

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

*DATE: September 11, 2006
TIME: 1:30 p.m.*

*PLACE: King Street Center
Seattle, Washington*

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair	Chair, Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Director, Department of Fish & Wildlife
Laura Johnson	Director, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Paul Ancich	Designee, Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Advisory Board
Josh Baldi	Designee, Department of Ecology
Jeff Breckel	Designee, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Jim Cowles	Designee, Department of Agriculture
Steve Leider	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Gretchen Hayslip	Designee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Alan Christensen	Designee, U.S. Forest Service
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Kim Katz	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Terry Wright	Designee, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

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 1:53 p.m.

Introductions were made and the agenda was approved as presented.

OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MONITORING AND DATABASE REPORT

Co-chair Ruckelshaus introduced this agenda item reporting that the reason the meeting began a little late was due to discussions on whether or not the Forum is really approving the monitoring and database report or not. This report is actually a combination of five different agency's monitoring programs.

Bruce Crawford provided background on this report and what information is contained in the report. He also explained how this document was laid out and how it summarizes the monitoring information.

In the July 2006 minutes, action items included approval of this report, due to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) by the end of September, and budget needs, due later in September. This meeting was added to the schedule in order to meet these deadlines.

Co-chair Jeff Koenings believes the reason this Forum was created was to coordinate monitoring needs across the state. He looks at this report as a way to get the information in one place and work on the coordination efforts. He believes this is a good first step in the coordination process.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus is convinced that we will need to do considerably more monitoring to get answers on watershed health and salmon recovery efforts. Before we will be able to get the funds for monitoring efforts we will need to show what is being done, how efforts are being coordinated, and that monitoring is being done in the most efficient and effective method. He does believe this document is a very good first step but not sure how to show the public how efficient and effective.

Bruce explained the recommendations from the Monitoring Oversight Committee were ranked and that the top 22 recommendations are listed on page 7 of the report. The list shows that many of the items have been implemented over the last five years and that progress has been made.

Recommendations are listed in the document starting on page 10.

Josh Baldi explained that the report is a compendium of what all the agencies are doing currently, but the integration and coordination of programs still needs to be done and he isn't sure the work has been done to do this yet.

Co-chair Koenings agreed with Josh that the first attempt to coordinate was to identify the gaps and have a consolidated format for what all the agencies are doing to see if there are any overlaps. Looking through the document he doesn't see much of this happening in major monitoring programs. A lot of time has been spent working on budgets for new monitoring efforts and filling gaps.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus stated that we do want to do a review to see if there are places that coordinating could happen.

Terry Wright commented that the recommendation from the Monitoring Oversight Committee (MOC) to the Legislature to fund the high priority items would cost \$90 million and that what we have to work with is way below the amount needed. He believes that even the items proposed would not address the bigger picture and wouldn't be able to monitor all 22 spots.

Co-chair Koenings doesn't agree that all 22 spots need to be monitored to get the answers.

Jeff Breckel reported that in the Lower Columbia regional plan they have a monitoring plan. His concern is that the list on page 10 isn't the locations that meet the Lower Columbia plan needs. Jeff also noted that he hasn't had time to take this report to his group or the other regional coordinators so would not be able to adopt the report at today's meeting.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus doesn't believe the Forum needs to adopt the report but to approve for submittal to OFM.

Laura Johnson noted that this report is due because of the budget deadlines and she believes there are a few themes that should be highlighted. As this document goes through the budget process it will get integrated into other processes such as Priorities of Government (POG).

Three major themes in the report are:

- Fish in and Fish out (trapping)
- Status and Trends monitoring
- Database compatibility and cross-walking

Bruce noted the handout of a chart on NOAA limiting factors, potential indicators, and current status of efforts. He feels we've come a long way in getting the information that is needed to answer budget questions and needs.

Terry believes the chart is focused more on the status and trends monitoring.

Steve Leider commented that he has looked at all the recovery plans in the state, especially the draft monitoring plans, and agrees that fish, status and trends, and monitoring were themes in all the plans so we may be closer than we thought.

Carol Smith believes that data consolidation is needed to add data compatibility and cross-walking.

Josh agrees and believes the cover letter can get to that summary of major themes.

Jim Cahill thanked the group for pulling the information together and that it was a good first step. He would suggest the group add the following to the report:

- An explanation of how the Forum came to the decision not to discontinue any of the monitoring efforts.
- How did you get the information for the report?
- How will the recommendations be developed?

