SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

October 29 & 30, 2003	John Wayne Marina Sequim, Washington

Day 1

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Jim Peters	Olympia
Tom Laurie	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission

CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 10:23 a.m.

Director Johnson provided an overview of the two-day meeting agenda and goals.

Chair Ruckelshaus reported he recently attended a tour and meeting in Chelan County. He discussed the amount of government owned lands in Chelan County and how this concerns the people of this county and several other counties around the state.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS
Financial Report
Debra Wilhelmi provided the Board with an overview of financial status. (See notebook for details.)

- All but the Yakima Regional Board contracts have been completed. Scope-of-work sheets were included in the Board meeting packets. Debra thanked the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) staff for work on the regional contracts. This work helped with the quick processing of the contracts.

- The Family Forest Fish Blockage (FFFB) program is progressing. The Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) has been updated on this program. An e-mail explaining this program has been sent to all lead entities and project sponsors.

- Staff is in the process of hiring a new Statewide Watershed Information Management Technical Advisory Committee (SWIM TAC) manager for management and continued development of the Data Portal.

Brenda McMurray asked about the amount of detail in the Upper Columbia Regional contract versus the other regional board contracts. Debra explained that Upper Columbia was the first contract and they did include more detail than the others. After the Columbia Regional contract was completed, it was later decided that as much detail was not needed in the contract since the work plan provides the detail.

Project Status Report and 4th Round Update

Rollie Geppert provided the project management report. (See notebook for details.)

Mike Ramsey provided an overview of Clallam County and a PowerPoint of closed projects. Clallam County has 36 SRFB projects valued at $9.7 million in SRFB funds.

The closed projects presented were:

- 01-1394A – Lower Big Quilcene N Bank Acquisition – Jefferson County
- 00-1081 R – Skokomish River Bourgault N Channel Restoration – Skokomish Indian Tribe

Chair Ruckelshaus asked about the status of the new category for showing projects that are physically complete but still being monitored. Rollie reported that staff is still working on this issue and hope to have the change to PRISM in place soon.

Lead Entity Advisory Committee Report

Shirley Solomon, LEAG Chair, and Brian Walsh, WDFW, provided this report.

- Last meeting was October 9 in the SeaTac area.

- Announced addition of new member Judy Phelps, Fish Biologist from Upper Columbia.

- Discussed the FFFP and need to make sure the lead entity priorities match with this process.

- Carole Richmond provided LEAG an overview of the Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee (JLARC) performance measures and progress so far.

- The rest of the meeting was dedicated to 5th Round issues. LEAG recommends:
    - Adoption of the LE strategy guidance as voluntary only.
    - Keeping the definition of restoration as broad as possible and keep acquisition in the definition when it is essential to the restoration.
    - Keeping acquisition as an eligible item. This is an important tool that the lead entities would not want to lose. Not all lead entities and watersheds feel the same about acquisition. Require project sponsor to demonstrate acquisition is the correct tool, only tool to use, and other choices have been exhausted.
    - Avoiding duplication in the role of Technical Panel. Focus on technical merit of the projects only.
    - Jim Fox has incorporated all suggestions into the recommendation. This was a difficult discussion and LEAG still doesn't feel there has been enough time to review the information. The LEAG passed a motion on the technical panel

process. The technical panel process is still broken and the SRFB needs to continue to make changes to be put in place before the 6th Round. Brian Walsh reported that the LEAG feels the Panel needs to look at the technical merits of the projects, not the social factors. Shirley believes the Issues Task Force (ITF) is going in the right direction and she is leaning away from the motion made by LEAG after attending the last ITF meeting and discussion.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked LEAG to look at the FFFP process and block grant process. On the acquisition issue, LEAG could be helpful in this discussion and need for changes in the law.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF JULY 2003 MEETING MINUTES

There were several corrections and points of clarification to the September 2003 meeting minutes.

Steve Tharinger **moved** to approve the September meeting minutes as corrected. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion. The September 2003 minutes were **approved** as amended and clarified.

2004 SRFB MEETING SCHEDULE

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

Resolution #2003-12 provided the 2004 SRFB meeting schedule as follows:

- February 19 & 20, 2004
- March 30 & 31, 2004
- June 24 & 25, 2004
- October 28 & 29, 2004
- December 2 & 3, 2004

Meeting locations will be posted as approved.

