

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Meeting Agenda

**September 12, 2018**

Natural Resources Building, Room 172, Olympia, WA 98501

**Time:** Opening sessions will begin as shown; all other times are approximate.

**Order of Presentation:** In general, each agenda item will include a presentation, followed by board discussion and then public comment. The board makes decisions following the public comment portion of the agenda item.

**Public Comment:** To comment at the meeting, please fill out a comment card and provide it to staff. Please be sure to note on the card if you are speaking about a particular agenda topic. The chair will call you to the front at the appropriate time. Public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

You also may submit written comments to the board by mailing them to the RCO, Attn: Wyatt Lundquist, Board Liaison, at the address above or at [Wyatt.Lundquist@rco.wa.gov](mailto:Wyatt.Lundquist@rco.wa.gov)

**Special Accommodations:** Persons with disabilities needing an accommodation to participate in RCO public meetings are invited to contact us via the following options: 1) Leslie Frank by phone (360) 902-0220 or email [leslie.frank@rco.wa.gov](mailto:leslie.frank@rco.wa.gov); or 2) 711 relay service. Accommodation requests should be received by March 7, 2018 to ensure availability.

## Wednesday, September 12

### OPENING AND MANAGEMENT REPORTS

<b>9:00 a.m.</b>	<b>Call to Order</b>	<i>Chair</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roll Call and Determination of Quorum</li> <li>• Review and Approval of Agenda (<b>Decision</b>)</li> <li>• Approve August, 2018 Meeting Minutes (<b>Decision</b>)</li> <li>• <i>Introduction and welcome of Amber Moore with Puget Sound Partnership (PSP)</i></li> <li>• Remarks by the chair</li> </ul>	
<b>9:15 a.m.</b>	<b>1. Director's Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Director's Report</li> <li>B. Legislative, Budget, and Policy Updates</li> <li>C. Performance Update (<i>written only</i>)</li> <li>D. Fiscal Report (<i>written only</i>)</li> </ul>	<i>Kaleen Cottingham</i> <i>Wendy Brown</i>
<b>9:45 a.m.</b>	<b>2. Salmon Recovery Management Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Salmon Recovery Conference Planning Update</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Salmon Section Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Highlights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Smith Island in Snohomish/Puget Sound (<a href="#">09-1279</a>)</li> <li>▪ Beards Cove Restoration in Hood Canal (<a href="#">14-1326</a>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Steve Martin</i> <i>Sarah Gage</i> <i>Tara Galuska</i>  <i>Elizabeth Butler</i> <i>Josh Lambert</i>
<b>10:15 a.m.</b>	<b>3. Update on Orca Task Force</b>	Steve Martin, GSRO

10:45 a.m.	4. Reports from Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Governor’s Office</li><li>Conservation Commission</li><li>Department of Natural Resources</li><li>Department of Fish and Wildlife</li><li>Department of Transportation</li><li>WA Salmon Coalition</li><li>Council of Regions</li><li>Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups</li></ul>	JT Austin Brian Cochrane Stephen Bernath Erik Neatherlin Susan Kanzler Alicia Olivas Steve Manlow
11:15 a.m.	BREAK	
11:30 a.m.	General Public Comment: Please limit comments to 3 minutes.	
11:45 a.m.	5. Update on the Lean Study	Kaleen Cottingham Judy Wells, MC <sup>2</sup>
12:15 p.m.	LUNCH (on your own)	
BOARD BUSINESS: DECISION		
1:00 p.m.	6. Assessments, Planning Grants & Eligibility	Tara Galuska, RCO
1:30 p.m.	7. Puget Sound Rapid Response	Tara Galuska, RCO Suzanna Stoikes, PSP
2:00 p.m.	8. Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop Update & Next Steps	Keith Dublanica, GSRO Pete Bisson and Leska Fore Monitoring Panel co-chairs
2:30 p.m.	BREAK	
BOARD BUSINESS: BRIEFING		
2:45 p.m.	9. Overview of the new Priority Habitat and Species: Riparian Ecosystem Document (which is part of the Aquatic Habitat Guidelines)	Keith Folkerts, WDFW
3:30 p.m.	10. Puget Sound Marine Survival & Hood Canal Bridge Study	Jacques White, LLTK
4:30 p.m.	ADJOURN	

**Next regular SRFB meeting:** December 5-6, 2018, Natural Resources Building, Room 172, Olympia, WA 98501

## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12, 2018

**Title:** Director's Report

#### Summary

This memo outlines key agency activities and happenings.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Direction
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Briefing

#### In this Report:

Agency update  
Legislative, budget, and policy updates  
Fiscal report  
Performance update

### Agency Update

#### Taking our Boards on the Road

This has been a big summer for RCO, having all four of its boards meet within 6 weeks and having three of those meetings on the road. The Washington Invasive Species Council traveled to Airway Heights, near Spokane, for its June 21 meeting where Northern Pike continued to be a hot topic. The council also heard about the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's new decontamination station on Interstate 90 near Spokane. The council was so pleased it decided to write a letter commending the department for its efforts to prevent the invasion of zebra and quagga mussels.



The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board met in Winthrop in July. The board had the opportunity to see funded projects on-the-ground. The projects that were highlighted throughout the tour of the Methow Valley included: the Chickadee trail system around Sun Mountain Lodge, the Winthrop Ice Rink, the Susie Stephens Bridge over the Methow River, the Mazama Trailhead, the Methow Community Trail, the Twisp Community Park and Trail, the Lehman Ranch, the Methow Wildlife Area, and Pearygin Lake State Park.

The Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group also met in June. At the heart of the meeting was the agency updates on proposed land acquisitions and disposals for 2019-2021 biennium.

And as you know, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board traveled to Stevenson, near the Oregon border for its late June meeting with the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB).

### Salmon Grant Applications Near Due

Salmon Section staff are managing grant applications, with 200 submitted so far for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board and Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration grant programs. Final applications were due August 9, as well as draft ranked project lists from each lead entity. The board's review panel met in July to discuss the site visits and identify which projects may need a review by the full review panel. The panel will meet again in September to discuss final applications. The review panel has until Sept. 28 to finish writing comment forms for projects.



### Lean Project to Exam Salmon Board's Grant Process Underway

A Lean project to look at the way projects are recruited, reviewed, and ranked for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board is well underway. Consultants have wrapped up interviews with lead entities, regions, sponsors, review panel, RCO staff, SRFB, and federal staff at NOAA. Surveys have been conducted with lead entities and sponsors. An internal working group has helped review project metrics and actively working on interviews with possible benchmark organizations. So far the working group has met with the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, the Transportation Improvement Board, the Department of Ecology's Floodplains by Design team, and the Washington Conservation Commission. The project is guided by a steering committee made up of members of the SRFB, regions, lead entities, and RCO staff.



### Orca Task Force

Last spring the Governor signed [Executive Order 18-02](#) directing state agencies to take several immediate actions to benefit southern residents killer whales and establishing a Task Force to develop recommendations for orca recovery and future sustainability. The report from the Task Force is due by November 1, 2018. The Task force is focusing on three areas that are major threats to these whales: prey availability, toxic contaminants, and disturbance from noise and vessel traffic. RCO is represented on the Task Force by the Director and the Prey Availability Work Group is being co-chaired by Steve Martin, RCO staff and the Executive Coordinator of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office.

## Employee Changes

- **Beth Auerbach** and **Brian Carpenter** joined Recreation and Conservation Grants Section as outdoor grants managers in August. Auerbach was a small business owner and has worked as an environmental consultant, planner, designer, parks liaison, farm intern, and lead rock climbing instructor. Carpenter was a camp and facilities director of YMCA camps in Washington.
- **Julia Marshburn** joined the Grant Services Section in July as an administrative assistant. She has experience running a small business, training others, and dealing with customers and their complaints.
- **Brianna Widner** joined the Invasive Species team in August. She has experience in outdoor education and previously worked for the Mason Conservation District.
- RCO said farewell in July to **Kenzi Smith**, our student intern for the Invasive Species Council.



Beth



Brian



Julia



Brianna

## Legislative Update

No update at this time.

## Fiscal Report

The fiscal report reflects Salmon Recovery Funding Board activities as of August 14, 2018

### Balance Summary

Fund	Balance
Current State Balance	\$8,627,989
Current Federal Balance – Projects	\$11,179,237
Current Federal Balance – Activities, Hatchery Reform, Monitoring	\$9,343,135
Lead Entities	\$761,918
Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) and Puget Sound Restoration	\$11,316,374

### Salmon Recovery Funding Board

For July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2019, actuals through August 14, 2018 (FM 13). 54.1% of biennium reported.

PROGRAMS	BUDGET	COMMITTED		TO BE COMMITTED		EXPENDITURES	
	New and Re-appropriation 2017-2019	Dollars	% of Budget	Dollars	% of Budget	Dollars	% of Completed
<b>State Funded</b>							
2011-13	\$1,041,597	\$1,041,597	100%	\$0	0%	\$507,786	49%
2013-15	\$6,733,668	\$6,655,163	99%	\$78,505	1%	\$2,712,409	41%
2015-17	\$11,226,506	\$11,226,506	100%	\$0	0%	\$4,520,194	40%
2017-19	\$15,694,911	\$7,145,427	52%	\$8,549,484	48%	\$479,786	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>34,696,682</b>	<b>26,068,693</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>8,627,989</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>8,220,175</b>	<b>32%</b>

PROGRAMS	BUDGET	COMMITTED		TO BE COMMITTED		EXPENDITURES	
	New and Re-appropriation 2017-2019	Dollars	% of Budget	Dollars	% of Budget	Dollars	% of Completed
<b>Federal Funded</b>							
2013	\$3,525,731	\$3,525,731	100%	\$0	0%	\$3,525,731	100%
2014	\$5,676,660	\$4,812,753	85%	\$863,907	15%	\$2,158,033	45%
2015	\$8,049,376	\$7,638,287	95%	\$411,089	5%	\$3,289,533	43%
2016	\$15,544,946	\$12,753,247	82%	\$2,791,698	18%	\$5,175,022	41%
2017	\$18,236,000	\$17,136,877	94%	\$1,099,123	6%	\$2,637,784	15%
2018	\$18,236,000	\$2,879,445	16%	15,356,555	84%	\$0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,268,713</b>	<b>48,746,340</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>20,522,373</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>16,786,103</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>Grant Programs</b>							
Lead Entities	\$7,689,199	\$6,927,281	90%	\$761,918	10%	\$2,680,438	39%
PSAR	\$75,653,126	\$64,336,752	85%	\$11,316,374	15%	\$15,915,502	23%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>187,307,719</b>	<b>146,079,067</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>41,228,652</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>43,602,217</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>Administration</b>							
Admin/ Staff	6,327,796	6,327,796	100%	0	0%	3,003,376	47%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,327,796</b>	<b>6,327,796</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3,003,376</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$193,635,515</b>	<b>\$152,406,863</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>\$41,228,652</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>\$46,605,593</b>	<b>31%</b>

*Note: Activities such as smolt monitoring, effectiveness monitoring, and regional funding are combined with projects in the state and federal funding lines above.*

## Performance Update

The following data is for grant management and project impact performance measures for fiscal year 2019. Data included are specific to projects funded by the board and current as of August 13, 2018.

### Project Impact Performance Measures

The following tables provide an overview of the fish passage accomplishments funded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) in fiscal year 2019. Grant sponsors submit these performance measure data for blockages removed, fish passages installed, and stream miles made accessible when a project is completed and in the process of closing. The Forest Family Fish Passage Program and Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program are not included in these totals.

Six salmon blockages were removed so far this fiscal year (July 1, 2018 to August 13, 2018), with six passageways installed (Table 1). These projects have cumulatively opened 7 miles of stream (Table 2).

