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

DATE: January 17, 2006
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Sawyer Hall
Lacey, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Director, Department of Fish & Wildlife
Laura Johnson	Director, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Bruce Crawford	Program Manager, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Josh Baldi	Designee, Department of Ecology
Carol Smith	Designee, Conservation Commission
Kim Kratz	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Steve Leider	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Sarah Brace	Designee, Puget Sound Action Team
Gretchen Hayslip	Designee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Richard Brocksmith	Designee, Lead Entity Advisory Group
Paul Ancich	Designee, Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Advisory Board
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 Jeff Koenings opened the meeting of the Governor's Forum on Monitoring (Forum) at 9:22 a.m.

Introductions were made and the agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 1, 2005 MINUTES

Laura Johnson **MOVED** to approve the December 1, 2005 minutes. Craig Partridge **SECONDED** the motion.

Richard Brocksmith asked for clarification on page 6 of the minutes. Richard will work with Bruce Crawford to amend the minutes. Minutes **APPROVED as amended.**

2006 FORUM BUSINESS AND SCHEDULE

Bruce presented this agenda item by reviewing the memorandum. (See *Proposed Upcoming FORUM Business Calendar* behind the January 17 notebook tab for details.)

Steve Leider asked about the bulleted calendar item for May regarding NOAA Fisheries priorities on salmon recovery and whether these recommendations would be linked to the regional priorities.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Kim Kratz, NOAA Fisheries, noted that they should be able to give an update on monitoring priorities at the April meeting, instead of waiting until the meeting in May.

Paul Ancich wondered how the status and trends monitoring might be incorporated into the NOAA priorities.

Josh Baldi noted that Ecology's work is broader than the NOAA guidelines but he will be checking with program folks to make sure they are working with NOAA as they develop priorities so the two fit together.

Co-Chair Koenings asked about the '07-09 agency biennial request and whether the Forum would be developing the plans for the different agencies.

Bruce explained that when the Forum first started, they were in the middle of the budget process and there were a few proposals that were similar. For the '07-09 biennial budget we will have the framework and results of the workshop to identify gaps and duplication to help develop the proposal for the Governor's office.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Co-Chair Koenings asked if there might be time on an earlier agenda to start identifying needs.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Bruce will develop a Gant chart to identify deadlines for steps along the way to be able to prepare this information.

Co-Chair Koenings noted that the Forum has grown since the last budget cycle and we should be able to get this information ready for the next cycle.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Josh wondered where Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) would fit into this information. He suggested adding the TMDL discussion to the April meeting agenda.

Co-Chair Koenings stressed the need to be sure all the pieces are ready for the May and July discussions so agencies will be prepared to develop their budgets in August and September. Agencies would be able to note the Forum's recommendation on items identified by the Forum for inclusion in their budgets.

Richard Brocksmith asked about reports from the subcommittees and when those might be presented. He also had a question on bringing regions into the subcommittee's work.

Bruce noted that the subcommittees would help formulate the products for the Forum agenda items.

Sarah Brace suggested inviting someone from the NOAA Science Center to provide a briefing on the work they are doing on the Puget Sound eco-system based management

research and monitoring. She feels this could provide a link with the Puget Sound Initiative.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Josh Baldi suggested this presentation should be sooner rather than later, possibly in April.

Bruce noted the need to identify who is working on the marine nearshore work.

Steve Waste said the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC) is not currently working on this but has been trying to.

Co-Chair Koenings suggested a more holistic approach by inviting the US Forest Service, NOAA, Puget Sound Action Team (PSAT), and others to see what all the different groups are doing on this topic and how they fit together.

Bruce will make the necessary revisions to the calendar. Co-Chair Koenings asked Bruce to include the process on how to coordinate the efforts.

2006 BIENNIAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR

Bruce Crawford summarized the draft 2006 Biennial Report for Forum consideration. (See handout for further details.)

Bruce noted that the last time the report was written there was concern that Priorities of Government (POG) was already completed before the report was done.

Laura Johnson noted that POG is discussing the need for linkages with the Forum so there would be a connection between the two.

Co-Chair Koenings commented on the titles that show the products and would like all the section titles to reflect the same language in the report (i.e., Forum Monitoring Recommendation on Statewide Measures of Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health).

Kim Kratz asked about the role of effectiveness monitoring and where this would be reflected in the report.

Craig Partridge noted how effectiveness monitoring is part of the diagram on page 10 of the report, but then seems to fade away. The focus appears to shift to status and trend monitoring but we don't want to lose the effectiveness monitoring portion.

Steve Leider suggested adding another section explaining why the focus has shifted to status and trends. He also noted that the report seems state agency focused. He suggested expanding on the introduction to explain how the Forum works to coordinate monitoring efforts statewide.

Steve asked what watershed monitoring report is being referred to in Figure 1 on page 2 – the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office's (GSRO's) State of the Salmon (SOS) report or a different report?

Bruce replied that the Legislature provided funds to the Forum, through IAC, for publishing a watershed monitoring report, but it hasn't been very clear exactly what the report should be. The last SOS report was done on more of a watershed scale. Bruce emphasized that this report needs to provide a statewide perspective in a simple format for the Legislature.

There was discussion on what the report should encompass and who should be doing this report – the GSRO, the Forum, or someone else. Steve believes the GSRO has the lead on this report with input from the Forum.

Craig still sees the SOS report as a general, easy-to-read document for the public, whereas this addition would be more of a technical monitoring report.

Richard Brocksmith talked about the need to add recommendations from lead entities and regions, such as fish abundance monitoring, and also to flesh out other details.

