

**SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD**  
**MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING**

As amended and approved at October 28 SRFB Meeting

July 18, 2005

Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, Washington

---

***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Mark Clark	Designee, Conservation Commission

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair William Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

The Chair noted two changes for the June 2005 meeting minutes. Due to lack of a quorum, the minutes were not approved at this time.

**MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS**

*Director's Report*

Director Johnson noted that this is the last meeting for the Board to make decisions on the 6<sup>th</sup> Round process.

*Financial Services Report*

Mark Jarasitis provided this agenda item. (See notebook item #2b for details.)

Mark reviewed a handout outlining the estimated 05-07 biennial capital funds budget.

Tim Smith asked about the high range 2006 federal estimate being lower than 2005 and whether there are earmarks or another reason for this.

Director Johnson responded that this was a conservative amount as we don't know what earmarks or the final amount will be. This number was provided for display purposes only.

*Project Management Report*

Neil Aaland presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2c for details.)

- Management report
- Veterans Conservation Corps
- Projects presentation

There were no questions on the project management report.

Neil provided the Board with an update on the status of the Veterans Conservation Corps work.

The Department of Veterans Affairs will:

- Create list of eligible veterans
- Offer consultation
- Provide on-going case management

The Board will identify criteria that will meet the requirements to give preference to projects that involve members of the Veterans Conservation Corps.

Mark Clark reported that there are conservation districts that have worked with other programs such as this and are interested in working with the new Veterans Conservation Corps.

Chair Ruckelshaus is concerned with giving projects high priority due to the Veterans' involvement but to make sure the criteria still highlights the high priority projects that have Veteran involvement.

Barb McIntosh and Tara Galuska provided a PowerPoint presentation of completed projects.

- #00-1681R – Beaver Creek Fish Passage
- #00-1042C and 00-1872C – Lower Columbia River Estuary – Grays River Phase 1 and 2
- #02-1581R Brownes Creek Instream Habitat Restoration
- #02-1206R Stillaguamish Old Channel Habitat Restoration

## **GOVERNOR'S SALMON RECOVERY OFFICE REPORT**

Chris Drivdahl presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2d for details.)

Chris announced that Bob Bugert has left the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) and that Steve Martin will be taking his place. Steve will start as a part-time employee for the first six months and then become a full-time staff member.

The Chair noted the good work that Bob Bugert has done and he will be sorely missed, but that Steve Martin will be a good addition to the team. Both Steve and Bob have done great work in Eastern Washington.

The Chair asked staff to draft a Recognition Resolution for Bob Bugert. This will be presented at the October meeting.

The Chair highlighted the Puget Sound Recovery Plan and encouraged everyone to read through this work.

Mark Clark reported that the Conservation Commission has asked him to address some concerns about the Skagit section of the Puget Sound Recovery Plan. The Commission would like to know, once it is available, how the process would move ahead and whether

comments would be integrated into the plan.

Chris noted that, after the comment period, any issues raised would be addressed. The recovery plan group met last week and discussed the issues of water quantity and riparian protection. Bob Everitt, WDFW Regional Director, is working on these issues with the agriculture community and the tribes.

Chair Ruckelshaus explained the recovery plan process as he understands it and how the different watersheds developed their individual chapters. Some watersheds used a more collaborative process than the Skagit Watershed.

### **LEAD ENTITY ADVISORY GROUP (LEAG) REPORT**

Steve Martin, LEAG Co-Chair, presented this report as LEAG Chair, Doug Osterman, was unable to attend today's meeting. (See notebook item #2e for details.)

Steve noted an error in the LEAG July 2005 minutes. Under the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) report, the amount of funding should be \$50 million not \$40 million and the funding is for the Pacific Northwest, not the Puget Sound only.

Steve reported that there was general consensus by LEAG that they would like to have implementation funding provided for each individual project rather than through the Tetra Tech EC Inc. sampling process. They would also like to make sure results from Tetra Tech EC Inc. are shared with the lead entities.

Director Johnson noted that there might be an issue of semantics in that each project is monitored for implementation and that the Board made a conscious decision to sample projects for effectiveness monitoring.

Another error noted in the LEAG minutes was in the SRFB 6<sup>th</sup> Round section where it notes that the Washington Wildlife Recreation Program (WWRP) has a new legislatively mandated program for Riparian Habitat. The minutes read that this program would provide \$40 million, when actually funding for this program is only available after funding for the WWRP program exceeds \$40 million.

Chair Ruckelshaus congratulated Steve in his new role with the GSRO.

### **WATERSHED HEALTH AND SALMON RECOVERY MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

Bruce Crawford, Monitoring Manager at the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC), and Bob Cusimano, Department of Ecology, presented this agenda item.

