

**GOVERNOR'S FORUM ON MONITORING
SALMON RECOVERY AND WATERSHED HEALTH
SUMMARY MINUTES**

*DATE: April 4, 2006
TIME: 10:00 a.m.*

*PLACE: Sawyer Hall
Lacey, Washington*

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair	Chair, Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Director, Department of Fish & Wildlife
Laura Johnson	Director, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Paul Ancich	Designee, Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Advisory Board
Josh Baldi	Designee, Department of Ecology
Jeff Breckel	Designee, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Richard Brocksmith	Designee, Lead Entity Advisory Group
Alan Christensen	Designee, U.S. Forest Service
Bridget Moran	Designee, Department of Agriculture
Bill Riley	Designee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Gretchen Hayslip	Designee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Russell Scranton	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Steve Leider	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Chris Drivdahl	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Paul Wagner	Designee, Department of Transportation
Steve Waste	Designee, Northwest Power and Conservation Council

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Co-Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting of the Governor's Forum on Monitoring (Forum) at 10:10 a.m.

The Co-Chair discussed the Stewardship of Coastal Rivers Conference to be held next week in Seattle. A report reviewing monitoring efforts will be discussed later in this meeting.

Introductions were made and the agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY MINUTES

Jeff Koenings **MOVED** to approve the January 17, 2006 minutes as presented. Paul Ancich **SECONDED** the motion. Minutes **APPROVED**.

STATE OF THE SALMON REPORT

Chris Drivdahl presented this agenda item. (See handout for further details.)

Chris is beginning to gather data for the next State of the Salmon Report. She will be having a meeting to discuss what data and maps are needed. Deadline for submission of data is September 1 with the report due to the Legislature December 1.

Jeff Koenings asked what will be used in place of the indicator dial displays as some of them didn't work in the last report.

Chris reported that Carol Smith is working on the dials and how to display the information more comprehensively. Some of the dials continue to be troublesome.

➤ **ACTION:** Steve Leider noted that there will be a more detailed discussion on the State of the Salmon Report at the May Forum meeting.

Jeff asked if the habitat subcommittee needs to look at what to do with the indicators for habitat. People are going to ask how habitat fits in and how it relates to fish production. He wondered if the habitat subcommittee should be tasked with this.

Carol reported that the status and trends monitoring will be the replacement for filling in the data.

Chris informed the Forum that there is nothing new at this time to replace the Limited Factors Analysis (LFAs) but will have more data in the future. She noted that this will be a difficult report since we don't have the data yet.

Jeff doesn't believe the EMAP status and trends is the way to show this information. In his view the connection between fish and habitat is missing.

Carol reported that if the assessment project gets funded there will be data, but if it doesn't get funded this information will be missing.

Steve suggested coming back to this discussion at the end of the meeting to see if the presentations being given at today's meeting answer some of these questions.

Chair Ruckelshaus reminded the Forum that the State of the Salmon Report is due at the end of the year.

2006 FORUM PROGRESS

Steve Leider reviewed the 2006 Forum Progress Gantt Chart that was prepared by Bruce Crawford. (See notebook for further details.)

The Chair was amazed at the number of reports that are due and how difficult it is to coordinate all the reports. He suggested that there might be a way to combine some of

the different reports.

UPDATE ON STATUS OF FRAMEWORK

Bob Cusimano, Department of Ecology, presented this agenda item along with Rob Plotnikoff and Kurt Krueger. Bob handed out the draft Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan. (See handout for further details.)

Bob gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the six issues posed at the Forum Workshop last April.

The Chair asked if there is something in the report that says that this information is needed to monitor the long-term effects of the work being done. Bob believes this is upfront in the goal.

Bob explained the master sample draw process that involves taking a 1:24,000 map scale coverage of rivers and streams and then dividing it into 1K segments, with the center as the sample point. This data goes into a probabilistic sample draw where sites can be selected from around the state to put into this list. All the data can be rolled up statewide. Both the state and federal government are working on this sampling effort.

Bob and Kurt discussed Remote Sensing, noting that the processes are advancing every year but are still not a substitute for on-the-ground monitoring, especially in the area of water quality.

Rob Plotnikoff talked about the Status and Trends Statewide Monitoring Framework Project workshops that were held between September 2005 and January 2006. The goal of this project is to develop a Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan (MP) for implementing a statewide probability based sampling effort to inform on the condition of streams, and rivers. This project will serve information needs of periodic reports like the "State of the Salmon" and can be used to produce assessment reports for aquatic ecosystems required by federal agencies as part of their recovery program.

At each of the four workshops the format used was to have:

- Two presentations focused on the topic of the workshop – providing examples of products and ideas
- Discussion on the topic of what we don't have as well as what we do have
- Summarization of where we are at the end of the meeting

The workshop topics were:

- The site selections and process and sub-populations
- Indicator performance, evaluation, and selection
- Existing data sets and their contribution to the monitoring plan
- Analytical products and status reports

Next steps:

- Draft monitoring plan review – comments due April 28
- Meet with Tribes on April 21 – comments due May 19
- Prepare final review draft by June 9
- Final review draft comments due by June 23
- Finalize monitoring plan by June 30

Board discussion:

Jeff Koenings asked whether the items being measured are the ones suggested by NOAA to meet the Limiting Factors issues.

Rob reported that all the categories needing measurements are included in the report. One reason they are asking for review of the document is to make sure a measurement has not been missed.

