

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

December 1 & 2, 2005

King Street Station 8th Floor Conference Room
Seattle, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by chair William Ruckelshaus at 1:17 p.m.

MONITORING FORUM UPDATE:

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #1 for details).

Bruce gave a brief overview of discussions held at the morning's Governor's Forum on Monitoring. The Forum had been asked to provide a recommendation to the Board on a Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) smolt-monitoring proposal. The Board felt this was a critical piece but didn't have enough information to decide whether the proposal included the correct sites to make a recommendation to the Board.

The Board discussed how the Forum could help the SRFB in making funding decisions on these programmatic issues. The Forum is trying to construct a comprehensive plan for statewide monitoring, not just salmon recovery monitoring. The Forum needs to know who is responsible for what portion of the monitoring and what are the statewide and regional priorities.

The Board also needs to have a process for programmatic funding requests. The Board should be flexible in funding these items if it is critical and there are no other fund sources. Some considerations would include being time related, crucial to the process, be something SRFB should fund, make sure it is at the proper scale, and consistent with the governor's budget.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Steve Tharinger **MOVED** approval of the October 2005 meeting minutes. Brenda McMurray **SECONDED**. Minutes were **APPROVED** as presented.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS:

Director's Report and Financial Services Report:

Director Laura Johnson provided both the Director's Report and the Financial Services Report highlighting several items. (See notebook Item #3b for details.)

Director Johnson noted that Larry Cassidy planned to be with the Board by phone but due to technical difficulties he is unable to participate, and Jim Peters was unable to attend due to need to attend the Conservation Commission meeting.

She noted an ad from Sunset Magazine with information about Alaska's "fish stickers" the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF). She also provided copies of Oregon's new biennium report for Coastal Coho. This report shows visually what is and isn't working in Oregon.

The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board has also expressed interest to get together with the SRF Board in the fall of 2006.

She noted that the SRFB Review Panel has been working very hard through the month of November. They are dealing with 143 requests for funding; they will be concluding today. The Review Panel's initial report will be out for lead entity review by December 7th.

Director Johnson gave a brief review of Salmon Recovery finances, noting that there is approximately \$26 million available for project funding in January. The SRFB will have an additional \$15-16 million from Federal 2006, but it will not be available until April 2006.

Chair Ruckelshaus reported that this year Washington still received the full \$25 million from the Congress even though the total PCSRF funding went from \$90 million to \$66 or \$67 million.

Communications Report

Susan Zemek presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #3c for details.)

Chair Ruckelshaus noted the importance of having a communication plan for legislators after the grant round meeting in January.

GSRO Report:

Written report only. (See notebook item #3d for details.)

Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) REPORT

There was no LEAG report presented at this meeting.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE (GMAP):

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

Bruce reviewed the Government Management Accountability Performance (GMAP) and Priorities of Government (POG) processes and what staff is doing to implement the GMAP process into the agency and Boards' strategic plans.

Public Testimony:

No public testimony on this agenda item.

Board Discussion:

Chair Ruckelshaus wants to make sure the Board doesn't set target goals on items the Board has no control over.

Tim Smith asked if the Board should have a target on any of these items such as barrier removal?

Chair Ruckelshaus replied that the Board only contributes to the opening up of barriers that are subject to Board funding that open up habitat that will contribute to fish recovery.

Dick Wallace noted Ecology's experience and how you format the questions depends on the audience, what the story is you want to tell, and at what scale you do GMAP. Dick also questioned if the Board would want regions to also use the GMAP process in reporting.

Brenda McMurray asked whose purview do the different issues fall under. She is not sure whether juvenile migrant monitoring should be under SRFB or WDFW?

Director Johnson believes that these are very legitimate questions and this is one reason the examples were included in this presentation, to start the discussion. Staff is struggling with the best reporting options and how to show this information. Natural resources are a very difficult topic to measure under the traditional GMAP process. She would welcome Brenda's offer to assist staff with this issue.

Steve Tharinger believes that since the SRFB Board gets the money we are expected to justify the spending.

Dick Wallace invited Bruce Crawford and IAC staff to attend an Ecology GMAP presentation to see how Ecology is presenting its information.