Bruce provided the Board with an update on the different monitoring efforts. He also reviewed the history of the status and trend monitoring framework process.

Dick Wallace suggested Bruce provide a one-page fact sheet on the overall approach to monitoring.

The Chair agreed that this would be a good idea and would like to have a copy in every meeting's notebook.

Bob Cusimano provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Habitat and Water Quality Status and Trends Statewide Monitoring Framework proposal. A handout was also provided for the Board's review. The proposal is to develop a guide for statewide monitoring with appropriate protocols along with workshops to develop and identify participants who will use these protocols. The request is for \$154,000 from the SRFB to fund this proposal.

Dick reported that this proposal is in response to the Board's direction to develop a monitoring framework and detailed plan.

The plan, if approved, would be scheduled for completion by May of 2006.

The Chair agrees that the state needs to do status and trend monitoring to be able to answer the questions presented by Congress on what we are getting for the money being spent on salmon recovery.

Craig Partridge asked if there is any estimate of what it would cost for wadeable and non-wadeable monitoring if the framework were implemented.

Bob reported that, as the framework is being developed, they may be able to identify costs but it is too soon now to give any numbers.

Craig then asked how long it might be before results would be seen.

Bob believes the first stage would be to complete a status assessment. The results might begin to be reported in 5 to 10 years, depending on what is being measured.

Craig would like to know, from a fish habitat standpoint, the usefulness of wadeable and non-wadeable monitoring while we are waiting for the other components to be developed and how much are we eventually going to have to spend on a usable system.

Bruce believes it is very useful and is the basis for assessments that have been done in the past. He noted that, as the nearshore marine component is of growing importance to the SRFB, it is imperative to know what is happening with fish biology in the marine environment.

The Forum's Nearshore Marine Subcommittee is looking into what type of randomized process could be employed.

The Chair suggested the Board would need to decide how it would integrate with other things that are not now funded.

Mark Clark noted that there is a lot of monitoring going on across the state, including volunteers, but some of the data is non-usable. He asked if there are going to be some safeguards in place to get usable data.

Bruce reported that the Monitoring Forum has a subcommittee working on establishing monitoring protocols so that data gathered by volunteers is useable.

The Chair wondered, as there is not a quorum present, what the next step would be for this monitoring framework proposal. The Board has not had time to review the details as they just received the proposal at today's meeting.

Larry Cassidy discussed how important the monitoring work is. He noted that, in the Columbia, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is cutting the monitoring funds where the federal government is requiring monitoring.

## **FOREST AND FISH PROGRAM**

Craig Partridge introduced Leonard (Lenny) Young, Manager of DNR's Forest Practices Division, and Dr. Geoff McNaughton, Administrator of DNR's Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program.

Lenny provided an overview of the Forest and Fish Program process and activities to date. He also detailed the adaptive management program used in the Forest and Fish Program. Lenny noted that policy development and implementation has a timeline for each step along the way so that decisions can be made in a timely manner.

Lenny reported on the program's funding sources and status. Of the \$18.1 million it received, \$14.5 million is from federal sources and is earmarked for spending. The remaining \$3.6 million comes from the state's general fund. At this time there is \$7.8 million in un-obligated funds, some of which will be used for work plan studies.

Geoff gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the Forest Practices Rule Groups and an overview of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) program. CMER is the science end of the adaptive management program.

Geoff reviewed CMER developed Critical Questions and Programs for each Rule Group, highlighting a few specific examples. CMER's focus is on the top three priorities:

1. Type N Buffer Characteristics (Non-fish buffers)
2. East side Stream Type F (Fish buffers on the East side)
3. Type N Amphibian Response (Testing rules designed to protect amphibian habitat)

This is the first year that CMER has tried to prioritize at a project level. In the past, it was prioritized at a program level only. He encouraged Board members to visit their website at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/forestpractices/adaptivemanagement> for information on the 2005 CMER Workplan.

Larry Cassidy asked about funding of bull trout monitoring. Geoff replied that they spend 25 percent of funds on bull trout monitoring annually and get a lot of additional data through this monitoring. Some of the funds they received were earmarked for this type of monitoring.

Craig Partridge would be very interested in coordinating monitoring efforts with what the SRFB is doing.

The Chair asked why the earmark is being removed. Geoff responded that this funding was designated only for a limited time.

The Chair asked for the Forest and Fish Program's help in looking at the adaptive management sections of the various recovery plans and providing input.

## **6<sup>TH</sup> ROUND ISSUES**

Neil facilitated this agenda item.

### *Review Panel Process Update*

Steve Leider and Rollie Geppert provided an update on the Review Panel Process.

