

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: December 7, 2022

Place: Hybrid - online via Zoom and in Room 172, Natural Resources Building, 1111 Washington Street SE; Olympia, WA

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members:

Jeff Breckel, Chair	Stevenson	Annette Hoffman	Designee, Washington Department of Ecology
Jeromy Sullivan	Kingston	Tom Gorman	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Kaleen Cottingham	Olympia	Chris Pettit	Designee, Washington State Conservation Commission
Chris Endresen-Scott	Conconully	Jeremy Cram	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Joe Maroney	Spokane	Susan Kanzler	Designee, Washington Department of Transportation

This summary is to be used with the materials provided in advance of the meeting. The Recreation and Conservation Office retains a recording as the formal record of the meeting.

Call to Order:

Chair Breckel called the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) meeting to order at 9:00 AM and requested roll call, determining quorum.

Motion: Move to Approve the December 7, 2022, Agenda

Moved By: Member Cottingham

Seconded by: Member Endresen-Scott

Decision: **Approved**

Motion: Move to Approve the August 2022 Meeting Minutes

Moved by: Member Endresen-Scott

Seconded by: Member Cottingham

Approved: **Approved**

Motion: Move to Approve the September 2022 Meeting Minutes
Moved by: Member Cottingham
Seconded by: Member Endresen-Scott
Approved: Approved

Chair Breckel recognized the hard work of applicants, staff, and partners in getting salmon grants allocated in 2022 and introduced new members Chris Pettit (Director of the Conservation Commission) and Joe Maroney (Director of Fishery and Water Resources for Kalispel Tribe of Indians).

Item 1: Director's Report

Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) **Director Megan Duffy** described agency activities and staff changes that have taken place since the September board meeting.

(See Item 1 memo [here](#))

Brock Milliern, RCO Policy and Legislative Director, said that the Governor's budget is coming out in December. The mid-November budget forecast was positive and showed an increase of \$762 million for this biennium and \$681 million for the next biennium. Mr. Milliern will compile a comparison of RCO's current allocation compared with the Governor's budget and make that available to staff and boards. **Member Cottingham** asked about the weekly Legislative emails that were previously sent to the board, and Mr. Milliern replied that he would send them to the board this session.

Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Report

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Report

Erik Neatherlin, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) Director, summarized the recent work completed by the GSRO. Key topics included legislative and partner activities, the Governor's Salmon Strategy Update for the 2023-2025 biennial work plan, the State of the Salmon Report, Salmon Recovery Network, and the Salmon Recovery Conference.

Tara Galuska, GSRO Orca Coordinator, summarized recent work around Southern Resident Orca Recovery. Key topics included the Department of Ecology's, GSRO's, and the Puget Sound Partnership's (PSP) guidance concerning the sunset Orca Task Force's recommendation 27, Orca Recovery Day, and the Southern Resident Killer Whale population.

Salmon Section Report

Marc Duboiski, Salmon Recovery Grants Section Manager, provided updates on the work of the salmon section including 2022 funded projects, an update on the Watershed Plan Review, and grant administration.

Chair Breckel asked if Mr. Duboiski and his staff had seen any trend in cost increases. Mr. Duboiski noted that there is approximately \$700,000 remaining of the board's \$1 million cost increase pot, which does not indicate a significant demand. However, he observed that sponsors may be finding funds elsewhere and that the \$25 million in supplemental funds for projects less than \$5 million can also be used for cost increases per board direction. Mr. Duboiski added that the costs are still rising and unpredictable.

(See Item 2 memo [here](#))

General Public Comment

None.

Item 3: Partner Reports

Council of Regions

Alex Conley, Chair of the Council of Regions (COR), provided an update on the work of COR. The regional salmon recovery boards continue to work with RCO and GSRO staff on several issues and sent a letter to the Governor's Office in support of both RCO's capital and operation funding requests. On [Item 5A](#) (which discusses possible approaches for allocating any increases in funding due to the IIJA NOAA appropriation), the regions recommend using a modified version of Option 1, in which the overall regular grant round amount is increased with IIJA funds and allocated using existing formulas; RCO staff can review all projects submitted statewide and choose the projects that best fit the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) criteria. COR does not support Option 2 because it requires more process. Option 3 could be workable but requires a new statewide grant round which requires a lot of investment where capacity is already stretched.

