cathy stated that this is a committee that is required by legislation. It will be a 9 member group. They will meet quarterly. The request is for a SRSRB Board or staff member to participate on this committee.

Del asked for volunteers. Del stated that during the exec committee meeting last week, Roland Schirman had stated that he would be willing to be the committee member if he was appointed by the board.

ACTION 4: Billy Bowles made a motion to identify Roland Schirman as a representative from SRSRB to serve on the policy advisory group for the Walla Walla Watershed Partnership. Dick Ducharme seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

WDFW Columbia River Salmon & Steelhead Recreational Angler Board – Member Appointment Update:

Del reported that Steve and he were selected as 2 of the 8 members on the WDFW Columbia River Salmon & Steelhead Recreational Angler board, and that their first meeting is to be September 10th, 2009 in Olympia. The letter of appointment is on page 22 of this meeting packet. Their travel expenses are covered by that program and they will report back to this board in September.

Review of Lead Entity Committee ranked project list for this grant round of SRFB funding:

Del reported that this grant round started back in the spring, 2009. At that time the SRSRB staff received about 30 pre-applications, conducted site reviews with the RTT and science panel from Olympia and had some board members and lead entity committee members participate in the site tours. Then, on July 20th the committee heard presentations from the project sponsors and the projects were pre-scored to provide the sponsors some sense of where their project ranked relative to the other projects. After more revision the 13 final applications were scored by the committee on August 11th at the Seneca building in Dayton. Board members present were Del Groat, Billy Bowles and Roland Schirman. The Lead Entity Committee (Don Howard, Larry Wilson, Del Groat, Jerry Hendrickson, Greg Farrens, Jed Volkman, and Mark Grandstaff) reviewed, scored and ranked the projects on the 11th. The results of that process appear on page 23 of this meeting booklet. The Committee did not re-rank any of the projects.

Summaries/descriptions, considerations and an assessment of the risk associated with funding or not funding each project were provided to the board in the July 28th meeting packet behind the pink page insert.

Del reminded the Board that at the last meeting they agreed to accept full applications from sponsors and establish a cut-line at the $1.6 million level. Any application sponsor above the cut-line could voluntarily phase their project so that the line could be moved further down the list. The board would then obligate funding from next year's grant round to the second phase of any project above the line.

Del then stated that Page 23 in this meeting booklet reflects what that policy results in and is supported by the Lead Entity Committee. This outcome is somewhat of a hybridization of the Board's discussion in July where we debated this year's list being a two year project list while being mindful that new/better projects may emerge next year. He reminded the board that if we approve the lead entity committee recommendation we would be obligating $791,000 from next year's project allocation, which would result in only $800,000 being available for new projects.

ACTION 5: Dick Ducharme moved to send a Letter to commissioners stating that we are having to fund the easement projects because they are not setting proper regulations along the streams. Del Groat seconded the motion and then discussion ensued with no action taken. The motion was tabled.

Approve final ranked list of approved projects and alternate projects:

Bob Johnson joined the meeting by phone.

Action 6: Cathy Schaeffer made a motion to fund the Tucannon Ranch Design Feasibilty Assessment as proposed contingent upon sponsor committing to some level of implementation. Cathy further moved to approve the projects as revised by the SRSRB Board (Listed below). Dick Ducharme Seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

1 – Tucannon River Off Set Dike	$100,000 (commit balance to next round 2010)
2 – George Creek	$119,000
3 – Wolf Fork Easement (Fairchild)	$137,000
4 – Mill Creek Flume Transitions	$527,000
5 - Mill Creek Sills Passage	$112,426

6 – Touchet River Easement (Chatman) $20,000
7 – North Touchet River Culvert $124,000
8 – Touchet River Easement (Ford) $35,000
9 – Toucet River Assessment Co Line to USFS $205,000
10 - Headgate Dam Fish Passage Assess $17,800
11 – South Patit Creek Ease (Fritze) $20,000
12 – Tucannon Ranch Design Feasibility Assess $178,804

Tucannon Dike Setback Implementation – Any unspent funds are applied to this project.

Due to a bare minimum quorum being present or on phone for this vote, Chairman Del Groat directed Steve to send out this approved project list, tomorrow morning. All board members would then have a chance to review this list and if anyone had real issues with an approved project on the list, a special teleconference meeting will be scheduled for Monday August 31st, 2009 @ 7pm. At that time, those who call in will discuss the project and that project would either remain on the list or be removed. It would be impossible to revise the project at that time. Thursday noon will be the deadline for a board member to notify staff of their disapproval of any project.

Confirm September 22nd, 2009 Board meeting and location:

Discussion: All members present really liked the Starbuck facilities and location. Dick Ducharme invited everyone to come to his house for fishing before or after the meeting. Steve pointed out that Anne had stated that the remote locations were unsuitable due to phone capabilities and other technical difficulties. Dick then revised his invitation to state that all could come and fish and then the board meeting could be held in the Dayton Office at the regularly scheduled time.