Steve described the Panel's review of strategies. As team leader, he noted that most requests for strategies to be reviewed are coming from lead entities not participating in a recovery plan. The Panel is working hard to turnaround comments in as timely a manner as possible.

Rollie described the Panel's requests for assistance for project review. He reported that 19 of the 26 lead entities have signed up for assistance and 46 projects have been reviewed to date with another 25 scheduled.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked what kind of assistance the lead entities are getting from the Review Panel. Rollie responded that the Panel uses criteria in Manual 18 for defining a project of concern, but the goal is to avoid this type of project.

### *Assessment Review Process and Parameters*

Neil and Rollie presented this portion of the agenda.

Rollie reviewed the assessment process and provided the following options for the Board to consider:

1. All assessments and studies would be eligible, including nearshore
2. Make all assessments and studies eligible, except nearshore
3. All assessments and studies eligible, except those associated with filling data gaps

The Chair asked if staff had a recommendation. Rollie responded that staff recommends keeping all assessments eligible as most of the lead entities are already well into the process to identify projects. This would be for lead entity specific assessments.

Brenda McMurray wanted to be clear that the Board isn't eliminating the option to present a multiple lead entity assessment if brought forward by the lead entities. Director Johnson replied that the option is not eliminated, but it would take additional coordination between the lead entities.

The Chair reported that NOAA is working on getting a research plan together by December. This plan may or may not help in prioritizing the multiple lead entity assessments but may identify areas that need additional data.

Director Johnson stressed that, as the Board did not amend the existing policy on

assessments in Manual 18, it will stay in place for this grant round.

### *Allocation Criteria*

Neil provided background on the first tier of the allocation criteria. (See memo on Allocation Criteria (1<sup>st</sup> Increment) behind notebook item #5 for details.)

Neil discussed proposed changes presented at the LEAG meeting. Neil, Tim Smith, and Jeff Breckel met after the LEAG meeting and developed other options for first tier allocation:

1. Every lead entity needs sufficient project money to construct and maintain a salmon recovery infrastructure.
2. Project money should flow directly to lead entities, as it does now.
3. Some portion of these project dollars should be allocated by geographic region.
4. Some portion of the allocation should be based on criteria similar to what has been discussed.

Discussed the first tier allocation. There was some question on what was meant by applying the first increment to a regional area.

Neil, Tim, and Jeff explained reasoning behind the option to allocate first tier money by a recovery region.

Jeff provided a handout depicting how funds were distributed in the past grant rounds by region.

Brenda McMurray is concerned about adding an additional layer in allocation to fund at a regional level when the Board hasn't gotten enough information together to be strategic in identifying how to make this allocation.

The Chair agrees with Brenda in that the Board needs more discussion and data before adding additional criteria for allocating the first tier.

Dick Wallace agrees that Board members haven't had the process discussion yet. There is a need to start thinking about how to do this but won't be able to in this grant round.

Tim explained that they are not proposing a change to any of the criteria, but to have a visual showing of funding allocation by regional area.

Neil noted that there is no change to the first increment plan in the memorandum, but would display the first increment differently, such as by regional area. He noted the need to start thinking about the 7<sup>th</sup> Round soon.

The Chair pointed out the LEAG recommendation to increase the 8 percent allocation to 10 percent to recognize listed species.

Brenda isn't concerned about raising the amount to 10 percent, but is not in favor of increasing the first tier allocation above 35 percent.

Larry Cassidy supported Jeff's concern about the multiple sub-basins under one lead entity –

Lower Columbia isn't the only lead entity with this concern. The additional percentage for listed species could address this concern.

Jim Fox reviewed the first tier allocation process and noted that stream miles and multiple listed species both address the lead entities covering multiple watersheds.

Larry Cassidy made a **MOTION** to keep the first increment of 35 percent and to increase the 8 percent allocation to 10 percent to recognize listed species. Brenda McMurray **SECONDED**. The motion was **APPROVED**.

Neil noted that staff would start having 7<sup>th</sup> Round discussions to work on policy changes.

## **MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

Director Johnson noted the need for the Board to return to this topic for a decision.

The Chair reviewed the proposal for the development of a Monitoring Framework and asked for a motion and decision on this project. The request is for \$154,000 from the SRFB to fund this proposal.

Brenda McMurray pointed out that she would approve any efforts needed to get the ball rolling on this issue. She would like to be sure other partners are also involved in this project.

Bruce Crawford reported that, although he hasn't contacted everyone involved, he has been contacting many groups who are supportive of this issue.

The Chair added that who is doing what and what it would cost is another item that needs to be included in the framework. Need to figure out how to do this in a rational way and spend the money wisely.

Mark Clark is concerned with the amount of funding allocated for staffing this effort. He would like to be able to adjust that amount through working with Bruce and Director Johnson.

