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

DATE: July 20, 2006 *PLACE: DOH Town Center 3*
TIME: 9:00 a.m. *Tumwater, 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
Jim Cowles	Designee, Department of Agriculture
Chris Drivdahl	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Donna Freier	Designee, Department of Health
Gretchen Hayslip	Designee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Steve Lanigan	Designee, U.S. Forest Service
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ron Shultz	Designee, Puget Sound Action Team
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Barry Thom	Designee, NOAA Fisheries

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 Jeff Koenings opened the meeting of the Governor's Forum on Monitoring (Forum) at 9:10 a.m.

Introductions were made and the agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF APRIL MINUTES

Laura Johnson **MOVED** to approve the April 4, 2006 meeting minutes. Paul Ancich **SECONDED** the motion. Minutes **APPROVED.**

STAFF REPORT

Independent Science Panel (ISP) Review of Intensively Monitored Watersheds (IMWs)
Bruce discussed a letter that was sent to the ISP from Bob Nichols, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), requesting a review of the 2006 IMW report to make sure the best science is going forward. The ISP will give a report to the SRFB at their September meeting.

Northwest Power Conservation Council (NWPCC)
Bruce reviewed a handout showing a sampling of the new monitoring projects proposed for funding by the NWPCC. He noted that two submitted projects, one for probabilistic sampling and another for hydrography, had already been designated as "do not fund". He believes that the council is struggling with prioritization, but the final decision on funding will be made by September.

Co-Chair Bill Ruckelshaus asked how much money would actually be appropriated.

Co-Chair Koenings reported that, in the past, the NWPCC has appropriated $170 million for WDFW projects. He noted that the council is basically starting over since completion of the subbasin plans. This year there has been a lot of competition for funds, with a heavy submittal of $800 million worth of projects.

Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funding (PCSRF) Phase 2 Metrics
Bruce explained the chart that was included in the meeting packet from NOAA regarding major limiting factors and habitat indicators in regional recovery plans.

Barry Thom reported that NOAA is working to update the factors at this time and are going through a review now for a 2007 report to Congress comparing recovery plans. They are finding some differences between what was reported and what shows up in the plan.

Co-Chair Koenings asked about PCSRF's two performance metrics.

Barry noted that one of the metrics is a quantification of resources being directed at each one of the major limiting factors. Overall, 70 percent of PCSRF funded projects address a major limiting factor identified in the recovery plan. The other metric is related to the actual indicators.

Bruce discussed the handouts comparing the regional limiting factors and habitat indicators and noted that they are waiting for all the information to come in from the regions. The goal is to have the most common set of indicators possible.

NOAA Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RME) Update
Barry Thom gave an update on NOAA's RME document. This guidance document expands on the listing decision framework document on how to develop a monitoring program to address those questions related to ESA listing decisions. Indicators developed for PCSRF should be included in the habitat component of that listing decision framework.

Barry reported that the document will be part of a federal register notice and posted on their website around the end of August.

Salmonid Field Protocols Handbook
Bruce gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the Salmonid Field Protocols Handbook. Project participants included dozens of contributors who reviewed more than 300

protocols for salmonid assessments, taking the best and combining them to come up with 15 full protocols for fish abundance and assessments. Bruce noted the need for common protocols to compare what's happening everywhere. Funded by the NWPCC, this publication has been three years in the making and is now out for final review.

Co-Chair Koenings commented that there are many ways to count fish and this effort tries to determine and pull together what is the most reliable method.

STATUS AND TRENDS FRAMEWORK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Bob Cusimano and Glen Merritt, both with the Department of Ecology, gave a PowerPoint presentation on status and trends monitoring. (See handout for further details.)

Bob reported that the status and trends monitoring plan is in draft form and they are still receiving comments. He noted that this has been a cooperative effort between Ecology, WDFW, and the Washington Conservation Commission (WCC).

Bob discussed the six issues that came out of the 2005 Workshop on Implementing Statewide Status/Trend Monitoring:

1. Sampling framework
2. Remote sensing
3. Identify local monitoring efforts
4. Indicators and protocols
5. Use of volunteers
6. Data management

Bob also provided the following five objectives:

1. Provide a framework that can be used at the state, salmon recovery region (SRR), and water resource inventory area (WRIA)
2. Provide a minimum of 80% confidence
3. Identify specific metrics or indicators
4. Incorporate existing information and monitoring data
5. Develop partnerships

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus would like to go ahead with efforts to coordinate and implement the plan and not wait for this work to be completed.