All present were in agreement that this would be the best plan of action for the next meeting. The meeting is to be held in Dayton at the Dayton SRSRB Office @ 6pm. Fishing invitation before meeting at Dick Ducharme's!

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:00pm.

Tasks & Actions

Review of Tasks

TASK 1: None.

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Action 1: Motion to approve the July 28th, 2009 meeting notes	Kelly Farnsworth	Michael Largent	Yes - Del Groat Abstained		
Action 2: Motion to approve July Expenses (RCO, WDFW, IMW)	Kelly Farnsworth	Michael Largent	Yes – Del Groat Abstained		
Action 3: Motion to send a letter to DOE regional director requesting appointment of a staff person to the RTT	Dick Ducharme	Billy Bowles	Yes		
Action 4: Motion to identify Roland Schirman as a representative from SRSRB to serve on the policy advisory group for the Walla Walla Watershed Partnership	Billy Bowles	Dick Ducharme	Yes		
Action 5: Motion to send a Letter to commissioners stating that we are having to fund the easement projects because they are not setting proper regulations along the streams	Dick Ducharme	Del Groat	Tabled		
Action 6: Motion to fund the Tucannon Ranch Design Feasibilty Assessment as proposed contingent upon sponsor committing to some level of implementation. Cathy further moved to approve the projects as revised by the SRSRB Board	Cathy Schaeffer	Dick Ducharme	Yes		

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 Holzmiller	Yes											
Dick Ducharme	Yes		Yes									
Dick Jones	Yes											
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes										
Gary James			Yes									
Del Groat	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Yancey Reser		Yes										
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Michael Largent		Yes	Yes									
Gary Thorgaard	Yes											
Kelly Farnsworth	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Bob Johnson	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Billy Bowles		Yes	Yes									

*First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member

MEETING NOTES – September 22nd, 2009

Place: 410B East Main, Dayton, WA 99328
Format: Regular

Board Members Present

Dayton: Del Groat (GC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Bill Bowles (GC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Roland Schirman (CC), Bob Johnson (GC), Dick Jones (CC)
On Phone: Gary James (CTUIR), Cathy Schaeffer (WWC), Yancey Reser (WWC),
Others: Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Steve Martin (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD),
On Phone: Brad Johnson (WRIA35)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum. (8 board members were present, 3 were on the phone.)

Welcome:

Del welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

Public Comment:

Del stated that a good time was had by all who participated in fishing at Dick Ducharme's that afternoon. Many caught steelhead – including Doug Mattoon, Steve Martin, Gary Thorgaard and Anne Chapman. It was expressed that this opportunity was appreciated by all and Dick Ducharme though not present was thanked for letting us fish on his place!

Additions to the Agenda:

None

Approval of August 25th, 2009 meeting notes:

Discussion: Cathy Schaeffer stated that under the section "Approve final ranked list of approved projects and alternate projects", the date September 31st for a special meeting, should the projects not be passed should be changed to August 31st.

Action 1: Doug Mattoon moved to approve the August 25th, 2009 meeting notes with the change of date described by Cathy. Bill Bowles seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Approve August Monthly Expenses:

LE $2,009.13
RCO $15,894.02
IMW $69,975.75

Action 2: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $15,894.02 expended in August 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $2,009.13 expended in August 2009 in the LE Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling

$69,975.75 expended in August 2009 in the IMW Budget. Doug Mattoon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. Del Groat Abstained.

Approve WWWCD contract amendment to include GIS mapping ($2500):

Discussion: Steve reported that staff had been searching for a cost-effective way to convert the current priority reaches maps from CAD Files drawings to geospatially referenced GIS maps, so that projects can be linked to specific locations and so that updates to the maps can be made by staff when the Board approves changes. The WW County Conservation District has an employee (Jonathan Thompson) who has the ability to update these maps. Steve, Kris and Anne met with Jonathan yesterday to discuss the task, timeline and approximate cost for the suggested contract amendment of $2,500.

Dick Jones stated that it may need to be a new contract instead of an amendment to the LE contract since the monies will actually be being paid by the RCO funds. All agreed.

Action 3: Dick Jones moved to authorize a new contract with the WWCCD in the amount of $2500.00 for GIS mapping. Gary Thorgaard seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Sport Fishing Panel Update:

Discussion: Del reminded everyone that he and Steve were appointed by WDFW to the sport fishing panel along with 6 others from the Columbia basin. He explained that this panel's assignment is to advise WDFW on how to manage the legislatively approved program and associated fee of $7.50 for fishing salmon or steelhead in the Columbia basin. The fee is to be used to improve monitoring and enforcement because WDFW wants to increase fishing opportunities, but they do not want to do so without ensuring compliance and making sure they have sufficient data to accurately manage the fishery. Del further stated that it is really important for us individually and as a Board to inform the fishing public of the importance of this small fee in that it will enhance our ability to keep these fisheries open and perhaps expand them.

