

**FORUM ON MONITORING
SALMON RECOVERY AND WATERSHED HEALTH
SUMMARY MINUTES**

DATE: March 23, 2010

PLACE: Natural Resources Building, Room 172

TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Olympia, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Wilkerson	Chair
Ken Dzinbal	Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery & Watershed Health
Kit Paulsen	City of Bellevue
Paul Ancich	Regional Fish Enhancement Group Coalition
Terry Wright	NW Indian Fisheries Commission
Steve McLellan	Policy Director, Recreation and Conservation Office
Ginny Stern	Department of Health
Sara LaBorde	WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jeff Breckel	Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Brad Thompson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife
Rebecca Ponzio	Puget Sound Partnership
Phil Miller	Executive Coordinator GSRO
Bob Metzger	U.S. Forest Service
Bruce Crawford	NOAA Fisheries Services
Dick Wallace	Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Josh Baldi	Department of Ecology
Jim Cahill	Puget Sound Partnership
Paul Wagner	Department of Transportation
Carol Smith	Conservation Commission

Meeting called to order at 9:06 a.m. by Chair Bill Wilkerson.

AGENDA Review

Paul Ancich made a motion to approve meeting minutes from December 2, 2009. Kit Paulsen seconded.
All in favor.

AGENDA Item #1: Legislative Update

Steve McLellan, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), went over the proposed supplemental budget for 2011-13.

AGENDA Item #2: Short Updates

Megan Duffy, RCO staff, relayed that \$80 million of PCSRF money for conservation and restoration is available through NOAA. The applicant notice will come out March 24th. The notice will tell what the allowable ask amount is. RCO will keep the group informed about how much they ask for and what amount will go towards monitoring.

Sara LaBorde presented an update on filling the LCR Monitoring Framework Gaps. Sara was in Washington, DC, to rally for funding and encourage NOAA to participate. They want \$1 million for proposed gaps projects from Oregon and Washington. This money would be an add-on to the regular PCSRF allocation.

Kit said they received 800 public comments on the draft Puget Sound Stormwater Plan. They want to be able to roll them up.

Bruce Crawford said that NOAA by law has to review ESA status. Many salmon were listed within a few years from each other and thus are coming due at the same time. It is important to put limited funds in the most appropriate places. PIBO has 1,200 sites worth of status and trends monitoring data. There are data collected by the U.S. Forest Service but with no fish linkage. Bruce said that there would be some hatchery effectiveness monitoring and that money was given to the tribes to implement habitat restoration projects.

Ken Dzinbal asked if the revised guidance would be published in the Federal Register? Bruce said if Barry Thom thinks we've made substantial changes, NOAA may have to re-publish the guidance in the Federal Register.

Dick Wallace mentioned the power plan is updated every 5 years and the primary goal is using energy better; it includes a look at better interaction between power generation and Fish and Wildlife needs. A monitoring strategy will take it one step forward. Dick said Forum data will be rolled into high level indicators. It was said that efficiency and alignment on core indicators was needed. Chair Wilkerson thought the Forum needed to comment on the strategy as an engaged entity.

ACTION ITEM: Ken to draft a coordinated comment letter for circulation and the Chair's signature by April 26th.

AGENDA Item #3: Developing a Puget Sound Comprehensive, Integrated Monitoring Plan

Nathalie Hamel, PSP's Monitoring Program Manager introduced herself to the group. Nathalie will be the PSP liaison for the Forum. She said PSP's proposal is to track progress in the health of Puget Sound and to ensure that local governments can fulfill their mandates. The plan is to assemble a steering committee for monitoring sooner than later. Involved will be John Becker, performance manager; the science director; Rebecca Ponzio, Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator; and the Science Panel. She will look at solid frameworks and what has been done so far to better improve what she is doing and take advantage of what the Lower Columbia River has done with regard to framework. Nathalie will be presenting the proposal for a Steering Committee at the April 9th PSP meeting with the Ecosystem Coordination Board, a meeting with the Science Panel, and later the Leadership Council, Deputy Director, etc.

The Chair, Jeff Breckel and Dick Wallace discussed more Lower Columbia estuary emphasis through Bonneville. They discussed interaction with Puget Sound and keeping things synced up among the four states and noted that they are ready and anxious to get the parties at the table to talk about coordination, including Oregon and Washington.

Chair Wilkerson responded by saying there is no coalescing force around monitoring and the Legislature is frustrated by that. He is supportive of the PSP's efforts in monitoring, but there is no one person/group in charge. The Legislature is going to need better answers about what is going on and results.

Dick Wallace noted that this requires two ingredients: willingness to have leadership to push it, and willingness to follow. We have to bridge the disconnect between science and policy.

The Chair said if he had to answer the question, he would say this Forum is the guiding organization and should provide oversight. As the PSP Steering Committee project moves forward, we need to have a synergy with the framework in Puget Sound; if things are different, then Puget Sound is in trouble, as is the Forum.

AGENDA Item #4: Consolidated State of the Salmon in Watersheds Report

Steve Leider summarized GSRO's plan for the next *State of the Salmon* biennial report:

1. This year, it will be prepared by the RCO.
2. There are new and different provisions in the statute. One is to require consolidation of preexisting reports.
3. The two Salmon Reports (RCOs and State of Salmon) will combine to be a high level status summary on watershed planning and so on.
4. It will be shorter and more consolidated.
5. It will be accessible in other ways, not just print.
6. It will shift gears to set up an approach to the results: like Status and Trends watershed health.
7. It will show three trends and an idea of what's happening in the regions as well as a statewide picture.
8. It will list the threats.