**Table 1. SRFB-Funded Fish Passage Metrics**

Measure	FY 2018 Performance
Blockages Removed	6
Bridges Installed	3
Culverts Installed	3
Fish Ladders Installed	0
Fishway Chutes Installed	0

**Table 2. Stream Miles Made Accessible by SRFB-Funded Projects in FY 2018**

Project Number	Project Name	Primary Sponsor	Stream Miles
<a href="#">14-1660</a>	Haehule Culvert Replacement	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	1.2
<a href="#">15-1533</a>	Rue Creek Salmon Restoration Project	Pacific Conservation Dist	4.2
<a href="#">16-1231</a>	Thunder Road Fish Passage Project	Quileute Tribe of the Quileute	1.6
<b>Total Miles</b>			<b>7.0</b>

**Grant Management Performance Measures**

Table 3 summarizes fiscal year 2019 operational performance measures as of August 13, 2018.

**Table 3. SRFB-Funded Grants: Management Performance Measures**

Measure	FY Target	FY 2018 Performance	Indicator	Notes
Percent of Salmon Projects Issued Agreement within 120 Days of Board Funding	90%	<b>86%</b>	●	7 agreements for SRFB-funded projects were to be mailed this fiscal year to date. Staff mail agreements on average 10 days after a project is approved.
Percent of Salmon Progress Reports Responded to On Time (15 days or less)	90%	<b>98%</b>	●	A total of 96 progress reports were due this fiscal year to date for SRFB-funded projects. Staff responded to 94 in 15 days or less. On average, staff responded in 5 days.
Percent of Salmon Bills Paid within 30 days	100%	<b>100%</b>	●	During this fiscal year to date, 164 bills were due for SRFB-funded projects. All were paid on time.
Percent of Projects Closed on Time	85%	<b>85%</b>	●	A total of 13 SRFB-funded projects were scheduled to close so far this fiscal year; 11 closed on time.
Number of Projects in Project Backlog	5	<b>6</b>	●	Six SRFB-funded projects are in the backlog. This is more than the last board meeting.
Number of Compliance Inspections Completed	125	<b>5</b>	●	Staff have inspected 5 worksites this fiscal year to date. They have until June 30, 2019 to reach the target.



## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Decision Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12, 2018

**Title:** Salmon Recovery Management Report

**Prepared By:** Steve Martin, Executive Coordinator, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office  
Tara Galuska, Salmon Section Manager, Recreation and Conservation Office  
Sarah Gage, Program Manager, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

#### Summary

The following memo highlights the good work recently completed by the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and the Recreation and Conservation Office's Salmon Section.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

- ☐ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☒ Briefing

### Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

#### Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) Work Plan Highlights

The 2018 GSRO work plan will be reviewed by GSRO and Director Cottingham later this year and is likely to be revised to reflect new and or changing tasks. For example, the Governor's Executive Order creating the Southern Resident Killer Whale (SRKW) Task Force and tasks assigned to the GSRO have added a significant unanticipated workload that will not end once the Task Force delivers its first report to the Governor in November. And while the state agency policy workgroup has yet to be created, (primarily due to demands on everyone involved with the SRKW) it will add additional responsibility. Outreach and relationship building needs to remain at the forefront but the effort for this task has waned in recent months.

#### Salmon Recovery Network Update

The Salmon Recovery Network (SRNet) has been meeting monthly and continues to encourage development of a new non-profit organization for the purpose of advocating for the salmon recovery efforts across the state and amongst many partners. During last legislative session, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) convened partners each Friday to review legislation and develop perspectives for other to use when they share their perspective in hearings or with legislators. TNC may convene salmon recovery partners, including those on SRNet, starting this fall to to prepare for the upcoming legislative session. At their early-June meeting, SRNet heard from several state agencies about their 2019-2021 budget priorities. The remaining agencies are scheduled to share their budget priorities with SRNet at the September meeting. Agency budget requests will be reflected in a condensed version of last session's "budget buddy" with the intended outcome being a letter from SRNet or individual organizations participating in SRNet, to the Governor in support of the agencies' budgets.

#### State of Salmon in Watersheds Report

Jennifer Johnson (GSRO) and RCO staff are building content for the 2018 State of Salmon report:

[www.stateofsalmon.wa.gov](http://www.stateofsalmon.wa.gov). Recovery regions, staff from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Ecology, and others are contributing. GSRO will meet with the NW Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC), the Governor's Office and SRFB September 2018



others to update the report to capture new data and stories about salmon recovery efforts from around the state. The report is on-line and accessible via computer or hand held device. The content in the report will be updated, and the usability will be improved, but the overall look and feel of the site will be consistent with our current version. The Governor's executive summary will be printed in December and will again include input from the Governor about our salmon recovery efforts, progress and challenges.

### **Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board (FBRB)**

In 2017, the FBRB developed a list of 79 projects (24 design and 55 construction) totaling \$51.4 million. The final adopted budget included \$19.7 million, which will fund 13 specifically-listed fish passage projects. The FBRB is scoping a public celebration for the first project constructed by this new program.

This year, the FBRB released a request for proposals (RFP) to more than 4,000 recipients, including the regional organizations and lead entities. This request was for projects in the coordinated pathway. At its August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, the FBRB approved \$31.3 million for 66 projects that address 81 barriers representing a mix of private, city, county and state sites that will open up roughly 160 miles of habitat. Further assessment is underway but at first glance about a dozen of these projects address chinook that would benefit SRKW but this initial estimate is subject to change. The FBRB and WDFW will be working closely with the RCO to develop the budget proposal for 2019-2021 based on the lists of projects received as part of this RFP as well as some of those that were submitted last biennium.

### **Washington DC outreach and Congressional field tours**

Steve Martin coordinated and attended a Washington DC Salmon Day outreach trip the week of June 11<sup>th</sup>. He worked with our congressional coordinators, regional directors, Tribes, and agencies on the message, team, and logistics for this June event. Salmon recovery leaders from Oregon, Idaho and California were part of the planning team and were part of the contingent that made the trip. Key message to our delegation was one of appreciation for their support of PCSRF and the many other federal programs we rely on in the Pacific Northwest. In addition to this June DC outreach effort, he also had the opportunity and pleasure of joining the very impressive Puget Sound team at their May 23<sup>rd</sup> Puget Sound on the Hill trip. These outreach efforts continue to be appreciated and welcome by our delegation.

In mid-August, Steve attended 2 days of a south Puget Sound/Hood Canal congressional field tour hosted and organized by WDFW. Several congressional staff members as well as Steve Koepecki (United States Army Core of Engineers, DC office) and multiple Puget Sound salmon recovery partners shared and learned about the WDFW Soos Creek hatchery upgrade, fish passage efforts in the pristine upper Green River, challenges with the Hood Canal floating bridge, Duckabush Estuary restoration plans and discussed nearshore habitat while aboard boats in Dabob Bay. Taylor Seafoods representatives discussed how they are adapting their operations to ocean acidification and then provided a barbecued seafood lunch for the group that was phenomenal and greatly appreciated. Scott Brewer, director of the Hood Canal salmon recovery organization reported the status and trend of Hood Canal summer chum noting the positive trend recent high abundance for this stock. At the end of the day, Steve commented to the group that we have seen many outstanding salmon recovery projects with strong partnerships leveraging multiple fund sources which are complete or active while noting the long, long list of excellent projects that are teed up awaiting funding. The PCSRF funds are critical to support the foundation by which other funds are leveraged and to fund the human capacity to make that work possible.

The following week, Steve and Eryn Couch participated in a field tour in southeast Washington hosted and organized by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC). Congressional staff from several states and from both eastern and western Washington attended, along with WDFW, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), Boonville Power Administration (BPA), and others. Tour sites included Lyons Ferry National Fish Hatchery, Little Goose Dam, a renewable energy Wind Farm on the hills above the Tucannon River, the Mill Creek headwaters as well as Mill Creek within the urban area of the City of Walla Walla, the South Fork Walla Walla River habitat restoration sites, and the CTUIR spring chinook hatchery which is undergoing significant expansion and increased production with funding from BPA. Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Executive Director, John Foltz, addressed the group at Mill Creek adjacent to the Walla Walla Community College. He reported that Mill Creek fish passage is finally getting addressed thanks to PCSRF/SRFB funded designs, USACOE commitments, CTUIR investments and project sponsorship by the Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group, Tri State Steelheaders. The Walla Walla Water and Environment Center was the site for the CTUIR to SRFB September 2018

discuss their programs including a lamprey hatchery that they are operating on-site. A very impressive suite of habitat restoration efforts were noted and much like Puget Sound, and all across the state, many, many more are lined up awaiting funding.

### **2019 Salmon Recovery Conference**

After a competitive request for proposals and review, RCO selected Western Washington University- Conference Services (WWU-CS) to provide conference management and registration services. The contract covers all aspects of the 2019 Salmon Recovery Conference except for session and presentation screening and selection, and the invitation of plenary speakers.

WWU-CS will hold and administer all the subcontracts (e.g., meeting facility, hotel/room blocks, catering, audio visual, exhibit booth and poster board supplier, etc.). The contractor will also be responsible for helping RCO set registration fees and sponsorship goals to ensure that the conference is self-supporting.

Significant staff time still will be required for contract oversight, session and presentation screening and selection, plenary speaker contact, other agenda development tasks, and Web site and social media content and posting. RCO plans for three committees to aid in conference development: 1) Logistics Committee—an in-house crew to work directly with WWU-CS; 2) Program Committee—subject matter experts to screen session and presentation proposals; 3) Steering Committee—board members and others who will provide high level ideas, vision, and direction.

Staff will provide updates at the board meeting, including progress on setting the date and place of the conference and coordination with the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission's International Year of the Salmon activities.

### **Lead Entity Shift**

RCO has received letters from the governments in Water Resource Inventory Area 13 (WRIA 13), i.e., the cities of Lacey, Olympia, Rainier, and Tumwater, the Squaxin Island Tribe, and Thurston County, that support designating the Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) as the lead entity organization. Formal resolutions from these governments are expected. TRPC plans to vote on this opportunity at its meeting on September 7. The role of the lead entity organization is to serve as the fiscal agent for the lead entity citizens committee, in this case the WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee, and help manage the citizens committee and local technical review committee in their role of developing the ranked list of habitat projects submitted to the board each year. The board provides capacity funding to support the contracted scope of work associated with this process. The fiscal agent does not itself have any decision-making authority over the ranked habitat project lists.

In their letters of support, the governments express confidence in the TRPC's 51-year proven track record of convening successful stakeholder processes. The Thurston Conservation District, the former lead entity organization, is no longer capable of fulfilling the requirements of a lead entity.

## **Recreation and Conservation Office - Salmon Section Report**

### **Joint SRFB OWEB June 2018 meeting Debrief**

At the June 2018 joint Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB), we received a warm welcome to the Columbia Gorge and insightful project tours. The meeting and tours demonstrated that there are strong conservation partners implementing critically important projects in both Washington and Oregon. RCO and OWEB staff held a debrief about the joint board meetings on July 10, 2018. Both agencies agreed that the interactions and presentations from and between the SRFB and OWEB members and staff were very positive and successful. There was much to be learned from one another on monitoring, communications, and overall funding strategies. It was so successful that staff discussed a commitment to a joint meeting with the boards every four years. We also discussed a joint meeting of the staff of each agency every counteracted four years, so that overall we would be sharing lessons learned at the board and staff levels every two years. We felt that there was a valuable enough exchange of information at both the joint board meeting in June 2018 and the joint staff meeting in 2016 to make it worth our efforts

to meet again. Joint thank you notes have been sent out from the Directors to entities who participated in the June 2018 project tours in Oregon and Washington and the hosts of the informal reception at Cascade Locks.