Questions about exactly how the collected monies will be handled then followed. The Sport Fishing Panel board will be advised if plans change and will have input. Fisheries and quotas for our area and the lower areas; Harvest quotas and the inequities of them concerning the lower and upper river; and Educating the public on the importance of harvesting hatchery fish vs. wild fish were all discussed. The concept of raising the limit to 5 and having everyone keep them was liked by Doug Mattoon. Del stated that the fishing regulations pamphlet and whether or not the small tributaries were open for fishing (example: Asotin Creek) when a stamp was purchased was mostly misunderstood and needed clarification.

Review of High Level Indicators for Salmon Recovery approved by the Monitoring Forum and draft watershed health indicators:

Discussion: Steve stated that after several years in the making, the Monitoring Forum approved the high level indicators for salmon recovery. He directed the board to the Forum charter in the meeting booklet. Steve explained that in a nutshell each of the recovery boards are represented along with most natural resource agencies and is responsible to the Governor for developing indicators for watershed health and salmon recovery and the protocols to be followed. The forum also reviews/recommends monitoring requests by the state agencies. He stated that the salmon recovery high level indicators were located in the meeting booklet on page

27 and the proposed draft watershed health indicators were on the next page for the board to review.

CREP Conservation Easement and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Discussion:

Del stated that Mike Denny & Steve have been appointed to the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP). He stated asked Steve to report on the CREP conservation easement WWRP program. Steve reported that this program is now authorized to take over CREP leases and convert them to semi-permanent or permanent conservation easements. A person with a current CREP contract can now go to the WWRP and get their easement converted to no less than a 25 year contract or more a more desirable in perpetuity easement. Steve stated that this is a $40 million dollar project. All the individual people who want to do this will be bundled into one to present to the WWRP. To calculate the evaluation of a conservation easement they will look at the valuation of the last 20 years times the current monthly rental rate that they are getting in CREP. The ones eligible are proposed to be those who have a 75% survival rate in their current CREP program. Brad Johnson stated that this will pretty much take care of all of the Asotin - Clarkston area, making most or all not eligible for this CREP program.

Review of meeting with Governor's Salmon Office and the Resource and Conservation Office held September 2nd:

Discussion: Del stated that the status, progress and obstacles each regional organization is dealing with are reviewed quarterly by the GSRO and RCO. He reminded that board that Steve had informed them that our review was September 2nd.

Steve reported that we missed one key deliverable which is a plan update that was due several months ago. He explained that the reviewers understand that we intentionally delayed this deliverable because we did not want to update our plan knowing that the middle Columbia DPS-wide recovery plan was being completed, that the hatchery reform actions are currently in a state of flux, and that the monitoring forum had not yet approved their high level indicators. Staff told the reviewers that it would be premature to make plan updates/revisions on these areas until statewide policies were in place. The reviewers acknowledged that decision, but suggested that we not wait because we have the knowledge and understanding to conduct plan updates based on the framework laid out in the recovery plan.

Staff then discussed with the reviewers the efficiencies with an emphasis on how well we are integrating watershed planning, salmon recovery, lead entity and the regional fisheries enhancement group. This discussion was prompted by the Governor's executive order that state agencies conduct a review of their existing operations and how they can become more efficient combined with policy by the SRFB that they consider allocating their money based on an evaluation of how efficient the various regions are.

Steve, Kris, Anne, Brad (on the phone in a separate meeting) and Matt from Cathy's office participated in the review. A report from the RCO and GSRO is anticipated to be available in October.

The last item was a review of our budget, expenditures and personnel issues. There were no issues with any of these items and Anne working with staff at WW Community College was praised for the quality of their documentation.

Steve reported that the reviewers did add one comment that is noteworthy – we need to develop a document or report that illustrates project accomplishments and changes in environmental indicators. This report needs to state the baseline condition, where we are today

and what our target is so that the public and policy makers see that we have a target and how far we are or conversely what the gap is to hitting the target. Staff will present a recommended outline and framework for this at one of our upcoming board meetings.

I-5 mitigation funding request from Oregon DOT:

Discussion: Del reported that NOAA is requiring that the Oregon Department of Transportation mitigate the impacts from a proposed I-5 Bridge near Portland by restoring habitat in upper river watersheds with an emphasis on passage improvements and habitat restoration for Snake River stocks. Kris reviewed our 3 year work plan and presented some barriers according to it to the RTT for review at last week's meeting. The RTT reviewed this request and have identified half-dozen fish passage barriers on state highways, primarily in the Pataha that would be a good fit. Kris briefly described the barriers identified as priorities by the RTT for the board. Buford Creek and Rattlesnake Creek on the Grande Ronde were included. Del stated that at Cottonwood creek there is a significant barrier. Kris clarified that this is a very preliminary list. The RTT will be working on this in the future. Staff is putting together the information on these sites and will present it to ODOT for their consideration. Steve pointed out that this is yet another example of organizations outside of our region looking to us for pre-identified projects consistent with our recovery plan that they can fund.

