

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

March 1-2, 2017

Item	Formal Action	Follow-up Action
1. Consent Agenda A. Approve December 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes	Decision Motion: Approved	No follow-up action requested.
2. Director's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director's Report • Legislative, Budget, and Policy Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fish Barrier Removal Board • Performance Update (<i>written only</i>) • Financial Report (<i>written only</i>) 	Briefings	No follow-up action requested.
3. Salmon Recovery Management Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors Salmon Recovery Office Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Status of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund Application – 2017 Salmon Recovery Conference Update • Salmon Section Report • Recently Completed Projects 	Briefings	No follow-up action requested.
4. Reports from Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council of Regions Report • Washington Salmon Coalition Report • Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Coalition • Board Roundtable: Other Agency Updates 	Briefings	No follow-up action requested.
5. Funding Decisions A. Continued Salmon Recovery Network (SRNet) Facilitation and Use of Return Funds	Decisions Motion: Approved	The board moved to approve continued facilitation of SRNet, extending the current contract with Triangle Associates through the end of 2017 by adding \$45,000 in return funds from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) with the expectation that SRNet identify a plan of action towards a private non-profit status.

B. How to fund intensively Monitored Watershed Restoration Treatment Projects in the 2017 Grant Round	Motion: Approved	The board moved to approve waiving the match requirement as an incentive, but no additional dedicated funding for the 2017 grant round. (This was listed as Option 2 in the board memo.)
6. Follow-up on grant application questions on climate change	Request for Direction	The board requested further discussion, likely at the May retreat and at the June meeting.
7. Hatchery Reform Video Update	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
8. 2016 State of the Salmon Report	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
9. Communication Plan and Fundraising Strategy	Decision Motion: Approved	The board moved to accept the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office/Salmon Recovery Funding Board Communication and Fundraising Plans as outlined in Item 9 of the board materials. Further, the board moved to ask the staff to prepare funding, staffing and implementation options for the board to discuss at its May 24, 2017 board retreat and approve following the adoption of budget by the Legislature.
10. Allocation Committee Recommendations	Briefing & Decision Motion: Approved	The board moved to adopt the one-year guidance (known as the Hood Canal negotiated proposal*) as the interim guidance for the 2017 grant round and ask the regions to continue a dialogue for a new approach to be submitted to the board in late 2017 for the regional allocation formula in 2018 and beyond, with a work plan to the board in June 2017. <i>*See Appendix A of these minutes.</i>
11. Planning for the May 2017 Board Retreat	Request for Direction	To support policy prioritization, a survey will be sent to the board, regions and lead entities, and RCO staff to rate the highest or most important priorities. The board will discuss the results at the May retreat.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: March 1, 2017

Place: Natural Resources Building, Room 172, 1111 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

David Troutt, Chair	Olympia	Carol Smith	Department of Ecology
Nancy Biery	Quilcene	Erik Neatherlin	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bob Bugert	Wenatchee	Megan Duffy	Department of Natural Resources
Phil Rockefeller	Bainbridge Island	Brian Cochrane	Washington State Conservation Commission
Jeff Breckel	Longview		

It is intended that this summary be used with the materials provided in advance of the meeting. The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) retains a recording as the formal record of the meeting.

Opening and Welcome

Chair Troutt called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m., welcomed the board, staff, and audience. Staff called roll and a quorum was determined. Member Susan Cierebiej was excused for the first day of the meeting.

Motion: Agenda adoption
Moved by: Member Bob Bugert
Seconded by: Member Nancy Biery
Decision: Approved

Chair Troutt recognized the life and service of Brian Abbott, Executive Director of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office. The board, staff, and members of the audience took part in sharing their respects.

Item 1: Consent Agenda

The board reviewed the consent agenda which included approval of the December 8, 2016 meeting minutes.

Motion: Consent Agenda
Moved by: Member Jeff Breckel
Seconded by: Member Nancy Biery
Decision: Approved

Management and Partner Reports

Item 2: Director's Report

Director's Report: Director Cottingham briefly updated the board on correspondence sent to the Nooksack Tribe regarding six projects approved at the December 2016 meeting and internal tribal issues that may affect project contracts and funding. RCO continues to seek a resolution with the tribe,

communicating contract timelines and needs for a quorum to determine sovereign immunity to enforce project agreements.

Director Cottingham discussed communications recently sent regarding staff functions and RCO organization as it pertains to salmon recovery efforts. The messaging included information about current staff capacity and statutory requirements to inform salmon partners as the agency prepares to replace Brian Abbott, the former executive director of GSRO. The board discussed the need to cover mandatory actions, e.g., contracts and monitoring, while maintaining momentum and capacity for more visionary and supplemental actions. Suggestions included formalizing the role and responsibilities of the leadership at GSRO and assessing programs and resources to maximize integration and collaboration. Further comments were welcomed to support the agency pursue a recruitment process in March.

Legislative, Budget, and Policy Update: Wendy Brown, Policy Director, briefed the board on the current legislative session activities, including the budget, bills of interest, and policy work at RCO. She highlighted a bill that would increase the frequency of the Puget Sound Partnership's (PSP) agenda action updates, continuing to progress smoothly through the House and Senate. Another bill, Senate Bill (SB) 5391, originally from the Department of Veteran's Affairs (VA), would formalize the relationship between the board and the VA, whereby the board would cooperate with the VA to inform them of salmon-related projects in which veterans could participate. Ms. Brown also continues to monitor revenue bills and others that would impact RCO's budget.

