

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

June 4 & 5, 2003

WSU Vancouver Campus
Vancouver, Washington

Day 1

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Jim Peters	Olympia
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission
Shari Schaftlein	Designee, Department of Transportation

CALL TO ORDER:

Opened at 9:35 a.m.

Chancellor Hal Dengerink welcomed the Board to the Washington State University (WSU) Vancouver Campus. He thanked the Board for the salmon recovery work being done and told the Board about the Vancouver branch campus. This campus has been in existence for 14 years and is continuing to expand. There are currently five branch campuses and each branch campus is very individualized.

Director Johnson reviewed the agenda for the day and one-half meeting. Due to continuing uncertainty in the federal and state budgets, this is primarily an informational meeting. Director Johnson highlighted the items requiring some decision at this meeting: Continuation of Engineered Log-Jam funding, addition of Pend Oreille's Cedar Creek dam removal project to the Scientific Funding request list, approval of funding for the Stillaguamish Pearson's Eddy project, and also the possible need for a 90-day signature delegation.

The agenda was approved as presented.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MAY 2003 MEETING MINUTES

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the May 2003 Meeting Minutes. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Tim Smith asked for a typographical correction on page 26, Partner Agency Comments, Nearshore project budget cost estimate from \$70 billion to \$7-10 billion.

Shari Schaftlein requested two minor wording changes: The first on page 8, revising the paragraph to read "project does have a scour problem upstream that will be taken care of in

the future” and the second on page 26, changing from “mitigation project list” to the “nickel project list.” This list can be found at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/nickel/ProjectList.pdf>.

The May 2003 minutes were **approved as amended**.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

Director's Report

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

Director Johnson reported that Jim Fox is recovering quickly from his May 20 surgery and should be back to work better than ever.

Director Johnson reviewed the 4th Round funding. A profile of the funding outcomes was handed out to the Board. Some of the figures from the 4th Round include:

- 70 of the 207 project requests were funded, or 34%
- \$21.8 million was awarded, out of the \$59 million in requests, or 37%
- Total match provided by the local sponsors is almost \$10.9 million in value
- Out of the 70 funded projects, 54 were rated HH, HM, or MH (representing 83% of the funds awarded, an all time high)

Rollie Geppert and Director Johnson met with Steve Tharinger on May 28 concerning the 5th Round Issues Task Force and next steps. Steve Tharinger will report on the 5th Round Task Force status on day two of this meeting.

Financial Report

Director Johnson provided the financial services report as Debra Wilhelmi stayed at the office to cover budget issues. (See notebook for details.)

The legislature is scheduled to pass the budget today.

Staff did hear from the Federal authorities. The budget recessions may not have been as high as originally anticipated so there may be a little additional money although it is still too soon to tell.

Director Johnson took the opportunity to talk about the sophistication of the PRISM system and gave the Board an update on the Natural Resources data portal. Commended Debra Wilhelmi on her work on both of these systems.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about interaction with the Legislature. The Board needs to be able to interact with the Legislature and work on grant-cycle timing to better line up with legislative actions. The Board needs to develop a process for interaction with the key legislators so they have factual information for decision-making.

Director Johnson agreed with the Chair's concern and believed staff tried to keep the Legislature informed but there still seems to be a disconnect. The Board will need to do more work on a legislative strategy for 2004 and beyond. Director Johnson noted that the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) has a grant program (Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program) that must submit a project list to the governor for approval

and then the Governor forwards it to the Legislature for final approval. This is called the LEAP list; the Governor and the legislators may remove projects from the list but may not add additional lists. Many other grant programs have similar processes.

The Chair noted this is a way to give the legislators a chance to understand the ranking process and reasoning behind funding certain projects.

Director Johnson also gave the Board an overview of the IAC evaluation process for scoring projects.

Craig Partridge, as one who also sits on the IAC Board, pointed out there are advisory committees made up of various user groups who review and evaluate projects. While this is a good way to evaluate the projects, the IAC Board loses the grass-roots connection that the SRFB enjoys through the lead entity process.

