

## SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

### MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

December 6, 2001

West Coast SeaTac Hotel – Seattle Room  
Seattle, Washington

---

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

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
James Peters	Olympia
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Shari Schafflein	Designee, Department of Transportation

---

#### **Call to Order**

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

The agenda was reviewed. Director Johnson noted that agenda item # 8, Regional Recovery Organizations, will be an action item.

#### **Topic #1: Review and Approval of the SRFB Meeting Minutes**

Two amendments were made to the October 2001, meeting minutes: John Roskelley was in attendance at the meeting and was added to the list of SRFB members present; and Craig Partridge was not in attendance at the meeting; his name was removed from list.

Brenda McMurray **moved** to accept the September meeting minutes as presented and the amended October meeting minutes. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion. **Approved.**

#### **Topic #2: Management and Status Reports**

*Financial and Director Report:* Director Johnson presented this agenda item updating Board members on Third Round application intake and budget concerns. (See notebook for details.)

During the report, Director Johnson received the news that the \$27 million in state capital funds, which had been “paused”, were un-paused as of 9:30 a.m. Capital budget calculations will need to be recast. At this point the Board should have \$25.8 million in state funds along with federal funds for disbursement over the next biennium.

The IAC/SRFB received \$12 million in federal funds. Ms. Johnson handed out a copy of a November 30, 2001, letter from D. Robert Lohn of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to Governor Locke suggesting three items to spend portions of this funding on ([letter attached](#)). The three items were: 1) at least \$2 million to Regional Funding (this will be discussed under agenda item 8); 2) a portion to restoring in-stream flows; and 3) a portion to convert the Forest and Fish Agreement into a Habitat Conservation Plan.

The Board should have approximately \$50 million in both state and federal money over the next biennium to spend on SRFB projects and activities.

*Project Management Report:*

Rollie Geppert presented this portion of the agenda giving the Board a power point presentation of completed projects. (See notebook and [attached copy of presentation](#) for details.)

**Topic #3: GSRO Report**

Written report only. (See notebook for details.)

**Topic #4: LEAG Report**

Jay Watson gave the LEAG report.

The Chair noted that this is Phil Trask’s last meeting as the lead entity coordinator for WDFW. He has accepted a position with the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board. Phil has done a great job as the lead entity coordinator and he will be missed.

Jay agreed with the Chair on the good work that Phil has done.

WDFW is currently recruiting to fill Phil Trask’s position.

Two major issues discussed at the LEAG meeting on December 5:

1. Measures of Success are being worked on by the LEAG. There is a rough working draft that is still going through review and revision.
2. Regional Support - the LEAG passed a resolution in support of regional efforts.

Under the Regional Support topic the LEAG asked the SRFB to:

- Look at the current WDFW process for providing grants for regional planning and the resulting outcome.

- Look for strengths that can't be funded currently, look at ways to augment the current funding level with more money to help fulfill regional activities.
- Hold some money for the second year to see if more regional organizations come into existence or if there are gaps that need to be filled.

Brenda McMurray asked if LEAG is looking at monitoring?

Jay said it still depends on the region but the monitoring issue may work into the base activities as time goes on. Monitoring is still an ill-defined mandate.

Ms. McMurray asked how the lead entities felt about regionalization.

Jay can't speak for all lead entities but would say it is dependent on the area. In four areas of the state it is a reality and lead entities believe they have to work with it. There is concern but most are working through the issues.

Jim Peters likes the regional approach but realizes in some areas it may not work.

Ms. McMurray noted appreciation to the LEAG for keeping the issues moving and communicating collective views and concerns from the lead entities. The chair echoed the sentiment.

### **Topic #5: Nearshore Project Update**

Tim Smith, WDFW, and Lori Morris, US Army Corps of Engineers, updated the Board on the Nearshore project.

The contract has been signed between the parties. Three positions have been filled: Toni Lick – accountant; Technical Lead – Tom Mumford (DNR aquatic – ½ time on project and ½ counted as nearshore); and Tim Smith as the Project manager. Tim's job has been redesigned to do this as well as the lead entity program management for WDFW.

The Nearshore Science Team has been seated. This group has been doing a lot of presentations.

Starting to see coordination on nearshore activities.

Ms. Morris gave a power point presentation on the overview of the Nearshore project. ([Copy attached.](#))

Board discussed the different issues surrounding the nearshore project.

