

**SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD**

**MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

October 28 & 29, 2004

Whatcom County Courthouse  
Bellingham, Washington

Day 1

---

**SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Jim Peters	Olympia
Mark Clark	Director, Conservation Commission
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources

**RECEIVED**

DEC 09 2004

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

---

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus welcomed everyone and thanked Whatcom County Executive, Pete Kremen, for the use of the courthouse for this meeting.

Mr. Kremen welcomed the Board to Whatcom County and thanked Chairman Ruckelshaus for all he has done in salmon recovery, for the citizens of Washington State, and the nation. He also thanked the SRFB board members for the work they are doing.

Bob Kelly, a member of the Nooksack Indian Tribe, provided an update on the regional recovery planning efforts and discussed the land use caucus and co-manager caucus. These groups haven't met yet and have a lot to do before June 2005.

The agenda was reviewed and approved.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Brenda McMurray clarified what she said on page 12 of the April 29 and 30 minutes. Chair Ruckelshaus would like to strike the word "best" from the best lists comment on page 5 of the minutes. This agenda item was finalized later in the meeting.

**MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS**

*Director's Report*

Director Laura Johnson reported on Steve Tharinger's health situation. Steve remains cheerful and optimistic.

Larry Cassidy is on assignment in Sapporo, Japan. He is one of two United States presidential appointees to the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission, an international group responsible for oversight of fish treaties.

The December SRFB meeting will be in Tumwater at the Tyee Convention Center.

Director Johnson thanked Rollie Geppert and his staff, and also Steve Leider of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), for their efforts on the 5<sup>th</sup> Round process. Good work by the panel and technical advisors.

Chair Ruckelshaus also thanked the group but noted that the Board hasn't given out any money yet and that is when the fireworks usually start.

Staff is working through state budget issues and Priorities of Government efforts. Should know in a few weeks about the budget recommendations for the next biennium. The state is \$1.1 billion in deficit, which is down from what it was last year.

The Chair asked for some sense on how the outgoing governor's budget would impact the new governor's budget.

Director Johnson responded that it depends on who the new governor is. Both Dino Rossi and Christine Gregoire are well aware of the budget process and will be able to express their priorities in the budgets they present. The outgoing governor's budget is usually the blueprint for the day-to-day budget efforts.

Dick Wallace reported that Governor Gary Locke has been working hard on making the transition as smooth as possible. Salmon recovery is probably in the bread and butter funding.

This Board and the executive director serves at the pleasure of the governor. Director Johnson will plan a short executive session at December's meeting to discuss transition changes if necessary.

Brenda McMurray asked about budget proposals presented by the SRFB.

Director Johnson introduced two new staff, Susan Zemek, Communications Manager, and Rob Kirkwood, Administrative Services Assistant Director. Neil Aaland, the third new hire, is on annual leave and is the Assistant Director for Grants and Project Services.

### ***Financial Services Report***

Rob Kirkwood presented this agenda item, noting changes to the format of the report. (See notebook item 2b for details.) The form was simplified to provide a better management tool.

Rob noted that there is about \$30 million for expenditures in the 5<sup>th</sup> Round grant cycle. Brenda asked about the reappropriation. Director Johnson asked Rob to distribute information to the Board members on the total amount since the beginning.

### ***Project Management Report***

Rollie Geppert presented this agenda item. (See notebook item 2c for details.)

A small correction was noted – 188 applications were submitted and 182 projects are being considered.

Rollie reported the completion of the first grant cycle under GSRO. It was a major accomplishment to expend the \$20 million – left \$1.1 million, which is about 5%. Staff would like to do better in the future but need to make sure the funds are spent in a meaningful way.

The Engineered Log Jam (ELJ) report is included as an attachment. The project sponsors will provide a full report at the completion of the fifth year of the projects.

Tim Smith agreed with the Chair that the ELJ report is an important report to get out for others to see and peer review.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the need to have this ELJ report reviewed as objectively as possible before approving future projects like this.