### 2018 Grant Round

Applications for the 2018 grant round were due on August 9, 2018, and Lead Entity ranked projects lists were due on August 15<sup>th</sup>. The Regions will be compiling information for their regional area summaries due to RCO by September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018. In December 2018, the board will be asked to fund SRFB projects funded with state 2017-19 funds and the 2018 federal NOAA Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery award funds (PCSRF). The board will also be asked to approve Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) projects for the 2019-21 biennium. PSAR projects are approved in advance of the legislative session and submitted with the budget request to the legislature. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) will also be submitting a PSAR Large Capital project list for board approval in December. The draft ranked PSAR Large capital list from PSP is shown as **Attachment A**. If the PSAR account is funded over \$30 million, then projects may be funded from this regionally ranked list.

To date in the grant round, all of the project site visits are complete. Site visits are organized by lead entities. They provide an opportunity for teams of two Review Panel members to see the proposed projects. Project sponsors have received initial comments from the Review Panel based on draft applications and site visits for incorporation into the final applications. Currently staff are reviewing final applications for completeness and any eligibility issues, and they will forward applications to the Review Panel for final comments on projects.

As of August 1, 2018, there are 223 applications in PRISM for SRFB and/or PSAR funds consideration. There have been 17 pre-proposals submitted for the PSAR Large Capital grant funds, and 13 projects made it to the draft ranked PSAR Large capital list. The average number of projects submitted per year for the last seven grant rounds is 180 projects, so we are within the normal range of projects submitted. Some of these will be funded with SRFB state and federal funding and the PSAR projects will be asking the board for approval in order to submit a list to the legislature for the 2019-2021 budget request.

### Approved Capital budget 2017-2019 biennium

RCO's salmon section has put the majority of projects funded by the Washington state legislature approved capital under agreement. The Washington State legislatively approved capital budget funded not only the SRFB and PSAR program projects approved by the SRFB, but all of the other salmon related programs identified below which receive funding in the RCO's budget. The Table below is a synopsis of all of the projects funded in the 2017-2019 biennium that are managed by the salmon section staff in the RCO. The [2016 Funding Report](#) includes the complete list of all SRFB approved PSAR projects and the [2017 Funding Report](#) includes information on all of the SRFB projects funded in December 2017 by the board.

**Table 1. 2017-2019 biennium Salmon Section project funding**

<b>SRFB Funding</b>	Salmon Recovery – Federal	\$37,000,000	107 projects funded to date (2017 grant round) 2018 grant round in progress
	Salmon Recovery SRFB state	\$19,711,000	
	Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration	\$40,000,000	96 projects
		<b>\$96,711,000</b>	

  

<b>Other Salmon Section Funding</b>	Estuary and Salmon Restoration	\$8,000,000	13 projects
	Family Forest and Fish Passage Program	\$5,000,000	18 projects
	Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board Grants	\$19,747,000	13 projects
	Washington Coastal Restoration Grants	\$12,500,000	21 projects
		<b>\$45,247,000</b>	

**Other salmon related programs**

- **Family Forest Fish Passage Program**, jointly managed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), the Washington Department of Natural Resources, and RCO received \$5 million in the budget, which will fund 18 projects.
- The new **Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board** Program jointly managed by the WDFW and RCO received \$19.7 million in the budget, which will fund 13 projects.
- The **Washington Coastal Restoration** grants (Washington Coast Restoration Initiative) received \$12.5 million in the budget, which will fund 19 projects.
- The **Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program** jointly managed by the WDFW and RCO received \$ 8 million in the budget, which will fund 12 projects.

**Budget Requests 2019-2021**

In August the SRFB decided upon a budget request for the 2019-2021 capital and operating budget. The Recreation and Conservation Office will also be submitting requests for our other salmon related programs. At the time of the writing of this memo, the ESRP request will likely be \$20 million. The project list will be shared with the board once it is complete. The FFFPP program may be requesting up to \$20 million including a request to do barrier inventory work. We are working with the WDFW on the Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board request. **Attachment B** is a draft ranked list of projects for the 2019-2021 biennium. The list contains \$26.4 million in proposed projects, but alternates may be added. The Washington Coast Restoration Initiative is currently reviewing projects for the 2019-2021 request. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) determines the funding request level for the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) Program. It is also based on the number of viable projects submitted for the next funding cycle. The request amount for PSAR is \$83 million.

In addition to these programs and funds, the salmon section manages some projects and contracts for the Chehalis Basin Strategy, the Washington Department of Ecology's Yakima Basin Integrated Water Resource Management Plan, NOAA Pacific Coast Critical Stock program, NOAA Coastal Resiliency program, and the Hatchery Scientific Review Group.

**Salmon Recovery Funding Board Grant Administration****Viewing Closed Projects**

**Attachment C** lists projects that closed between May 10, 2018 and August 1, 2018. **Attachment C** lists projects that closed between May 10, 2018 and August 1, 2018. Each project number links to information about a project (e.g., designs, photos, maps, reports, etc.). Staff closed out fifty-four projects or contracts during this time period.

## Amendments Approved by the RCO Director

The table below shows the major amendments approved between May 10, 2018 and August 1, 2018. Staff processed 56 project-related amendments during this period; most amendments were minor revisions related to administrative changes or time extensions.

**Table 2. Project Amendments Approved by the RCO Director**

Project Number	Project Name	Sponsor	Program	Type	Date	Amount/Notes
<a href="#">15-1147</a>	Yakima River Floodplain Assessment & Final Design	Trout Unlimited Inc.	Salmon State Projects	Cost Change	5/31/18	Increase SRFB funds by \$4,000 to complete additional hydraulic modeling.
<a href="#">14-1322</a>	Duckabush Riparian Habitat Acquisition	Jefferson Land Trust	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	Cost Change	7/17/18	Increase funds by \$10,000 to assist sponsor with debris removal.
<a href="#">16-1495</a>	Chimacum Creek Lower Mainstem Protection	Jefferson Land Trust	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	Cost Change	5/22/18	Increase funds by \$7,000 using 15-17 PSAR return funds to for pursuing parcels.
<a href="#">16-1638</a>	Stillaguamish Floodplain Acquisitions	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians	Salmon State Projects	Project Type Change	7/26/18	Add restoration elements to two acquired properties.
<a href="#">14-1384</a>	Dungeness Habitat Protection – RM 6.5 to 7.5 Phase	Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	Project Type Change	7/23/18	Project was changed from restoration to acquisition only as unable to acquire property.
<a href="#">14-1935</a>	Wilcox Farm Floodplain Restoration Design	South Puget Sound SEG	Salmon Federal Projects	Scope Change	5/21/18	Reduce scope from preliminary design to conceptual design.
<a href="#">15-1058</a>	Lower Bear Creek Natural Area Additions	King Co Water & Land Res	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	Scope Change	5/31/18	Change from easement to fee simple on a property and remove easement from second property.
<a href="#">16-1568</a>	Hunter Point Road Fish Barrier Improvement	Thurston County Public Works	Salmon State Projects	Scope Change	7/10/18	Sponsor completed preliminary designs under budget and was able to advance to final design.

The following table shows projects funded by the board and administered by staff since 1999. The information is current as of August 1, 2018. This table does not include projects funded through the Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board program (FBRB), the Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFPP), the Washington Coastal Restoration Initiative program (WCRI), or the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP). Although RCO staff support these programs through grant administration, the board does not review and approve projects under these programs.

**Table 3. Board-Funded Projects**

	Pending Projects	Active Projects	Completed Projects	Total Funded Projects
Salmon Projects to Date	25	408	2,331	2,764
Percentage of Total	0.9%	14.8%	84.3%	

## Attachments

Attachment A: Draft 2019-2021 PSAR Large capital list from the Puget Sound Partnership  
Attachment B: Salmon Projects Completed and Closed from May 15, 2018 through August 1, 2018  
Attachment C: 2019-2021 DRAFT – Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board Project List.

Attachment A

Draft Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Large Capital Project List

RANK	Project Number	Type	Project	Snapshot	Sponsor	Cost request
1	18-1534	Rst	Middle Fork Nooksack Diversion Dam Removal	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Bellingham City of	\$10,560,250
2	18-1300	Rst	Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Clallam County of	\$3,046,868
3	18-1671	Rst	Pilchuck Dam Removal Restoration Project	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Tulalip Tribe	\$1,495,730
4	18-1258	Rst	Riverbend Floodplain Restoration Construction	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	King Co Water & Land Res	\$5,900,000
5	18-1235	Rst	Skokomish R USACE Project Implementation	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Mason Conservation Dist	\$7,175,486
6	18-1832	Acq	Pearson Shoreline Protection	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Whidbey Camano Land Trust	\$800,000
7	18-1291	Rst	Elwha River Engineered Log Jams - Ranney Reach	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$1,507,872
8	18-1887	Acq	Skookum Creek Conservation (Large Cap)	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$3,117,509
9	18-1401	Rst	Downey Farmstead Side Channel Restoration Phase II	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Kent City of	\$5,307,492
10	18-1225	Acq	Lower Big Beef Creek Acquisitions	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Hood Canal SEG	\$2,695,100
11	18-2053	Pln,Acq	Stillaguamish Estuary Acquisition and Design	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians	\$2,500,000
12	18-1537	Rst	Shelton Harbor Estuary Restoration	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$2,518,790
13	18-1470	Rst	Harper Estuary Bridge Construction 2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>	Kitsap County of	\$3,585,719
						<b>\$50,210,816</b>



## Attachment B

### Draft Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board projects 2019- 2021



Rank	Stream Name	County	Project Sponsor	Scope*	Total Requested Amount
1	Johnson Cr	Clallam	Clallam County	Planning	\$199,060
2	MF Newaukum R	Lewis	Lewis County	Planning	\$97,730
3	NF Ostrander Cr	Cowlitz	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Restoration	\$530,893
4	Johnson Cr (2 barriers)	Okanogan	Trout Unlimited	Restoration	\$1,294,908
5	Coleman Cr	Kittitas	Kittitas Co CD	Restoration	\$1,306,080
6	Cottonwood Cr	Asotin	Asotin Co CD	Restoration	\$445,300
7	Dayton Cr	Mason	Mason County	Restoration	\$420,304
8	Catherine Cr	Snohomish	Wild Fish Conservancy	Planning	\$89,611
9	Chumstick Cr (2 barriers)	Chelan	Chelan County	Restoration	\$488,286
10	Little Pilchuck Cr	Snohomish	Tulalip Tribe	Planning	\$197,633
11	Uncle Johns Cr	Mason	Mason County	Planning	\$339,788
12	Mill Cr	Walla Walla	Tri-State Steelheaders	Restoration	\$1,667,912
13	Cooke Cr (2 barriers)	Kittitas	Kittitas Co CD	Restoration	\$688,543
14	Johnson Cr	Okanogan	Trout Unlimited	Restoration	\$489,673
15	NF Ostrander Cr	Cowlitz	Cowlitz County	Planning	\$322,150
16	Trib to MF Newaukum R	Lewis	Lewis County	Planning	\$68,200
17	Railroad Cr	Clallam	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	Restoration	\$103,779
18	Thorndyke Cr	Jefferson	Jefferson County	Planning	\$198,313
19	Lower Hoko Wetland Complex	Clallam	Clallam County	Planning	\$199,960
20	Delameter Cr	Cowlitz	Cowlitz County	Planning	\$242,250
21	Johnson Cr	Okanogan	Trout Unlimited	Restoration	\$480,670
22	Caribou Cr (2 barriers)	Kittitas	Kittitas Co CD	Restoration	\$355,334