6th ROUND ISSUES:

A panel consisting of Neil Aaland, Doug Osterman, Tim Smith, and Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

Jim Fox reviewed the 6th Round allocation of fund process to date. The first increment will look similar to last year. WDFW has given us an update on the number of river miles, used in the 1st increment calculations. Foster Creek did not submit a project list so funds will be divided between 25 lead entities. Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board had a 5th ESA listing in its area.

Jim noted that the Review Panel is reviewing the list of projects submitted by the 25 lead entities. All lead entities are being rated on the fit of the project list to their strategy or regional salmon recovery plan. All lead entity lists are being examined to identify projects of concern (POCs). Lead entities that are not participating in regional recovery planning will be evaluated on strategy quality.

The information the Board will have available at the January 5-6th meeting will include the Review Panel report and the staff report.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the Review Panel is doing anything with the projects that have regional plans approved versus those who have either not submitted their plans yet or have submitted but not yet approved. Jim responded that he believes they will all be treated as they were submitted and that there will be a narrative on the status.

Neil Aaland provided a status report on the Review Panel's work. The Panel has completed all lead entity presentations and is scheduled to release the draft report to the lead entities on December 7, 2005, for their review. After the report is finalized staff will release it to the Board and to the public for comment on Monday December 19.

About 20% of the projects are labeled Projects of Concern's (POCs). He believes the compressed timeline and fewer fix-it loops may have contributed to the higher percentage of POCs this time.

Brenda McMurray asked about the discussion between the NOAA Technical Recovery Team and the SRFB review panel when there was a recovery plan submitted. Neil reported that staff convened a meeting in September 2005 with the Technical Recovery Teams and the Review Panel and exchanged information and questions. It was a helpful meeting but the process hasn't progressed far enough for this to be really successful in receiving additional information for the SRFB process.

Brenda would like there to be discussion in the report about any Technical Review Team comments relevant to SRFB work.

Tim Smith provided a presentation on the Lead Entities' November allocation work session and its recommendations to the Board.

Tim reviewed the first increment "Equitable Allocation" discussions.

Director Johnson reminded the Board that this amount was about \$9.1 million last year but as the Board topped-up the projects, the funding amount for the first increment ends up being closer to \$10 or \$11 million which actually leaves less funding for the second, or if used, the third increment of funding.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the Board could top-down the list.

Director Johnson noted that this would be a possibility if that were what the Board agrees to. Steve Tharinger suggested just drawing the line at the 35% amount for the first increment and then using the second or third increment criteria to finish funding the projects.

Board agreed to use the 2nd increment for any topping-up.

Jim Fox noted the Issues Task Force suggested leaving partial funded projects as partially funded. Another approach is if the first increment got the project to over 50% funding then round up or if less than 50% then round down.

Tim had a third option to use the additional criteria during the third increment of funding, a “Discretionary Allocation”: The Board discussed:

- Hold aside some percentage for a third increment. (*Board agreed*)
- At least 2% allocated to lead entities submitting “region-wide lists. (*Board agreed to 2%*)
- Consider “Topping-off” partially-funded projects on the highest ranked lists (*Board agreed*)
- Reconsider funding specific POCs as appropriate (e.g. new information) (*Board did not agree*)
- “Pull-up” projects with specific criteria. (*Board is not comfortable skipping projects to get to other specific projects but would possibly consider the next available project on the list*)
- Fund “cusp” projects that have highest sponsor match (*Board agreed*)
- Fund “cusp” projects for sponsors with “records of success” (*Board is not sure what criteria the Board would use to decide on this. New sponsors would not have a record to use. Tim believes criteria of number of projects completed within time and budget would be able to be used to show record of success. This would be the last criterion to use for a last project. This would be information that the staff would provide for the Board.*)
- Reserve funds for unanticipated in-year needs, construction overruns, etc. (*This is usually done before the funding has started but the Board agreed to look at this at the end of the process.*)
- *Board would also like to leave its options open for additional criteria that may arise*

Craig Partridge would like to have a staff recommendation on which projects could possibly fall under the funding lines depending on the different scenarios. Board members will want to thoroughly review project information of the projects that may be funded but maybe not as thoroughly review projects that are not destined to be funded.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked the Board if they would like to have the third increment or not.

