

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

## MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

March 8, 2007

Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, Washington

Day 1

---

### SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County (attended afternoon portion only)
Joe Ryan	Seattle
David Troutt	Olympia
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Barb Aberle	Designee, Department of Transportation

---

### CALL TO ORDER:

Chair William Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 8:37 a.m.

The agenda was reviewed and approved as presented.

### MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

#### *Director's Report*

Director Johnson reviewed the agenda, highlighting:

- The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office's work on Sec. B permits, with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Regional efforts
- 2007 Grant Round preparation
- Introduced Brian Abbott as the new Salmon Grants Section Manager. Chair Ruckelshaus congratulated Brian on his new position.

#### *Project Management Report*

Brian Abbott presented this agenda item by providing the Board with a written report and presentation of projects. (See notebook item #2c for details.)

- 01-1230R LWD Placement on SF Touchet River
- 05-1437R Beaver Creek Estuary Restoration
- 01-1238R Ahtanum Creek Fish Screens
- 04-1695R Dekay Road Barrier Corrections

Brian updated the Board on the upcoming Salmon Recovery Funding Board Sponsor's Conference to be held on April 26, 2007 in Tacoma. He introduced the members of the planning committee and gave a general overview of the day's agenda.

## **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

Joe Ryan **MOVED** approval of the January 2007 meeting minutes. David Troutt **SECONDED**. The Board **APPROVED** the minutes as presented.

### *Financial Services Report*

Mark Jarasitis presented this agenda item (See notebook item #2b for details.)

Mark provided the Board with an update on the current status of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) budget and project funding. He informed the Board that the agency received one finding on the audit conducted for federal funds. The agency has taken actions to correct this issue. He also reviewed notebook materials on budget standing.

The Board discussed the congressional budget. It currently looks like 2007 will remain at the 2006 level for the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF). Washington is hoping to be held at the \$25 million level but it is not sure how the earmarks will be handled.

Tim Smith noted that although the one hand-out concerning the State of Washington's funding request had a \$67 million section a group has formed to discuss need and they are recommending a \$90 million funding level for 2008.

### *Legislative Update*

Jim Fox highlighted nine bills directly relating to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB).

- HB1374 and SB5372, on the Puget Sound Partnership.
- HB1598, requiring all entities receiving SRFB funds to be subject to the Public Records Act. This may cause some concern for private and non-profit partners. Tim noted that he found the same language in the Puget Sound bill
- HB1656, Puget Sound Research Account, encouraging coordinated research priorities for Puget Sound.
- HB1813 Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) name change bill scheduled for a hearing next Thursday.
- SB5164, Veterans Conservation Corps, requires SRFB to identify projects for them to work on and includes an expanded version of the program developed previously.
- SB5224, would have moved the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) to the IAC but it has been amended to keep the GSRO in the Governor's office and puts the Monitoring Forum into statute.
- SB5236, addresses public lands management.
- SB5567, creates a salmon and watershed planning workgroup.

Chair Ruckelshaus provided an update on the Puget Sound Initiative. There is an effort going to combine two different bills and reach the best result possible. He is cautiously optimistic that this will be a success. Developing the entity and implementing the plan are two different things. This entity is meant to compliment the current activities going on in Puget Sound, not to duplicate efforts or recreate the wheel.

## **PARTNER REPORTS**

Tim Smith, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), reported on:

- Technical workshops on nearshore projects that were recently completed.
- Newly released technical report on Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound.
- Working on assessment of fish utilization of nearshore areas and will likely have a project proposal for SRFB approval. This would be a single project supported by several lead entities with nearshore in the Puget Sound.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked how that would coordinate with the Recovery Council.

Tim hopes this would provide information for the Recovery Council as projects by the lead entities would have better information.

Carol Smith, Conservation Commission representative, reported on the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). A report was completed and she is hoping to add to this program.

Barb Aberle, Department of Transportation, reported on the culvert test lab at the Skookum Hatchery. They are out of money and have until June 2008 to find funds or scrap this effort. There is a lot of interest from researchers but they don't want to pay for this.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if this research has been turned into projects or used to develop projects.

