

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

October 28 2005

Natural Resources Building, Room 172
Olympia, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Mark Clark	Designee, Conservation Commission

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by chair Bill Ruckelshaus.

The agenda was reviewed. Two issues need to be addressed at this meeting 1) regional funding requests and 2) second increment of the 6th round grant funding.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS:

Director's Report:

Director Johnson presented this agenda item.

She reviewed staff work since the last board meeting. The next SRFB meeting is in Seattle on December 1 and 2. There will be a Governor's Forum on Monitoring Watershed Health and Salmon Recovery meeting the morning of the 1st.

She also noted the name change process the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) is currently going through. There is no interest in changing the name of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

Steve Tharinger presented the board with a certificate of appreciation from the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe for the Jimmycomelately projects.

Dick Wallace asked about scheduling a meeting with the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB). Director Johnson discussed the changes in leadership within OWEB and the possibility of joint tour in the summer. Staff continues to work closely with OWEB, especially Bruce Crawford with the monitoring efforts. Chair Ruckelshaus recently met in Washington D.C. with others involved with the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) funding.

Financial Services Report:

Mark Jarasitis presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2b for details.)

Mark handed out a chart of available funds. Director Johnson noted that the board doesn't have spending authority for the full amount. Money is there but the final authorization has not occurred yet.

Director Johnson highlighted the note on "other programs" in the chart. Chair Ruckelshaus asked if this was going to be on the January agenda. Director Johnson is asking for board direction on "other program" funding including possible programs to include and amount of 6th Round funding to set aside for other programs. This will be part of the January funding meeting agenda.

Dick Wallace noted an error on the chart, \$47 million where it should be closer to \$41 million. Mark will revise the sheet and provide the update to the board.

The Federal 06 budget still is being decided. Tim Smith reported that the hurricane effects are more likely to affect the FFY07 budget.

Project Management Report:

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2c for details.)

Project managers (Barb McIntosh, Brian Abbott, Tara Galuska, Mike Ramsey, and Marc Duboiski) provided a presentation on closed projects:

- 00-1870 Monahan Creek Culvert Replacement – Cowlitz County
- 02-1629 Pearson's Eddy Acquisition – Cascade Land Conservancy
- 00-1176 Salmon Creek Restoration – Jefferson County Conservation District
- 00-1078 Sportsman's Club Oxbow Reconnection – Pierce County Conservation District
- 02-1492 Wiley Slough Restoration Design – Skagit Watershed Council

Monitoring Measurements and Technology Report:

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2d for details.)

Bruce went through the SRFB monitoring strategy chart in the notebook explaining the various types of monitoring the board is tracking.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if Bruce had gone through the monitoring efforts with LEAG recently. Bruce noted that it has been about six months since he has met with LEAG. Chair Ruckelshaus suggested Bruce attend an upcoming LEAG meeting to discuss monitoring efforts with them.

Dick Wallace said he appreciated Bruce's chart but still would like to see the connectivity between the different monitoring types displayed and a footnote on what the acronyms stand for.

Bruce reported that staff needs to go through a certification process to verify the data submitted to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) on the PCSRF funds. Staff is working to get this year's data entered into PRISM for uploading into the NOAA system.

Bruce said he would like to find ways to spend the federal salmon recovery funds more quickly than in the past grant cycles. As long as there are uncommitted funds in the federal account he needs to report quarterly on why the board has not committed these funds. He also needs to report on the list of data gaps, why we are missing this data, and when the gaps will be filled.

Bruce updated the board on PRISM upgrades.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that we are in a complicated period for monitoring right now. Coordinating monitoring needs and still being cost effective is crucial for continued funding.

Communications Report:

Susan Zemek presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2e for details.)

Chair Ruckelshaus would like communication to be on an upcoming agenda to discuss in more detail with pre-meeting information. The chair believes there needs to be a communication plan and strategy for the board. Need to do a better job of communicating what the board is doing and how to get more support for the projects.

Director Johnson noted that it is also time to look at the board's "Mission and Roles" document once again since it hasn't been updated since 2001.

2006 MEETING SCHEDULE:

Director Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #3 for details.)

