

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

November 30 & December 1, 2000

NRB 172
Olympia, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver (arrived at 11:00 a.m.)
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Dan Wrye	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Shari Schaftlein	Designee, Department of Transportation

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 10:45 a.m. with discussion about the Kennedy Creek tour several Board members attended prior to the start of the meeting. He was impressed with the coordination and volunteer efforts this project has accomplished.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

Director's Report: Director Johnson introduced SRFB staffers Marc Duboiski and Mike Ramsey to the Board. The other new project managers and Rollie Geppert will be joining the meeting tomorrow since they are attending the technical review meeting in Ellensburg today.

Brenda McMurray mentioned that she had a chance to stop by the technical review meeting yesterday and it was going well.

Director Johnson also introduced Don Finney. He works for NMFS on SRFB projects, to streamline permitting of salmon habitat projects.

Election results: John Roskelley was re-elected in Spokane County and Eric Johnson (previously of IAC/SRFB staff) has been elected a Lewis County Commissioner.

Financial Report: Debra Wilhelmi updated the Board on current budget status and future budget projections.

Ms. Wilhelmi reported that the Hatchery Scientific Research group has sent out research grant applications. An update will be given at a future meeting.

Legislative Update: Jim Fox gave the legislative update. Unable to give specific details on the composition of the legislature since there are still several races that have not been decided yet. The Board submitted two pieces of request legislation to OFM. Jim has not heard yet whether the bills were approved for introduction.

GSRO Report: Chris Drivdahl reported that the first public meeting on the soon to be released State of the Salmon Report will be held on December 12 in Lower Columbia. The report is at the printer and will be mailed next week.

PROJECT MONITORING - UPDATE

Terry Wright gave a quick update on the Hatchery Reform process and how the money will be divided and used.

Jim Fox and Terry Wright presented thoughts on project implementation and effectiveness monitoring.

Jim Fox summarized the progress of the monitoring work group addressing this issue.

The Independent Science Panel (ISP) will be presenting its monitoring framework document within the next month. The Chair would like a presentation by the ISP outlining the framework. He would also like the work group to work with the lead entities to make sure they are able to work with the monitoring guidelines

Larry Cassidy addressed the three monitoring levels:

- Project specific: Covers what projects accomplish, should be part of the project and a given.
- Adaptive management: There is not much of a need for that component at this time.
- "Is it working?": This is the biggest component. WDFW and Tribes should be the stewards for monitoring since they are the legal stewards for the resource.

Brenda McMurray pointed out that project monitoring information could be used for adaptive management by the Board, helping to guide the Board's funding priorities.

SRFB'S REPORT TO LEGISLATURE

Director Johnson reviewed the Board's draft report to the legislature. She requested comments and suggestions from the Board prior to December 8. Report is due to the legislature at the end of December.

LEGISLATIVE HEARING PREPARATION

Board members briefly discussed how to present comments to the House Capital Budget Hearing this afternoon.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like to open the discussion and encouraged Brenda McMurray and Larry Cassidy to speak also. He also asked to have the state agency members attend the hearing to answer questions and share their thoughts.

NEARSHORE AND ESTUARINE ISSUES

Jim Fox gave a brief introduction on nearshore and estuarine protection and restoration funding issues. After the Early 2000 grant cycle, the Technical Review Panel recommended that the SRFB develop a nearshore and estuarine effort to identify high priority areas for protection and restoration. In response, two meetings concerning nearshore and estuarine issues were held. The first was attended primarily by people from the Puget Sound region and a second meeting was held focusing on the coastal and lower Columbia regions. A copy of the meeting report is on the SRFB Web page.

After the introduction, Jim Fox presented a four-person panel:

- Anne Schaffer, WDFW staff and marine nearshore representative on the SRFB Technical Panel.
- Andrea Coping, NW Straits Commission
- Jay Watson, Hood Canal Coordinating Council
- Scott Redman, Puget Sound Action Team

Panel members stressed the importance of the nearshore environment to salmon and informed the Board of various nearshore and estuarine activities happening in the state and noting other nearshore and estuarine issues that need to be addressed.

After the Panel presented their information, the Board received public testimony concerning nearshore and estuarine issues. Most of the public testimony supported the need for improved ways to identify and prioritize estuarine and marine nearshore projects and at the same time preserve existing lead entity processes.