### **Topic #6: Third Round Technical Panel**

Jim Kramer led this agenda topic.

Chair Ruckelshaus welcomed Technical Panel members Jeanette Smith, Steve Toth, and Paul DeVries

Jim Kramer gave an overview of the Technical Panel process to date and the next steps. He then asked the Panel members to answer three questions:

1. Did you think the meetings were useful for you to understand the status, abilities and needs of individual lead entities?
2. How do you think the meetings were useful for lead entities?
3. What suggestions, concerns or issues do you have about the process so far?

Jeanette Smith, principal scientist at the Washington office of the Pacific Watershed Institute and lives in the Methow valley. It was helpful to her to travel throughout the state, to see where lead entities have common problems and where there are unique differences. Would like to have seen more of the watersheds than project specific areas. Information exchange between lead entities seemed to be helpful for the lead entities. The Panel was able to give different areas ideas on what is working in other areas of the state. In the future, may need more one-on-one time with some of the lead entity areas. Monitoring still seems to be a concept and not in practice.

Steve Toth, Hydrologist, has worked mostly with forest and fish issues. This is the first year he has been on the panel and found it very interesting to see what is going on outside the forestry issues. Both the meetings and field visits were helpful to understand. It was difficult for the lead entities to articulate their strategies. The strategy is very important for the technical panel to understand. Suggested creating a template to use when developing strategies. Also agrees with Jeanette that some areas would benefit with more technical assistance at the project level.

Paul DeVries, environmental consultant, was on last year's technical panel. Lead entity process is invaluable. Saw a lot of progress made over the last year. The technical panel visits are helpful in clarifying needs. There seems to be confusion on the difference between goals and strategies. Paul is not sure a template would work since strategy needs vary across the state. If a template is developed, need to keep in mind the wide array of differences across the state. A design phase review is needed on projects.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the Technical Panel got a sense of the lead entity citizen committees and if they have a broad spectrum of representation.

Response: Varied widely from place to place and whether or not there was buy-in. Small private landowners were not always represented. Paul did see progress this year from last year. Definitely improved but still a ways to go.

Brenda McMurray asked if there would be a way to show where a lead entity is in developing the strategy.

Kramer mentioned that staff has been compiling a listing of lead entities and where they are in their strategy process.

Paul suggested the Board distinguish more between assessments and projects. He would like to see a higher level of scrutiny on assessments and require they lead to future projects before being funded.

Since he was unable to attend the meeting, Blake Feist answered the questions in an e-mail to Jim Kramer. Below are his answers:

*1. Did you think the meetings were useful for you to understand the status, abilities and needs of individual lead entities?*

*Yes. However, I think visiting "representative" projects was problematic for two reasons. First, many project sponsors felt left out if their potential project site was not visited. Since it's not possible to visit all of the potential projects, we should not visit any of them. Second, I did not get much out of visiting potential restoration sites, so I did not really see the utility in it.*

*2. How do you think the meetings were useful for lead entities?*

*The meetings allowed the lead entities to become familiar with Tech Panel members, Jim Kramer, and various SRF Board personnel. I believe that instills trust in the lead entities with respect to the review process, and gives them an opportunity to improve their strategy and prioritize candidate projects.*

*3. What suggestions, concerns or issues do you have about the process so far?*

*I have one suggestion, in addition to my suggestion of omitting site visits in question #1. Utilize the large scale planning strategies used for marine reserve designs that are now being adapted for watershed restoration by Mary Ruckelshaus at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. I believe that these techniques could improve the ability of lead entities to choose the spatial distribution of their projects.*

*Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback, and I apologize for not being able to discuss this in person.*

## **Topic #7: 2002 Planning**

Director Johnson reviewed the current 2002 schedule.

The February meeting will be a day and one-half session including 2002 planning time.

### **Topic #8: Regional Recovery Organizations**

Director Johnson opened this presentation by giving an overview of the Regional Recovery request and the \$12 million in federal funds from Congress. A letter from NMFS to Governor Locke suggests three items on which to spend portions of this funding. The three items are: 1) at least \$2 million to Regional Planning; 2) a portion to restoring in-stream flows; and 3) a portion to convert the Forest and Fish Agreement into a Habitat Conservation Plan. The SRFB will be discussing the \$2 million Regional Recovery request at this meeting and continue discussion on the rest of the funds at the February 2002 meeting.