WA Salmon Coalition

Mike Lithgow, chair of the Washington Salmon Coalition (WSC) and the Kalispel Tribe Natural Resources Department Desk, discussed WSC work, including engaging in RCO's Manual 18 update. The WSC appreciated the good communication from RCO policy staff and were happy to provide input. WSC supports the remaining projects identified

by the regions for the large supplemental project list. Like the regions, WSC supports utilizing existing processes to allocate any additional IJA funds. WSC also supports the proposed one-time shift of \$208,000 in monitoring funds to the regions for regional monitoring projects. Finally, Mr. Lithgow expressed his appreciation for RCO's budget ask for capacity for the lead entities.

Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups

Lance Winecka, Executive Director of South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group, shared current Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group (RFEG) work. Mr. Winecka thanked RCO staff for getting contracts out quickly, enabling project sponsors to speed up engineering, permitting and bidding, which leads to an earlier start to construction and hopefully savings down the road.

RFEGs are supportive of the RCO's capacity fund request for lead entities and regional organizations.

Mr. Winecka mentioned interest in the Governor's Budget and funding improvement within the Salmon Recovery Plan. They are specifically interested in the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) "salmon in schools" program, which provides funding to low-income schools to educate them on salmon. All of the RFEGs are working with OSPI on this effort.

Mr. Winecka commented that the 'no match policy for those riparian projects with buffers greater than site potential tree height' is great because match is difficult to acquire.

Mr. Winecka said that the process the RFEGs use is not simple and appreciates board's acknowledgement of capacity that goes into applying for grant funds and implementing projects.

BREAK: 10:10 – 10:25 AM

Chair Breckel moved Item 8 up on the agenda.

Item 8: Statewide Salmon Strategy Workplan Update

Katie Knight Pruitt, GSRO Salmon Recovery Coordinator, presented the biennial workplan of State budget and policy priorities to implement the Governor's 2021 updated statewide salmon strategy. A budget proviso in the 2022 supplemental budget directed the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) to work with state agencies to develop a biennial workplan for state agencies that includes legislative and policy

priorities along with the budget required to support agency work that supports the Governor's Statewide Salmon Recovery priorities. The proviso further directed that the proposed budget for salmon recovery align with tribal priorities and regional salmon recovery plans. The proviso also established a position in the GSRO to lead this work. Work plan highlights include significant funding for salmon habitat restoration projects, regulatory improvements, assessments of riparian areas, reducing toxics in waterways, stormwater infrastructure, streamflow restoration, planning for climate resiliency, salmon reintroduction in the upper Columbia River, improved salmon harvest monitoring, and predation management.

(See Item 8 memo [here](#))

Members expressed their support for the workplan and coordinated salmon recovery efforts.

Public Comment:

None.

Member Jeromy Sullivan joined the meeting at 10:47 am.

Item 4: Supplemental Funding Decisions

Kat Moore, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, introduced regionally proposed projects for the \$50 million appropriated in the 2022 supplemental budget. The appropriation directed that the \$50 million was to be used on salmon recovery projects valued at \$5 million or more. Several large-scale projects were approved at the board's September meeting, and the remaining projects were presented during this item discussion. Projects were presented from the Upper Columbia, Snake River, Washington Coast, and Yakima Basin regions.

(See Item 4 memo [here](#))

Upper Columbia

Dave Hecker, Coordinator of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB); **Tara Gregg**, UCSRB Project Manager; and **Chris Johnson**, Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation, presented on the [Sugar Reach Channel Reconnections Implementation project](#) and two alternate projects. The Sugar Reach Channel Reconnection Implementation project is located on the Methow River and intended to restore 2.6 miles of side-channel, 11.6 acres of Floodplain, 9 acres of riparian plantings, 2.9 miles of floodplain channels, and 44 wood placements. UCSRB worked closely with technical and citizen committees to review and rank their projects for submission. Below are the cost details of each project.

