



## UCSRB MEETING

Chelan County Commissioners Meeting Room  
400 Douglas Street  
Wenatchee, WA

Thursday, February 22, 2007  
10:00 AM - 3:00 PM

### MEETING MINUTES

**Board Members Present:** Bud Hover, Okanogan County, Chair  
Ron Walter, Chelan County  
Bill Towey, Colville Confederated Tribes  
Lee Carlson for Paul Ward, Yakama Nation  
Mary Hunt, Douglas County  
Julie Morgan, UCSRB Executive Director  
Derek Van Marter, UCSRB Associate Director

**Others Present:** Sarah Walker, Chelan Conservation District; Chuck Jones, Alliance Consulting for Douglas County; Nick Christoph, Okanogan County; Becky Schmitt, Okanogan County; Kate Terrell, USFWS; Lynn Hatcher, NOAA Fisheries; Chris Parsons, WDFW; Bob Bugert, GSRO; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; and Steve Kolk, USBR.

#### Action Items:

1. **NOAA** will work with **UCSRB staff** to review comments and proposed revisions to the plan in preparation for the March 21-22 meeting.
2. **Julie** will send a general letter to those that submitted comments thanking them and describing the next steps.
3. **Derek and Julie** will draft a job description for the administrative assistant and present that to the Board in March.
4. **Derek** will work with **Carol Cowling** to complete and submit the IRS paperwork for federal tax exempt status.
5. **Julie** will work with **Bob Bugert** to draft a comment letter to NOAA regarding the Limit 8 program.
6. **Julie** will submit the revised budget and scope of work to the SRFB.
7. **Derek** will work with the contractor to revise the DC briefing packet in time for the Board's trip in early March.

#### **Welcome and Introductions (Commissioner Bud Hover, Chair)**

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 by Chairman Bud Hover

#### **1. Approval of Meeting Minutes - January 25, 2007**

*Mary Hunt moved to approve the January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting minutes. Ron Walter seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

#### **2. Status of Recovery Plan Adoption (Hatcher)**

- **Lynn Hatcher** said NOAA had received a lot of thoughtful comments and that he was pleased with the response.
- He presented a list of names of those that submitted comments for the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery plan.
- The next step is to review the comments and revise the plan, as needed.
  - On March 2 the NOAA team will be meeting in Portland to go over the comments and proposed edits. NOAA will send review materials to UCSRB staff on March 5 and they will have 2 days to review it.
  - Staff will meet on March 7 to go over the proposed edits. The focus is on the UCSRB meeting on March 21-22 in Chelan to review the comments and suggested revisions with NOAA in a public forum.
- **Mary Hunt** asked if we will see the comments. **Julie Morgan** provided copies of a CD with each of the 67 letter and email comments.
- **Lynn** said that the UCSRB should get their packets by March 18 to prepare for the March 21-22 meeting.
- **Kate Terrell** said the sooner the better given the amount of information that would have to be reviewed by the Board members and staff.
- **Bob Bugert** stated that everyone should be familiar with many of the comments as many are similar to what the Board previously saw in the last round of public comments.
- **Lynn** said that the legal analysis will take some effort to review and then to go over in the meeting on March 21-22.
- **Bud** asked Lynn about the legal analysis and how it would be organized.
  - Big technical items would be addressed first.
  - After March 7, the team will have a better idea of the technical items that will need to be addressed. After that, the team will move on to the legal issues, but a timeframe has not been set.
- **Lynn** said that in general, hatcheries were a focus of a number of comments. American Rivers, WA Trout and the Farm Bureau sent in several substantive comments. Grant PUD sent in comments concerning Nason Creek.
  - **Bud** asked about other Federal agencies. Lee Carlson said that USGS, US Forest Service, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service sent in comments.
- **The UCSRB agreed that two days would be sufficient to review the comments and proposed revisions.**
- **Julie** asked for a commitment from staff to review the comments on March 5 from NOAA in preparation for the staff meeting on March 7. Staff said it seemed as though they could pull out the key issues for March 7.
- After March 21-22, **Lynn** said that NOAA will summarize all of the comments and publish responses in the *Federal Register* through a separate process.
- **Bill** suggested the Board set some precise expectations for the public meeting.
  - For instance, regarding recommendations for change in the plan should summarize the issue, and concisely present the change. The Board should then be asked if it is comfortable accepting the revision.
  - **Bud** said that some members of the public that submitted comments may want a further explanation of how the Board will respond to or address their comments.
  - **Bill** agreed and clarified that the Board needs to decide whether to assign staff the task of reviewing all comments and highlight the salient items that the Board will need to consider in discussing any necessary revisions to the plan.
  - **Lynn** agreed that with the approach outlined by Bill, it will help keep the focus at the March 21-22 meeting. He thought that two days with staff and one day with NOAA at the end of the month would work well.