Ms. Brown briefly summarized RCO's 2017-19 capital budget requests as they compare to the Governor's budget. She described the Book 1 versus Book 2 budgets and summarized the potential effects on the budget, particularly for the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) fund. Director Cottingham and Ms. Brown also mentioned potential impacts from school levies and the McCleary decision; to facilitate these education-related needs, agencies are required to demonstrate how budget reductions of up to 25% would impact their respective functions, funding match, and funding appropriations. The board discussed the funding match requirements and application review process of each of the grant programs included in the Governor's budgets (Book 1 and 2), receiving clarification on agencies that conduct review independently, overlap with other agencies, and utilize the board's review panel process.

Ms. Brown discussed budget provisos that 1) provide funding for a LEAN study that would bring efficiencies to the project development and prioritization process; and 2) provide funding for the top thirteen projects ranked by the Fish Barrier Removal Board. RCO expects the House and Senate budgets to be released later in March.

Item 3: Salmon Recovery Management Report

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO): Sarah Gage, Program Manager for Lead Entities, provided updates on the 2017 Salmon Recovery Conference, the current status of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) application, and the Fish Barrier Removal Board.

Ms. Gage thanked the contributing agencies and partners who help prepare for and sponsor the 6th annual salmon conference, which is scheduled for April 25-27 in Wenatchee. This year, the conference is co-sponsored by Long Live the Kings and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and hosted by Pyramid Communications. The conference will include two full days of sessions, as well as a poster session, happy hour, plenary speakers, and an outdoor recreation event. Further details are available in the board materials or at: http://www.rco.wa.gov/salmon_recovery/2017-SalmonConference/ConfHome.shtml.

Ms. Gage updated the board on the PCSRF pre-application, due March 3, 2017. She summarized the application priority areas, clarifying the amount that the agency can request in terms of funding amounts

(maximum \$25 million). The application includes funding asks primarily for regional organizations, contingent upon state funds secured through the Legislature to fund lead entities, as well as funding asks for the board's communications plan.

Salmon Section Report: Tara Galuska, RCO Salmon Section Manager, provided an update on the 2016 and 2017 grant cycles. She summarized grant project application metrics for the 2016 grant round, sharing that staff are working to put projects under agreement. For the 2017 grant round, Ms. Galuska shared the timeframes for review panel meetings, site visits with lead entities, project site visits, and application workshops.

Ms. Galuska shared that the agency is working on developing a streamlined PRISM module that will support internal management of the grant application process. Surveys conducted periodically of lead entities and regional organizations provide data that will inform the development process.

The board discussed the most recent updates to Manual 18 and the timing of review panel meetings, noting that it would be beneficial to allow more time for sponsors to prepare their applications.

Recently Completed Projects: Grant managers Mike Ramsey, Marc Duboiski and Ameer Bahr presented information about recently completed RCO projects.

Ameer Bahr, Outdoor Salmon Grant Manager, presented the Duwamish Gardens Restoration Project (RCO #13-1099) of the Puget Sound Recovery Region, sponsored by the City of Tukwila and associated with the Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity. The City of Tukwila excavated a two-acre site, removed 45,000 cubic yards of material, and created an acre of shallow water mudflat and marsh habitat restoring the shoreline at Duwamish Gardens in King County. The project provides essential habitat between freshwater and saltwater, where young salmon feed and grow, increasing their chance of survival before the transition to saltwater. Off-channel and shallow water habitats in this stretch of the Duwamish River provide opportunities for Chinook salmon, currently listed as threatened with extinction under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). People can access from East Marginal Way, where they will find a small parking lot, trail, viewpoint, and interpretive signs that focus on the cultural history of the area and ecological features of the site.

Mike Ramsey, Outdoor Salmon Grant Manager, presented the Three Crabs Restoration Education and Outreach Project (RCO #15-1329) of the Hood Canal/Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Regions, sponsored by the North Olympic Salmon Coalition and associated with the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon. The project improves access to estuarine and off-channel habitat by enhancing and stabilizing the connection between Meadowbrook Creek and the mainstem of the Dungeness River. The project removed several buildings, a 1,600 foot levee, and two undersized culverts, as well as rerouted the road, installed a 61 foot bridge, and retained a small parking lot for visitors.

Marc Duboiski, Outdoor Salmon Grant Manager, presented the North Fork Nooksack River Farmhouse Reach Project (RCO #13-1276; 14-1655; 15-1287) of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region, sponsored by the Nooksack Indian Tribe and associated with the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board Lead Entity. Mr. Duboiski added information about the tribal sovereign immunity issues discussed during the Director's Report, stating the more will be known in the next few weeks. The project is comprised of several phases constructed over the last three years with the goal of improving channel stability and establishing forested islands, including braided channels to benefit ESA-listed Chinook and Steelhead. Mr. Duboiski shared a drone video that displays aerial imagery of the project in between phases.

Item 4: Reports from Partners

Council of Regions (council): Melody Kreimes provided an update on behalf of the council, focusing on the transition to her new role as director and the relationships that each region continues to build. Additional region directors Alicia Olivas, Steve Martin, Alex Conley, Steve Manlow, and Jessica Helsley joined her, speaking to the strength of the council due to common goals and the ability to reach consensus in many areas.

Washington Salmon Coalition (WSC): Amy Hatch-Winecka, WSC Chair, and John Foltz, WSC Vice-Chair, summarized the information provided in the board materials regarding WSC work. Mr. Foltz provided an update on the lead entity process, part of the preparations for the upcoming grant round. Efforts to prepare lead entities continue, ensuring consistent messaging with local elected officials and legislative representatives. As part of the legislative outreach, WSC will hold town-hall meetings to share salmon-related needs and messaging. The WSC did not hold a winter retreat, but will hold their annual meeting on June 6-8, 2017 in Chelan. The meeting will highlight climate change discussions, refining their action plan, and election of executive officers; the board is encouraged to attend. Ms. Hatch-Winecka summarized lead entity staff changes and current vacancies. Mr. Foltz shared a video from the City of Kent describing the Mill Creek Side Channel project, as well as information regarding a project located in the Nisqually region. Further details on all topics are included in WSC report in the board materials.

