

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

February 14 & 15, 2008

Room 172 NRB
Olympia, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steve Tharinger (Chair)	Clallam County
Harry Barber	Washougal
David Troutt	DuPont
Don "Bud" Hover	Okanogan County
Bob Nichols	Olympia
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Melissa Gildersleeve	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 Steve Tharinger opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m.

Steve Tharinger welcomed our new board members and introductions were made.

Steve Tharinger approved agenda as presented with a few additional items.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2007 MEETING MINUTES

Bob Nichols **MOVED** to approve the December 2007 meeting minutes. Bud Hover **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** December 13, 2007 minutes as presented.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS:

Director Cottingham provided this agenda item. (See notebook item #2 for details)

Director's Report:

Director Cottingham highlighted a few items from the report.

- Staff changes – This is Amie Fowler's last meeting as she will now move to the fiscal department. Patty Davis is the new executive assistant for the director, deputy, and special assistant. Also, the new board liaison will start next week.
- Staff has tried a new media coverage approach that uses telephone calls to reporters in addition to written new releases. This coverage has increased 48 percent from last year.
- A request for Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funding (PACSRF) is due March 24. Each state is limited to \$25 million. The Recreation and Conservation Office will work closely with Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, local tribes, and Governor's Salmon Recovery Office to submit a prioritized list for funding.

- We are starting the process for the RCO's budget for the next biennium. The strategic plan is due in June and the final request due in August.
- The 2008 work plan will be used to judge her work accomplished and priorities.

During the December 13, 2007 board meeting, the Board approved \$161,737 funding for the Touchet River project. A data entry error in PRISM resulted in an incorrect funding request and sponsor match. The funding request was short by \$55,970 and the match reported was over by \$53,910, so the project total was short by \$2,060. Staff would like to present Resolution #2008-04 to approve the correction of funds.

Resolution #2008-04

Bud Hover **MOVED** to approve Resolution #2008-04. Bob Nichols **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** Resolution #2008-04, funding adjustment for project # 07-1527, Touchet River Mile 42.5 Habitat Enhancement.

Project Management Report:

Brian Abbott, Section Manager, presented this agenda item.

Brian noted the new project areas and the hard work from staff to prepare for the upcoming 2008 grant round. He thanked Amie Fowler for all her hard work and congratulated her in her new position with fiscal.

Tara Galuska provided a powerpoint presentation that highlighted completed projects:

- Rocky Creek Barrier Replacement, 01-1373 C
- Mashel River Restoration, 04-1437 R
- Skokomish River Tide Gate/Culvert, 01-1302 R

Steve thanked Tara and noted that these presentations are always a highlight of the meeting. He asked Tara about the monitoring done with these completed projects. Tara and Lance Wineka, South Puget Sound Enhancement Group, provided a history on current monitoring.

Steve Tharinger noted the budget reports provided at past meetings and mentioned he would still like to receive these reports showing funded project from past rounds.

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP

David Dicks, Puget Sound Partnership presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 3 for details)

David updated the Board on the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) formed last year by the legislature. The original agency was inadequate to deal with the scope of problems. Statistics show Puget Sound is in significant decline, which led to the creation of the Partnership. He provided background on the setup of the partnership. The Partnership has been assigned to first, create an action plan to recover the Puget Sound by 2020, and second, to promote communication and public engagement. The difference from the original agency is that each agency would review its plan internally and work

through the action team to coordinate plans into one to present to the legislature. He noted the current monitoring system, and believes it is critical for showing progress made.

Steve noted it's important that salmon are not be lost in the shuffle. He is very impressed with the partnership is rolling up these efforts. He noted the need for a way to monitor the accountability.

David noted that now's the time for the wall between the Board and the Partnership to come down. There is a lot of overlap and the Partnership is not interested in reinventing wheels that are working well; they want to bring more efficiency.

Tim Smith provided an update on the coordination with the Partnership and the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership. Ways they have tried to coordinate are:

- Timing of projects – coordination with the SRFB process.
- How projects are evaluated.
- Hands on management of contracts. Mike Ramsey manages the Puget Sound area as an Outdoor Grant Manager. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife has purchased part of Mike's time to work on nearshore projects as well.