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt the 2004 SRFB meeting schedule as presented. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Resolution #2003-12 **approved** as presented.

The December 2003 OWEB/SRFB meeting is being postponed due to schedule conflicts.

5th ROUND STEPS AND BUDGET ISSUES

Director Johnson introduced this agenda item. (See notebook and handout for details.)

Director Johnson discussed the estimated amount of funding available and need to track congressional actions. Another source of possible funds are the returned funds from projects closing short or not being completed. The subcommittee is working on a policy recommendation for returned funds and will bring their recommendation to the Board at an upcoming meeting.

Director Johnson outlined the funding amount that staff assumes will be available for the 5th Round. Currently it appears there will be $28.4 million available for projects as long as there

are no additional earmarks placed on this funding. Current budget provisos require $23.1 million be directed to restoration projects; this leaves $5.3 million for all other projects. This is the best estimate of funds that the Board will have to work with in December 2004.

Director Johnson provided the Board with a handout illustrating the timeline for items needing Board review and decision during the remainder of 2003 and 2004. She reviewed the 5th Round issues still needing Board decision and other items needing to be addressed in 2004.

Director Johnson noted that one item not listed under eligibility yet is programmatic type funding (25th List).

Director Johnson explained that due to time restrictions, the Board may need to continue with current practices on some of the 5th Round issues and wait until the 6th Round to make changes.

Ed Manary asked about the amount of funding that could go toward acquisitions. If the funding levels Director Johnson outlined are accurate and the budget proviso is accurate, $5.3 million is a small amount available for projects other than restorations. Are there any dollars left for acquisition? Director Johnson explained that the net number includes all SRFB actions taken today, including funding of the regional boards.

Brenda McMurray noted that another issue for 2004 is a presentation by Ecology on saving water for salmon recovery. She is still working on getting this presentation lined up and has asked Jim Fox for his assistance.

Chair Ruckelshaus also noted the need for a discussion on what the Board strategy is and changes needed for this strategy. Steve Tharinger reported that the ITF is focusing on process and funding issues not on the Board strategy. The Board may need to be clearer about what the Board strategy is.

TOUR

The Board meeting recessed at noon for a tour of local project sites.

Sam Gibboney, Jimmycomelately Project Coordinator, and Pat Crane, Clallam County Fish Biologist, lead the tour, which focused on the Jimmycomelately project. This project is a very complicated project with many partners and funding sources.

The SRFB meeting reconvened at 2:40 p.m. Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the local group for the excellent tour.

REGIONAL FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT GROUP (RFEG) REPORT

Paula Mackrow, North Olympic Salmon Coalition Executive Director, provided the RFEG report. (See handout for details.)

Paula handed out a depiction of project development. She wanted the Board to see that there are times that an opportunistic approach is more important than a strategic approach when identifying restoration or acquisition projects.

WATERSHED-BASED MITIGATION AND SALMON HABITAT FUNDING: AN OPPORTUNITY

A panel consisting of Megan White, WSDOT, Peter Birch, WDFW, Robert Wubbena, Economic and Engineering Services, Inc., Rick Anderson, Applied Hydrology Northwest, and Phil Miller, GSRO, presented this agenda item. (See notebook and handout for details.)

Megan White explained the watershed approaches to mitigation and restoration projects and what Transportation Permit Efficiency and Accountability Committee (TPEAC) is and what the differences are between mitigation and restoration.

Peter Birch explained watershed-based mitigation and the watershed subcommittee vision.

Robert Wubbena and Rick Anderson explained practical applications in the environmental permitting process.

Phil Miller summarized the presentation. This is not only an opportunity but also a challenge.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the panel for the presentation and feels this is a wonderful project and that they need to continue to work on this at a faster pace.

Brenda McMurray asked if the group is looking at projects in a particular watershed area now that can be used for mitigation later? Megan White explained that this process hasn't gotten that far yet but the state does have a wetlands banking program and this program may get to that point in the future.

Tom Laurie asked who is on the TPEAC. He was informed that TPEAC is a broad based group including representation by both state and local governments and tribes.

