

**Governor's Forum on Monitoring
Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health
Summary Minutes
DRAFT**

Date: February 1, 2005
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: Room 172 NRB
Olympia, Washington

Members Present:

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair	Chair, Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Brad Ack	Director, Puget Sound Action Team
Bill Backous	Designee, Department of Ecology
Ken Berg	Designee, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Alan Christensen	Designee, U.S. Forest Service
Mark Clark	Director, Conservation Commission
Bruce Crawford	Program Manager, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Chris Drivdahl	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Lee Faulconer	Designee, Department of Agriculture
Laura Johnson	Director, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Kris Petersen	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Bill Riley	Designee, U.S. EPA
Russell Scranton	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Ginny Stern	Designee, Department of Health

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Co-Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the 4th meeting of the Forum at 9:00 a.m.

The agenda was reviewed and approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER MEETING

Laura Johnson **MOVED** to approve the minutes as presented. Jeff Koenings **SECONDED**. November minutes **APPROVED** as presented.

STATE OF SALMON REPORT

Chris Drivdahl, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office, presented the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office's State of the Salmon Report.

Chris presented an overview of the State of the Salmon Report. She highlighted several issues:

- **Volunteers** - Since this is one of the items of most interest, Chris suggested that volunteer hours be one thing the Forum may want to monitor in the future.
- **Water Quality Index** – Excellent information was received from Ecology but because of the way the data is gathered, and the way it was indexed as a whole, the information is masked so the true risk to fish may not show on an individual stream.

This portion of the report was not as useful as it could have been if different factors were chosen. Ken Dzinbal explained in more detail how the water quality data is collected and shown. Steve Leider explained that the indicator depicts the WRIA level. Chris believes this is the area that needs the most work because it doesn't tell the whole story.

- **Habitat Quality Index** - For the Habitat Quality maps, five data sets were used: Flood plain, riparian, sedimentation, and instream habitat (LWD and pools).
- **Smolt Production Index** - Chris would like to see more work done to clarify the smolt production index since this shows a truer correlation between habitat and fish without ocean conditions or harvest issues getting in the way.
- **Dozen Dials** – Chris believes a dozen dials are enough although three of the twelve need some changes before the next report.
- **Reporting** - Need to try to maintain reporting consistency. We have been reporting on this information since 1999 so have some record. Need to consider audience, reporting scale, what the problem is and what we are doing for it, and whether it is working.
- **Barriers** - The barriers need to be better displayed in the next report.
- **Habitat and fish indices** are both needed in future reports.

Talked about favorable reception of this report by legislators and confidence in the information. For the most part they are willing to accept that the information is not as good as it could/should be but that it is the information that they want. They appreciated the art – pleasing to the eye seems to be important. The way the information was displayed in clear graphics in this report was not as intimidating as a stack of numbers in past reports.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus noted that this report is due every two years. It is obvious that this year's report has come a long way in identifying the audience and providing the information. He commended Chris on her leadership on this document.

STATUS AND TRENDS – COMBINED OPTIONS

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item.

An Ad Hoc Committee consisting of representatives from the State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Puget Sound Action Team (PSAT), Department of Ecology, Conservation Commission, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) are working on this issue.

Bruce gave a PowerPoint presentation on status-trend monitoring and explained how it differs from project scale effectiveness and watershed scale intensive monitoring. His presentation included an overview of the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP). Bruce discussed five different options for monitoring, with the recommended option being:

- EMAP in wadeable streams by Salmon Recovery Region (SRR) – 350 sites at \$4.3 million per biennium
- Non-wadeable streams pilot in one SRR – 50 sites at \$331K per biennium
- Riverine-tidal areas pilot in one SRR – 50 sites at \$331K per biennium
- Total 450 sites at \$4.9 million per biennium

The questions for the Forum to answer are:

- What data do we really need to answer the status and trend questions,
- What are the funding amounts needed, and
- How many years does it take to make a 2% change?