Rollie reported that there are 703 active projects with completed projects at 53 percent.

Scott Potter, DNR Small Forest Landowner Program, Brett DeMond, WDFW, and Brian Abbott gave a Family Forest Fish Passage (FFFP) program update.

Discussed House Bill 1095, which was designed to help small landowners meet forest and fish regulations. Two million dollars was budgeted for the first biennium – first \$1 million has been allocated to 36 sites. Seven of the projects were completed in the summer and fall of 2004.

DNR makes the final funding decisions for the FFFP program. Once funded, SRFB project managers use PRISM for project tracking.

Mark Clark asked why the remaining sites weren't funded – location or funding limitations? Brian reported it was mostly due to priority and location – unfunded projects continue to be on the list.

Brian highlighted six FFFPP projects.

He discussed the WDFW mapping of these projects and how this is a great tool for evaluating these projects.

Brian mentioned some of the highlights of the first FFFP program funding cycle:

- Early success
- Enthusiasm of sponsors
- Current barrier inventories (helps in prioritizing)
- Lead entities supportive of program
- Application process is short and simple for the landowner
- Collaboration among the three agencies – working well

Brian noted that this is a model for a statewide fish passage program.

Craig Partridge pointed out that, after doing the quick math, it looks like about \$15,000 per mile opened, which is low.

Brian gave a summary of the numbers:

SRFB passage projects – 256 miles (3.65 avg) – \$77,265

FFFP projects – 58 miles (1.62 avg) – \$18,294

Chair Ruckelshaus stressed the need to be careful about these numbers – if you don't factor all aspects in, then the numbers can be misleading. Only want the honest numbers.

Mark Clark congratulated the group for being so responsive with the FFFP program and getting things done so quickly.

Dick Wallace also congratulated the group on the good work. May be too soon to tell if this will get completed within the fifteen-year schedule due to funding limitations.

Craig said this was a “low-hanging fruit” effort and will be going in to the legislature to request more funding. Craig also asked if this helped the different groups communicate and work together.

Brian responded that yes, it was helpful, as this is an effort of coordination between RFEGs lead entities, small forest landowners, etc.

The Chair asked Craig about the 15-year schedule and if the projects have been prioritized.

Craig responded that yes, it is on a 15-year timeline and the projects have been prioritized. Large forest landowners are also under the 15-year timeline and are working on their projects.

There was discussion on sequencing of these projects.

Viewed three-minute video from WDFW on this program.

### ***Communications Report***

Susan Zemek reported on her communications audit. (See notebook item 2d for details.)

Brenda discussed the need for legislative pieces to be pulled together so we are all on board with the same messages. Pre-session meetings will be starting, and we need to have the materials ready.

Susan responded that she has already started working on this.

### **LEAG Report**

Brian Walsh introduced Doug Osterman as the new LEAG chairperson and reported that Steve Martin is the new vice-chair. Doug will join the Board on several issues during the presentations today to give the LEAG report.

Brian provided a summary of the last four meetings LEAG has had since its last report to the Board and discussed the facilitation of the meetings. LEAG meetings are open to all lead entities and other groups that are interested in this process.

LEAG consists of nine members with a buddy system in place for getting input from all lead entities. Will have two meetings on west side of state and one on east side. Doug will share LEAG input on next funding round and the watershed enhancement. A survey has been sent to the LEs on administrative process.

Doug welcomed Susan Zemek to the office of the IAC and looks forward in working with her in communicating lead entity efforts.

The facilitation process was positive and provided a way for the LEAG to be more effective. Will work towards consensus in reports and will bring LEAG identified issues to the Board. If LEAG is unable to reach consensus, then there will be a vote and a minority report will be brought to the Board, the first of which Doug will present later today.

