



YAKIMA BASIN
FISH AND WILDLIFE
RECOVERY BOARD

April 14, 2011
Strategic Review Meeting
As approved by the Board 7.6.11

Those present:

Members: Mike Leita & Terry Keenhan (Yakima County), Dave Brown (City of Yakima), Nancy Lillquist (City of Ellensburg), Dan Olson (City of Union Gap), Leo Bowman & Adam Fyall (Benton County), John Hubbard (City of Kennewick), Paul Ward (Yakama Nation)

Guests: Lynn Hatcher, (NOAA), Jeff Tayer (WDFW)

Staff: Alex Conley (Executive Director) Yuki Reiss (Recovery Program Coordinator), Denise Buck (Operations and Outreach Coordinator)

The Board reviewed the powerpoint of homework reponses prepared by Denise and discussed the following:

Board Accomplishments:

Accomplishment noted in addition to those on screen:

1. The fact that Department of Ecology came to the Board for participation in the YRBWEP process.
2. Website.
3. Completion of Research Monitoring & Evaluation Plan.
4. Adding new positions.
5. We are a model for others (Ex. Siskiyou Co. supervisors' visit).
6. Bringing people together to provide a solution and then taking that solution and asking for resources to accomplish rather than asking for help to solve a conflict.
7. The level of conflict has significantly changed since the Board was formed.
8. Fostered a spirit of cooperation.
9. Our scale of projects is larger than other areas.
10. Our successes are tied to no particular political agenda and are voluntary in nature which has built our credibility.
11. Having the support of counties and cities is very meaningful.
12. Changed the "culture of conflict" to a "culture of diplomacy".
13. Used to have to fight to keep money for restoration versus irrigation efficiency now SRFB allocation process is functioning.

14. Setting up the Steelhead Technical Team big accomplishment.
15. We have progressed regarding “other” species, moving from steelhead to bull trout to lamprey. It maybe time to address wildlife too.
16. Board continuity as membership shifts. Cannot become complacent.
17. We have a shot at delisting in 5-10 years depending on out of basin conditions.

Responses to revisit of 2006 Board Functions:

1. Some we have done thoroughly and some should be future work plan tasks.
2. Need to seek outside funding sources, especially with groups that have overlapping interests.
3. We have been an advocate to bring in funding to local entities (CSF, BPA, etc). We can and will diversify staff funding.
4. We need to keep focused on funding goals.
5. Our role in setting the game plan has helped direct spending in a good way.

Partner Survey responses:

1. Our role is to coordinate the “story” on what fish recovery looks like.
2. Annual meeting should show progress and highlight accomplishments.
3. Is there a direct connection to all the “plans” in the SRFB process?
 - a. Angie stated that there is a general connection to the sub basin plan and a more direct connection the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan.
4. Are we or should we add lamprey to our steelhead, bull trout habitat monitoring?
 - a. Alex explained our current role.
 - b. Paul stated that it is important to the Nation and a future priority.
 - c. Outreach will need to be part of the strategy.
 - d. Without the Nation’s interest there would be no emphasis placed on lamprey.

Vision for the Future:

1. There is a need for clarification of “planning” quagmire. By thinking less about the sub-basin plan we de-emphasize uplands and non-fish species. Need to keep the subbasin plan alive and clarify the relationship between all our planning products.
2. Board needs to emphasize role of Board members informal outreach; Board needs to tell story of environmental services
3. Need to look at broadening funding for the Board- need to be proactive, not lucky.
4. Board reaffirmed role as coordinator, but not direct project sponsor
5. A discussion needs to be held... by diversifying do we dilute our core purpose?
6. Alex asked if the Board saw any gaps or need for additional coordinating roles.
 - a. Perhaps we could enlarge the agenda to include “aquatic resources”.
 - b. The mission has broadened from Lead Entity to plans, and we should keep it broad and not limit ourselves.
 - c. There is a danger of spreading ourselves too thin.
4. A discussion was held on the topic of economic prosperity versus environmental values.

Work Plan:

1. Mike Leita presented a vision/action dynamic graphic. He stated that maintaining our board is not good enough and that we should not be static. We should focus outreach to attract more board members (enthusiastic ones). Need to maintain constructive Board/Executive Director balance.
2. Monitoring isn't just about how many fish there are; we need to increase the focus on habitat and project monitoring
3. There should be a deeper discussion held on each objective of the work plan.
4. Question was asked, is the work plan for Board or staff? The Board is directing the work of the staff by approving the work plan.
5. Suggestion was made to rename Objective A to Administration and place it at the end of the work plan.
6. The Board's vision and direction should be stated at the beginning of the work plan.
7. It was suggested that where necessary YBFWRB and the Board be changed to reflect whether we mean the organization or the actual Board.
8. Bull trout action plan should have its own line.

Items to be discussed more in depth at future Board meetings:

1. Lamprey
2. Outreach- use outreach plan and committee to flesh out approaches
3. Monitoring- bring Board to speed on current activities and discuss directions
4. Wildlife- do we take it on? Do we keep a broader mission?
5. Funding
6. Board engagement
7. Threats (challenges)
8. By-laws
9. Work plan objectives