Barb noted that some information has been used but most of the research has not been completed yet.

The Chair asked how much funding was needed.

Barb reported that \$1 million of research projects would be useful.

## **GSRO REPORT**

Steve Leider introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #3 for details.)

- GSRO Update
- NOAA Permit Project Report

Steve reported that Chris Drivdahl is out ill. She wanted to report that the new federal permitting process has not reached closure as planned, but she hopes to reach completion by the end of this month or early next month. This has become a possibility due to the completion of the recovery plans. Without the plans the federal government would never have considered this new process. Steve introduced Matt Longenbaugh from the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to provide an update on the permitting process.

Matt reported that the limit eight process comment period ends on March 14, 2007. NOAA hopes to finalize soon after that. He discussed the projects that would be covered under this new process, which he hopes will save people time and money on getting projects completed.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that this is a valuable service. He is looking forward to this becoming a reality. He suggested having training for the project sponsors to help them understand this process.

Matt noted that coverage will only be for SRFB projects listed under the Endangered Species Act. More information is posted on the GSRO website.

#### **REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS – Future Operations Support**

Steve Martin, Chair, Council of Regions, introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

##### *Northeast Region – Update and Budget Request*

Mark Wachtel, WDFW program manager, provided an update on the Northeast Region. He summarized the white paper on the Northeast process for the Board (See notebook item #4c for full white paper.) Mark listed both concerns and support heard during the public comment period on this document. The decision to go forward with phase two of the northeast regional process is recommended. Mark requested that the Board approve the release of phase two funds for this effort. The next step would be stakeholder meetings and development of a regional organization with presentation of the phase two white paper to the SRFB by December 31, 2007.

The state of Idaho is interested in working on this process to create a strategy for bull trout. United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has agreed to participate in the process. This would not be a rewrite of the current near final plan but implementation of the plan.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that staff has not had time to review the white paper. With Chris Drivdahl being out the GSRO does not have any staff to advise the Board at this time. The Board has set aside the funds, but is not ready to approve release of these funds yet.

The Chair would like to know what the USFWS thinks of this plan, including how it fits into their overall strategy.

Mark is not sure the questions can be answered until after they start the collaborative process.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked what the staff review would do.

Director Johnson is not sure what the staff review would entail. She wonders if the Board would like to wait to make the decision in May or would like to approve it now following the decisions after phase two.

David Troutt asked if waiting to make a decision until later would slow things down.

Mark noted that they had told people, if phase two funding is released, the next meeting would be held in late April or early May. So, if the decision isn't made until the May meeting this would slow them down considerably.

Steve Martin reported that as a GSRO person, he was involved in this process and he supports going onto phase two of this process. He felt the consultant was very honest and thorough in the phase one efforts. He agrees with the suggestion to have a focused agenda with clear side-boards. He also reported that he will be meeting with the coastal lead entities later in March. He sees this as an exciting time for regional development.

Chair Ruckelshaus was still not comfortable approving this without staff review.

David asked how long it will take to get staff review since he would rather not slow the progress down by not approving the release of this funding today.

Joe Ryan agrees with David on this recommendation.

Director Johnson believes either approach will work. The Board has already reserved these funds, so it is just an authorization to proceed that will need to take place.

Mark noted that the budget request is \$59,553.00.

Craig is wondering what phase two will provide. Is it going to address the concerns raised in phase one or will it be a continuation of the same discussions?

Tim Smith heard the need to have a clear recommendation on what the framework will be for phase two.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that it is important to be clear on what the outcome will be.

Steve Martin believes the definitive outcome would be to get memorandums of understanding from the various parties to start the collaborative process.

David Troutt **MOVED** to give staff approval to release phase two funding. Joe Ryan **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED**.