23	Mill Cr (2 barriers)	Walla Walla	Snake R Salmon Rec Board	Planning	\$117,729
24	Uncle Johns Cr	Mason	Mason County	Restoration	\$420,304
25	Trib to Little Pilchuck Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish Co CD	Restoration	\$224,459
26	Mill Cr	Chelan	Chelan County Nat Res	Restoration	\$494,599
27	Parke Cr (2 barriers)	Kittitas	Kittitas Co CD	Restoration	\$302,953
28	Talbot Cr	Clallam	Clallam County	Planning	\$197,060
29	Mason Cr	Clark	Clark County	Planning	\$155,200
30	Seabeck Cr	Kitsap	Kitsap County	Restoration	\$2,066,837
31	Kenney Cr	Whatcom	Whatcom County	Planning	\$442,500
32	Squalicum Cr	Whatcom	City of Bellingham	Restoration	\$447,268
33	Fisher Cr (2 barriers)	Skagit	Skagit County	Planning	\$332,000
34	Spurgeon Cr (2 barriers)	Thurston	Thurston County	Restoration	\$1,700,000
35	Naylors Cr (2 barriers)	Jefferson	Jefferson County	Planning	\$198,850
36	Geissler Cr (3 barriers)	Grays Harbor	Chehalis Basin Task Force	Restoration	\$590,408
37	Scammon Cr	Lewis	Lewis Co CD	Restoration	\$147,227
38	Scammon Cr	Lewis	Lewis County	Restoration	\$561,560
39	Dickerson Cr	Kitsap	Kitsap Co CD	Restoration	\$494,500
40	Minter Cr	Pierce	Pierce County	Planning	\$90,000
41	George Davis Cr (3 barriers)	King	City of Sammamish	Planning	\$722,350
42	Langlois Cr	King	Snoqualmie Vall Water Impr Dist	Planning	\$65,200
43	Ebright Cr	King	City of Sammamish	Planning	\$352,100
44	Kristoferson Cr	Island	Island Co DNR	Restoration	\$544,718
45	Starbird Cr	Skagit	Skagit County	Planning	\$46,500
46	Scammon Cr (2 barriers)	Lewis	Lewis County	Planning	\$160,100
47	Sexton Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Planning	\$141,780
48	King Cr	Lewis	Lewis Co CD	Restoration	\$200,076
49	King Cr	Lewis	Lewis County	Restoration	\$371,678
50	Willows Cr	King	City of Redmond	Restoration	\$400,000
51	Ravensdale Cr (2 barriers)	King	King County Parks and Rec	Restoration	\$2,513,614
52	Trib to MF Quilceda Cr	Snohomish	City of Marysville	Restoration	\$162,740
53	Secret Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Planning	\$122,230
54	Trib to Grader Cr	Clallam	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	Restoration	\$68,931

55	Trib to Starbird Cr	Skagit	Skagit County	Planning	\$64,000
56	Williams Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Planning	\$63,750
57	Lyon Cr	King	City of Lake Forest Park	Planning	\$200,000
58	Secret Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Planning	\$144,755
59	Secret Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Restoration	\$694,025
60	Trib to Silver Lk	Snohomish	City of Everett	Planning	\$188,000
61	Ennis Cr (2 barriers)	Clallam	City of Port Angeles	Planning	\$200,000
62	Panther Cr	King	City of Renton	Planning	\$424,150
63	Erick Cr	Cowlitz	Cowlitz County	Restoration	\$1,099,050
64	Trib to Little Pilchuck Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Planning	\$200,000
65	Trib to Little Pilchuck Cr	Snohomish	Snohomish County	Planning	\$200,000
66	Trib to Little Pilchuck Cr	Snohomish	Sound Salmon Solutions	Restoration	\$190,000
					<b>\$28,749,578</b>

\*SCOPE: Planning projects are funded for design-only; Restoration projects are funded for construction.

## Attachment C

### Salmon Projects Completed and Closed from May 15, 2018-August 1, 2018

Project Number	Sponsor	Project Name	Primary Program	Closed Completed Date	Project Snapshot
<b>11-1320</b>	Mid-Columbia RFEG	Lower Cowlitz Creek Restoration, Phase 2 & 3	Salmon Federal Projects	6/11/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>13-1056</b>	Skagit Land Trust	Middle Skagit Watershed Habitat Protection	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	6/11/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>13-1405</b>	Asotin Co Conservation Dist	Riparian Restoration - IMW Study Area	Salmon Federal Projects	6/5/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>14-1328</b>	Mason Conservation Dist	Skokomish River General Investigation 2014	Salmon State Projects	6/12/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>14-1335</b>	Lower Columbia River FEG	SFK Toutle@ Johnson Creek Restoration	Salmon State Projects	6/13/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>14-1660</b>	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	Haehule Culvert Replacement	Salmon Federal Projects	7/26/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>14-1898</b>	Nez Perce Tribe	Restore Alpowa Creek Fish Passage	Salmon Federal Projects	5/25/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>14-1900</b>	Columbia Conservation Dist	PA 24 Floodplain and Channel Complexity	Salmon Federal Projects	7/16/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>14-2264</b>	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	WDFW Lower Columbia VSP Monitoring – 2015	Salmon Federal Activities	6/6/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1054</b>	Bothell City of	Sammamish River Side Channel Restoration - Ph 3	Salmon State Projects	6/18/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1056</b>	Snohomish County Parks Dept	Meadowdale Beach Park & Estuary Restoration Design	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	6/18/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1096</b>	Lewis County Conservation Dist	Wisner Creek Channel Reconnection	Salmon State Projects	5/24/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1106</b>	Kalispel Tribe	LeClerc Creek Restoration - Phase III	Salmon State Projects	6/26/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1147</b>	Trout Unlimited Inc.	Yakima River Floodplain Assessment & Final Design	Salmon State Projects	7/16/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1194</b>	Hood Canal SEG	IMW - Seabeck Creek Restoration Design	Salmon Federal Projects	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1309</b>	Palouse Conservation District	Steptoe Creek perched culvert replacement	Salmon Federal Projects	5/30/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>15-1377</b>	Yakima Basin FWRB	Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board 15-17	Salmon Federal Activities	7/27/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>

Project Number	Sponsor	Project Name	Primary Program	Closed Completed Date	Project Snapshot
<b>15-1485</b>	Skagit River Sys Cooperative	Whidbey Basin Pocket Estuary Census	Salmon Federal Projects	6/22/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-1231</b>	Quileute Tribe of the Quileute	Thunder Road Fish Passage Project	Salmon State Projects	7/18/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-1509</b>	Quinault Indian Nation	Lower Quinault Invasive Plant Control (Phase 5)	Salmon State Projects	5/24/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-1524</b>	CREST	Columbia- Pacific Passage, Hungry Harbor Design	Salmon Federal Projects	6/12/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-1568</b>	Thurston County Public Works	Hunter Point Road Fish Barrier Improvement	Salmon State Projects	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-1606</b>	Washington Water Trust	Swauk Creek - Permanent Flow Restoration	Salmon Federal Projects	5/25/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-2101</b>	Asotin Co Conservation Dist	Asotin IMW Monitoring YR10	Salmon Federal Activities	5/23/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-2316</b>	Whidbey Camano Land Trust	Barnum Point Phase 1 - East Tract Acquisition	Puget Sound Acq. & Restoration	5/17/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>16-2496</b>	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	IMW Fish Program Monitoring 2017	Salmon Federal Activities	5/23/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>
<b>17-1045</b>	Kitsap County of	Kitsap Shoreline Armor Removal	Salmon State Projects	7/25/2018	<a href="#">Snapshot Link</a>

## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Decision Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12, 2018  
**Title:** Assessments, Planning Grants & Eligibility  
**Prepared by:** Tara Galuska, Salmon Section Manager

#### Summary

Planning projects, both designs and general assessments that lead to on the ground projects, are eligible project types in the Salmon Recovery funding Board's (SRFB) annual grant round. To meet the specific program priorities outlined in the federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) application, staff is recommending a change to adjust the criteria for planning grants, specifically general assessments that do not produce a design. Planning / design grants would continue to be eligible, and planning / assessments projects, also known as data gaps, would continue to be eligible with associated criteria outlined in this memo.

Manual 18 will be updated based on the decision by the SRFB.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Request for Decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Direction
<input type="checkbox"/>	Briefing

#### Purpose of Decision:

In order to maintain our strong competitiveness in PCSRF, the SRFB will continue to fund general assessments, but will use state funds (not PCSRF funds) for these projects. In Puget Sound and Hood Canal, these projects must come through PSAR and for the rest of the state, general assessment projects must use state bond funds, as set forth in this memo. This decision will allow eligible assessment (data gap) projects meeting the criteria outlined in this memo to proceed. The amount of funding available will be limited to \$200,000 total per grant round per region (from their regional allocation) for each of the following regions: Snake, Coast, Upper, Lower and Mid-Columbia. There will be no cap on the projects in Hood Canal and Puget Sound, all which must come through PSAR.

### Background

General assessments can be an important tool to implementing salmon recovery plans. All eligible planning grants must lead to on the ground project implementation either through a project design or understanding a data gap identified in a recovery plan that clearly limits subsequent project identification and development. Funding for our salmon grant programs come from the NOAA administered federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) award and state bond funds appropriated in the capital budget.

#### Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) Program Priorities

NOAA evaluates requests for funding in three priorities, in ranked order. To be most competitive, the majority of our funding request should be in priority one.

1. Priority One. Projects that address factors limiting the productivity of Pacific anadromous salmonid populations that are either: listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), or necessary for the exercise of tribal treaty fishing rights or native subsistence fishing. Typically these are habitat improvement projects (e.g., an on-the-ground project like a levee setback project). Priority One projects may also include the development of project-specific engineering or designs that are a necessary precursor to implementing on-the-ground habitat improvement projects (excludes development of generic designs). Planning, coordination, landowner outreach, assessment and monitoring projects are not eligible under Priority One.
2. Priority Two. These projects provide effectiveness monitoring of habitat restoration actions at the watershed or larger scales for ESA-listed anadromous salmonids, status and trend monitoring that directly contribute to population viability assessments for ESA- listed anadromous salmonids, or monitoring necessary for the exercise of tribal-treaty fishing rights or native-subsistence fishing on anadromous salmonids.
3. Priority Three. These projects include all other projects consistent with the Congressional authorization with demonstrated need for PCSRF funding. This includes, for example, capacity funding, planning, coordination, landowner outreach, assessment, research, and monitoring (i.e., monitoring at less than watershed or population scale). General assessments fall into Priority Three.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) anticipates a greater proportion of the available PCSRF funding will be distributed to the higher ranked PCSRF Program Priorities. Projects in Priority One are considered restoration and acquisition actions and planning projects that produce a design. It is clear that assessments that do not produce designs are Priority Three projects.

Washington State puts all of its habitat projects into Priority One in the PCSRF application and budget, and will continue to do so. To do otherwise could reduce Washington's competitiveness and result in a lowered federal funding award. In order to continue to fund general assessments, which are not considered Priority One projects, Washington will have to use state funds. But there are limits to how much state funding can go to these projects.

This memo presents options to continue to meet salmon recovery priorities, including doing assessments that do not produce designs, while also continuing to be competitive in the state's application for the PCSRF award.

### **Current Eligible Planning Costs -- Manual 18**

Currently Manual 18 identifies the following as eligible planning grants. Planning projects that address limiting factors include assessments, project designs, inventories, and studies that are necessary precursors to implementing on-the-ground habitat projects.

Planning projects intended only for research or general knowledge and understanding of watershed conditions and functions, although important, are **not** eligible for funding. The results of proposed planning projects must lead **directly and clearly** to the following:

- A conceptual, preliminary, or final project design. See [Appendix D](#) for definitions and expected outcomes for each of these phases of project development. For the purposes of this manual, all design projects must address a particular problem at a specific location. See the "Design-Only Projects" discussion below for information on project criteria necessary to qualify for zero project match.

Or

- Filling a data gap identified as a high priority (as opposed to a medium or low priority) in a regional salmon recovery plan or lead entity strategy. All of the following also must apply:
  - The data gap clearly limits subsequent project identification or development.
  - The regional organization or lead entity and applicant can demonstrate how it fits in the larger context, such as its fit with a regional recovery-related, scientific research agenda or work plan, and how it will address the identified high priority data void.
  - The region and applicant can demonstrate why SRFB funds are necessary, rather than other sources of funding.
  - The results must clearly determine criteria and options for subsequent projects and show the schedule for implementing such projects, if funded.

