



STATE OF WASHINGTON

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

May 2009

Item #8: Funding Allocation and Decisions

Prepared By: RCO Staff and Chris Drivdahl, GSRO

Presented By: Chris Drivdahl, GSRO
Brian Abbott, Salmon Section Manager

Approved by the Director:

Proposed Action: Decision

Summary

To prepare for 2009-2011 funding decisions, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) directed regional organizations and lead entities within each recovery region (the "regional area") to work together and find an eight percent reduction in their combined budgets. The board will discuss the budget reduction efforts, review any new information regarding state and federal budgets, and finalize capacity funding levels at the May board meeting.

Background

Several key items contained in the state budget for the 2009-2011 biennium affect the board's planning and funding strategy efforts. Specifically, the budget cuts lead entity funding by \$140,000 and reduces board grant funds by \$8 million.

Lead Entity Reduction

The \$140,000 cut to lead entity funding in the state general fund budget will be addressed by shifting administration of the program from the Department of Fish and Wildlife to the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO).

Board Grant Fund Reduction

Assuming that federal funds remain constant during the biennium, an \$8 million cut in state funds would result in a 20 percent reduction in total board funds. In February 2009, the board considered several approaches for addressing this cut. The approaches presented to the board at its February meeting were:



1. Allocate the reduction only to projects and preserve the infrastructure intact. The full cut would be borne by reducing the number of projects. Doing so could result in cutting the grant rounds from two to one.
2. Allocate the cut equally to infrastructure and projects (i.e., apply the same percent reduction to both).
3. Establish a target infrastructure reduction up to 20 percent and allocate the remaining cut to projects. The infrastructure reduction would be realized with either a 20 percent cut to all regional budgets and/or by asking regions and lead entities to identify cuts and prioritize their functions based on minimum requirements set by the board.

After a discussion of the likely budget reductions and the approaches presented, the board asked that each regional area, consisting of the regional organization and lead entities within a given recovery region, work together to identify an eight percent reduction in their combined budgets. Attachment A shows the reduction targets. Lead entities that are not associated with a regional organization were directed to identify an 8 percent reduction in their budgets.

The "regional areas" submitted the results of the budget reduction exercise to the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and the Recreation and Conservation Office. Each regional area met its 8 percent reduction target. The results of the eight percent reduction exercise are summarized in Attachment B. The regions and lead entities will present their approaches and the effects of the cuts at the May board meeting.

Next Steps

Following the board's decisions in May, RCO staff will prepare lead entity and regional organization contracts for the 2009-2011 biennium.

Attachments

- A. Reduction targets
- B. Summary of the eight percent reduction exercise

Attachment A: Reduction Targets

Geography/Region/Lead Entities	07-09 Funding	Carryforward	8% Target	Target 09-11 Budget
PUGET SOUND				
Puget Sound Regional Org.	\$1,578,324	\$1,578,324	(\$126,266)	\$1,452,058
Island County	\$100,000	\$100,000	(\$8,000)	\$92,000
King County 8	\$120,000	\$120,000	(\$9,600)	\$110,400
King County 9	\$120,000	\$120,000	(\$9,600)	\$110,400
Kitsap County	\$100,000	\$100,000	(\$8,000)	\$92,000
Mason CD	\$84,000	\$84,000	(\$6,720)	\$77,280
Nisqually	\$125,000	\$125,000	(\$10,000)	\$115,000
North Olympic Peninsula	\$160,000	\$160,000	(\$12,800)	\$147,200
Pierce County	\$110,000	\$110,000	(\$8,800)	\$101,200
San Juan CD	\$100,000	\$100,000	(\$8,000)	\$92,000
Skagit Watershed Council	\$160,000	\$160,000	(\$12,800)	\$147,200
Snohomish County	\$125,000	\$125,000	(\$10,000)	\$115,000
Stillaguamish Tribe	\$124,000	\$124,000	(\$9,920)	\$114,080
Thurston CD	\$80,000	\$80,000	(\$6,400)	\$73,600
Whatcom County	\$130,000	\$130,000	(\$10,400)	\$119,600
Subtotal, Puget Sound	\$3,216,324	\$3,216,324	(\$257,306)	\$2,959,018
HOOD CANAL				
Hood Canal Regional Org.	\$750,000	\$750,000	(\$60,000)	\$690,000
Hood Canal C.C.	\$160,000	\$160,000	(\$12,800)	\$147,200
Subtotal, Hood Canal	\$910,000	\$910,000	(\$72,800)	\$837,200
UPPER COLUMBIA				
Upper Columbia Regional Org.	\$870,000	\$870,000	(\$69,600)	\$800,400
Chelan	\$160,000	\$160,000	(\$12,800)	\$147,200
Foster Creek	\$28,000	\$28,000	(\$2,240)	\$25,760
Okanogan	\$140,000	\$140,000	(\$11,200)	\$128,800
Subtotal, Upper Columbia	\$1,198,000	\$1,198,000	(\$95,840)	\$1,102,160
MIDDLE COLUMBIA				
Middle Columbia Regional Org.	\$570,000	\$570,000	(\$45,600)	\$524,400
Yakima, Kittitas, Benton	\$130,000	\$130,000	(\$10,400)	\$119,600
Subtotal, Middle Columbia	\$700,000	\$700,000	(\$56,000)	\$644,000
LOWER COLUMBIA				
Lower Columbia Regional Org.	\$813,700	\$813,700	(\$65,096)	\$748,604
Lower Columbia FRB	\$160,000	\$160,000	(\$12,800)	\$147,200
Subtotal, Lower Columbia	\$973,700	\$973,700	(\$77,896)	\$895,804
SNAKE				
Snake Regional Org.	\$667,176	\$667,176	(\$53,374)	\$613,802
Snake River	\$130,000	\$130,000	(\$10,400)	\$119,600
Subtotal, Snake	\$797,176	\$797,176	(\$63,774)	\$733,402
COAST				
Coast Regional Org.	\$406,808	\$488,170	(\$39,054)	\$449,116
Grays Harbor County	\$110,000	\$110,000	(\$8,800)	\$101,200
Pacific County	\$100,000	\$100,000	(\$8,000)	\$92,000
Quinalt Nation	\$90,000	\$90,000	(\$7,200)	\$82,800
North Pacific	\$70,000	\$70,000	(\$5,600)	\$64,400
Subtotal, Coast	\$776,808	\$858,170	(\$68,654)	\$789,516
NORTHEAST				
North East Regional Org.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pend Oreille CD	\$100,000	\$100,000	(\$8,000)	\$92,000
Subtotal, Northeast	\$100,000	\$100,000	(\$8,000)	\$92,000
CLICKITAT COUNTY	\$110,000	\$110,000	(\$8,800)	\$101,200
TOTAL	\$8,782,008	\$8,863,370	(\$709,070)	\$8,154,300