EFFECTIVENESS AND STATUS/TREND MONITORING

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item. (See notebook and handouts for details.)

Bruce explained that it isn't necessary to sample 100% of the projects; can sample between 10 and 25% of each category for a sufficient data sample.

If the Board had started to monitor projects in 1999, they would have answers to many of the project types by now.

Need to start monitoring efforts Spring 2004 with 4th Round projects. If the Board waits until 5th Round projects they would not be able to begin until 2005 or 2006 and would put the answers even farther out.

Bruce noted that the Independent Science Panel (ISP) has already reviewed and endorsed the process he outlined as a valid science-based approach. He has worked with a statistician to make sure proper statistical tests are incorporated into the evaluation process parameters. He has also worked with bi-state groups such as the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) and the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnerships (PNAMP). To

date, Washington has been a leader in watershed health and salmon recovery monitoring efforts.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if Washington could combine efforts with Oregon to save money by having a joint agreement on monitoring sampling and needs. Bruce reported that through his work with Oregon, there might be opportunities to combine efforts.

Staff is looking for Board decision on whether or not to proceed with the monitoring efforts. Chair Ruckelshaus would like periodic updates on costs and progress brought to the Board.

Steve Tharinger **moved** to adopt Resolution #2003-13 – Project Effectiveness Monitoring. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion. Board **approved** Resolution #2003-13 as presented.

It was also noted that, "Status and Trends" were part of the Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) project; this is an important knowledge element. This issue was missing from the earlier monitoring strategy and has now been added to the latest version. Bruce will present information on status and trends monitoring at a future Board meeting.

5TH ROUND ISSUES TASK FORCE INTRODUCTION AND UPDATE

Director Johnson provided a preview of the second day of the meeting and issues still needing to be addressed.

Meeting recessed at 5:42 p.m.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

October 29 & 30, 2003	John Wayne Marina Sequim, Washington

Day 2

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Jim Peters	Olympia
Tom Laurie	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission

CALL TO ORDER:
Meeting reconvened at 8:30 a.m.

5TH ROUND ISSUES TASK FORCE ISSUES
Chair Ruckelshaus started the presentation by commending Steve Tharinger and the ITF members for the hard work they have done on this topic so far.

Steve thanked the ITF for its hard work and dedication. Steve and Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook and handouts for details.)

Jim reviewed the items in the meeting notebook and outlined what the ITF is requesting from the Board at this meeting:

1. Lead entity strategy guide - decision
2. New approach for the Review Panel – decision
3. New approach for allocating fund and evaluating the lists – direction and guidance for the next ITF meeting

To start this agenda item, the Board was provided with lead entity strategy presentations from representatives from four lead entity areas:

- Roy Huberd and Doug St. John, Pierce County WRIAs 10 & 12
- Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council (WRIA 16 and portions of WRIAs 14, 15, & 17)
- Amy Hatch-Winecka, Mason and Thurston County (WRIAs 13 & 14)

The presenters were previously provided seven questions to answer during their presentation:

1. What is the current status of your strategy? Newly developed, previously developed but being revised, in place no changes, or few changes needed.
2. If being revised, what was the first version missing or how will this version be different?
3. What was/is the hardest part of strategy development? The public involvement, the scientific data, or something else.
4. What does the Board need to know about your strategy – how is it unique?
5. Give a brief overview of the priorities identified in your strategy, how community issues were considered in developing these priorities, and how the strategy is and will be used to identify projects to be submitted to the SRFB. If you have an executive summary or table of contents that shows the strategy's major elements, bring copies to the meeting.
6. What would be the most helpful input/technical assistance the Tech Panel could provide for your strategy?
7. How can the Board help?

<u>Pierce County</u>

Roy Huberd and Doug St. John presented strategy information for Pierce County (WRIAs 10 & 12). (See handout for details.)

First Roy provided the Board with an overview of the Pierce County process to date. He then asked the following two questions of the Board:

- Is this program set up for a lead entity or for an individual watershed? Pierce has two distinct watersheds in their lead entity area – can they submit two lists – Roy is asking for a yes or no answer.
- Does the SRFB place a higher priority on projects that affect Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species and a lower priority on projects that do not affect an ESA listed species? And if so, how do they compete in an area without ESA listed fish?