Member Biery asked the WSC members to describe their role in sharing SRNet and board messaging with the lead entities. Ms. Hatch-Winecka explained that there are some limitations in place that prevent all lead entities from engaging with the Legislature, but she has taken on the role of advocating for them or communicating their concerns along with her messaging efforts.

Regional Fisheries Coalition (RFC): Colleen Thompson provided an update on behalf of the coalition regarding communications and legislative outreach. She shared the new branding of the coalition, transitioning from the "Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups Coalition" to the "Regional Fisheries Coalition," to include a new website design and related content: <http://regionalfisheriescoalition.org>. The site includes information about the coalition's education and outreach efforts across the state. Their annual work plan will include metrics for gauging public use of the site. As part of messaging this legislative session, the coalition has held over one hundred meetings with legislators. Ms. Thompson expressed appreciation for collaboration with SRNet and commented on the effectiveness of unified messaging.

Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology): Member Smith provided an update on Ecology's agency budget requests; they anticipate up to \$5 million in reductions this biennium. Ecology continues to monitor the federal administration and impacts to the Environmental Protection Agency, a major funding source for Ecology; any cuts in EPA funding will negatively affect many of Ecology's programs.

Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC): Member Cochrane provided an update on WSCC's budget asks and comparison with the Governor's budget. He will be attending a salmon-related conference later this summer in California and will report back to the board.

Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR): Member Duffy provided information on DNR's new Commissioner of Public Lands, Hilary Franz, and related policy and budget priorities for forest health and wildfire management.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Member Neatherlin provided an update regarding WDFW's budget outcomes in the Governor's budget, highlighting the inclusion of funding for the *Washington's Wild Future* initiative. The agency continues to focus on a bill that has received mixed

approval from the recreational fishing community due to fee increases; the agency is concentrating its energy to pursue this bill for revenue needs. He shared that WDFW has a paper on restoration impacts on salmon recovery, an example of agency-generated science that is peer-reviewed, published, and serving the agency in meeting recovery goals.

General Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Break: 3:24 p.m. – 3:44 p.m.

Board Business: Decisions

Item 5: Funding Decisions

Item 5A: Continued Salmon Recovery Network (SRNet) Facilitation and Use of Return Funds

Sarah Gage, GSRO Program Manager for Lead Entities, provide background on the work of the SRNet work group. SRNet workgroup members have agreed on budget priorities and continue to engage legislators regarding salmon-related funding needs. They are seeking to enlarge membership and increase their focus on state-level policy issues. SRNet workgroup members agree that ongoing professional facilitation support is vital to maintaining the momentum that SRNet has built as a forum that can speak with a unified voice for salmon and as a venue for coordination and collaboration among member organizations.

Ms. Gage shared the staff recommendation that the board approve the continued facilitation of SRNet by adding \$45,000 (from returned funds) and extending the current contract with Triangle Associates through the end of 2017.

Director Cottingham shared support for continued facilitation, commenting on the success of agreed-upon goals reached by SRNet members. She shared that the next step would be to form an independently-funded advocacy group, as they cannot lobby themselves with public funds. Member Rockefeller emphasized the need to clearly communicate these restrictions on lobbying. Director Cottingham shared that how the board chooses to spend PCSRF funds will come into play later this year, as they will decide on funding received through that grant award for communication needs. Mr. Breckel requested a later briefing to prepare staff, partners, and the board for a decision in December.

Motion: Move to approve continued facilitation of SRNet, extending the current contract with Triangle Associates through the end of 2017 by adding \$45,000 in return funds from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) with the expectation that SRNet identify a plan of action towards a private non-profit status.

Board Discussion: Member Neatherlin believes that it is critical that SRNet remain a functioning entity and that non-profit status is an achievable, important goal.

Colleen Thompson agrees with establishing a non-profit status, but expressed concerns about timelines to achieve the designation. Member Duffy questioned the membership of SRNet, in terms of the high volume of government officials, expressing that expansion is necessary to diversify the group.

Chair Troutt suggested addressing this with SRNet members; Amy Hatch-Winecka agreed, discussing the need to address communication needs and barriers from areas across the state. Member Neatherlin agreed, discussing

actions that could lead to the formulation of a more “formal” coalition effort. Member Breckel agreed with the need to expand and establish an advocate group long-term; although, SRNet is not at the stage of capacity, organization, and funding to establish a clear advocacy effort. Member Biery cautioned against adding a deadline for SRNet to reach non-profit status, but agreed with the direction.

Moved by: Member Bob Bugert
Seconded by: Member Phil Rockefeller
Decision: Approved

Item 5B: How to Fund Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) Restoration Treatment Projects in the 2017 Grant Round

Keith Dublanica, GSRO Science Coordinator, Bill Ehinger, Washington Department of Ecology, and Pete Bisson, Monitoring Review Panel Chair, addressed the board regarding funding for Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) restoration treatment projects. Mr. Dublanica provided background and context for a discussion regarding whether to continue to set aside IMW funding, which will reduce the amount available to allocate for projects across all regions. He explained that this year will be the last to receive Pacific State Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) federal funding. Mr. Dublanica discussed the continued efforts to collaborate with the technical review panel, detailing the four existing IMW complexes in order to facilitate a discussion about where IMW treatments were implemented, what other treatments are necessary, what costs are associated, and how to include regional and sponsor perspectives.