#### *Coastal Region – Update*

John Sims provided the update for the Coastal Region. They have received informal agreement from the SRFB chair that he will attend the May meeting of the coastal planning group. One policy representative from each lead entity will be the decision makers. Triangle Associates will be the consultant. Agreement will be reached through consensus, with other non-voting members also in the room. The next meeting is in Hoquiam on March 21, 2007. Phil Miller is the GSRO staff member supporting the Coastal efforts. Ozette sockeye and bull trout are the listed fish species in this area. No decision is needed from the Board at this meeting.

Chair Ruckelshaus hopes that the outcome of regional efforts will be to have one project list for the region, to prioritize the areas according to what is the best for the fish.

John noted that although the only listed salmon species are the ozette sockeye, other species in the region are below historic levels and need to be prioritized.

Tim Smith is excited about the potential development of the regional approaches. The potential of looking at programs with regional evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) levels versus the historic method, which looks at county or watershed levels, is a very positive effort.

Phil Miller noted that one member of the group sees the coast as one of the highest priority areas.

John noted that this may be a policy that the Board wants to look into to give the healthier stocks higher priority to keep them healthy.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that while this may be true, the federal funding has limitations.

#### *Council of Regions Report*

Steve Martin, Steve Leider, and Alex Conley provided the Council of Regions report. (See notebook item #4a for details.)

Steve Martin provided an update on what the regions have been doing and how the 2007-2008 budgets were developed. The group agreed to keep the budget requests within 10 percent of the past budgets. (Two handouts were provided giving an overview of the regional requests: one summarized the requests and the other detailed the costs to date with the pending requests.)

Steve identified the next steps:

- Regional priorities are being integrated into existing programs such as the growth management plans and water quality

- Work programs developed
- Commitments (volunteers are supportive)
- Reconciling goals and reaching agreement
- Implementing projects and programs

The groups have depended almost exclusively on SRFB funds but are now looking at ways of branching out and securing other sources of funding.

#### *Budget Request for Six Regions*

Steve Leider reviewed the GSRO report outlining the regional funding requests and asked for Board approval to continue funding this effort.

Director Johnson noted that staff recommends that the Board reserve the unspent \$2.5 million to begin work on the regional contracts. Staff would also like the Board to provide input on the proposed scope of work and accountability needs for the regions.

Chair Ruckelshaus agrees that the Board should reserve the money. The issues about functions and accountability are important. He believes the functions should come from the regions since each region will have different needs. Accountability is key to be able to see what the Board is getting for these funds.

David asked if the Board is being asked to approve the levels of funding listed on the chart.

No, staff is only asking for the Board to approve setting aside the \$2.5 million for regional efforts and for staff to begin working with the regions to clarify scope of work, budget, and accountability needs.

The Chair agreed the functions are different for each region and making the decisions on this is difficult since it will be, in many aspects, harder and different from the planning stage of the efforts.

Steve Martin noted that the self-imposed 10 percent cap forced the regions to prioritize their work plans and provide the bare minimum efforts needed to implement the next steps.

Members discussed the difficulty in developing an accountability system for this effort. They need to make sure Board and regional roles are clear. It is in the best interest of everyone to be accountable and have clear outcomes.

Director Johnson suggested that the Board indicate their comfort in reserving existing federal money, to direct staff (including the GSRO) to enter into final negotiations to develop work plans to stay within the 10 percent, and to come back in May for final approval.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like assurance to support and continue the regional efforts. He emphasized the need for a collaborative effort more than a negotiation.

Joe Ryan is okay with approving the \$2.5 million in federal funds to continue these efforts, but is not clear on how to evaluate them.

Craig noted that if the Board is looking for bottoms up development of the budget then they have achieved it. He believes this is not a budgeting effort for the Board, but rather an accountability effort with the budgeting effort in the regional hands.

Chair Ruckelshaus was less concerned with the amount of money than with making sure the system is accountable. The Board needs to first understand what implementation efforts are needed.

Director Johnson believes staff should be able to scrub the proposed budgets and come back to the Board with options in May. The accountability topic will need to be clearly stated in the agreements.

