

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

September 12, 2006

King Street Center
Seattle, Washington

Day 1

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Joe Ryan	Seattle
David Troutt	Olympia
Mark Clark	Director, Conservation Commission
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
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 9:15 a.m.

The agenda was reviewed and approved as presented.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS

Mark Clark, Conservation Commission, discussed concerns with the fire season and project areas that are being burned. He stated that areas which were burned have very erosive soils and they are concerned about what will happen this winter. He also reported that the Commission has alerted the Governor's office and the Office of Financial Management (OFM) that there may be some funds needed for these lands and projects.

Dick Wallace, Department of Ecology, provided an update on Ecology water quality standards, which are now completed and should be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by the end of the year. They also completed the public review of storm water permits, which should be issued by this winter. Low water levels and water temperature were also mentioned as items of concern and controversy.

Tim Smith, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), remarked that in July they had a very successful lead entity training program. The session had a terrific turnout and a lot of positive feedback on this training from the lead entities. Tim believes it was money well spent.

The Executive Committee for the Nearshore project awarded \$2.5 million dollars to a new program called Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program. The most notable project associated with this funding was the dike removal at the Skokomish estuary.

Tim mentioned that the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) money was not yet passed in the budget by Congress, so it looks like there will be continuing resolutions until the beginning of the year. Tim will go back in November to learn more about the budget progress.

Chair Ruckelshaus introduced Tukwila Mayor, Steve Mullet, and provided background on Mayor Mullet's work with the Puget Sound.

Mayor Mullet welcomed the Board and discussed Tukwila's commitment to the salmon recovery program. He discussed how the SRFB has provided about \$8 million for their efforts, which has then leveraged another \$14 million in project funds.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF JUNE 2006 MEETING MINUTES

Joe Ryan asked for a change in the minutes. He remembered that the Board approved funding for the Hood Canal project equaling \$350,000. He also remembered that they agreed to hold the \$300,000 in funding for the Lower Columbia projects until after the Independent Science Panel review. He would like to see the minutes changed to reflect these updates.

Joe Ryan **MOVED** to approve the June 2006 meeting minutes as amended. Steve Tharinger **SECONDED**. The Board **APPROVED** the minutes as amended.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

Director's Report

Director Johnson provided this agenda item highlighting:

- IAC is proceeding to get approval for an agency name change to *Recreation and Conservation Funding Office*.
- Director Johnson acknowledged Mark Jarasitis' hard work on submitting a budget.
- Bruce Crawford will be retiring as of October 1 and we will all miss him. There will be various retirement parties and recognitions for Bruce coming up.

Chair Ruckelshaus seconded Director Johnson's comments about Bruce.

Financial Services Report

Mark Jarasitis presented this agenda item by providing the Board with a written report and budget handout. (See notebook item #2b for details.)

Mark explained the reasoning behind the budget development and what each of the requests would cover.

Chair Ruckelshaus mentioned that the request was a big jump compared to the previous requests, although still less than what the regional plans will actually cost.

Dick Wallace pointed out that even with that jump, many of the requests are below the actual funding needs.

Tim Smith noted that the federal awards may exceed the spending authority. Mark responded that if we get additional awards then we would need to go to OFM for approval of that additional funding.

Joe Ryan asked about the coordination with the regional entities to get the funding amounts.

Mark Jarasitis reported that he worked with the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) and tried to figure out what would be a reasonable amount to request.

David Troutt said that we need to coordinate with the regions and try to ask for the same amount in order to have a better chance of receiving that amount of funding.

Chair Ruckelshaus reported that we are out of sync with the requests and budget cycle. Therefore, it is difficult to make a coordinated request in this session, although he still believes it needs to be coordinated.

David noted that the Tribes think if we need a certain amount of funding then we should ask for that amount.

Director Johnson noted that the question is "who is responsible for this funding within the State and what slice is the SRFB responsible for?"

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed a recent meeting he attended with the Governor and explained the reasons behind the funding choices. He described the need for people to understand the nature of the problem before they can truly support it.

