

UCSRB Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 24, 2005

1:00 – 5:00 pm

Chelan Fire House #7
232 E Wapato - Chelan, WA

Board Members Present: Paul Ward, Yakama Nation
Ron Walter, Chelan County
Chuck Jones on behalf of Mary Hunt, Douglas County
Bill Towey, Colville Confederated Tribes
Bud Hover, Okanogan County

Others present: Denny Rohr, UCSRB Facilitator; Dick Nason, UCSRB Staff Coordinator; Julie Pyper, Okanogan County; Bob Bugert, GSRO; Keith Wolf, KWA/Colville Confederated Tribes; KWA; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Kate Terrell, USFW; Dennis Beich, WDFW; Bob Foster, WDFW; Sandy Cox, Okanogan County

Those joining by phone: Lynn Hatcher, NOAA-F; Elizabeth Gaar, NOAA-F

Guests: John Easterbrooks, WDFW; John Hunter, Commissioner, WDFW; Lynn Heminger, Douglas County PUD; Tom Briggs, Landowner Association; Ken Sletten, Okanogan Farm Bureau; Darlene Hajny, Okanogan County Farm Bureau and Okanogan County Salmon Recovery Advisory Committee

Action Items

Lynn and Bill to contact **Mike Eng** to set up a meeting with **Mike** – UCSRB to take the lead in setting up the meeting – Tentative meeting date 3/23/05 at 9:30am

Bill Towey to draft a response letter to the Farm Bureau letter in the Wenatchee World on February 18, 2005

Dick and Bill to work with **Bob Bugert** on the planning for the Commemorative event for the Upper Columbia

- I. Welcome and Introductions (**Bill Towey**, Vice Chair)

BOARD ACTION

- II. Meeting Minutes (**Bill Towey**, Vice Chair)
 - A. November 19, 2005
 - B. January 26, 2005
 - C. February 17, 2005 *

Ron moved to accept the meeting minutes as written with corrections made to the 1/26 meeting minutes. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

BOARD DISCUSSION

- III. **Lynn Hatcher**, NOAAF: NOAA Discussion (60 min) (on the phone: **Lynn Hatcher**, and **Elizabeth Gaar**)
- A. Policy Forum
 - B. Facilitator
 - i. Time frame
 - ii. **Ron** and **Paul** both felt that the board needed to meet with **Mike Eng**, in person if possible
 - iii. **Lynn** and **Bill** to contact **Mike Eng** to set up the above meeting – UCSRB to take the lead in setting up the meeting
 - iv. Tentative meeting date – 3/23 at 9:30 am
 - C. OOSE (out of subbasin effects)
 - D. **Mike Eng's** Email
 - i. **Chuck** asked if the Board had considered what the duties of the Board will be since the policy forum hasn't been defined yet and it's definition is pretty vague to try and figure out what is trying to be accomplished
 - ii. **Bill** outlined his vision of the process
 - 1. Choosing the facilitator
 - 2. Stakeholders to identify the larger group
 - 3. The Board is taking on the leadership role for the selection of the facilitator
 - 4. Engaging the public in the process and expanding what the UCSRB has created and begun thus far and then defining the issues that need to be worked on and provide clarity
 - E. Draft Policy Forum letter:
 - i. **Lynn** suggested that the letter would need to go to the ECR Institute and **Mike Eng**. **Elizabeth** thought that sending the letter to the Institute was a good idea.
 - ii. **Elizabeth** thought that the letter was a good strong showing of the Board's interest and intent
 - iii. **Elizabeth** mentioned that the core team may want to include stakeholders as well
 - iv. **Dick** asked if NOAAF was going to be an active participant in the Policy Forum. Both **Elizabeth** and **Lynn** answered yes to that question
 - v. **Elizabeth** said that issues exist already and it would be great if we could begin to address them now rather than later
 - vi. **Elizabeth** mentioned that their staff has created a draft document that they are only a couple of days away from distributing to the UCSRB and Staff – The document keys up survival rates across the H's using best available science. She also suggested that the UCSRB have their technical folks review this document.
 - vii. **Lynn** mentioned that it was very specific to the Upper Columbia region
 - viii. **Elizabeth** mentioned that it is a work in progress that they can update with any feed back that they receive (one of the questions NOAAF will have about the document is: does it provide the information that the Board is looking for)
 - ix. **Elizabeth** thought that the document could be sent out by early next week
 - x. **Keith** suggested a March 1 discussion date so that it could be keyed up for the March 10th HCC meeting.