Upper Columbia				Allocation: \$4,794,000	
Project number	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Share	Proposed Supplemental Funding	Total Project Cost
22-1806	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation, Sugar Reach Channel Reconnections Implementation	\$4,974,000	\$206,001	\$4,794,000	\$5,000,001
22-1807	Yakama Nation, Nason Creek and State Route 207 – Phase 1	\$4,794,000	\$3,822,780	\$0 Alternate	\$8,616,780
22-1815	Chelan County Natural Resources, Icicle and Peshastin ID Instream Flow Project	\$4,794,000	\$321,787	\$0 Alternate	\$5,115,787
			Total	\$4,794,000	

[\(See presentation here\)](#)

Board members inquired about project permits and noted that this single phase, large project would be worth highlighting with the legislature. Presenters explained that permits were not in hand, but conversations with permitters had been held.

Snake River

John Foltz, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board; **Ali Fitzgerald**, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board; and **Morgan Morris**, Tri-State Steelheaders, presented on the [Mill Creek Passage project](#). Mr. Foltz talked about the Snake regional process for large supplemental projects; context for Mill Creek Fish Passage; what is being proposed for \$4.79 million; and what is left to do. Mr. Foltz noted that the Mill Creek Fish Passage is identified as a significant barrier to recovery of the middle Columbia steelhead. This project will also benefit Columbia River bull trout, spring chinook, and pacific lamprey.

This project addresses fish passage issues created by the weirs, bridges and concrete flumes, which will all face upgrades or removal.

Below is a break down of the proposed project.

Snake River Region				Allocation: \$4,794,000	
Project number	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Share	Proposed Supplemental Funding	Total Project Cost
22-1802	Tri-State Steelheaders, Mill Creek Passage – Large Capital Project	\$16,487,334	\$206,001	\$4,794,000	\$16,693,335
			Total	\$4,794,000	

The scope of work for this project will be scaled to available funding.

[\(See presentation here\)](#)

Board members inquired about the underground section and cost savings of one large project versus multiple phase projects. Presenters explained that the underground section is in the early phase and speculated that completing one larger project would be far less costly than breaking it into phases.

Washington Coast

Mara Zimmerman, Coast Salmon Partnership; **Tom Kollasch**, Willapa Bay Lead Entity Coordinator; **Jackie Ferrier**, Willapa Bay Wildlife Refuge; **Alex Barton**, Western Rivers Conservancy; and **Nelson Matthews**, Western Rivers Conservancy, presented on the [Willapa Coastal Forest – Phase 1 project](#). It was notable that this is an acquisition project of more than 1,000 acres near the Willapa Bay. This area is known to have chum, coho and Chinook, steelhead and coastal cutthroat. Below is a table of the cost breakdown:

Washington Coast				Allocation: \$4,794,000	
Project number	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Share	Proposed Supplemental Funding	Total Project Cost
22-1803	Western Rivers Conservancy,	\$4,974,000	\$206,001	\$4,794,000	\$5,000,001

	Willapa Coastal Forest – Phase 1				
22-1807	Quileute Tribe, Quillayute River Historic Oxbow Implementation	\$4,794,000	\$206,001	\$0 Alternate	\$5,000,001
			Total	\$4,794,000	

[\(See presentation here\)](#)

During discussion by board members, Member Sullivan inquired as to tribal ability to enter the proposed acquisition to practice tribal treaty rights.

Ms. Zimmerman and Ms. Ferrier responded that the affected tribe is the Shoalwater Bay Tribe, which is not a treaty tribe but is a supportive partner. They also noted that most of the refuge is open for hunting.

Members also inquired about project scalability, property management, and pay-for-use access. The sponsors explained that the budget for the project will shift depending on the appraised value of each parcel. They also mentioned that a property management plan exists; limited road maintenance management will need to be maintained as the project is mainly conservation based. Additionally, sponsors noted that private hunting groups lease the property, but those leases will be terminated. Director Duffy noted that RCO also requires a stewardship plan for acquisitions.

Yakima Basin

Michael Horner, Yakima Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board presented on [Gap to Gap](#) and two alternative projects. It was notable that the Gap to Gap project received previous funding, so funding from this track would be used for the [Yakima River Corridor Plan Implementation Phase II](#) project, which is part of a larger project that has been on-going for several years. This full reach and restoration project will benefit steelhead, coho, bull trout and other resident fish within its 650 acres of floodplain habitat by purchasing the 39-acre Yakima River RV Park. The project will include the removal of a levee and private berm, reconnection of side channels, the removal of irrigation, and revegetation of the floodplain.