Lead entities want to be involved in every step of the funding process.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked Doug and noted that it is the LEAG's role to provide the Board with input. If the lead entities don't succeed the Board won't succeed – it is key for the lead entities to bring forward the best projects by being inclusive in all local interests so they are supported. The Chair noted that something is still missing: how to determine if the strategies are what they ought to be. Need to determine if the correct strategies are in place.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed how it will be necessary to conform strategies to work with the regional plans and how they need to be tightly connected. Would like LEAG to look at how the lead entity citizen and technical advisors are tied into the local government (both tribal and local government) to the lists. The Chair is willing to meet with the local groups (city and county councils) to make sure everyone knows what is going on and to make sure the lists are the highest priority projects and supported locally.

Chair Ruckelshaus posed the following issues for LEAG consideration and response:

- Define measurable success and share with the Board
- Provide the best possible projects
- Ensure projects happen
- Determine how local governments are involved – lead entities should tie in closely with regional planning boards
- Assess to determine the right strategies

Doug thanked the Chair for his willingness to meet with the local governments and looks forward to the challenges set before the LEAG.

Dick provided a topic to start thinking about – evaluating if we still have the right boundaries for lead entities (boundaries were self-selected originally). We probably do, but something to think about. May want to align future efforts more closely by geographic boundaries.

## **2005 MEETING SCHEDULE**

Director Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt the 2005 SRFB meeting schedule as presented. Jim Peters **seconded**. Resolution #2004-10 **approved** as presented.

John Thompson, Whatcom County LE, provided an overview of tomorrow's tour and handed out a packet of information.

## **5<sup>th</sup> ROUND UPDATE**

### *#4a - Estimated funds*

Director Johnson presented this agenda item. She reviewed a handout of budget information highlighting fund sources, possible uses, and a summary of fund demands and availability leaving an estimated \$30.2 million for project funding in the 5<sup>th</sup> grant round.

Brenda McMurray noted that the Board talked about monitoring at its June meeting – what it looks like to invest in this and how much will need to be spent in the next few years. She requested these numbers for the December meeting.

Chair Ruckelshaus said that it is a reasonable request and something the Governor's Forum on Monitoring needs to discuss also.

Rob Kirkwood and Director Johnson will work on gathering these numbers for the December meeting.

The other item Brenda would like the Board to look at is regional recovery plans – this funding was not called out in last year's federal funding, although a letter from Bob Lohn suggested support of these efforts.

Director Johnson pointed out the Lower Columbia request for additional funding for the first 6 months of 2005 for plan implementation. They are requesting an answer at the December board meeting.

The Chair feels this needs to be brought together under a broader policy issue and coordinated through the new governor's office.

Brenda suggested the Board gear up for discussion on broader priorities at its January meeting.

Chair Ruckelshaus thought this could be on the January agenda, if appropriate, but he believes it should be more broadly coordinated.

#### *#4b - Review Panel Process*

Steve Leider presented this agenda item.

Steve reviewed the 5<sup>th</sup> Round process and updated the Board on where the process is to date:

- 188 projects submitted
- 3 deemed ineligible
- 3 withdrawn by lead entities
- 27 projects of concern

Steve discussed the strategies and strategy ratings. There were six categories that were rated – more good strategy ratings in all six categories, few excellent ratings. The Review Panel found ratings for fit of project ranking to be unreliable, given the range of strategy specificity and focus, and thus recommended not using rating of this category. They suggest using the narrative for identifying the level of fit to the strategy.

The Board members discussed this recommendation and how they will make a decision on excellent, good, fair and poor using the narratives. The Board would like to have this process written up.

The final report will be distributed on November 15.

Steve showed different interpretations of the data showing a very closely ranked list – none providing clear, natural breakpoints, just a steadily decreasing line from excellent to good, down to fair and poor.

Craig noted that, although it is a gradual decrease, there is a difference between the top and the bottom strategy ratings listed.

Craig believes that the Board will be able to come up with a way to make decisions. He wants to see the ordering of lead entities by criteria – then how much they are asking for in project order.

Craig also said fit of the list should not be used for those lead entities with a bad focus and specificity. We could use fit of the list for the better lead entities. “Excellent” leaves room for improvement. Narratives are important.