Bull trout planning "interest":

Discussion: Steve put this on the agenda as a standalone item because it was brought up at the quarterly review meeting by the GSRO. The question being asked is do we want to take a proactive position and develop a specific bull trout recovery plan or stay with our position that the good work we are doing for salmon and steelhead are sufficient to aid in the recovery of bull trout. The USFWS is charged with developing a bull trout recovery plan. They had draft versions earlier that remain draft. USFWS also told Steve and John Andrews (WDFW) at a meeting in Spokane a few years ago that they might consider a locally developed plan but unlike NOAA they will be the final author and owner of the plan. Steve asked the board if they wanted to develop a bull trout recovery plan for USFWS to consider adopting.

Discussion was that the bull trout are now being monitored or kept track of during current salmon recovery activities, if they are seen. There being no new monies for any extra bull trout work, and also the fact that generally what is good for salmon is also good for bull trout was the consensus of the group. All agreed to stay with the boards' current position at this time.

Project cost amendments – continued discussion from previous Board meeting:

Discussion: Del stated that at the last meeting staff informed us of our existing policy that requires a project sponsor to get co-lead (conservation district) approval of any project cost increases and that there have been a few that have been nearly $100,000. The board discussed a threshold amount that would require full board approval. Steve asked if the board wanted to revise the lead entity by-laws to reflect this or continue with the boards' current existing policy. Steve stated that SRFB policy allows staff to recommend increases up to 20% with Director Approval, but more than 20% requires subcommittee approval of their Board.

Discussion then followed pertaining to this matter. Pros and Cons about projects that are marginal in board approval in the first place and asking for cost increases were expressed. Project integrity concerning initial cost estimates were expressed. Review by the board for

requested cost increases was expressed as a duty of the board. Steve stated that he just wanted to get some reactions from the board so that he could put this on the agenda for next meeting as an action item. He requested that board members be thinking about participating in a subcommittee or how the board would like to handle these requests. (ie: as a special meeting handled like the executive committee meetings / whoever may call in).

Additional discussion about a discretionary pot of money ($10,000) then followed for low cost project opportunities that come up and are needed to be implemented ASAP. These project opportunities do not fall into a normal project round and are usually not available during such rounds. LWD opportunities and the storage of LWD in prep for upcoming projects were mentioned as an example.

Announcements:

John Andrews (Regional Director of WDFW) would like to attend a board meeting in the near future, he wants to bring a hatchery management reform person with him.

There will be a Hatchery Review Team Stakeholders meeting at the Whitman in Walla Walla, Sept 29th at 2-4pm to unveil their recommendations for hatchery reform.

Confirm October 27th, 2009 Board meeting and location:

Discussion: Del, our chairman suggested that we go back to the ITV format with Steve in Clarkston for the next meeting. All Agreed. Del suggested thinking about having the next meeting in the Pullman area, due to those members traveling extensively during the last couple months.

The next meeting will be held at the WWCC Campus in Walla Walla at the WEC and in Clarkston at the WWCC Campus there (ITV Format).

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 pm.

Tasks & Actions

Review of Tasks

TASK 1: Contract with WWCCD for GIS Mapping in the amount of $2500.00.
TASK 2: Develop a document or report that illustrates project accomplishments and changes in environmental indicators to present to the board.

Review of Actions

Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Action 1: Motion to approve the August 25th, 2009 meeting notes	Doug Mattoon	Bill Bowles	Yes		
Action 2: Motion to approve August Expenses (RCO, WDFW, IMW)	Roland Schirman	Doug Mattoon	Yes – Del Groat Abstained		
Action 3: Motion to authorize a new contract with WWCCD in the amount of $2500 for GIS Mapping	Dick Jones	Gary Thorgaard	Yes		

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			Yes								
Jay Holzmiller	Yes											
Dick Ducharme	Yes		Yes									
Dick Jones	Yes			Yes								
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes		Yes								
Gary James			Yes	Yes								
Del Groat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Cathy Schaeffer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Yancey Reser		Yes		Yes								
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Michael Largent		Yes	Yes									
Gary Thorgaard	Yes			Yes								
Kelly Farnsworth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Bob Johnson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Billy Bowles		Yes	Yes	Yes								

*First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member

MEETING NOTES – October 27th, 2009

Place: Walla Walla Community College Campus, Walla Walla WEC Room #2023 & Clarkston Room #201
Format: ITV Format

Board Members Present
Clarkston: Del Groat (GC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Bill Bowles (GC), Doug Mattoon (AC), Gary Thorgaard (WC), Bob Johnson (GC), Michael Largent (WC)
Walla Walla: Roland Schirman (CC), Dick Jones (CC), Yancey Reser (WWC), Perry Dozier (WWCC).
On Phone: Stuart Durfee (WWC)
Others Clarkston: Steve Martin (SRSRB), Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Duane Bartels (PCD)
Others Walla Walla: Anne Chapman (SRSRB), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Cathy Schaeffer (WRIA32)
On Phone:

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order and verified a quorum. (11 board members were present, 1 were on the phone, total of 12.)