Yakima Region	Remaining Allocation: \$3,609,135
----------------------	--

Project number	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Share	Proposed Supplemental Funding	Total Project Cost
22-1961	Kittitas County Public Works, Yakima River Corridor Plan Implementation Phase II	\$3,609,135	\$1,390,866	\$3,609,135	\$5,000,001
22-1967	Yakama Nation, Toppenish Creek at Pom Pom Road Floodplain Reconnection	\$3,609,135	\$1,390,866	\$0 Alternate	\$5,000,001
			Total	\$3,609,135	

[\(See presentation here\)](#)

Member Cram asked about why the projects were prioritized as they were. Mr. Horner replied that the RV park acquisition was considered a once-in-a-generation opportunity; it is where a lot of floodwaters gather and is considered critical.

Public Comment

None.

- Motion:** Move to Approve the Large Supplemental Projects ranked lists from the Upper Columbia, Snake River, Washington Coast and Yakima Basin regions as shown in the Updated Attachment A
- Moved by:** Member Sullivan
- Seconded by:** Member Endresen-Scott
- Approved:** Approved

Public Comment:

None.

LUNCH: 12:45 – 1:30 PM

Item 5: Future Funding Pathways – 2023 and 2024

Jeannie Abbott, GSRO Program Coordinator and **Nick Norton**, RCO Policy and Planning Specialist, presented options for direction should increased funding become available in 2023 via NOAA’s Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) given the passing of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). This memo also summarizes a path forward for a 2024 Targeted Investment Grant Round should funding be available. Options presented were:

	2023 Grant Round	2024 Grant Round <i>*For the 2024 grant round, the board may select to combine all funds (TI & IIJA) greater than the \$18M grant round for one Targeted Investment project selection process</i>
Option 1 Regional Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular grant round • Regional allocation for PCSRF IIJA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular grant round • Regional allocation for PCSRF IIJA • TI grant round for 23-25 TI funding
Option 2 Regional Allocation Plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular grant round • Regional allocation for PCSRF IIJA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project list must contain a project of regional significance, meeting IIJA objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular grant round • Regional allocation plus for PCSRF IIJA • TI grant round for 23-25 TI funding
Option 3 Large Project List	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular grant round • Region large project list for PCSRF IIJA (NOAA objectives) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular grant round • TI grant round for 23-25 • Region large project list for PCSRF IIJA

(See Item 5 memo [here](#))

Before discussing the options, Director Duffy provided two points of clarification: we do not know if or at what level RCO will receive IJA funding. This year, the state received \$6 million in IJA funding and the board directed that funding to be used in the targeted investment process. Member Endresen-Scott asked if any IJA funding received this year could be distributed using the same criteria as was used for the 2022 Targeted Investment grant round. Director Duffy responded that we do not know yet what the criteria might be, because NOAA could decide to add additional criteria. Moreover, part of this presentation is about possibly changing the targeted investment criteria due to lessons learned over the past year and to consider whether there could potentially be one process for additional funding when it is allocated to the state. Chair Breckel, Member Cram and Member Hoffman expressed that consistency in process and criteria from year to year is important.

Alex Conley presented an alternative to Option 1: increase the grant round by the amount of IJA funds and allocate to regions via current formula to create lists to submit to RCO. Staff could then look at the funded projects across the state and pick the projects that best meet IJA criteria – it is a fund-shift in the background that lets the regions run their grant rounds and still get the best projects.

While several board members supported Mr. Conley's proposed option, members and the RCO Director expressed concern over how regions can ensure that projects on their lists will meet the IJA criteria, especially engaging underserved communities. Mr. Conley replied that much of the criteria should be like other funding sources, but the Requests for Proposals (RFP) would need to include the underserved communities criteria.

As discussion continued, it was suggested that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board technical review panel and RCO salmon staff be included in the project review process before presenting them to the board. Member Endresen-Scott suggested that completing one larger project at once versus spreading the funding throughout to the regions would be more beneficial.

Cheryl Baumann, North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity coordinator, said that her lead entity is a huge area that covers many miles. For this large area, \$719k is allocated from the board in a time when the lead entity regularly receives three project requests per year of \$1 million dollars or more. She said that many of the big projects brought to the board start out as small projects.

BREAK: 2:54 – 3:02 PM

Mr. Norton said that the next motion is to ask the staff to look at the next Targeted Investment grant round. He indicated that 2022 was the first formal targeted investment

grant round and with the benefit of experience, potential areas of change have been identified to possibly incorporate into the next iteration.