Data will be collected for the Coast and Columbia this year, and data for the non-salmon areas by the end of the biennium. It is a big step forward in being able to say where the gaps are and what the basis is for identifying the gaps. In a nutshell, it comes together to reflect fish trends and habitat. The 2010 report will be similar in content, but with less attention to indicators or implementation of actions. The report will reflect what is going on in habitat. A core group of lead agencies will form the production team and their information will flow into the report. The reach has been broadened to federal agencies and others to show where things are hitting the ground. Steve hopes the Forum can help shore up those opportunities or help us learn where relationships exist and information is available. He was not sure how far they will expand on predation and ocean conditions and returns; perhaps a case study or profile. He said they will put a lot of effort into showcasing the statewide dials. The report will be a GMAP product.

Dick wanted to make sure there is emphasis on fish and watershed health. He doesn't want to lose the piece on connecting our actions and threats. We will want to track what is done and where it ended up.

Steve Leider said he hasn't figured out if there will be a public review. The audience of the *State of the Salmon* is high level decision makers and the lay public, which is why the report will be concise and easily accessible.

Ginny Stern thought it was important to link data in the report into deeper information on the web. Sara echoed that sentiment by saying there is a *State of the Resource* report. Data is going into a variety of reports and the information should be the same. The reports should work together and have coordinated data.

The Forum liked the idea of including a section on monitoring. Jim Cahill noted that the Forum needs consistent state and federal funding to move forward on this approach.

ACTION ITEM: Bring a recommendation to the June Forum meeting on how to portray monitoring in the *State of the Salmon* report.

AGENDA Item #5: Reforming the Naturals

Josh Baldi mentioned the lack of coordination by agencies on monitoring. He discussed the Coordinated Monitoring and Citizen Science at length. The Chair noted that the Forum would be a good place to have a calendar of activity for all agencies that the Forum can coordinate. Josh said agencies could hear an update, with an idea of scope and deliverables, and provide feedback and ask questions. Forum can make sure the agencies are following the directives. He said it will help answer the question of whether they are coordinating and if it follows the framework of the Forum. Josh acknowledged that we hope to have a

better opportunity to have coordination among all these entities and having common protocols around local, state and federal processes.

FIRST ACTION ITEM: Send PDF of appendix to Forum members.

SECOND ACTION ITEM: Schedule visitors (Josh Baldi ECY) for update on what they are doing with the executive order and what is consistent with the Forums mandates.

AGENDA Item #8: Protocols and Metrics

Ken gave an update on the March 23rd Portland NOAA Metrics Workshop. With clarity from that workshop, we can move forward on protocols and habitat monitoring. Ken spoke at length about protocols and metrics, noting that we are further ahead with fish. The American Fisheries Society published a sizeable book that is a compilation of protocols for monitoring salmon across the west.

Ken mentioned a number of agencies are working on an EPA grant developing a salmonid data exchange network. Ken noted a need to draw on technical staff. The Chair charged Forum members to commit to Ken that our technical report teams would bring recommendations and exchange dialogue. Ken said there will be an agreement for fish in/fish out monitoring and how juvenile salmonid data can be shared across agencies. He noted that there is not yet a list of water quality and fish protocols that is acceptable to everyone. Ken said the Puget Sound Partnership funded the first portion of the status and trends monitoring. He said the trick will be to see how much alignment we can see and whether we need to add additional protocols. Bob Metzger said the Forest Service is more than AREMP and PIBO and they are happy to help.

AGENDA Item #7: Effectiveness Monitoring and IMWs – Regional Planning

Ken gave an overview of effectiveness monitoring and intensively monitored watersheds (IMWs). He discussed bridging across the desired outcomes and developing protocols, operationally aligning the programs and participation through PNAMP. Terry Wright mentioned the effectiveness monitoring plan for Columbia River and Ken noted that the inventory and the scope of work actually included Puget Sound. Bruce explained how they are tied together. When the SRFB first started funding monitoring, everyone did things differently. They decided to do an inventory of who is doing what and then fill the gaps. Some of the same is true for Puget Sound, but he doesn't think there is a good inventory of who has done what in Puget Sound.

AGENDA Item #6: Forum Sunset Planning

Chair Wilkerson relayed that June 30, 2011 is the end of the Forum. He thinks the Forum has proven its worth and should consider recommending an extension. He said you have to evaluate the worth of the forum as agencies, tribes and associations.

Bruce explained that under Governor Locke, the Legislature created a \$1 million bill to establish a monitoring effort. Initially, the number one priority/recommendation was to maintain a Monitoring Forum and it is the only place where the organizations were forced to come together, share and be accountable. It could still function if it sunsets and turns into an executive order.

The Forum discussed its accomplishments, value added, progress, coordination and coming to agreement about the Forum's role and key issues and tasks to undertake and deliverables if an extension is in order.

ACTION Item: Ken will create a sub-group to come up with a range of legislative options.
The meeting **ADJOURNED** at 2:23 p.m.

Next Meeting: June 16, 2010 in Olympia