

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS, DECEMBER 6-7, 2012

Agenda Items without Formal Action

Item	Follow-up Actions
Item 1: Management Reports	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Reports	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 3: Reports from Partners	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 4: Lead Entity Consolidation	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 7: Communication Plan Updates	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 8: State of the Salmon in Watersheds Report	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 11: Assessment of Roles and Responsibilities for the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	There were no follow-up actions.

Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Follow-up Actions
Minutes	Approved Minutes from September 2012	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 5: 2012 Grant Round	<p>Approved \$1,195,165 in SRFB funds for projects and project alternates in the Hood Canal Region.</p> <p>Approved \$2,700,000 for projects and project alternates in the Lower Columbia Region.</p> <p>Approved \$360,000 for projects in the Northeast Region.</p> <p>Approved \$6,795,035 in SRFB funds for projects and project alternates in the Puget Sound Region.</p> <p>Approved \$1,258,333 in PSAR funds for projects in the Puget Sound Region.</p> <p>Approved \$1,598,400 for projects and project alternates in the Snake River Region.</p> <p>Approved \$1,953,000 for projects and project alternates in the Upper Columbia Region.</p> <p>Approved \$1,620,000 for projects and project alternates in the Coastal Region.</p> <p>Approved \$1,776,600 for projects and project alternates in the Yakima Mid-Columbia Region.</p>	<p>There were no follow-up actions.</p> <p>The Washington Coast Region has asked that the board consider inviting the Wild Fish Conservancy to do a briefing on its Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Use Assessment project.</p>
Item 6A: Manual 18 Administrative Updates	Approved incorporating the criteria regarding acclimation ponds into Manual 18.	Staff to distribute Manual 18 for stakeholder comment before completing it in January 2013.

Item 6B: Manual 18 Review Panel Policy Recommendations	<u>Adopted</u> the recommendations of the Review Panel to update Manual 18 policies regarding knotweed control, beaver reintroduction projects, and Review Panel evaluation criteria.	Staff to consider the salmon recovery niche of knotweed strategy as part of its policy work during 2013. Staff will work with Member Troutt to address his concerns about the streambank stabilization language, and will share the resulting draft language with the board.
Item 9: Board Meeting Schedule	<u>Approved</u> the revised dates for 2013.	Staff to notify the code reviser and post the dates on the RCO web site.
Item 10: Approve Funding and Scope of Work for Monitoring Program Assessment	<u>Approved</u> the use of \$75,000 in 2012 monitoring funds for an assessment of the board's monitoring strategy.	Final report to the board in October 2013.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: December 6, 2012

Place: Olympia, WA

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

Bud Hover, Chair	Okanogan County	Bob Everitt	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Harry Barber	Washougal	Carol Smith	Conservation Commission
Josh Brown	Kitsap County	Craig Partridge	Department of Natural Resources
Phil Rockefeller	NWPCC	Melissa Gildersleeve	Department of Ecology
David Troutt	Olympia		

Josh Brown arrived at 1:55 p.m. Mike Barber was excused.

It is intended that this summary be used with the notebook provided in advance of the meeting. A recording is retained by RCO as the formal record of meeting.

Opening and Welcome

Chair Bud Hover called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and a quorum was determined.

Phil Rockefeller moved to adopt the agenda.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

David Troutt moved to adopt the September 2012 minutes.

Seconded by: Harry Barber

Motion: APPROVED

Item 1: Management Reports

Director Cottingham presented information as described in her director's report, focusing on the reviews of the salmon recovery structure, audits, hiring of a new policy director, information technology initiatives such as the online application tool, and training. She also explained the status of salmon-related budget requests for the state capital and operating budgets. She also addressed the constitutional amendment, and reminded the board about their responsibilities to adhere to the laws about lobbying during the legislative session.

Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Reports

Brian Abbott reviewed the information from the management report. Grant manager Kat Moore reviewed the recently completed Bear River project; the board funded the design work but not the restoration. She reviewed future plans for the site and the effects of the restoration. Chair Hover asked if the outreach issues had been resolved. Moore responded that there was a new refuge manager and some new officials, and that they were working on the issues but that they had not been resolved. Member Troutt asked if they had adopted a Comprehensive Conservation Plan. Moore said they had. She then discussed the

Condit Dam Removal, which is not a board-funded project, but the board will be participating in several related habitat and restoration projects. She shared a National Geographic video of the dam removal.