Chair Breckel asked that the board look beyond the next targeted investment grant round and consider broader objectives. He directed staff to create a working committee for the process, which would bring back information to the board.

Members Cottingham, Endresen-Scott and Cram all volunteered to be on the working committee.

Public Comment:

None.

Motion: Move that for the 2023 grant round, any IJA funding received be distributed via the regional allocation formula. Each region shall indicate which projects, if any, on their 2023 lists, they believe meet the NOAA's IJA objectives. The staff and review panels shall use this information to recommend to the SRFB which projects to fund with IJA.

Moved by: Member Cottingham

Seconded by: Member Sullivan

Approved: *Approved*

Motion: Move to recommend that staff review the goals, priorities, objectives, criteria, and processes of the Targeted Investment program. The review will include a working committee to support the review. Staff will provide updates to the SRFB at the March meeting.

Moved by: Member Endresen-Scott

Seconded by: Member Sullivan

Approved: *Approved*

Item 6: Manual 18 2023 Updates

Nick Norton and **Kat Moore** presented proposed policy changes and administrative revisions to Manual 18: Salmon Recovery Grants for the 2023 grant round. These revisions incorporate changes resulting from suggestions from the Technical Review Panel and Recreation and Conservation Office staff, and feedback and edits from regions, lead entities, and project sponsors. Key changes proposed included policy changes to the design-only match waiver to increase the eligibility cap and required

completion timeline; increase threshold where preliminary design deliverable are required prior to application for construction funding for large restoration projects; clearly defining prohibited and allowed uses; clarify cost increase procedures; add content to Appendix D: Design and restoration project deliverables; add content and clarity to Appendix D: design-build projects; and add clarity for Appendix K: targeted investments.

(See Item 6 memo [here](#))

Member Pettit asked about the definition of preliminary design. Ms. Moore responded that Manual 18, Appendix D defines preliminary design for board projects. As a new member of the board, Member Pettit asked for a meeting with Mr. Norton and Ms. Moore to get a better understanding of how Manual 18 approaches restoration design and project phasing.

Chair Breckel asked how stakeholders have responded to the proposed changes. Mr. Norton shared that feedback had been largely positive, but that some concern was expressed related to requiring conceptual design in order to be eligible to submit a field-fit application when the request is for less than \$350,000 from the board. This is a higher bar than required previously and is included to give the review panel enough information to provide a thorough technical review.

Public Comment:

Alex Conley thanked staff for work on Manual 18. He raised a concern that requiring a conceptual design threshold for smaller field-fit projects before application means that applicants would potentially need to stretch out a project across multiple grant rounds.

Motion: Move to Accept policy changes to the following Manual 18 sections as further presented by staff:

- Design-only Match Waivers
- Prohibited and Allowed Uses
- Cost Increase Procedures
- Appendix D Deliverables
- Design-Build Projects
- Appendix K
- Large restoration project definitions

Moved by: Member Cottingham

Seconded by: Member Sullivan

Approved: Approved

Item 7: Upland Acquisitions Policy Options

Leah Dobey, Policy Specialist, and **Marc Duboiski** presented options for the board to proceed on a potential policy relating to the funding and match requirements of board acquisition projects that include, to varying degrees, upland acreage. The options presented include:

- Option 1 - Approve a policy that defines upland acres and sets standards for increased match based on the percentage of upland acres in a proposed acquisition; or
- Option 2 - Develop acquisition-specific criteria in Manual 18, Appendix F to support sponsor project development and technical review of acquisition projects with upland components; or
- Option 3 - Take no action.

(See Item 7 memo [here](#))

During board discussion, members expressed support for Option 1. Member Cottingham noted that sponsors should explain the reasons why an acquisition may need to include over 75 percent upland. This would provide a clear understanding of why the upland is included.

Board members asked whether the policy would be for a specific period of time or permanent until/unless the board chose to change it. Director Duffy and staff confirmed that if a policy were adopted, it would be permanent until the board takes different action. Member Endresen-Scott asked about when the definition of uplands and the value of the uplands would be reviewed to determine if it was working. Mr. Duboiski replied that staff would monitor how a new policy is applied for two years, it will take up to a year of stakeholder outreach to analyze and propose a different approach. Member Endresen-Scott clarified that if it turns out to be a problem, the board can always change it.