Bruce commented that there would be more discussion on other proposals later in the meeting.

Bob showed some examples of statewide probabilistic sampling framework.

Glen provided several graphs that showed remote sensing data collected in 2000-2004.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus noted that this information raises questions about problems associated with accuracy and whether the right things are being measured to determine

habitat health. Scientifically sound data needs to be backed up. He doesn't feel this information would communicate to the public the health of streams. We need to present

an accurate and understandable picture because if people don't understand there's a problem, they won't vote to have anything done.

Jeff Breckel stated the need to have a mechanism that explains this information in a form that is recognizable to the decision makers and the public. We need to be clear in terms of what we're trying to relate and how we're trying to use this information.

Bruce explained that the data could be made more understandable by scoring the most important information only.

Barry wondered who would be determining the criteria for setting the goals and targets for shifting the trends.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus replied that, at this time, there is no one to do that from a statewide perspective. He noted that at a statewide level, the data doesn't make sense. He suggested identifying the limiting factors and addressing them in the report.

Bruce emphasized that that is the point of this framework. Unless you have a framework, and implement status and trends, you would never be able to determine whether you've made progress in those limiting factors. You would only be able to say that you've made restoration actions, while at the same time degradation would be happening.

Chris Drivdahl commented that we need to get started doing this type of study in order to have a State of Salmon (SOS) report that is accurate and answers the questions.

There was discussion, and some confusion, regarding the cost figures presented by Ecology compared with those in the draft report to OFM.

Bruce reminded the group that there are two different budget items. For this discussion, the issue is with the SRFB contract with Ecology to develop the framework as opposed to what Ecology is proposing to do. He asked Bob what the cost would be to implement the framework as it is.

Bob replied that the cost would be $926,000 per year.

Bruce noted that the biennial budget proposals would be discussed later in the meeting.

STATE HYDROGRAPHY GIS DATA LAYER

Joy Paulus, IAC, and Tim Young, WDFW, gave a PowerPoint presentation on State Hydrography GIS Data Layer issues. Joy and Tim represent the Salmon and Watershed Information Management Technical Advisory Committee (SWIMTAC).

Tim explained that, at the present time, there are three versions of the state hydrography data layer. The natural resource agencies each use their own hydro layer to meet agency needs. Updates and additions to the hydro layer are addressed ad hoc by each agency

leading to numerous discrepancies. There is no statewide mandate for building a framework layer.

Joy stressed the need to have one consistent hydro layer that all interested natural resource agencies could contribute to, update, and use, with one agency designated as keeper of the data. Funding is needed in order to move forward with this proposal.

Joy discussed SWIMTAC's proposed recommendations for the hydro layer issues:

1. Support the use of a single 24K hydro layer for Washington with a central repository where all agency updates are made.
2. Support the inclusion of hydro into the Enterprise Architecture as first cross-agency (Tier 1) dataset.
3. Assign content management to one state agency once governance is clearly understood and project is funded.
4. Endorse and support the Cross-Agency GIS Hydrography Data Project Decision package being proposed by SWIMTAC.
5. Draft and sign MOA for Cross-Agency GIS Hydrography Data Project participation.

Co-Chair Koenings asked whether SWIMTAC had addressed the issues of governance and common protocols.

Joy responded that they have settled on a data model and governance models are in place. There will need to be some refinement to be ready for consolidation of data.

Chris Drivdahl noted that she has tried to find out how many miles of stream are blocked for anadromous fish, but has been unable to get an answer because there are three different sources of data.

Craig Partridge spoke in support of a one layer data system. DNR is the heaviest user of the hydro system and it is imperative that it be correct and available.

Carol Smith expressed strong support for a single hydro layer. She noted how it impacts the State of Salmon Report, status and trends monitoring, and the Conservation Commission, among others.

Joy summarized what is needed to help move this effort forward is the endorsement and support from the Forum and a commitment from state agencies.

OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MONITORING AND DATABASE REPORT

Bruce welcomed Jim Skalski, Budget Policy Analyst with OFM, who was invited to give his remarks to the Forum regarding the monitoring and database report.

Jim highlighted the reasons for the report and budget proviso to OFM. This report is a piece left out of the Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy (CMS). In order to proceed in funding agencies' needs, OFM needs to know the details of what and how natural

resource agencies are monitoring, the costs involved, and whether there are gaps, overlaps, or duplicate efforts.

Jim highlighted three critical areas dependent on the agencies' completed report:

1. Budget process
2. Priorities of Government (POG)
3. Puget Sound Initiative

Jim offered his assistance to those having issues that are preventing them from completing their part of the report.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus asked if Jim had looked at problems associated with agencies needing to undertake certain monitoring requirements in order to be eligible for federal funds.

Jim reported that OFM is aware of this and stressed that these need to be highlighted in the report as it may be possible to go to the federal agency and modify the need to still meet the federal requirements.

Bruce gave a brief overview of the draft report. He pointed out that the first part of the report is organized in order to give a short description of monitoring programs and associated databases. This summary information is taken from the surveys that were given to each agency. All the questions in the proviso are reflected in the surveys.

Ron Shultz noticed that the draft report tends to be very quantitative, in terms of what was spent on monitoring in different areas, but not qualitative. He asked what type of analysis OFM would do with this data if it is only just a quantitative snapshot.

Jim responded that just knowing what monitoring exists helps OFM begin the funding determination process. In most cases, the monitoring activity is probably under-funded and the data may be used as a basis to increase funding. It also helps to frame the scope of what monitoring should look like and helps to prioritize what activity is most important to be doing.

Bruce called attention to the section in the report on Recommendations for Improving Monitoring and Data Management. The proviso asks agencies to recommend what monitoring should no longer occur, any new monitoring activities, and what things should be combined. He noted that this section is very short because there hasn't been much input from agencies. This is an area that greatly needs to be expanded.

Jim informed the Forum that OFM would grant an extension until the end of September to complete the report, even though it is the second or third time they have asked for this

information. He stressed that it is incumbent upon the agencies to get all the information on the table – a rough estimate is better than leaving an answer blank. It could mean some changes, but they could be positive changes or more funding. He pointed out that if we can't tell the baseline story in full, we won't do well.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus is in support of giving OFM what is required and stressed the need to tell the honest story about what you're getting for the money you're spending.

Co-Chair Koenings stated that the Forum would need to meet in mid-September to review the final copy of this report and also to discuss budget items. That would give agencies two to three weeks to get their information to Bruce.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Bruce pointed out that he would need the information by the third week in August in order to get a final draft of the report to agencies the first week in September. He urged agency directors or designees to make sure the information is accurate.

REVIEW OF 2007-09 AGENCY MONITORING AND DATABASE BUDGET REQUESTS
Bruce presented this agenda item. (See Agency Tentative Monitoring Budget Proposals handout for further details.)

Bruce discussed the budget proposals document which includes a table of first draft budget items to be submitted to OFM as part of the report. It also includes placeholders for some projects, such as the Conservation Commission's Watershed Data Pilot Project (WDPP).

Carol Smith gave a brief description of the WDPP that has just gone live. The centralized web-based database of salmon habitat and watershed data was developed to store habitat project information and will contribute implementation monitoring information for various statewide needs, including the SOS report.

Jeff Breckel wondered why there are so many different databases out there that track projects.

Bruce commented that this is a decision the Forum needs to make. He referred to page 45 of the OFM report, under the heading "Create Enterprise Architecture Grant Management Module for Natural Resource Agencies", which lists a number of similar efforts going on, including the OFM accounting office which is creating an enterprise architecture grant program for all grants issued in the state.

Carol noted that the WDDP project is not a grants management tracking system as it only tracks biological parameters and basic project data. Part of their process was to build in compatibility and crosswalks with the vendor pulling information from existing databases. Since they are working with private landowners, the information cannot be put into a centralized database due to privacy issues.

Chris Drivdahl noticed that the chart was not representative of all the agencies' monitoring requests.