Item 3: Reports from Partners

Council of Regions: Jeff Breckel presented the Council of Regions report. He noted the work that they have been doing with regard to the assessment of GSRO, the review of monitoring support, and their work with agencies to accomplish recovery plans, and noted specific items they would be discussing with each agency. They are looking forward to working with Conservation Commission on legislative initiatives and the same with Ecology. Rockefeller asked what the legislative initiatives might be; Breckel responded that included support for the conservation districts and support for the state match on programs like the conservation reserve enhancement program (CREP). On the State of the Salmon report, it has been a significant undertaking. They have invested a great deal of time and are anxious to see it come together.

Lead Entity Advisory Group: Darcy Batura presented information about leadership within various lead entities and shared a printed report. They are considering changing the name of the LEAG, and have developed a communications group. They are looking at improving their web site to do a better job at telling their story and using videos.

Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups: Lance Winecka noted that RFEES are working to secure their federal funding, continuing their work to secure funding through the egg and carcass program with WDFW, and doing more educational outreach to the legislature.

Mendy Harlow presented information about their approach to controlling knotweed in riparian areas. She noted how they are able to use other funds to control the knotweed, and then use board funds to replant the areas. Member Troutt asked what their regional strategy looks like. Harlow responded that they focus first on freshwater, then on estuaries, and then on areas that don't have transport issues (e.g., terrestrial areas). They also address data collection and reporting, and use shared control methods so that they are using effective amounts. There also is a shared public outreach, monitoring, and lessons learned component. Member Barber asked how knotweed ranks compared to other salmon recovery needs. He and Hover suggested it should be a class A weed, rather than a class B weed, thereby requiring landowners to do the work. Member Troutt asked if the strategy gets to the watershed level. Harlow responded that it does get to that level, and often gets to the parcel-by-parcel level. Winecka noted that the lead entity is developing a similar plan in the Nisqually area. Member Rockefeller asked if there is a policy to deal with knotweed each time it is encountered. Harlow responded that they deal with it when it is encountered, so that they do not spread it in the process of doing other work. She also noted that they are able to use less herbicide over time as the plants die back. Member Smith asked if they work with conservation districts and others, and share methodologies and maps with them to achieve a strategic approach and funding strategy. Harlow responded that they do.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Member Bob Everitt noted that Jennifer Quan has been selected to fill the vacancy left by Sara LaBorde during the summer. She likely will be taking on the board position in 2013. He also noted the federal sequestration of funds could result in a 7.8 percent reduction in funds for the hatchery program. WDFW will not do much with regard to the hydraulic permit program during legislative session, but is working on a web-based system to make it more efficient.

Conservation Commission: Member Carol Smith noted that they will be seeking funding from the legislature for the voluntary stewardship program. Once funding is found, there will be a technical panel

and recovery plans to deal with agricultural lands in critical areas. They also will be seeking funding for CREP, which is designed for riparian restoration toward salmon recovery. There is a lot of interest in the legislation to exempt landowners who participate in conservation efforts from civil liability.

Department of Natural Resources: Member Craig Partridge had no updates.

Department of Ecology: Member Melissa Gildersleeve updated the board on watershed planning grants. They will know if there is money after the legislative session.

Northwest Power Council: Member Rockefeller noted that the Northwest Power Council will be initiating year-long process to develop an updated fish and wildlife program for the Columbia Basin. They like to hear from the public, tribes, and fish and wildlife agencies. This is an opportunity for a strategic repositioning of the program efforts funded by Bonneville.

General Public Comment

There was no general public comment.

Item 4: Lead Entity Consolidation

Julie Morgan, Derek Van Marter, and Lloyd Moody presented this topic. Julie Morgan noted that the genesis of the effort was a letter from RCO Director Cottingham asking the region to explore the idea in the effort to reduce costs and improve efficiencies. She described the process, including actions and decision points, noting the RCO's involvement in the process. Morgan noted that cities, lead entities, and tribes were involved in the process, giving input and helping to design the structure. She shared how tasks would be administered by the region under the new structure. She provided a draft of the report, noting that a final report would be submitted to Director Cottingham the next week. A single lead entity coordinator would be hired, and would start in January 2013. Lead entities and tribes were integral to the transition process. She shared a list of organizations that wrote letters of support, noting that some were not interested in the process, while others increased their engagement and asked for annual updates. She noted that they will maintain separate citizen committees to respect local preferences. They also met with project sponsors to understand their concerns; their preferences will be reflected in the regions. Van Marter thanked the board for letting them handle it locally rather than top-down. The cost savings will be 10 percent. Director Cottingham noted that additional budget reductions would not be added to that. Chair Hover noted it relieves perceived conflicts of interest and saves money.