IV. **John Hunter**, WDFW Commission Member (20 min)

A. WDFW Policy Decision: Wild Winter Steelhead Management in Mainstem Columbia River Fisheries

- i. Concern about the take of steelhead in order to capitalize on a spring Chinook
- ii. Much debate on the percentage 8-1 vote settled on a 2 – 4 % take
- iii. **John** was concerned about the precedent that this may set
- iv. This decision may effect land use policies
- v. **John** requested that any comments the UCSRB and Staff may have can be emailed to commission@dfw.wa.gov
- vi. **Dick** asked if it was true that Washington and Oregon have to agree on this before the change can occur – That is **John's** hope
- vii. **Dick** mentioned that their was a huge lobbying effort on the part of the commercial fisheries
- viii. Is there going to be a meeting on the commissions level to discuss and negotiate this issue – **John** answered that the commission leaves those negotiations to Staff they are not involved in that
- ix. None of the these species are destined for the UC waters
- x. **Bud** suggested that the Board have one voice on the comments that be submitted to the Commissioners
- xi. **John** suggested that the UCSRB consider whether or not they want to take on an official stance on this
- xii. **Ron** asked if Oregon was set up the same way as in Washington – regarding the fish and wildlife
- xiii. **Mike** mentioned the discussion that he has had with his watershed groups and they understand that it may not effect the fish up here but were concerned about the precedent being set
- xiv. **John** felt that the social impact is the greater impact
- xv. **Paul** mentioned that we do want to return a fisheries to the region
- xvi. **Paul** stated that he is not ready, as a board, to create a common comment
- xvii. **Dick** asked what **Tuck's** objection was to the increase – **John** answered that it was the increase itself

B. Public Lands management document

- i. Wanted to write their own policy before it got written for them
- ii. Lands 20/20 Vision – they are not going to buy up land simply because it is offered. Prior to a land purchase it will need to be established as to why that land would need to be purchased – for a specific reason
- iii. **Bud** mentioned that Okanogan County has concerns in their area because
 1. We need to know before the land is bought so that the county and the stakeholders have a say in what happens to that land
 2. Want to make sure that land that is currently being irrigated continues to be irrigated and not taking land out of production – and maintains the economy in the area
 3. The lands that have been purchased are not being maintained
- iv. **Ron** asked how the 20/20 Vision is going to be integrated into the 5610 bill that **Senator Parlette** has sponsored – **John** said that it will be integrated
- v. **Ron** asked if WDFW was purchasing any WWRP lands – **Dennis** answered that yes they were

C. **Bill** suggested that we continue to keep these lines of communication open.

V. Board Policy Issues Review/Discussion (**Bill Towey**, Vice Chair) (30 min)

A. Okanogan County Farm Bureau/Okanogan County Resource Council Comments *

Ron moved to approve the definition of the Board's recovery definition. **Bud** seconded the motion and requested discussion to include comments received from **Darlene Hajny** of the Okanogan County Farm Bureau. The motion was passed.

- B. **Darlene** mentioned that the first mission statement that was created mentioned viable and sustainable but not harvestable
- C. The Farm Bureau's comments document was passed out
- D. **Dick** gave a quick synopsis of what the public comment process is for comments and the resolution of those comments
- E. **Dick** gave a brief summary regarding the next draft # 2 which is due out March 31.
 - i. Staff proposed that the month of July would be a review period
 - ii. Staff also proposed that they set up 2 comment check in meetings in August
- F. **Bill** suggested that the Board consider making a motion to incorporate the policy statements into the draft plan now so that the public can have input on those statements
- G. **Bud** made the statement that he wants to ensure that years down the road these policy statements can't be re-interpreted or misconstrued
- H. **Ron** assumed that these policy statements would be incorporated into the plan – but are we meeting the mark from the public?
- I. **Ron** also made the request that especially since the Farm Bureau has taken the time and effort to comment on these policy statements – we need to ensure that we acknowledge and respond to their comments and that they are somehow incorporated into the plan
- J. **Bob Bugert** stated that these policy statements, whether finalized or not are an important piece that the biological folks need for furthering their work – the policy statement of recovery is very consistent with the LCFRB that was accepted by NOAAF
- K. **Bob Bugert** also addressed the harvestable issue in the goal statement – the GSRO does want to keep that in the plan as a goal
- L. **Bob Bugert** stated that it is necessary to establish clear definitions of these terms so that the technical criteria can then be developed
- M. **Chuck** mentioned that he feels that a press release is necessary on this topic
- N. **Ron**, having changed his position on this, agrees with **Chuck** regarding a press release: release them as draft policy statements and we would more than likely get input from the public
- O. **Bill** suggested that there would be a comment period and process
- P. **Bud** reminded everyone of the timeline that we are on and voiced the concern that “we can't study this to death”
- Q. **Ron** suggested that we incorporate these into the policy and continue to get comments on them
- R. **Keith** suggested that we marry up the process on the policy statements and the plan draft reviews
- S. **Chuck** suggested that we separate the recovery statement from the rest of the policy statements