Project Management Report

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item by providing the Board with a written report. (See notebook item #2c for details.)

Neil noted the written report is in the notebook and stated that later in the afternoon he will get into the details of the report.

LEAG Report

Jeanette Dorner, the new Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) chair, presented this agenda item by providing the Board with a written report.

Doug Osterman discussed his time on the LEAG and time as chair and expressed how much he appreciated working with the Staff, Board, and other lead entity representatives across the state.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked Doug for his time and welcomed Jeanette as the new LEAG chair.

Jeanette expressed her excitement in taking on this new role and how LEAG will continue to work with the Board.

Jeanette reviewed the meeting summary sheet that she handed out to the Board.

- LEAG workshop – She agreed with Tim Smith about the quality of the training workshop that the WDFW put on and stated that it was well worth everyone's time.
- Criteria for Success – She had a good conversation with Neil Aaland and the IAC. The LEAG recommended reviewing the homework that the regions provided in the spring to see if they have done what they said they would do and to use this as the primary criterion.
- 7th Round – Discussed both the pros and cons of the new process from the lead entities.
- Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) - Reported that they are working with federal agencies to streamline their permitting processes for restoration projects.

Permitting is still a major concern for the project managers both at a state and federal level. The work that is being done by the GSRO should help considerably with the process.

Director Johnson believes we should get a written summary of this effort to the Board.

The Chair would like a letter from the Board to the entities involved to assist in supporting this effort.

Doug reported that the LEAG discussed sending a letter of support, but doesn't know if the letter has been drafted yet.

Dick Wallace believes we should be working with Chris Drivdahl, GSRO and LEAG on specific key permits. It may be better to focus in on just a few key permits that are holding things up.

Jeanette's personal goal as Chair of LEAG is to continue in Doug's footsteps, being a good communicator with all of the groups involved.

Dick Wallace thanked Doug for his work.

Communications Report

This was a written report only.

(See notebook item #2d for details.)

MONITORING EFFORTS

Effectiveness Monitoring – TetraTech-EC Inc.

Bruce Crawford provided a short background on the Board's monitoring efforts and introduced the first presentation by TetraTech – EC Inc. (See notebook item #3a for details.)

Jennifer O'Neil, Program Coordinator, provided the presentation for TetraTech and described the methods used for determining site specific effectiveness of both restoration and habitat protection projects funded by the SRFB. She displayed data from a wood placement project that was sampled in 2004 and 2005.

Riparian planting projects will be monitored by the changes in vegetation structure and canopy density. She gave an example of a project like this in Centralia.

Jennifer also provided data from a dike removal project and of a channel reconnection project in the Skagit River. She further stated that they will begin monitoring spawning gravel projects in 2005. Using index scores and established rating criteria Tetra Tech is monitoring fresh water habitats, focusing on salmonids and macroinvertebrates.

Board Discussion:

The Chair asked about the ability to get volunteers involved in this process.

Bruce reported that some of the work is at a level that really needs to have professional staff to do the work, but about a third of the parameters which could be monitored by volunteers.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed cost effectiveness and explained how to use volunteers to improve the cost effectiveness for the monitoring efforts.

Jennifer reported that they are working on ways to involve volunteers.

Bruce reported that the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) is using the same protocols as Washington, so it should prove to be helpful for future efforts.

Tim Smith asked if some of the project types with data gathered will be able to predict the future and develop criteria for future projects in order to get the best results.

Jennifer reported that this is part of the work that the University of Washington is doing with the data being collected. It could be used for that type of analysis, although it hasn't been done yet. The initial groundwork is being laid.

Bruce discussed status and trend monitoring and explained how it could help with distribution, including using the Environmental Monitoring Assessment Program (EMAP) to determine distribution over time.

Status and Trend Framework – Ecology

Bruce Crawford introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #3b for details.)

Bob Cusimano, Ecology, provided the status and trend framework presentation.