Chair Ruckelshaus replied that the statute that created the SRFB requires the Board give greatest preference to lead entity strategies and project lists that benefit salmonid populations that are listed under the ESA. This is the Board's charge by the Legislature. The Board has not refused to fund projects that were otherwise beneficial to fish that didn't have specifically listed fish in them, but the Board was told by the Legislature to give preference to listed species.

Ed Manary responded to the question concerning project lists, reporting that in those instances that a single lead entity has more than one WRIA the ultimate product is a single list that covers the entire lead entity area. The Chair concurred with Ed's response but also noted that this has caused problems in the past where some lead entities have just combined two separate lists without prioritizing the projects.

Roy Huberd then provided an overview of the Pierce County strategy.

Roy explained there are several factions in the WRIA 10/12 area: Rural and urban split, shared strategy process, EDT issues (some like, some don't), use of 2514 process, SRFB purists, Steelhead people, listed stocks only, intermittent provocateurs are also at the table.

Jim Peters empathized with Roy having a wide variety of interests at the table but also stressed the need for a good strong mission and goal. Many times groups get volunteers that have an interest in a certain project and once their project gets funded, or doesn't get funded, they leave the table and others take their place.

Steve Tharinger recounted his experience with the salmon recovery process in a large diverse lead entity area.

Mason and Thurston Conservation Districts

Amy Hatch-Winecka provided the WRIA 13 & 14 presentation. (See handout for details.)

Amy informed the Board that the Mason and Thurston Conservation District strategies are currently undergoing extensive revision.

- Although she represents two separate lead entities, they are discussing merging the two into one and are working together using the same technical teams with separate citizen committees.
- There have been six of eight scheduled workshops with technical and citizen representatives from both WRIAs.
- One thing that is putting their strategy on hold is that they have decided to revisit the Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA) for WRIA 13. WRIA 13 was one of the first LFA completed and additional information has come in since then that they would like to incorporate into the LFA.
- They are establishing restoration/preservation goals and actions for each watershed.

Amy then reviewed the strategy outline they will be using for their strategy documents.

Amy's suggestions for assistance by the Board included:

- Continuing the two-day sessions with the Technical Panel, allowing the Panel to tour current project proposals, and
- Focus on preventive restoration and preservation activities in WRIAs, not entirely upon ESA listed regions.

Amy reported that her lead entities don't depend completely on SRFB funds for projects but look for funding sources that fit the best.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Richard Brocksmith provided the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) presentation.

Richard gave an overview of his lead entity area explaining how complicated the area is. There are approximately 500 projects needing funding in the area. It is difficult to prioritize the projects in a strategic way versus an opportunistic one.

They are continually updating their strategy but the one constant they have used in all revisions is a priority on the federally listed species.

Three goals with current revision are to:

- Refine the geographic focus, as suggested by the SRFB Technical Panel,
- Synthesize the extensive amounts of recent technical work products that they have, and

- Extending connection to community.

Other thoughts from the HCCC:
- They are trying to get away from opportunistic prioritizing to strategically prioritizing their project lists.
- They would like to participate in the small grants program.
- Trying to combine both the citizen and technical panel meetings.
- Doesn't feel the SRFB Technical Panel is very useful and would rather have the money go toward projects.
- He encouraged the Board to fund ELJs.

Craig asked how familiar the three groups were with each other's strategies?
Pierce and Mason/Thurston vaguely familiar with each other's strategies but the HCCC has kept their strategy under wraps.

Tim Smith mentioned the tour on day one of the meeting and how the Jimmycomelately project may not have been purely salmon recovery but more ecosystem restoration. He asked the panel how they focus – ecosystem or salmon?

Amy Hatch-Winecka and Richard Brocksmith both work toward a more ecosystem approach.

Steve Tharinger asked if local elected officials are at the table.
Amy responded that no elected officials are on the Mason County Lead Entity committee but there are elected officials on the Thurston County committee.
Roy responded that the local officials do not sit on the committees but appoint members to the committees and are involved in that way.

