

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

---

*DATE: August 23, 2004  
TIME: 1:30 p.m.*

*PLACE: NRB Room 172  
Olympia, Washington*

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair	Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Brad Ack	Puget Sound Action Team
Mark Clark	Conservation Commission
Bruce Crawford	Office of the Interagency Committee
Laura Johnson	Office of the Interagency Committee
Bridget Moran	Department of Agriculture
Bob Nichols	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Craig Partridge	Department of Natural Resources
Ken Stone	Department of Transportation
Dick Wallace	Department of Ecology

---

**ITEM 1. OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Co-Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting with a brief overview of the legislative success of salmon and watershed monitoring. The Independent Science Panel (ISP) recommended the state develop a coordinated monitoring strategy and action plan to meet salmon recovery goals and objectives. In 2001, the Legislature passed, and Governor Locke signed into law, SSB 5637, creating the Monitoring Oversight Committee (MOC). By December 2002, the MOC had completed an Executive Report, a Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy, and an Action Plan and, with the cost estimated at \$90 million over two biennia, prioritized the different activities with \$500,000 per biennium. In July 2004, Executive Order 04-03 was signed by Governor Locke creating this monitoring forum to develop ways to implement strategy recommendations to see if progress is being made and how the money is being spent. The state needs to answer honestly what we are getting for the money. Need to make sure the data is available and readable for everyone.

Co-Chair Jeff Koenings pointed out all the agencies sitting around the table with different forms of monitoring going on and agreed that we all need to coordinate and make this information readable to all (citizen science). Make sure the public feels they are being involved and informed on what is happening. Limited funds are available so need to coordinate what is going on and make sure that it is clearly presented to the public. The Columbia River is a poster child both for what is wrong and what has gone right. He stressed the need to get reliable, transparent information out to those who need it.

Dick Wallace noted that bringing together both aspects, watershed health and salmon recovery, is another way to tell the story and coordinate efforts.

Craig Partridge reflected on the April 29, 2004, OWEB/SRFB meeting and monitoring efforts. He was struck by the efforts of improving communication on what is happening in the programs and what is happening in monitoring.

## **ITEM #2 – IMPLICATIONS OF EXECUTIVE ORDER CREATING GOVERNOR’S FORUM ON MONITORING**

Bob Nichols thanked the co-chairs for their efforts in getting to this point.

Bob reported that Governor Locke is focused on two things:

1. A common set of measures that can tell the story – take data and roll it up to tell the story in a way that the ordinary person can understand.
2. The need to standardize data across all forums in the region.

Bill asked Bob about including others, such as the Federal agencies, in this effort. Bob responded that there is a need to discuss that today. When dealing with an Executive Order, we should start with the state family then decide whom else to bring in.

Brad Ack asked why it has taken so long to get this group together.

Bob noted that protecting past monitoring efforts and finding a way to work together is such a large animal. All the preliminary work has been done and now the group is ready to move forward and should be able to see progress.

Laura Johnson reported that the efforts have been highlighted in the Monitoring Strategy’s Executive Report. Unfortunately, the MOC ran out of time and money in the last legislative session.

Bill noted it’s important for this to be seen as a non-partisan committee. By clearly identifying this to the new governor-elect as soon as possible, we should be able to keep the effort going without having to start over again with the new administration.

Bob reported that Chris Drivdahl, Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office, and Bruce Crawford have been working on coordination with Oregon’s Watershed Enhancement Board but don’t have a formal recommendation. Now they have the cover umbrella.

Craig reported they have had good examples and agencies are coordinating.

Mark Clark feels technology is helping with the coordination and we can now integrate information that couldn’t be coordinated in the past.

Jeff thinks the hard part now will be who determines what the data means – what one group may think of as progress another may feel is a failure.

### **Item #3 – HISTORY OF WATERSHED HEALTH AND SALMON RECOVERY MONITORING ACTIVITIES IN WASHINGTON**

Bruce provided a PowerPoint presentation on the history of events and budget for the council.

Bill would like to use resolutions to formalize decisions made by the group.

Brad wondered how all the efforts would come together by the deadline (recovery plans, monitoring, funding, etc.). Need to present the finished product June 2005.

### **Item #4 – ROLE AND STRUCTURE OF FORUM**

Discussed the make-up of the members of this group and whether membership should be expanded to include federal and other state agencies.

Reviewed the tasks and precautions listed on the “Summary of Executive Order” handout. Bill asked about the wording “shall not hinder agencies from using other protocols to address mandated agency-unique activities” and if these protocols should be used for all.

Jeff would like to make the decision on federal and/or local forum participation before making decisions on the process. Who should be included on this forum?

Dick would like to make sure the groups that are asked to join realize it is a two-way street – bringing both policy and technical sides to the table.

Jeff emphasized that it is the state’s monitoring efforts, but if the federal groups don’t think it will work then the state needs to rethink the process.

Bill noted the need for all members to be full participants in the process.

Craig believes we need to give federal agencies the option to join or not, but encourage them to participate.

Bob asked about what the difference would be between this forum and the Oregon forum if this group also includes the federal players.

Bruce reported that PNAMP has the next level down.

Craig feels there is a need to add value – not by adding another level of monitoring but by improving the system through both coordination and policy decisions.

Brad observed that this group could give the charge to have others do the work, such as a technical subcommittee.

Bruce would like to keep this group at the policy level.

Mark asked whether Department of Health (DOH) and the Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) should be invited.

Bob asked what the purpose of this group should be. If it is to include more issues, then DOH and CTED should be asked to join, and maybe revise the Executive Order to formally include them.

Jeff would also like to include federal groups and asked if there is a role for the local groups.

Laura sees the need for wider communication, but maybe not as many at the table – federal, tribal, CTED, and Health. She is concerned about losing the focus. The group could bring in participants on an ad hoc basis to present information or bring people in to get their input.

Bill commented that there needs to be communication with the local groups but need federal groups at the table.

There was consensus that the federal agencies need to be included. Tribes also need to be included – west side and Columbia River representatives.

Craig feels the group needs to get to the deliverables without losing out on the institutional aspects of this effort.

Jeff would like to have the tribal involvement, along with Federal (NOAA, EPA, Forest Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service) and Department of Health.

It was decided that Bruce would draft a letter from Jeff and Bill to invite these groups to the next meeting. Bill and Jeff will call the groups and talk to them before sending the letters. Jeff will call to invite Olney Patt at Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission. Preliminary decision was made to go with consensus, quarterly meetings, and workgroups. The meetings will be held in the Olympia area for the most part, and at times in Seattle.

Agenda items for next meeting:

- Draft charter document from state perspective
- Definitions of consensus and workgroups
- Decide additional workgroups
- Briefings (SWIMTAC, PNAMP, etc.)
- Briefing on what has been implemented so far (Brad)
- Regional planning efforts and implementation (GSRO)
- POG
- Budget

It was decided that Bruce and Steve will continue to go to PNAMP meetings for now.

We have two months to get budget information in as a group.

Bruce asked about a legislative steering committee. It was decided there is no need to have legislative representatives at this time, but should provide a briefing to committee chairs.

Bob urged Ken Stone, Department of Transportation (WSDOT), to be involved with this process so that this group can work toward a process that supports WSDOT monitoring efforts.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

---

Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair

Next Meeting:       October 20, 2004  
                          John L. O'Brien Bldg, Hearing Room A  
                          Olympia, Washington