The Board discussed how the three pieces of the Board, Nearshore Partnership, and PSP all fit in together.

BERK AND ASSOCIATES STUDY OF GRANT PROCESSES

Rachael Langen, RCO Deputy Director, and Pia Franzese and Heather Rogers, Berk & Associates, presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 8 for details)

Rachael Langen provided some background on re-appropriations. If capital funds are not spent within a biennium, the RCO ask the legislature to carry over funds to the next biennium. There are many reasons that a sponsor may not complete a project on time. RCO hired Berk and Associates to focus on five areas:

- RCO's re-appropriations,
- RCO's effectiveness,
- Ability of project sponsors to complete their project on time,
- RCO's project management and tracking approaches, and
- Providing greater incentives for project sponsors to deliver on-time projects.

Heather Rogers added that the final report is due to RCO tomorrow, February 15. She provided background on the steps taken during the analysis of the agency. RCO faces many challenges in the salmon section due to projects not being completed on time. One reason for the increasing re-appropriations is that the rate of funding is increasing significantly.

General findings include:

- Project delay is caused by many internal and external factors
- Grant managers workload is tied to project delivery concerns

- Lack of standard internal processes and policies
- There are no formal reporting and information systems in place
- RCO response to project delay helps perpetuate the cycle
- Other grant agencies are experiencing similar project delay issues

Pia highlighted the strategies and recommendations. The following recommendations are actions that address three specific issues facing the RCO: project delivery; grant manager workload; and organizational efficiency and cohesiveness.

Bud Hover asked for clarification on the recommendation to hire five new staff in order to handle re-appropriations and expressed his concern about the cost to hire these staff.

Kaleen noted that this report is due tomorrow. Staff will look at the recommendations at an all staff meeting, where they may come up with something new.

Craig Partridge noted the 36 different recommendations and asked how staff will prioritize them. Kaleen noted that they may bring policy issues back to the Board such as how they phase funding.

Jim Fox noted that our grant programs average 3 percent overhead for projects compared to 8-15 percent in other funding agencies.

Steve noted this will need to be something to look at as it does affect funding and efficiencies of programs. He agrees that with the number of projects and funding, there is a need for more staff.

Kaleen noted that she will continue to work with the chair of each board and will continue to bring back any decisions made.

David noted the need to look at the future in order to solve these issues. The expectations have not clearly been expressed to lead entities and now he sees it unfair to put these new expectations on them. There will be a negative effect on sponsors as they are already at their capacity.

Tim asked if they found any difference with acquisitions or restorations. Heather noted they found acquisitions have more delays because they are unpredictable challenges.

BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY

Lynn Helbrecht, Biodiversity Council Executive Coordinator, presented this agenda item.

Lynn gave a history of the council and reviewed the strategies that were recently published.

Steve mentioned questions the Board may have when looking at funding projects, for example, whether a project would score higher if it were in an area of risk.

Bud asked how they determined what is at risk. Lynn provided an example: if there are 200 species in an area that are in decline, the habitat will decline in the value.

Tim noted something that may benefit the Board is that the risk system will affect the acquisitions, such as steering sponsors toward the areas at risk to help salmon but also benefit biodiversity.

GOVERNOR'S SALMON RECOVERY OFFICE (GSRO) REPORT

Chris Drivdahl, GSRO, presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 4 for details)

Chris highlighted the permit streamlining for restoration projects and hopes to report at the next meeting that it has been completed. It should be ready for the federal register by the end of the month.

GSRO has been working with RCO and other agencies on concerns they've heard about the expense of large woody debris (LWD), as the board heard wood is very expensive. They have been asked to coordinate a storing area that would work as a wood bank. It looks like three different agencies will have areas to store LWD. A ballpark estimate is that \$15 million Board funds have been spent on large woody debris for salmon projects.

The GSRO has begun working on the budget requests for the next biennium, collecting the top priorities identified in the recovery plans for assistance from the state and federal agencies.