Steve Tharinger would like to use a third increment.

It was agreed that the Board does need to reserve some amount for topping-off and other specific projects.

Director Johnson noted that the staff report would provide different scenarios for the Board’s review depending on today’s decision.

Craig noted that since we might have 25 projects on the cusp, having the sponsor record might be persuasive.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Doug Osterman to comment on records of success as a criteria and on whether we are buying more trouble if we have a high percentage set aside.

Doug said people were supportive of using records of success because it was statutory. You could deal with this if the sponsor hasn't completed projects from early grant rounds. Staff could identify if a sponsor has had a track record of cost over-runs, which might be another measure of "success."

At the July meeting the Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) was pretty open to having the Board use up to 15% for discretionary funds for funding additional projects.

Brenda McMurray would be more comfortable with 10%.

Steve Tharinger is comfortable with 10-15%.

Director Johnson noted that one way to handle it could be to give direction to staff to use discretion on presenting different scenarios.

Craig Partridge would like to make sure there is a level of confidence in whatever scenarios used.

Brenda commented that when in doubt, use the decision the fish would like the most.

Chair Ruckelshaus agreed with Brenda, "Where do we really help the fish".

Tim Smith reviewed considerations for the second increment, "Competitive Allocation", 50-60% of funding:

- Board reviews "non-regional" LE's based on Review Panel comments on the first "6 questions"
- Non-Regional LE's receiving satisfactory strategy reviews move to final "2 questions" review stage
- Non-Regional LE's not receiving satisfactory strategy reviews are assigned to lowest allocation group
- IAC staff ranks LE's 1-25 based on scoring under final "two questions" review stage
- IAC staff groups LE's on matrix (excellent/excellent; Excellent/Good, etc.)
- Board allocates percentage of second increment funds to groups, generally using 5th round relative values (5%-3.33%)

Tim explained the way the lead entities would be grouped.

Chair Ruckelshaus was concerned that most of the lead entities would fall in the upper quadrant and so he would like to have staff run some scenarios since there are too many unknowns. Staff will then see how the lead entities rate.

Tim thanked the Board and believes the discussions today made the process more transparent and the lead entities will be appreciative.

Neil Aaland commented that he believes that staff has enough to come back to the Board with something meaningful.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Public Testimony:

Hood Canal Project Comments:

Ken VanBuskirk, citizen member, has lived in a small community on the Hood Canal for fifty years. Testified on one of the projects on the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) list that is in his area. Does not believe this project was decided on by a community effort. Bruce Landram, Hood Canal/Belfair resident, echoes what Ken said. He said that up until June the Pacific North West Salmon Center excluded public from its meetings. This is a group spending public money but not allowing the public into the meetings. Asking the Board to tag the funds that SRFB gives. He states the local process needs to be open to the public.

John Blankenship, employee for the Hood Canal Enhancement Group and on the Pacific Northwest Salmon Center Board. They are a 501 C3 private entity that uses public funds for projects. They are an open group but do have closed meetings when discussing funds. Mr. Blankenship gave an overview of the project and public support of this project. They are going to amend the price of the project to better reflect possible appraisal price.

Chair Ruckelshaus responded that the Board hadn't known about this project before today but sees there is a lot of passion and concern around the project. The Board is unable to address the issue at this meeting but will be aware of this project in the January funding meeting.

Richard Brocksmith provided a letter from the HCCC regarding this project.

Comments From Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board:

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, exposed concern with the amount of funds that the Lower Columbia receives versus the Puget Sound region. When looking at lead entity lists the balance isn't there for an effective statewide recovery plan. The Lower Columbia Board is urging the Board to become more strategic in funding the Regional Boards. This is a critical issue for the Lower Columbia and will not wait for another round to get answers.

Brenda McMurray commented she has listened to Jeff's comments. She believes the Board has responded to this concern by funding the Regional Boards' work so the Regional Boards can set priorities at a regional level. The SRFB has not had the tools in the past to prioritize this work but believes now that the regional plans have been submitted there will be tools for the Board to use. The Board and State can't afford not to work toward the regional priorities. Now that the Board has the tools that have gone through the NOAA process, it will be able to apply the plans to the next round but not ready for this round.