Steve Tharinger **MOVED** approval of the 2006 meeting schedule, Resolution #2005-01. Brenda McMurray **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** the 2006 schedule:

- January 5 & 6, 2006
- April 6 & 7, 2006
- June 8 & 9, 2006
- September 14 & 15, 2006
- December 6 & 7, 2006

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Steve Tharinger **MOVED** approval of the July 2005 meeting minutes. Brenda McMurray **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion:

Chair Ruckelshaus asked about the paragraphs on page 4 of the July minutes discussing volunteer monitoring. Bruce Crawford clarified the information stating that the Monitoring Forum has a subcommittee working on establishing monitoring protocols so that the data gathered by volunteers is useable. Bruce will work with Tammy Owings to amend the language in the minutes.

The chair also asked for clarification on page 10 on what Craig Partridge said. This was a typo and just need to change the wording from "funding" to "funded."

The July 2005 meeting minutes were **APPROVED** as clarified.

LEAG REPORT:

Paul Dorn, LEAG vice-chair, provided the LEAG report. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

Dick Wallace asked about the comments on page 2 on "overhaul of the system" and "reluctance to delegate to the state." Paul explained the issue with shared governance on the various duties and requirements.

REGIONAL RECOVERY PLANS:

Chair Ruckelshaus introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

He noted that the SRFB clearly has the authority to fund these regional groups. Chris Drivdahl presented her findings on the review of the regional planning efforts. Each of the regional boards presented their story on regional planning efforts.

Snake River Regional Recovery Board

Steve Martin, executive director of the Snake River board, introduced Snake River board members Eric Meyer and Columbia County Commissioner Dick Jones.

Commissioner Jones provided an overview of his involvement with the Snake River board process. He wanted to emphasis the importance of continued funding for implementing the plan and continuing the efforts.

Eric Meyer provided his thoughts on the Snake River board process.

Chair Ruckelshaus commented on the Snake River board's process, the SRFB funding restrictions and needs, regional structures, and how to support these efforts. He also thanked the Snake River board members for coming to the meeting and involvement in the process.

Steve Martin reported on two documents, the full recovery plan and the public summary. The abbreviated public summary is a quick way for everyone to see what the plan is and how much it will cost. They also need to develop an inventory of projects that have been completed in the area. This is not a static document but a living document that will be worked through in a public setting. The public has got to be involved for the process to be a success.

The Snake River board is requesting \$454,980 where the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) is recommending a base of \$375,000 for this region.

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Douglas County Commissioner Mary Hunt, Paul Ward, and Denny Rohr presented for the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery board.

The Upper Columbia is still working on finalizing its plan before the end of the year. The first full week of December they will review the public comments and incorporate changes to the plan. The plan is scheduled to be presented December 15.

Paul provided an update on where the board is on their plan and next steps.

Commissioner Hunt provided her thoughts on the plan and success so far. She highlighted the reason for their request being above the base; to hire a half time technical staff.

The Upper Columbia is four watersheds covering a large area of land so it will take a lot of coordination.

The Upper Columbia is requesting \$395,749 where the GSRO is recommending a base of \$375,000 for this region.

Dick Wallace thanked Commissioner Hunt not only for the work with salmon recovery but also on water issues.

Yakima Basin Recovery Board

Paul Ward and Joel Freuedenthal presented for the Yakima Basin Recovery board.

Paul and Joel both provided an overview of their process, changes needed, and how recovery planning is working in the Yakima basin. It is important to note that the board is working with their lead entity to combine into a single implementation organization.

The Yakima basin is requesting \$315,683 and for reauthorization of funds remaining in their current grant, where the GSRO is recommending a base of \$375,000 for this region.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

Jeff Breckel and George Trott, Wahkiakum County Commissioner presented for the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board.

Commissioner Trott provided his comments on the recovery process in the Lower Columbia.

Jeff gave an overview of the recovery plan and implementation process in the Lower Columbia area.

The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board is requesting \$395,000 where the GSRO is recommending a base of \$375,000 for this region.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Jay Watson and Jefferson County Commissioner Phil Johnson presented for the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC).

Commissioner Johnson gave his overview of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council's process and history of commercial fishing practices from the early 1970s to late 80s.

Jay gave an overview of the HCCC budget and reasons for the amount of its request.

The HCCC is requesting \$529,238 where the GSRO is recommending a base of \$375,000 for this region.

Puget Sound Shared Strategy

Jim Kramer presented for the Puget Sound Shared Strategy.

Jim provided an overview of the Shared Strategy process and next steps.