Welcome:

Del welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. Cathy introduced Perry Dozier, Walla Walla County Commissioner, as our new board member for Walla Walla County, stating that he was replacing her on the board.

Public Comment:

Approval of September 22nd, 2009 meeting notes:

Discussion: No Discussion.

Action 1: Roland Schirman moved to approve the September 22nd, 2009 meeting notes. Dick Jones seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Approve September Monthly Expenses:

LE $6,160.27
RCO $15,159.08
IMW $29,994.06

Action 2: Doug Mattoon made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $15,159.08 expended in September 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $6,160.27 expended in September 2009 in the LE Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling $29,994.06 expended in September 2009 in the IMW Budget. Bob Johnson seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. Del Groat Abstained.

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

Additions to the Agenda:

HRT Meeting Update

added to the agenda after the letter to the United States Senate, Senator Patty McMurray.

Consider Requiring Board approval of project cost increase requests; Revise Lead Entity Bylaws if necessary:

Discussion: Chairmen Del Groat explained that at the last meeting we had a discussion about increased cost request for projects. Steve then gave an example of some of the unanticipated cost increases that projects can run into. He again explained what the SRFB Policy was: if project cost increase requests are over 20%, then they require board approval, but if the project increase request is less than 20% staff can recommend the increase with director approve. Steve then asked if the board wanted to approve co-lead approval of these cost requests under 20%. Duane Bartels stated that 20% over a million dollar contract would be a significant amount and he thought that it should be a dollar amount. Discussion then followed concerning different options for this revisal. (Such as 20% or a set dollar amount ($50,000)). Concerns over conveying that projects could be estimated under actual cost amounts and that this is acceptable were then discussed. Perry Dozier raised the question about projects being treated unfairly if a 20% or $50,000 cap was set. The question was raised as to whether these requests were time critical or not. Larry Hooker stated that some of these projects are time critical and there does need to be a means to deal with these requests in a timely manner.

Action 3: Dick Jones moved that any project increase request previously approved by the board (SRFB $ amounts only) if above 10% has to come before the board for approval. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Any costs below the 10% amount have to go before the LE Board. (Comment from Steve)

Update re: SRFB Review Panel's remarks and subsequent project proposal revisions

Discussion: Steve reported that he, Kris and Dave Karl went before the SRFB panel in Olympia last week. There were originally 3 POC's - Projects of Concern. (Page 21 in the Meeting Booklet - Project #7, #12 and the 1st Alternate) Kris then briefed the board on the 3 POC's and why they were listed as POC's. Kris reported that all have been removed from the POC list after meeting with the SRFB Panel, as long as all things are done as stated at that meeting. Steve reminded the board that they had agreed to obligate funding to the alternate project (Tucannon River Off-Set Dike Construction (09-1596)) for next year's round. This will affect the amount of monies available to new projects in the 11th Round.

Kris reported that the SRFB Review Panel had stated that the SRSRB had the best list that was presented to them (saved the best for last). Steve, Dave and he had received lots of praise from the SRFB Review Panel.

Reforming Natural resource agencies:

Discussion: Governor Gregoire's Initiative to reduce Natural Resource Agencies. A letter was formed working with other Salmon Recovery regions and sent to Governor Gregoire concerning this issue.

BPA Anadromous monitoring RME framework:

Discussion: $57 million being spent. Two goals: Monitor projects that are being funded and whether or not these projects are addressing the VSP Goals. Steve reported that the meeting was unproductive on the first day and he came home after the first day. Mark Schuck and Glen Mendel of the WDFW will be coordinating with Steve on future meetings. This board does not receive any BPA monies at this time. It is very political and if a species tanks in a certain area, even though a place like Asotin is well positioned for some of this funding, they may lose out because of it.

Brad suggested this board send a letter to the government stating that their accord should support the Asotin IMW.

WDFW Sport Fishing Regulations – Major Cycle Rule Proposals:

Discussion: Del stated that Steve and he had received information in the mail last week concerning the Rule Proposals. Page 29 in the meeting booklet is the webpage that addresses these proposals. Steve asked if there needs to be a work day to address issues that this board may want to advance to WDFW on these changes. He asked if anyone was interested to please email him.

Context and notice of letter sent to the Honorable Patty Murray, United States Senate in support of continued PCSRF Funding:

Discussion: The letter to Senator Murray's office is located on page 27 in the meeting booklet. Steve explained that other states are not eligible at this time for these monies. Some of these ineligible states are asking that they become eligible due to them also having endangered species. This will significantly impact monies available to the Pacific Coastal States, making fewer monies available. Steve stated that this letter has already been sent asking the continued support of the PCSRF and its funding for the protection and recovery efforts of salmon in Washington State.

HRT Meeting Update:

Discussion: Doug reported that Steve, Brad and he attended the meeting. He then reported on what he perceived the meeting was about. Doug stated that he does not believe it will go anywhere because they have not coordinated with anyone else (SRSRB Plan, etc…) so no one else will support it. Steve stated that they have revised their recommendations: Restate program goals, decrease # of adults allowed to go up cottonwood creek, LISTEN TO TAPE!!!