The production team will soon be in place to begin working on the next year's State of Salmon Report (SOS). The theme will likely profile the tenth anniversary of the Salmon Recovery Act.

David Troutt asked how they are gathering information for the 2009-2011 budget? Are you going to lead entities and local groups? Chris noted they are working with the regions, and it is their responsibility to work with the lead entities.

Harry Barber noted the liability issues that come along with the LWD. He requested that the Board get a formal opinion on the liability for sponsors.

Steve Tharinger noted that this has come up before and believes that Board should talk with an Attorney General. Kaleen noted adding it to a policy list. Jim Fox noted involving DNR and other entities.

LEAD ENTITY ADVISORY GROUP (LEAG) REPORT

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

Jeanette noted that lead entities are back out preparing for projects in the next round. They appreciate Brian Abbott and staff for preparing a comment period for the next round. She noted that lead entities believe it is helpful for the board to make as many decisions as possible for the next round so they can get started with a good list for December 2008.

Jeanette highlighted the recommendations supported by lead entities such as:

- To start the grant round for the 2008 grant round in March as it will allow for more project review.
- Allow design-only projects up to \$200,000 with no match requirement.
- Having a year round review panel.
- Allowing alternates.

Jeanette noted that there was not enough time for lead entities to do a thorough review of the Review Panel memo. They have noted a number of the issues are controversial in nature, and LEAG would like to be part of any decisions that are made based on the Review Panel recommendations.

Steve noted that the Board may not have the ability to make all decisions today on the 2008 grant round, and asked if she would be available at tomorrow's meeting. Jeanette noted she believes the lead entities would prefer that they wait to move forward on the Review Panel recommendations. Steve asked if they could start the round without the policy decisions made. Jeanette feels like it may be an issue such as the role of the Review Panel and the Issues Task Force. Steve noted the concern of the Review Panel is whether we are funding the best projects for the salmon.

LEAG supports the regional allocation percentages for the next round with the potential for the coast region to receive an extra one percent from the Board. She would like to request that Barbara Rosen present in her place tomorrow during the allocation discussion, but Barbara needs to leave early so she asked the Board to move the agenda item earlier in the day.

Jeanette noted the lead entity program supplemental request, lead entity outreach, and lead entity training on February 25 & 26.

After the hearing the Berk report, she checked with other lead entities in the room to get a feel of thoughts and noted they would like the opportunity to work together for solutions, and asked to involve lead entities in the discussion. The factor on the delay of projects was not clear. Lead entities are very invested in the projects but there are not a lot of resources. Kaleen noted that she welcomed lead entities' comments.

COUNCIL OF REGIONS (COR) REPORT

Steve Martin, COR chair, presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #6 for details)

Steve Martin provided the history of the Council of Regions. He appreciated the presentation on the Puget Sound Partnership and the idea to coordinate efforts. He noted the importance of lead entities and thanked Brian Abbott and staff for providing the opportunity to provide comment on staff recommendation for the next grant round.

Steve Tharinger asked about the "assured return" comment in the regional allocations update. Steve Martin clarified that this would take two organizations coming to an understanding to exchange funds in grant round to help address salmon recovery.

Steve Tharinger supports the idea of allocating funds to different regions but is not comfortable with the *assured return* concept. Steve Martin clarified that language could be drafted but it may not need to be a Board policy but something that is worked out between the regions.

REVIEW PANEL MEMO TO THE BOARD

Steve Leider and Brian Abbott presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #9 for details)

Steve highlighted key notes in the memo provided.

- Panel recommends that the Board ask the Panel to identify projects with medium benefit and medium certainty.

Craig noted a previous discussion with the Panel and Board and remembered that the question was how confident are the distinctions of high, medium, and low. The panel felt most confident between medium and low. He asked what has changed that the Review Panel can easily determine that "best-of-the-best" call and what the Board would be gaining.

Steve Leider clarified that the recommendation does not say that anything in the process is broken, but that this is a way to improve it. If there is an attraction to know where the "wow" projects are, this is the opportunity for the Review Panel to note them.

David noted the Nisqually project funding in the 2007 round, and that a way for the Board to hear about the larger projects is through the process and local community.