Bob explained the objectives of the status and trends monitoring plan for rivers and streams. He discussed the top five metrics identified in a recent EPA Regional Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (REMAP) analysis, which include: dissolved oxygen, riparian disturbance, fish cover, and the percentage of sand and bed stability. He further explained the final tasks of the framework project and relationships to limiting factors, such as suspended solids, turbidity, and excessive sedimentation.

Bob described the uses of the status and trends data for items like the State of the Salmon Report and regional, State and Federal mandates.

Board Discussion:

Joe Ryan asked about the top five metrics in the REMAP analysis. Bob explained the parameters and how they could be measured.

Glen Merritt, Ecology, explained the reference sites and the need for finding 10 undisturbed sites. There are actually 20 metrics used but today's discussion just showed the top five.

Joe asked where water temperature fell on the list. Glen explained that temperature didn't show up at all on this list in the REMAP analysis.

The Board discussed the importance of macroinvertebrates as metrics and why they are a good indicator of stream health.

Craig Partridge wanted to be reassured about the temperature issue. Bruce explained that the EMAP sites are taken randomly and mostly at wadeable streams at higher elevations and are limited to 50 sites.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the need to make the information understandable on where we are today and where we are going over time. The Chair is having a hard time translating this information into usable language for the general interested public. He hopes that we will get to a point where we can say, using this data, here's where we were and where we are going so that people can understand.

Bruce explained the need to take all the parameters and make it meaningful at the broader scale for others to understand. The US Forest Service has started this work

with their data and Stream Keepers in the North Peninsula, because only seeing numbers doesn't help to articulate the information.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked that they simplify it enough so that it means something to the public. For instance, the process and terminology of "fish in and fish out" means something to the public.

Tim Smith noted the importance of getting this information and said that it is part of the Board's responsibility to figure out what information is needed to tell the story. He wondered if mayfly larvae are important for the *fish in fish out* strategy or are there better data sets to tell the story?

Dick Wallace asked about an executive summary for this report and wanted to know what this information would tell us. He laid out an outline for the report including:

- Background information.
- Description of the framework.
- Description of the fish in fish out approach.
- Guidance to help people understand results when they are found.

The Board continued to discuss ways to translate data into answers for policy maker's questions. Bruce noted that this process was started at yesterday's Monitoring Forum meeting.

Dick Wallace would like to have Bruce work on a list of what monitoring is going on, what each one answers, and the timeline for each.

Independent Science Panel Review of Intensively Monitored Watershed Program Report

Bruce Crawford introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #3c for details.)

Dr. Ken Currens, Independent Science Panel (ISP) Chair, presented information on the ISP review of the Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) report. He felt it was a comprehensive report and doesn't believe there are any other projects like this. This is leading the way for other states and has helped others to start their work.

Dr. Currens listed several recommendations in order to improve the likelihood that the IMW project will achieve its objectives.

- Develop specific, detailed study plans for each study component.
- Work cooperatively to develop meta-analyses in Washington and across the Pacific Northwest.
- Describe organization structures to meet program objectives.
- Clarify expectations by generalizing results from IMWs to other watersheds.
- Develop mechanisms to ensure coordination of restoration actions.
- Support collaborations that already exist in the Pacific Northwest and expand this collaboration.

Dr. Currens would like to see committed funds for long-term monitoring projects.

Board Discussion:

The Board discussed how the IMWs can help the Board when making funding decisions and help regions and lead entities prioritize projects in their watersheds.

Joe Ryan noted that the Board hasn't decided on the Lower Columbia IMW project yet and is wondering if we need to see a revised Columbia River Study design to have the ISP review, in order to say whether the funding amount is correct or if it will work.

Dr. Currens noted that the Lower Columbia hasn't been working on this as long.

Craig Partridge asked if we can extrapolate information for multiple species from the work being done now. Dr. Currens believes this is what they have been doing so far. If they are wrong on one then they are wrong on a lot, so hopefully they are right.

There was continued discussion on the study and which species and information are the best to gather.

David Troutt would like to have the best scientific minds come back to the SRFB to say how to best design IMW monitoring for Chinook.