Member Troutt asked if the new lead entity has been formed; she noted that it would happen on January 1, but the paperwork is in place. He asked how they would manage two citizen committees. Van Marter responded that they already maintain three citizen committees and submit one regional list, and explained the process of developing the project list.

Item 5: 2012 Grant Round

Brian Abbott thanked salmon section staff for their hard work in 2012 to make the grant round work. He also acknowledged Marnie Tyler for her work in helping to create the funding report.

Abbott described the 2012 grant round timeline, noting the major milestones leading up to the funding meeting. He noted that for Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) funds, the funding table includes some returned funds. The total that the board is approving includes those funds. He also noted that the project of concern for the Hood Canal region had been cleared by the Review Panel, and staff was recommending that the board approve the list with the project clear and approved as an alternate.

Patty Michak gave an overview of the Review Panel comments, explaining what they found worked well and what did not. They have asked that they reduce the review cycles from four to three in the 2013 grant cycle. They noticed this year that there are some projects that are setting the stage for future high-cost, large-scale projects; the Review Panel is concerned that funding may not exist. Member Barber asked if the projects could be sequenced. Michak responded that many would be, but that some construction projects cannot be sequenced, or would incur additional costs if they were because equipment would be staged multiple times.

Comments from the Regions

Hood Canal: Richard Brocksmith and Richard Carlson presented information about the application process, noting that they included more community involvement in 2012. Brocksmith noted that they have complete agreement on the list between the citizen and technical committees, and they are very proud of their list. Member Troutt asked if the Regional Implementation Technical Team (RITT) reviewed Hood Canal projects. Brocksmith responded that they review the 3-year work plan. For summer chum, they work directly with NOAA domain team, which has greater technical expertise. Chair Hover asked what the issue was on the project of concern. Brocksmith responded that the project was proposed narrowly, so it didn't provide enough material to satisfy the Review Panel. It took them a lot of time to get from a concept to a detailed proposal, and there was a lot of miscommunication. Member Troutt asked about how the funding for project six (#12-1385, Dosewallips and Duckabush Acquisitions 2012) would be applied. Brocksmith responded that the partial funding would go to the higher priority acquisition first, as a condition of the citizens' committee. Brocksmith then discussed results of the projects, in terms of escapement and spatial diversity.

Lower Columbia: Jeff Breckel stated that there was a good process in 2012. Most of the projects were designed and implemented to build on work that was already done in the subbasins. They have two projects that are related to knotweed. This has been a concern for their technical review panel, but these provide systemic approaches. Both projects are proposed by the conservation district, and both focus on finding the uppermost extent of the knotweed. He addressed a few projects with conditions, and noted that the local technical committee agreed with the conditions. Breckel concluded by stating that they had a good turnout and good support from sponsors, resulting in a good list.

Northeast: Nick Bean presented. He noted that they had a typical year that resulted in two good projects. They are going through a transition process. Kelley Jorgenson provided really good comments for the project sponsors, and that worked well, making it a clean grant round process. Director Cottingham reminded the board that these projects are funded with state funds because the Northeast has no anadromous fish.

Puget Sound: Jeannette Dorner reviewed their selection process, noting that there was good progress on coordinating the Review Panel and the RITT. In 2012, there were 52 projects for Puget Sound. Dorner highlighted a few projects of note: Rocky Bay Estuary Acquisition, Lower Ohop Creek Protection and Restoration, and Fir Island Farm Restoration. She thanked the board for the thorough review and selection process, and thanked RCO staff for their support and assistance. Director Cottingham noted that she and Dorner attended a ribbon-cutting at Port Susan the day before.

Snake River: Steve Martin noted that he appreciates the regional allocation framework because, when combined with the three-year workplan, it provides a great degree of predictability. That works well for planning. He thanked the board, but took time to also thank the landowners who allow the work on

private property, the sponsors, grant manager Kay Caromile, the Review Panel, and the rest of the RCO. He noted that projects are becoming more complex, and are requiring more integration of multiple funding sources and partners. They have Bonneville Power Administration, tribes, and the city of Dayton as sponsors this year.

