



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

April 16, 2007

TOPIC 10: 2008 REGIONAL ALLOCATION PROPOSAL

Prepared By: Neil Aaland

Approved by the Director: 

Presented By: Laura Johnson

Proposed Action: Direction from Board

Background:

At its March meeting, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) tentatively approved the policy manual and schedule for the 2007 grant round. As part of its discussion, the Board also decided to review the target regional allocations and consider revising them for the 2008 grant cycle. SRFB staff was directed to come back in May 2007 with a proposal for how this review would occur, with the goal that it would be completed by the end of 2007. Staff has discussed this with the Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) and with several regional representatives attending the LEAG meeting. (The Council of Regions did not have a meeting during this timeframe).

There were two primary questions for discussion:

1. What specific issues should be reviewed?
2. What process should the SRFB use to re-visit the target regional allocations?

Discussion

The target regional allocations were developed during the first half of 2006 by an "Issues Task Force" (ITF) chaired by SRFB Member Steve Tharinger. Various ways of allocating the available funding were considered. The ITF ultimately decided to recommend to the SRFB an allocation formula that largely reflected "fish-centric" criteria, but with a "transitional adjustment" to mitigate the magnitude of some of the changes. The resulting allocations (used for both the 2006 and 2007 grant cycles) are shown at the end of this memo. I have also included, for detailed background information, the memo presented to the SRFB in April 2006 that describes the allocation formula.



What process should the SRFB use to re-visit the target regional allocations?

The options include:

- Establish another Issues Task Force; or
- SRFB and GSRO staff develop recommendations, in consultation with LEAG and Council of Regions (COR)

The LEAG discussion did not provide a consensus recommendation, but was helpful in providing comments on some of the options. Comments made include:

- It would be useful to have the start of this process wait until September, after state budget decisions (including the Puget Sound budget issues) are made and after the summer project planning season
- The process needs more input from individual lead entities, apart from just engaging with LEAG
- Transparency is very important; frustrations were expressed about the 2006 ITF process where some believed the COR recommendations on allocations were accepted without having been previously discussed
 - It was also noted that many believe there are good and productive interactions now between LEAG and COR, and these are appreciated

What specific issues should be reviewed?

Staff discussed the following possibilities with LEAG:

- Revisiting the factors used in 2006 (such as shoreline miles or numbers of stocks);
- Revisiting the weightings of those factors; and
- Revisiting the transitional adjustment.

Comments made include:

- The northeast and the coast regions are both undergoing a process to determine whether and how to organize differently, and thus the percentage amounts of the funding should be reviewed
- The listings of steelhead and the Puget Sound budget issues also warrant a review of the percentage amounts

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the following process and initial issues identification:

1. Use a staff-generated process instead of another Issues Task Force. SRFB and GSRO staff would conduct outreach, gather relevant information, and work with the various stakeholders. This would culminate in a staff recommendation to the SRFB on whether and how the target regional allocations should be revised.
2. The process would begin with a preliminary report to the SRFB at the July meeting, discussing in greater detail some of the issues and options to be developed. Staff would more fully begin to work with stakeholders in September.

The initial goal would be to provide the final recommendations at the SRFB meeting following the December 2007 funding meeting.

3. The process would begin with a focus and review of the several issues identified above. These would be discussed at SRFB meetings at several points during the process. If circumstances warrant, additional issues may be added for the discussions.

2007's Target Regional Allocations

- o Lower Columbia Region – 15%
- o Puget Sound (including Hood Canal) Region – 45%, plus \$250,000 for HC Summer Chum plan
- o Mid-Columbia Region – 10%
- o Upper Columbia Region – 11%
- o Snake Region – 9%
- o Northeast Region – 2%
- o Coastal Region – 8%