The Board discussed the idea of having another review level and noted that they are not comfortable with the Review Panel making that determination, but welcomes their comments non-formally.

Steve Leider highlighted the recommendation of region-by-region summary and/or report cards.

Craig Partridge expressed concern about the year-round "full-time" Review Panel at the last meeting, and gained clarification on his concerns. He still questions having them year round and losing independence. He feels like the report card idea leads further in that direction.

Bud Hover discussed the need to hear the regional information, but holds concern that they would be making decisions the Board should make. Bob Nichols agrees with the caution of a report card unless there were categories to rate.

Harry Barber noted the Review Panel could seek the best practices and share with other regions.

Bob commented on how pleased he was to see how the Review Panel provided locals the technical assistance on a service based need but he would not want them to lose the independence.

Steve highlighted a recommendation from the Panel that requested guidance about Board benefit and certainty criteria and eligibility for protection projects. An alternative would be for the Board not to make the regulatory context a basis for eligibility, but instead make eligibility dependent on project being in areas with the highest specific overall biological benefit among all high priority areas.

The board discussed concerns of acquisitions. Board members do not feel comfortable adding this level of criteria. Steve Tharinger noted that there is value to this distinction of upland areas but the question is how we get there.

Steve Tharinger asked what decisions on eligibility the Board would need to make. Steve Leider noted if the board needs more time to discuss, then decisions could be made at a later time, but they would appreciate guidance.

Resolution #2008-02

Steve Tharinger presented Resolution #2008-02, recognizing Joe Ryan for service to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. Bud Hover **MOVED** to approve Resolution #2008-02. Bob Nichols **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** Resolution #2008-02 as presented.

Public Testimony:

Steve Martin, COR chair, provided testimony on the Review Panel recommendations. It is important to reaffirm the role of the regional organizations to ensure that the projects presented are consistent with the recovery plans. They value the current role of the Review Panel but would like to recommend that none of the recommendations heard today be added into policy for the 2008 grant round as many lead entities have already begun their process.

Steve Tharinger asked Steve Martin if there are any guidance on acquisitions and the issues on upland areas. Steve M. noted that it has faced the Snake River region for several years. They have seen scope increases in conservation easements and to bring that back in they have established a maximum width criteria and a strong recommendation to phase projects.

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia, noted that the biggest priority in the region is preserving the habitat they have now. They do not view acquisition as the primary means of protection but at a last resort. There is recognition that there are not enough funds to buy every piece of property. He suggested finding the problem and then finding a way to fix it.

Jeanette Dorner, LEAG chair, noted that each region is trying to complete projects that best address their strategy. She has not heard questions about the acquisition that does not come back to the benefit of the strategy. It seems like there is still some confusion about having criteria left from previous rounds and Board members questioning that criteria. It seems that when the Review Panel gets into looking at the benefit and the constancy with the recovery plan, that they are wading into the strategic area.

Alex Conley, Yakima Watershed, noted one part of Review Panel mandate lacks clarity where it would be appropriate to have board-level policy decisions made. That part is the review of the regional processes, as there is not clear guidance on how it should be done. He would encourage that it not be done or if it is, there be clear criteria and thought out approach.

2008 GRANT ROUND – MANUAL 18

Brian Abbott and Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 10 for details)

Staff requests some guidance today to craft language in order to start the grant round and come back for approval of Manual 18 in May. They also seek guidance on issues for future grant rounds.

Brian provided some background on the 2006 to current 2008 grant rounds and highlighted the 2008 revisions proposed, including:

- Combine Manual 18 and 18b – **Board supports.**
- Start “project review” in March – **Board supports.**
- Allow for design only projects with no match requirement – **Board supports.**
- Revise the combination project policy – **Board supports.**
- Implement landowner acknowledgement requirement – **Board supports.**
- Revise application proposal (scope of work) – **Board supports.**
- Conduct Review Panel meetings quarterly – **Board supports.**
- Allow for project alternates – **Board supports.**
- Identify project with high benefit and certainty, and continue to identify projects of concern. – **Board does not support.**
- Prepare a region by region report card – **The Board does not support the report card but would like to see the information informally.**

Leslie presented additional item for future rounds:

- Move the funding decisions to April.
- Address project eligibility issues.
- Review and improve standards of review.

