

Columbia River Salmon and Steelhead Recreational Anglers Board

FINAL

Meeting Notes 8/12/15

In Attendance:

Del Groat	CRSSRAB, Region 1, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board
Steve Martin	CRSSRAB, Region 1, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board
Bob Whitehall	CRSSRAB, Region 2
Dan Davies	CRSSRAB, Region 2, Trout Unlimited
Tom Fritsch	CRSSRAB, Region 5, CCA
Jerry Rhodes	CRSSRAB, Region 3, CCA, Camp Patriot
Jeff Korth	WDFW, Region 2
Mike Tonseth	WDFW, Region 2
Chris Donley	WDFW, Region 1
John Easterbrooks	WDFW, Region 3
Cindy Le Fleur	WDFW, Region 5
Julie Grobelny	WDFW, Region 5

No members of the public were in attendance

Discussions During the Meeting:

1. Lands agent Project:
 - a. Purpose- to look at property availability to increase access to fishing areas in Region 5. Looking for land owners that would allow the public to access creeks and rivers to fish.
 - b. Cindy would like to extend project into 2016. This 30K project was slotted to be completed in 2015, but WDFW does not have the staff in the lands division to complete work.
 - c. **Decision:** Board voted and agreed to extend project into 2016.
2. Final Reports and project renewals for CRSSRAB funded projects
 - a. Board does not want to establish a rigid timeline for completed reports
 - b. Board agrees that when the report is completed, send to the board
 - c. Board wants progress reports for renewals to show that the project is successful
3. CRSSRAB vacancy
 - a. Board can have no less than six and no more than 10 Board members
 - b. As of the meeting there are currently seven serving Board members
 - c. Board discussed if they should fill the 10th position and if so what region the vacancy should be filled in?
 - i. Should the vacancy balance out the regions?
 - ii. Legislation does not require a Board representative live the area represented, nor even in the Columbia River Basin.
 - iii. Add an At Large position?
 1. this could be someone really active, not necessarily from the Columbia River

- d. Discussion:
 - i. Region 3 only has one Board member
 - ii. Group understands the value of the At Large position, could the At Large position cover region 3?
 - iii. 10th position should go to region 3
 - iv. **Decision:** Board agrees that the 10th Board member position should go to Region 3
 - v. CRSSRAB 2015 number of Board members by region
 - 1. 3 in Region 5 (1 vacancy)
 - 2. 2 (previous to meeting 1) in Region 3 (1 vacancy)
 - 3. 3 in Region 2 (1 vacancy)
 - 4. 2 in Region 1
 - e. **Action Item:** Jeff Korth will send the announcement to the group and wait for feedback from group. The official vacancy announcement will be sent out in the next few weeks soliciting nominations to fill the three vacancies.
- 4. CRSSRAB member term
 - a. Stagger start of term by region so not all Board members leave at the same time.
 - b. Three year term?
 - i. Renew if member is active?
 - c. Term timeframe does not need to be in the process manual
 - d. Justification for longer term than three years?
- 5. CRSSRAB by-laws
 - a. **Action Item:** Mike Tonseth will send out the bylaws in two versions by when??
 - i. Unmodified by-law Word document to group
 - ii. Including his input using track changes with what could be modified
 - b. **Action Item:** Julie Grobelny will coordinate edits and consolidate the groups' edits
 - c. This will likely take two iterations
 - d. The document with everyone's edits will be discussed at later meeting
- 6. New member packet
 - a. This should include...
 - i. By-laws
 - ii. ESSB
 - b. Group discussed if this packet should be in a notebook or just electronic files
 - i. No decision was made
 - c. Consider compiling all of the typed meeting minutes together for a running history of the group
- 7. Board meetings
 - a. Annual meetings
 - i. This is stated in the by-laws
 - 1. 2nd Wednesday in August
 - 2. Last Thursday in February
 - b. 2016 annual meeting dates
 - i. August 10, 2016
 - ii. February 25, 2016
 - c. Minutes go out to group within 30 days of the meeting
 - i. This is stated in the by-laws
 - d. Meeting minute edits/comments need to be back to coordinator within 30 days
 - e. Agenda sent out to the group two weeks prior to meeting via email
 - f. Group can add as many additional meetings as the group needs
- 8. Sign at Methow Access Site