Following are options for the board to consider for the 2019 grant round and forward.

## Options for Considerations

### Option 1: Do Nothing

This option keeps the above eligibility criteria exactly the same. In order to do this, all general assessments that do not produce a design would have to be funded out of state bond funds.

#### Option 1 Pros:

- Unlimited assessments that do not produce designs could be funded.
- No change for sponsors. They are accustomed to this criteria.
- There are data gaps identified in recovery plans that could be funded and will lead to projects.

#### Option 1 Cons:

- Unlimited assessments that do not produce designs could be funded.
  - There may not be enough state funds to fund all the proposed assessments in any one year because of the need to have enough state bond funds to fulfill the 33% required match for PCSRF.
  - There may not be enough state funds because we need state funds not obligated for federal match to fund things not able to be funded with PCSRF funds, including the northeast region, bull trout projects, and projects that have federal matching funds. These projects have a need for any state funds above the required 33% match.
  - Assessments that do not produce a design are considered Priority Three by NOAA.
-



**Option 2: Planning design and planning assessment projects remain eligible with the same language as Current Eligible Planning Grants shown above, with the addition of the following criteria:**

- Projects located in the Puget Sound and Hood Canal regions must be funded with Puget Sound Restoration and Acquisition (PSAR) funds.
- Projects in salmon recovery regions located in the Lower Columbia, Snake River, Upper Columbia, Yakima Basin, Northeast, and Washington Coast must be funded with state funding (not federal) (up to \$200,000 per region) and may not be used as match to RCO's Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund award.
- The region must provide a letter of support for the project. The project is not eligible to be submitted without a letter from the region.

**Option 2 Pros:**

- High priority general assessments could still be funded. In the Puget Sound Region, there would be no caps, but in the rest of the state, up to \$1 million per year could be available to implement important projects.
- The SRFB has funded on average \$900,000 per year for the past ten years in general assessments and the \$1 million is in line with that annual average expenditure.

**Option 2 Cons:**

- We have to use state funds to fund assessments, and cannot match PCSRF with the funds, but it is limited to \$1 million per year.
  - Additional tracking will be required by lead entities and RCO staff to ensure the limit of \$200,000 is maintained, and to ensure that these project types receive only state funds and do not match the PCSRF award.
  - Assessments that do not produce a design are considered Priority Three by NOAA
- 

**Option 3: Planning / assessment projects that do not produce a design are ineligible**

This option would take general assessments/data gaps that do not produce a design out of Manual 18 and make them ineligible for any funding. The only type of planning project that would remain eligible would be projects that produce a level of design as outlined in Appendix D of Manual 18.

**Option 3 Pros:**

All projects funded through the SRFB grant round would be in Priority One.

RCO would not have to use any state funds without matching to PCSRF.

### Option 3 Cons:

- Identified data gaps in salmon recovery plans to prioritize on the ground projects would not be eligible to receive funding through the SRFB.
- Staff has heard that there continues to be a need to fund general assessment projects that do not produce a design in order to continue with project and salmon recovery planning in their lead entities. Taking this option out would be a big change to the grant program.

## Implementation Strategy

Once the board decides on an option, Manual 18 will be updated for 2019. For this current grant round, 2018, general assessments will be funded with state general bond funds.

## Analysis

Below is an analysis of the three options and a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each. The board could choose any option.

Option 1, *Do Nothing* is a risk to the SRFB and the RCO because there may be too many applications in any given grant cycle to accommodate giving this type of project only state funds. RCO may not have enough state salmon funds to match the PCSRF award in any given year.

Option 2, *Planning design and planning assessment projects remain eligible with the additional criteria* is a viable option, because it creates a limit on funding but still enables important assessments to be funded. This enables the regions and lead entities to continue to fund data gaps that are identified as important in regional recovery plans. The requirement to coordinate with the region is an important addition to ensure the highest priority data gaps are being funded to implement recovery plans.

Option 3, *Planning / assessment projects that do not produce a design are ineligible* is the least popular option in that lead entities and regions would no longer be able to fund important data gaps and redesign work that is necessary to implement recovery plans.

## Staff Recommendation

RCO staff recommends that the board approve Option 2, which continues to maintain eligibility for planning grants that do not produce a project design, up to \$200,000 from the allocation of each of the following regions: Snake, Coast, Upper, Lower, and Mid-Columbia regions for a total of \$1 million allocated to planning grants without a design in any given grant round. Hood Canal and Puget Sound can continue to fund these type of projects with no limit with PSAR funds. Overall regional allocations, as approved by the SRFB in March 2017 will not change.

## Next Steps

If approved by the board, RCO staff will update Manual 18, and include this information in their application workshops in the 2019 grant round.

### Suggested Motion:

Approve up to \$200,000 state funds per grant round from each of the following region's allocation: Snake, Coast, Upper, Lower and Mid-Columbia, to be used for assessments that do not produce a project design using criteria outlined in Memo 6. The SRFB regional allocations approved in March 2017 do not change.

## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Decision Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12, 2018  
**Title:** Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund  
**Prepared By:** Suzanna Stoike, Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) manager  
 Marc Duboiski, Salmon Recovery Senior Outdoor Grant Manager  
 Tara Galuska, Salmon Section Manager

#### Summary

This memo summarizes the use of currently available “returned funds” in the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) program. This proposal recommends allowing these returned funds to be pooled in the proposed Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund. This fund could have up to \$1 million of Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration returned funds that could be used for highly important and time sensitive acquisition projects in Puget Sound that were not funded in the biennial grant round. If a lead entity proposed a project and it was funded using these rapid response funds, the lead entity’s PSAR allocation would be reduced by the award amount in the following PSAR grant round, thus replenishing this source of funding for future availability.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Request for Decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Direction
<input type="checkbox"/>	Briefing

### Background

The Puget Sound Partnership hears from lead entities and sponsors that the biennial nature of the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration program can make it difficult to acquire highly important parcels that come on the market between grant rounds. The Recreation and Conservation Office has a very good tool, the Waiver of Retroactivity, that can be used to acquire parcels in advance of the grant round, should the sponsor have the funds to acquire immediately. Despite this tool, not all sponsors have the funding or access to loans to make important acquisitions possible. That is how this concept came about; to help sponsors acquire parcels that are very important to salmon recovery that are put up for sale at a time not coordinated with the grant rounds. Many times sponsors work for years with landowners on a potential sale, but sometimes an important parcel comes up through the market.

On November 30, 2017, the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council approved staff’s recommendation to create a rapid response revolving fund for PSAR using currently available returned funds, up to \$1 million. This will allow for immediate funding opportunities for strategic acquisitions be implemented in a timely manner. This pilot opportunity is being called the “Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund” and is designed to support urgent and essential strategic habitat acquisitions within Puget Sound.

Since the November 30<sup>th</sup> SRC meeting, staff have worked closely with the lead entity coordinators in Puget Sound, practitioners and project sponsors, RCO grant managers, Partnership staff, and with new external partners to develop the fund outline shown in Attachment A.

## **Analysis**

The creation of this funding opportunity helps resolve a frustration throughout the region that PSAR funding is not nimble enough to acquire land that may come on the market that is significant to recovery efforts. Timing is critical to successfully obtain ownership or easement rights. Acquisition opportunities that fall outside of the typical grant timeline may wait up to 18 months before another opportunity for funding arises. Due to this constraint, many high-priority parcels may be lost to development. This Rapid Response Revolving Fund is designed to provide timely funding for essential and urgent acquisitions.

This funding source still requires the same high rigor of review necessary for all SRFB projects, and ensures funds are being spent expeditiously and effectively. As proposed, it will require review by the SRFB review panel, the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council Executive Committee, the PSAR program manager, and the RCO Director. Projects that are not cleared by the SRFB Review Panel would not be considered for this funding.

Most important to the effectiveness of this funding source is the speed at which decisions are made. PSP and RCO staff are seeking approval to establish this funding opportunity using returned PSAR funds of up to \$ 1 million. Any acquisition project must be submitted by the lead entity and reviewed and cleared by the Review Panel. The Partnership's decision-making body, the Leadership Council, holds statutory responsibility for the approval of funding towards recovery efforts. Decision making for the Rapid Response Fund will be delegated to the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council Executive Committee in order to expedite decisions for use of this Rapid Response Revolving Fund. We are seeking to also delegate authority to the RCO Director for project approvals in order to expedite decision-making while not compromising the integrity or fiscal responsibility of involved parties.

## **Administrative Updates and Policy Clarifications**

RCO staff will work with the PSAR program manager to integrate the Rapid Response Revolving Fund into Manual 18 PSAR Appendix B. Any projects seeking to use the Rapid Response Revolving Fund must abide by the applicable policies as outlined in RCO Acquisition Manual 3 and Salmon Recovery Manual 18. Additional administrative burden will be minimal, and will involve executing contracts for the small number of projects that receive Rapid Response funding on a quarterly basis.

SRFB review panel members will be requested to provide review of projects submitted. RCO staff will establish a standing agenda item on the SRFB review panel meeting agenda to review, discuss and approve or not approve projects seeking Rapid Response funding. This additional burden should equal out, as this project will no longer need to be reviewed as part of the traditional funding cycle. Additionally, the lead entity will have a reduced allocation that is likely to lead to a reduced number of projects requiring review the following year.

RCO and PSP will monitor the contractor and staff time invested in the execution of this funding opportunity, and will adaptively manage the fund to minimize capacity requirements.

### **Policy Changes**

There are no policy changes requested as part of the administration of this fund. Existing policies will be used to administer these projects, including eligibility criteria.

### **Opportunity for Stakeholder Comment**

This policy was reviewed with lead entities and approved by the Salmon Recovery Council in an open, public meeting.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approving the establishment of this Rapid Response Revolving Fund, and reporting back to the board in the Salmon Section report at each board memo on the use of these funds.

### **Next Steps**

Staff will finalize the review process with involved parties. The Rapid Response Revolving Fund will then be active. PSP will distribute notice about this funding opportunity to all interested parties. The first opportunity for projects to be submit is November 2<sup>nd</sup>. Projects will be considered once the request is complete and submitted to the Puget Sound Partnership.

### **Suggested Motion**

Approve the Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund and use up to \$1 million PSAR project returned funds for important, prioritized and time-sensitive acquisition projects in the Puget Sound region. Delegate the authority to the RCO Director to fund projects that have been approved by the lead entity and the Puget Sound Partnership and that have been reviewed and cleared by the SRFB Review Panel and to track the use and future replenishment of the fund in future PSAR allocations.

### **Attachments**

- A. Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund Overview ("Rapid Response Fund")
- B. Criteria breakdown for project evaluation (for SRC EC and PSAR program manager review)

## Attachment A: Puget Sound Rapid Response Fund Overview

### Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund (“Rapid Response Fund”)

**Purpose:** To provide rapid access to funds for urgent and essential strategic habitat acquisitions within the Puget Sound.

**Funding availability:** The total funds available for the 2019-2021 biennium are \$1,000,000. The program will consider costs associated with single acquisitions of up to the full amount available, \$1,000,000.

#### **Funding requirements:**

- Funding distributed to any project must be returned to the fund by the lead entity, through the lead entity’s next PSAR allocation no more than 30 days following the passing of the next state capital budget.
- No alternative funding reimbursement mechanism is currently acceptable.
- All projects funded through the Rapid Response Revolving Fund must comply with the policies and guidelines outlined in RCO [Manual 3](#): Acquisition Projects and applicable policies in [Manual 18](#).
- Funds must be spent within 6 months of contracting.
- No time extensions will be available for these funds.