After Board discussion, staff was directed to present this information to the LEAG and other interested parties then come back to the Board at the April meeting with options for Board decision. Jim Fox will engage the Technical Panel to get their insights on this issue. The Board will also need to discuss how to address projects that cover a larger area and affect more than one lead entity.

Public Testimony:

David Hoopes, San Juan County CD: At low tide in San Juan County there are about 700 islands and lots of nearshore. Mr. Hoopes liked the memo and is leaning towards option 1.

Jacque White, People for Puget Sound. Need to coordinate estuary projects. The area he is working in doesn't have a limiting factors analysis, which it makes it hard to prioritize projects. Propose developing a restoration plan. Use existing technology to find the data gaps.

Dennis Canty, King County: Puget Sound Initiative has \$40 million set aside through the Corps for habitat projects. The matching share is 65% and they need to consult with several entities on the projects, one of which is the SRFB. New Federal Estuary restoration program will provide \$225 million to restore marine habitat. He asked the Board to support these two programs when connecting with Washington DC contacts and encouraged coordination of the projects.

Janet Kearsley, Island County: Would like to work with a nearshore technical group.

Paula Mackrow, North Olympic Salmon Coalition: Read a paragraph on salmon use in Puget Sound. Feels that the estuarine area is the more important area to protect and restore. Prefers option 1.5/1.75 as Jay Watson mentioned.

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board: Delighted the Board is focusing on estuarine projects. Need a coordinated bi-state process to do the work in the Lower Columbia region and work with the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program. Encouraged Larry Cassidy that the NWPPC needs to be involved also.

Keith Dublanica, Habitat Biologist for the Skokomish Indian Tribe: Discussed tribal involvement with nearshore and estuarine areas in Hood Canal. The Skokomish Indian Tribe is a member of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council and has submitted projects through the lead entity process. Mr. Dublanica will submit written comments at a later date.

John Cambalik, NOPL: Need to combine several of the options and work toward coordination of the lead entities. The coordination may work best through LEAG and suggests the Board send Jim's memo through the LEAG and lead entity process.

Cathy Lear, Clallam County: Sees the process in two distinct areas: the watershed area; and, the estuarine channel area that all the salmon need to pass through to get to the ocean and, if they survive the ocean, return back through to get back to the watershed area. Supports option 1.5/1.75.

Next Steps:

Craig Partridge thinks this has been a very good discussion and the Board has the capacity to work on this issue. The Board needs to support the individual lead entities but also recognize the need to coordinate the lead entity areas to cover the estuarine areas.

Brenda McMurray wants to see the Board to maintain contact with the resources they met with today.

Shari Schafflein noted that nearshore projects are some of the most complicated when getting permits and are more expensive than other types of projects so the Board needs to start thinking about these details.

Bill Ruckelshaus mentioned that this issue reminds him of his work with the EPA on indoor air pollution. Need to start working on the nearshore/estuarine issue now even though studies need to be done. Things shouldn't be put on hold because we haven't done the study yet.

Laura Johnson suggested staff come back to the Board with follow-up at the April meeting. This will give staff time to present information to the LEAG and others interested in this issue and develop a staff recommendation for the Board.

Jim Fox will engage the nearshore technical team to get their insights on this issue and the Board also needs to address projects that come before them that cover a larger area and faces more than one lead entity.

Adjourn for Day 1 at 5:40 p.m.

DAY 2

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
John Roskelley	Spokane
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Dan Wrye	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jeff Koenings	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife (came in at 11:20 a.m.)
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Gerry O'Keefe	Designee, Department of Ecology
Shari Schaftlein	Designee, Department of Transportation

Meeting reconvened at 8:25 a.m.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 30, 2000 MINUTES

Brenda McMurray **moved** to approve the October SRFB meeting minutes. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion. Minutes were **approved**.

WAC RULES

Ms. Johnson updated the Board on the status of the WAC rule filing process and next steps needed. Staff recommends adoption of Resolution #2000-09.

Discussion:

Brenda McMurray questioned the definition for “acquisition” and would like to include acquisition or lease of water. Laura Johnson will reword this section to clarify.