STATE OF WASHINGTON

GOVERNOR'S SALMON RECOVERY OFFICE

Natural Resources Building, PO Box 43135 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3135

TO: Steve Tharinger, Chair
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

FROM: Chris Drivdahl
Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

DATE: April 23, 2009

SUBJECT: **Regional Organizations' 2009-2011 Budget Requests**

The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office has been assisting regional organizations with development of their 2009-2011 biennial budget requests. Our role has been to

- Design the process
- Coach, critique, and otherwise badger organizations and individuals
- Organize materials for SRFB review

The attached material represents a compilation of the individual submittals by the regional organizations. It is organized into five parts:

- I. Summary table of regional budget requests: displays annual amount requested by region
- II. Regional strategic assessment : answers four questions about operations in each region
- III. Regional organizations' activity summary table: displays what principal activities will be accomplished in 2009-2011 with requested funds
- IV. Impact of 8% reduction: highlights specific activities that will not be done
- V. Recommendations

REGIONAL ORGANIZATION BUDGET REQUESTS

2009-2011 REGIONAL SUMMARY

REGION	8% REDUCTION FY10 REQUEST	8% REDUCTION FY11 REQUEST	8% REDUCTION 09-11 REQUEST	8% SRFB REDUCTION TARGET	2007-2009 REGIONAL BUDGET
Snake	\$307,280	\$306,522	\$613,802	\$613,802	\$667,176
Upper Columbia	\$400,200	\$400,200	\$800,400	\$800,400	\$870,000
Middle Columbia	\$261,778	\$261,778	\$523,556	\$524,400	\$570,000
Lower Columbia	\$366,050	\$380,990	\$747,040	\$748,604	\$813,700
Puget Sound	\$726,029	\$726,029	\$1,452,058	\$1,452,058	\$1,578,324
Hood Canal	\$345,000	\$345,000	\$690,000	\$690,000	\$750,000
Coast	\$224,558	\$224,558	\$449,116	\$449,116	\$488,170
Total	\$2,600,365	\$2,600,365	\$5,275,972	\$5,278,380	\$5,737,370

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

Background

Regional organizations were asked to provide a two page strategic assessment of four aspects of their work: operational plan, performance progress, key problems and opportunities, and performance measures and targets.

YAKIMA BASIN FISH & WILDLIFE RECOVERY BOARD

Alex Conley, Executive

Director

Summary of operational plan. During the upcoming biennium, we plan to complete remaining recovery plan elements (a detailed steelhead monitoring plan and a bull trout action plan) and work with key partners to implement our recovery plan. We expect to rely almost exclusively on Board staff and time donated by partners in the basin for this work; if budgets allow, limited technical contracting may be used to accelerate completion of remaining planning tasks. We do not anticipate significant equipment purchases during the upcoming biennium; technology expenses will consist of some small contracts for website and database support.

Performance assessment. The last biennium was a productive one for the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board. During this time period we:

1. Completed the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan and worked with NOAA to ensure its integration in NOAA's Middle Columbia River Steelhead Recovery Plan. This was a major 2+ year collaborative effort to update and rewrite the 2005 Draft of the Yakima Sub-basin Salmon Recovery Plan and conduct associated outreach. The end result is a broadly supported document that meets NOAA's needs and is being actively utilized to guide anadromous fish recovery efforts in the Yakima Basin.
2. Worked with the USFWS and local partners to highlight the need to accelerate bull trout recovery efforts in the Yakima basin in order to avoid local extinctions and significant regulatory risks. The Board is leading efforts to develop a Yakima Basin Bull Trout Action Plan that clearly identifies priority actions for bull trout in a form that provides much needed guidance for current on-the-ground management and will also dovetail into the planned USFWS Bull Trout Recovery Plan.
3. Effectively integrated the Board into numerous ongoing fisheries and natural resource policy discussions in the Yakima Basin, such as the Bureau of Reclamation's Yakima Project ESA consultation working group and the Department of Ecology's efforts to propose a comprehensive water supply and habitat improvement program for the Basin. Both of these processes relied heavily on new Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan.
4. Worked with NOAA Fisheries, the Washington Forum on Monitoring and partners in the Basin to initiate discussion of how to address monitoring needs for salmon recovery efforts in the Yakima Basin.

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

5. Participated in statewide policy forums related to salmon recovery, including the Council of Regions, the Lead Entity Advisory Group, and SRFB meetings and work groups.
6. Ran the 2007 and 2008 SRFB grant review process for the Yakima Basin and worked extensively with project sponsors to identify, develop and fund projects that implement priorities identified in the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan.
7. Built the organizational capacity of the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board, which was founded in 2006. In the 2007 to 2009 biennium, the new Board grew from 1 staff member to 3, established a long-term office space and maintained the active engagement of participating County, City and Tribal governments.

Challenges during this biennium period stemmed from the longer-than-anticipated time required to successfully roll the Board's Salmon Recovery Plan into NOAA Fisheries' Middle Columbia River Steelhead Recovery Plan. While our 2007-9 work plan was written presuming full staffing from the beginning of the biennium and NOAA's scheduled completion of its recovery plan by late 2007, the development of the draft NOAA plan continued through September 2008 (the final is due out in mid-2009). Revising the Board's plan and managing the process of rolling it into the larger NOAA plan became the primary duty of the executive director, leading to a slow down in hiring, securing and equipping our office and other logistical tasks. While a Lead Entity Coordinator was hired at the beginning of the biennium, further hiring was deferred until completion of the draft recovery plan. The recovery program coordinator hired in March 2009 is the lead on completion of the remaining planning products. We plan to hire an administrative position in the near future. The anticipated staffing level for the upcoming biennium (2.5-3 FTEs for the regional organization duties) should be sufficient to allow more rapid completion of tasks, and represents a slight reduction from the 3+ FTEs originally envisioned in the recovery organization contract for the 2007-9 biennium (Lead Entity staffing remains constant at 1 FTE).

Key problems and opportunities. The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board is well-positioned to promote fisheries recovery in the Yakima Basin. We have built our credibility in the basin and in larger regional forums, and have established a track-record of 1) developing planning documents that are being used by a broad array of partners to help focus investments where they are needed; 2) supporting project and policy-level initiatives to get recovery actions done; and 3) telling the story of salmon recovery in the Yakima Basin in a compelling and broadly accessible manner. Challenges facing the Board include: 1) the need to focus our limited resources on key priorities that meet both local and higher-level needs; 2) maintaining the active engagement of all members of the Board (we have excellent participation from all three counties, the Yakama Nation and key Cities, but have variable levels of engagement from some of the smaller cities in the basin). We are concerned that proposed funding levels will not support needs to complete remaining planning processes without reducing their quality. To address this, we propose using \$70,000 of unspent funding to cover technical contractors to accelerate and improve development of the steelhead RME plan and the Bull Trout Action Plan.