Brenda McMurray made a **MOTION** to approve leeway for the Director in funding this proposal, but not to exceed \$160,000. Larry Cassidy **SECONDED**. The motion was **APPROVED**.

## **PROGRAMMATIC POLICY**

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #5d for details.)

Although staff has no recommendation, it did present four options for Board review and approval.

1. Award grants only to projects that have come through the Sixth Round lead entity process.
2. Consider providing grants only to programs and activities previously funded by the Board.
3. Consider providing funding only for activities initiated by the SRFB and related to

SRFB program evaluation and reporting.

4. Consider soliciting proposals through a formal Request for Proposals process.

Larry Cassidy **MOVED** to adopt approaches 2 and 3. Brenda McMurray **SECONDED** the motion with a question on timing of National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) funds.

(Director Johnson will need to get back to Brenda with that number.) Motion was **APPROVED**.

## **REVIEW PROCESS FOR LEAD ENTITIES NOT INCLUDED IN REGIONAL RECOVERY PLANS**

A panel consisting of John Sims, Neil Aaland, Steve Leider, Lee Napier, and Mike Johnson presented this agenda item with Neil facilitating. (See handout for details.)

Steve Leider provided a report on the Technical Recovery Team (TRT) process.

Larry Cassidy asked how hatchery and harvest is handled.

Steve feels the Board is looking at projects under habitat only and in the future may want to integrate the other H's.

Neil reviewed the notebook memorandum and attachments, noting that tributary habitat is the only new element to the review questions.

Public Testimony:

Lee Napier, Mike Johnson, and John Sims presented their testimony. Lee Napier noted that Selinda Barhuis was unable to attend today's meeting but the testimony reflects her comments also. (See written testimony for details.)

The recommendation to the Board is to adopt staff's recommendation for this year's review process, with immediate action to start looking at Round 7, and funding of Limited Factors Analysis (LFA) for filling of data gaps.

The Monitoring Forum will be hearing a proposal by the Conservation Commission concerning funding of the LFA at its meeting on July 19.

There was discussion on the potential funding of the LFA and how to process this request sooner if the Monitoring Forum approves it.

Chair Ruckelshaus made a **MOTION** to approve the staff recommendation for review of plans. Larry Cassidy **SECONDED**. The motion was **APPROVED**.

A decision on LFA funding will wait until after the Monitoring Forum meeting on the July 19.

## **MITIGATION FUNDS DISCUSSION**

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

Staff recommends that eligible applicants be allowed to use mitigation funds from a third party as a matching share, as long as IAC/SRFB funds are not used to replace any part of the mitigation fund or payment.

Director Johnson explained the recommended policy and how the IAC's policy has worked.

Chair Ruckelshaus **MOVED** to adopt the recommended mitigation funds policy. Larry Cassidy **SECONDED**. The motion was **APPROVED**.

Brenda McMurray wants to send a clear message that the use of mitigation funds needs to be above and beyond required mitigation action.

Craig Partridge noted that the IAC policy makes sure this funding is not a substitution to carry out the mitigation, but if the mitigation is funded, it should be used for the most good.

Public Testimony:

John Sims, WRIA 21 Lead Entity Coordinator, noted that since they have lost effectiveness monitoring as an eligible cost, they would like to have effectiveness monitoring back as an eligible matching fund item.

Director Johnson noted that this is a legitimate question for the Board and staff to consider in the 7<sup>th</sup> Round.

Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, talked about the LEAG discussion on effectiveness monitoring.

## **INTERAGENCY MITIGATION OPTIMIZATION EFFORT**

Tim Smith presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #8 for details.)

Tim outlined the current process and the process for improvement proposal outlined in the document.

Tim outlined three project level process improvements for the Board's information:

1. Identify process facilitator
2. Pre-application conference
3. Concurrent, integrated multi-agency review

Tim didn't review all the new tools proposed but did want to highlight the tool to accelerate development of project implementation work schedules for salmon and water.

## **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Larry Cassidy **MOVED** to approve the June 9 & 10, 2005 meeting minutes with the Chair's suggested changes. **SECONDED** by Brenda McMurray. The June 2005 meeting minutes were **APPROVED** as amended.

**2006 MEETING SCHEDULE – INITIAL DISCUSSION**

Tammy Owings will follow-up with Board members to get a draft schedule out for approval at the October meeting.

**PARTNER AGENCY REPORT**

Tim Smith provided an update on the Smolt Monitoring Status Report.

**ADJOURN**

The July 2005 meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

\_\_\_\_\_  
William Ruckelshaus, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Future Meetings:            October 27 & 28, 2005  
   Place TBD