Brenda McMurray asked HCCC if they focus on SRFB funds only or if they look to other funding sources? Richard responded that they do look at project specific alternative funding but are mostly SRFB funding centered.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the panel for presenting their strategies. First emphasis on listed species but can also fund other fish projects. In meeting with the federal groups it is clear that the federal money is supposed to be focused on listed species to help lift the burden from the state for recovery of the listed species. Over 60 percent of the SRFB money comes from federal dollars and so the Board needs to be able to show they are making a difference with the money we receive. Endangered species is where the focus needs to be. He reminded the panel members that as they work on the strategies they need to keep recovery in mind and be sure the recovery plans get into place. Down the line lead entities and regional boards will need to fold the individual strategies into the overall recovery plan.

A GUIDE TO LEAD ENTITY STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT
Jim Fox reviewed the draft "Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development".

Jim explained that this document has been before the ITF at three separate meetings, presented at LEAG, distributed to all lead entities for comment, and posted on the web page for public comment.

Some comments have been received, incorporated, and reviewed again. This document is not perfect and not meant to be perfect, this is an advisory document that will change as the process changes.

ITF Recommendations Regarding Project Evaluation, Allocation of Funds, and the Role of the Review Panel
Jim Fox reviewed this document and explained the ITF thinking behind and reason for recommending the ideas presented in this document.

Board and ITF Member Discussion:
ITF members Doug St. John, Steve Leider, Steve Martin, Brian Walsh, and Shirley Solomon joined the Board during this discussion.

Steve Leider articulated his view of the proposed 5th Round process and how the ITF is working on this transformation.

Shirley Solomon noted that Skagit County is now in the process of adding to their strategy and will be taking it to their full Board in January for adoption. If the SRFB Review Panel meets with them in December it will be difficult to incorporate any comments provided by the Review Panel into the strategy.

Craig Partridge noted that it is obvious that the Board will not be able to get a Review Panel in place to review the strategies prior to the time the lead entities need to start their 5th Round work. Craig does not believe the Board should replace one acrimonious process with another.

The Chair noted that the Review Panel is there to help not antagonize the lead entities.

For Shirley it is a timing question – they do not want to be found deficient in their strategy after it is used to solicit projects.

Steve Tharinger asked Shirley if she is okay with the Review Panel asking the 12 questions and discussing how the projects fit into the strategy and answering the 12 questions. Shirley is okay with answering the 12 questions.

Jim Peters noted that we will never get to the point that strategies are complete. Data will come in and things will change each year. He does not want the lead entities to feel this is a hopeless cause. Every year we will have lead entities at different points in strategy development.

Public Testimony
Pat Crain, Clallam County – Commended the ITF for the work they have done so far.

- Acquisition policy – positive statement to keep the same process in place.
- Asked if the lead entity will get to decide which projects are funded or if the Board will make the final decision.
- Asked about the opportunistic projects versus the strategic projects – feels the Board should let the lead entities decide to fund an opportunistic project.
- Funding cap makes sense but perhaps the ITF could consider an exemption to the cap. If

a project stands out but is above the cap, a lead entity could choose one large project above the cap versus several other projects below the cap.

- Good idea to give higher amounts to areas meeting specific criteria but may not be the best way to handle it.
- Asked how non-technical members would be selected for the review panel.
- Discontinuing individual project monitoring from funding is not a good idea.

Willy O'Neil, Association of General Contractors (AGC), presented five points:

- AGC strongly opposes an acquisition preference. They don't think that it is based on current best available science.
- AGC doesn't think there is a need for a new level of review at the SRFB level.
- AGC believes the legislature created through HB2514, as well as 2496, essentially the state salmon recovery plan and the current direction is losing sight of that.
- The SRFB actually has the role of the Technical Review Team (TRT) greater than what state law says they should be doing. And now the Board has created another layer of review, or are attempting to at this meeting.
- AGC doesn't believe the SRFB has any focus in state law on just endangered species. The entity that is actually supposed to have a preference for species listed under the federal ESA, are the local lead entities and then they're supposed to incorporate that into their critical path schedule. The AGC believes that the state legislature when they wrote 2496 was very intentional in making sure that it was one of the factors considered, but not <u>the</u> factor considered.
- For some reason the SRFB meeting moved from Yakima to Sequim for the October meeting. He didn't see a notice of this move in the state register.

Doug Osterman, King County WRIA 9 Lead Entity – Supports ITF recommendations and commended the work.