Performance measures and targets. Key products to be produced this biennium include:

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

1. A final Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan that is incorporated into the final federally-approved recovery plan for Middle Columbia River Steelhead by October 2009.
2. A Bull Trout Action Plan for the Yakima Basin that directly supports identification and implementation of projects that benefit bull trout. Draft to be completed by Dec 31, 2009; final to be complete by March 31st, 2010.
3. A Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for steelhead in the Yakima Basin that become a supplement to the NOAA-approved Recovery Plan. Draft to be completed by May 15th, 2010; final to be completed by Sept 30, 2010.
4. An implementation schedule that synthesizes the actions identified in the Board's steelhead and bull trout plans and the Lead Entity Habitat Work Schedule for the Yakima Basin (work in progress; completion due by June 2010, with annual updates thereafter).
5. A draft State of the Yakima Report that provides information required by state and Columbia Basin-level reporting efforts by June 30, 2010; final by Oct 2010.
6. A ranked project list for SRFB funding that integrates the Lead Entity and Regional Recovery Organization processes. Due in September of each year.
7. Active participation in key decision-making processes in the Yakima Basin (ongoing);
8. Ongoing support of partners' efforts to develop and fund projects and policies that implement key recovery actions

LOWER COLUMBIA FISH RECOVERY BOARD *Jeff Breckel, Executive Director*

Summary of Operational Plan. Based on the SRFB's 8 percent budget reduction guidance, the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) proposes the following FY 2010 work plan:

1. Completion of the Lower Columbia (Oregon/Washington) ESU Recovery Plan is expected by the end of the FY2010. The Washington portion of the plan was completed and adopted on an interim basis by NOAA in 2006. A draft plan for the Oregon portion of the ESU is currently under review by NOAA Fisheries. Work is underway to prepare an overarching document integrating the Oregon and Washington plans and NOAA's estuary recovery module. Key tasks include policy and technical work on recovery goals, coordinated hatchery and harvest measures, ESU monitoring needs, and the estuary implementation framework. Upon completion of the full draft ESU plan package, work will focus on public outreach and final plan revisions based on public input. Key FY 2010 resource needs include LCFRB staff (approximately 0.5 FTE) and technical consulting support (\$50,000).
2. Implementation Work Schedules assist recovery partners in identifying, planning, and implementing their recovery actions. They promote coordination among partners and provide the basis for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on progress. The LCFRB has developed a web-based tool to support the development and maintenance of implementation schedules. Over 30 partners have initiated work on implementation work schedules. In FY2009, work will focus only on completing work schedules for 25 to 30 key recovery partners, rather than all 82 partners, and on compiling a regional work

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

schedule. Primary partners include federal and state natural resource agencies, counties and cities. Key FY 2010 resource needs include LCFRB staff (approximately 1.1 FTE) and technical consulting support associated with implementation issues (\$95,000).

3. Recovery actions have occurred over the past 10 years without a comprehensive monitoring system to document and evaluate progress. Acquiring adequate progress information is critical to policy, funding, and on-the-ground implementation decisions. The RME program plan will be finalized in concert with the completion of Lower Columbia (Oregon/Washington) ESU Recovery Plan. Broad implementation of the RME plan will be deferred. Implementation will occur incrementally if and when resources become available. Completion of the RME plan and coordination of implementation preparations in FY 2010 will require LCFRB staff (approximately .5 FTE).
4. The LCFRB will facilitate recovery plan implementation activities by working with partners individually and collectively to coordinate implementation efforts, ensure actions are consistent with the recovery plan, and resolve technical and policy issues. Efforts will be reduced to focus on activities offering the greatest potential recovery benefit. These will include hatchery and harvest actions, forest and resource land management, local land use programs, and waters resources. Key FY 2010 resource needs include LCFRB staff (approximately .5 FTE).

Performance Assessment. Completion of the Lower Columbia (Oregon/Washington) ESU Recovery Plan has been delayed over a year due to Oregon's delays in completing recovery planning for its portion of the ESU. Completion of the ESU plan is now expected by mid-2010. The LCFRB has completed substantial revisions to the Washington recovery plan, including those for coho, which were ESA-listed after completion of the original LCFRB recovery plan. Final Washington plan revisions are dependent on recently initiated efforts to integrate the Oregon and Washington plans into a single ESU plan.

Implementation Work Schedules are the keystone to a coordinated and effective recovery effort. Over 30 recovery partners have initiated development of work schedules, but most remain incomplete. Progress has been slower than planned to due to the higher than expected need for LCFRB assistance to partners and prolonged vacancies in two key LCFRB staff positions.

A draft framework plan for a lower Columbia RME program has been prepared. Completion of the plan must be done in concert with development of the Lower Columbia (Oregon/Washington) ESU Recovery Plan and Pacific Northwest, statewide, and Columbia Basin coordinated monitoring efforts.

The LCFRB has worked with its partners to address important recovery actions, including minimum stream flows, new water right rules, enhanced habitat strategies, hatchery and harvest measures, and improved coordination of habitat needs and mitigation efforts.

Delayed work on the ESU Recovery Plan and key staff vacancies will result in an estimated unexpended fund balance of \$150,000 for 2007-09 biennium.

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

Key problems and opportunities. The LCFRB work program for the 2009-11 biennium is designed to maintain a viable, but reduced program based on the SRFB's 8 percent budget reduction guidance. Staffing levels are reduced to 2.6 FTE from the current biennium level of 3.1 FTE and a planned 2009-11 staffing need of 4.8 FTE.

The LCFRB is committed to working with NOAA Fisheries, and Oregon and Washington agencies to complete the Lower Columbia ESU Recovery Plan. Staff resources are expected to be adequate; however, \$50,000 in funding for technical consulting support is problematic. Carryover of \$50,000 allocated by the SRFB for this work would address this shortage. If this option is not viable, \$50,000 allocated for technical support of Implementation Work Schedules in the proposed FY 2010 budget would be redirected to completing the recovery plan. This redirection would result in the elimination of consulting technical services needed to evaluate the consistency of proposed partner actions with the recovery plan.

Work on Implementation Work Schedules and facilitation of implementation will be reduced to focus only on 25 to 30 key agencies offering the greatest potential contribution to recovery, rather than all 82 recovery partners. Key focus areas would include hatcheries and harvest, public land management, local government land use programs, water resource management, and forest land management and conservation programs. \$125,000 funding needed for habitat progress tracking will be pursued from other sources.

The RME program framework plan will be completed and implementation priorities will be developed. Full program implementation will be deferred. Implementation actions, including adoption of standards, methods and protocols, and data collection and management will be coordinated with federal, state and local partners and implemented incrementally based on priorities and, if and when, resources become available. \$100,000 for technical support in developing implementation actions will be sought from others sources.