#### **Rapid Response funds projects that:**

- Demonstrate clear and immediate threat of habitat loss from sale or development.
- Cannot obtain funding elsewhere in time to secure the property.
- Meet one of the following criteria:
  - Are identified within a regionally approved salmon recovery chapter or acquisition strategy as high value or high priority,
  - are approved alternates on a lead entity’s ranked list,
  - are within an approved reach or geographic envelope, or
  - are adjacent to previously acquired parcels.
- Maintain high ecosystem and habitat value with consideration to climate impacts.
- Have a letter of support from the lead entity for funding.

#### **What Rapid Response Revolving Fund *does not* fund:**

- Restoration projects
- Parcels or footprints not identified as highest priority in an approved salmon recovery chapter or strategy
- Projects currently being considered for funding from SRFB/PSAR (those likely to receive funding through a normal allocation)
- Projects not vetted and approved through the Lead Entity program (on the four-year work plan)

#### **How Rapid Response approvals work:**

Projects will be considered once the request and application is complete and submitted to the Puget Sound Partnership. If projects have not undergone a previous SRFB review process, the SRFB review panel needs to review and approve the projects. Once the SRFB review panel approves, the Salmon Recovery

Council Executive Committee (SRC EC) and the Puget Sound Partnership PSAR program manager—as delegated by the Leadership Council—will rank the project. If there is only one project requesting funding, the project will be reviewed and forwarded, but no ranking will occur. The SRC EC and PSAR program manager will score the proposal(s) from *low* (1) to *very high* (4) based on the following criteria:

- Urgency of the proposal
- Significance to achieving recovery (impact)
- Support from lead entities, partners, landowners and neighbors
- Long-term impacts of climate to the landscape
- Cost considerations for ecosystem value
- Leveraging of other funding sources

The SRC EC and PSAR manager will recommend projects receiving summary scores of *high* (3) and *very high* (4), in ranked order, to the RCO Director under delegated authority from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB).

Funds will be available for contracting to approved projects following the RCO director's approval.

**Timeline for application review for 2018 – 2019:**

- Deadline: Nov 2 | SRFB review panel review| PSAR manager and SRC ranking by Nov 19 | RCO director approval
- *Anticipated 2019 dates to be added by December 2018*

Funds will be allocated throughout the 2-year period until funds are exhausted. Any unspent funds will be applied to projects still in need of funding from the most current approved PSAR large capital list. The Rapid Response Revolving Fund will be refreshed by the lead entity who successfully submitted a project in a prior biennia, through a reduction in their PSAR allocation from the region in future biennia.

**How to apply:**

Applicants must obtain a PRISM number and fill out all the necessary information in PRISM.<sup>1</sup> Applicants of new projects are required to submit **all materials required** as if they were applying through the SRFB/PSAR regular grant round. For cost increase or scope increase requests, please refer to [Manual 18](#), and contact your RCO grant manager and PSP Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator regarding your request.



## Attachment B: Puget Sound Rapid Response Criteria

### Puget Sound Rapid Response Criteria

#### Urgency of the proposed Acquisition

(1-low, 2-medium, 3-high, 4-very high)

- Critical (4)
  - It is clear funding is immediately necessary to prevent severe impact from one or more documented direct threats.<sup>1</sup>
- High (3)
  - Funding is needed as soon as possible because of potentially damaging impact and documented threat.
- Medium (2)
  - Funding will solve uncertainty or greatly alleviate landowner anxiety that could lead to potential withdrawal of the property by the landowner, but no immediate threat is documented.
- Low (1)
  - Funding will lead to improvements like expedited workflow or phasing/sequencing.

#### Significance to achieving recovery (impact)

(1-low, 2-medium, 3-high, 4-very high)

- Extensive (4)
  - There is significant POSITIVE impact on recovery.
  - Multiple threats are affected by the change. Enabling conditions to recovery are vastly improved.
- Significant (3)
  - There is clear POSITIVE impact on recovery.
  - At least one threat is affected by the change.
- Moderate (2)
  - There is some POSITIVE impact on recovery
  - Threat reduction potential exists, but is indirect or uncertain.
- Minor (1)
  - ANY impact is nominal due to unclear threat potential.

#### Support from lead entities, partners, landowners and neighbors

(1-low, 2-medium, 3-high, 4-very high)

The project must be fully supported by the lead entity with no minority opinions. All partners must demonstrate engagement. Landowner acknowledgement forms must be in place at the time of application. Letters of support from project partners are highly encouraged.

- Significant support demonstrated (4)
- Some support; no red flags (3)
- Some support; potential project delays identified (2)
- Limited support; more outreach needed before project moves forward (1)

**Long-term impacts of climate to the landscape****(1-poor, 2-good, 3-better, 4- best; Averaged score (Scale 1 – 4))**

- Is the project positioned to address an immediate pressure that directly impacts Chinook population survival and is the project design life >10 years? (Scale 1 – 4)
  - For nearshore, this includes: direct inundation, saltwater intrusion, sedimentation, and erosion
  - For freshwater, this includes: higher river and stream temperatures, lower summer stream flows, and higher winter stream flows
- Did the sponsor identify quantitative or qualitative changes to the immediate pressures (examples given above) projected with climate change? (Scale 1 – 4)
- Will projected climate changes limit the effectiveness of the project? (Scale 1 – 4)

**Cost considerations for ecosystem value****(1-low value/cost ratio, 2-medium value/cost ratio, 3-good value/cost ratio, 4-very good value/cost ratio)**

- Has a low cost relative to benefits to important socioeconomic factors and the predicted salmon benefits for a project in that location. (4)
- Has a reasonable cost relative to the contribution to salmon recovery goals for a project in that location (3)
- Has a reasonable cost relative to the predicted salmon benefits only for a project in that location. (2)
- Has a high cost relative to the predicted salmon benefits for a project in that location. (1)

**Leveraging other funding sources (1-low, 2-medium, 3-good, 4-very good)**

- Significant funding secured (4)
- Significant; with some funding secured (3)
- Moderate; some funding secured (2)
- Minor to moderate funding; mostly unsecured (1)

**Project scoring matrix:**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>SRC EC Score</b>		<b>PSAR Program Mngr Score</b>		<b>FINAL score</b>
Urgency of the proposal		+		/2 =	
Significance to achieving recovery (impact)		+		/2 =	
Support from lead entities, partners, landowners and neighbors		+		/2 =	
Long term impacts of climate to the landscape		+		/2 =	
Cost considerations for ecosystem value		+		/2 =	
Leveraging of other funding sources		+		/2 =	
<b>FINAL SCORE</b>					<b>Total/6 = final score</b>

<sup>1</sup> Direct threats are the proximate human activities or processes that have caused, are causing, or may cause the destruction, degradation, and/or impairment of biodiversity targets (a specific element that a project has decided to focus on and whose condition the project ultimately seeks to impact) Direct threats are synonymous with sources of stress and proximate pressures. (<http://cmp-openstandards.org/using-os/tools/threats-taxonomy/>)

## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12 , 2018

**Title:** SRFB Monitoring Panel Effort Updates and Project Effectiveness work session planning

**Prepared By:** Keith Dublanica, GSRO Science Coordinator  
Pete Bisson and Leska Fore, Co-chairs of the SRFB Monitoring Panel

#### Summary

This is a briefing memo following up on the 2018 monitoring panel recommendations discussed at the June 2018 meeting. The panel's recommendations were approved, with one caveat. Any next iteration of project effectiveness monitoring (or other monitoring) shall be presented to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) for any funding decisions.

The board's direction to the monitoring panel at the June meeting was to convene a project effectiveness "workshop" this autumn to assess the potential to modify monitoring categories and/or to develop any recommendations for future monitoring or complementary efforts. It had been hoped to hold this workshop in advance of the SRFB's September meeting. That was not possible. This briefing discusses the revised logistics of that monitoring workshop, outlines possible invitees, and provides a brief overview of the purpose of the workshop.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Decision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Request for Direction</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Briefing

### Monitoring Panel Members

Pete Bisson, Co-Chair	Bisson Aquatic Consulting, LLC
Leska Fore, Co-chair	Puget Sound Partnership
Ken Currens	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Dennis Dauble	Environmental Assessment Services (retiring 9/30/18)
Marnie Tyler	Ecolution, LLC
Micah Wait	Wild Fish Conservancy
<hr/>	
<i>Jody Lando</i>	<i>BPA - on hiatus from Panel participation TBD</i>

## Current Status of Effectiveness Monitoring

The Monitoring Panel recommended that the SRFB enter into contracts to complete the field work for Phase 1 of the current Project Effectiveness Monitoring in 2018 and draft a final report, to be completed by February 2019. Project Effectiveness Monitoring (reach-scale evaluations of various types of habitat restoration) is in transition between completing the initial phase (Phase 1) of the effort and a potential second phase (Phase 2). The monitoring panel deferred its comprehensive evaluation until the Phase 1 synthesis and final report are completed in early 2019. The monitoring panel is in agreement that additional discussion is needed to focus and refine the objectives of Project Effectiveness Monitoring.

Board members and others have expressed an interest in perhaps using some of the federal funding dedicated to monitoring for other high priority monitoring needs instead of for Phase 2 of effectiveness monitoring, especially those focused on or necessary for any de-listing effort.

In order for the board to make a decision about whether to continue Phase 2 of effectiveness monitoring or whether to identify other high priority monitoring needs, the Monitoring Panel decided to hold an effectiveness monitoring workshop. The SRFB withheld any decisions on the use of remaining monitoring funding until the workshop is conducted.

## Next steps for project effectiveness workshop

The Monitoring Panel intends to convene a project effectiveness monitoring workshop this fall, likely to occur between October 1 and November 16, 2018, with a possible follow-up session in early 2019.

The purpose of this workshop is to provide an opportunity for the state-wide stakeholders interested and involved in monitoring salmon recovery efforts to weigh in on the future of the SRFB monitoring program and to share the results of past monitoring efforts. We will focus on the needs for monitoring information, especially related to the implementation of salmon recovery plans. We anticipate objective facilitation to help bring diverse, and nontechnical, perspectives into the conversation to identify needs for a modified monitoring program and the use of federal funds dedicated to monitoring.

The Potential invitees/ contributors:

- Salmon Recovery Funding Board monitoring sub-committee
- Council of Regions
- Monitoring practitioners
- Regional Technical staff
- Agency representation (federal, state, tribal)

The Monitoring Panel intends to contract with a facilitator. Both comments and suggestions will be solicited that lead to a successful and productive workshop and a possible follow-up with selected participants in early 2019. The following questions and table were solicited from panel members for discussion.

---

## SRFB Monitoring Panel Scoping Questions

Monitoring Panel members answered the question:

*What are your top 3 questions regarding how to support or re-shape statewide monitoring efforts to support salmon recovery?*

MP questions are relevant and could be answered by:

- Regional reps (Council of Regions) & project sponsors
- SRF Board members
- Larger scientific community re: Effectiveness assessment
- The Monitoring Panel members (ourselves)

Some of these questions are being addressed by the SRF Board's monitoring portfolio, and others need a new approach.

---

Evaluative questions, who can answer, and are they currently addressed by the SRFB monitoring portfolio of projects

Question (abridged)	Who can answer	SRFB Mon. Portfolio?
What info, in what format, do you need about effectiveness of actions?	Regions, sponsors, SRFB	Roni PE review
Who is audience for monitoring results? How are results used?	Regions, sponsors, SRFB	
Do decision makers want more certainty re: habitat or fish?	SRFB	
Is habitat loss > habitat gain? What tools?	Sci. Comm.	
How evaluate impact of large restorations on salmon? i.e. dose/response.	Sci. Comm.	IMWs, FI/FO
What tools available to assess effectiveness at reach, subwatershed, and watershed scales at shorter time scales?	Sci. Comm.	IMWs
How do we "roll up" projects to watershed scale?	Sci. Comm.	Skagit IMW
How apply new tools, e.g., UAVs, remote sensing.	Sci. Comm.	