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt Resolution #2000-09. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion. Resolution #2000-09 **adopted**.

ENGINEERED LOG JAM PRESENTATION

In the Early Action 1999 and Early 2000 grant cycles, the SRFB funded three projects described as engineered log jams (ELJs) around Western Washington. These types of projects utilize experimental technology and require close monitoring to determine their benefit to salmon. The Board requested staff convene a workshop to help define the direction of current and future monitoring associated with ELJ projects. On August 24, 2000, the SRFB staff, along with staff from WDFW and NMFS, held a workshop to bring ELJ and large woody debris (LWD) experts together.

Marc Duboiski of IAC/SRFB staff introduced George Pess, NMFS, and Kevin Bauersfeld, WDFW. George and Kevin presented the information from the Engineered Log Jam workshop. (A copy of their report is on the SRFB Web page.) Below are the six conclusions and recommendations presented by George and Kevin:

Summary Conclusions:

- Engineered log jams (ELJs) are experimental in-stream flow control structures based on the architecture of naturally occurring stable log jams in large river systems. ELJs in large rivers need to be designed/monitored more comprehensively than what historically has been done for large woody debris (LWD) placement in smaller streams.
- Project proponents should identify a need(s) for ELJs that relate to specific objectives. The stated project objectives should be used to define the specific ELJ monitoring regime. The ELJ design needs to be site and objective specific.
- There is a need for geomorphic, biological and engineering analysis for these projects. The reach-level assessment is crucial for developing effective projects, and the formal stability analysis adds an engineered dimension. Pre-project information and assessments are crucial for adequate ELJ project design. Public safety (risk to public infrastructure and recreation use impairment) needs to be considered and addressed during project planning and design.
- ELJ project design and construction should be fully documented.
- Existing monitoring funding is too short to meet the time frame required to evaluate the project.
- Fish response to ELJ projects should be described in terms of biological significance rather than just statistical significance (Peters et al. 1998).

Recommendations:

- Use the definition of an ELJ as stated in #1 of conclusions above.
- Project proponents need to make sure objectives are clear. Proponents also need to clearly define the project-specific ELJ monitoring.
- Pre-project information and assessments are crucial for adequate ELJ project design. ELJ project design and construction should be fully documented. It is important to note that since ELJs are an experimental technology, it should not be assumed the same design can be used everywhere.
- The ELJ structure(s), the channel response to the structure(s), and the biological response to structure(s) should be monitored.
- Monitoring funding should match the timeline to evaluate the project's objectives. A strategic long-term approach to monitoring is needed, minimum of 10 years.
- An independent group or organization needs to be formed to help define long-term monitoring strategies and techniques.

THIRD ROUND - SCHEDULE

Director Johnson reviewed the memorandum provided in the Board notebook. Two options for grant timing were presented. The Board needs to make a decision at this meeting, to plan for the next several months and to get ready for the next grant cycle. (See notebook for written report.)

Public Testimony:

Jay Watson, Hood Canal Coordinating Council: There is no perfect option but Option 1 seems to be more workable.

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board: Concerning project sponsors in the Lower Columbia area, Option 1 puts them in the August-September timeframe which is a burden to them since this is when they are trying to get their projects completed. Understands the logistical problem in jumping into a new cycle so close to the current cycle. There may be a way to do a transitional phase this year and then go with full Option 2 in future cycles.

John Cambalik, North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity: Supports Jay in suggesting Option 1 for his area also. Polled his sponsors and they said there really isn't any "good" timing but that Option 1 seems to work best for them. Option 1 gives more time to prepare applications.

Phil Trask, Department of Fish and Wildlife: Project applicants should be the drivers of this process and the lead entity process is still somewhat volatile and still

changing in regions and with possible new lead entities. Option 1 would work better.

Board discussion:

Shari Schaflein brought up the issue of permitting and how the timeline should be set with permitting timelines in mind.

Steve Meyer suggested an Option 3. This option would have a three-year sliding scale adding a couple months to the process each year and in three years we would be at Option 2.

After Board discussion, it was agreed that there is no perfect option, but Option 1 with a two-week adjustment seems to be the most workable. Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt Resolution #2000-10, for Option 1 as amended in the staff recommendation. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion. Board **approved** Resolution #2000-10. This schedule has application materials available no later than July 2, 2001, lead entity project list submittal on November 30, 2001, and funding decisions made in early March 2002.