Director Johnson noted with high cost projects at the top of the list that may not be covered in the first increment funding level, it might prove to be a challenge.

#### *4c - Allocation Decision Process*

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4c for details.)

Brenda asked for staff to illustrate the first increment, use narratives to make second increment decisions.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked staff to create funding options.

Two other pieces of information that the Board will be receiving:

- Projects in IMW areas. Are there projects that are either in a controlled area that the Board would not want to fund, and/or others that may be lower on the priority list that are important to the IMW and maybe should be funded? This report will be presented to the Board for consideration.
- Three projects on lists are proposing to do juvenile fish assessments – these are also part of one of the multiple lead entity assessment proposals. These projects are piecemeal where the multi-lead entity assessment would be a coordinated effort.

Jim asked for Board direction on working toward a more coordinated approach through the multiple lead entity assessment process.

Chair Ruckelshaus supports this suggestion.

Director Johnson asked if the Board needed any other information for the December meeting. She noted the November 15 release of the final report to be sent out for comment. Steve and/or Jim will be briefing the Board members on this report.

Brenda would like a report from the Review Panel and Technical Advisors, giving their input on this cycle. Steve indicated that the Review Panel is preparing a summary of comments for the Board, suggesting it be delivered after the 5<sup>th</sup> Round funding decisions. After discussion, it was decided that there will be enough information in the report but she would still like to see an opportunity for the Review Panel to meet with the Board at a future meeting.

## **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES, Continued**

Brenda presented her recommended changes to the June 2004 minutes and **MOVED** to adopt the June 24 and 25, 2004 minutes as amended and the September OWEB/SRFB minutes as presented. Jim Peters **SECONDED**. Both sets of minutes were **APPROVED**.

## **5<sup>th</sup> ROUND UPDATE, Continued**

### *#4d - Multiple Lead Entity Assessments*

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. Jim reviewed the history of this agenda item. Announcement went out – received eight requests on October 8. Two projects were found ineligible leaving six projects requesting \$2.8 million.

Jim reviewed the marine nearshore request and the Board earlier approved that Jim work with the other projects on the lead entity lists that cover portions of the Puget Sound.

Tim believes the Board does need to figure out a way to better coordinate the different efforts going on around the Sound – may not be able to get all the way there in this grant cycle but will be able to get closer with an incremental approach to get to a coordinated effort.

The proposal goes with the philosophy that when assessing the Puget Sound, there is a need to cover a broader area and not take a piecemeal approach or end up with large gaps.

A question for the Board: If it decides to not fund the larger effort, does it still fund the individual projects even though this may be more of a piecemeal approach?

Brenda noted that this was her concern back in June when the multiple lead entity assessment project requests went out after the lead entity lists were already far along in their process.

Jim circulated a draft RFP and met with LEAG prior to the release of the notice. There was concern about favoritism toward the Puget Sound since there are smaller lead entities in the area; in areas where there is a larger lead entity covering multiple watersheds in its area, it is not eligible. The reason for this process was to encourage coordination between lead entities where a single lead entity is already able to coordinate projects across watersheds.

Doug shared LEAG concerns with the process:

- These multi lead entity assessments won't be compared with the lead entity strategies, and
- The funds going toward these projects should not be taken away from funds going to the lead entity projects.
- There was a clear split within LEAG and a minority report is available to the Board.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked why nearshore assessments are applying only in north Puget Sound and not all of Puget Sound. He went on to say that the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board is one lead entity and a multi-WRIA so it can always submit assessments as part of its normal lead entity process.

Jim Peters asked if there has been an analysis on whether this will facilitate a cost savings or other efficiencies.

Jim Fox said there has been some analysis and that that the Board should get more for its money and good information for future projects and strategies.

Doug reported that for the Puget Sound, this would be key information in helping Puget Sound lead entities identify the best projects.

Brenda asked if this would be better accepted if the projects went through the same rigor as the other projects.