Mr. Ehinger expanded upon correspondence shared with the board about why IMW funding is necessary (see Correspondence section of the board materials). He discussed specific examples pertaining to IMW complexes, explaining that the degree to which funding affects complexes varies widely. Site-specific restoration treatment strategies allow flexibility and adaptive management, identifying fish responses and directing efforts in a more targeted manner.

Mr. Dublanica summarized the collaborative efforts to provide information to the monitoring review panel. Mr. Bisson explained that reviewing IMW projects is a large part of the monitoring panel’s work, stating that issues arise with long-term treatment needs and monitoring. The long time periods result in difficulty obtaining statistically significant data that pertains to what is working or affecting a site; short-term, frequent efforts would support more scientifically defensible results.

Director Cottingham asked for clarification regarding the previous estimate of cost. Mr. Ehinger explained that the initial funding was an estimate; changes since that time include incorporation of various restoration plans into the assessment. Chair Troutt added that the original question addressed how much funding is necessary to observe a significant response in salmon recovery, asking again what would it cost to see responses now; Member Breckel echoed the question of need and how much time is necessary. Mr. Ehinger expressed the difficulty in obtaining concrete data as it is unknown how fish will respond to habitat changes; however, studies provide adequate data for base assumptions of the time needed for long-term monitoring and fish response. Mr. Bisson responded to Chair Troutt regarding targeted efforts and funding, stating that usable scientific results are achievable, although the answers may not be conclusive. To address this, he supported spreading resources across a number of sites. The board discussed the original need for IMW treatment funding, driven by the lack of data to adequately determine fish response.

Member Rockefeller expressed that the funding over three years has not produced the desirable results and questioned whether this was a time to continue funding; rather, he supported pausing and assessing

each site for detectable responses. Member Smith summarized the discussion, stating that the board made the best decision possible based on available data, there is consensus that more time is needed; the question remains whether enough treatments have been applied or it's time to wait for fish to respond.

Public Comment

Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, addressed the board regarding the Asotin IMW complex. He explained that the region has a direct way of moving forward with monitoring; therefore, due to clear funding and decision structures, the treatments in the IMW are complete and cause for celebration. Their board will meet with the Upper Columbia IMW complex treatment team to support their efforts on March 16, focusing on restoration design, species' needs, and implementation. The board discussed alternate funding sources used by the Snake River region to achieve their monitoring goals, and whether or not this strategy would work for other IMWs.

Steve Manlow, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Director, thanked the board for dedicated support of IMW treatment funding, specifically addressing the Abernathy complex. He explained that, across several projects, responses for some species are more visible than others and continued funding would support further data gathering to answer these questions. He responded to Member Rockefeller about necessary funding, stating that many projects are already funded. The exception, Erick Creek, lacks a design to inform a true estimate, but currently holds at \$1.2 million.

Alicia Olivas, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity Program Coordinator, expressed appreciation for the funding set aside for IMWs during the last three years, detailing projects in which funding was used to implement treatments. She explained that there are completed projects that now only require monitoring; other projects may need further treatments and funding. She advocated for a no match requirement, despite the fact that some projects are county-sponsored and would receive match regardless.

Member Bugert asked whether projects rank higher due to their potential impact on listed species; Ms. Olivas and Mr. Martin affirmed the higher ranking.

Eli Asher, Restoration Ecologist with the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, addressed the board regarding the Abernathy IMW complex. He stated that legislators mainly ask whether fish are returning, a question that the Abernathy complex also aims to answer. For projects within the complex, he explained that projects, design, and plans are in place that could be implemented with approximately \$2 million. After that time, he believes the sites would benefit from monitoring alone to detect fish response. Should funding not be set aside specifically for IMWs, certain projects within the complex could go through the standard project evaluation and ranking process, although the watershed is not a focus for other major funding sources.

Chair Troutt suggested postponing a decision until after the presentation of the Allocation Subcommittee recommendations (Meeting Day 2). He agreed with Member Smith's comments on assessing fish status and response, stating that he also agrees with Mr. Bisson's strategy of pausing treatments and focusing on monitoring. Member Duffy and Member Biery requested a summary of IMW statuses to assess whether some should receive funding to push them to completion. Mr. Bisson suggested compiling a synthesis of complex projects that provides an analysis of methods that are effective to inform other efforts. Director Cottingham summarized the IMW complex regions responses, stating it is not necessary to set aside funding at this time, however tomorrow's discussion on allocation funding may be a reason to revisit a decision on IMW funding.

Board Business: Request for Direction

Item 6: Follow-up on Grant Application Questions on Climate Change

Leslie Connelly, RCO Natural Resource Policy Specialist, shared a summary and analysis of the responses from grant applicants to a new question asked about climate change in the most recent grand round. Themes emerged from the responses, such as adaption to climate change and how to mitigate climate change impacts. Examples of the former included creating higher set-back levies or adjusting acquisition strategies for land and water. Examples of mitigation included reducing impacts of impervious surface that may happen if certain properties are not required. Based on their response, project applicants have a general awareness of climate change impacts and how to address adaptation needs. She discussed potential next steps, issues to consider, and requested feedback how to proceed with addressing the effects of climate change on funded projects.