Performance Measures and Targets for FY 2010. Completion of the Lower Columbia ESU Recovery Plan: April 2010

1. Completion of a regional Implementation Work Schedule for key recovery partners: May 2010
2. Completion of RME program plan: April 2010
3. Updated habitat strategy: March 2010

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP *Joe Ryan, Salmon Recovery Director*

Summary of operational plan. The key priority in Puget Sound for the next year will be to integrate salmon recovery work more completely into overall ecosystem recovery. The first step in this will be to integrate the salmon recovery watershed coordinators on the Partnership's salmon team with the Partnership's Regional Liaisons. Overlapping geographic responsibilities will be eliminated. These staff will focus more broadly in a narrower geography. While their principal focus will be on salmon recovery, they will be responsible for implementing all aspects of the Action Agenda at the local community level. This integrated team will work with local communities to maintain the strength of salmon recovery lead entities and build an integrating organization for the broader Action Agenda. Steelhead recovery planning will be another challenge for the region in this biennium. NOAA's Technical Recovery Team is expected to complete its population studies. These studies, once complete, will form the basis for steelhead recovery planning.

Performance assessment. The region is lagging in important aspects of salmon recovery. Local capacity is declining, capital budgets are inadequate, and we haven't developed a strong system for habitat protection.

The recession has reduced local government tax revenues, reducing support for salmon recovery efforts. We expect that \$50,000 EPA grants will be made to each watershed very soon. We are hopeful that PSAR capacity funds can be directed to lead entity core functions.

The financing plan provides for a doubling of federal, state, and local capital investments in habitat restoration and protection. This has not occurred. It was hoped that most of the new funding would come from re-directing mitigation funds. This source of funds is not likely to materialize to the degree it was hoped. The inclusion of PSAR at \$33 Million in the Governor's, House, and Senate proposed budgets is a good sign. It is hoped that NOAA economic stimulus funds for restoration will also help with filling the budget gap. Finally, the Partnership is making some progress on its in-lieu fee program for mitigation.

Another area where the region likely is lagging is in habitat protection. While development pressures are reduced due to the economic recession, it is possible that the region has lost considerable habitat function since the recovery plan was adopted. The Partnership lacks clear data to show whether we are gaining or losing ground on habitat function. The Partnership is currently developing a system for keeping better track of habitat status and trends.

Key problems and opportunities. The Partnership was created with very high expectations. With the Action Agenda completed, this year the Partnership must deliver tangible results for local communities, more broadly than for salmon recovery, while at the same time maintaining salmon recovery as top priority. Salmon recovery and Sound recovery must go hand-in-hand.

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

Performance measures and targets. Key products and targets for 2009-10 are focused in large part on integrating salmon recovery into ecosystem recovery. These are:

1. Integrating salmon recovery and ecosystem recovery
 - a. Regional Liaisons and new staff are trained in salmon recovery. To be completed by December 31, 2009
 - b. Clear roles for Salmon Recovery Lead Entities in relation to local integrating groups for implementing the Action Agenda. To be completed by March 31, 2010
 - c. Clear roles for local integrating groups in relation to salmon recovery. To be completed by March 31, 2010
2. Implementation Monitoring
 - a. Three-year work program updates will be completed by each of 14 watersheds, reviewed and commented on by the Recovery Implementation Technical Team and the Partnership's Policy Review Team, and follow up meetings held with each watershed to discuss technical and policy comments. To be completed by June 30, 2010.
3. Adaptive management and monitoring at the watershed scale
 - a. The Partnership will complete a template for watershed-scale monitoring and adaptive management. This will include working with the Regional Implementation Technical Team and up to three watersheds to pilot the template and advance monitoring and adaptive management in each of these three watersheds. To be completed by June 30, 2010.
 - b. The Partnership will complete a near-term guidance for watershed-scale monitoring and adaptive management. To be completed by June 30, 2010
 - c. The Partnership will complete an updated draft for a regional monitoring and adaptive management plan to be submitted for review by NOAA. To be completed by June 30, 2010.
 - d. The Partnership will incorporate salmon monitoring and adaptive management into the Partnership's monitoring and adaptive management approach for Puget Sound ecosystem recovery. To be substantially advanced by June 30, 2010.

HOOD CANAL COORDINATING COUNCIL _____ *Scott Brewer, Executive Director*

Summary of operational plan. Implementation needs of the Hood Canal summer chum plan require a coordinated effort of all interested and concerned parties. HCCC as the regional recovery organization responsible for implementation of the Plan must provide the discussion forum and opportunities to discuss and debate the science and information, provide for the development of appropriate tools, and disseminate pertinent information in a timely fashion. With the onset during the 2007-09 biennium, of the Puget Sound Initiative and establishment of the Puget Sound Partnership, HCCC now must work as the local and regional liaison with other larger scale efforts. HCCC must function as the umbrella organization to provide a place for salmon recovery in the context of an overall ecosystem-based management approach. Resources necessary to implement the Plan include the capability to provide facilitation, discussion forums, communication and outreach. A certain level of technical ability is also

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

needed to develop tools that can be used at the regional and local level. These tools combined with discussion forums can provide the geographic context for local and regional salmon recovery efforts. Specifically resources are needed to:

- bring together all interests in salmon recovery to understand issues, determine relationships and develop synergy amongst the various interests,
- make available access to tools, information, and data to assist in decision-making, and
- provide web page and internet-based dissemination of information.

Performance assessment. During the 2007-09 biennium, two aspects became apparent and are being responded to by the HCCC. HCCC realizes that salmon recovery is part of a larger scale context involving an ecosystem-based management approach. To address this context HCCC must be able to create a larger table to bring in all concerned groups and articulate salmon recovery in context of a larger overall conservation strategy for Hood Canal and Puget Sound. HCCC has revised its overall mission and is embarking on processes that will attempt to comprehensively understand the environmental, social, and economic conditions affecting health of the Hood Canal watershed and its relationship to Puget Sound. Work completed and already in progress as a result of the implementation of the Plan provides a critical foundation towards this understanding. Salmon recovery implementation work will be the foundation to build the comprehensive approach and must continue.

Key problems and opportunities. Key problems facing HCCC and successful implementation of the Plan are 1) lack of resources for adequate monitoring capability to understand effectiveness of projects and land use actions and, 2) capacity at local level (county and tribal) to address salmon recovery specific actions. To fully address these key problems will require funding and resources that are unlikely given the current economic climate. HCCC, however, believes that certain opportunities can allow a limited ability to address these key problems. The Puget Sound Partnership (Partnership) was established by legislation and enabled under RCW 90.71 in 2007. Some sections in that legislation establish formal relationships between the HCCC and PSP relative to specific issues. The Partnership is the regional recovery organization for Puget Sound Chinook. HCCC and the Partnership work together to affect salmon recovery and water quality protection throughout Puget Sound. The work of the HCCC is focused in the Hood Canal watershed. Other working relationships with regard to other issues are in development based on the Partnership's *Puget Sound Action Agenda for 2020* and the priorities set out in the Hood Canal Action Area profile as part of that Action Agenda. Using the resources and knowledge gained through development and implementation of the Plan, HCCC will work to develop an overall Hood Canal watershed conservation strategy. Tools in development as a result of Plan implementation will provide the opportunity for local authorities to examine land use and regulatory programs and their effects on salmon habitat and watershed health. An additional concern for HCCC is development of the Puget Sound steelhead recovery plan, a necessary function in the coming biennium for which we do not have adequate resources.

