

**GOVERNOR'S FORUM ON MONITORING
SALMON RECOVERY AND WATERSHED HEALTH
SUMMARY MINUTES**

DATE: April 14, 2005

TIME: 8:00 a.m.

PLACE: LaQuinta Inn

Tacoma, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair	Chair, Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Terry Wright	Designee, Northwest Indian Fish Commission
Laura Johnson	Director, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Lee Faulconer	Designee, Department of Agriculture
Bruce Crawford	Program Manager, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Bill Backous	Designee, Department of Ecology
Alan Christensen	Designee, U.S. Forest Service
Brad Ack	Director, Puget Sound Action Team
Ginny Stern	Designee, Department of Health
Stu Trefry	Designee, Conservation Commission
Russell Scranton	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Elizabeth Gaar	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Chris Drivdahl	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Bob Wunderlich	Designee, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bill Riley	Designee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Jeff Breckel	Designee, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Richard Brocksmith	Designee, Lead Entity Advisory Group
Paul Ancich	Designee, Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Advisory Board

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Co-chair Jeff Koenings opened the meeting of the Forum at 8:07 a.m. Members of the Forum and audience introduced themselves.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Co-chair Bill Ruckelshaus **MOVED** to approve the February 1, 2005 minutes as presented. Terry Wright **SECONDED**. Minutes **APPROVED**.

MONITORING WORKSHOP REPORT

Co-chair Koenings was very pleased with the discussions held during the April 13 "Monitoring for the Future" Workshop.

Bruce Crawford summarized the group breakout discussions. Approximately 88 people attended the workshop. Attendees were divided into three breakout groups, with each group assigned two indicators from the State of Salmon Report (SOS).

- Group A – Juvenile Salmon Abundance and Effectiveness Monitoring
- Group B – Water Quantity and Barriers
- Group C – Nearshore Habitat and Adult Salmon Abundance

Each group also discussed Water Quality and Freshwater Habitat.

Bruce provided background on the purpose of the workshop and goal for the meeting, which is to provide the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) with a recommendation on status and trend monitoring.

The two items ranking highest on the list of importance are adult and juvenile salmon abundance, since these are both indicators that were requested by the public. Both items rated medium in certainty in terms of the quality of existing information.

Water quality and freshwater habitat were next in importance, but there was no strong agreement on how they should be monitored. Both rated low in certainty because there are no ongoing existing programs for habitat or water quality measurements they are not statistically sound.

Water quantity seemed to be next in importance. Suggestions were made to look for possible ways to tie water quantity in with water quality monitoring efforts. This item rated medium in certainty.

There was discussion on better ways to display barrier information. The consensus is that the information is good as is, but could be better. This item indicated high in certainty.

Nearshore habitat was rated not applicable since it is not currently one of the SOS dials. However, there seemed to be general agreement that this would be a useful dial and should be included in the next SOS report.

The group wasn't as sure that effectiveness monitoring needed to be one of the dials, but that it would be useful information. There are a lot of effectiveness monitoring efforts happening and this is something that should be displayed. Current efforts are on a five-year cycle so this would be a way to show what is happening on a two-year cycle.

Bruce reviewed each of the individual item's changes suggested for no new money, small amount of money, and large amount of money. (See handout for further information.)

Adult Fish Abundance

Co-chair Koenings noted that in his breakout group they discussed the necessity to make sure fish are handled with care when using volunteers.

Sara LaBorde was surprised with the priority that was put on fish.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus suggested using new fish measuring techniques and the need for more measuring stations.

Elizabeth Gaar asked why monitoring populations determined by recovery plans were in the high cost column.

Sara explained that if 14 of 22 are the correct populations then it may not cost more, but if more are needed it could increase the cost.

Elizabeth asked if there was any discussion on where to put the monitoring stations and at what level.

Co-chair Koenings noted that this discussion didn't get to that level of detail. It was only the first step for a recommendation on what the right things are to monitor. Details will be worked out later.

Bruce noted that people in the adult fish abundance group wanted to also discuss juveniles and the people in the juvenile fish abundance group wanted to discuss adults.

Juvenile Fish Abundance

Steve Leider reported that folks would like to stress that this is an important measure. He noted that one more bullet needs to be added for no new money.