Upper Columbia: Julie Morgan and Derek Van Marter presented. Van Marter thanked the board and said that the success in Washington is due to the top-down approach that makes resources available to the local decision makers. He then reviewed regional highlights, and the need to have a way to share the story and line up funding for large-scale projects. He noted that they have started to work with others on related issues like forest health. Morgan then discussed how fish are responding, sharing adult abundance figures for sockeye, steelhead, and spring Chinook. Van Marter concluded the presentation, stating that their ongoing success is dependent on voluntary involvement of landowners, so they are continuing to work on the landowner liability issue.

Washington Coast: Miles Batchelder thanked the board and the RCO. He also noted that it remains important to fund preservation of healthy populations along with recovery. This was a good grant round for them, with a good process that resulted in a strong list. He noted that having Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) projects be eligible is important to them because so much prime habitat is on timber company land. He also noted that the Wild Fish Conservancy is doing the third round of funding on the Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Use Assessment. He wants to have the sponsor present results to the board. He mentioned the Wein's Farm Riparian Acquisition, which has 100 feet of water rights; this is an important first step to do some water rights banking in the Chehalis Basin. He also noted that the regional plan is near completion.

Klickitat Lead Entity: John Foltz from the Klickitat Lead Entity presented information about the three projects they are proposing and the numbers of steelhead. Member Gildersleeve asked about the relationship to Condit Dam. He responded that the extent of the restoration is still up in the air, so they are waiting to do any work until the issue is resolved. Member Rockefeller asked when he thought that might be sorted out. Foltz responded that he thought that sponsors would step in soon for simple revegetation projects because the need is great. They need to start looking at the projects and planning soon.

Yakima Basin: Alex Conley discussed the Yakima Basin, reminding the board of the diversity of the region and the types of projects that they are doing. They are working with a number of partners to do different types of work, which may or may not be funded by the board. He shared data about how fish are responding to the work, noting that some populations are doing better than others. He also shared 2012 highlights of their process and list. He thanked the board, staff, and Review Panel for their support and work.

Josh Brown moved to approve \$1,195,165 in SRFB funds for projects and project alternates in the Hood Canal Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-01, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Josh Brown moved to approve \$2,700,000 for projects and project alternates in the Lower Columbia Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-02, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: Phil Rockefeller

Motion: APPROVED

Director Cottingham noted that this includes projects for the Klickitat County lead entity.

Josh Brown moved to approve \$360,000 for projects in the Northeast Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-03, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Josh Brown moved to approve \$6,795,035 in SRFB funds for projects and project alternates in the Puget Sound Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-04, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Josh Brown moved to approve \$1,258,333 in PSAR funds for projects in the Puget Sound Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-04, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Chair Hover noted that unallocated funds would be awarded through the process noted in Manual 18.

Josh Brown moved to approve \$1,598,400 for projects and project alternates in the Snake River Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-05, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Phil Rockefeller moved to approve \$1,953,000 for projects and project alternates in the Upper Columbia Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-06, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Phil Rockefeller moved to approve \$1,620,000 for projects and project alternates in the Coastal Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-07, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Phil Rockefeller moved to approve \$1,776,600 for projects and project alternates in the Yakima Mid-Columbia Region, as listed on Funding Table 2012-08, dated December 6, 2012.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Director Cottingham noted that this includes one project for the Klickitat County lead entity.

Item 6A: Manual 18 Administrative Updates

Brian Abbott and Marnie Tyler presented the information as described in the staff memo. They highlighted changes to the grant round schedule, clarifications to the allowable uses policy, and clarifications to how mitigation funding can be used in conjunction with board funds. In addition, they are proposing changes to the design requirements for phased and large scale restoration projects. The board was concerned about projects getting funded for construction before design was complete, and supported the staff effort.

Director Cottingham clarified that the allowable uses policy question about acclimation ponds applied to land acquired with board funds. She stated that she wanted to ensure that staff could give consistent responses to sponsor requests. The board expresses reservations about any policy that would be too prescriptive, and asked a number of questions about the word "temporary," landowner preferences, community support, relationship to implementation plans, relationship to salmon recovery, and ground disturbance. They asked staff to provide revised criteria via email. Marnie Tyler clarified that the board was asking for revised criteria that ensured that acclimation ponds were consistent with original purpose, had no ground disturbance, promoted a naturalized setting, and minimized visual impacts. Abbott clarified that the policy was designed to allow proposals that met those criteria to be approved more easily; others would go through an allowable uses process.