- Include viable salmonid population criteria.
- Identity gaps in technical review.
- Revisit regional allocations formulas.
- Assessment of assessments.

FAMILY FOREST FISH PASSAGE PROGRAM – UPDATE

Jason Lundgren, Mary McDonald, and Jeff Davis presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #12 for details)

Jason provided a program introduction and overview, highlights and accomplishments, and project examples.

Steve Tharinger asked for the definition of a small forest landowner. Mary McDonald, Small Forest Landowner Office, DNR, noted that a small forest landowner harvests less than 2 million board feet per year, or averaged over three years if they exceed the single year amount. There is no acreage size.

Craig Partridge asked how funds are prioritized within streams. Jason noted that they are prioritized on a local scale and prioritize within a basin.

Carol Smith asked the percentage of barriers the FFFPP is unable to fund. Jason noted there are 500-550 eligible applicants in the program and roughly 100 projects have been funded.

Tim Smith asked for the percentage of administrative cost. Jason noted that engineering costs are usually 10-20 percent of the project. Projects rarely take longer than two years to complete.

Craig noted that earlier in the program the cost per mile was low, and asked if as the program continues, staff feel the cost of the projects is rising. Jason noted that they are more expensive, but they are cost effective. They build projects that will last a long time and will not need to be replaced.

The board discussed monitoring removing barriers. Jason noted the goal of the program is to assist small forest land owners with barriers, fish are a priority but not at the same level as SFRB. Craig Partridge noted the program goals are the goal of the legislature.

Tim Smith would be interested in a report showing costs; Steve Tharinger noted that anywhere we can, we should transfer knowledge to save money. He would like to see costs of past rounds and cost now with engineering. Jason noted that the sites are so different it is difficult to compare cost. The benefits show in the project quality.

Mary noted the benefit of the engineers, there was a backlog due to lack of knowledge. Last year there were 18 projects, the best year so far. The engineers were able to get the projects completed and cleaned up the backlog.

Jason noted the small number of re-appropriations and believes this is due to working with the sponsors upfront and finishing projects within a two year period.

OVERVIEW OF THE FOUR H'S – HATCHERY REFORM

Chris Drivdahl, Rob Jones, Sara LaBorde, and Jeff Breckel presented this agenda item.

PowerPoint presentations were presented to the Board providing background on the four H's (Habitat, Hatchery, Harvest, and Hydropower) with a focus on hatchery.

Highlights included:

- 85 percent of the fish left are hatchery fish
- In the Puget Sound, there are 120 hatchery programs and 90 in Lower Columbia.
- The goal of the Endangered Species Act is to have fish make it on their own and not rely on hatchery fish. It's not how many fish, but how productive they are, how diverse they are, and how they will make it on their own.
- The projection of triangle of goodness
- Hatcheries are likely to be permanent.

Resolution #2008-03

Steve Tharinger presented Resolution #2008-03, recognizing Dick Wallace for his service on the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. Bud Hover **MOVED** to approve resolution #2008-03. Bob Nichols **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** Resolution #2008-03.

REGIONAL AREA ALLOCATIONS

Brian Abbott and Chris Drivdahl presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 14 for detail)

Brian noted the two discussions for the Board today are: the decisions on the 2008 grant round allocation, and decisions for 2009 and beyond. He asked for guidance from the Board. He provided background and highlighted four options for the 2008 grant round allocations:

- 2006-2007 allocations
- Redistribute 2.5%
- Redistribute 2.5% proportionally
- Redistribute 1% proportionally

Steve Tharinger clarified that there would not be credit for future rounds, but that if regions would like to transfer funds that is appropriate. Steve asked if the Board would like more discussion on which option to choose or if they were ready to make an allocation decision.

Steve Tharinger asked for a **MOTION** to approve option four.

Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish Board, noted on behalf of LEAG, there is no objection to option four, although it is not exactly the same as presented. COR did not specify that

the 1 percent should come from discretionary funds, but has left it to the Board to decide where the funds came from.

Director Cottingham noted that she gets on average one project a week for cost increases.

Resolution #2008-01

Bud Hover **MOVED** to approve option four to redistribute one percent proportionally. Bob Nichols **SECONDED** to approve option number four. Board **APPROVED**. Resolution #2008-01 will be filled in with the percentages from option number four.

Brian noted the funding decisions for 2009 and beyond and provided some questions for the Board and asked for guidance.

Steve noted the history of past rounds and the changes from ITF to regional allocations with selected criteria. He asked if the Board would like to consider different criteria to determine how to allocate funds.

David Troutt volunteered and noted that it might be time to create a new ITF after having some thoughtful discussion with LEAG and COR.

Bud Hover would like to hear from COR, and the Puget Sound Partnership for comments as they will be the ones who run these regions.

Steve Tharinger noted the board supports the idea of an ITF 3 to look at the allocation formula for 2009 and beyond, David Troutt has volunteered to coordinate this effort to include COR, LEAG, GSRO and the SRFB.

Bud Hover **MOVED** to approve creating an ITF 3 to look at allocation formulas for the 2009 and future grant rounds with the understanding to include LEAG, COR, GSRO, and SRFB. David Troutt will chair this effort for final board decision in January 2009. Bob Nichols **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED**.

Bob Nichols requested updates at every other meeting Board meeting.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Brian Abbott and Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item # 11 for details)

The Board adopted its *Mission, Roles and Responsibilities* document in 2001. There have been multiple changes to the landscape of salmon recovery since 2001. Leslie highlighted the Board mission, roles and responsibilities, and funding strategy, noting the changes. Staff recommends the Board revisit the mission and strategy document and consider revising it to reflect current conditions. Leslie presented three options and highlighted the pros and cons:

- Retain current mission and strategy

- Amend current mission and strategy
- Update mission and strategy

Steve Tharinger noted that things do need to be changed, but requested that staff come back and highlight the changes that have not been listed in the memo. Bud Hover asked if the Board wants to start looking at the other areas such as the four H's. Steve noted that they are good things to think about.

Bob Nichols noted the changes that do need to be addressed, but that there is a second set of issues the Board discussed yesterday. As we go through these policies, instead of a piecemeal approach, let's see if we can incorporate them all.

Steve would like to address the questions about the four H's. Bob noted that it will be helpful to have a list of policy issues.

Craig Partridge noted the core function of the Board is funding.

Tim mentioned revisiting the statute and noted the veto message to decide what programs to continue. Maybe this is a point of time for the Board to think about what needs to be changed in order to move salmon recovery forward and focus on the mission. Maybe this should be part of the charge for the ITF so that they are not being duplicated. Steve agrees although he would like to Board to make decisions and believes the ITF has a full plate.

Kaleen noted the timing to submit the strategic plan, which will govern the biennium budget. She envisions this as a stand-alone strategic plan for the Board to incorporate with the agency plan. If we tag this to the ITF, this will extend the short time frame. She noted that as staff work through the easier tasks, to have one or two board members view the draft plans.

Steve asked for participation. Bob Nichols mentioned sending drafts to each member before Board meetings. Steve noted that the Board will need staff to provide comments, and mentioned past legislative guidance. He would like to have updated materials.

Leslie clarified that what she is hearing is that the Board has chosen option number two – amend current mission and strategy.

Kaleen asked for clarification on the strategy document. The Board would like staff to take the mission and goals and do their best to amend them to deal with changes. Steve noted updating graphs and councils, but the language changes are broader principles. List the broader policy issues, and maybe in May the Board could give more clarity.

Brian noted the amendments requesting a 20 percent cost change consist of subcommittee and need to have two new Board members serve on this committee. Bud

Hover **MOVED** to approve Harry Barber and Bob Nichols to serve on the amendment sub committee. David Troutt **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED**.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.



Steve Tharinger, Chair

Next meeting: May 1 & 2, 2008
 Wenatchee, WA