The Chair is concerned with the comments being heard from Jeff today, as the Board is unable to make additional changes to the allocation process for this grant round at this time.

Director Johnson noted that the Board doesn't have tools to make changes but she believes the next grant round will be very different in how the Regional Boards are handled.

The meeting recessed at 6:00 p.m.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

December 1 & 2, 2005

King Street Station 8th Floor Conference Room
Seattle, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Stu Trefry	Designee, Conservation Commission

Chair Ruckelshaus reconvened the meeting at 9:03 a.m.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT REPORT:

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See handout for details, notebook item #6.)

Rollie Geppert updated the Board on the 6th Round project review process. As of December 1, 2005 there are 169 eligible projects and 24 projects or 14% of them are projects of concern. On December 7th the draft report will be available to the lead entities for review, then the draft report will be revised and given to the public for review.

Mike Ramsey provided a presentation on 3 completed projects:

- 04-1335 Piner Point on Maury Islands- King Co. Water & Land Restoration
- 04-1594 Rainier Beach Lake Shoreline Restorations-Seattle Parks & Rec Dept
- 02-1622 Issaquah Log Cabin Reach Acquisitions- Issaquah Cr Log Cabin Reach Acquisition

INITIAL ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND TIMELINE FOR 7TH ROUND:

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

Neil reviewed the notebook memorandum and asked for Board comment and direction for the 7th Round.

Board Discussion:

Brenda McMurray commented on the regional allocation question. After thinking about it, is it really the way the state should go, or should we focus on endangered species? What is it we need to do as a state to recover the species and what actions need to be taken? This is a

little different way of thinking than in the past.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted the need to be careful not to put too much process in dividing species and their regions.

Three topics he'd want discussed:

1. Lead entity area – do we have the right lead entity areas for the different species? Some redrawing of the boundaries may need to be looked at but may not be possible.
2. Make sure citizen committees are working properly. Maybe WDFW needs to take the lead in this. Need a process in place and criteria for a citizen committee to work correctly. Are the right people involved and are they trained in how to have an open process?
3. Allocation of money – do we need a new allocation formula? What kind of criteria can we use, that is objective.

Tim Smith noted that one of the things that WDFW worked hard at was trying to provide incentives to have lead entities roll-up into an optimal level of coverage for the area. It works best when the Board gets a project list that addresses the issues for a region.

He commented that, after this round WDFW will be getting together with some of the lead entities and talking about providing training and guidance for lead entity work. The allocation formula has been evolving from the start but may ready for an accelerated process for allocation. The emphasis may be less in the strategy but more on the fish needs of the area.

Steve Tharinger noted the Monitoring Forum and how their work may link back to the projects needed for the fish.

Dick Wallace commented that we are facing a fundamental shift in how we are working with the regions. He is not suggesting another task force but possibly a survey to see what resources are out there and how all this works together. If we are going to entertain block grants then we need to look at the whole administrative process. Tim brought up a good question to think about. How do regions fit into the process? What is the quality of the lead entity strategy and how does it fit with the regional plan? What is the SRFB's portfolio on funding of projects and programs and what is the right mix? What criteria should the Board use for funding at a regional level?

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Dick Wallace to share his notes with Neil Aaland and expressed the need to figure out how to sequence the needs for the next round.

Steve Tharinger asked about future timelines.

Director Johnson noted that if the Board wants to stay on the current timeline with a December 2006 or January 2007 funding meeting, Sponsors and Lead Entities really need the guidance by April. May want to work with constituents and not have a grant cycle next December or January but have a longer process. Need to have a group working on this issue.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like staff to come back to the Board with a list of options at the January meeting.

Doug Osterman noted that LEAG has discussed this at least twice and are ready to start meeting on this issue in January.

Steve Tharinger asked Doug if he feels folks would be able to get the process ready to go in April, or if there are a lot of projects in the system. If so, the Board should delay the start so groups can get projects done.