Jeff Breckel came forward to provide his thoughts on this topic. He believes all the regions are working with partners in developing work plans, defining schedules, gathering milestones, and then monitoring the implementation of the plans. They agree with getting clear information from groups involved to see if they are fulfilling their obligations or not.

Alex Conley discussed the need to look at funding at a regional level and leverage funding across programs.

Steve Martin asked what the next steps are.

Director Johnson noted that the Board is signaling that they are considering setting aside \$2.5 million for regions. Staff will work collaboratively with the regions to develop scopes of work. Staff will also work with GSRO on budget scrubs to provide options at the May SRFB meeting for final approval.

Joe Ryan made a motion to set aside \$2.5 million. David Troutt **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED**.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like to see an accountability system and roles of who does what in the recommendation.

Jay Watson came forward to provide his thoughts. Jay noted that all of the regions have contracts and deliverables. He suggested pulling from past information. He believes they have been accountable in the past and will continue to be accountable in the implementation phase.

The Chair believes the regional efforts are the best shot at recovering salmon.

## **LEAG Report**

Jeanette Dorner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

Jeanette reviewed discussions held at the last Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) meeting and issues that the lead entities propose to change in the next round. She will be part of the 2007 Grant Round discussion to continue to provide LEAG input.

## **2007 GRANT ROUND**

### *Homework Assignment*

Neil Aaland introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #6a for details.)

Neil provided an overview of the homework assignment. The general topics addressed were:

- 1) Intra-regional funding allocations
- 2) Local technical review
- 3) Public participation
- 4) SRFB Review Panel
- 5) Relationships between habitat work schedules and project lists
- 6) Relationships to target regional allocations

Carol Smith asked about having funding align with habitat work schedules. She wondered if there will be an indication of where the projects fall on the work schedule or how they fit in.

Steve Leider said there is not a short answer to the question because different lead entities use this term differently.

### *2007 Policies*

Does the SRFB need to establish any policies regarding intra-regional funding allocations?

Staff recommended that no formal policy is needed for 2007.

Board discussion:

- Would like to see this continue to evolve to get to regional allocations.
- Are there gaps in the technical review?
- Include a question on this year's information submission questionnaire about the level of independent technical review provided.
- Ask the Review Panel to provide general overview comments on the review processes leading to the 2007 project lists.

David Troutt discussed the need for independent review to make sure there is independence between the review of projects and the development of the lists to avoid conflicts of interest.

Steve Leider discussed the technical review efforts in several other regions and ways to keep the review processes independent.

Joe Ryan noted that this went back to an earlier discussion regarding gaps in reviews versus duplication of efforts. He would like to have the Review Panel look at the local review process concerning gaps and duplication.

The Board discussed issues its Review Panel needs to address when reviewing project lists. Last year they asked about the basis for the project list and the plan was to continue to address it the same this year.

David would like to come back to this issue at the end of the discussion, as he still has some concerns.

#### Local Technical review

Does the SRFB need to establish any policies?

Staff Recommendation: No, it seems that lead entities and regional organizations are doing what they can.

Board Discussion:

Chair Ruckelshaus reported that this is a constant communication issue. They may need to have IAC staff work on better ways to communicate SRFB issues.

Steve Tharinger suggested making sure local government leaders are invited to all of the different meetings and workshops concerning this information.

#### SRFB Review Panel

What changes are needed for the early part of the Review Panel process?

Staff recommendation: Direct the Review Panel to meet with regional technical teams, to clarify roles, and direct the Review Panel to meet as a whole earlier in the summer. July 9 and 13, 2007 would be good to provide a preliminary and optional full group review of projects.

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

#### Should new Projects of Concern (POC) categories be included?

Staff Recommendation:

Yes, staff has drafted new categories of "need more information" and "conditional approval" which reflect the informal approaches used in the 2006 round.

Board Discussion:

The more clarity that can be provided the better. The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

Is a process needed for resolving differences of opinion regarding eligibility issues?

Staff has prepared language that explains how eligibility is determined:

1. Project managers and section managers review and confirm eligibility.
2. If eligibility is questioned, director provides a final review (which may include assistance from the Review Panel).