Laura Johnson cautioned against adding more recommendations at this late date and suggested possibly adding a paragraph explaining that these are the key recommendations from this Forum.

Bruce noted that he would make the suggested edits and send a copy to Forum members for review and comments before sending the final report, which is due January 31.

OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (OFM) INTERIM STATUS REPORT

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item. (For details, see handout titled "March 2006 Interim Report and Database Investments in Salmon Management and Watershed Health".)

Bruce noted that he has sent a draft report to all the agencies involved in the OFM report. Information in this report was gathered a few years ago through a survey sent to each of the agencies asking them to fill in monitoring data. Agencies need to get comments back to Bruce by April 21, 2006. Bruce will have an updated draft report for discussion at the May 11 Forum meeting.

The Forum discussed how this information would be used and what needs it will meet. This may be a start for including local and federal databases and figuring out how to combine them into one interface.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST AQUATIC MONITORING PARTNERSHIP (PNAMP) UPDATE

Jennifer Bayer, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), provided an overview of PNAMP. (See handout of presentation for details.)

Jennifer, who is the PNAMP coordinator, noted that the group's main purpose is to provide a forum for coordinating state, federal, and tribal aquatic habitat and monitoring programs. Bruce Crawford periodically attends PNAMP meetings, providing updates on activities of the Forum.

PNAMP's main objectives are to:

- Provide a technical forum to develop, coordinate, and inform monitoring and evaluation programs
- Provide a forum and process for communication with decision makers
- Be a clearinghouse for sample design, protocol development, and data management activities
- Facilitate a process to establish landscape/ecosystem metrics

Jennifer discussed protocol comparisons and the potential of standardizing them, which is a large part of what PNAMP is doing. They also plan to conduct an inventory of aquatic resource monitoring in the Pacific Northwest this year and will be working with Bruce as they gather Washington's data. Their results will be web-based.

In addition to adopting a monitoring coordination structure, Jennifer reported that PNAMP has identified and developed workgroups for five key elements of monitoring: watershed condition monitoring, effectiveness monitoring, fish population monitoring, estuary monitoring, and data management.

COLLABORATIVE, SYSTEMWIDE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROJECT (CSMEP) BRIEFING

Dave Marmorek, ESSA Technologies Ltd., provided an overview of CSMEP explaining what it is and what they are doing. (See handouts for details.)

Dave noted that CSMEP, a three-year project that was initiated in September, 2003, is focused on the issue of system-wide monitoring and evaluation of fish status. Their vision is a coordinated effort to collaboratively improve the quality and consistency of fish monitoring data, and the methods used to evaluate these data, to answer key questions relevant to major decisions in the Columbia Basin.

Craig Partridge asked Dave if he has had discussions on the relationship between cost and certainty.

Dave responded that they have begun to have these discussions, but found that they need to look at the status quo monitoring first and see what you won't get without spending money.

Bruce explained that their first task was to figure out what monitoring efforts were already in place, how well they worked, and how good the data was. We need to take on the question of what data do we need to track fish through the whole cycle and how is this going to link everything together.

Dave discussed the first pilot project that forced them to integrate across all four of the H's looking at the cost benefit.

UPDATE ON SUBMITTALS TO NORTHWEST POWER AND CONSERVATION COUNCIL (NWPCC)

Bruce introduced this agenda item with Ken Dzinbal, Department of Ecology, providing the presentation on the proposal submitted to the NWPCC for funding. (See handout for details.)

Steve Waste thanked the Forum for submitting this proposal and explained the process for reviewing the proposals. Even though the project is in the Washington section only, he feels this is a significant enough piece for the whole basin.

Joy Paulus, IAC, noted that the Salmon and Watershed Information Management Technical Advisory Committee (SWIMTAC) also submitted a proposal expanding on the data integration system. This proposal, requesting $1.3 million for three years, is to build a regulatory database.

Josh Baldi asked about funding the west side status and trends monitoring as this proposal would be part of the Columbia Basin area only.

Ken replied we will need to start looking for additional fund sources, but this was an opportunity for funding of the Columbia Basin area.

Paul Ancich asked if this proposal is only for gathering information on status.

Ken replied that at this time they are only getting status information since that is the first step to getting data on trends. He noted that this proposal is only for four years.

Kim Kratz commented that the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) database and the BPA Pisces system are not consistent and may never line up.

Ken responded that they are aware of this and will be working on a way for everyone to share the data.

Steve Leider pointed out that this shows how expensive this information is to obtain. He feels it would be nice to have statewide data for the SOS, but even if we were able to get funding for all four regions, we would not have a consistent set of data for four years.

Bruce explained some of the thinking behind the proposal.

Co-Chair Koenings noted that this is not a short-term management system for data but is intended for the long-term.

ESA SMOLT MONITORING UPDATE

Marnie Tyler, WDFW, presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.)

Marnie handed out a draft copy of the "Washington State Smolt and Adult Monitoring of ESA Listed Species" and explained how Table 1 is used. She also discussed what information has been incorporated since the last time the Forum reviewed this document. This will be an adaptive management tool in the future, not only for WDFW but also for the Forum.

Kim Kratz asked about the link between major population groups (MPGs), primary populations, and habitat status and trends.

Bruce noted that this was looked at but would significantly increase costs as a much bigger data set would be needed than for WRIAs since there are numerous MPGs.

Ken Dzinbal feels there is nothing inconsistent with the data gathering with the two separate proposals.

Co-Chair Koenings believes it is important to measure both the juveniles and adults in the same area. He is still skeptical on whether this data can be gathered through random sampling.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair

Next Meeting: April 4, 2006
TBD