Doug said that it varies but the other issue that groups are working on is the funding of Regional Boards. Neil and Doug have talked about a first increment funding process only and have an eighteen-month timeline for the rest of the funding process to give time for Technical Review Team review of Regional plans and funding strategies for regional process.

Jim Fox asked about timing and the issue of delaying the funding through a legislative session. If we stay on the April schedule but don't have the allocation process and details until later how much problem would there be?

Doug Osterman replied that it depends on the level of changes. If there were major changes then that would be a problem.

Dick Wallace noted that in regional areas there is almost a two-tier distribution process, one at the regional level and at the lead entity level. He agrees it would be good to do the upfront allocation.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked how the Board wants to structure and review the projects? May want to take more time. Using incremental funding may provide additional time for other details.

Director Johnson noted that LEAG, Council of Regions, WDFW and SRFB staff would be working on this issue. She asked who else needs to be involved?

Dick Wallace and Steve Tharinger volunteered to be part of the committee working on this issue.

Brenda McMurray hopes to fund projects for species recovery per species. She believes that the Board needs to look at the bigger issue of how things are set up and is it correct for recovery.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like to have Brenda write up how she sees this working.

Tim Smith believes that the SRFB is really working under two different charges in one process. Need to look at both charges (equitable distribution and the endangered species) and make sure we are staying within these two charges.

Dick Wallace noted that the Legislature has added the regional structure, which may help.

Director Johnson noted that Joe Scordino, Deputy Regional Administrator of National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has asked to join the SRFB at an early 2006 meeting to give the NOAA insight on the salmon recovery planning process.

SMALL GRANT PROGRAM UPDATE:

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) and Evergreen Funding Consultants presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #8 for details.)

Krystyna Wolniakowski provided a presentation on the *Community Salmon Fund: Progress Report, 2005*.

Board Discussion:

Chair Ruckelshaus noted NFWF has processes such as this in other states and asked Krystyna what her thoughts are on how the LE process works in this state and are there lessons to learn from other states?

Krystyna commented that the lead entities provide local knowledge, which is very helpful. They have tried to use local groups in other states also, although Washington is probably the most intense with seventeen processes at the same time. This has been a great process so far and believes the lead entities feel this way also.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Krystyna to let the Board know her thoughts on block grant lessons, as NFWF is the closest to receiving a block grant from the SRFB.

Steve Tharinger believes this has been a very successful process and asked if NFWF plans to make a formal proposal to the SRFB to continue this process.

Krystyna Wolniakowski commented that if they were invited to make a proposal then they might do so. She would like to find a way to continue the program.

Stu Trefry helps on the Pioneers in Conservation projects, which are also funded through NFWF. Those aren't reflected in the chart. He believes it would be helpful for the Board to see these projects also since they are sound projects.

Doug Osterman asked Dennis Canty and Krystyna about the remaining \$350,000 and if the four lead entities that weren't chosen in the original process could put projects forward?

Krystyna noted that reason to keep it to the 17 was because those were the 17 that were chosen for this grant round. She will go back and look at the original agreement and see if those additional lead entities could be included.

Chair Ruckelshaus gave the staff direction to go back and look at the contract and work with the lead entities and NFWF to figure out this issue.

Director Johnson asked Krystyna if they were to continue this process with SRFB in 2006, how big do they see this could be, and when do they think they would need an invitation from this funding source?

Krystyna would be willing to work with all the lead entities, although the 17 already tended to max NFWF out. They would like to know by early spring if there is a possibility of continued funds from the SRFB. They estimated \$120,000 per lead entity in the last round.

SMOLT MONITORING REQUEST/WDFW MONITORING APPROACH:

Tim Smith presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #9 for details.)

Bruce Crawford joined Tim for this agenda item.

Tim provided an overview and background on the WDFW smolt-monitoring program. He presented a proposal to the SRFB for funding of the WDFW monitoring program of \$300,000 that is needed to continue monitoring needs.

WDFW monitoring efforts include:

- Continue the current level of fish-in/fish-out monitoring
- Align life-stage monitoring for specific stocks
- Initiate smolt/escapement monitoring in sub-regional groupings lacking data
- Investigate new approaches to fill gaps in “gravel to gravel” data collection

Board Discussion:

Chair Ruckelshaus still has concern with funding programmatic issues that should be funded through legislative means. It is clear from the Monitoring Forum that we might be able to report to the Congress that we have a system in place for monitoring fish-in/fish out properly. He is not sure why the Legislature hasn't funded this program and doesn't know if this proposal will get us to where we need to be.