Member Breckel expressed support of including the climate change questions and the suggested ways to support applicants in responding during the grant process. He stated the need for criteria in order to make data gathered useful. Member Bugert agreed, adding the need for local or regional teams to provide input on what factors should be considered in the criteria. In line with these statements, Ms. Gage explained that the upcoming salmon recovery conference will include a climate change track and is an opportunity for further discussion about the addition of scored application questions. Member Rockefeller concurred, emphasizing the need to pre-emptively identify stressors to species.

The board requested further discussion, likely at the May retreat and at the June meeting.

Item 7: Hatchery Reform Video Update

**Postponed to Thursday, March 2.*

Closing: Day One

Chair Troutt adjourned the meeting for the day at 5:41 p.m.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: March 2, 2017

Place: Natural Resources Building, Room 172, 1111 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

David Troutt, Chair	Olympia	Carol Smith	Department of Ecology
Nancy Biery	Quilcene	Susan Cierebiej	Department of Transportation
Bob Bugert	Wenatchee	Erik Neatherlin	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phil Rockefeller	Bainbridge Island	Megan Duffy	Department of Natural Resources
Jeff Breckel	Longview	Brian Cochrane	Washington State Conservation Commission

Call to Order

Chair David Troutt called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Staff called roll and a quorum was determined.

Member Neatherlin provided information about a video hosted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). The Fish Barrier Removal Board (FBR Board) submitted their [2017-19 capital budget](#) request that includes a funding proposal for thirteen fish passage projects. In support of this budget request, the FBR Board produced [outreach materials](#), an [ArcGIS story map](#), and most recently, a video "[Making Way for Salmon](#)." Member Neatherlin shared the video with the board.

Board Business: Briefing

Item 7: Hatchery Reform Video Update

**Postponed to Thursday, March 2.*

Jennifer Johnson, GSRO, previewed a video clip as part of a larger video project funded by the board that communicates about salmon hatcheries and hatchery reform; the clip shared at the meeting focused on the importance of hatcheries to tribes. The final project, developed by Wahoo Films, will include three video clips and a longer overview video, all to be debuted at Salmon Recovery Conference in April 2017. Ms. Johnson provided background and context regarding the planning, design, and funding of the videos, which are part of a larger strategic communication plan. The videos' audiences are decision-makers, salmon restoration and hatchery managers, and the general public, to be shared at meetings, hearings, and in visits with legislators and legislative staff and posted on websites and social media channels.

Item 8: State of Salmon Report

Jennifer Johnson, GSRO, presented the [2016 State of Salmon in Watersheds](#) biennial report and accompanying [website](#), developed in collaboration with Pyramid Communications. RCO and GSRO are required by statute (RCW 77.85.020) to produce this biennial report for the Legislature describing progress on salmon recovery efforts, including the spending of salmon dollars and the status of fish and habitat, to be published at the end of every even-numbered year.

Ms. Johnson highlighted changes released as part of the 2016 version, including a simpler platform that is more focused, easier to navigate, and better for viewing on mobile devices. She shared that the GSRO and recovery regions' communications plan, user feedback, and recommendations from Pyramid Communications strongly influenced the re-design. Relative to previous years, improvements to the *2016 State of Salmon* report and updated website have already proved successful, resulting in larger numbers of website visitors, more media coverage, and significant positive feedback from viewers. The effort realized the vision of a new, insightful way to share salmon data in a narrative format with a wide range of audiences.

The Departments of Ecology (Ecology) and Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and RCO provided data for several *State of Salmon* indicators displayed in the new website. The site now includes a data portal for housing authoritative data sets that can be used for three reports: the *State of Our Watersheds* report (by the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission), the *State of the Sound* report (by the Puget Sound Partnership), and our *State of Salmon* report. In addition to the website, GSRO produced a *State of Salmon* executive summary (now called the *Governor's Update*), both in online and printed formats. The latter report intends to clearly link the Governor's office with GSRO through its updated title, calling out the shared goals and Washington-driven actions in salmon recovery.

Ms. Johnson acknowledged the efforts, contributions, and data provided by a number of partners, developers, editors, and others teamed up on the project, all of which supported the development of the

new website. She guided the board through key points in the website, highlighting messaging, goals, and available information. The website also includes information about regional investments and recommendations for reaching salmon recovery goals, as well as locally-focused ArcGIS story maps that provide a detailed look at salmon recovery issues and projects across the state.

Ms. Johnson segued from the website stories and maps to the supporting data, partner information and sources, and the twelve indicators of salmon recovery. She explored the salmon data portal, the singular location for sharing authoritative data sets about salmon, salmon habitat, funding, and projects.

The board acknowledged the improvements, expressing appreciation of the work put into implementing the re-design and updates. Member Bugert emphasized the strong language regarding climate change, stating that it is necessary and an important inclusion. Ms. Johnson responded to questions about communication and outreach, sharing the plan to post *State of Salmon* information on social media and other sites; however, there needs to be collaboration among other agencies, tribes, and organizations in sharing the website and data to encourage widespread use.

Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board, echoed the excitement and appreciation for the new website. He spoke to the collaboration with regional organizations, noting that the drive to share clear, accurate data improved the process, improved the product, and improved the relationships between GSRO and regions.

Break: 10:18 a.m. – 10:35 a.m.

Board Business: Decision

Item 9: Communication Plan and Fundraising Strategy

Barbara Cairns, Pyramid Communications, and Nancy Biery, Board Member, represented SRNet and the contracted communications specialists tasked with developing a communications plan and a supporting fundraising strategy for the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) and the board. Member Biery commented on the goals of the communications framework as it evolved, ever focused on education and collaboration. She emphasized the numerous iterations that were the result of continued feedback and revision. Ms. Cairns summarized the development of a communications plan and a supporting fundraising strategy, imparting details from users of the previous *State of Salmon* website that informed the larger communications plan. She acknowledged the vision, commitment, and motivation of Brian Abbott to bring these plans to fruition.