Public Comment:

Vanessa Kritzer, Executive Director, WA Association of Land Trusts (WALT), supported the first policy option. WALT has a long history of work with the board. The organization submitted comments on Manual 18 and stated that Option 1 best addressed their concerns. Uplands make a difference in riparian areas, salmon habitat and watershed

function. WALT was not opposed to Option 2, but Option 1 was noted as being more helpful during the 2023 grant round.

Dan Roix, Conservation Director, Columbia Land Trust (CLT), was supportive of Option 1, stating that it substantially addresses concerns that were raised during the input process. Option 1 will provide some certainty for project sponsors. CLT has brought more than the 15 percent match required for projects and, like many land trusts, will continue to do so. There will be times when the organization brings forward projects with uplands critical to salmon recovery.

Motion: Move to approve Option 1: Tiered Match Approach as presented by staff

Moved by: Member Cottingham

Seconded by: Member Endresen-Scott

Approved: **Approved**

Item 9: Monitoring Update

Erik Neatherlin and **Keith Dublanica**, GSRO Science Coordinator, presented an update on the status of monitoring funding, the monitoring synthesis report and adaptive management strategy, and the remote sensing “proof of concept” pilot. Mr. Neatherlin mentioned that Bob Bilby, PhD was the lead author of the IMW Synthesis Report, which will be finalized in March 2023. This report builds on other reports such as the IMW matrix, Pacific Northwest Aquatic Management Plan Management Implications Report, and the Western Washington IMW Habitat Monitoring Report.

Pete Bisson, Monitoring Panel Co-Chair, mentioned that the Adaptive Management Strategy is underway and the draft will be presented in 2023. The group intends to select a framework and approach, integrate science and lessons learned, and engage with the monitoring subcommittee and board for further direction.

Addressing the remote sensing projects, Mr. Bisson explained that larger and small side channels in the rivers have occurred since reconnecting the floodplains. This has provided positive response to spawning and rearing.

In addition, given that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has secured state operating dollars to fund the WDFW fish in/fish out gaps, there is a recommendation to set aside the \$208,000 fish in/fish out funding for other regional monitoring priorities.

(See Item 9 memo [here](#))

Member Cottingham asked why this is only a one-time shift – will this be built into the PCSRF application? Mr. Neatherlin clarified that the PCSRF application categorizes “monitoring” as tier 2 priority, and therefore, it is okay to shift funding between monitoring activities so long as you do not fund (lower) tier 3 priorities with (higher) tier 2 priority funds. Mr. Neatherlin further clarified that the reason this is one time funding is that there may be other types of monitoring that the board wants to fund in future years.

Public Comment:

None.

Motion: Move to Approve a one-time fund shift for up to \$208,000 of fish in/fish out monitoring funding to be made available for regional monitoring projects. Selection and approval of the projects will occur via the grant round process.

Moved by: Member Endresen-Scott

Seconded by: Member Cottingham

Approved: Approved

Item 10: Partner Reports

Partner reports were submitted in writing.

Conservation Commission

Member Pettit, Conservation Commission Director, shared that the Conservation Commission continues to implement the \$10 million in SRF funding from the supplemental budget in partnership with the conservation districts throughout the state. At present, over \$7.5 million of the overall total has been encumbered. Of that amount, 1/3 is focused on the technical assistance and engineering necessary to implement the projects and 2/3 is focused on project implementation. Additional rounds of projects have already been submitted and are expected to be approved in the coming months until the total amount is expended. The Commission was pleased to see its budget requests proposed as part of the Governor’s budget and continues to undertake structural adjustments and update policies to ensure the most efficient and effective implementation of any additional funding availability into the next biennium. Lastly, the Commission has hired staff and expedited implementation of the Sustainable Farms and Fields program to achieve carbon sequestration benefits tied to conservation project and practice implementation.

Department of Ecology

Member Hoffman, Department of Ecology (ECY) Assessment Program Manager, stated that ECY continues to work with the Governor's office and OFM on several areas with ties to salmon recovery. I would like to highlight the work on 6ppd-q, which is a tire anti-degradant chemical.