---

## **Request for Board Action**

The Monitoring Panel is requesting direction on the scope of the workshop and the future of SRFB investments in monitoring.



## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12, 2018

**Title:** Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's Updated Riparian Guidance

**Prepared By:** Keith Folkerts, Tim Quinn, Terra Rentz, Department of Fish and Wildlife

#### Summary

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is nearing completion of an update of their 1997 Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) riparian management recommendations. The new document consists of two volumes: Volume 1 synthesizes science related to riparian ecosystem composition, structure and function of riparian ecosystems within the context of the broader watershed. This volume was reviewed by the Washington State Academy of Sciences. Volume 2 is WDFW's management recommendations. This policy document reflects WDFW's values as informed by science.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Direction
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Briefing

### PHS Riparian Management Recommendations

#### Context

WDFW's mission is to protect and perpetuate fish and wildlife for the citizens of Washington State. To that end, WDFW provides information to land use decision makers through its Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) program. PHS consists of several elements including a list of Priority Habitats (such as riparian areas) and Priority Species, maps of where these occur, science-based Management Recommendations, and technical assistance from Habitat Biologists regarding how to interpret and implement the Management Recommendations.

For the past six years WDFW has been preparing an update to the 1997 PHS Riparian Management Recommendations. Following Ecology's wetlands example, the science synthesis is contained in Volume 1 while the Management Recommendations are in Volume 2. Volume 1 has been reviewed by the Washington State Academy of Sciences and contains WDFW's peer-reviewed synthesis of riparian science. Volume 1 is Best Available Science (BAS) regarding riparian function for the purposes of the Growth Management Act (GMA) and Shoreline Management Act (SMA). Volume 2 contains recommendations based on its mission and values as informed by Volume 1's science synthesis; volume 2 is not BAS.

Volume 2 was presented to the public for a 90-day comment period, which ended August 17, 2018. The final document is expected by the end of 2018.

## Content

### Volume 1

Volume 1's definition of riparian ecosystem, consistent with the National Academy of Sciences, includes the immediate "riparian zone" plus the upland "zone of influence." Full riparian ecosystem function can be provided within the riparian ecosystem (referred to as the Riparian Management Zone, RMZ) depending on the conditions (i.e., composition and structure) within the RMZ. Volume 1 has chapters on each major riparian function: Hydrology/Stream Channel Morphology, Wood, Stream Temperature, Pollutant Removal, and Nutrient Dynamics. In addition, Volume 1 has chapters on riparian ecosystems of the Columbia Basin and the influence of watershed conditions on aquatic and riparian systems.

### Volume 2

Volume 2 is WDFW's best professional judgment primarily intended to inform local governments' efforts to conserve riparian ecosystems and protect fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. The recommendations are advisory, that is, local governments are not required to use the guidance. The guidance reflects WDFW's values as guided by its mission and informed by riparian ecosystem science. We support an ecosystem-based management approach, which recognizes stakeholders' values, to implementing land-use policies.

Volume 2 consists of five chapters:

1. Introduction
2. GMA/SMA and Protection of Critical Areas
3. Regulatory Tools
4. Restoring Riparian Ecosystems and Protecting through Voluntary Stewardship
5. Improving Protection through Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Four Appendices present details regarding how to determine Site Potential Tree Height of a 200-year-old tree (SPTH<sub>200</sub>) using web-based information, SPTH histograms for each county, an adaptive management matrix, and case studies of how the application of science can vary depending upon management objectives.

## Differences between the current document and the 1997 document

### Major differences between the 1997 PHS Riparian document and the 2018 update

Topic	1997 document	2018 document
Width of buffer/Riparian Management Zone (RMZ)	Either 150', 200', 225', or 250' based DNR stream type, channel width, and mass wasting potential	In forested ecoregions, the RMZ varies from ~51' to ~260' based on Site Potential Tree Height (SPTH <sub>200</sub> ). In the Columbia basin, the RMZ width varies based on pollutant removal/water quality function and vegetation characteristics.
Watershed considerations	Largely absent	Describes relationship between watershed and riparian processes, identifies most important watershed processes to aquatic functioning
Separation of science from management recommendations	Combined in one document; no way to differentiate between the two.	Separated into two volumes. Clear delineation between science and policy.
Scientific foundation of management recommendations (MRs)	Largely absent; often cites no science or a few studies.	MRs are linked to scientific concepts and current understanding of riparian ecology within a watershed context. High quality, peer-reviewed science. MRs demonstrably informed by BAS.
Land use management within buffers/RMZs	Vague, aspirational: Buffers are "Restricted use zones"; impacting activities "should be carefully conducted."	Specific, measurable, actionable: As land use intensifies, jurisdictions should provide for No Net Loss of riparian functions within RMZs, and provide compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts.
Terrestrial wildlife	Addressed	Not addressed (refers to 1997 document)
Monitoring and Adaptive Management	Not addressed	Fully addressed. Includes a chapter relevant to local governments.

### Next Steps

A three-month public review period ended August 17; the document is currently being revised in response to comments received. The final, WDFW-approved document is expected to be available in November 2018.

## Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

### APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

**Meeting Date:** September 12, 2018  
**Title:** Puget Sound Marine Survival & Hood Canal Bridge Study  
**Prepared By:** Tara Galuska, Salmon Section Manager

#### Summary

Jacques White, Executive Director of Long Live the Kings, will give a presentation on Puget Sound Marine Survival and The Hood Canal Bridge Study.

#### Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Direction
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Briefing

### Marine Survival

In 2013, Long Live the Kings received a Salmon Recovery Funding Board grant to evaluate the drivers of ocean survival for Puget Sound Chinook that inhabit the San Juan Islands and which are listed as threatened with the risk of extinction under the federal Endangered Species Act. Long Live the Kings identified critical periods of growth and associated habitats and looked at whether temperature, food supply, energetic quality of food, or competition are the primary factors limiting growth. The work focused on the near-shore and offshore areas of the San Juan Islands where salmon are present as well as the Whidbey Basin and Bellingham Bay to capture as much of the early marine residence period as possible. This work helped refine the focus on the priority habitats and ecological conditions to protect and restore by providing more detail about the relationship between specific habitats and areas, their ecological conditions, and the growth and survival of salmon that use the San Juan Islands. This project complemented similar work in central and south Puget Sound as part of a collective effort to investigate the decline in marine survival of Puget Sound Chinook. The project has since garnered other funding.

### Hood Canal Bridge Assessment

Recent studies indicate slower migration times and higher mortality of out-migrating steelhead smolts at the Hood Canal Bridge relative to other areas of Puget Sound. Initial results suggest predation of steelhead is exacerbated by the bridge. However, as a fish passage barrier, it is important to determine where along the bridge mortality is greatest, and functionally how the bridge leads to increased predation (e.g., pontoons and changes to circulation influencing migration behavior, bridge components predator roosts/hideouts, light and noise affecting fish and/or predator behavior). In 2015, Long Live the Kings received funding through RCO to study the impact of the bridge on salmon. This active assessment is isolating the mortality mechanisms and using this information to develop the proper management actions to address the mortality.

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

September 12, 2018

Item	Formal Action	Follow-up Action
<b>Consent Agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve August 2018 Meeting Minutes</li> </ul>	<p><b>Decision</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Move to approve meeting agenda for Wednesday, September 12<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p><b>Moved by:</b> Member Jeff Breckel  <b>Seconded by:</b> Member Bob Bugert  <b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Move to approve August 9<sup>th</sup> 2018 meeting minutes.</p> <p><b>Moved by:</b> Member Jeff Breckel  <b>Seconded by:</b> Member Phil Rockefeller  <b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>	No follow-up action requested.
<b>1. Director's Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Director's Report</li> <li>Legislative, Budget, and Policy Updates</li> <li>Performance Update (<i>written only</i>)</li> <li>Financial Report (<i>written only</i>)</li> </ul>	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
<b>2. Salmon Recovery Management Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governors Salmon Recovery Office Report                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salmon Recovery Conference Planning Update</li> </ul> </li> <li>Salmon Section Report</li> </ul>	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
<b>3. Update on Orca Task Force</b>	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
<b>4. Reports from Partners</b>	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
<b>5. Update on the Lean Study</b>	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.

6. Assessments, Planning Grants & Eligibility	<p><b>Decision</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Move to approve up to \$200,000 in state bond funds per grant round from each of the following region's allocation: Snake, Coast, Upper, Lower and Mid-Columbia, to be used for assessments that do not produce a project design, using criteria outlined in Memo 6.</p> <p><i>NOTE: The SRFB regional allocations approved in March 2017 do not change. No assessments will be funded with PCSRF funds – only state bond funds or PSAR.</i></p> <p><b>Moved by:</b> Member Bob Bugert  <b>Seconded by:</b> Member Jeff Breckel  <b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>	No follow-up action requested
7. Puget Sound Rapid Response	<p><b>Decision</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Move to approve the Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund and use up to \$1 million PSAR project returned funds and Delegate the authority to the RCO Director. (<i>See Minutes for detailed information</i>)</p> <p><b>Moved by:</b> Member Jeff Breckel  <b>Seconded by:</b> Member Bob Bugert  <b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>	No follow-up action requested.
8. Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop Update & Next Steps	Request for Direction (Not a Decision as originally stated on the agenda)	Staff will brief the board following the workshop
9. Overview of the new Priority Habitat and Species: Riparian Ecosystem Document (which is part of the Aquatic Habitat Guidelines)	Briefing	<p><b>Follow-up:</b></p> <p>Board needs to return in 2019 to discuss whether to require a minimum buffer width for all restoration projects for riparian habitat (staff to create recommendation).</p>
10. Puget Sound Marine Survival & Hood Canal Bridge Study	Briefing	No follow-up action requested



## SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

**Date:** September 12, 2018

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

### Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

---

<b>David Troutt, Chair</b>	Olympia	<b>Carol Smith</b>	Department of Ecology
<b>Bob Bugert</b>	Wenatchee	<b>Susan Kanzler</b>	Department of Transportation
<b>Jeff Breckel</b>	Longview	<b>Erik Neatherlin</b>	Department of Fish and Wildlife
<b>Phil Rockefeller</b>	Bainbridge Island	<b>Stephen Bernath</b>	Department of Natural Resources
<b>Jeromy Sullivan</b>	Kingston	<b>Brian Cochrane</b>	Washington Conservation Commission

---

*Excused: Member Smith, Member Cochrane, and Member Bernath.*

**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 David Troutt called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m., he welcomed board, staff, and audience. Staff called roll and a quorum was determined.

**Motion:** Move to approve meeting agenda for Wednesday, September 12<sup>th</sup>.  
**Moved by:** Member Jeff Breckel  
**Seconded by:** Member Bob Bugert  
**Decision:** Approved

The board reviewed the consent agenda which included approval of the August 2018 meeting minutes.

**Motion:** Move to approve August 9<sup>th</sup> 2018 meeting minutes.  
**Moved by:** Member Jeff Breckel  
**Seconded by:** Member Phil Rockefeller  
**Decision:** Approved

Member Neatherlin, briefed the board on the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) hatcheries policy statement and that the agency is still committed to Salmon Recovery.

Director Cottingham took a moment to explain the correspondence in the member folders in order to prepare for the days meeting. The board invited Amber Moore from Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) to come up and introduce herself in her new role.

### **Management and Partner Reports**

#### **Item 1: Director's Report**

**Director's Report:** Director Cottingham briefed the board on several happenings at RCO including, updates from the federal Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) audit, staff changes, lean study progress, and a reminder that the State of the Salmon report is due to be released before the end of the year.

