

Skagit Watershed Council
Meeting of the Board of Directors – Final Notes
April 9, 2015 SWC Office, Mount Vernon, WA

(* indicates action item; indicates decision)

Attendance: Chair Ken Dahlstedt, Bob Everitt, Richard Brocksmith, Carolyn Kelly, Loren Everest, and Colleen McShane. Not in attendance: Brenda Cunningham, Margaret Fleek, Steve Hinton, and Jon-Paul Shannahan.

The meeting was called to order at about 9:09 am without a quorum until Carolyn arrived at 9:18 am.

March Meeting Notes

***The notes should reflect a change from 2006 LFA to 2001 LFA on page 4. *Richard asked Allison to number the pages of the Board notes. *Richard will number the emailed document titles to match the agenda item numbers. Bob moved and Colleen seconded approval of the March 5, 2015 notes (#2), which the board approved unanimously.**

Draft Agenda Review

The board approved the agenda (#1).

Executive Director Report

- February Financial Report (#3)

Richard made general comments about the February 2015 financials.

All issues noted at the last meeting have been corrected. SWC profit and loss is in the black. Colleen asked why the income and expenses don't match between the profit & loss and budget vs. actual statements. Loren noted that the only difference between incomes is that the "event income" wasn't shown in the budget vs. actual. Richard and Carolyn noted that the budget vs. actual doesn't include fixed assets and depreciation on the expense side unlike P&L.

***Richard will look at all financials since August to determine the origin of the discrepancies.**

***The Board will consider for approval at the next meeting once the discrepancies have been corrected and/or addressed.**

- Lead Entity Program Update (#4)

Eleven projects submitted as letters of intent were invited to submit full proposals. All projects except the one for Marblemount Hatchery applied. The hatchery project needed more time to work out details. One project was a steelhead-only project as allowable per the 2015 Interim Steelhead Strategy.

The LOI's started at \$6.9 million and were subsequently reduced to \$6.7 million in the draft applications, which exceeds the anticipated \$5.4 million in available funding; this will make the job of choosing projects and allocating funds more difficult than in past years. To stretch the funding, SWC can consider partially funding projects and phasing funding requests over time.

The Legislature is still debating the capital budget, so funding allocations haven't firmed up yet.

Site Visits: SWC staff sent a kick-off email on April 8 to the two committees: TRC and LECC. Richard shared the agenda that shows which projects will be visited each day.

1st day - upper reach sites; 2nd day - middle river sites and planting proposals and rock removal project at Skiyou Reach; 3rd day - Big Lake and Milltown.

***Board members wishing to attend site visits from April 28-30 should notify Richard.**

- Correspondence re: Membership of Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland (#5)

The board discussed the recent letter from Skagitonians to SWC dated March 24 that noted their concerns about SWC's lack of consideration for agricultural needs in the valley and also requested four seats on the board. In May, the Board was planning to have a work session on how to better incorporate agricultural interests in our planning processes, though that is now proposed to occur in September instead. SWC's response will acknowledge receipt of their request and their concerns. It will reiterate that SWC has reached out to increase membership and we are seeking opportunities for all to work cooperatively. If they want their requests considered, they are invited to come to the table. ***SWC will invite Skagitonians to participate in the September work session.**

***Ken will work with Richard on the letter's content and agreed to sign it. Ken volunteered to meet with and deliver the letter to Allen Rozema.**

- Upcoming Board Agenda Topics (#12)

The board discussed the list of potential Board agenda topics over the next 6 months as generated by the Executive Committee. Schedule changes include cancelling the July meeting and changing the August board meeting to a 30-60 minute phone meeting. The potential agenda topics presented through September are a good road map to move forward.

- Executive Director Performance Review Process

The TWG and Protection Subcommittee chair will be asked for input on their working relationship with Richard and more broadly performance areas that can be enhanced for the whole organization. The Executive Committee will do the actual performance review, as well as review the compensation and salary package. ***The results will be discussed by the Board at the next available meeting before the Chair shares with the Executive Director.** Any adjustments to compensation and salary will be retroactive to April 1, 2015. The intent of the review is not to exclude anyone from the process but to also be respectful of people's time.

- External Committee work

- Salmon Recovery Council (SRC): Richard is on the legislative subcommittee of the SRC and is working with them to stay abreast of the budget outlook and the impact of any budget decisions on the legislative priorities SWC Board has adopted. At this time, the Senate has zeroed out Floodplains by Design; and ESRP, SRFB and PSAR budgets were all cut back significantly.
- Richard volunteered to participate in the National Estuary Program riparian advisory group which has quite a bit of funding they've been unable to allocate. This way, he can be aware of funding allocations and advocate for some of that money to go to local funding needs, as best determined by local and tribal groups. The Skagit

community has a history of getting the job done and making progress. The board reiterated that this involvement must keep in mind the constraints as outlined by existing SWC procedures/policies and other issues that come with strings attached.