If it takes 15 years to see a 2% change, is this worth it to the legislators to support the effort? What do we really need to answer the question of what trend is going on and its significance to salmon recovery?

Policy questions for this meeting:

- Is the cost worth the information obtained?
- Are answers obtained for stakeholders?
- If so, at what scale?
- If not, we should inform our stakeholders that we will not answer those questions in the future.

Bill Riley asked if this included federal funding.

The response was: No.

Alan Christensen asked if this includes sampling on federal lands.

The response was: No.

Brad Ack noted that new initiatives with budget implications won't be looked at favorably but existing efforts need to be looked at. He asked if we have looked at existing efforts. Bruce responded that we've partially done this and we can use some of the information but it might not answer the questions that we need to answer.

Brad noted that the governor's reason in creating this forum was to make the best use of the existing monitoring efforts, not to create new efforts.

Co-chair Koenings agreed with Brad, this Forum is supposed to see what is being done and how the Federal government fits in. He likes the project monitoring efforts that are in place. Still need to find out the results of the Intensively Monitored Watersheds (IMWs). He likes what Brad is saying and would propose the Forum sponsor a workshop that brings the components together to look at the efforts by all the different groups. Policymakers would also attend this workshop to develop a monitoring plan for the state and possibly also include Oregon representatives. After the workshop, the Forum could go to the Legislature and let them know what is going on across the region and what the state's responsibility would be to get the missing information. The Forum would need to sponsor this event to get the right people. Co-chair Koenings proposed

having this event the latter part of March or early April and to try to dovetail with the new budget proposal. The key to making the workshop a success is a good, solid steering committee and bringing all the principal players together. Co-chair Koenings' suggestion to the Forum is, instead of deciding on the status and trends monitoring needed at this meeting, have the workshop first and then decide on monitoring needs.

The Forum members discussed the monitoring workshop and who needs to be included. Chris Drivdahl noted that monitoring is required in the regional recovery plans and regional recovery representatives should be included in the workshop. Others suggested local governments be included. Carol Smith would suggest involving the lead entities.

Co-chair Koenings sees this as a holistic approach with local, state, tribes, and non-governmental organizations all having a role and need to be invited to attend.

Alan Christensen attended a meeting where Bob Lohn spoke and talked about regional recovery plans and OSE (outside subbasin effects) and the need for data. He thinks this workshop is a great idea.

Co-chair Koenings believes the Forests and Fish plans also need to be linked to this event.

Bill Riley talked about the western EMAP project and that the key to survival is coordination of the efforts. He supports the idea of a workshop.

Bruce Crawford discussed a grant opportunity for EMAP that needs to be in by March. He also noted that EPA might help if we want to do this workshop, although the timing is a little off.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus asked for a show of support for Koenings' proposal. No one raised any objection to the proposal.

Bill Backous is in support of the workshop. Need to make sure the correct questions are presented and that there is interaction between technical and policy people.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus noted the need for support from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) so input to their budget process is timely.

Brad Ack noted with the new GMAP and POG process this would be a good time to pull monitoring information together and be able to show the gaps.

Co-chair Koenings agreed that information from the workshop would show what we are doing and where the gaps are.

Laura Johnson noted that scope is the issue – what some call monitoring others call research and vice versa.

The Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy listed state agency monitoring efforts across the state with a cost of more than \$100 million.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus asked Chris if there would be any risks to the State of the Salmon report due to having this workshop. Chris didn't see any problem.

Need technical, policy, and budget people at this workshop as well as the governments. Co-chair Koenings believes the workshop would help the federal agencies in setting their budgets on monitoring efforts.

Alan Christensen reported that his agency (USFS) is working on a 10-year analysis of monitoring and believes that they would appreciate this information.

Kris Petersen believes that the role of this Forum is to set the monitoring direction for the state agencies and a workshop sounds like a good idea. Agrees with having a workshop.

Russell Scranton asked if we should go through the PNAMP effort to put this workshop together.