Dick Wallace discussed the idea of fund consolidation or coordination to provide the Legislature with a complete project list. Currently a group could get funding from several different sources without going through the SRFB lead entity process. One of the pending watershed planning bills requires lead entities and watershed planning units to work together to coordinate habitat projects prior to getting SRFB funding. Coordination efforts may be something the SRFB would want to build into the funding process, forcing groups to coordinate efforts. He also noted the need to be aware that some legislators are concerned with not only the percent of funding going to acquisition projects but also the funding going for infrastructure work versus projects. There are people pushing for less money to be spent on infrastructure and more to be spent on on-the-ground projects.

Brenda McMurray discussed a points system for project review connecting the projects more with the local strategies. There would be policy issues to look at but may want more of a score for the overall project.

Steve Tharinger agreed this is one of the issues that the ITF needs to review. The need for overall clarity is the first item the ITF will look at, then they will identify and prioritize the rest of the issues.

Larry Cassidy thought the ITF will need to really think hard about prioritizing by ESA listing. It may be better to assist non-endangered fish before spending money on endangered fish. This is a salmon recovery funding board and the board may want to focus more on the recovery issue.

Project Status Report and 4th Round Update

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

SRFB project managers Brian Abbott, Tara Galuska, and Barb McIntosh provided a PowerPoint review of four completed projects:

- 00-1768 – Koontz Creek
- 01-1231 – Green Creek Fish Passage
- 00-1693 – SF Coppei Creek Riparian Buffer
- 99-1332 – Entiat River Rock Vortex Weirs

Pictures and summaries of these projects will be featured on the newly redesigned IAC web page. To view featured projects go to www.iac.wa.gov.

Project Changes Report

Brenda McMurray provided the project changes report. Five amendment requests were brought to the subcommittee in the last month. Decisions were made on all five projects; four were approved and one was denied.

The subcommittee would like clarification of one issue: When changes are denied, what happens to the returned funds? This discussion has not been brought before the Board in the past.

The Chair asked for the subcommittee's recommendation. It seemed to him that if a project sponsor is unable to complete a project that has gone through the lead entity and SRFB funding process then the project sponsor should not be given the funds for another project that has not gone through the full grant process.

The subcommittee recommends the funds come back to the Board for reallocation.

The Chair would like specific language for Board decision on this issue. There may be reasons that the project should be amended but other times it would require the money be returned to the Board.

Director Johnson will work with the subcommittee to come back with a policy guidance document for Board approval at the July SRFB meeting.

Steve Tharinger agrees with this and noted that project agreements do provide the project timeline and requirements.

Tim Smith requested that the policy guidance document outline the whole process from the subcommittee steps through the final decision-making to cancel a project.

Craig Partridge asked about the possibility of having alternate projects that are ready for funding if the funds come back to the Board. Director Johnson noted that an alternate list is one of the issues the ITF will be addressing.

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Report

Steve Meyer gave a quick update on the GSRO report. (See notebook for details.)

Mr. Meyer thanked Larry Cassidy for the work that Tony Grover has been doing on the eastside Technical Review Team (TRT) work on the Columbia Basin.

The governors of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana are meeting in Idaho on June 5 to review the new four governors' document on power and fish issues. There are two new governors since the last time this group met.

The Board discussed the document the four governors will be reviewing. This document will focus mostly on power generation with commitment to watershed health and salmon recovery.

Discussed recovery planning documents and how these plans should/could be used in the future.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL ORGANIZATION SUPPORT

Steve Meyer, Director of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), provided the overview of this agenda item.

As the budget stands currently, lead entities will be funded at the current level.

The GSRO is not ready to make a final recommendation for regional funding at this meeting and will be working with the regional boards and staff to look at four issues:

1. Development of deliverables (legislature need tangible deliverables),
2. Importance of regional organization coordination with federal ESA requirements,
3. Cost containment, and
4. Budget direction from the legislature.

Mr. Meyer recognized that some of the regional organizations have a cash flow issue and requested the Board give Director Johnson the authority to extend funding for 90-days to allow regions to continue working at current level until GSRO is ready to give the Board a recommendation at the July or September board meeting.

Director Johnson will provide a resolution for Board consideration before the meeting adjourns.

4TH ROUND UPDATE

Director Johnson introduced this agenda item and provided the Board a summary of 4th Round funded projects.

Cedar Creek Fish Passage Restoration Project, #02-1461R, City of Ione, Pend Oreille Lead Entity (See notebook for details.)

Don Commins, lead entity coordinator, John Andrews, WDFW Regional Director, John Whalen, Regional Fish Program Manager for WDFW, Tim Cummings, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Sandra Lemcke, WDFW Watershed Steward presented this agenda item.