Committee Reports

After hearing from the executive committee their desire to have summary reports for each committee, Richard shared highlights from each of the following:

- **Technical Work Group: March Report (#6)**

The Group has confirmed proposal eligibility and committee membership; provided input on site visits; determined that the Fir Island farm project does meet Board conditions; and recommended approval of the cost increase amendment for Hansen Creek.

- **Protection Subcommittee: March Report (#7)**

Richard gave a verbal summary as the notes are still in progress.

They've started putting together protection strategy update options and are preparing a set of policy decisions for the Board's consideration and direction.

- **Monitoring & Adaptive Management Subcommittee: March Report (#8)**

They are working hard to update the Chinook monitoring plan with solid direction on Tidal Delta monitoring activities (which will be a model for Puget Sound) and have helped develop an opportunity for SRSC to receive \$10K in funding from the Puget Sound Partnership to document their existing protocols. Additionally, they established a sub group to develop freshwater monitoring which will meet in the next couple weeks. They are/will also be considering how Chinook monitoring can inform Steelhead monitoring/assessment. Group recommends to TWG and Board to allocate as much as 10% of SRFB funds to monitoring in 2015 and to recommend a process for proposal vetting.

Old Business

- WDFW Fir Island Farm Estuary Restoration Project (#9)

Carolyn moved and Loren seconded that SWC conditions for the Fir Island Farm Estuary Restoration Project have been met and that the project should be approved, which the Board approved unanimously. Bob Everitt recused himself.

- SWC Personnel Policies (#10)

The board discussed the summary document Richard created outlining proposed changes in personnel policies, new proposed policies (with some track changes), and the old personnel policies for Board reference. The Board was supportive of the policies as proposed, though wanted to strengthen a key point or two. ***Carolyn will propose changes to address a couple loose ends for the Board to vote on in May. They will clearly define a contact person on the board (the chair or other as designated by the board) for any human resources concerns.**

- Lead Entity/SRFB Monitoring Project Development and Vetting Process (#11)

The committee has some of the funding in place to finish the monitoring plan, but not all of it. PSP has not provided any funding to watersheds for Phase II, and SWC didn't take any of the \$40K which PSP provided for watershed work in Phase I. Since SWC completed

the Phase I work without PSP's direct financial support, ***the board discussed asking for funding now to finish the product.**

Other Discussion: The SRC and SRFB both adopted policies that allow funding for monitoring projects. SWC can allocate as much as 10% of SRFB projects for monitoring (estimated to be no more than \$124,000/year.) This however would reduce the amount available to the projects at a time when SWC doesn't have enough monies to fully fund projects, now and possibly in the future. However, the Board felt that project monitoring reinforces the credibility of the SWC's efforts. This proposal lays out a process the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Subcommittee will use to reach consensus on a single proposal, vet through the TWG, and pass or fail with the LECC.

*** The Board asked Richard to approach the funding entities for money to finish the monitoring plan. Richard will write up a proposal with the basics of a funding strategy for the Board to consider at their next meeting in May, though it won't be fully formed since the M&AM subcommittee doesn't meet again until May 11 and details are conceptual still. If funding from PSP doesn't come through, then the Board will make a recommendation to the LECC.**

Bob moved and Carolyn seconded that Richard seek funding to adequately finalize the monitoring plan for Phase II, and if PSP funding isn't available, then come to the Board in May with a project proposal for board consideration. The Board unanimously approved the motion.

New Business

- Re-allocating Returned PSAR Funds of \$133,000 to Hansen Creek Design (#13)
As a result of meeting federal requirements for bridge designs, increased site analysis needs, lack of budgeting for specifications and bid documents, and costs exceeding preliminary estimates, Skagit County has requested an additional \$133K, matched by their own funds of \$34,200 to meet original project deliverables. The watershed has just that amount of funding available since the Fir Island Farm (FIF) Estuary Restoration Design project recently closed under budget. The TWG suggested that the SWC send out an RFP with the caveat that the funds be allocated and spent by June, 2015 - a very short timeframe. The Hansen Creek project was the only project that fit, and is a high priority, Tier 2 area. The lesson learned is recipients must read Manual 18 regarding design requirements and deliverables.
The Board noted that this points out an opportunity for improvement to the project review process. The Hansen Creek Project had a poor design estimate and no one picked up on it in the project proposal.
***The Board asked that each year staff review Manual 18's design product checklist and compare with each project's list of deliverables.**
Carolyn moved and Bob seconded to approve reallocation of the funding and that the review process be more specific going forward, which the Board approved unanimously.
Ken recused himself from voting.
- ***The Board asked that prior to the Board meeting Richard develop suggested language for motions so as to facilitate the Board's decision process.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 am.