Ms. Cairns shared that board discussions and direction in 2014-2015 provided the initial basis for developing a unified communications plan. As part of the assessment of existing communications at the time, the information seemed to provide detail, but lacked a broad scope or framework that captured the enormity of salmon issues across the state. Feedback from legislators and other salmon partners shed light on the need to begin forming a common "salmon story" that fully described the status and need of salmon in Washington through an accessible, intentional, and strategic network. The vision is for every region to have and utilize the developed messaging framework and to spread a consistent message throughout their region and across the state.

To support strategic development, Pyramid Communications conducted a feasibility study (see Item 9 in the board materials to read the full study). The study provided information about gaps in data and communication, public understanding, and outreach efforts. Two main issues were uncovered, supporting development of a fundraising plan: inconsistent awareness horizontally and laterally about salmon recovery issues and a lack of funding and capacity to support existing and future efforts. Additionally,

there exists strong need for a communications staff person at GSRO to manage and lead implementation the communications plan.

Ms. Cairns provided an outline of the recommendations for the communications plan, emphasizing areas for continuously sharing information, providing linkages with other existing reports (e.g., the *Governor's Update*), and having capacity to coordinate a this broad effort at a level that can support local, centralized entities. The new *State of Salmon* website exemplifies these goals, as it was designed with the concept of widespread accessibility and use, making participation and local engagement a priority. Ms. Cairns explained that several different approaches supported the website's success, including individual landing pages for regions, use of best practices in technology and design, and bold messaging. Within three weeks, Pyramid and GSRO were able to identify a dramatic increase in use and reporting, evidence of successful and effective changes. Similar results from social media analysis provided further evidence that the plan is having a positive impact in amplifying key messages.

Ms. Cairns concluded by emphasizing the need to take charge of salmon messaging and provide a clear framework that will support salmon recovery goals. Each plan includes specific strategies and funding suggestions that need leadership and coordination, capacity, and resources to implement.

The board expressed consensus in needing to fund and implement the communications and fundraising plans, acknowledging the challenges discussed by Ms. Cairns.

Motion: Move to accept the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office/Salmon Recovery Funding Board Communication and Fundraising Plans as outlined in Item 9 of the board materials. Further, move to ask the staff to prepare funding, staffing and implementation options for the board to discuss at its May 24, 2017 board retreat and approve following the adoption of budget by the Legislature.

Moved by: Member Bob Bugert

Seconded by: Member Nancy Biery

Decision: Approved

The board discussed the upcoming opportunities at the 2017 Salmon Recovery Conference for further outreach and sharing of the communication framework messaging and goals. Board members acknowledged the work of Ms. Cairns, Member Biery, and the many others who supported development of the plans. Staff will develop proposals for board consideration from the plans and present them at the June meeting.

Lunch: 11:45 a.m. – 12:50 p.m.

Board Business: Briefings & Decision

Item 10: Allocation Subcommittee Recommendations

Leslie Connelly, RCO Natural Resource Policy Specialist, summarized the progress of the Allocation Subcommittee, tasked with developing recommendations on the allocation of salmon state and federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) money. Historically, allocations were based on subjective factors that have led regions to pursue an objectively-based formula that recognizes regional approaches, complexity, and differences, as well as listed and non-listed species. Ms. Connelly described previous approaches to determine allocation funding, including a summary of the 2006 Task Force and factors that the subcommittee mainly agreed upon to determine the new formula. Due to the short amount of time and lack of consensus on factors to use, there is no formal recommendation from the subcommittee.

Therefore, the recommendations shared today were primarily focused on a proposed project allocation formula.

Ms. Connelly presented scenarios developed by the subcommittee that illustrated the potential outcomes of various allocation formulas. She guided the board through several assumptions that affect allocation scenarios, including funding from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), additional funding from the state for bull trout, or that the formulas may affect regions diversely, and ultimately, that the formula for allocation should continue to be revisited. The subcommittee established several guidance principles to achieve consensus using these assumptions, e.g., balancing regional needs and taking a state-wide perspective.

Ms. Connelly presented the biological and geographic factors agreed upon by the subcommittee, describing remaining issues of using a population versus species scale for the former factor, and how to count miles for the latter factor. Ms. Connelly displayed a comparison of the current allocation to the outcomes of two different scenarios in which the biological and geographic factors are assigned different weighted percentages (based on exercises conducted by the subcommittee); the comparisons highlighted the funding shifts that would occur among certain regions.

Ms. Connelly requested board direction on the assumptions and framework utilized, questions about the role of verifying data for the allocation, how to move forward using adaptive management, and concluded with a proposed timeline for moving forward with the subcommittee recommendations.

Ms. Connelly responded to board questions regarding the inclusion of existing NOAA-endorsed salmon recovery plans which include information about restoration potential and productivity, explaining that the plans were used heavily for population data and habitat productivity; however, the plans did not make it possible to compare data equivocally as all regions are unique.

Public Comment

Alicia Olivas, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity Program Coordinator, addressed the board with a proposal to allow more time to regions to come to a consensus on a formula for allocation. The proposal included the recommendation to use an independent consultant; she shared data tables with the board with an alternate structure for allocation across regions using weighted formulas (*see Appendix A for the interim proposal*). The proposal attempts to link allocations to the criteria while considering the data insufficiencies. Ms. Olivas shared that all regions, except Northeast, have had the opportunity to review this proposal.

Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, shared comments from a letter drafted by his board outlining their concerns regarding the process to reach a new allocation formula. He expressed concerns about the factors and percentages used to reach the proposed framework, stating that there was something “fundamentally wrong.” He encouraged the board to use the information presented lightly, cautioning that the data is not consistent or robust enough to provide a sound framework. He stated his belief that a stronger biologically-based process exists. He expressed concurrence with Ms. Olivas’ proposal of an independent consultant to answer the fundamental question of how effective salmon recovery funding is and how it is being implemented. He advocated that the subcommittee report be used “lightly,” and that his board is open to a more collaborative, region-driven solution.

Mr. Martin responded to board questions about the criteria used, explaining that there are too many inconsistencies in the data, too many complexities and nuanced factors that are preventing acceptance of the current recommendations.

Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board, addressed concerns about how the biological and geographic factors were determined and the surrounding lack of consensus. He explained that the resulting scenarios are too nuanced in how data is used in various scenarios and have dramatic differences across regions. He rejected the proposed scenarios and shared feedback from his board about how to reach an allocation formula that is more equivocal.

Melody Kreimes, Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) Executive Director, **Steve Jenkins**, Douglas County Commissioner, and **Andy Hover**, Okanogan County Commissioner, addressed the board. Ms. Kreimes agreed that more time is needed to determine an allocation formula. She stated that the input from the UCSRB was not solicited or included in the formulation of the recommendations. Explaining the local environmental concerns, she shared information about how the proposed allocation scenarios would disproportionately affect the Upper Columbia region. She advocated for a solution that all regions can agree upon. UCSRB member Mr. Jenkins provided background context regarding historical funding allocations, explaining that the give and take across regions causes contention and has been a difficult process. He agreed with the need for a more equitable solution. Mr. Hover cautioned the board on deciding policy based on insufficient data that has far-reaching implications. He discussed the conflict between objectively viewing scientific data and experiencing the local environment. He urged a more thorough vetting process, and recommended maintaining the current funding levels while reviewing current data, then moving to make a policy decision.

Chair Troutt summarized the public comment received and asked the regional directors what could be agreed upon, using a percentage-based adjustment as an example. Mr. Jenkins and Ms. Kreimes expressed concerns about how this would translate to projects and lead to uncertainties about sustained funding. Chair Troutt explained that while there remains some disagreement, it is important for the board to make progress today, even minimally.

Jessica Helsley, Coast Salmon Partnership Executive Director, commented on the need to update the historical formula that no longer serves regions. She spoke to the inequality of resources and capacity, characterizing her region as consistently receiving insufficient support. However, she explained that the region remains open to collaborating with the board and regions to reach an equitable solution.

Stacy Vynne, Puget Sound Partnership / Puget Sound Regional Organization Regional Manager, expressed support of the proposal submitted by RCO staff and believes either would be beneficial to the region. She acknowledged the work of the facilitator and the regions' attempt to reach consensus, supporting a data-driven decision. She stated that the region would support a consensus-driven solution, but further guidance from the board is necessary. She responded to board questions about the cost-benefit tradeoff of pursuing debates on the allocation formula, an issue of limited staff time and capacity.

Steve Manlow, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Director, appreciated the subcommittee process established by the board. He acknowledged the lack of consensus, but cautioned the board against getting lost in the data and instead, focusing on the scenario outcomes. He expressed support of the Hood Canal interim proposal. Long-term, the region recognizes that funding shifts are always a concern. The interim proposal would provide certainty for project funding and allow for necessary additional time to develop allocations that more closely address recovery goals.

Jacob Anderson, Klickitat Lead Entity Program Coordinator, supported a solution that would provide consensus and meet the needs for future adjustments.

Amy Hatch-Winecka, Washington Salmon Coalition (WSC) Chair, and **John Foltz**, WSC Vice-Chair, acknowledged the difficulties in reaching consensus, concerned about fracturing communication across regions. She agreed with the suggestion to allow more time to consider a long-term allocation, and that

the board should consider the interim proposal. Additional time would allow for data refinement and further analysis in fall and winter, supporting development of more effective criteria for potential adoption at the December meeting and implementation in 2018. She commented on the cap on lead entities in the interim proposal, stating that this may need more discussion. Mr. Foltz stated the lack of consensus on the metrics utilized and of the inequitable impacts to different regions of the proposed scenarios' weighted criteria.

Chair Troutt clarified that the goal is to find a solution that moves the state forward as a whole, without detrimentally impacting any specific region.

Break: 2:26 p.m. – 2:44 p.m.

Council of Regions Directors, Melody Kreimes, Alex Conley, Jessica Helsley, Steve Martin, Stacy Vynne, Alicia Olivas, and Steve Martin addressed the board. Ms. Kreimes spoke on behalf of the board, stating their desire for additional time to reach consensus.

Chair Troutt shared that the PCSRF application will be submitted tomorrow and should include information about an allocation formula tied to biological criteria, in order to avoid an unfavorable award or response from NOAA. The board and COR discussed the expansion of the subcommittee to alleviate regional tensions. Chair Troutt clarified that there was consensus on revisiting the formula more frequently.

Motion: Move to adopt the one-year guidance (known as the Hood Canal negotiated proposal*) as the interim guidance for the 2017 grant round and ask the regions to continue a dialogue for a new approach to be submitted to the board in late 2017 for the regional allocation formula in 2018 and beyond, with a work plan to the board in June 2017.