Co-chair Koenings explained that these systems weren't set up to measure what we wanted to measure but are the existing measurement systems. They may not be the best way to communicate what is happening since it was designed for a different reason. The challenge now is to go back to improve the items to measure and how to do it. This is true for all the indices.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus asked what is needed in a recovery plan for monitoring to allow you to see if the fish are recovering. We all need to decide how much assurance is needed to see if we are moving toward recovery and what needs to be monitored.

Elizabeth Gaar was not prepared to answer that question at this time since this is a discussion NOAA is currently having. Two questions that need to be asked: What does a recovered ESU and a recovered population look like? What is the time period? This needs to be coordinated across all the Technical Recovery Teams (TRTs).

Jeff Breckel reported that the Lower Columbia Region has already done this in their plan. Elizabeth noted that the roll out will be on Monday and that Lower Columbia will hear what NOAA thinks about their plan at that time.

Freshwater Habitat Quality Index

Steve Leider emphasized the need for a timeframe if there is no new money. Need to think about when to report on changes since there will be no new information.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus noted that some things need to be reported to show that we are doing something. We can describe how we need to look at each particular trend, but two years does not give you enough data to spot a trend.

Steve emphasized the need to be clear on what is being reported.

Phil Miller reported that, within his breakout group, there was a lot of interest in focusing on whether the habitat index is good enough for the State of the Salmon (SOS) report and/or is it good enough for policy decision making.

Co-chair Koenings asked two questions: How do you use long-term management decisions in the short-term? Was there discussion on the long-term data needs as well as a two-year short-term option?

Craig Partridge questioned whether we should spend funds to sharpen our view on the SOS or in a way that allows us to improve recovery. He also asked where we should add quality. In his workshop breakout group, people were more willing to spend money on the policy making end.

Elizabeth Gaar doesn't see where this would be mutually exclusive. There was discussion of Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) reporting and funding amounts.

Craig noted that this has been discussed at almost every meeting.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus pointed out that the recovery plan should take over this end of the reporting.

Alan Christiansen wonders how to make this information understandable at the higher levels. What has changed due to what we have done in recovery efforts?

Bruce restated one point Chris Drivdahl made in her presentation – in two years we wouldn't have new information if all we have is the past Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA).

Jeff Breckel asked when progress would be assessed. He reported that the Lower Columbia Region assesses implementation every two years and status and trends every 12 years.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus noted that if you were looking at information every 12 years, you still would need to look at the data.

Elizabeth believes that reporting would need to be done more often than every 12 years.

Co-chair Koenings asked how you could get the information out while the longer-term changes are being made.

Stu Trefry reported that, in his group, LFA served its purpose, especially in areas that have a recovery plan. He would like to know about areas that don't have a recovery plan. What is needed for these areas? Could LFAs still serve a useful purpose in these areas?

Co-chair Ruckelshaus commented that a lot of lead entities use LFAs in their strategies as a way of displaying information.

Stu doesn't understand how this would fill the gaps since LFAs are a one-time snapshot.

John Sims has been trying to find ways to keep LFAs pertinent. Strategies also need to be looked at every year and updated every two or three years.

Lee Faulconer commented that LFAs still have value and shouldn't be written off. It may be well worth the money to redo the LFAs in some areas.

Chris Drivdahl asked whether it is important to have the same information everywhere or is it okay to have an index in recovery regions and a different measurement in other areas.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus asked Chris what she sees as her assignment for the report.

Chris replied that she would focus on listed species.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus believes that this is what Congress is asking for also. If we want to display information other than the listed species, then we need to be clear what we are displaying.

There was discussion on the reporting and monitoring needs and the differences between the two.

Co-chair Koenings pointed out that this topic needs further discussion.

Water Quality Index

Bruce noted that this indicator created a great deal of diverse opinions among the workshop participants. Two camps emerged from the discussion:

1. Use Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) to denote the "red zones". Could increase samples by a large amount and not need precision and certainty goals.
2. Use the full suite of factors in water quality index instead of pulling out a few for salmon.

Bruce stated that no agreement was reached on which approach was best. He wondered about moving to a landscape depiction.

Sara LaBorde reported that the big discussion in her group was how to show or stratify the information.

Steve Leider discussed the intended audience and the opportunity to link water quality and water quantity information.

Phil Miller wanted to show both water quality and quantity and be able to differentiate more between the two.