Abbott and Tyler also discussed the addition guidance related to managing invasive species and cultural resources. Abbott concluded by discussing the next steps of stakeholder involvement.

Revised Acclimation Pond Language

On the second day of the meeting, December 7, 2012, Marnie Tyler, Brian Abbott, and Marc Duboiski presented follow-up information about acclimation ponds. Duboiski noted that the typical temporary pen was installed for 6 to 8 weeks and showed some examples at project sites. Tyler presented the following revised draft criteria for allowing acclimation ponds on board-funded sites, without the allowable uses process:

- Proposed use is consistent terms of existing board conservation easement between the sponsor and landowner.
- Salmon Recovery Region or Lead Entity has reviewed and approved supplementation proposal for consistency with the salmon recovery plan.
- Listed species are not harmed or negatively affected.
- Proposed use is consistent with sponsor/landowner board conservation easement terms.
- The acclimation pond is a natural pond, wetland, or stream channel (off-channel or side channel)
- Temporary structures only during juvenile rearing season. Usually 6-8 weeks in the Spring (March through May). Structures removed after acclimated juveniles are released.
- No excavation or construction of ponds is allowed. No earth moving, water diversion, or substantial alteration to the existing habitat conditions is conducted. Efforts taken to use least impactful methods to achieve project goals.

Member Gildersleeve noted that they have seen a number of these operations, and that they can affect water quality. She asked that the criteria include a requirement that they have all required permits, and that the sponsors contact the Department of Ecology. Member Troutt was concerned that if there is excavation, that it would automatically be disallowed; Tyler clarified that it meant that they just needed additional review. Member Rockefeller asked who decides if a project meets the criteria. Tyler responded that the sponsor would be able to make the determination, but the grant manager must be notified. Director Cottingham noted that it was consistent with compliance policy.

Public Comment

Julie Morgan, Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, commented that they forwarded this request to RCO because acclimation ponds are consistent with hatchery best practices. They are trying to get fish into smaller acclimation areas so they rear in more natural settings.

Josh Brown moved to incorporate the criteria into manual 18.

Seconded by: Phil Rockefeller

Motion: APPROVED

Item 6B: Manual 18 Review Panel Policy Recommendations

Patty Michak presented information about the Review Panel recommendations, as described in the memo.

Knotweed: Member Barber asked how the questions that were proposed addressed who else was doing the work. Member Partridge asked how the questions would get at the bigger strategy and wants to look at the salmon niche. Michak acknowledged that the questions do not get at broad strategy, and that the Review Panel wanted to do that work in 2013.

Director Cottingham noted that part of the problem is that knotweed is on the "Class B" list and there is a funding gap. Director Cottingham asked if RCO staff need to add this to the policy list for 2013, starting with an assessment of the funding picture. Member Partridge thought that would be a good idea. Member Troutt suggested that staff should consider how effective the investment has been to date; he would not want to see funding reduced if it is making a difference. Chair Hover said that he would prefer a strategic approach with an end date. Member Barber noted that they can do a great job, but that their funding should be going to salmon. Member Brown agreed, and suggested that they also need to be coordinated with the right local partners. He noted that the board cannot do everything, and counties can put an assessment in place.

Public Comment

Scott Moore, Watershed Steward, Snohomish County, had two knotweed projects approved today and is also the chair of the King County Noxious Weed Control Board. In Snohomish County, the work was tied closely with the salmon habitat, so this funding made sense. Their project was flagged as a project of concern; he welcomed the questions and concern. He hopes to participate in developing the questions for the guidelines. Ten years is not unreasonable for surveying for doing stewardship. He thinks knotweed is a threat to any salmon project. He is concerned that knotweed control is not considered restoration unless there is planting as well; it takes three years of treatment before it makes sense to plant.

Jill Silver, 10,000 Years Institute, also has board-funded knotweed projects and shared weed booklets with the board. She has done a number of salmon recovery restoration projects, but started dealing with knotweed when it invaded the Hoh River. She expressed concern that knotweed and other invasive species could reverse the benefits of the restoration projects that the board has funded. She encouraged the board to think of itself as a funder of knotweed control in salmon habitat.