He recently attended the annual Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA) meeting where the Governor spoke. She talked about her trip to eastern Washington and regional salmon recovery planning efforts and talked about the "Washington Way" where we don't wait for the federal government to tell us what to do in salmon recovery but take the initiative into our own hands.

The shared strategy plan covers 14 watersheds and is more than 5,000 pages long. This was a large undertaking with coordination between many different local governments, elected officials, and citizens. The Shared Strategy now is planning to stay in place for another 18 months or until an implementing organization is in place.

The Puget Sound Region is requesting \$1,139,900 where the GSRO is recommending a base of \$900,000 for this region.

Chris Drivdahl provided her thoughts on the timeline for implementation, funding requests, and the reasoning behind the baseline funding amounts.

Base funding would cover five items:

1. Completing the plan adoption process with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS),
2. Coordinating with implementers to ensure their programs reflect the actions and science embodied in recovery plans,
3. Tracking implementation and results and reporting on them,
4. Initiating, facilitating, or implementing key regional programmatic actions, and
5. Coordinating development and implementation of funding strategies to support plan implementation.

GSRO will work with others to develop a long-term funding strategy to bring back to the board and to take to the Legislature and the Governor.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Chris when she could come back to the board with a recommendation for additional funding. Chris recommended coming back to the board at the December meeting for the additional funding amounts. There also may be need for additional funding for monitoring of recovery plans.

Brenda McMurray believes the five items Chris is proposing capture the needs. She is wondering if Chris has had time to sit down with the regions to see how these five items fit into their plans.

Chris reported that these are the five items that are consistent in all the regional plans.

Jim Kramer noted that there is a disagreement. He believes the budgets they submitted cover the five items and don't believe they need to do anymore work to justify their budgets. He recommends the board approve the budgets as presented and not have them go through another process.

Chair Ruckelshaus agrees that the items are needed but that the board needs to know more details before deciding on the two different budget proposals.

Chris noted that there are questions on some of the details of the budget requests and she is not sure they are appropriate for PCSRF funding or if there isn't another source for this funding. She is not recommending the boards don't get funding, just that the details are looked at by SRFB staff. Chris noted that one way would be to fund the boards' requests with the condition that staff would review elements for eligibility before contracts are signed.

Chair Ruckelshaus suggested approval of board budgets as presented and then have staff review details before the contracts are signed.

Steve Tharinger is not convinced of the need to fully fund the boards at today's meeting. He has issues with the legality of using the PCSRF funds for some of the budget items,

redundancy, and organizational issues between lead entities and regional organizations.

Brenda McMurray noted that Steve brought up some very good questions and she also has a lot of questions. She doesn't believe the board has had the opportunity to discuss what the board's obligation for these efforts is and that in the long run this is just a small amount of the total amount of funding that will be needed to implement these regional plans.

Brenda McMurray **MOVED** that the board fund the total request by regions pending scrubbing by the director, staff, and GSRO on eligibility of proposals and on the technical fit of the five items. Steve Tharinger **SECONDED** the motion.

Director Johnson added the need to add that funding be contingent on delivery of the final draft recovery plan to NMFS before December 31, 2005.

Board **APPROVED** the funding request by the regional boards.

Tim Smith would like to be included in the scrubbing the legality of fund requests, addressing the five items, and consistency in approach to funding of the actions.

6th ROUND ISSUES:

A panel consisting of Steve Leider, Rollie Geppert, and Neill Aaland presented this agenda item.

Review Panel Process Update:

Steve Leider presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #6 for details.)

He reviewed the Review Panel process update portion of the notebook memorandum.

The board discussed the Review Panel's suggestion to add a more detailed rating for the projects.

Brenda McMurray is not comfortable as the process was not in place at the beginning and there is no assurance that all projects would be "evaluated" in the same way.

Dick Wallace would not want project specific comments at this point in the process but would like the Review Panel to let the board know if there is something missing in the criteria.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like the Panel to share with lead entities and the board if they find projects that they believe are really outstanding.

Steve reported that it wasn't that the Review Panel was wanting to add new criteria but to be able to look at all the projects and if there are some that are really outstanding being able to highlight those projects for the board.

Craig Partridge is concerned that this sounds like a way that the projects may get re-ranked and the board needs to be careful with that.

The board agreed that having the Review Panel add more information to the projects would not be a good idea for this round but that the Review Panel come back with suggestions for the 7th Round.