Bill Ehinger wasn't sure there was enough data available.

Discussed different levels of reporting: east versus west, urban versus rural, etc.

Water Quantity

Phil Miller observed how the critical and low flow basins have been displayed and believes this information will probably not change in the near term. He discussed the breakout group's recommendations and how they came to the decision. Also discussed the usefulness of flow measurements and how random sampling may not be very useful. The instream flow incremental method (IFIM) is needed before the flow measurements really show any change, whether good or bad.

Chris Drivdahl asked whether the recommendation is to report on both high and low flows or just low flows in the next SOS.

Phil noted that his group discussed the full hydro variations, modeling this information, and some integration of both water quality and quantity.

Elizabeth discussed instream flow in relationship to fish needs.

Co-chair Koenings noted that Ecology and WDFW did prioritize the 16 critical basins and are working on priorities for setting instream flow.

Alan Christiansen asked if Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) data was included. The NRCS is funding this information in the Klamath area. Washington may want to contact NRCS and ask for their assistance.

Ginny Stern asked if an instream flow has been set, is it being met?

Chris replied that this is a question for more than instream flow - it is for all enforcement issues.

Co-chair Koenings asked what the long-term issues and the short-term results are that we can show.

Terry Wright talked about tying the parameters back to fish and water quantity. He wondered if there are enough flows to get fish out and flows to get fish upstream.

Alan pointed out that the report could identify critical areas and what appropriate levels are but doesn't show who controls these items. Maybe the report should show who the key players are on this topic.

Bruce noted that water quantity is one of the harder indices to measure. What are we trying to show? What is progress? How do we show what the information relates to?

Co-chair Ruckelshaus commented on the need to tie all the indicators to fish and identify the impact, or potential impact, on fish.

Barriers

Phil Miller reported that the topic of barriers was the clearest of the items worked on by his group. There appears to be a lot of confidence in the information, but not satisfaction, and not showing a need in relationship to the response.

Bob Wunderlich asked if U.S. Fish and Wildlife service data are included in the SOS.

Chris Drivdahl replied that it does not have U.S. Fish and Wildlife service data.

Bob suggested they provide this information in the next report.

Nearshore Marine

Bruce Crawford discussed the nearshore marine category, which does not currently have an indicator in the SOS. He noted that more work is needed on this indicator and a subcommittee could be formed to bring back suggestions to a future Forum meeting.

Sara LaBorde reported that her breakout group had good discussion on great things happening in the Puget Sound and Lower Columbia areas and need to look at this information before moving on to the next step.

Chris Drivdahl asked if nearshore marine is something we should work on with Oregon since this is a coast-wide issue. She feels that, since other groups are also working on this issue, we could connect with them to help develop indicators.

Effectiveness Monitoring

Bruce Crawford summarized the breakout groups' discussions on effectiveness monitoring.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus cautioned that, when discussing effectiveness monitoring, some people mean different things.

Co-chair Koenings acknowledged that people are doing good things for fish and we need to give them credit for that. People (citizens, federal, state, and tribal agencies) need to see that they are making a difference and receive credit for what they do.

Jeff Breckel believes effectiveness monitoring needs to go beyond habitat and include hatcheries and other issues.

Craig Partridge agrees with the terminology. He discussed how the words we use are

important and the need to distinguish between the State of the Salmon reporting and the state of salmon recovery reporting. One is a long-term exercise and the state of salmon recovery is something we have to do in the short-term.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus believes it is really "state of actions" we are doing to recover salmon.

Steve Leider asked if the Forum also would like to have a subcommittee on effectiveness monitoring.

Terry Wright noticed a common theme in the reports. He suggested tying the information to current protocols to take advantage of existing information.

Co-chair Koenings thought the main focus of the workshop was to bring all the groups together to see what other information is out there.

Ginny Stern suggested contaminants as another possible indicator.

SUBCOMMITTEES

The decision was made to establish five subcommittees. The subcommittees are to bring recommendations to the Forum at its next meeting on July 19.

Barrier Subcommittee

This subcommittee is to bring back to the next Forum meeting recommendations for incorporating federal barrier information into the existing Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Information and Assessment Project (SSHIAP) database and how better to display barrier information and targets by Salmon Recovery Regions.

Bill Backous wondered if part of the charge was to increase the certainty of the indicators.