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

Performance measures and targets. During the July 1, 2009 to June 30 2010 time period HCCC will:

1. continue development and implementation of adaptive management and Plan revision/modification process
2. refine and update land use and habitat assessment tools and interactions with land use authorities
3. maintain an effective education, communication and outreach strategy
4. place salmon recovery in context of overall watershed conservation strategy.

UPPER COLUMBIA SALMON RECOVERY BOARD

Julie Morgan, Executive Director

Summary of operational plan. In the new biennium, the UCSRB will build on key recovery coordination and facilitation activities they have attended to since adoption of the recovery plan in 2007. Additionally, the UCSRB discussed and developed guidance for new initiatives that are integral to recovery of listed species in the Upper Columbia. One such key initiative is development of an all-H forum to discuss implementation of recovery actions in all H sectors. The upcoming biennium will see greater emphasis on translating the monitoring results into information for use by project sponsors and agencies with reporting responsibilities. The first completion of the adaptive management cycle will also occur during this timeframe. We will continue to rely on UCSRB staff, local watershed coordination groups, and other key partners to carry out the tasks of the UCSRB operational plan.

Performance assessment. While we have successfully completed most of the tasks within the current scope of work, we do see some key performance gaps. Some of these performance gaps include the current status of the bull trout recovery plan, lack of a comprehensive plan amendment process - although some adaptive change mechanisms are included in draft Appendix Q of the Recovery Plan - long-term funding for the data steward, and a long-term financial plan for implementation. Some tasks have become much more complicated, and therefore take more time, such as Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) BiOp coordination. Others have resulted in a much higher level of effort than the scope of work outlined, such as securing additional outside resources (e.g. negotiation of the MOAs with BPA). Overall, we believe we have achieved a higher level of success than previously anticipated given the complexity of processes in the Columbia Basin and Washington State.

Key problems and opportunities. We have analyzed our strategy for implementation of the Recovery Plan and see several areas in need of improvement. These gaps may be problems or opportunities based on several factors such as: (a) the outcome of various Columbia Basin wide processes; and (b) the current economic conditions that may exacerbate existing problems with implementation.

Potential implementation gaps include:

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

- Permitting: there is an extraordinary level of effort needed to review old and develop new policies (e.g. WDNR and large woody debris placement), including additional staffing at agencies; with endangered listings, some projects in the UC are ineligible for certain programmatic permitting options
- All-H integration and facilitation, such as successful implementation of the HSRG recommendations;
- Adequate funding and technical support to successfully implement adaptive management at the ESU scale;
- Coordination of funding and working successfully with funding entities;
- Implementation of more complex projects, such as a reach-based approach to project implementation; and
- Implementation infrastructure. While we have had more successful financial support for projects, we see a gap in the infrastructure at every level to handle the implementation of additional and more complex projects (e.g., permitting and regional coordination).

Performance measures and targets. The key performance measures and targets are in bold in the scope of work, but we would like to highlight that we plan to:

- Develop an RTT analysis workshop, including a complementary report;
- Host adaptive management conferences;
- Update implementation schedules with mid-range work plans and associated funding commitments;
- Host one major outreach tour for members of the federal caucus, Washington State legislative members, Washington State members of the NPCC, and staff of the Northwest Congressional delegation;
- Convene an Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Forum to review actions in all the H sections;
- Develop reporting tools for All-H integration; and
- Report implementation by sub-basin highlighting implementation, and status and trend monitoring results.

WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

Executive Director

Nancy Allison,

Summary of operational plan. Although salmon runs are at historically low numbers in coastal watersheds and recovery work is needed, the Coast Region enjoys some of the healthiest and most productive salmon rivers in the country. In 2002, scientists at the NW Fisheries Science Center stressed the importance of protecting existing high-quality habitats and asserted that protection of this habitat should be given priority over degraded habitat restoration because there is a higher rate of success in maintaining good habitat than there is in trying to recreate or restore degraded habitat. To that end, the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership is developing a Coast Region Action Plan that will strengthen the four Lead Entity Group (LEG) strategies and provide a more coordinated and region-wide approach to restoration and

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

monitoring needs, identify data gaps, discover efficiencies, improve communication, and support region-wide funding opportunities.

Phase I is underway, in partnership with the Wild Salmon Center, and will provide a technical evaluation of the status of current data that will serve as the foundation of the plan. Phase II is a technical analysis of the management strategy options and will develop goals, strategies, and specific actions. Along with a determination of commonalities and differences across the five WRIAs and in each LEG strategy, and an assessment of data gaps, key activities for the planning process include mailed surveys and the facilitation of four workshops across the region to garner local input into the scope, focal species, and limiting factors to be addressed in the coast region recovery efforts.

Two needs are problematic under the current funding scenario. One is the participation of the four Lead Entity Groups. Without sufficient funding to support the participation of each Lead Entity Coordinator (LEC), the regional plan will not be grounded in a truly local perspective. The second is scientific technical expertise. WCSSP staff will facilitate the workshops, conduct surveys and analyze the survey input, write much of the non-technical text, and coordinate the editing and synthesis of all plan components. However, though we anticipate that some technical expertise will be available from our partners without cost, there will be a need to contract for certain components of the scientific expertise. Without sufficient funding to support this need, the plan will not be based upon the best available scientific information and analysis.

It is anticipated that each LEC would need support for a minimum of eight additional hours per month throughout the planning process (18 months of the next biennium) to properly provide input into the planning process. Please note that this is an added time burden dedicated to the planning process, not for their base time spent working on standard regional issues. Four LECs at an average hourly compensation rate of \$55/hour for 18 months equals a total additional funding need of \$31,680, or \$7,920 added to each LEG contract to support local participation. Since we have not yet completed Phase I (the needs assessment) of the plan, we do not have the specific details of the technical expertise that will be required for Phase II, but have estimated that \$50,000 would likely meet the need. Once we know more specifically what technical resources are needed, we would leverage the \$50,000 into more as necessary from outside of SRFB. Total funding need to support local involvement and technical expertise for the planning process is \$81,680.

Performance assessment. Of the 15 tasks outlined in the current WCSSP contract, all have been completed. Activity 3 required that “initial phases of developing a regional recovery plan” be implemented. Although there is much work to do to complete the plan, certainly the initial phases have been implemented. A full day workshop in January resulted in a concept paper outlining the proposed elements of the process, and the needs assessment currently underway in partnership with the Wild Salmon Center will provide the informational foundation for the plan.