PROGRAMMATIC FUNDING ISSUES

Debra Wilhelmi reviewed the programmatic activities funded to date and their current status. Four administrative issues were covered separately in the notebook memo: time extensions, future programmatic requests, requests for additional funds, and forest and fish – Federal 2001.

Time Extensions for the Programmatic Contracts: Recently staff has received several requests for time extensions to the existing agreements. SRFB staff is requesting authority to extend the programmatic activities through not later than June 30, 2002. The extension would require an agency written justification and adequate re-appropriation from the Legislature. If authority is granted, staff will report to the Board all extensions requested and action taken.

Board discussion:

Jim Peters would like to see criteria for approving the extensions.

John Roskelley would like to see a status report every couple of months.

Following this discussion, there was Board consensus with extensions through June 30, 2002, when criteria are met.

Forest and Fish Agreement: It appears that the federal budget for FY 2001 will include funds dedicated to the Forest and Fish agreement through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. To avoid delay in contracting this money, staff has begun working with the Department of Natural Resources to ensure contracts will be ready as soon as the funds officially arrive. The Board indicated consensus with this approach.

Future Programmatic Requests: Staff is recommending agencies seek alternate funding sources for on-going activities in their 2001-2003 budgets. Since the Board does not know if the Legislature will budget the programmatic activities in the individual agency budgets or not, and there are two currently-funded programmatic activities not included in any agency budgets, it is possible the Board will be asked for programmatic funds in the future. The Board will need to address the following questions: Will the Board continue to fund programmatic activities? What is the process for programmatic activities to come before the Board? What documentation/presentation is needed for making a decision?

Board Discussion:

Bill Ruckelshaus does not feel the Board should be allocating funds that should be appropriated to the agencies performing these activities.

Jim Peters agrees.

John Roskelley agrees also. The Board needs to be funding projects and monitoring of the funded projects.

Brenda McMurray believes there might be programmatic activities that the Board would want to approve and she doesn't want to see the Board close the door completely on funding of programmatic activities.

Dan Wrye stated that Fish and Wildlife has requested the programmatic funds be redirected to the agency's budget. WDFW has submitted this request through the Governor's budget request, still pending.

Craig Partridge noted that the Department of Natural Resources is taking the same approach as Fish and Wildlife. He also informed the Board that the natural resource agencies are bringing forward an overall salmon budget to OFM through the Joint Cabinet. It may be helpful for the Board to support the agencies' programmatic funds that will be most helpful to the SRFB project funding during the legislature, both by attending hearings and testifying and also through mentioning the need for these activities in various reports.

Gerry O'Keefe said the reason this programmatic money was given to the Board was because of the limitations on other fund sources. So when the Board discusses supporting of additional funding there are tradeoffs involved. It is going to be a tough environment.

Shari Schaftlein would also like to see a window left open for funding of some pilot projects or other programmatic items.

Steve Meyer believes the JNRC budget process may be more elegant this year in that the SRFB has been included from the beginning in the process and not added late in the game.

Director Johnson suggested looking for a different name for future activities the Board might want to fund. The “programmatic” tag is from past funding cycles and future requests may need to be labeled differently.

People for Salmon (PFS): The Chair then asked Chantel Stevens, Executive Director PFS, to address the last issue. He noted that People for Salmon is one of the activities that is not included in agency budget requests.

Chantel Stevens gave a presentation on the People for Salmon (PFS) program, outlining what People for Salmon has done in the past and plans for the future. She emphasized volunteer activities and the support PFS provides for such activities.

Board Discussion:

Brenda McMurray discussed her experiences with volunteers. There is a need for a pool of people, and the need to have someone local to each area to help with keeping the pool of people active to work on grassroots initiatives and promote volunteerism.

John Roskelley would like a detailed expense sheet on PFS spending for the last two years. Laura Johnson offered a separate session with him since the amount of information is large. Brenda McMurray would like also to see this information.

Jim Peters would like to see some of the outcomes that PFS has done since their inception.

Jim Kramer reminded the Board that PFS was asked to outline the PFS volunteer strategy at this meeting, rather than a program critique.