Sara LaBorde stated that there is a high level of certainty for barriers, but need to find ways to display the information to get a higher level of satisfaction.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus suggested that everyone who needs to be part of the subcommittee be brought to the table.

Elizabeth Gaar noted that there are some watersheds that span Washington, Oregon, and Idaho so we need to make sure the states all use comparable data in these overlapping watersheds.

There was discussion on the need to coordinate data where able and use Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) and other resources that overlap the state such as BPA.

The Barrier Subcommittee will be convened by Dave Price, WDFW, with participation by

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Forest Service.

Nearshore Subcommittee

This subcommittee is to bring recommendations to the Forum at its next regular meeting on a specific indicator, or set of indicators, to be included in the SOS that would characterize marine conditions in Puget Sound, the coast, and the Lower Columbia River estuary.

The Nearshore Subcommittee will be convened by the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP) and Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP). Others who wish to participate include NOAA Fisheries, the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, Greg Sieglitz from the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB), Ecology, and Health.

Effectiveness Monitoring Subcommittee

This subcommittee is to bring back to the next Forum meeting recommendations for incorporating restoration actions across the state and to show the extent of all agency actions toward salmon recovery and watershed health.

The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Commission will serve as lead agencies on this subcommittee. NOAA Fisheries, DNR, and the U.S. Forest Service also expressed interest in serving on this committee.

Habitat and Water Quality Subcommittee

This subcommittee is to develop a detailed proposal for a monitoring framework for the state that incorporates local, state, tribal, and federal efforts.

Bruce provided an overview of this proposal.

1. Contract with USEPA and Ecology to create a statistically valid statewide sampling framework of randomly distributed sampling locations per Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) protocol. It would include wadeable and non-wadeable streams and rivers and the sampling design would be developed to answer status and trends at the statewide, Salmon Recovery Region, and WRIA scale if fully implemented.
2. Work with county, tribal, and local partners to identify where local monitoring efforts can be accommodated into the statewide design, and what it would cost to have contributing partners collect the same data using the same protocols at those sites.
3. Develop a sampling design with 30 sampling stations per domain and an approximate certainty of 80 percent.
4. Incorporate remote sensing into the sites identified under #1 above so that land use and land cover can be compared and tracked and correlated with ground measurements of habitat and water quality indicators.
5. Drawing from U.S. Forest Service experience, utilize the most responsive indicators at appropriate time intervals.
6. Develop a strategy that maximizes the use of volunteers.

Richard Brocksmith noted that, from what he's heard from the lead entities, they are in

favor of this type of proposal. One of the limiting factors for the local efforts is a database to enter their information.

Paul Ancich asked about PRISM protocols and if this system, or another system, could be used.

Bruce replied that the required information would still be entered into PRISM but would need to have another system for unique data sets.

Jeff Breckel noted the need to find a way to link recovery regions to indicators.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus agreed that it should be part of the plan.

This subcommittee will be convened by the Department of Ecology. WDFW, IAC, GSRO, NWIFC, and NOAA Fisheries will also participate in developing a detailed framework proposal for the June 9, 2005 SRFB meeting.

Fish Subcommittee

This subcommittee is to look into ways to improve the juvenile migrant index. This can be done by changing the benchmark years and by rotating the locations where juveniles are trapped. It was felt that the number of smolts per adult spawner needed to be expressed in the next SOS report due to the great deal of emphasis placed on the Viable Salmonid Populations criteria in recovery plans.

This subcommittee will also work toward methods to standardize the chart to show the status of all salmon, not just listed species. They are to work to show harvest and spawners on the same charts so that total marine production can be displayed, compared to recovery targets, and to develop ways to improve confidence limits and to display the results of monitoring populations determined as most appropriate by the recovery plans developed for each Salmon Recovery Region.

NWIFC and WDFW will serve as lead agencies on this subcommittee. NOAA Fisheries, EPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group also expressed interest in serving on this committee.

Water Quantity

Bruce will look at water quantity issues further and come back with a recommendation at the next meeting.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus talked about citizen scientists and the need to keep this in mind when developing frameworks and protocols.

ADJOURN

Both co-chairs thanked everyone for being part of the past two days of monitoring meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair

Next Meeting: July 19, 2005
 Natural Resources Building #172
 Olympia, Washington