Don Commins gave an overview of the project information and updated the Board on some of the issues the Board questioned at the May 1 & 2 meeting.

John Whalen continued to update the Board on bull trout issues and reviewed the project objectives:

- Restore fish passage for adfluvial bull trout into Cedar Creek watershed, including 10 miles of proposed bull trout Critical Habitat (recovery population target 150-250 adults)
- Restore stream form and function, including large wood and gravel transport
- Reduce water temperature below dam

Dick Wallace asked about migration of bull trout past the other existing barriers below the dam. Dick also asked about the bull trout and eastern brook trout association. What's the likelihood of success of this project with these two issues?

John Whalen answered the questions: WDFW will be planting bull trout to get the population going again and will address the relationship between eastern brook trout and bull trout.

The Chair is still concerned with the fishery management issues, which are not a function of this Board. The Chair thought the reason for removing the dam was a safety issue and that this would then enhance the fisheries resource in the area. He asked what the \$641,000 would be spent on. Response was all the money will be used for dam removal.

The Chair also asked the original reason for the dam removal. Response was that the dam removal was part of the bull trout recovery plan and that the safety issue was secondary.

Sandra Lemcke reported that she had approached the town over six months before Ecology presented the order for the dam to be removed for safety reasons.

Brenda McMurray has a broader concern with funding of this project. She does not want the Board to set a precedent in rereviewing projects after the Board's funding meeting.

Director Johnson outlined the three things the Board could do: say no to funding this project, say yes to funding, or say yes if money is available (include this project on the funding conditional list).

Steve Tharinger is still not ready to make a decision on this project. It is not clear to him whether this is a public works project or a fish recovery project.

Ecology does not have funding or funding sources to provide dam repair.

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed the three ways the Board could handle the issue. He would like to know if the Technical Panel would now rate this project high benefit, high certainty or if it is still a medium benefit, low certainty.

The Chair would like a more detailed response from the SRFB Technical Panel prior to making a final decision.

Need to be careful to document the decisions and why the Board makes them. Also need the right kind of technical review.

Science Provisional Project, Pearson's Eddy Acquisition, #02-1629A

Tara Galuska reviewed the project and updated the information. (See notebook for details.)

Jeanette Smith provided a SRFB Technical Panel update. Due to updated information the Technical Panel would change the low benefit to salmon rating to a medium benefit to salmon. Both of the two major issues have been answered.

This project was on the scientific conditional list.

Brenda McMurray **moved** that the Board approve funding of project #02-1629A Pearson's Eddy. Steve Tharinger **seconded** the motion. Board **approved**.

Brenda McMurray reflected that this is another case warranting site visits to proposed projects during the SRFB Technical Panel review.

Public Testimony

Peggy Bill, representing the Cascade Land Conservancy, requested the Board include the Lower Pilchuck Acquisition project (#02-1654) to the funding conditional list. This project was rated medium certainty of success and medium benefit to salmon and was the fourth ranked project on the Stillaguamish project list.

The Board responded that it does not want to open the door to all lead entities to bring projects back before the Board once the funding decisions have been made. The request for moving this project to the funding conditional list was denied.

LEAD ENTITY WORKSHOP

Workshop Report

Brenda McMurray and Brian Walsh presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

The workshop had several objectives and three key issues.

Objectives:

- To clarify and refine what should be contained in lead entity strategies
- To clarify how strategies are used now and in the future, and by whom
- To solicit feedback about ways to improve the project evaluation process
- To explore how lead entity strategies fit into regional salmon recovery plans

Issues:

- Lead Entity Strategies
- State Technical Panel
- Funding

The Board discussed the issues, objectives, and need to provide positive incentives for those completing strategies and recovery plans.

The Chair asked if, under the State Technical Panel bullet number two, it meant cost-effectiveness or cost benefit? These are two different things, both important.

Cost-effectiveness would mean the project was done in the most efficient manner, the most "bang for the buck". Cost benefit means that for the money spent, the ratio of fish returned or miles of habitat opened up was the best for the money.

Brian Walsh replied that it may be a combination of the two meanings since this was a compilation of the comments received.

Steve Tharinger asked Brian Walsh and Brenda McMurray if the three issues were the main issues for the ITF to review?