Public Testimony:

Steve Craig, Nisqually River Council: Discussed volunteer program experiences through the Nisqually River Council. Noted there is no overarching volunteer strategy. Would like to see a volunteer summit to identify what is going on out there, what groups are involved and where we want to be in the future with volunteers. Need to address protocols needed for data collection, monitoring, and restoration techniques. Need to address volunteer training. Need tribal reps, PFS, WSU cooperative extension, Washington State University, Conservation Commission, the business community, and other groups in the initial core group. Need to define who should be doing what.

2ND ROUND APPLICATIONS

Ms. Johnson announced the results of the guesses for the number of applications expected in this grant cycle. Shari Schaftlein predicted 240 and the Chair came in a close second with a guess of 262. The actual number received was 249.

Laura Johnson showed the materials we’ve received for the projects: five large notebooks, which contain the 23 lead entity responses and 249 project applications.

Rollie Geppert introduced the new project managers: Brian Abbott and Barb McIntosh.

SECOND ROUND – PROCESS AND ELIGIBILITY ISSUES

Jim Kramer briefed the Board on the status of the Technical Panel project review meetings and thanked Panel members, involved agencies, and agency staff for their hard work and dedication to this process. Without member agency support by dedicating staff to this effort, the Panel would not be as effective as it has been.

The Panel consists of nine experts: Brian Allee, Executive Director, Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority; Kevin Bauersfeld, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife; Tim Beechie, National Marine Fisheries Service; Paul DeVries, Private Consultant, RH2 Inc.; Karl Halupka, US Fish and Wildlife Service; Ken Hammond, Retired Central Washington University Professor; George Pess, National Marine Fisheries Service; J. Anne Shaffer, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife; and Carol Smith, Washington State Conservation Commission.

The Panel has completed its first two days of project review meetings in Ellensburg on November 29 and 30.

In general, the Panel is seeing strategies developed and better projects presented. Jim Kramer presented to the Board examples of policy issues raised by the technical panel from the first two meeting days:

- Eradication of Brook Trout: A project calls for the eradication of Brook Trout that are predatory of Bull Trout. The Board has funded eradication projects in the past, but of plants, not animals.
- Other funding sources: Some of the projects may be better funded by other sources (e.g. the IFIM study and EDT work could be funded by NWPPC).
- Irrigation improvements and saved water: The projects may not rank as high on a purely technical basis but citizens' committees often rank these projects higher.
- Projects that are good projects but need to increase certainty of success: The Panel would like to try to increase certainty of success by suggesting changes to the project before funding.

Jim Fox reviewed other policy issues implicit in the Second Round.

How does the Board reward regional collaboration?

- Fund more projects on such lists?
- Evaluate them higher?
- Reserve some funds to present a choice of incentives to the participating lead entities? and/or
- Support projects with support by multiple lead entities?

Board members commented there is a need to make sure the regional grouping makes sense. Department of Fish and Wildlife certifies the lead entity groups and, when the groups regionalize, WDFW should ensure the groupings make sense.

Allocation of funds to lead entity lists.

- If the amount of projects recommended for funding is higher than the amount of funding available, how will the Board decide how to divide the funds amount the lead entity areas?
- If a new lead entity doesn't have any projects that are ready for funding will the Board consider giving the lead entity funding to develop or finalize its watershed assessment so it will be able to bring back better projects in the next cycle?

A brief discussion ensued.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS

Dan Wrye reminded the Board that LEAG has been formed to help the Board in decision-making process. The next LEAG meeting will be held on January 23. On January 24th there is a meeting with all twenty-five lead entities to review documents and budget suggestions.

Shari Schafflein informed the Board of WSDOT fish passage grants available for cities. The Web site at www.wsdot.wa.gov/ta/progrmgt/grants/enhance.htm gives more information on the TEA 21 enhancement grants. DOT encouraged lead entities to review this and how it can be used to compliment their projects.

Gerry O'Keefe reported that Ecology has acted on the Shorelands Management Act WACs.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: March 1, 2001 – Olympia
 April 5-6, 2001 – Olympia
 May 23 & 24, 2001 - Pasco

G:\TammyO\SRFB Meetings\2000\Nov 30 Dec 1 2000\11_30 12_1_00 Minutes.doc