**See Appendix A of these minutes.*

Moved by: Member Phil Rockefeller

Seconded by: Member Bob Bugert

Board Discussion: Member Neatherlin asked to include the clarifications noted in the proposal be part of the board motion. Director Cottingham suggested amendatory language, which was incorporated by Member Rockefeller into his motion. Member Breckel requested that the COR return in June with a work plan for completing this work, with assistance and guidance from the board as needed. Director Cottingham again suggested language, which was incorporated by Member Rockefeller. She noted that she will continue conversations with the regions to extend the contract with Elizabeth McManus to facilitate the regional tasks, as appropriate.

Decision: Approved

Item 5B: How to Fund Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) Restoration Treatment Projects in the 2017 Grant Round (continued)

Keith Dublinica, GSRO Science Coordinator, recapped the earlier board discussion on IMW restoration treatment funding and the decision to postpone a motion until the allocation recommendations were discussed. He presented revised options for board decision ([see Item 5B presentation](#)). The board discussed the options, considering impacts to the Hood Canal and Lower Columbia regions. Considering

the interim allocation proposal now approved, the regions' directors and board discussed funding the IMW complexes and potentially waiving match requirements, as well as specific project needs within the two regions. Several board members stated the need to complete treatments and move to a monitoring phase. Before approving additional IMW treatment funding, the board requested additional information from the monitoring panel regarding Hood Canal IMW projects' significance to the larger ecosystem improvement.

Motion: (Option #2) Move to approve waiving the match requirement as an incentive, but no additional IMW-dedicated project funding for the 2017 grant round.

Moved by: Member Bob Bugert

Seconded by: Member Nancy Biery

Decision: Approved

Board Business: Request for Direction

Item 11: Planning for the May 2017 Board Retreat

RCO Director Kaleen Cottingham shared that the board's Retreat Planning Subcommittee and RCO staff met on February 9, 2017 to begin the development of an agenda for the retreat scheduled for May 24, 2017 at the LOTT Clean Water Alliance building in downtown Olympia. Summarizing the subcommittee discussion and suggested agenda topics, Director Cottingham requested board direction on the proposed retreat agenda, as well as a review of the current and potential policy priorities or special projects to include on the list of potential work for the coming biennium.

The board discussed the policy priorities and grouped them into themed categories according to funding, the role of the board, and the future direction of the board. To support policy prioritization, a survey will be sent to the board, regions and lead entities, and RCO staff to rate the highest or most important priorities for the coming biennium. The board will discuss the results at the May retreat.

Closing

Chair Troutt adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for June 14-15, 2017 in Olympia.

Approved by:



David Troutt, Chair

6/14/17

Date

Interim Regional Project Allocation Proposal															
	WRIAs		Salmon Miles Including Saltwater Shoreline		Non-listed stocks		Listed Salmon/Steelhead Populations		Non-listed Species		Listed ESU/ DPS #		Listed Bull Trout Pops		Calculated Allocation
Proposed Weights	5%		10%		10%		35%		10%		20%		10%		
Region	#	Weighted Percent	#	Weighted Percent	#	Weighted Percent	#	Weighted Percent	#	Weighted Percent	#	Weighted Percent	#	Weighted Percent	Percent
Coast	5	0.50%	7,342	2.63%	113	4.48%	1	0.22%	5	2.78%	2	1.74%	5	0.39%	12.74%
Lower Columbia	5	0.50%	2,566	0.92%	3	0.12%	68	15.04%	1	0.56%	5	4.35%	3	0.23%	21.72%
Mid Columbia	6	0.60%	2,011	0.72%	12	0.48%	7	1.60%	5	2.78%	2	1.74%	16	1.25%	9.17%
Northeast	1	0.10%	262	0.09%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.87%	2	0.16%	1.22%
Puget Sound	19	1.90%	12,652	4.53%	114	4.52%	54	11.94%	3	1.67%	3	2.61%	67	5.23%	32.41%
Hood Canal C.C.	5	0.50%	968	0.35%	0	0.00%	11.0	2.43%	0	0.00%	1	0.87%	0	0.00%	4.15%
Snake River	3	0.30%	1,212	0.43%	1	0.04%	10	2.21%	1	0.56%	5	4.35%	16	1.25%	9.14%
Upper Columbia	6	0.60%	901	0.32%	9	0.36%	7	1.55%	3	1.67%	4	3.48%	19	1.48%	9.46%
Total	50	5.00%	27,914		252	10.00%	158	35.00%	18	10.00%	23	20.00%	128	10%	100.00%

Negotiated allocation proposal with regions with a decrease in allocation accepting 5% reduction with the exception of Puget Sound

Region	Allocation Scenario	Current Allocation	Negotiated PROPOSAL	Percent change from current	Percent change from scenario
Coast	12.74%	9.00%	9.57%	6.33%	-24.90%
Lower Columbia	21.72%	15.00%	20.00%	33.33%	-7.90%
Mid Columbia	9.17%	9.87%	9.38%	-4.96%	2.32%
Northeast	1.22%	2.00%	1.90%	-5.00%	55.78%
Puget Sound	32.41%	42.04%	38.00%	-9.61%	17.25%
Hood Canal C.C.	4.15%	2.35%	2.40%	2.13%	-42.16%
Snake River	9.14%	8.88%	8.44%	-4.95%	-7.65%
Upper Columbia	9.46%	10.85%	10.31%	-4.98%	9.02%

Historic SRFB Funding

FY 2001-'06 Percent	FY 2007 Percent	FY 2008-'16 Percent
10%	8%	9.00%
7%	15%	15.00%
6%	10%	9.87%
2%	2%	2.00%
57%	42.61%	42.04%
6%	2.39%	2.35%
3%	9%	8.88%
9%	11%	10.85%
100%	100%	100%