Tim Smith believes that these are good points. They have tried to get this funded through the Legislature but so far, have not been able to get the funding. They plan to request again for the next budget. They are trying to get this program in alignment with fish-in/fish out monitoring and trying to make sure money spent on the program is being spent on the most critical stocks. It would be appropriate if the Board wants to condition the funds and work with Bruce to make sure the sites are the correct sites.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked whether the sites are in the correct place. Is this effort meaningful in the overall system? This may be a process that the Forum subcommittee needs to work on.

Bruce Crawford noted that the table is of the historic monitoring sites. He pointed out the Dungeness is the only site in the Puget Sound Chinook ESU for the Juan de Fuca major population group. The Green River site has good spawning information and would be a good site. Cedar Creek would also fill in information. If you want to be 80% sure, then are these the best sites to monitor? We don't have that information yet but Bruce would be willing to help find that information. Bruce pointed the Board back to the GMAP presentation and pointed out the gaps in smolt monitoring and how we don't want to lose what little data we currently have. He still looks forward to making sure the correct sites are being monitored and determining at what level of certainty the state wants to invest in.

Chair Ruckelshaus is willing to invest some in keeping this information but does not just want to fund these specific sites again because that is where we have monitored in the past or because there is a gap in this information.

Dick Wallace asked if the Cedar Creek is a new site?

Bruce noted this site is rather new (4 or 5 years) and the reason it was chosen is because there is a dam on the Lewis River just upstream of Cedar Creek. If SRFB does not monitor Cedar Creek the down side is we lose data, there will be a gap in the information but on the other hand there may be a better site to start monitoring next year.

Chair Ruckelshaus is convinced that the \$215,000 can be well spent but needs to be analyzed to make sure these are the best spots for the monitoring.

Bruce noted the need to approve funding soon as WDFW needs to put the monitors in early spring but SRFB could condition the grant to have WDFW bring back a chart that is fully formatted and displays all current sites, fund sources, and where key populations occur and what should be monitored.

Chair Ruckelshaus would also like to condition these charts to show reasoning and criteria for choosing the sites.

Brenda McMurray asked who is having that discussion, and at what point will that prioritization will be available.

Bruce Crawford noted that the Forum's Fish Subcommittee has addressed this issue and reported back to Forum. They gave two proposals; one suggested rotating traps but keeping one or two for historical purposes. They believed that would be difficult to do so the other proposal is to figure out how many sites are needed per major population group.

The Board discussed the pros and cons of this proposal and issues surrounding the decision on which sites to fund.

Brenda McMurray is concerned that if the Board funds this, it will continually be brought to the Board for funding.

Decision:

Steve Tharinger **MOVED** to approve the \$215,000 but would not fund any more of the monitoring programs until getting a clearer picture, Bill Ruckelshaus **SECONDED** with the caveat that WDFW would work with Bruce to look at the overall monitoring system question and determine if these sites or others are the correct sites to monitor and bring that information to the Board.

Bruce Crawford believes the chart needs to be expanded to show all the monitoring sites not just the endangered species sites.

The Board **APPROVED** with clarification that this does not include the \$85,000.

Steve Tharinger believed what he heard at the Monitoring Forum meeting yesterday was that the Monitoring Forum needs to make the proposal and take it to the Legislature to fund the monitoring needs of the state. A proposal developed by the Monitoring Forum, supported by the Governor's Office and SRFB should also be supported by the Legislature.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS:

Dick Wallace noted that the Board often runs out of time for this topic and would be curious to see what the interest is.

Bill Ruckelshaus believes it would be helpful for the Board to hear what Ecology is doing to see a bigger picture and would like to set aside a future date.

Dick noted that Ecology's three priorities are:

- Improved mitigation process
- Work on watershed and in stream flows
- Moving beyond waste such as mercury

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: January 5 & 6, 2006
 April 6 & 7, 2006