Key problems and opportunities. Please note that the WCSSP proposes to allocate \$38,000 to support LEG participation in basic regional activities. The LEGs agreed that \$5600 of that would be taken off the top to bring the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group back to its historic

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

funding allocation. The remaining \$32,400 was distributed amongst all four LEGs based on the percentage distribution of regional support from the current biennium. To be clear, this \$32,400 is to support the LEGs for time spent on standard regional activities, not the additional time burden required for the planning process.

The key problem for the Coast Region during the 2009-2011 biennium is funding to support development of the Coast Region Action Plan. As described above, WCSSP will need a minimum of \$81,680 to support local involvement and scientific technical expertise. There is also a need to support Grays Harbor County as the fiscal agent for WCSSP. The County has estimated that approximately 4 hours per month is required to administer the contract for a total of \$2,600 for the biennium. WCSSP anticipates that there will be approximately \$104,000 remaining on the current contract and requests that that be the source for these funding needs (\$84,280).

Additionally, there is a need to support the implementation of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan. The plan has been completed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), but support is needed for implementation. The local Steering Committee has agreed that quarterly meetings of the group will be sufficient for implementation. Four entities, including WCSSP, have volunteered to “co-lead” the implementation process. NMFS will be investigating funding sources to continue facilitation services needed for operation of the local Steering Committee, but has asked the other co-leads to also provide support. The other two co-leads (Clallam County and Olympic National Park) will provide leadership and manpower, but do not have the means for financial support. NMFS will provide financial support for four meetings and WCSSP requests funding to support the other four meetings during the full biennium. Facilitation and other charges are \$5,500 per meeting, which for four meetings equals \$22,000. WCSSP and NMFS are requesting that this support come in the form of funding from the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF).

Performance measures and targets. Key products for the 2009-2011 biennium include:

1. Creation of Board of Directors by July 2009
2. Detailed outline of Coast Region Action Plan by November 2009
3. Initial draft of Coast Region Action Plan by July 2010
4. Completed Coast Region Action Plan by December 2010
5. Draft procedure for coordinating and addressing regional and LEG monitoring needs by December 2010
6. Completed regional monitoring and adaptive management procedures as a supplement to the Coast Region Action Plan by April 2011

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY BOARD *Steve Martin, Executive Director*

Summary of Operational Plan. Completion of the Middle Columbia (Oregon/Washington) Steelhead ESU Recovery Plan by NOAA Fisheries is expected by August 2009. The Washington portion of the plan (Management Unit Plan), completed by the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board and adopted on an interim basis by NOAA in 2005, requires revisions to reflect commitments provided in response to comments received and to reflect integrated goals, objectives and strategies for harvest and hatchery measures, ESU monitoring needs, and reporting measures. Work is currently underway, led by NOAA-F in collaboration with Idaho and Oregon, to develop a Snake River ESU recovery plan for spring/summer Chinook, summer steelhead and fall Chinook. The approach uses management unit plans from each state for habitat measures and will prepare harvest and hatchery measures based on near-term management plans and policies (HSRG, HRT, HGMP, etc). Key tasks include policy and technical work on recovery goals, coordinated hatchery and harvest measures, ESU monitoring needs, implementation framework and reporting measures. Upon completion of the full draft ESU plan for Mid C Steelhead in FY 09 and the full draft ESU plan for Snake River populations in 2010, work will focus on public outreach and final plan revisions based on public input. Key resource needs include SRSRB staff, partner support, and technical consulting support.

Implementation Work Schedules assist recovery partners in identifying, planning, and implementing their recovery actions; they also promote coordination among partners and provide the basis for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on progress. The SRSRB has developed a 3-year implementation work schedule that is shared and supported by our implementation partners. The work schedule will be housed in the Habitat Work Schedule (HWS) so that information is easily shared, updated, and reported. Work will focus on compiling a regional work schedule that includes assessments, research, outreach, artificial production measures, and harvest management recommendations. Primary partners include federal and state natural resource agencies, counties and cities. Key resource needs include SRSRB staff and partner support.

Recovery actions have occurred over the past 10 years without a comprehensive data compilation, storage and reporting system. Acquiring progress information and reporting project accomplishments is critical to policy, funding, and on-the-ground implementation decisions. An implementation progress database with commitments from partners to enter and store project information will be developed in FY 2010.

A draft RME program description will be finalized in concert with completion of the two ESU-based Recovery Plans (Mid C Steelhead ESA and Snake River ESUs). The role of the SRSRB will be to coordinate new monitoring programs based on the Snake River RME Plan and to the extent possible synchronize existing monitoring programs with RME needs for salmon recovery. Completion of the RME plan and coordination of implementation preparations in FY 2010 will require SRSRB staff.

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

The highest priority of SRSRB is to facilitate recovery plan implementation activities by working with partners individually and collectively to coordinate implementation efforts, ensure actions are consistent with the recovery plan, and resolve technical and policy issues. Efforts will be focused on activities offering the greatest potential recovery benefit. These will include hatchery and harvest actions, forest and resource land management, local land use programs, and waters resources.

Performance Assessment. Completion of the Middle Columbia Steelhead ESU Recovery Plan has been delayed due to Oregon's delays in completing recovery planning for its portion of the ESU but is scheduled to be complete in 2009. Completion of the Snake River Steelhead and Salmon ESU Recovery Plan has been delayed due to other NOAA Fisheries commitments and the need to coordinate with Oregon and Idaho recovery planning and is not expected to be complete until 2010. The SRSRB intends to complete revisions to its Washington Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan based on our commitments to address comments received, including those for RME, hatchery and harvest decisions. Final Washington MU plan revisions have been dependent on efforts to integrate the Oregon and Washington plans into a single Mid-Columbia Steelhead Plan and to develop an integrated Oregon, Idaho, Washington plan for the Snake River ESUs.

Implementation Work Schedules are the keystone to a coordinated and effective recovery effort. Implementation and policy partners have developed a "provisional" 3-year work plan and a 15-year long range implementation plan. The near term, 3-year work plan includes habitat actions, RME, assessments, outreach, hatchery and harvest recommendations. This work plan is dynamic and is updated annually. Progress has been slower than planned for the hatchery and harvest sections due to delay in other planning initiatives (HSRG, HRT, HGMP, etc) and unresolved policy positions from our partners.

A draft framework for a Snake River RME program has been prepared including on-going monitoring programs and existing gaps that need to be filled for purposes of recovery needs and stock status updates. Completion of the plan must be done in concert with development of the Mid-Columbia steelhead and Snake River ESU Plans and Pacific Northwest, statewide, and Columbia Basin efforts to coordinate monitoring.

The SRSRB has worked with its partners to address important recovery actions, including minimum stream flows, new water right rules, enhanced habitat strategies, hatchery and harvest measures, and improved coordination of habitat needs and mitigation efforts.