Dr. Currens was open to the challenge, but needs to have the SRFB help frame the questions that they want answers to.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like to see if the IMW plans can answer the questions that are asked in the report. He suggested not making a decision on the Lower Columbia IMW today, but rather work with the regions and lead entities to see if the plans can be improved to answer more of their questions.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Bruce if they put off the decision until they get more clarification about their questions, would this gap in time hinder the effectiveness of the data?

Bruce Crawford doesn't see a problem with deferring the funding of the Lower Columbia project, although it will postpone getting the answers by another year. He also believes that this needs to be a partnership with the regional entity, because their support is crucial.

Tim Smith believes this is a policy decision the Board needs to make, because if they are using programmatic funds then they are taking funds away from projects.

Steve Leider, GSRO, discussed his work with the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) and let the Board know that they will get more information about

the level of IMW funding shortly. Based on a PNAMP overview of IMW efforts, the expected duration of IMW is about ten years.

Tim Smith would like to see how to do monitoring directly related to Chinook.

Steve Tharinger supports not funding the Lower Columbia IMW today and wants to find out more information on how to gather Chinook information.

The Board asked Dr. Currens and the ISP to assist the Board in developing the right questions.

The Board decided not to fund the Lower Columbia IMW at today's meeting and decided to defer Bill Ehinger's IMW presentation due to the time crunch.

Smolt Monitoring

Bruce Crawford introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #3e for details.)

Greg Volkhardt, WDFW, provided this presentation describing the current work, priorities and funding for the smolt monitoring projects. He displayed graphs outlining the viability attributes such as abundance, productivity and diversity. He then mentioned the factors and threats for monitoring recovery.

Greg showed examples of other smolt monitoring projects done by the WDFW on the Deschutes and Hood Canal areas. He listed the statewide approach for monitoring listed salmon, using the *fish in fish out* method to estimate productivity and to monitor populations, ensuring that they are consistent with regional recovery plans. He displayed all rivers that currently have *fish in fish out* data, including their dedicated funding.

Greg described what WDFW proposed for SRFB funding and how it would fit into the status and trend framework discussed earlier by Bob Cusimano. He summarized what the *fish in fish out* project would hope to achieve and what the total SRFB funding request will be used for.

Chair Ruckelshaus wanted to know how they decided on how much money to request.

Greg would like to see a FY07-09 budget package requesting funding for projects that have not been funded in the past such as Cedar Creek, Skagit, and Dungeness.

Joe Ryan asked how this request compares to how much was spent last year.

Director Johnson asked how soon he will need the answer regarding the Board's funding. Greg replied that last year they got the answer during the December SRFB meeting and although it is not desirable to wait that long, it was workable.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that he thought it would be part of the combined package being sent to the Legislature.

Bruce agreed, but he noted that this was a stop gap for legislative funding.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if Greg had shown this to the regions or lead entity areas. Greg replied that he did not report directly, but has shown this to the WDFW regional director and the Skagit project is part of that IMW.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like to wait until the proposal is ready and the regions have had time to review it.

Public Testimony:

Doug Osterman, King 9 Lead Entity Coordinator, stated that this was the first time he has seen the information and appreciates Chair Ruckelshaus' comments about reviewing this with the lead entities and regional entities. The Green River smolt trap is key to the King 9 integration plan.

Board Discussion:

Dick Wallace would like to know how these places are linked with the issues that are the most important to the SRFB and how they compare based on that criteria.

REGIONAL ISSUES UPDATE

Neil Aaland provided an overview of these two new regional efforts and their funding requests.

Pend Oreille Proposal

Sandy Dotts and Mark Watchel provided this presentation. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

Chair Ruckelshaus asked how many lead entities are in this region. Sandy reported only one.

The Chair asked about the total geographic area and number of watersheds which are covered by this lead entity.

Sandy reported that not all of the geographic area is covered and stated that there are thirteen WRIAs within this region.

Chair Ruckelshaus encouraged creation of only one lead entity to cover the whole area so that one ranked list can come forward, making the process easier.