It was noted that there are also the 12 workgroup issues that SRFB staff has been working on and the parking lot issues that will be sent to Steve Tharinger shortly for the ITF to provide recommendations.

Brian Walsh reported that the LEAG hasn't met since the last SRFB meeting but that LEAG plans to meet in July, which will be a follow-up meeting to the workshop. Brian also reported that there are three LEAG representative positions up for appointment/reappointment.

Dick Wallace would like to see the guidance coming from the ITF to be recorded in one guidance document.

Issues Task Force Process

Steve Tharinger provided the Board with an update on the ITF process. What he is hearing the most is the need for clarity. He hopes to have one meeting of the ITF prior to the July SRFB meeting. He would then like to work on the issues in July and August and come to the Board in September with recommendations. This may be ambitious and it may take longer to develop recommendations for all the issues identified for 5th Round.

SMALL FOREST LANDOWNERS' FISH PASSAGE PROGRAM

Craig Partridge introduced this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Lenny Young and Jed Herman presented this agenda item. (Three handouts)

Lenny Young reviewed the handout information and highlighted the effects of HB1095.

This did not change the provisions for the large forest landowners.

Jim Peters asked if there would be a problem if a small landowner uses the land for different uses. Lenny explained that blockages would be considered on roads identified as forestland roads. These are roads that are either on forestland or provide access to forestland.

Jed Herman reviewed the work ahead. Several projects have been identified that could come before the Board within the next year. Still need to locate all the small forest landowners. This is hard to do since many people have their property in other use categories within the county. Building working relationships will be key to the success of this effort.

DNR hopes to have the emergency rules ready by the August Forest Practices Board meeting with final rules by June 2004.

Hope to move quickly on "low hanging fruit" projects but the full process and development of working relationships will take time.

Two million dollars has been allocated to start work on projects. This is a multi-year process. Large landowners are still responsible for fixing blockages within 15 years, starting in 1999. DNR does not know the extent of the small forest landowner numbers or the number of years it will take to work through these blockages.

Will need to have an overall watershed ranked list of barriers, then a small forest landowner list (a list within a list). The number one forest landowner project may not be the number one project on the full watershed list.

Brenda McMurray asked if the existing WSDOT barrier lists would be used to help with the overall priority list.

Yes, the Legislature made it very clear that efforts should not be duplicated and existing information, such as the WSDOT data, should be used to develop the final prioritized list.

SRFB staff has been working with DNR staff to develop a process with options to be presented to the Board at the July meeting.

Brenda McMurray would like to see the Small Forest Landowner projects included in the regular SRFB funding cycle for applications submittal, technical review, and project funding.

NEARSHORE UPDATE

Tim Smith, WDFW, and Kurt Fresh, NOAA Fisheries, presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Tim Smith provided an overview of the project to date and future plans.

Kurt Fresh reviewed the Guidance for Protection and Restoration of Nearshore Ecosystems. This document has three major parts: Definitions, Principles, and Concepts; Elements of a Strategic Plan; and Criteria for Developing and Selecting Projects.

Kurt then reviewed "Salmon in the Nearshore – White Paper." This document summarizes what is known about the salmon life-cycle within the nearshore and how salmon juveniles use nearshore habitat,

You may find out more about the nearshore project by checking out the web site at www.pugetsoundnearshore.org.

Tim Smith provided an update on next steps concerning the 5th Round nearshore issue. PSNERP is planning a workshop in July on nearshore assessments. Starting in late August, the implementation team will be setting up workshops with local restoration groups to do the technology transfer, and the team will continue to coordinate all the various processes.

Discussed issues concerning this project and possible ways to integrate into existing programs.

Day 1 adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

From 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. the Board heard a presentation from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board at the Heathman Lodge.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

June 4 & 5, 2003

WSU Vancouver Campus
Vancouver, Washington

Day 2

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

Day 2 – The meeting reconvened at 8:23 a.m.

OTHER PROGRAMMATIC REQUESTS

Limiting Factors Roll-up

Ed Manary presented this portion of the agenda. (See notebook for details.)

Mr. Manary summarized HB 2496 and the status of limiting factors analysis. He presented a request for funds to develop a roll-up of all separate limiting factors analyses into one comprehensive report. He explained the plan and timeline for this project. SRFB staff will work with constituents to make sure there is a need for this document and bring the recommendation back before the Board in July.