Doug answered that yes, the majority would have preferred waiting until the next grant cycle to implement this process.

*#4e - Small Project Grants – solicitation approval*

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4e for details.)

Jim is requesting approval from the Board to release the Request for Proposal (RFP) for a small project grant program for consideration at the December meeting.

Brenda asked why we would want to farm this out versus administering this process ourselves.

Jim noted that that would be part of the evaluation process along with the amount of matching funds any group can bring to the table.

Jim outlined the 10 criteria for the eligible small project grants program proposals and the 11 evaluation criteria.

Staff is requesting Board approval of the process, to have a subcommittee review this process using the proposed criteria, and bring recommendations to the Board in December.

Brenda asked whether or not it is cost effective to have two grant programs or should this small grant program be wrapped into a normal SRFB grant cycle?

Director Johnson explained that the IAC/SRFB office does handle a lot of different grant programs but they are usually for larger grants. Small grants mean working with more corporate entities, non-profits and may not be the best way to reach constituents. The

pilot project handled the first small project grants very well, but it was hard to show results – where if it was through the SRFB it would be easier to show results.

Brenda doesn't want to add more work to the lead entities but to give them better results.

Doug had the same concerns as Brenda in that this is another process with a fiscal impact. He also heard a lot of positive results from small projects and that other lead entities have small projects that they would like to be able to fund.

The Board discussed pros and cons on a small project grant program.

One thing that may be missing from the proposed RFP is to state the amount of the grant. The Board may want to identify the amount for projects.

Brenda also didn't see the time these funds would be available – she suggested a one-year program.

Director Johnson suggested not specifying the timeframe or the amount of money but make the requestor lay out the plans for money needed, time, and geographic range.

Jim Peters **moved** to have the RFP prepared and offered for bid. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Board approved.

#### *#4f Project Ineligible Policy Decision*

Selinda Barkhuis, NOPLÉ lead entity coordinator, requested the Board change the third ranked project, #04-1546 Sadie/Susie Barrier Removals, to an eligible project. This is a barrier removal on land owned by DNR, which is under Forest & Fish Program guidelines to be replaced within the next fifteen years. The Board had determined that Board policy would be to not fund projects that are legally obligated, which this project is.

Selinda raised the following three points:

- This project has full support of LE group
- Was told that the project would be eligible
- Amendment that made project ineligible

This is a very important project to the lead entity.

This project also falls in the IMW area.

Director Johnson clarified the process by which the determination of ineligibility was made. At its December 2003 meeting, the Board discussed the 5<sup>th</sup> Round and, using discretion in RCW 75.46.170 (8), made the policy decision that projects otherwise required by Forest & Fish would be ineligible.

Dick asked Craig to answer the DNR's plan to fix these projects.

Craig noted that the current SFRB policy may not be the best way to handle this project. The DNR thought that this project would be eligible for funding. DNR is spending a lot of money doing its job to fix the blockages on its land. Where there is a regulatory requirement but the entity doesn't have the funds to meet the requirement, then the Board has stepped in and provided funds to get similar work done.

Discussed the eligibility issue and whether or not to fund this project.

Craig would like to have the board reconsider this project and at a later date have a policy discussion on the eligibility issue. What he recalls from the December 2003 meeting was that the Board was indecisive on this issue.

Jim Peters provided his input on this issue and if the board wants to look at this policy in the next grant cycle then that is fine, but this cycle was clear in it not being an eligible project.

Craig had the discussion with the regional manager about the priority of this project – there is no new information in DNR to change the priority.

Selinda reported that this project is #3 on their list and they will not remove it from their list so the Board will be seeing the project in December.

Chair Ruckelshaus cautioned the Board not to lose sight of what is best for the fish and that it is up to the lead entity whether or not they want to leave the project on their list. Will look at authority to be able to waive this process.

Director Johnson noted that staff would get policy manuals and previous discussions to the Board for review prior to the December meeting.