Board Discussion:

Steve Tharinger asked if this is where the process stopped.

Staff noted that yes, this would happen early in the process.

Should the Review Panel time be allocated by a region?

Staff recommendation:

Not at this time. Based on homework responses, this does not appear to be an issue.

Board Discussion: No discussion.

What changes are needed for the later part of Review Panel process?

Staff Recommendation:

Primary changes are tasking the Review Panel to resolve issues as early as possible (e.g. the optional mid-summer review session).

Board Discussion: No discussion.

Should the SRFB provide any direction regarding the relationships between project lists and implementation plans?

Staff Recommendation:

Not at this time

Board Discussion:

Carol would like to see more linkage between habitat work schedules and recovery plans.

Should research filling data gaps be allowed as an eligible grant item?

**Staff recommendation:**

SRFB should reiterate its preference for on-the-ground projects, but allow up to 10 percent of regional allocation to be used to address highest priority research needs identified in plans, to be determined by region.

**Board discussion:**

This continues to concern the Chair. Without a research plan it is hard for the regions to decide whether there are gaps and if the information is needed.

Neil Aaland responded that some areas feel that they have gaps. This is a high priority on their recovery plan.

The Chair noted that the proposed guidance language in the grant manual should be okay.

Craig wants to make sure that other sources of funding have been considered before coming to SRFB for funding of this kind of project.

David believes that if a project like this comes forward, is part of the recovery plan and fits the other side-boards then the Board shouldn't limit the funding to 10 percent. The Board doesn't limit funding amounts for acquisitions or restoration projects and he believes that this issue would be self-limiting.

Board members agreed with David's comments.

In May staff will bring back wording on this.

Carol Smith would like some examples from regional recovery plans, including where this type of project has been identified and how it ranks on the list.

The Chair agrees with Carol's concern and would like to see this information in May.

What direction should the SRFB provide regarding target regional allocations?

**Staff Recommendation:**

SRFB should direct lead entities to submit project lists that meet the target allocation as closely as possible. They may identify additional projects that don't exceed 25 percent of their target to serve as fall-backs. Allowing post-September scope and project changes is acceptable, but may require re-ranking by local committees and may require another review by the Review Panel if changes are significant.

**Board Discussion:**

The Board is okay with additional projects and does not want a cap on the number of projects added to the list. They would not want to see a lot of additional projects on the list.

### What direction should the SRFB provide regarding eligibility issues?

#### Staff Recommendation:

Language in the draft manual has been clarified and the full list of eligible and ineligible items is included. Staff considered but decided not to recommend, development of a "special projects" category. Additional SRFB discussion is recommended for later in the 2008 grant round as warranted.

#### Board Discussion:

Board agrees with the Staff recommendation.

### Should the SRFB consider revising the regional target allocations for the 2008 grant round?

#### Staff Recommendation:

Staff concurs with the suggestion made in the homework responses. Initial steps would include:

- Discussion at the upcoming Council of Regions and LEAG meetings
- Presentation briefing memo at May SRFB meeting outlining recommended approach to developing changes
- Goal is to have a revised target allocation by the start of the grand round

#### Board Discussion:

Some of this will depend on what the Legislature does with Puget Sound and other issues concerning the SRFB.

The Chair would suggest the need to have regions and lead entities provide their suggested changes.

### Withholding Funds

Staff has drafted an option for SRFB discussion to withhold 10 percent of available funds to assist with minor additional funding and supporting Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) related habitat projects. A decision is not needed today. The Board can make a final decision at the May meeting.

#### Board Discussion:

The Board did not support holding aside 10 percent for IMW, although some funds have been held back each grant cycle for unanticipated needs. Since the Board doesn't know what the budget will be, and there will be new information from the Forum, the Board may want to hold some money aside. The Board does not want to have funds held out from project funding. They would like additional discussion on the overall budget at the next meeting.

### Review Panel Budget:

The Board further discussed the need to approve funds for the Review Panel at this meeting.