Dick Wallace thinks this document would be useful to many different groups. This document would provide a comprehensive view of all the limiting factors.

NW Straits Commission

Tom Cowan presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

This request is for a regional approach to derelict gill net removal.

Mr. Cowan provided a video on derelict gear removal showing the devastation caused by derelict gear.

Although there are many different types of derelict gear, this project request is for gill net removal only since this is the gear that can cause salmon mortality.

The NW Straits Commission has contacted lead entities within the Puget Sound and Hood Canal areas. The lead entities were in support of this effort although there was some concern that the lead entities could lose project money to fund this effort.

Thousands of tons of gear are in the NW Straits waters. At least 100 gill nets have been identified in the salmon migratory waters and removal of this gear would be the focus of the project.

The Board asked about preventing the future loss of gill nets. SB 6313 calls for WDFW to provide a report to the legislature on how to prevent future losses.

The geographic area includes the NW Straits only. The hope is to extend into the Hood Canal area as funding permits.

Do not want to have volunteers working on this project since it is so dangerous. Protocols have been developed to provide guidance on how to successfully remove this gear.

The enforcement side of this issue is very difficult.

The Chair noted that there is a need for coordination between the different agencies involved in this effort (WDFW, NW Straits, Coast Guard, DNR, etc.). The SRFB is not the place to come for ongoing funding.

Mr. Cowan reported that they are working to get funds from many different sources and the request to the SRFB would be for gill nets only and in salmon migratory areas so that it is salmon focused. Requests to other sources are for removal of crab pots or other gear not as harmful to salmon.

The derelict fishing gear removal request is for \$150,000. Staff recommends holding this request for decision at the July SRFB meeting.

5TH ROUND ISSUES – POLICY DEVELOPMENTS AND UPDATES

Steve Tharinger will be heading up the Issues Task Force (ITF) to look at 5th Round issues. He will soon identify the ITF members to work on these issues.

After looking at the list of tasks, it is apparent this will take some time. The Board needs to clarify the start of the 5th Round, not a specific date but general start date. Hopes to have the ITF identified in the next week or two. He was hoping for a smaller group but is now thinking it may take a larger group (9 or 10) and he will need representatives from several interest groups. This will need more time than originally anticipated.

Steve Tharinger hopes to have one scoping meeting before the July SRFB meeting. Work through summer and fall and come back to the Board in the fall to start the 5th cycle later in the fall.

Dick Wallace appreciates Steve's taking on this item. He offered to help and provide Ecology's support.

Brenda McMurray wants to make sure Steve keeps public feedback in this process. She volunteered the whole Board to help Steve with the ITF.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the relationship of decisions on grant funding and the Legislature. This needs to be better coordinated since currently the timing doesn't work very well.

The 5th Round could start some time in the fall of 2003 although the Board is not ready to commit to a specific start date at this time.

Brenda McMurray asked if the Board wanted to shop sample strategies around or not. This is one of the clarifying issues that will need to come back to the Board in July. Another item important to her is what happens to the saved water.

Steve Tharinger mentioned the criteria the LCFRB uses when assessing acquisition projects and would like to look at possible criteria to use when assessing SRFB projects.

Dick Wallace wants to help with the coordination between watershed planning and other efforts around the state.

MONITORING

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item along with Dr. Bob Bilby and Dr. Bill Ehinger. (See notebook for details.)

Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Bruce Crawford is not asking the Board for a decision today but will bring it back in July.

He used the medical profession as an analogy to watershed health (diagnosis, treatment, monitoring, evaluation, and performance measures).

The Chair reminded Bruce that sometimes at the end of the process the doctors still don't know what the problem is so don't want to promise results that may not be achievable.

Mr. Crawford reviewed the Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy (CMS) recommendations:

- Establish a permanent watershed monitoring council
- Adopt monitoring protocols
- Establish data portal
- SRFB and NWPCC should set aside funds for a sampling program that measures effectiveness of projects
- Create one or more Intensively Monitored Watersheds (IMWs)
- Increase the number of trap sites where juvenile migrant salmon are enumerated

He outlined suggested effectiveness monitoring numbers. The Chair does not believe that 80% success of passage barriers is a victory. Bruce Crawford said it is a policy call the Board will be asked to make.

Dick Wallace said the Board might want to look at a different measurement for monitoring success such as shading percent or stream miles opened up.