To date, ECY has:

- 1) developed a method in water,
- 2) conducted a hazards assessment,
- 3) contracted with universities to continue toxicity testing and best management practice (BMP) effectiveness monitoring,
- 4) convened expert workgroups to help review scientific and technical information to inform next steps for assessment strategies and mitigation actions (we have published a legislative report on 6ppd in road runoff: assessment and mitigation strategies), and
- 5) given presentations on our work to the Puget Sound Partnership.
- 6) worked/working with academia and industry representatives to create a roadmap for safer alternatives
- 7) requested funding to continue to fill information gaps, grow analysis capabilities including laboratory method in sediment, conduct baseline monitoring to evaluate action effectiveness, develop new criteria for the use of BMP's, expand coordination with state and federal partners, continue the search for safer alternatives and develop a cohesive strategy to eliminate the use of this chemical.

Department of Natural Resources

Member Gorman, Washington State Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Resources Division Manager, said that DNR is continuing to pursue several legislative initiatives that directly or indirectly support salmon recovery and conservation.

- **Derelict Aquatic Structures Removal (GF-S \$1.14M / Cap \$20M)** - Funding and legislation to remove and restore derelict aquatic structures to protect our waterways and improve fish habitat. Program will work with Tribes, local governments, and nonprofits to address and remove derelict structures from state and privately-owned aquatic lands.
- **Watershed Resilience Action Plan (WRAP) (GF-S \$2.86M)** - Funding needed to meet Snohomish WRAP deliverables, including kelp and eelgrass stewardship; a large woody debris program; aquatic restoration grants; culvert removal; and begin planning for pilot projects in three additional target watersheds for systems-level efforts to benefit salmon recovery.

- **Protect Public Lands and Tribal Rights (GF-S \$7.8M)** - Funding to hire ten (10) law enforcement officers to allow DNR to better protect our public lands and cultural resources.
- **Natural Area Preserve Act turns 50! (GF-S \$3.35M)** - Funding to celebrate the importance of the Natural Areas Preserve Act (NAPA) and allow DNR to better identify, protect, and manage important natural area ecosystems for the next fifty years.
- **Urban Forestry (GF-S \$8M)** - Funding for additional community grants that provide necessary assistance for increasing our statewide urban tree canopy.
- **HEAL Act and Environmental Justice Investments (GF-S \$3M)** - Funding to create the Office of Equity and Environmental Justice within the agency to centralize the agency's environmental justice (EJ) vision and create capacity across all divisions while becoming the public facing program for DNR's EJ and Equity work.
- **Growing Roots for Next 7 Generations (GF-S \$2.4M)** - Funding to expand the agency's Tribal Affairs Department to address growing government-to-government needs for all Tribes in the state across all agency programs, including requirements under the recently passed HEAL and Climate Commitment Acts.

Department of Fish and Wildlife

Member Cram, WDFW Salmon Recovery Policy Lead, said that WDFW is eagerly awaiting the Governor's budget and subsequent dialogues regarding our budget and policy priorities. We are also excited to have delivered multiple new reports that are available on our website. They pertain to net ecological gain, riparian, coastal steelhead, SRKW vessel adaptive management, European green crabs, Columbia River fisheries, and other relevant topics. We encourage everyone to check them out online.

Department of Transportation

Member Kanzler, Washington State Department of Transportation Fish Passage Coordinator, reported that WSDOT corrected 14 injunction barriers this past summer, improving access to nearly 30 miles of salmon and steelhead habitat within Western Washington.

Among the barriers corrected this past summer, WSDOT constructed a 113-foot span bridge under SR 169 Ravensdale Creek located in WRIA 9.

- Over the period of two construction seasons in 2021 and 2022, WSDOT partnered with King County to correct three barriers located on Ravensdale Creek, including the culvert under SR 169 and two nearby culverts under the local pedestrian trail in Ravensdale Creek Natural Area.

- King Co Parks Department received a \$2.5 million grant from the state Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board for fish passage restoration at the two county barriers on Ravensdale Creek, located just downstream of SR 169.
- One of the King County Parks' barriers was completely abandoned to allow for an open channel.
- The second King County Parks' barrier was replaced with a 100- foot span pedestrian bridge.
- These projects collectively opened 2.4 miles quality habitat for salmon and steelhead in Ravensdale Creek.

ADJOURN: 4:51 PM

Next meeting: March 8-9, 2023. Location: Olympia WA.

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jeffery Breckel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Chair Jeffery Breckel