Comments are due this Thursday. Install Weir in the lower Touchet and in the Tucannon

Brad Suggestions

Steve asked if he should send a letter. Doug suggested that Steve send a Generic letter acknowledging their study and stating they should consider our SRSRB Plan. Brad stated that it should contain statements that you need to protect the economy by supporting hatchery projects and protecting wild populations at the same time??????

Confirm November 24th, 2009 Board meeting

To be held at Roland Schirman's home at 120 Weinhard Rd, Dayton WA:

Action 4: Dick Jones moved to hold the next meeting at Roland Schirman's House. Bill Bowles seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

The next meeting will be held in Dayton at Roland Schirman's House (120 Weinhard Road).

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:17 pm.

Tasks & Actions

Review of Tasks					
TASK 1: **TASK 2:**					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
Action 1: Motion to approve the Sept 22nd, 2009 meeting notes	Roland Schirman	Dick Jones	Yes		
Action 2: Motion to approve September Expenses (RCO, WDFW, IMW)	Doug Mattoon	Bob Johnson	Yes – Del Groat Abstained		
Action 3: Motion that any project increase request previously approved by the SRSRB board (SRFB $ amounts only) if above 10% has to come before the board for approval.	Dick Jones	Roland Schirman	Yes		
Action 4: Motion to hold next SRSRB Board Meeting at Roland Schirman's House in Dayton, 120 Weinhard Rd.	Dick Jones	Bill Bowles	Yes		

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			Yes	Yes							
Jay Holzmiller	Yes											
Dick Ducharme	Yes		Yes									
Dick Jones	Yes			Yes	Yes							
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes							
Gary James			Yes	Yes								
Del Groat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Perry Dozier					*Yes							
Yancey Reser		Yes		Yes	Yes							
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes							
Michael Largent		Yes	Yes		Yes							
Gary Thorgaard	Yes			Yes	Yes							
Kelly Farnsworth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Bob Johnson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Billy Bowles		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							

*First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member

MEETING NOTES – November 24, 2009

Place: Roland Schirman's House, 120 Weinhard Rd, Dayton, WA 99328
Format: Regular
Board Members Present: Del Groat (GC), Kelly Farnsworth (WC), Bob Johnson (GC), Roland Schirman (CC), Dick Jones (CC), Jay Holzmiller (AC)
On Phone: Yancey Reser (WWC), Dick Ducharme (CC) 6:39pm.
Others: Steve Martin (SRSRB), Terry Bruegman (CCD), Brad Johnson (WRIA35), Duane Bartels (PCD), Kris Buelow (SRSRB), Larry Hooker (WWCCD), Cathy Schaeffer (WRIA32), John Andrews (WDFW), Dave Karl (WDFW)
On Phone: Anne Chapman (SRSRB)

Chairman Del Groat called the meeting to order a quorum was established at 6:39pm. (6 Board members were present, 2 were on the phone, total of 8.) He then thanked Roland for the fish dinner.

Recognition of Cathy Schaeffer's Membership on the SRSRB Board:

Del took a moment to recognize Cathy as having served on the SRSRB Board. Cathy is one of the founding members of the board and has served since 2002. She has provided helpful insights and direction as a board member and while she is no longer a voting member she will be a key participant as we move forward with our planning unit partners. Del stated that he hoped she would remain active, calling in on the executive calls, etc; as her opinion is valued. Cathy stated that it has been a great experience.

Additions to the Agenda:

Steve stated that he would like to add an action item – The support of the SRSRB for the nomination of Billy Bowles to the RCO Land and Water Conservation Flood advisory Committee. He has volunteered to be on this board. The nomination would benefit if the board would support this nomination.

Shuffle of agenda while waiting for quorum to be established:

IMW Update and possible action to support a project proposal:

Discussion: Del stated that Steve has a power point with information regarding the IMW but since many board members are calling in he will provide it the next time we meet. The IMW is moving ahead with data collection on both fish and habitat and the contractor is on-time and under budget. The current contract ends the end of this year. Steve reported that he is working with WWCC and the RCO on the possibility of a contract extension as opposed to opening it up as a competitive process. The reason is that the tasks for the next phase are almost identical to the existing contract and scope of work. More information will be available at the next meeting.

Steve further drew the boards' attention to the fact that most of the area in the IMW is privately owned and that the proposed treatments require landowner support. It has been suggested that it would be great if this property was in public ownership so that we had 100%

confidence and certainty that our restoration plan can be executed as described. Steve then introduced John Andrews (WDFW), who was in attendance to discuss a possible opportunity to acquire the property.