Bruce Crawford noted that there are three possible levels of monitoring; the first and least expensive is basic design criteria monitoring where level three, the most expensive, is actual fish counting. The Board needs to decide what it wants to invest in monitoring.

Volunteers could do spawner monitoring but probably not juvenile monitoring. Could train volunteers to do the monitoring. This would be a way to involve communities in salmon recovery. Would need to be properly trained and checks.

Dick Wallace talked about the level of confidence needed during monitoring some “no-brainer” projects may not need to be monitored at as high of level as other more complicated projects. Another question that will need to be answered is how many projects of each type need to be monitored.

Director Johnson informed the Board that parts of this funding wouldn't be new money but shifting of the 15-20% currently going to each individual project for monitoring.

Monitoring is essential to the overall program success. The question is what percentage of the budget should go toward monitoring. The Board needs to look at confidence level wanted and decide on the percent of budget to use on monitoring.

Intensively Monitored Watersheds

Dr. Bob Bilby presented this portion of the agenda.

Dr. Bilby gave the Board an overview of the Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) process and scientific reasoning behind this approach. Oregon's Department of Fish and Wildlife is currently funding 10 IMWs along the coast.

Proposing IMWs in Washington to focus on Coho, Steelhead, and cutthroat species.

Smolt Monitoring

Bill Ehinger presented more detail on the Smolt Monitoring proposal.

The IWM program suggested steps include:

1. Continue long-term smolt monitoring in candidate basins
2. Statewide assessment in candidate basins
3. Assess current conditions in proposed IMW basins
 - a) Use available data
 - b) Collect additional data where needed
 - c) Determine if basin is suitable for IMW
4. Install basic infrastructure in selected basins (flow, climate, adults)
5. Develop testable hypotheses. Write study design and implementation plan.

Smolt monitoring site candidate basins are Hood Canal and Lower Columbia. There could be other sites across the state.

Dr. Ehinger presented the two options for funding:

- Option 1: Full funding of the IMW Program and the Smolt Monitoring Program – Total FY04 cost: \$900,000
- Option 2: Full funding of the IMW Program only – Total FY04 cost: \$650,000.

A staff recommendation will be brought before the Board for decision at its July meeting.

ENGINEERED LOG JAMS (ELJs) – REPORT/APPROVE NEXT PHASE

Mike McHenry, Lower Klallam Tribe, and Mary Lou White, Washington Trout, provided an overview of the Elwha River and North Fork Stillaguamish River ELJs respectively. (See notebook for details.)

Some of the conclusions reached for Elwha ELJ project include:

- 16 logjams have been constructed since 1999 within the treatment reach.
- All structures intact with little or no change in size. Logjams have been subjected to 10 bankfull or greater flows including a 26,500 cfs event on January 9, 2002.
- Positive changes in scour depth, substrate, and flow patterns have been observed since 2001.
- Preliminary results show primary production 10-15 times greater on ELJ surfaces than other surfaces.
- Distribution of Chinook redds appears related to presence of wood and pools.
- Wood is an important pool forming factor in side-channels, but less important in mainstem habitats of the Elwha.

Some of the conclusions reached for the Stillaguamish ELJ project include:

- There has been no wood accumulation on the C-Post Bridge.
- ELJs are stable after being inundated 24 times.
- ELJs increased Chinook holding pool frequency.
- ELJs increased residual pool depth.
- ELJs increased cover, habitat complexity, and shade.

Director Johnson presented Resolution #2003-05 to the Board. This Resolution is requesting continued funding of the ELJ Monitoring projects. This request is not for “new money” but is funding that was set aside during the original request.

The Board discussed the need to continue funding log-jam monitoring. The Board would like a follow-up presentation in one year (June 2004).

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt Resolution #2003-05 with a caveat to facilitate and accommodate Bruce Crawford’s monitoring efforts.

Steve Tharinger **seconded** the motion. Board **approved** Resolution #2003-05.

BUDGET UPDATE

Director Johnson provided the Board with a budget update. Both the Senate and House budgets provide lead entity funding but no regional entity money. The Capital budget has not been released yet and may provide funds for regional councils.

OTHER PROGRAMMATIC REQUESTS

Krystyna Wolniakowski, Regional Director, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), and Dennis Canty, President, Evergreen Funding Consultants presented this request.