- **Julie** said she drafted a general letter as a response to those that submitted comments, and to let them know what is happening next.
  - The **Board** agreed that would be a good idea.

### 3. Cost Estimate (Jones)

- **Chuck** said that he was asked to complete two tasks:
  - a. Estimate the percentage of funds used for protection and restoration from previous funding of salmon recovery efforts; and
  - b. Extract information to estimate scenarios of cost that include protection with Evergreen Funding Consultants (EFC) estimate of restoration costs.
- **Julie** thought that the write-up of the methodology from EFC looked good for distribution to NOAA Fisheries and that it would be easy for them to include the methodology in the plan.
- **Lynn** also thought it was really good. He added that an economist at NOAA looked at it and thought it was great work.
- **Bud** asked what the time frame was for the cost ratio.
  - **Chuck** said he wasn't considering a time frame, but he thought ten years, but that it doesn't take into consideration where the money is coming from.
- **Julie** said that the ratio of 45% for protection and 55% for restoration was close to the historic funding amounts.
- **Ron Walter** talked about what costs would be for acquisitions in the future.
  - **Bud** asked if restoration was a one time deal or if it would have to be constantly maintained and managed.
  - **Kate** said that once a project is complete, it generally should be left alone to allow nature to take its course.
  - **Bill** thought it was well laid out.
  - **Mike Kaputa** asked if the Board was supposed to pick one of the cost estimates.
  - **Julie** said the idea was to choose one so that it the habitat costs could be included in the plan.
  - The Board had a long discussion about how much acquisition / protection / restoration will cost.
  - Based on historical spending, **Julie** suggested the 45%-55% ratio would be the best option of those presented.

*Bill Towey moved to adopt the \$296,425,000 amount for recovery (45% protection and 55% restoration). Ron Walter seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

*Mary Hunt made a motion to adopt the EFC Methodology. Bill Towey seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

- **Mike** said that Bud Hover had a good point in regards to the long-range maintenance of acquisitions. Mike said that Steve Kolk, with the US Bureau of Reclamation, has a good presentation on the on-going maintenance needs of projects that the Board might find useful to hear.

### 4. Management, Logistics, and Updates

- Budget Update (Morgan)
  - **Julie** wanted to focus on the total expenses as of February, which was \$135,424.60. She reported that the organization's budget is in good shape.
- UCSRB Administrative Assistant (Hover and Christoph)
  - **Bud** said that Sandy Cox had resigned from Okanogan County and the UCSRB. He said that he, Nick Christoph and Julie Morgan had some discussion about the

administrative assistant position. Together, they concluded that the person that fills the position should be based in Wenatchee with Julie Morgan and that a half-time position would suffice for now. There is room in the new office in Wenatchee.