John then described the intent and asked for SRSRB support as a partner in their application to the RCO. He then presented some maps of the charley creek area for the board members review. He stated that discussions had happened between Cooks and WDFW about the purchase of their property in the past, before the passing of Mr. Cook. The WDFW is working with the county on their application to the RCO. WDFW would be willing to negotiate with the landowners in order to make the acquisition happen. (Example: the owners keeping their houses, etc…) Dick Jones stated that he was opposed to WDFW acquiring more lands. More discussion continued with concerns about funding and other issues that could be important in acquiring more land and the management of these lands. It was asked if there was a possibility that these lands if acquired would be leased for grazing. Dick Ducharme stated that when lands are in state ownership, it is too easy for people to sue the state entities for the effects on watersheds, etc when grazing or other like activities are allowed. When it is a private landowner, it is not as easy. He further stated that easements might be a better way to go. This allows for the private landowner to keep the stewardship in their hands and the activities on the land is dictated by them, making it hard for these big entities to sue them.

Steve stated that he had had a conversation with Commissioner Mattoon on this issue. Doug was in support of this acquisition largely because of the IMW located in this area and the monies being spent on it.

John Andrews stated that they are seriously considering going ahead with this application for the acquisition of these lands, however if the board did not support this, they might reconsider their position.

Dick Ducharme asked if they would consider conservation easements. John stated that conservation easements are not high on their list due to the fact that as land passes through different owners and time goes by, the owners become unaware of what exactly the easement means and it gets hard to enforce the easement. Del stated that this is a different issue or special place. (Different than other issues.)

Del stated that the Forest service would be willing to square up boundaries.

John restated that the WDFW would like to have county and SRSRB support. There is an internal WDFW deadline of December 1, 2009. The WDFW will then rate their internal applications. Support from the SRSRB would help right now, but would also certainly help later on in the process. Del stated that he would not like to see any action done now due to board members not being strongly in attendance tonight. Dick Jones stated that he is strongly opposed to the purchase of these lands by a state entity and he would most likely not change his mind due to the public wishes of Columbia County. Discussion of each county and the differences of each county and the respect of the wishes of those counties followed. Dick Ducharme stated that because of the law suits that are trying to get the grazing permits discontinued from state lands he would not want to support this acquisition. He strongly believes that private owners would be in a better position to manage these lands.

Del stated that due to board members not present and it being apparent there was not going to be consensus on this issue, he would suggest that we table this issue until the next meeting.

Action 1: Dick Ducharme moved to table action to support/not support WDFW acquisition application of IMW property to RCO. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. The Motion carried by consensus.

Approval of October 27, 2009 meeting notes:

Discussion: No Discussion.

Action 2: Dick Ducharme moved to approve the October 27, 2009 meeting notes. Roland Schirman seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Approve October Monthly Expenses:

LE $5, 562.60
RCO $24,513.66
IMW $45,679.21

Action 3: Roland Schirman made a motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $24,513.66 expended in October 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $5,562.60 expended in October 2009 in the LE Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling $45,679.21 expended in October 2009 in the IMW Budget. Dick Jones seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus. Del Groat Abstained.

Appointment of Board Member(s) to assist in selection of contractor to Update/Revise SRSR Plan:

Steve reminded that board that we have $80,000 for the purpose of revising and updating our plan and a contract with RCO that requires us to initiate this work this month. Steve has been working with WWCC to publish a request for proposals that is currently in the newspapers and journal of commerce. The closing date is early December and then a review of the proposals needs to be done and selection of a contractor. Steve asked if there was anyone willing to assist in this process.

Action 4: Dick Jones moved to appoint Kelly Farnsworth, Cathy Schaeffer, Brad Johnson and Roland Schirman to the committee to assist in the selection of a contractor to Update and Revise the SRSR Plan. The motion was seconded by Bob Johnson. The motion carried by consensus.

Review and Approve comment letter on Hatchery Reform Recommendations:

Discussion: Del stated that the letter was included in the meeting packet. Steve explained that the letter had been reviewed by a few board members, and asked if any others had suggested edits or revisions. He further stated he would like to get it signed and submitted to the HRT. Steve then reviewed the edits for the board members that were inserted with the suggestions of people like Glen Mendel, Gary James, Del Groat and others. Dick Jones pointed out a Typo to Steve.

Action 5: Dick Jones then moved to approve the Comment Letter on Hatchery Reform Recommendations with the typo fixed. Dick Ducharme seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Letter of Support to Congressman Dicks and House delegation for continued PCSRF Funding:

Discussion: Del reminded that board that they had supported a letter to Congresswoman Murray urging support for the PCSRF appropriation. It is understood that the Senate has passed

legislation that includes an appropriation of $80 million for the PCSRF account. The House version of the bill does not include a PCSRF appropriation. A House/Senate conference committee will be convened to resolve the differences in the two bills. In the interim Steve is asking for our approval to endorse the letter to Congressman Dicks that is included in our packet.

Action 6: Dick Ducharme moved to send a letter of support to Congressman Dicks and House delegation for continued PCSRF Funding. Dick Jones seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

It was then recommended that this letter be sent to everyone.