- a. In honor of the late Irv Connor, former Board member from R2
 - b. What should the design be?
 - i. Kiosk?
 - ii. Practical?
 - iii. Name the site after him? (Yes...Board liked this idea---the "Irv Connor memorial water access site")
 - c. **Action Item:** Chris Donley will investigate some designs and send to group
9. Process Manual discussion
- a. Board should decide what it needs versus what it wants in the manual
 - b. Make it functional so it can be easily used as reference
 - c. WDFW's draft table of contents has information for new members
 - d. What information should be put in the appendix
 - i. Back ground info
 - ii. Project reports and a list of the Board members
 - iii. Since most projects are renewals, include the updated project information including quantification of economic benefits
 - iv. By-laws
 - 1. Group member roles are included in the by-laws
 - a. Role of Chair and co-chair
 - b. Role of Board
 - c. Role of WDFW
 - d. Role of Coordinator
10. Proposals
- a. Format
 - i. Considerations to be added
 - ii. Written for public readers (no technical jargon; simple language that is clear and concise---laymen's terms)
 - iii. Website set-up
 - 1. Goal of agency is to post proposals on WDFW's website for public to view
 - 2. **Action Item:** Cindy Le Fleur will set up website
 - 3. Manual shouldn't contain any reports
 - a. Reports and proposals should only be posted on website – not included in process manual
 - b. Use web and social media to distribute information
 - 4. Post minutes and proposals on website
 - 5. An example of the layout can be found on YBFWRB website. There is a past project folder that includes a summary of previous projects in laymen's terms.
 - b. Public involvement
 - i. Should the public be allowed to submit proposals?
 - ii. Group needs to establish the guidelines?
 - iii. The Board would be looking to the WDFW members for guidance because they can recognize the pit falls of public submittals.
 - iv. What are the rules for public submittals?
 - v. What is the screening process for proposals?
 - 1. WDFW already screens agency staff proposals, but good to lay out ground rules for the public
 - vi. Can for profit companies apply/submit a proposal?
 - 1. **Decision:** Board decides that for-profit companies are ineligible

- vii. How to make the public aware of how to apply for and submit a proposal?
 - 1. Use the website to apply
 - 2. Send out a public notification?
 - viii. Work with WDFW staff to let the public know that proposals are being accepted
 - 1. Announce on WDFW face book page
 - c. How to evaluate proposals
 - i. Create a standard on how proposals are evaluated
 - ii. What should be put in application (reflect what is considered by the board during evaluation process; include in process manual)
 - iii. Table of contents outlines the process on how to judge proposals
 - iv. Flag the application elements the CRSSE process manual sub-committee should review at their meeting
 - v. Jeff Korth wants to prioritize elements that would benefit WDFW.
 - vi. The review/process of evaluating proposals should be documented in the CRSSE process manual
 - vii. CRSSE is not funding hatchery or habitat projects
 - viii. Other WDFW advisory groups have pit-falls because they lack or have poorly defined criteria and reporting and/or because the information is not out there for the public to see.
 - 1. Reports should be simple and accessible
 - ix. Project sponsors are accountable for the success of their project and for reporting the results back to the board
 - x. A formal contract should be executed with the sponsor or implementing entity of a public proposal
 - xi. Give highest priority to proposals that are clearly focused on maintaining or expanding fishing opportunity
 - xii. Steve and Cindy would like to see guidelines instead of criteria; up to the prerogative of the board
11. Format of the Procedural Manual
- a. Should the procedural manual include a flow chart showing how the board is going to operate
 - b. Form a small group (sub-committee) to review the manual development process and draft versions
 - c. Does the group want the procedural manual to be process oriented or an encyclopedic reference document?
 - i. Jeff Korth believes that WDFW would benefit from a process oriented manual
 - d. There were several definitions/descriptions of a flow chart
 - i. An outline of the process “interfaces between how approved”
 - ii. Manual is a flow chart of how the process works
 - iii. Decision-tree style flow chart
 - 1. ALEA grants have a good example of a decision making process
 - a. Group could use their template for this process
12. ESA table in procedure manual appendix
- a. List of species in rivers and ESA status
 - b. What are the ESA issues?
 - i. Use the table as a guide on the WDFW website or as a reference in appendix
 - ii. Include descriptions of ESU's

- c. Make public aware that they could be encountering listed species where they are fishing. Provide links to additional information so proposals don't affect listed species.
13. Table of Contents
- a. History of species
 - i. Not needed
 - 1. No decision made
 - b. Purpose
 - i. Good place to put the development of the CRSSE initiative - history of how the CRSSE started
 - ii. Shrink purpose down to a page to a page and a half
 - iii. **Action Item:** Jeff Korth and Bob Whitehall -going to work on developing a paragraph on the purpose of the CRSEE initiative I don't remember?
 - c. Columbia Basin fisheries: Pre-CRSSE
 - i. Defined as prior to CRSSE and why this program was needed.
 - ii. **Action Item:** WDFW RPM's work on putting a paragraph together on Columbia River fisheries prior to CRSSE funding I don't remember?
14. Break down on procedural manual
- a. **Action Item:** Julie send out draft manual after sub-committee meets in September
 - b. Group provide edits to Julie in track changes
 - c. Group agrees to wrap up the manual by the February meeting
 - d. This process will likely take three to four iterations
 - e. Group agrees on a 30-day turnaround time for each iteration
 - f. Sub-committee will send out pieces of the manual in an effort to speed up the review process
 - g. Sub-committee
 - i. Cindy
 - ii. Chris
 - iii. Jerry
 - iv. Steve
 - v. Julie
 - h. Sub-committee goal is to layout the process of the Board
 - i. **Action Item:** Julie will send out doodle poll for sub-committee meeting
 - j. Where meet?
 - i. Tri-Cities area
 - 1. At Jerry's house
 - a. Sub-committee agreed to meet at Jerry's house
 - k. Timeframe of when to meet?
 - i. Early September
 - 1. **Action Item:** Jerry will develop his ideas of a flow chart, prior to September meeting.
15. Review of Board Roles
- a. Co-Chairs
 - i. Steve and Bob
 - b. Sargent at Arms
 - i. Jerry
16. Meeting adjourned