Project List Overview:

Rollie Geppert presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #6 for details.)

He reviewed the second half of the notebook memorandum highlighting the project lists. Rollie reported that one project on the San Juan lead entity list had been dropped and so the correct number of projects is 172 not the 173 as noted in the memorandum.

Craig believes it would be useful to shine the light on the staff report. Encouraging staff to be explicit and transparent on the process and their comments on projects.

Allocation Criteria (2nd tier):

Paul Dorn joined the panel during this discussion. (See notebook item #6c for details.)

Neil Aaland reviewed the options presented in the memorandum.

The board discussed the various options presented and ways to address the second increment funding.

Public Testimony:

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, noted that this is an important issue for his region. Every time the board changes its allocation process it upsets some people since they aren't getting as much as they were expecting. Believes some level of funding should go to each lead entity. Believes there is a reason to allocate across regions just as the board has allocated across lead entities although, as with the lead entity allotments, this would not be a guaranteed amount but the regions would have to meet certain criteria.

In the second increment – take 10 percent for discretionary funding take 55 percent and allocate across the regions not the same amount per region but use a weighted decision. Jeff laid out his funding allocation proposal. He also provided a handout with his proposed allocation plan.

Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually River Lead Entity, highlighted points presented in the comment letter submitted by the Nisqually River Council. The Council is in support of

option number 1 and 4. They like the idea of breaking the second increment up into three groups: a larger portion for those lead entities who have a high rating for strategy and fit to list, a smaller portion for those lead entities who do not receive as high a rating, and a third portion reserved for allocation at the SRFB's discretion. She discouraged the board from changing its process this late in the grant cycle. She would begin discussion on the 7th Round now to work through the allocation concerns and prioritization on funding. The discretionary funds could be used to fund projects highlighted by the review panel and to top off certain lists.

John Sims, Quinault WRIA 21 Lead Entity, would stop evaluating quality of strategies as most of the strategies should now be pretty good. What is a concern now is how lists link to the strategies. If the board takes fit of project list to the strategy as the scoring and rate some way then put together with Neil's criteria for option number 1. Not sure the board has time to adjust to Jeff's proposal in the time we have left in this grant round.

What chair Ruckelshaus is hearing from most of the lead entities is to not change the process from the last grant cycle.

Steve Tharinger agrees with John that there probably won't be as much difference in the lists as there was last year.

Director Johnson suggested the need to look at tie-breakers when the board gets down to the last of the funding. There is some statutory requirements that can be looked at. The board will obviously need to continue this discussion at the December meeting.

Craig Partridge wanted to make sure to address staff's question on holding discretionary funding aside. Not sure how to make this work.

Tim Smith said he just read the statutes and noted the requirements in the statute and one is the definition of the term equitable and the other is how to count endangered species. Equal is not equitable and the board needs to define what equitable means.

Director Johnson noted that in January, staff will bring two options as a recommendation for funding.

Dick Wallace would like to have time on the December agenda to discuss the 7th Round.

Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) Monitoring Funds:

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item.

A memo from Bill Ehinger was handed out outlining the concern with projects that are key to intensive monitoring but may not be on the lead entity list. Bruce discussed this issue with the board.

Craig Partridge asked where these projects came from. Bill Ehinger noted these are projects that have been identified by the IMW process. Each project is a little different but most have been identified as projects that fall under the IMW review. These projects may have a higher priority for monitoring than habitat value.

Dick Wallace noted that he is very supportive of the IMW process but not for adding IMW projects to the lead entity list.

* Bruce noted that most lead entity strategies discuss the need for IMWs but not the funding of these projects.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted the need to be aware of these projects and separate funding could be used.

Craig noted the funding identified as optional and how the board could use this to fund key IMW projects.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES AND PERFORMANCE (GMAP):

Bruce Crawford's GMAP presentation was postponed until the December meeting.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS:

Tim Smith noted that Fish and Wildlife will be presenting a smolt monitoring request to the Governor's Monitoring Forum on December 1 and would like to present this request to the SRFB on December 2. The department will need a funding decision in December to be able to set traps in January.

There were no other partner agency reports.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:



William Ruckelshaus, Chair

12/1/05
Date

Future Meetings: December 1 & 2, 2005, Seattle, Washington
January 5 & 6, 2006, Olympia, Washington