Beavers: Member Everitt noted that agencies have been asked to come up with beaver management plans, and asked how the idea of relocation fits. Director Cottingham noted that this is not about managing problem beavers.

Stream Bank Stabilization: Member Troutt commented that he was uncomfortable with the language and thought that there were some difficult definitions. He offered to work directly with RCO staff to address his concerns. The result will be shared with the board by email.

Public Comment:

Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, commented that they are trying to find guidance that balances multiple interests. Before there are huge changes, they should look at all perspectives on the issue.

Evaluation Criteria:

Public Comment:

Alex Conley, *Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board*, commented on the evaluation criteria. He suggested that the terms "large" and "cost effectiveness" be defined. They will make those noted during the stakeholder comment period. He suggested that the definition be made based on dollar amounts.

Josh Brown moved to adopt the recommendations of the Review Panel to update Manual 18 policies regarding knotweed control, beaver reintroduction projects, bank stabilization projects, and Review Panel evaluation criteria.

Seconded by: Phil Rockefeller

David Troutt moved to amend the motion to remove the bank stabilization portion of the motion.

Seconded by: Harry Barber

Motion: APPROVED

Main Motion: APPROVED

Item 7: Communication Plan Updates

Susan Zemek presented the plan update, as described in the staff memo, along with quotes from the stakeholder survey that highlighted successes and challenges. She also shared statistics about web use and media coverage. The proposed plan was attached to the memo.

Rockefeller asked for a copy of the presentation. Brown asked if the news articles specifically mentioned the RCO; Zemek responded that they mentioned either the RCO or the boards. He also asked about the note about recognizing top ranking projects through RCO awards. Director Cottingham explained how they do "big check" ceremonies and ribbon cuttings on the RCFB side; part of the communication plan will be to find ways to do this on the SRFB side. She noted that board members also participate; SRFB members indicated an interest in playing the same role. Josh noted he would also be willing to do op-ed pieces. Board members suggested projects that highlight partnerships or complex approaches would be good. Troutt also offered the idea of social marketing, and to have measurable goals about target audiences.

Director Cottingham noted that this is a five-year plan, and that she wants to be very cautious about social media.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: December 7, 2012

Place: Olympia, WA

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

Bud Hover, Chair	Okanogan County	Bob Everitt	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Harry Barber	Washougal	Carol Smith	Conservation Commission
Josh Brown	Kitsap County	Craig Partridge	Department of Natural Resources
Phil Rockefeller	NWPCC	Melissa Gildersleeve	Department of Ecology
David Troutt	Olympia		

Mike Barber was excused.

It is intended that this summary be used with the notebook provided in advance of the meeting. A recording is retained by RCO as the formal record of meeting.

Opening and Welcome

Chair Bud Hover called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and a quorum was determined.

Item 8: State of the Salmon in Watersheds Report

Jennifer Johnson shared a preview of the web site, which is scheduled to launch on December 28. She highlighted ways in which the site will offer live data by navigating through select pages at the state level and for the Snake Region. Member Barber noted the continued absence of nutrient data; Director Cottingham reminded the board that if other agencies do not collect the information, the RCO cannot report it. Board members expressed concerns about the presentation of some data. For example, David Troutt was concerned about the use of pie charts to show harvest data. Member Brown asked if the board could be more involved in the presentation of data in future reports. Member Troutt noted that abundance is still a focus, and wants more emphasis on VSP parameters. Johnson responded that they continue to have the discussion with WDFW. Scott Boettcher, subcontractor to Paladin Data Systems, and Tim Smith, who have partnered on the site, also thanked the board and noted that the move to the web is a huge effort that brings greater transparency to the work. Member Barber commented that he was glad to see that the data split hatchery from wild fish.

Director Cottingham said that they would launch the site on December 28, and then announce it in mid-January after it is tested for major glitches. There will be an update in May to add video.

Public Comment

Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish Recovery Board, thanked Jennifer for her work, and noted that it was a lot more work than anyone anticipated. This process has been a new way of working with a lot more back and forth communication about sharing and integrating data. It has been the best peer review that has been done yet. He believes that these discussions need to continue.

Item 9: Board Meeting Schedule

Rebecca Connolly presented the schedule as described in the memo. She noted that one board member had announced a conflict with the May meeting dates and proposed an alternate date. The board approved the alternate date of May 21-22, 2013.

Josh Brown moved to approve the revised dates as presented.

