

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

DATE: July 19, 2005

TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Natural Resources Building

Olympia, 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
Josh Baldi	Designee, Department of Ecology
David Jennings	Designee, Department of Health
Paul Wagner	Designee, Department of Transportation
Mark Clark	Director, Conservation Commission
Joe Scordino	Deputy Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries
Chris Drivdahl	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ken Berg	Designee, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jeff Breckel	Designee, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Richard Brocksmith	Designee, Lead Entity Advisory Group
Paul Ancich	Designee, Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Advisory Board
Tom Karier	Designee, Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Jeff Uebel	Designee, U.S. Forest Service

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 Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting of the Governor's Forum on Monitoring (Forum) at 9:03 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Laura Johnson **MOVED** to approve the April 14, 2005 minutes. Chris Drivdahl **SECONDED**. Members **APPROVED** adoption of the minutes as presented.

FORUM STAFF REPORT

Bruce Crawford presented his staff report. (See notebook "Staff Report for July 19, 2005" memorandum for details.)

Bruce introduced Josh Baldi as the new representative from the Department of Ecology.

Bruce also reported that Steve Waste would represent the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC) when Tom Karier is unavailable.

Bruce reviewed the memorandum highlighting the budget status and the required Forum report due to the Governor's office by January 2006.

Bruce then reviewed the 2003 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) rating of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) and suggested changes for improvement to the matrix. The Forum can assist by creating measurable performance indicators and targets based on our State of Salmon Report's high level indicator review and negotiations with NOAA Fisheries.

Chris Drivdahl noted there may be a distinction between monitoring for PCSRF reporting and monitoring for salmon recovery. She suggested the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) could take the lead on recovery plan monitoring and include regional representatives Jeff Breckel, Richard Brocksmith, and others. Chris also noted that Russell Scranton, NOAA Fisheries, has been working on guidelines for recovery plans and he should be included in the group working on this issue.

Chris reported that Lower Columbia and Hood Canal are both ready to start implementing their plans but need some guidelines.

WHAT CONGRESS WANTS TO KNOW ABOUT SALMON RECOVERY

Joe Scordino, Deputy Regional Administrator for NOAA Fisheries, provided an overview of PCSRF Funds and what NOAA is expecting as accountability. (See handout for details.)

Joe reported that the final report to Congress would be available next week.

Discussed the need for reporting to Congress and what needs to be measured. Need to make sure that the committee staff is getting the information they want. Also need to coordinate what Tim Smith, WDFW, and Rich Innes, Conservation Strategies LLC, are doing in Washington, D.C., as well as NOAA and congressional staff.

Chris Drivdahl pointed out that the list includes state and tribal volunteer efforts, and reported that she has been trying to figure out how to measure this without much success. She asked how important it is for volunteer efforts to be measured.

Joe reported that what they are looking for is how the money is being leveraged through public support.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus believes it is very important to track volunteer work and would like to see a process developed to do so.

Chris stated that she would continue to work on volunteer tracking for the State of Salmon Report.

Continued to discuss reporting needs and continued funding for salmon recovery. First step is seeing what is being done so performance metrics are developed. NOAA would like to see if this work is making a difference. Results can be measured by using effectiveness monitoring or more intensive monitoring on a limited number of projects.

Bruce noted that this Forum is key to coordinating a response to Congress, State Legislators and the Governor, since it represents so many different entities.

ADULT AND JUVENILE ABUNDANCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Brad Thompson and Greg Volkhardt, WDFW, provided this presentation.

Brad provided an overview of the subcommittee and then provided a report on the Adult Indicator Discussion.

Display number of harvested fish:

- Option 1. Estimate natural origin harvest from coded wire tagged indicator stocks and natural origin/hatchery origin (NOR/HOR) escapement ratio.
- Option 2. Develop new identification methods (genetics and otolith chemistry) for mixed stock harvest analysis.

Chris Drivdahl noted something she has struggled with every year when thinking about the audience of the report – that what is displayed for the State of Salmon Report is different from what may be needed for a regional recovery plan report.

Subcommittee recommendations:

- Option 1 not viable
- New identification methods should be developed and implemented
- NOR harvest data will not be available for 2006 State of Salmon Report
- Add text in State of Salmon Report to explain reason for harvesting listed fish

After discussion, several of these recommendations may not be viable and may need to be looked at again.

Chris asked about different ways to roll up the information to show the data. She would like the subcommittee to recommend the best way to present the information.

Greg Volkhardt talked about juvenile indicators.

Need:

- 2004 State of Salmon Report primarily relied on data from state monitoring sites
- Need to incorporate smolt production estimates from other monitoring efforts

Recommendation:

- Develop a statewide smolt production database where state-tribal smolt recovery efforts can be easily accessed by interested individuals.

Options for improving the smolt index:

- Regional smolt production index as is
- Regional smolts per spawner-based trend analysis
- Regional smolts per watershed area-based trend analysis

Next steps:

- Need to conduct a sensitivity analysis on each of the options
- Review options with respect to final smolt trap distribution decision

Questions to the Forum:

- Can any of these approaches be excluded at this point?
- Are there other approaches that should be considered?

Co-chair Koenings doesn't feel we could exclude any approaches at this point. We need something that would address productivity and capacity separately, instead of a mixture of the two, since they answer two different questions. It's important to know whether our watershed manipulations are working independent of the number of fish delivered to spawning grounds.