In September 2002, Krystyna Wolniakowski and Dennis Canty presented the concept to the Board for a small restoration grants program. At the time the Board raised several questions that they hope to answer. The request at this meeting is seeking funding support to begin a new Puget Sound pilot program for small grants. Key facts about this request include:

- The NFWF is ready to commit more than \$1 million in funding to a pilot small grants program.
- There are nine sponsors standing by to initiate small grant programs in their communities.
- Some of the sponsors are having difficulties with the dollar-for-dollar match required to participate.
- A modest grant from the SRFB will allow millions of dollars worth of work to proceed.
- The Board is invited to be a full partner in the design and development of the program.
- The program is highly complementary to the Board's other funding goals and programs.

Staff will review this request and develop a recommendation for Board consideration at the July SRFB meeting.

RESOLUTION #2003-06 – DIRECTOR AUTHORIZATION

Director Johnson presented Resolution #2003-06 to the Board. Wording of the Resolution provides that the Board recognizes that before July 2, 2003, certainty regarding funding amounts and policy guidance may not be available. There are several programs and regional organizations with current SRFB contracts that would otherwise expire on June 30, 2003. To allow orderly resolution of these contracts and prevent inadvertent consequences, the Director will be authorized to extend time conditions and/or funding. Such authority shall extend to no later than September 30, 2003, and for funding at a prorated carry-forward level only.

The Director shall report to the Board on July 2, 2003, any actions taken under this authority.

Brenda McMurray **moved** to approve Resolution #2003-06. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved**.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:47 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: July 2, 2003
 Cedar River Watershed Education Center
 North Bend, WA

**SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD
RESOLUTION #2003-05
Funding Engineered Log Jam (ELJ) Monitoring**

WHEREAS, in April 2001 the SRFB funded up to \$700,000 for two ELJ monitoring projects on the Elwha and North Fork Stillaguamish Rivers, (#01-1085N, Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe and #01-1193N, Washington Trout), requiring development and implementation of a five-year monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of this experimental technology and the benefits to salmon; and

WHEREAS, both grant agreements stated:

1. The Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe and Washington Trout may be reimbursed up to \$140,000 each during the first two years of the ELJ monitoring projects. Both organizations will report annually to the SRFB regarding the monitoring data collection efforts and any preliminary monitoring results regarding the effect of the ELJs on the physical habitat and/or biological response of adult and juvenile salmon.
2. After two years of annual reports, the SRFB will decide whether to authorize the remaining \$210,000 each for expenditure over an additional three years for each project, and both sponsors will continue to report annually; and

WHEREAS, the Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe and Washington Trout each presented annual monitoring reports in 2002 and 2003; and

WHEREAS, the SRFB has provided funding for these two monitoring projects for their first two years; and

WHEREAS, the SRFB has determined that supporting the remaining three years of each project will provide benefits to salmon habitats and to the Board's knowledge about these types of projects;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRFB provides up to an additional \$210,000 each to the Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe and Washington Trout for the ELJ monitoring projects; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding is contingent on the Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe and Washington Trout's continued collaboration with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, coordination with the SRFB monitoring strategy, and that both sponsors continue to provide annual monitoring updates to the SRFB.

Moved by: Brenda McMurray

Seconded by: Steve Tharinger

Approved/Defeated/Deferred (underline result)

Date: June 5, 2003

**SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD
RESOLUTION #2003-06
Providing Signature Authority to the IAC Director**

WHEREAS, the Board recognizes that before July 2, 2003, certainty regarding funding amounts and policy guidance may not be available.

WHEREAS, there are several programs and regional organizations with current SRFB contracts that would otherwise expire on June 30, 2003.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, to allow orderly resolution of these contracts and prevent inadvertent consequences, the Director is authorized to extend time conditions and/or funding.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, such authority shall extend to no later than September 30, 2003, and for funding at a prorated carry-forward level only.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, authority is limited to the SRFB grants listed below. Projects # 02-1378, 00-1617, 01-1198, 02-1018, 02-1020, 02-1342, 02-1016, 02-1377, 99-1740, 02-1163, 99-1744, 02-1264, 02-1374, 02-1376, and 02-1202.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Director shall report to the Board on July 2, 2003, any actions taken under this authority.

Moved by: Brenda McMurray

Seconded by: Steve Tharinger

Approved/Defeated/Deferred (underline result)

Date June 5, 2003