Seconded by: David Troutt

Motion: APPROVED

Item 10: Approve Funding and Scope of Work for Monitoring Program Assessment

Neil Aaland presented the information as described in the staff memo. He then presented a draft scope to produce an updated SRFB Monitoring Strategy with recommendations for implementation. The scope of work includes three major tasks:

- Review the three components of current strategy and evaluate their effectiveness in meeting program goals
- Review/evaluate the monitoring components of the regional salmon recovery plans and determine which elements are appropriate for state funding
- Evaluate how information is exchanged on monitoring results and make recommendations on changes

The work also would include evaluating (1) how current SRFB monitoring fits into monitoring in Washington currently being conducted by federal agencies, (2) current funding levels for SRFB monitoring and whether the present three major components are funded at appropriate percentages, and (3) whether (and how) a portion of funding should be reserved for regional monitoring or ad-hoc activities. The cost would be about \$75,000 and would be done through a competitive process. The final report would be done in October.

Director Cottingham noted that due to the timeline, the board may need to make funding decisions in May 2013 based on the existing paradigm. She noted that the assessment also would include a transition strategy if it recommended changes.

Member Troutt asked that a tribal representative be added to the steering committee. Member Rockefeller suggested involvement of Bonneville Power Administration and Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Member Gildersleeve asked if there would be a peer review of the strategy. Director Cottingham responded that it would be an investment strategy, not a scientific strategy.

Member Rockefeller noted that the monitoring should at minimum supply data for the high level indicators noted in the State of the Salmon report, and asked if the contractor's approach would look at all of the different types of monitoring to get to high level indicators. Director Cottingham responded that the use of NOAA funds is governed by their guidelines, but that some of the initial information indicates that some respondents think there should be a shift in the funding priorities.

Public Comment

Tim Quinn, Department of Fish and Wildlife, commented that he applauded the effort, but the fundamental way to evaluate a monitoring program is decide what questions they want to answer with their monitoring. He encouraged the board to think through what they want to know as part of the effort. It also is important to know how important each question is. Some of the work already has been reviewed.

He also suggested that it is important that the board fully understand what each of the monitoring programs can do.

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, said that he is pleased with Neil's presentation and the proposal. One of the strongest points is the need to consider what is going on across the state with monitoring. State of the Salmon is showing what is going on in the watersheds. The board should see what is going on and be strategic about filling its needs and the unmet needs in the regions.

Phil Rockefeller moved to approve the use of \$75,000 in 2012 monitoring funds for an assessment of the board's monitoring strategy.

Seconded by: Josh Brown

Motion: APPROVED

Item 11: Assessment of Roles and Responsibilities for the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

Kaleen Cottingham presented this topic, beginning with an overview of the background and responsibilities of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office. She noted that their focus has moved from advocacy and policy to operations, and that some stakeholders have expressed concern about this shift. In light of this situation, she hired the consultant to assess the roles and responsibilities of the office, and described the work of the consultant to date. She noted that the consultant was unable to attend, and asked board members for feedback on the questions in the board memo.

All board members noted that there has been a change in the role of the GSRO over time, especially for the GSRO executive coordinator. Board members noted that in the past, the coordinator played a larger role with regard to the governor's policy on salmon recovery and provided a single "voice" for salmon recovery messaging at the state level. Some board members expressed a desire to have the GSRO return to the governor's office; Director Cottingham responded that the assessment was bound by the current legal structure. It was suggested that the GSRO could potentially have a stronger role despite the legal structure.

Most board members agreed that high-level advocacy, integration across agencies and programs, serving as a point person/agency for state and federal efforts, and coordination were all important functions for the GSRO. Some board members, however, believed that if functions such as coordination or advocacy were institutionalized across agencies, then they could be removed from the GSRO.

Board members also discussed a broader role for the regional boards in doing the advocacy work for salmon recovery.

Public Comment

Jim Kremer, citizen, remarked that what is happening in the state is a grand experiment, and referenced the discussion on monitoring. He said that it is interesting to see something become institutionalized, and you lose the gravitas and innovation. He suggested that thinking about how to build on the role of the regions is an important way to think about this, and that the power of salmon recovery is in bringing all of the local resources together to solve problems.

Steve Martin, Snake River Recovery Region, noted that there is a lot of institutional knowledge and encouraged the board to include more people in the conversation. Salmon recovery is going to take both regions and GSRO. For example, he represented the regions in a conversation with Commerce about the