Jim would also organize by efforts, instead of by agency, as this would help show if there any overlapping monitoring efforts.

Jim commented that he is amazed at the number of databases and how many things are being measured. He suggested prioritizing what is being monitored and what is most important – this may be an item to add to next year's work plan.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus noted that, in putting together the first comprehensive monitoring plan, we found that everyone wants more things monitored and the need to prioritize.

Gretchen Hayslip suggested writing a paragraph on how the comprehensive monitoring plan went out to different groups to gather the data and prioritize the items.

Alan Christensen appreciated the data included and believes this will be helpful in his office.

Co-chair Koenings noted the good comments and that it shows the need to lay out our future plans.

Bruce noted that he could work with the steering committee to add some language as requested by Jim Cahill. He could get the report to OFM by October 1.

Jim Cahill agreed to the October 1 deadline.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus would like to have the changes circulated to the Forum before turning the report in.

Terry asked if there was a way, on page 10, to include the salmon recovery region proposals for monitoring efforts.

Bruce reported that he has tried to do this. He has met with all the regions and, although he received information from a couple of the regions, the others weren't there yet and unable to provide the information needed.

Terry explained that we don't necessarily need to detail this information, but to just note this is happening.

2007-09 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUESTS

Bruce introduced this agenda item.

Erik Neatherlin, WDFW, reported that there were a couple of errors in the Fish Population-Smolt Monitoring amount, which should be \$1,706,000 not \$2,095,000. This is the request for new money. That is the only change on this sheet but may find more inconsistencies in the detailed reports.

Bruce reported that what you see on this document relates directly to NOAA's Limiting Factors document the Forum just reviewed. This document also follows the three major themes.

Discussed combining the monitoring budget requests into one proposal to give to OFM to show collectively what the state believes is important.

Terry asked how much this is integrated with the Forest and Fish programs. Bruce reported that Forest and Fish has been doing some monitoring and there has been some discussion with them to see how they fit in. He is not sure where their data points are.

Bruce believes Forest and Fish may be able to pick up some of the identified sites.

Josh reported that WDFW and Ecology have been involved in discussions on how to integrate the information. He wondered whether the Regional Fish Enhancement Group (RFEG) proposal might compete with Ecology's proposal but wasn't ready to comment on it since he hadn't seen the RFEG proposal yet.

Bruce explained that possible way would be that portions are contracted out to private groups, but to continue to have the state agencies be the stewards of the data and consistency.

Jeff Breckel wants to make sure the regions are included.

Laura believes this conversation is worth starting, and worth starting soon, but not sure if it is doable in the next two weeks. She believes it will take six months at least to get through this discussion.

Terry sees that as a problem since the legislative cycle doesn't want to fund duplicative efforts so this issue needs to be figured out before the Legislature gets to the final budget decisions.

Co-Chair Koenings reminded Forum members that they have been working on this for the last 24 months and everyone has had an opportunity to contribute and he is concerned when people around the table say they haven't had an opportunity to contribute to the product. He suggested anyone who wants to be included then get involved with this effort over the next two weeks.

Jim Cahill appreciates the additional time the Forum has put into this effort. He said the limiting factors document is very helpful, but if he sees the word "yes" all across the row that will give him a red flag. There may be good reason to have different groups doing the same thing but they need to know why.

Jim also commented on the database requests. He noted that in reading the current information, it doesn't tell him what is being asked for. Jim suggested giving a better explanation of what is being asked for, what it will be used for, and how the information will be used.

Laura appreciates Jim's comments and that it should help agencies in putting together their budget packages.

Paul Ancich reported that he took part in all the status and trends monitoring workshops and efforts and strongly believes all three could be combined and better coordinated.

STAFF REPORT

Bruce reported to the Forum that he has submitted his retirement which is effective October 1, 2006, so this will be his last Forum meeting in his current role.

Bill discussed Bruce's work with the Monitoring Forum and all the steps forward that Bruce has helped facilitate for the state. We are going to miss him and will have a hard time replacing him for this effort and hopes that he will continue to work on monitoring efforts in some form.

APPROVAL OF JULY 2006 MINUTES

Co-Chair Koenings **MOVED** to approve the July 20, 2006 meeting minutes. Laura Johnson **SECONDED** the motion. Minutes were **APPROVED**.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.



Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair

Next Meeting: December 6, 2006
 Comfort Inn – Tumwater