Bruce said PNAMP has the same problem with getting all the efforts together – PNAMP hasn't received much interest from Puget Sound and this effort needs to include all of Washington. Some collaborative work has been going on in all the groups.

Need steering committee to plan a tight workshop design for questions, scale, etc.

Need OFM involved in steering committee. Getting background information will be very important to the success of this workshop.

In summary:

Workshop on Monitoring Efforts

- Timing – late March early April
- Include principal players – technical, policy, and budget representatives from state, local, federal, and tribal governments along with lead entities, non-governmental organizations and possibly Oregon.
- Design somewhat on the order of the shared strategy workshop.

Purpose

The workshop will focus upon what is needed to make the State of Salmon a scientifically accurate and creditable document. It will inform the Forum so that they can reach a funding decision on April 14, 2005, and so that they can provide a recommendation to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

Monitoring required in the regional recovery plans is a question that needs to be answered by this group.

Forests and Fish plans also need to be linked to this event.

With the new GMAP and POG process, this would be a good time to pull monitoring information together and show where the gaps are.

Need steering committee to get the answers – tight workshop design for questions, scale, etc.

Provide a hierarchy of discussion – from highest level down to local efforts.

Stagger the workshop to see how each layer fits into the overall efforts.

Identify what data gaps need to be filled.

Provide options or presentations to OFM and the Governor's office.

Work from the Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy findings instead of starting from scratch.

Who pays for the Forum? Continuing State of Salmon report work? Current money is mostly spent – will need to find out what we can do. Forum sponsoring – may be able to bring funding together from different groups. OWEB may also be interested in helping if they are involved and can benefit from this effort.

This needs to be a well-focused workshop, on both salmon recovery and watershed health.

The steering committee will consist of a representative from each of the Forum members who wish to participate – both federal and state.

PRIORITIZATION OF FORUM TASKS

Bruce talked about the Forum Tasks and priorities and what the various work groups may include:

- Policy/Technical
- Nearshore/Marine Technical
- Fish Technical
- Habitat Technical
- Water Technical
- Effectiveness Monitoring Technical
- Statewide and Regional Indicators
- Ad Hoc Modeling and Monitoring Evaluation

Forum members discussed the different subcommittees needed and the reporting structure.

Co-chair Koenings sees a need to establish a policy committee, not just ad hoc, so the Forum will know who is on the subcommittee and where to send projects.

Need to decide the other technical committees. The rest of the committees will come out of the workshop. The data group is already set with SWIMTAC.

Brad Ack asked if breaking the groups down into fish, habitat, and water might continue to perpetuate the differences. He suggested combining the three committees into one group.

Co-chair Koenings thought the groups would be separate, take results to the policy committee for additional work, and then to the Forum for final decisions.

Brad Ack suggested having one technical committee with three subgroups.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus suggested forming a policy/technical committee with subcommittees.

Since the next meeting isn't scheduled until April 14, Bruce will need to update everyone on committee make-up through e-mail updates.

Chris Drivdahl reported a need to invite a regional representative and a lead entity representative to be included on the Forum.

Bruce reported that at the last Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) meeting, they requested representation on the Forum. LEAG voted and proposed Richard Brocksmith. Bruce told them that it is not his call to bring another representative to the table.

The Forum agreed with the need to add LEAG and Council of Regions representation to the Forum. Will need to send a letter to LEAG and the Council of Regions asking for representation on the Forum and requesting a letter noting who the representatives will be.

Bruce reported that we now have a Forum web page on the IAC server at <http://www.iac.wa.gov/monitoring/default.htm>. This page will post meeting minutes, agendas, the roster, and other documents related to the Monitoring Forum.

A bill (SB 5610) is working its way through the Legislature to create the Monitoring Forum legislatively. This bill would do more than just create the Forum.

CHARTER

Craig Partridge **MOVED** to approve the charter as presented. Jeff Koenings **SECONDED**. The charter was **APPROVED** as presented.

Forum members agreed this was a productive meeting.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair

Upcoming Meetings: April 13 & 14, 2005
 July 19, 2005
 October 5, 2005