Delayed work on the ESU Recovery Plans will result in an estimated unexpended fund balance of \$20,000 for 2007-09 biennium.

Key problems and opportunities. The SRSRB work program for the 2009-11 biennium is designed to maintain a viable, but reduced program based on the SRFB's 8 percent budget

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS

reduction guidance. Staffing levels will not change but partner and contract services will be reduced as will office operating expenses.

The SRSRB is committed to working with NOAA Fisheries, Oregon, Idaho and Washington agencies to complete the Mid-Columbia Steelhead Recovery Plan and the Snake River Recovery Plan for multiple ESUs. Staff resources are expected to be adequate; however, \$80,000 in funding for consulting support for revising our MU plan is needed above the SRFB proposed \$307,000. The unspent \$20,000 in the current SRFB contract plus an additional \$60,000 for this work would address this shortage. If this option is not viable, the MU Plan will lag behind the NOAA ESU plans and will be deficient in incorporating commitments responsive to public comment as well as updated hatchery and harvest recommendations.

SRSRB staff resources are adequate for managing the 3-year work plan and developing the coordinated project accomplishments database in collaboration with our partners. However, additional funds will be sought from other sources for coordinating and reporting projects funded by the NPCC and the 2008 FCRPS Action Agencies.

The RME program framework and plan will be completed after the Mid-Columbia and Snake River ESU recovery plans are finalized. Full RME program implementation will be deferred. RME actions, including adoption of standards, methods and protocols, and data collection and management will be coordinated with federal, state and local partners and implemented incrementally based on priorities and whether resources become available.

Performance Measures and Targets for 2009-2011 Biennium. Key products to be produced this biennium include:

1. Completion of the Middle Columbia ESU Recovery Plan: August 2009
2. Implementation progress data base: December 2009
3. Completion of the Snake River ESUs Recovery Plan: December 2010
4. Completion of comprehensive regional Implementation Work Schedule: April 2011
5. Completion of RME program plan: April 2011
6. Updated habitat strategy: June 2011

III

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' ACTIVITY SUMMARY 2009-2011

Region	Support Collaborative Decision Making	Refine and Manage Recovery Plan	Coordinate Implementation and Reporting	Coordinate Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan	Communicate with Public, Tribes, and Agencies	Financial Plan for Operations and Implementation
Coastal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create board of directors (BOD) • Fully execute interlocal agreement • Conduct regular meetings of BOD & Advisory Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Committee and Technical Team established • Determine commonalities and differences affecting salmon sustainability across region • ID key data gaps affecting planning & analysis of sustainability and determination of how to address them • Complete and obtain BOD approval of outline for Regional Action Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed project list prioritized within each LE • Assist facilitation of implementation of Lk Ozette recovery plan • Attend LE meetings • Provide data for State of Salmon Report • Host annual meeting and include a State of the Region presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft procedure for coordinating and addressing regional and LE monitoring needs • Completed regional monitoring and adaptive management procedures as supplement to Coast Region Action Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach materials including brochures • Website launched • Annual report to SRFB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of potential funders developed • Completed templates for grant proposals • Additional funding needs and potential funding sources for regional Action Plan developed • Secure long term funding for administrative support
Puget Sound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct 5 Recovery Council meetings • Facilitate RC communication with Leadership Council • Conduct 11 watershed leads meetings • Meet monthly with Recovery Implementation Technical Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff are trained • Role clarification for LEs & other Action Agenda implementers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 year work program updates in 14 watersheds • Provide data for State of Salmon Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Template for watershed monitoring and adaptive mgmt • Near term guidance for watershed monitoring and adaptive management • Regional Draft monitoring and adaptive management plan submitted to NOAA • Salmon monitoring plan incorporated into PSP monitoring plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with appropriate groups • Annual report to SRFB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing plan for operations and implementation developed in conjunction with HCCC

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' ACTIVITY SUMMARY 2009-2011

Region	Support Collaborative Decision Making	Refine and Manage Recovery Plan	Coordinate Implementation and Reporting	Coordinate Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan	Communicate with Public, Tribes, and Agencies	Financial Plan for Operations and Implementation
Hood Canal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct BOD meetings • Present progress reports to BOD and public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct symposium on status and progress of Plan activities • Produce report with recommended plan revisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct annual summer chum symposium and produce summary report • Revise web page to reflect status of recovery plan implementation • Meet with partners to discuss regulatory programs and strategic plans; incorporate into habitat work schedule • Provide data for State of Salmon Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize monitoring needs required by NOAA • Report progress on monitoring and adaptive management • Report progress of development and use of habitat assessment tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with education and outreach groups and provide summary report of progress • Maintain website • Annual report to SRFB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In conjunction with PSP, provide report on progress of developing funding opportunities
Lower Columbia River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct BOD meetings • Reactivate Recovery Plan Implementation Committee • Conduct technical advisory committee meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete OR/WA recovery plan roll up • Complete coho update • Update all recovery plans with new data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated 6 year implementation schedule • Updated 6 year habitat work schedule • Implementation partnership agreements • Provide data for State of Salmon Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete regional monitoring program plan • Develop and implement detailed work plan for VSP, action effectiveness, habitat status and trends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct 3 public workshops on recovery plan • Assist NOAA in outreach on recovery plan • Conduct meetings and workshops; maintain website; publish reports • Annual report to SRFB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop recovery cost estimate • 6 year implementation funding priorities
Middle Columbia River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct BOD meetings • Participate in other decision forums, including Planning Units, Storage Study, USBOR Project • Maintain independent non-profit organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete final Mid-C steelhead recovery plan with OR • Complete bull trout action plan • Develop steelhead research, monitoring, and evaluation supplement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain implementation schedule • Support recovery actions of partners • Participate in bi-state Mid-C steelhead recovery forum • Develop state of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate implementation of steelhead recovery plan monitoring • Coordinate bull trout RM&E • Liaison between state/regional and local RM&E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearinghouse for info on salmon recovery and plan implementation • Communicate with Klickitat County on Mid-C recovery • Develop BOD newsletter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate sources of funding and apply for grants

III

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' ACTIVITY SUMMARY 2009-2011