- **Chuck** asked if a budget amendment was needed to get someone hired. **Bud** said it would likely take a couple of months to get someone hired, and that an amendment would not be needed.
  - **Bill** asked if the approach was to use half of Sandy Cox's time at the County, and if so whether that would be advantageous. He was curious to know how it would work out as a half-time position.
  - **Julie** said it would have to be someone who would be flexible and be able to take minutes for the board and be able to conduct regular office work.
  - **Bud** said that Okanogan County would continue to provide the service until the new person was hired. There will be advertising time, interviewing time, so it may be April before that happens.
  - **Bill** wanted to make sure that the budget was taken into consideration, and asked to wait for the final decision on the position until the Board had a discussion of the budget in the afternoon.
  - **Bud** agreed and said he was leaving it up to **Julie** to inform the Board on the budget implications. He said it would be fine to postpone a decision on the position until the afternoon.
- 501(c)3: Pros and Cons (Van Marter)
    - **Derek Van Marter** presented an issue paper he prepared on the UCSRB's current non-profit status, and the pros and cons of pursuing federal tax exempt status. In summary, he said that although it was a 25-page application and cost money, the IRS could tax the organization if its year-end holding exceeded \$5000. There were really no administrative disadvantages of pursuing 501(c) 3 federal tax exempt status. He asked if the board would like to proceed with the application.
    - **Bud** called for questions or comments. **Bill** said it was a good issue paper and was well-organized. **Ron** asked whether the cost could come out of the grant monies. **Derek** said that the cost could come out of the budget, and that other regional recovery organizations already have gone through the process.

*Bill Towey made a motion to direct staff to pursue federal status as a tax-exempt 501 (c) 3 organization. Mary Hunt seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

- Limit 8 Update (Bugert)
  - At the October meeting Chris Drivdahl gave an update on the GSRO's work regarding the Limit 8 proposal. NOAA has accepted their program. Comments will be accepted until March 14.

*Mary Hunt made a motion to task Julie Morgan to work with Bob Bugert to draft a comment letter to NOAA Fisheries regarding the federal limit exclusions under the 4(d) rule. Ron Walter seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

- Funding Update
  - BPA Funding List (Morgan)
    - **Julie** showed the final table of funding allocation from BPA. She said that she gives the board credit for getting twice as much as the original provisional allocation by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council.

- **Bill** noted that there was an \$800,000 error on the BPA calculations for the CBMEP project for years '08 and '09, which is being corrected.
- Upper Columbia Request to SRFB for 7<sup>th</sup> Round (Kaputa)
  - **Mike** said at that the last meeting they asked for a six month extension on the current contract and the SRFB graciously agreed to that request.
- Funding Coordination (Bugert)
  - **Bob** said an effort was underway to convene funding entities to examine opportunities for coordination of implementation for salmon recovery. He said that SRFB is sponsoring a funding coordination meeting on April 26. NOAA Restoration Program and USFS Challenge Cost-Share Program will be there. There will be a series of conferences. He said he will keep the Board posted.

Bud Hover presented Bob Bugert with a commemorative picture at this time.