Wendy Brown, RCO Policy Director, highlighted a few topics for the board: agency decision packages are due today to the Office of Financial Management, and RCO has been working on putting together a budget appropriation for the 2019-2021 biennium which the board approved during the August 2018 meeting.

## **Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Report**

**Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO):** Steve Martin, GSRO Executive Director, updated the board on the GSRO work plan that will be reviewed by GSRO and Director Cottingham later this year; and is likely to be revised to reflect new and changing tasks. For example, the Governor's Executive Order creating the Southern Resident Killer Whale (SRKW) Task Force, and tasks assigned to the GSRO, have added a significant unanticipated workload that will not end with the delivery of the first report to the Governor in November.

Sarah Gage, GSRO reviewed the role and budget for lead entities in Washington State, as well as the role of the Washington Salmon Coalition. She was pleased to report there were no delays in projects in the grant round for WRIA 13 due to transitions of staff. Ms. Gage continued her presentation by updating the board on the status of the 2019 Salmon Recovery conference; noting that Western Washington University Conference Services (WWU-CS) has been selected to provide conference management and registration services. Ms. Gage concluded her presentation with a reminder that there will still be a significant amount of staff time required for conference oversight, session selection, and presentation screening—among other duties.

Board discussed sponsorships, forming a steering committee, and how contracting out the conference may or may not affect any potential profits made from the conference for this year.

Jennifer Johnson, GSRO, provided the board an update on how the State of the Salmon report is progressing, and reviewed the history of the report and how it has continued to evolve since it has come to the GSRO several years ago. Board discussed importance of keeping the SOS report about salmon, not orcas. The board volunteered several ideas and directions that the report could go in order to keep it relevant and scientific, but also hopeful and engaging.

**Salmon Section Report:** Tara Galuska, RCO Salmon Section Manager, debriefed the board on the June 2018 Joint Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) meeting. Both agencies agreed the interactions and presentations from the SRFB and OWEB members and staff were very positive and successful. Ms. Galuska informed the board that there has been a staff discussion regarding the desire for a similar joint meeting with the boards every four years.

Board discussed the benefits of having a policy level meeting about focused investment strategies before the next joint OWEB meeting.

Ms. Galuska concluded by her presentation by providing a brief update from the current SRFB grant cycle. She reminded the board that the projects currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Panel are the very same projects coming before the board in December for funding.

**Recently Completed Projects:** RCO Grants Managers Elizabeth Butler and Josh Lambert presented highlights of closed SRFB projects.

**Smith Island:** Elizabeth Butler, reviewed the Smith Island project in Snohomish/Puget Sound that just recently breached its existing dike and opened up the estuary on August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018 ([09-1279](#)).



The board discussed the challenges of many sources, funding a single project, the success that has been achieved through working together with multiple agencies and stakeholders, and highlighted that this is one of the largest projects that RCO has ever managed.

**Beards Cove:** Josh Lambert, provided an overview of the Beards Cove Restoration project in Hood Canal (14-1326).

### **Item 3: Update on Orca Task Force**

Steve Martin, GSRO Executive Coordinator, provided an update and background information on the Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force that was created last spring through an executive order by Governor Inslee. A report from the task force is due to the Governor this November with recommendations for moving forward. RCO is represented on the task force by Director Cottingham, with Steve Martin co-leading the prey availability workgroup.

Board discussed details of the recommendations moving forward, the roles of the various entities involved in the process and potential topics to look out for in the upcoming legislative session.

### **Item 4: Reports from Partners**

**Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT):** Member Kanzler, provided an update about WSDOT's action in removing the yellow paint containing PCB's on roads. Additionally, she mentioned WSDOT is also represented on the Orca task force on the vessel noise workgroup.

**Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW):** Member Neatherlin provided an update on a recent congressional tour he participated in, as well as a reminder that WDFW's new director is still getting up-to-speed in his new role. He also mentioned an upcoming conference (May 2019) of the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission, which the U.S. will be hosting this year; noting there would be more details to come.

**Washington Salmon Coalition (WSC):** Alicia Olivas, provided an update on the lead entities, which have just finished wrapping up their projects; for many of them it is still currently construction season. Ms. Olivas also briefly mentioned the role of the lead entities in the Lean meetings, providing feedback and giving interviews. She closed her presentation with a briefing of several upcoming meetings the WSC will be involved in over the next few months, and will have more updates for the board in December.

**Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups (RFEG):** Jason Lundgren, director of the Cascades Columbia Enhancement Group, provided the board with a quick update of the number of projects submitted to the SRFB this year. He also mentioned that in addition to SRFB projects, the RFEG's also apply for funding and are active sponsors for other fish projects such as Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFPP) and Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP). Mr. Lundgren closed by letting the board know they are still interviewing to fill the executive assistant vacancy.

Board expressed their hope for the RFEG's to stay active in the Salmon Recovery Network (SRNet) and continue to contribute their great ideas.

**Council of Regions (COR):** John Foltz, Snake Region, and Jess Helsley, Coast Region, briefed the board on the Council of Regions updated work plan. One of the items that has come out of the work plan is the need to hire a COR coordinator; someone who can focus full time on these issues. Ms. Helsley let the board know the next step in the plan will be to reach out to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to talk about key concerns.

Mr. Foltz noted COR wants to change the structure of their presentations for future updates to the board. This new structure would make for shorter, more focused presentations with specific regions rotating through to present each meeting. Board discussed what this new format would look like moving forward, consensus being it could potentially take up to five more minutes in updates.

In addition to the presentation, Ms. Helsley announced that she has accepted a new position at Wild Salmon Center and that this will be her last meeting with the SRFB. Board discussed all the great work that Ms. Helsley has been able to complete out on the coast, and thanked her for her dedication to salmon recovery.

In closing, Mr. Foltz was joined by Tricia Synder of Mid-Columbia to discuss their proposal for the strategic plan. Ms. Snyder highlighted how their region now has greater diversity, and they are getting closer to having a viable salmon population, but there is still much work to be done due to the sheer size of the projects that need to be completed. Board discussed Mid-Columbia's plan to move forward, as well as their support for a consistent message. They reiterated their desire for Mid-Columbia to succeed and pave the way for other regions in the future.

#### **Public Comment**

No public comment was received at this time.

*Break – 11:30 a.m.*

#### **Item 5: Update on the LEAN Study**

**Lean Study:** Judy Wells, of MC2, and Director Cottingham updated the board on that status of the Lean study. The most recent phase of the study has involved substantial information gathering from various partners. This information will help with the current state analysis, as well as mapping out of processes to help facilitate future meetings. Ms. Wells closed by reviewing some of the highlights and themes that have come out of the study thus far.

Board discussed findings and asked for clarity on several of the survey comments.

*Lunch – 12:30 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.*

#### **Board Business: Decisions**

##### **Item 6: Assessments, Planning Grants & Eligibility**

Tara Galuska, Salmon Section Manager, briefed the board on planning projects. She reviewed both designs and general assessments that lead to projects, and eligible project types in the SRFB annual grant round. To meet the specific program priorities outlined in the federal PCSRF application, staff is recommending a change to adjust the criteria for planning grants; specifically general assessments that do not produce a design. Planning/design grants would continue to be eligible, and planning/assessments projects (also known as data gaps) would continue to be eligible.

Board discussed and asked clarifying questions about allocation, priorities, and terminology.

**Motion:** Move to approve up to \$200,000 in state bond funds per grant round from each of the following region's allocation: Snake, Coast, Upper, Lower and Mid-Columbia, to be used for assessments that do not produce a project design, using criteria outlined in Memo 6.

*NOTE: The SRFB regional allocations approved in March 2017 do not change. No assessments will be funded with PCSRF funds – only state bond funds or PSAR.*



**Moved by:** Member Bob Bugert  
**Seconded by:** Member Jeff Breckel  
**Decision:** Approved

#### **Item 7: Puget Sound Rapid Response**

Tara Galuska, Salmon Section Manager, and Suzanna Stoike, Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator at Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), summarized for the board the use of currently available "returned funds" in the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) program. This proposal recommends allowing these returned funds to be pooled in the proposed Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund. This fund could have up to \$1 million of PSAR returned funds that could be used for highly important and time sensitive acquisition projects in Puget Sound not funded in the biennial grant round. If a lead entity proposed a project and it was funded using these rapid response funds, the lead entity's PSAR allocation would be reduced by the award amount in the following PSAR grant round, thus replenishing this source of funding for future availability.

Board discussed and asked clarifying questions about funding and the agility to act.

**Motion:** Move to approve the Puget Sound Rapid Response Revolving Fund and use up to \$1 million PSAR project returned funds for important, prioritized and time-sensitive acquisition projects in the Puget Sound region. Delegate authority to the RCO Director to fund projects that have been approved by the lead entity, Puget Sound Partnership and SRFB Review Panel and to track the use and replenishment of the fund in future PSAR allocations.

**Moved by:** Member Jeff Breckel  
**Seconded by:** Member Bob Bugert  
**Decision:** Approved

#### **Item 8: Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop Update & Next Steps**

Keith Dublanica, GSRO, Pete Bisson and Leska Fore, monitoring panel co-chairs, followed up on the 2018 monitoring panel recommendations discussed at the June 2018 meeting. The board's direction to the monitoring panel at the June meeting was to convene a project effectiveness workshop this autumn to assess the potential to modify monitoring categories and/or develop any recommendations for future monitoring or complementary efforts. However, that meeting wasn't able to happen before the September SRFB meeting. Mr. Dublanica, Ms. Fore, and Mr. Bisson discussed conflicts that prevented the workshop from happening, as well as ideas to move forward.

Board discussed the various monitoring methods, and pros and cons of having a workshop that involves other state agencies and partners.

*Note: This item was not a request for decision, as labeled on the agenda. This item was a request for direction.*

**Public Comment:**  
No public comment was received at this time.

**Break – 2:30 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.**

#### **Item 9: Overview of the new Priority Habitat and Species: Riparian Ecosystem Document**

Keith Folkerts and Tim Quinn, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's Habitat Program, summarized the draft updates to the Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) riparian management

documents. The new document consists of two volumes. Volume 1, is made up of synthesized science related to riparian ecosystem composition, and structure and function of riparian ecosystems within the context of a broader watershed. Volume 2 is WDFW's management recommendations. These documents are still in draft form.

Board discussed the difficulty of policy and science work and how appreciative they are that this kind of work is being done. Once WDFW finished Volume 2, the board will be asked to discuss whether to change any requirements for restoration projects related to buffer width.

#### **Item 10: Puget Sound Marine Survival & Hood Canal Bridge Study**

Jacques White, Long Live the Kings, briefed the board on the Puget Sound Marine Survival. Mr. White reviewed several factors contributing to the decline of salmon, and the value of hypothesis driven research. Mr. White stressed the findings are important when it comes to addressing issues of marine survival, and it will not only help fish populations recovery, but will help with Southern Resident Killer Whale Survival.

Board discussed the importance of this work, and how crucial is it to communicate the findings to partners.

Iris Kempt, Long Live the Kings, briefed the board on the Hood canal bridge study. She reviewed the history of the bridge, corresponding issues, and why the bridge has been a continuing problem. Ms. Kempt reviewed several hypothesis of how and why the bridge effects incoming and outgoing salmon migration. She brought up topics that included predation, light and noise pollution, and temperature effects. Ms. Kempt stressed to the board that the project and research is still very much in data analysis mode, and that all of the data she has shown has been from year one. Year two data is still being analyzed and won't be available until 2019 at the earliest. She closed by highlighting that the data set over the next year will help them better understand fish densities and patterns around the bridge.

Board asked clarifying questions about what will happen now, and what the recommendations are moving forward.

#### **Closing:**

Chair Troutt adjourned the meeting for the day at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held December 5-6<sup>th</sup> in the Natural Resources Building, Room 172, in Olympia, WA 98501.

#### **Approved by:**



David Troutt, Chair



Date