Region	Support Collaborative Decision Making	Refine and Manage Recovery Plan	Coordinate Implementation and Reporting	Coordinate Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan	Communicate with Public, Tribes, and Agencies	Financial Plan for Operations and Implementation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update BOD planning products 	<p>Yakima Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide data for State of Salmon Report 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and improve website Annual report to SRFB 	
<p>Upper Columbia River</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct BOD, Regional technical team, and implementation team meetings Develop support mechanisms to assist BOD with mission Initiate and facilitate new forum to strategically discuss all H recovery sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and maintain plan amendment process Update implementation schedules in each watershed Assist with completion of bull trout recovery plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report implementation actions by watershed Host tours of region Regional status reports based on monitoring results provided to partners Assist regional technical team project review process by providing resources and communications among partners Provide data for State of Salmon Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement regional monitoring and adaptive management program with milestones Develop and maintain databases of monitoring data in regional format, including Habitat Work Schedule Provide info to watershed action teams Develop list of critical uncertainties and recommendations to address Host regional technical team analysis workshop to assess plan progress Host adaptive management workshop to accept proposals for plan changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, maintain, and coordinate communication products such as website, newsletters Provide and attend opportunities community outreach Annual report to SRFB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct funding coordination workshops for region Secure long-term funding for data steward Refine financial plan for UCSRB and secure funds Develop financial plan with long-term suggestions that may become part of implementation schedule Maintain independent non-profit organization Improve capacity for contract management

III

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' ACTIVITY SUMMARY 2009-2011

Region	Support Collaborative Decision Making	Refine and Manage Recovery Plan	Coordinate Implementation and Reporting	Coordinate Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan	Communicate with Public, Tribes, and Agencies	Financial Plan for Operations and Implementation
Snake River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborate with planning units, RFEG, CDs, etc. Conduct BOD meetings Incorporate hatchery reform recommendations into 3 year implementation schedule Participate in recreational fish harvest quota allocation setting process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refine/manage 3 year implementation schedule, RME framework, updates, and revisions Participate in Snake River salmon and steelhead multi-state ESU recovery plan roll up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate implementation with sponsors and report actions Report implementation actions from 3 year work schedule Provide data for State of Salmon Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate monitoring activities of technical partners Provide reports on monitoring results Participate on Monitoring Forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct public outreach meetings Maintain website Annual report to SRFB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete operations financing plan

IV

EIGHT PERCENT REDUCTION IMPACTS

Regional organizations were asked to prepare budgets reflecting an 8% reduction in their operating budgets for 2009-2011. This takes them collectively from \$5,737,370 in 2007-2009 to \$5,278,380, or a reduction of \$458,990. Impacts of these reductions on regional operations in the coming two years are summarized below.

Hood Canal:

- Will not add staff to address monitoring and adaptive management in a comprehensive fashion

Puget Sound:

- Some loss of current service levels
- Reduced frequency of regional meetings; conference calls will replace, as possible
- Reduce overlap between LEAG and Watershed Leads meeting agendas
- Increased funding support sent to lead entities to compensate for lead entity 8% reductions

Upper Columbia:

- Reduced ability to develop partnership funding for recovery plan implementation
- Reduced ability to facilitate project coordination and communication among project sponsors within sub-basins
- Reduction in funding to support watershed action teams and other partners implementing recovery plan

Snake River:

- Operational efficiencies in the current biennium will result in no impact from the loss of 8%
- Actions contemplated to utilize efficiency dollars gained will be postponed or cut back

Coast:

- Support funding for lead entities will be reduced by 50%, impacting their ability to continue participating in ongoing regional efforts
- Basic outreach activities will be eliminated as staffing level is cut from 3 FTEs to 2.5 FTEs

Yakima:

- The level of administrative support for the Board is reduced by .5 FTE, reducing time of executive director to do substantive policy and technical tasks
- Contracted technical support for RME planning will be reduced, likely lengthening overall time to complete the plan
- Conference registration fees for staff and Board members will be reduced by 50%

IV

EIGHT PERCENT REDUCTION IMPACTS

- Recovery coordinator position will not go to full time (remains at three-quarter time) which slows production of the Board's technical products

Lower Columbia:

- Completion of implementation work schedules will focus on only 25-30 key partners out of 82
- Broad implementation of RME plan will be delayed
- Facilitation of recovery plan implementation of through working with partners will be reduced to highest priority activities in harvest, hatcheries, forest and resource land management, local land use programs, and water resources

V

RECOMMENDATIONS

While budget reductions are unwelcome and do result in either loss of certain services or increasing length of time for products, for the most part these are frustrating but not catastrophic. There is one area, however, that raises concerns. In all but the Upper Columbia region recovery plans are still being crafted; that is,

- Lower Columbia: Lower Columbia ESU recovery plan roll up with Oregon is underway
- Yakima and Snake: Mid-Columbia steelhead ESU roll up with Oregon is underway
- Snake: Roll ups on Snake River steelhead ESU and Snake River Chinook ESU recovery plans with Oregon and Idaho are commencing
- Puget Sound and Hood Canal: Puget Sound steelhead technical work is underway, and plan writing should commence in the coming biennium
- Coast: Lake Ozette sockeye plan will soon be final, but facilitation of parties implementing the plan is above current level funding. Additionally, technical support for development of Coast Region action plan is above current level funding

We believe it is vital that salmon recovery regions maintain a visible and active presence in these endeavors to ensure accurate and full integration of Washington's management units (those portions of the ESU currently with NOAA-F approved recovery plans). Without full ESU recovery plans, the vital analysis of status and trends – and, possibly, delisting – cannot occur, nor can all “H” activities be completely integrated. With proposed reductions impacting regional ability to implement plans a statewide reality, it is unlikely that recovery organizations can also maintain sufficient policy and technical presence in plan roll up or development exercises to ensure these processes move forward to completion in a reasonable time frame.

Thus, we recommend the SRFB consider a special, one-time appropriation to each of these organizations for the purpose of completing ESU scale recovery plans. We suggest a separate, programmatic appropriation be negotiated with regional organizations with specific deliverables and time frames according to the following distribution:

V

RECOMMENDATIONS

Region	Tasks	Allocation
Snake River	1. Complete Mid-C Steelhead ESU recovery plan with Oregon 2. Complete Snake River Salmon ESU recovery plan with Oregon and Idaho	\$80,000
Middle Columbia River	1. Complete Mid-C Steelhead ESU recovery plan with Oregon	\$70,000
Lower Columbia River	1. Complete Lower Columbia River recovery plan with Oregon	\$50,000
Washington Coast	1. Facilitate implementation of Lake Ozette recovery plan 2. Technical support for development of Coast Region Action Plan	\$100,000
Puget Sound and Hood Canal Regions	1. Begin development of Puget Sound steelhead recovery plan	\$250,000
Total		\$550,000

Because regional organizations were provided funding to accomplish this task during the 2007-2009 biennium and were unable to complete it (mostly because the task is far more complicated and dynamic than originally anticipated by NOAA-F, so it is taking far more time to do), those regions engaged in these efforts have considerable funds that will be returning to the SRFB; we estimate approximately \$860,000 will be unspent at the end of this biennium (June 30, 2009). Our ultimate goal of delisting these fish cannot be realized without this scale of plans, so it is in our interest to help NOAA-F complete the task. We suggest it is an appropriate use of these funds to develop a specific contract for regional organizations to participate in completion of the recovery plans. This should not change their base level numbers but be regarded as a one-time, program-specific allocation.