The Chair asked this group to pay attention and said that if Phase 1 doesn't work then they should be willing to not have a region.

Mark Watchel noted that the answer to this question will be in March of next year. Mark believes this is the right time to develop a regional plan in the Northeast. The \$20,000 would be matched with WDFW in-kind support of Sandy and Mark's time and travel.

Coastal Proposal

Lee Napier presented this proposal with support from John Sims, Mike Johnson, and Cheryl Baumann. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

David Troutt asked how much WDFW has contributed to this effort. Tim Smith reported they have provided \$5,000. WDFW plans to contribute up to \$20,000 in order to help the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity (NOPE) group.

Mark Clark wants to set an example since there are other areas around the state that are also concerned with paying travel for stakeholders. He is not against providing additional funding to the coordinators to talk to more of the stakeholders.

Craig Partridge agreed with Mark's comments. He believes this is a very important part of the state and would rather put dollars in this resource than the stakeholders.

John Sims wondered if the coordinators were to find out that stakeholders aren't interested then would the Board be okay with them staying as lead entities only?

Chair Ruckelshaus answered yes and stated that the Board hasn't paid for this part of the process to date, so this is something new.

Tim Smith reported that WDFW is putting together a list of all the groups involved in the regional efforts and believes there will be over a thousand involved. He would be concerned with budget issues if we start a precedence to fund stakeholders to attend the meetings.

Neil Aaland suggested that he and Director Johnson receive discretion to work with the lead entities to confirm the final amount of the agreement somewhere between \$57,000 and \$86,000.

Chair Ruckelshaus summarized that the request would be for \$20,000 for Pend Oreille and to fund \$57,000 later with a report and an additional cap amount.

Steve Tharinger made a **MOTION** to have Pend Oreille get the \$20,000 now, and to hold the full \$86,000 until after they come back with a report.

Chair Ruckelshaus is concerned with doing this. He would rather Phase 1 be funded now and wait for Phase 2 funding until they get answers concerning stakeholder interest.

David Troutt **SECONDED** Steve's motion. **MOTION** was **APPROVED** without Chair Ruckelshaus' support.

2006 GRANT ROUND UPDATE

Process to Date and Proposed Final Report

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4a for details.)

Neil discussed the Review Panel's work since mid-June, including its review of 161 projects. He stated that the Review Panel visits are going well and at least one panel member has been available to visit each site. Neil described how the final report will differ from last year's.

Neil explained that the 7th Round final report will have a format similar to last year with an introduction, evaluation of the projects, and process. It will include a staff report and state the next steps. In addition, the final report will identify projects of concern (POC) and provide information for areas included in the regional recovery plans and for other lead entities.

Criteria for Success

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 4b for details.)

Neil reminded the Board that in June there was a suggestion to reduce the allocation if regional processes were considered to be inadequate. Staff prepared an initial draft and met with the Council of Regions. Neil recommended that the primary measure of success should be how each area followed its processes.

Neil listed four recommended criteria and suggested that the staff would measure these using the Review Panel's report, homework responses, and October presentations. From this information they would be able to tell if the process worked and if the allocation was warranted and also consider any shortcomings and additional steps that might be needed.

Board Discussion:

Craig Partridge asked for clarification on what the review of criteria is.

Neil clarified that the recommendation is not to add an additional step, but to review the original submittal to see how it matches the final submittal.

Director Johnson recalled that in June the comments were less about results and more about the process for lead entities. They wanted to ensure that there is internal communication.

Steve Tharinger agreed with this recollection.

Mark Clark recalled that last year there were a couple POCs that received funding and wanted to know how that would work this year. His assumption is that POCs won't get funded this year.

Neil agreed that staff's assumption was also that POCs would not get funded.

Dick Wallace has heard multiple options including guaranteed funding, preallocated funds, and allocated funds. His belief is that it was not guaranteed or preallocated if the process wasn't followed.

Chair Ruckelshaus believes they should delegate that flexibility to the regions and they can decide based on what they have found from their homework.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked what the Board would do if a region approved a list for \$1 million and there was a \$200,000 POC on their list?