Ron made the motion to respond to the Okanogan County Farm Bureau's letter to the editor and include the policy statements (2-6) and recovery definition and the vice-chair (**Bill**

Towey) would draft that response . **Chuck** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

- T. **Dick** reported that the HCC next month will be working on Harvest issues and that they have been requested to create a draft statement
 - U. Staff recommended that a definition be created for out of subbasin effects
 - V. Staff also recommended that a definition be created on the following:
 - i. Anadromous fish
 - ii. Bank stability vs Bank mobility
 - iii. Fish passage over natural barriers
 - W. **Dick** suggested that the Board direct the staff to work on these statements/issues
- VI. Staff Report (**Dick Nason**) (10 min)
- A. Staff reported on the assignments given to the Staff by the Board at the January Board meeting
 - B. Reductions in budgets have been made by Douglas & Okanogan County
 - C. Budget increase for BioAnalysts is requested in the amount of \$27,000
 - D. Staff is not satisfied with the work products from J&S – request a budget reduction
 - E. Items needed from the TRT / NOAA
 - i. Viability Curves for Upper Columbia steelhead and spring Chinook (by 03/01/05).
 - ii. Updated MSAs for Upper Columbia steelhead and spring Chinook (by 03/01/05).
 - iii. Out of Subbasin Effects (by 04/01/05).
 - iv. Cost/Benefit Assessments (by 04/01/05).
 - v. Relationship of recovery to other efforts (by 04/01/05).
 - F. Update on the Master Planning Schedule – **Dick** reviewed the changes on the schedule (changes in track changes)
 - G. **Dick** also mentioned that some discussion on the GSRO review took place and he has asked that Bob Bugert combine all of the agencies comments prior to the May 2, 2005 Quarterly review so that all of the conflicts are taken care of ahead of time
 - H. Budget constraints/concerns still exist after June 30, 2005
 - I. **Bud** stated his concern on the April draft and the amount of time folks will have to review the plan – **Chuck** addressed **Bud's** concern by stating that this is why Staff is requesting the creation of the July review period.

Chuck moved to increase BioAnalysts budget by \$27,000 and to reduce the J&S budget by an amount the Staff will propose. **Bud** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

- J. Assignment: Budgetary estimates for post June 2005 – Staff suggested that given the creation of the policy forum Staff will need to review the previously submitted budget. Wanted to advise the Board.
- K. **Bill** asked if Staff needs a time line for getting this information finalized
- L. **Bob Bugert** mentioned that **Chris Drivdahl** is out until March 7th and Staff could have until then to get that new information to her – Copy **Bob Bugert** with this new information when it is submitted to **Chris Drivdahl**
- M. **Chuck** outlined the three elements that will be added to the post budget
 - i. RTT Chairmanship funding
 - ii. Policy Forum
 - iii. Adoption process
- N. Everyone is to send their new budgetary estimates to **Chuck** so that he can compile them prior to the Staff meeting on 03/02/05

Chuck made the motion to direct staff to adjust the J&S contract as necessary to complete the policy and program elements by other means. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

- O. **Bob Bugert** – suggested that the reviewing agencies convene prior to the May 4 quarterly review to reconcile any possible differences in comments by the agencies.
- P. **Dick** asked **Bob Bugert** if the May GSRO review and August GSRO review can be used to address comments. Bob responded that this would be appropriate.