Bruce responded that the chart only reflects those he has received. Some agencies aren't finished with their analysis and this is the first attempt at putting it all together. He reminded everyone to make sure to separate what the SRFB contracted them to provide and what the Forum asked for.

Co-Chair Koenings asked whether the monitoring projects should be included within the agency's budget or in the budget submitted by the Forum.

Laura Johnson reported that, technically, the Monitoring Forum can't turn in a budget request. She noted that from time to time an agency may be asked, on behalf of a very specific multiple agency effort, to be the placeholder resident. Primarily, the Forum can only endorse budget decision packages. She believes where the Forum adds value is in policy and strategy expressions. The technical pieces will get worked out in consultation with OFM.

Chris wondered if there is a presumption that monitoring being proposed by state agencies will meet the needs of regional recovery plan organizations that are obligated to monitor whether or not it's working. If not, will they need to go back to the SRFB to fill in the gaps?

Co-Chair Koenings doesn't believe the agencies included regional needs in their budgets. If the needs are there, then it could be a gap or missing element.

Jeff Breckel commented that if it's not something that is part of an agency's normal mission, and something that needs to be monitored, then it probably hasn't been picked up in the agency's budget.

Co-Chair Ruckelshaus noted that the Council of Regions should raise that question because there are requirements for implementation of their plans. In most plans, the funding requirements are identified, but not the source of the funds.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Co-Chair Koenings asked Jeff Breckel to bring the issue of regional budget needs to the next Forum meeting.

There was further discussion on the individual agency budget proposals as compared to the draft chart.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Co-Chair Koenings recommended each agency give Bruce updated budget request information and fill in the missing data by the third week in August.

2006 STATE OF SALMON REPORT UPDATE

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

Chris gave a quick summary of changes contemplated in the 2006 State of Salmon in Watersheds Report (SOS). Among the changes are:

- Improving the indicators used in the 2004 report, including adding a statewide hydro dial
- Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliant harvest goals data will be consistent across each species
- Hatchery management plans meeting ESA – will either use same dial as 2004 or may use Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG)/Artificial Production Review and Evaluation (APRE) suggestions charted against actions
- Northeast and Coastal regions will be included
- Each region will have mapped information
- WDFW to provide hatchery measurements
- New chapter on threats

Chris is concerned that she has been unable to get the information from NOAA's database which tracks all restoration projects. She suggested that the Forum sign an MOU so that this data can be released.

Barry Thom reported on NOAA's database and has recently learned that the science center is awaiting certification from each agency that contributed in order to comply with a data quality act before it can give out any data.

Chris hopes to have more than just SRFB projects included in the report. She would also like to include projects from the US Forest Service, BPA, WCC, and the Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group.

Chris reminded the group of important dates coming up:

- Sept. 15 – Data for the dozen dials is due
- Sept. 30 – Data on individual watersheds due
- Dec. 8 – Presentation for Legislative Committee

The Co-Chairs encouraged the representatives on the Forum to be sure that information that is needed for the SOS report is given to Chris in a timely fashion.

IMPACT OF HARVEST ON ESA LISTED SALMON

Sara Laborde, WDFW, presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.)

Sara gave a PowerPoint presentation on the impact of harvest of ESA listed salmon on recovery efforts and how it should be displayed in the 2006 SOS report.

At the 2005 Forum Workshop, participants expressed a desire that future SOS reports display harvest impacts on an ESU scale in such a manner that its impact on meeting spawner abundance goals could be determined. WDFW and the tribes have been working on an approach that will meet this need.

Two key questions:

1. What is the abundance, fishing mortality, and number of spawners for fish returning to natural spawning areas and to hatcheries?
2. Where does fishing mortality occur, and how does it compare to the number of spawners?

Sara discussed the life cycle monitoring framework and current harvest assessment methods. She noted that results would be aggregated by major population group since specific results would make the SOS report excessively long.

Sara presented two graphs showing the same harvest information in two different formats. Each graph displayed fish mortality and spawners in natural and hatchery fish, both pre-listed and post-listed. There was consensus that Alternative A would be the best way to display the harvest data in the SOS report.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

_____

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair

Next Meeting: September 11, 2006
King Street Center, Seattle