- Would like the ITF to work a little more on the last bullet on page 4 of the ITF Recommendations document.
- Need to be clearer on what it means to be operating at the level of a region.
- Supports notion of caps – better to deal with the notion of caps now than to wait until the funding meeting.

Steve Tharinger **moved** for Board approval of the LE strategy guidelines, Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion on proposed guidelines. Board **approved** the lead entity strategy guidelines as presented.

The other issue staff needs direction on is the sense of the Board on the "ITF Recommendations on Allocation of Funds and Role of the Review Panel" document.

Brenda McMurray doesn't want to have the process add another layer and questions the way of showing the validity of the projects. She wants to make sure it is as simple a process as possible and streamlined.

Craig Partridge noted that the lead entities would still be ranking their projects and the Board would be funding the projects on the ranked list.

Acquisition – Protection is in the laws, would be limited on how much could be spent on acquisitions. This has been a lead entity call on whether or not they want to bring acquisition

projects before the Board for funding.

Tim Smith noted the statement of a priority for acquisition is not helpful. The Chair suggested the ITF re-look at this statement.

Steve Tharinger listed the issues that the ITF will be looking at in its November meeting:

- Prioritization
- Clarification of restoration
- Acquisition – clarification language

Director Johnson noted that acquisition would still be an eligible project but it would be up to the lead entities if acquisitions rank high on their priority lists or not.

Tim Smith questioned the time needed for the December SRFB meeting. There was great discussion at this meeting but it took five hours to discuss three items. If the Board hopes to complete decisions on the 5th Round issues at its December meeting they will need more than one day.

Director Johnson responded that one possibility would be to begin the meeting on Thursday the fourth in the afternoon and from 8-3 on Friday the fifth.

The Board agreed to extending the December meeting to a two-day meeting starting on the afternoon of December 4 and completing by 3:00 p.m. on December 5.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

_____ _____

William Ruckelshaus, Chair Date

Future Meetings: December 4 & 5, 2003 – Olympia, Washington

RESOLUTION SRFB #2003 - 12

2004 SRFB MEETING SCHEDULE

BE IT RESOLVED, the schedule for 2004 Regular Meetings of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board is hereby adopted as follows:

February	19 & 20, 2004	Thursday-Friday
March	30 & 31, 2004	Tuesday-Wednesday
June	24 & 25, 2004	Thursday-Friday
October	28 & 29, 2004	Thursday-Friday
December	2 & 3, 2004 *(5th Round Grant Decisions Meeting)*	Thursday-Friday

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, staff is directed to publish notice in the State Register accordingly.

Note: Unless otherwise announced, all sessions of the Board adopted above shall be regular sessions of the Board, and may include from time to time site tours and workshop format sessions.

Resolution moved by: ___Brenda McMurray_____

Resolution seconded by: ___Steve Tharinger_____

Adopted / Declined (underline result)

Date: ___October 29, 2003_____

SRFB RESOLUTION #2003-13
PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING

WHEREAS, SRFB is committed to be able to identify and report the results and outcomes of projects selected for grants through the system of lead entities; and

WHEREAS, SRFB's goal is to support project lists and individual proposals thereon that are cost effective and have the greatest potential for benefit to threatened, endangered, and depressed salmonids; and

WHEREAS, to date SRFB has awarded grants which include various monitoring expenses estimated to average $500,000 per year; and

WHEREAS, SRFB intends to modify its approach to effectiveness monitoring to improve scientific credibility and to report results in the shortest time possible,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board approves not to exceed $326,000 for FY 2004 and $569,000 for FY 2005, to begin a systematic science-based effectiveness monitoring program (including 4th Round approved projects where possible) as detailed in the SRFB *"Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy"* and staff presentation of 10-29-03, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director be authorized to execute any and all project agreements necessary to facilitate prompt implementation of monitoring.

Resolution moved by: _____Steve Tharinger____

Resolution seconded by: _____Jim Peters_____

Adopted _X__ Defeated ___ Deferrred___

Date:___October 29, 2003_____

Other Board Decisions

Approval of the Lead Entity Strategy Guidelines
Steve Tharinger **moved** for Board approval of the LE strategy guidelines, Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion on proposed guidelines. Board **approved** the lead entity strategy guidelines as presented.