Joe Ryan **MOVED** to include \$200,000 state funds for the Review Panel. Steve Tharinger **SECONDED**. The Board **APPROVED**.

Public Testimony:

Jeanette Dorner inquired about the eligibility restraints on a group of lead entities who wanted to submit a joint project. Lead entities have discussed interest in doing this at some of their meetings. Another item of concern was regarding projects that have been approved, but need scope changes. What is the lead entity role in this process? She recalled that these projects would need to go back for review. Jeanette would like to have these issues clarified and added to the manual.

Director Johnson noted that the real issue is about project eligibility, since the lead entities are already eligible. The lead entity role in scope changes can be clarified and added to the appendix. Both issues can be added to the manual fairly easily by staff.

Board members agreed that they are okay with joint lead entity projects.

Jeanette commented that lead entities recall a policy decision made in 2005 that never made it into the policy manual regarding lead entity roles in significant scope changes and the need for review. One lead entity wanted to make sure this procedure was included in the manual.

Jim Kramer commented on a gap in the sequencing of projects. Puget Sound supports the multiple lead entity projects. Elected officials are concerned with the amount of resources it takes to go through this process. Jim believes it is at this point that the Board needs to look at how the program is administered and try to start streamlining. He recalls an agreement, which kept the allocation in place for at least two cycles. He recommends waiting to make any changes to the allocation process.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if Jim has any suggestions on how to streamline.

Jim noted that he is not familiar with the administration but believes there may be a group that could look at the processes and find ways to streamline. They need to be able to look at this objectively. He would suggest taking some SRFB staff to contract with a process auditor to look at the process.

Joe Ryan thought that if the sequential habitat project list is available then the Board should be able to step through the projects and this should be a way to streamline the process.

The Chair believes there is value in streamlining the process.

In summation, Director Johnson noted that the Board has accepted most of the staff recommendations with a few additions. Staff will do a final draft for Board approval in May.

Carol suggested a change for page 21 in the draft. Regarding "striking the lead entity plans"

Director Johnson suggested adding "for those areas that are not under a regional plan"

David Troutt would like a way to make sure steps are being taken to ensure independent project review.

Director Johnson noted that the office of the IAC is hiring a consultant that will be looking at the back end of the funding process and would be looking at ways to streamline grant progress. This should provide some suggestions on ways to streamline.

Jeanette noted that LEAG really appreciates the Council of Regions and how much help Steve Martin has been to LEAG. She created a new award for Steve, the LEAG appreciation award for going above and beyond the call of duty.

#### **ENGINEERED LOG JAMS - UPDATE**

Mike Ramsey introduced this agenda item, providing the background on the Engineered Log Jam (ELJs) projects.

Mary Lou of Wild Fish Conservancy (formerly Washington Trout) presented information on the Stillaguamish River project.

Conclusion:

- ELJs improve habitat
- They are stable although a couple of the jams are not as stable as others

Mike McHenry, Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, presented information on the Elwha River project.

Conclusion:

- Structures are stable
- Seeing good results
- Fish use them for holding pool habitat
- Log jams retain spawning gravels and increase spawner abundance.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked what will happen when the Elwha's dams are removed.

Mike reported that removal of the dams will have little effect on the log jams.

Carol Smith said increased water temperatures and some disease problems occur due to hatchery operations upstream. She wanted to know if the log jams have helped that problem.

Mike reported that they might help but there hasn't been a noticeable change.

The Chair asked if money was available, what would be the best way to spend money to temporarily alter rivers and to restore fish.

Mike would say ELJs are a tool to accelerate recovery but you need to be careful in the placement, especially when used with other methods.

Mary Lou noted that the overall need is to replace watershed processes and this is one small aspect of that renewal. The log jams have increased riparian zones.

Carol noted that other actions need to be completed in conjunction with or before the log jams.

**Adjourned:**

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Ruckelshaus, Chair

5/3/07  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Next meeting:  
May 3 & 4, 2007  
Centennial Center  
Cle Elum, WA