Chris Drivdahl of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) gave a Power Point presentation summarizing the regional recovery efforts to date. (See notebook and [attached presentation](#) for details.) The regional groups referenced in this portion of the agenda include the four existing regional groups: 1) Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, 2) Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, 3) Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, and 4) The Shared Strategy in Puget Sound.

Phil Trask of WDFW then gave a Power Point overview of the WDFW salmon recovery grant program. ([Presentation attached.](#)) In 2001, the Washington State Legislature allocated \$1 million to WDFW in a budget proviso to develop a salmon recovery grant program for local and regional efforts. The eligible groups in this portion of the agenda include both local and regional groups with an emphasis on regional efforts, although local components are also included (up to twelve applications are expected). This process puts a cap on funding of \$125,000 per year for funded groups. Within the WDFW grant process guidelines the Shared Strategy is not an eligible entity.

Discussion was held on recovery regions, watersheds, ESU recovery planning, regional recovery plans, and NMFS approval of the various plans and level of coverage needed by NMFS to approve the plans. NMFS has indicated it would like to have the plans be at an ESU level not at an individual watershed level.

Curt Smitch, of the GSRO gave an overview of the evolving process for salmon recovery. The next level is to more formally recognize the need for regional salmon recovery boards. In 1998, the legislature started funding salmon recovery at the project level. It then created the lead entity approach working at a watershed level. We are now ready to go the next step, which is the ESU or regional recovery area. Curt Smitch is requesting the Board provide \$2 million in funding for the regional recovery groups to begin development of their regional recovery plans.

Brenda McMurray asked Mr. Smitch to explain what the funding request is actually for, what is it that we know we need and is the request for supporting departmental budget to provide technical expertise or federal actions to be engaged?

Response: Curt Smitch explained the request is for \$2 million to go to the regional boards to hire staff to provide the infrastructure and development of the plan. This money would be to supplement the WDFW funding. This is not funding for state or federal agencies.

Director Johnson recommends the Board give direction to staff on how to proceed with follow

through on the NMFS letter requests. Specifically, staff would work with WDFW and the Cabinet to develop a process, complementary to the WDFW process, for disbursement of up to \$2 million for Regional Recovery efforts. Staff will come back in February with recommended spending plans for: regional recovery funding; instream flows; Forest and Fish. Staff will work with Ecology, WDFW, and the Cabinet for instream flow recommendation; and work with DNR, the partners, and the Cabinet on the Forest and Fish recommendation.

Chair Ruckelshaus suggested that some of the regional recovery funds be held back per Jay Watson's earlier recommendation by the LEAG.

Brenda McMurray would also like to provide capacity funding to the lead entities.

Jim Peters made a **motion** to follow through with Director Johnson's outlined process specifically for the \$2 million in regional recovery regions to complement the WDFW process, coordinating closely with WDFW. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Motion **approved**.

Dick Wallace noted that December 1 is the statutory timeline for watersheds wanting to set instream flows. He will work with staff and bring a recommendation to the next meeting.

A request letter was received from Terry Wright concerning funding for the Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups (RFEG). Due to time constraints, this will also be discussed at the February meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ 2/8/02 \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

- Future Meetings: February 7 & 8, 2002 – Olympia
- April 11 & 12, 2002 – Olympia (Funding Meeting)
- May 23 & 24, 2002 - TBA

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Review and Approval of the SRFB Meeting Minutes:**

Brenda McMurray **moved** to accept the September meeting minutes as presented and the amended October meeting minutes. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion. **Approved**.

**NMFS Funds (\$12 Million):**

Director Johnson recommends the Board give direction to staff on how to proceed with follow

through on the NMFS letter requests. Specifically, staff would work with WDFW and the Cabinet to develop a process, complementary to the WDFW process, for disbursement of up to \$2 million of the \$12 million for Regional Recovery efforts. Staff will come back in February with recommended spending plans for: regional recovery funding; instream flows; Forest and Fish. Staff will work with Ecology, WDFW, and the Cabinet for instream flow recommendation; and work with DNR, the partners, and the Cabinet on the Forest and Fish recommendation.

Jim Peters made a **motion** to follow through with Director Johnson's outlined process specifically for the \$2 million in regional recovery regions to complement the WDFW process, coordinating closely with WDFW. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Motion **approved**.

G:\TammyO\SRFB Meetings\December 6 & 7, 2001\12\_6\_01 Minutes.doc