There was discussion about volunteers and whether they would be able to do some of the measurements. Certain categories can be measured by volunteers with oversight and training by experts.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus would like to make sure the volunteers are used to keep the energy up for recovery efforts but need to channel the volunteer efforts to the right monitoring efforts so that they aren't measuring the wrong things and become discouraged.

Jeff Breckel noted there are different kinds of volunteers and levels of effort. Some volunteers are dedicated and willing to provide on-going measurements where others are willing to do a one-time effort

Alan Christensen reported that Oregon funds volunteer efforts that have been very successful and are using a state framework for all the monitoring efforts. The problem is that the training needs to be at the statewide monitoring level.

Steve Waste noted that NOAA supports local efforts and this has been the way to get a lot of the data we currently have. People like to see that they are part of a larger effort.

Carol Smith believes that a proposal like this, if funded, would be a way to get data for the State of the Salmon Report.

Jeff Koenings isn't seeing how probabilistic designed sampling gets information to a specific WRIA level.

Bob and Rob both explained that this information can be partitioned out from the rest of the data and you can get to your level of data needs.

Richard Brocksmith talked about the different levels of data gathering and the range from the full-time professional to the local volunteers.

Josh Baldi suggested that it might be better to think about whether we have the protocols

in place to get the data. It doesn't matter who the data is being gathered by as long as the protocols are the same and being followed.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Steve Leider suggested that members read this report and that we have a more in-depth discussion on this effort at an upcoming Forum meeting.

GIS/REMOTE SENSING-BASED MONITORING PROGRAM

Steve Lanigan, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), presented this agenda item. (See notebook for further details.)

Steve reported that they first looked at a northwest forest plan area scale and identified evaluation criteria and attributes to evaluate. The evaluation criteria had a rating that fell between "poor" and "good" and were assigned a value between -1 and +1. USFS executives felt this provided a good overview but asked them to now look at the information at a smaller scale, such as a WRIA. Now have an interagency stream layer at a 1:24,000 scale that others should be able to use.

Steve talked about a new way to get data on in-channel characteristics called "Green LIDAR", which allows mapping of stream channels. There is only one camera that can provide this information and it is on the east coast.

Steve is working on a way to align west and east side monitoring programs. It has been a challenge and there is agreement on the need for probabilistic sample designs

Josh Baldi asked if the two different efforts are working together.

Steve reported that the protocols used are a little different so they haven't gotten there yet. They are looking at common protocols and whether there is a cross-walk that can get to the same place. The probabilistic sample design is the direction most groups are moving toward.

Steve wonders if there should be a focus group working on a small area and coming to an agreed upon process. After having a success story, they could then move on to a larger area.

Mike Crouse, NOAA Fisheries, reported that the executives received a report on the forest plan and recommitted to continue with this work.

STATUS OF NOAA GUIDANCE ON MONITORING PRIORITIES

Mike Crouse presented this agenda item. (See handouts for details.)

Mike reviewed the Listing Status Decision Framework for how NMFS will determine an ESU is recovered.

Russell Scranton reviewed what needs to be in a regional recovery and adaptive management plan.

Russell then walked through an ESU scale decision process using Mid-Columbia steelhead major population group as an example. This is not a required process for regions to use but is preferred by NOAA so that everyone can be on the same page in assessing the status of the listings. Every domain does not need to have a monitoring plan that looks the same but to take the basic information and model it to fit the individual ESU.

Board discussion:

Jeff Koenings asked why this document isn't going out to the Tribes and regions to get their comments before presenting the final document.

Mike Crouse noted that they have tried to get feedback from the different groups but, since this is guidance for recovery planning and the deadline is coming up, they need to get it completed soon.

Steve Waste is encouraged to get some guidance from NOAA and believes it will be flexible enough to fit people's needs.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus and Jeff Koenings both encouraged a review period for this document before it is released as a final document. This will affect many people and the more they feel involved in the process the more support may be garnered.

Mike will take this back to Bob and hopefully they will be able to release a draft so that groups working on their chapters can see how this document helps or what is missing.

INTEGRATED MONITORING PROPOSAL

Damon Desner and Kit Paulsen, representing local government and the City of Bellevue, presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.)

Water quality and stormwater management is better managed at a watershed level since stormwater (like salmon) know no borders.

Local government is asking for a state framework for stormwater and water quality monitoring.

Josh Baldi noted that the Department of Ecology does not disagree with the proposal and even requested budget funding for this program but the request did not receive funding.

Bill Moore, Ecology, explained the NPDES permit process. He pointed out the lack of status and trends monitoring and the need to integrate that into the stormwater permitting process.

Kit discussed the volunteer issue. They have found that in some areas, the volunteers do the job of monitoring as well as the "professionals". She feels volunteers should be used when feasible as this helps the local citizens to be more vested in the process.

Josh asked how the new proposals match up with existing efforts and how to get these funded. He believes we need to work together to develop a proposal for status and trends monitoring for storm water management and would like to talk about this at a future meeting.

Steve Leider noted that this is the first time local government has brought a proposal before the Forum and it was appreciated.

REVIEW OF WATER QUANTITY MONITORING STRATEGIES

Due to lack of time, Josh Baldi volunteered to send the information out for review and have an abbreviated presentation at the May meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Agenda items were discussed for the next meeting of the Forum:

- Status of Framework
- Water quality monitoring strategies
- State of the Salmon Report – data needs
- Integrated monitoring proposal
- Status and trends monitoring proposal for stormwater (July)

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.



Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair

Next Meeting: July 20, 2006
 Natural Resources Building