



STATE OF WASHINGTON

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

May 19, 2006

**TO:** SRFB Members & Designees

**FROM:** Laura E. Johnson, Director *LEJ*

**PREPARED BY:** Bruce Crawford, Monitoring Program Manager *BK*

**SUBJECT:** Programmatic Funding of Projects Occurring in Intensively Monitored Watersheds (IMW)

**Problem Statement:**

IMW projects have no standing in the Lead Entity scoring or ranking mechanisms for awarding grants. Because the primary populations needing recovery and restoration to meet ESA recovery goals are not necessarily in the same streams where IMWs have been developed, IMW investments are in danger of being compromised.

**Background:**

The PCSRF federal money administered by NOAA Fisheries and the additional matching state funds have been a pivotal mechanism for funding salmon recovery actions in the Pacific Northwest. Through this program lead entities, salmon recovery regions, habitat restoration projects, habitat protection projects, assessments, monitoring, and many other aspects of salmon recovery have been funded. The continued flow of money is crucial if we are to be successful in recovering salmon and our watersheds. In keeping with this, the SRFB is increasingly under pressure to justify annual expenditures through NOAA Fisheries to Congress. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2003 gave the PCSRF program an unsatisfactory score for Results/Accountability, and gave the overall program a "Results Not Demonstrated" finding. Since that date congressional language has continued to earmark the appropriation with a warning that there are insufficient performance measures and that the Congress has "received no assurances that these funds have actually contributed to the recovery of Pacific salmon populations". The federal FY-04 appropriation committee report "directs that 2 percent of the funding provided to through the PCSRF shall be used for validation monitoring"



Although research has shown improvements in specific phases of fish life history due to management actions, ultimately, cause-effect relationships between management actions and salmon population response must be established to assess the effectiveness of regulatory and restoration actions in restoring salmon. Development of an approach using IMWs is one means of studying the linkages between management actions and fish production.

Also, in July of 2003, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board decided to fund four clusters of experimental IMW watersheds to demonstrate that the habitat restoration projects funded by the Board were indeed creating more fish in the watersheds.

The basic premises of IMWs is:

- That the complex relationships controlling salmon response to habitat conditions can best be understood by concentrating and integrating monitoring and research efforts at a few locations because the types of data required to evaluate the response of fish populations to management actions that affect habitat quality or quantity are difficult and expensive to collect.
- Focusing efforts on a relatively few locations enables enough data on physical and biological attributes of a system to be collected to develop a comprehensive understanding of the factors affecting salmon production in freshwater.
- Fish populations have an inherent high natural variability, and because this occurs there will need to be sufficient projects implemented in the experimental treatment watersheds in order to detect a response in fish.
- Because projects are expensive and the percentage of habitat treated needed to be high, small watersheds were chosen for monitoring, so responses to habitat restoration could be amplified.
- Sufficient baseline information is necessary. The IMW scientists have been busy developing before treatment baseline information in the control and treatment streams for fish abundance, water quality, flow, and habitat.

**Action Needed:**

Sufficient numbers of projects are now needed in the treatment watersheds in order to affect the limiting factors being studied and to evoke a response in the fish populations. There have been difficulties in the past two grant rounds because IMWs have no standing in the scoring or ranking mechanisms for awarding grants, and because the primary populations needing recovery and restoration to meet ESA recovery goals are not necessarily the same streams where IMWs have been developed.

The IMW scientists were asked to provide an estimate of restoration costs in the treatment basins in both Hood Canal (three streams) and the Lower Columbia (two streams) complexes. Although they do not have complete project lists for these basins, they have cost estimates for several projects as well as the actual cost for restoration of both treatment streams in the Strait of Juan de Fuca complex. Based on these figures and advice from several project sponsors, estimated restoration costs and a schedule are presented in Table 1. They will certainly seek other funding sources as the

opportunities allow but did want to show the SRFB the magnitude of the restoration required.

Table 1. Estimated costs of restoration in Hood Canal and Lower Columbia IMW complexes.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Little Anderson</b>	<b>Seabeck</b>	<b>Big Beef</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Abernathy</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2006</b>	\$350k			\$300k		<b>\$ 650k</b>
<b>2007</b>	\$350k	\$850k				<b>\$1,200k</b>
<b>2008</b>			\$950k			<b>\$ 950k</b>
<b>2009</b>				\$1,000k	\$1,300k	<b>\$2,300k</b>
<b>2010</b>				\$1,200k	\$1,200k	<b>\$2,400k</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$700k</b>	<b>\$850k</b>	<b>\$950k</b>	<b>\$2,500k</b>	<b>\$2,500k</b>	<b>\$7,500</b>

With the implementation of the recently funded projects in the Strait of Juan de Fuca complex, planned restoration there will be complete. The planned restoration projects in the Skagit Estuary IMW will likely rank high and so the IMW scientists foresee no need for special consideration there.

**Recommendation:** Based upon discussions with the IMW scientists and with some Lead Entity leaders, it is recommended that:

1. Either IMW projects come automatically out of the first increment before allocation to the Lead Entities takes place, or
2. The SRFB should provide a certain amount of programmatic funding to accommodate some IMW projects each year until the necessary treatments have been made.