Columbia County Levee Roundtable:

Discussion: Steve has been actively involved in the Columbia County Levee Roundtable along with Commissioner Jones. The roundtable is a group of local governments joined by WDFW, USACE, NOAA Fisheries, CTED, RCAC, Gerri Coleman with congresswoman McMorris, WaDOT, FEMA, and others to try and develop a plan that will satisfy the contradictory federal policies which are that the USACE requires vegetation to be removed from levees or jurisdictions lose their certification and therefore FEMA assistance in the event of a flood while NOAA and the EPA have critical habitat and TMDL requirements that need to be met by local governments and others. There are a few angles being taken which are (1) request a time extension under PL 84-99 like the state of California received, (2) conduct a watershed assessment to identify opportunities to reduce flood risk for which we approved funding for this assessment, and (3) demonstrate good faith by removing select/problem trees to retain certification while larger processes proceed. The roundtable meets the last Friday of every month and is being facilitated by WDFW. Letters describing this predicament and frustration have been sent to the USACE, DOT, and our federal congressional members. The City of Waitsburg has requested to be a new member of the roundtable.

Review comment letter on WDFW Sport Fishing Regulation Proposals:

Discussion: Thanks to Kelly Farnsworth, Gary James and Glen Mendel for their input on the letter to WDFW regarding the sport fishing regulation proposals. The letter is in the meeting booklet. Steve stated that he would like action on this tonight so that he can finalize this and get it signed and sent.

Action 7: Dick Jones moved to approve the letter to WDFW regarding the sport fishing regulation proposals. Bob Johnson Seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

The support of the SRSRB for the nomination of Billy Bowles to the RCO Land and Water Conservation Flood advisory Committee:

Action 8: Roland Schirman moved that Steve draft a letter of support and send to the RCO Land and Water Conservation Flood Advisory Committee. Dick Jones Seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

Confirm December 22, 2009 Board meeting & location:

Discussion: Considering that the 22nd is a couple days before Christmas we should discuss an alternative date if we are going to meet. Steve suggests we think about meeting via ITV

because we may be ready to select our plan revisions contractor and because there are always incipient or on-going initiatives that he benefits by having board input and direction.

Action 9: Dick Ducharme moved to cancel the December meeting. Dick Jones seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:53 pm.

John Andrews announced that he was retiring and that he wanted to Thank the SRSRB Board for the service and good work of the board. He stated that his successor will be appointed to come down and meet and work with the board. He stated that it is important to look back and remember the advancements we have made in Salmon Recovery, in coordinating with WDFW as a partner, and everyone else for the benefit of salmon. He has been honored to work with his agency and the SRSRB.

Tasks & Actions

Review of Tasks					
TASK 1: **TASK 2:**					
Review of Actions					
Action Title	**Motion**	**Second**	**Consensus**	**Vote**	**Pass**
Action 1: Motion to table action to support/not support WDFW acquisition application of IMW property to RCO.	Dick Ducharme	Roland Schirman	Yes		
Action 2: Approve the October 27, 2009 meeting notes.	Dick Ducharme	Roland Schirman	Yes		
Action 3: Motion to approve the invoices/vouchers totaling $24,513.66 expended in October 2009 in the RCO Budget, the invoices/vouchers totaling $5,562.60 expended in October 2009 in the LE Budget and the invoices/vouchers totaling $45,679.21 expended in October 2009 in the IMW Budget.	Roland Schirman	Dick Jones	Yes – Del Groat Abstained		
Action 4: Motion to appoint Kelly Farnsworth, Cathy Schaeffer, Brad Johnson and Roland Schirman to the committee to assist in the selection of a contractor to Update and Revise the SRSR Plan.	Dick Jones	Bob Johnson	Yes		
Action 5: Motion to approve the Comment Letter on Hatchery Reform Recommendations with the typo fixed.	Dick Jones	Dick Ducharme	Yes		
Action 6: Motion to send a letter of support to Congressman Dicks and House delegation for continued PCSRF Funding.	Dick Ducharme	Dick Jones	Yes		
Action 7: Motion to approve the letter to WDFW regarding the sport fishing regulation proposals.	Dick Jones	Bob Johnson	Yes		
Action 8: Motion that Steve draft a letter of support and send to the RCO Land and Water Conservation Flood Advisory Committee.	Roland Schirman	Dick Jones	Yes		
Action 9: Motion to cancel the December 2009 meeting.	Dick Ducharme	Dick Jones	Yes		

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			Yes	Yes							
Jay Holzmiller	Yes					Yes						
Dick Ducharme	Yes		Yes			Yes						
Dick Jones	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes						
Roland Schirman	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes						
Gary James			Yes	Yes								
Del Groat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Perry Dozier					*Yes							
Yancey Reser		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes						
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes							
Michael Largent		Yes	Yes		Yes							
Gary Thorgaard	Yes			Yes	Yes							
Kelly Farnsworth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Bob Johnson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Billy Bowles		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							

*First meeting as a SRSRB Board Member