Mark Clark would wait on the funding decision until the project can be fixed..

Steve Tharinger asked what would happen if the Board decides not to fund POCs and tells the region to not bring forward lists with POCs?

The Chair doesn't agree with that because it gives the Technical Review Panel the decision power.

The Board continued to discuss the pros and cons of POCs, allocation amounts and criteria to use.

Jeanette Dorner stated that it seems like the question shifted from following the strategic plan to the POCs.

Board Decision:

The Board would like staff to evaluate the process but not to make recommendations on what the Board will decide. The Board does not want staff suggesting delays for funding of the lists.

Craig Partridge recommends that the criteria be a synthesis of the second assumption in order to ensure the regions did what they said they would do.

Public Testimony:

Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board, had some concern with the POC discussion. His lead entity lists are due next week and his regional list in two weeks but he doesn't have a formal POC list yet.

Rollie Geppert reported that the Review Panel will meet on October 19 and 20 to review all projects and affirm as a group whether or not a project is a POC. October 23-27 is when the regional and lead entity presentations will be made to the panel.

Joe Ryan suggested submitting a longer project list so that if the POC turns green it is okay, and if the POC turns red they can take it off the list. In other words, if the yellow flag turns red and you don't want to take the risk then pull the project.

Chair Ruckelshaus agreed, but wanted to clarify that the money will go into a common pot and not necessarily into that project, so the list must be increased to accommodate this.

The Board decided it is okay to adjust the local match and SRFB grant, although 15 percent is still the minimum for the match amount, as long as it didn't change in scope. If there are still POC's after the final review, there will be one more chance to discuss this with the Board, however, this is a gamble.

Jeanette summarized the Board's decision. She said that if a POC is submitted to the SRFB at the December meeting as part of a project list and the SRFB is not convinced by a proponent's request to fund the project, despite the POC rating, the project will not be funded. In addition, the lead entity or region will not be allowed to substitute another project to access their full allocation. Instead the allocation will be reduced by the amount of the POCs that the SRFB decides not to fund. The basic intent of the SRFB policy is to provide an incentive for regions to remove final POCs from the project list before it reaches the SRFB in December.

CONSERVATION RESERVE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (CREP) UPDATE:

Time ran out for this presentation so an apology was made to Carol Smith, Conservation Commission, for delaying her presentation.

2007 MEETING SCHEDULE:

Laura Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

Proposed 2007 meeting dates:

- January 25 & 26, 2007
- March 8 & 9, 2007
- May 3 & 4, 2007
- July 12 & 13, 2007
- September 27 & 28, 2007
- December 13 & 14, 2007

Joe Ryan **MOVED** to approve Resolution # 2006-02, 2007 meeting schedules. Steve Tharinger **SECONDED** the motion. Board **APPROVED** Resolution 2006-02 as presented.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORT

David Troutt announced that on October 12 the celebration for the final part of the restoration project in the Nisqually Watershed will be taking place and they would like to have Chair Ruckelshaus attend and be a key speaker at the opening.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:



William Ruckelshaus, Chair

_____ **Date**

Future Meeting: December 6 & 7, 2006
 Comfort Inn Conference Center
 Evergreen Room, Tumwater



RESOLUTION #2006-02

ADOPTION OF THE 2007 SRFB MEETING SCHEDULE

BE IT RESOLVED, the following schedule for 2007 Regular meetings of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board is hereby adopted; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, staff is directed to publish notice in the State Register accordingly.

January 25 & 26, 2007	Thursday and FridayLocation TBD
March 8 & 9, 2007	Thursday and FridayLocation TBD
May 3 & 4, 2007	Thursday and FridayLocation TBD
July 12 & 13, 2007	Thursday and FridayLocation TBD
September 27 & 28, 2007	Thursday and FridayLocation TBD
December 13 & 14, 2007	Thursday and FridayLocation TBD

Resolution Moved By: Joe Ryan

Resolution Seconded By: Steve Tharinger

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: September 12, 2006