Lunch Break (Executive Session) ..... **Noon - 12:45**  
**Reconvene at 1:45**

**5. Proposed UCSRB SOW and Budget for 2007-2009 (Morgan)**

- **Julie** said that at the last meeting the Board spent a lot of time on the budget numbers for the upcoming regional budget proposal. She received got considerable feedback.
  - A sixth element has been added to the scope of work for all regions.
  - For the Upper Columbia, **Julie** said she thought that our chances of success would be better if we combined our efforts with the Council of Regions and kept the budget request within the 10% cap increase requested of all the regions.
  - She presented a table showing that the last UCSRB contract was 12 months instead of 18 months, which affected the percent increase being requested.
  - She showed a pros and cons list to use to refine the numbers. She said that since this was implementation, and all the regions were previously engaged in planning, no one really knew what was needed. However, the request was the best estimate of what the UCSRB needed to implement the plan.
  - **Bud** said that the numbers need to be justified.
  - The Board engaged in a long discussion of the historic approach to funding the participating entities to provide the services that are needed for the UCSRB.
  - **Bill** revisited the administrative assistant position at this time and asked if more than a half-time person was necessary to coordinate the various tasks.
    - **Mary** said that Sandy Cox was always a constant and would be hard to replace.
    - **Julie** said she was comfortable with a half-time person at this time, and that if the UCSRB needed a full-time person sometime in the future, she could go to the SRFB to ask for additional funding.
    - **Bob Bugert** said that was a large focus of his office right now, to come up with additional funding opportunities.
  - **Bill** said he liked the concept of taking all the entities and identifying appropriate tasks that each of them could complete. This approach would allow the UCSRB to collectively decide the most efficient way to get tasks completed.
  - **Bud** said he was not focused on where the money was spent as long as it met the goal as efficiently as possible.
  - **Bill** said that people would wonder where the money would go and there would be speculation about that.
    - **Lee Carlson** said that each of the entities gave Julie their proposed deliverables based on the budget request. He said the logical approach

was to identify what the UCSRB needed to implement the plan, add up the request, and whatever was left would be placed into the contract amount funding deliverables from each of the entities.

- After discussion, the Board agreed to modify the budget.
  - **Bob** said that the UCSRB would be applauded if it submitted the modified budget.
  - **Bud** said that if it is all that is available, the UCSRB will have to adjust its priorities accordingly.
  - **Ron** said this is the first year of implementation, so the UCSRB is establishing its track record.

*Ron Walter made a motion to approve the revised budget amount of \$435,000. Bill Towey seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

*Lee Carlson made a motion to approve the scope of work as outlined. Bill Towey seconded the motion and the motion was passed.*

## 6. Washington D. C. Coordination and Review of Key Requests

- **Julie** reviewed the calendar of meetings established for the UCSRB's trip to Washington, DC. She identified the Board member leads for each meeting with a senator, representative, or agency.
- She handed out a draft UCSRB brochure that will be used as a briefing packet for each of the meetings.
  - **Julie** requested that they edit the brochure in the meeting so that it could be finalized before they leave.
  - The Board suggested edits as they read through it.
- **Julie** reviewed with the Board the key messages that they would deliver in each of their meetings.
- **Mary** asked for a cheat sheet of the key messages in addition to the handout.

### Public Comment

None

### Adjourn Meeting

**Bud** adjourned the meeting at 2:08 PM

Following adjournment, Bill Towey suggested that the Board nominate Sandy Cox for the Esther Stefaniw Award. He said that if everyone agreed, he would handle the details; everyone agreed that was a good suggestion.

The next meeting of the UCSRB will be on March 22<sup>nd</sup>. Additionally, the UCSRB will be hosting a 2-day workshop to review the comments that NOAA Fisheries received during the Federal Register Notice (FRN) 1. The FRN 1 for the *Proposed Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan* closed on January 29<sup>th</sup>. The 2-day workshop is open to the public and will be held in Chelan at the:

### 2-Day Plan Review Workshop

March 21 and 22  
Chelan Fire House  
232 E. Wapato  
Chelan, WA 98816

## Summary of Motions

**Mary Hunt** moved to approve the January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting minutes. **Ron Walter** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Bill Towey** moved to adopt the \$296,425,000 amount for recovery (45% protection and 55% restoration). **Ron Walter** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Mary Hunt** made a motion to adopt the EFC Methodology. **Bill Towey** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Bill Towey** made a motion to direct staff to pursue federal status as a tax-exempt 501 (c) 3 organization. **Mary Hunt** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Mary Hunt** made a motion to task Julie Morgan to work with Bob Bugert to draft a comment letter to NOAA Fisheries regarding the federal limit exclusions under the 4(d) rule. **Ron Walter** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Ron Walter** made a motion to approve the revised budget amount of \$435,000. **Bill Towey** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

**Lee Carlson** made a motion to approve the scope of work as outlined. **Bill Towey** seconded the motion and the motion was passed.