EFFECTIVENESS/IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Lee Faulconer and Stu Trefry presented this agenda item. (See Implementation Subcommittee Report handout for details.)

Recommendations:

- State of Salmon Report should reflect the full range of projects carried out across the state by all entities.
- Need to develop a common database template that is easy to use and strongly encourage funding and implementing agencies to use it. The Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation's (IAC's) Project Information System (PRISM) may be a good way to start or may be adopted as the template.
- Include implemented projects in the 2006 State of Salmon Report from a greater number of entities compared to the 2004 report.
- The Forum should request the Salmon and Watershed Information Management Technical Advisory Committee (SWIMTAC) conduct a survey of all funding and implementing agencies for salmonid habitat restoration and protection projects. Also an assessment of existing databases and what it would take to get the data compatible should be requested.

Bruce will ask SWIMTAC to take on this project and report back to the Forum in October.

Chris Drivdahl suggested asking agencies whether their system can be adapted to PRISM instead of asking what they have. Chris will work with the subcommittee and SWIMTAC to ask the right questions in the survey.

MARINE NEARSHORE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Tom Mumford presented this agenda item. (See Marine Nearshore Indicators Subcommittee Report handout for details.)

Recommendation:

- Develop a suite of indices that more fully reflect the complexity of the estuary and marine ecosystem. The indices fall under the main categories of “Inputs from Watersheds,” “Habitat,” and “Ecosystems, Communities, and Species.”

Next steps:

- Subcommittee will work with the Forum to develop a strategy for prioritizing and completing the development of the indices.

Discussed the different indices and how to get this information.

Suggestion was to move up the shoreline indices. Chris Drivdahl suggested the salmon centric indices might be important to keep at the top of the priority list.

By next meeting:

- Focus the indices – prioritize and add costs in order to get to the cost benefit issue.
- Recommendation from the subcommittee on what should go into the State of Salmon Report.

BARRIER SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Dave Price presented this agenda item.

Proposal 1. Additional elements of the fish passage indicators that can be added with no additional funds:

- Miles of habitat opened
- Map the location of known barriers
- Map known barriers by ESA Listings
- Show compliance rates
- Show the target goal
- Show funding sources
- Show major repair entities
- Show efforts underway

Proposal 2. Additional elements of the fish passage proposal that can be added with little additional funds:

- Improved projections of unknown barriers (\$8K)
- Pilot study to validate repair estimates (\$24K)

Proposal 3. Additional elements of the fish passage proposal that can be added with large amounts of additional funds:

- None proposed

David Jennings suggested this data is prime for an interactive GIS application giving people an opportunity to identify potential barriers.

Terry Wright discussed the need to narrow the target number of barriers to those that are cost effective to replace.

Bruce Crawford agreed that not all barriers needed to be corrected and had Dave Price do an overlay a few years ago that cut the 30,000 estimated barriers down to 1,500 barriers that occur in waters that affect ESA listed species.

The subcommittee needs to flesh out the “what’s the finish line” indicator and bring back to the Forum.

HABITAT-WATER QUALITY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL

Bob Cusimano and Kirk Krueger presented this agenda item. Bruce introduced this agenda item with a brief history of the status and trends monitoring framework. (See “Habitat and Water Quality Status and Trends Statewide Monitoring Framework” notebook memorandum for details.)

At the July 18, 2005 Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) meeting, the Board approved funding for development of a monitoring framework.

Both the Forum and the SRFB need a copy of the framework once it is completed.

Chris Drivdahl believes this is a good thing for the 2008 or 2010 report but is concerned with what information to include in 2006 for habitat and water quality conditions. She asked that the workgroup provide recommendations on that issue.

There was discussion on data needs and ways to get the right data.

Craig Partridge heard concerns about the budget and hopes the group will reserve judgment until it finds out what the actual costs are going to be. He believes it would be helpful if we continue getting the message out that we need both effectiveness monitoring and status and trends monitoring, not one or the other, and hold costs down on all the different kinds of monitoring that are important to recovery.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Carol Smith presented this agenda item. (See Coastal GIS Modeling Proposal Briefing Paper in notebook materials for details.)

Co-chair Ruckelshaus provided some history on past SRFB funding of assessments and feels that the next step is to work with Bruce Crawford and Laura Johnson to develop a proposal to take to the SRFB in October.

Forum members concurred that this information is important.

SMOLT MONITORING FUNDING PROPOSAL

Tim Smith presented this agenda item.

Tim provided information from a recent conversation he had with OMB staff in Washington, D.C. When Tim asked how to get the highest ranking in OMB for salmon recovery, he was told that the more fish status metrics he provided, the higher the program would be rated.

Tim then provided the smolt monitoring funding proposal.

Co-chair Koenings announced that there was a new listing in the spring of the Lower Columbia Coho.

The subcommittee presented information only and is not asking the Forum for anything at this time.

NEXT MEETING

Agenda items were discussed for the next meeting of the Forum:

- Tying salmon recovery plan monitoring together – GSRO will lead
- 2006 schedule adoption
- Upcoming reports
- Follow up from today's reports
- Status and trends framework update
- NOAA would like to give briefing on plan review and where monitoring fits in

Co-chair Ruckelshaus is concerned with comments from heads of subcommittees that some members have not been attending the meetings. He stressed that, for this effort to be successful, everyone needs to be represented.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.



William Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair

Next Meeting: October 5, 2005
 Natural Resources Building #172
 Olympia, Washington