VII. Habitat Coordinating Committee Report (**Keith Wolf**) (30 min)

- A. 98% done on the first round of the matrices
- B. Will be doing some analysis on the matrices and actions on how much that gets us (EDT will be one tool that will be used)
- C. March 8th will be the first run of the matrices in EDT
- D. Took out the monitoring needs from the matrices and will put them in a separate table
- E. Took out the protection efforts from the matrices and will put them in a separate table
- F. Next 4 meetings of the HCC will be focused on Harvest and Hatchery (3 PUDs, WDFW, Tribes)
- G. **Tracy** needs the matrices that are due on 2/25/05 (tomorrow) in order to get Section 5 out.
- H. **Mike** updated everyone on the participation in one of the HCC meetings from the Entiat and Okanogan folks
- I. **Kate** reported that the Wenatchee and the Entiat matrices final drafts were completed today
- J. **Kate** suggested that **Tracy** leave the Methow until the last – and **Julie** suggested that **Tracy** leave the Okanogan until second to the last
- K. **Kate** suggested that Okanogan County get comments from the Forest Service: **Jenny Molesworth** and **Dave Hopkins**

VIII. **Bob Bugert Report** (Bob Bugert) (20 min)

- A. GSRO
 - i. There was a commemorative event from the LCFRB on 15 December.
 - ii. GSRO feels that it is important for the UCSRB to sponsor a commemorative ceremony which the Governor could transfer the plan to the federal government.
 - iii. Bob Bugert asked if we should combine all 3 commemorative events at a central location, or should we have three separate events, so the locals could participate better?
 - iv. GSRO proposes that the dignitaries would fly from point to point on the same day
 - v. **Bob Bugert** asked the Board what its preference is for this event
 - vi. GSRO thinks that having the Governor's presence is important and gives it a higher profile
 - vii. **Bob Bugert** requested that the UCSRB designate one contact person for him to work with on these logistics
 - viii. **Dick** and **Bill** volunteered to work on these arrangements

- ix. **Bob Bugert** asked if the Board wanted to bring in **Senator Murray, Representative McMorris, Representative Hastings or Senator Parlette**, etc.
 - x. **Dick** suggested August 25, 2005 as a potential date – it is already a Board meeting date
- B. RTT**
- i. Status & Trend monitoring for the Wenatchee – in its 2nd year
 - ii. Effectiveness monitoring for the Entiat – tying into the bridge to bridge project – Funds provided by the Northwest Science Center and the work is being done by the Forest service, Chelan Co Conservation District and US Fish and Wildlife
- C. Tributary Committee**
- i. Operating procedures have been adopted
 - ii. Timelines are good
 - iii. Shooting for March 29th to announce grant applications
 - iv. Everyone should be receiving something in the mail from **Mark Schiewe**
- D. Bob Bugert** asked if the Board wanted to invite **SRFB Chairman Ruckelshaus** up for any reason – and suggested April 28 or May 26 Board meetings – **Julie** suggested that April be the first choice because it coincides with the Governors budget release

GENERAL DISCUSSION

- IX. Public Comment (**Bill Towey**, Vice Chair)
 - A. **Darlene Hajny** – looking forward to getting the updated habitat matrices and the enforcement info
 - B. **Darlene** mentioned the report created by Redmond and will give a copy to **Julie**
- X. Reminder: Hydro Workshop, Feb 24th, 6:30 - 9:00 pm (**Bill Towey**, Vice Chair)
- XI. Next Regular Board Meeting: Wednesday, March 23, 2005 (**Bill Towey**, Vice Chair)
(Note change from regular meeting day)
Note: 9:30 am meeting added to the line up.

* Added after agenda distribution

Summary of Motions

Ron moved to accept the meeting minutes as written with corrections made to the 1/26 meeting minutes. **Paul** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Ron moved to approve the definition of the Board's recovery definition. **Bud** seconded the motion and requested discussion to include comments from **Darlene Hajny** of the Okanogan County Farm Bureau.

Ron made the motion to respond to the Okanogan County Farm Bureau's letter to the editor and include the policy statements (2-6) and recovery definition and the vice-chair (**Bill Towey**) would draft that response. **Chuck** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Chuck moved to increase BioAnalysts budget by \$27,000 and to reduce the J&S budget by an amount the Staff will propose. **Bud** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

Chuck made the motion to direct staff to adjust the J&S contract as necessary to complete the policy and program elements by other means. **Ron** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.