Public Testimony:

John Sims, WRIA 21 Lead Entity, also has an ineligible project they believe is a valuable project for coho – they are also keeping it on their list. The locals believe the DNR 10-year timeline is too far out and that the project needs to be funded sooner. Would like the Board to discuss local projects being brought forward even if it is on the DNR list. (John reported later that the project is scheduled more than 10 years out.)

Craig appreciates the time the Board spent on this issue.

## **MONITORING ISSUES**

### *#5a – Monitoring Updates*

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item.

He provided an update on the Governor's Forum on Monitoring. A subcommittee will be convened before the next Forum meeting to help prioritize the budget requests.

The Forum members were provided with presentations on federal, state, and local levels of data gathering efforts.

Bruce also updated the Board on SRFB funded monitoring efforts. Ecology and WDFW have been very active in putting together the IMWs and they are on schedule and budget.

Bruce has been very pleased with the contractor, Tetra Tech. They have completed their summer's work and are working with us to incorporate the data into the PRISM database to go into the pyramid roll up all the way to the PCSRF reporting.

Next week Bruce will be presenting monitoring efforts by Washington State at the American Fisheries Society meeting in Stevenson.

Bruce has been getting calls from other groups with interest in the state's monitoring efforts.

Dick would like to see the IMW reports in one report, not separate documents since it is harder to keep track of the efforts. He would also like to see an executive summary and information that is easy for the public to understand.

Chair Ruckelshaus suggested working with Susan to get this information out to the public on what has been happening with monitoring.

#### *#5b – Status and Trends Monitoring*

Bruce introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #5b for details.)

Dr. Timothy Quinn and Dr. William Ehinger provided a presentation on this agenda item.

Request is for a decision on continuing to fund status and trends monitoring at the December Board meeting.

Dick complimented the coordinated efforts that are happening in the monitoring efforts.

Status and trends concept presentation. Provides feedback on current conditions and changes through time over a broad geographic area. Can't afford to do IMWs in all watersheds – too expensive. Therefore, it is necessary to have broad scale status/trends data to complement IMW work.

Questions to ask when planning status/trends:

1. What to monitor
2. Where to monitor
3. How to monitor

Many things can be monitored and need to limit what is being monitored

Annual budget estimates per sampling frame to measure all five domains will cost roughly \$1,005,256.

As data points get added each year, you will be able to see status and trends in a WRIA but it would take about five years to get to that point.

A subcommittee of the Monitoring Forum will look at budget requests, and by December this Board will know what should be funded. Still need governor's budget and what other efforts still need funding.

Brenda wants to know what questions we are trying to answer with this, who are we providing the information to, and what will the information be used for. This should be answered for the Board before each funding request.

Bruce believes he can clearly list the questions that are being answered.

Tim Smith believes this is clearly what the Monitoring Forum was set up for; we need to get this work coordinated.

Tim Quinn expressed thanks to Bruce for keeping this issue on the front burner and that the Forum has a greater chance of success due to what has been done so far.

#### **ADMINISTRATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

Brenda McMurray presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.)

Brenda provided background on the unspent funds issue and possible options for handling these unspent funds.

Dick believes clarity and being up front in this process is key and that feedback is needed from the lead entities. Hope to make the decision at a meeting soon, possibly in January.

Jim Peters asked about the projects that have delayed starts. Are there ways to take care of this in another way, depending on why it fails? Brenda reported that the current process would stay in place. If it is permitting delays or other delays that just a little time would help, then additional time would be allowed for on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Ruckelshaus believes it might be helpful to look at the best practices in this field to see how others handle this situation. Look earlier and later in the incentives – make sure the proposals are the most cost efficient and at the other end make sure the project has been successful.

Mark discussed the need to award the project sponsors who get done and provide feedback along the way.

Doug Osterman noted that it is to the advantage of the lead entities to stay in contact with the project sponsors. Suggested Brenda incorporate the lead entity into the process.

Tim Smith talked about the reappropriation needs. Laura noted that the IAC is under direct orders from the legislature to complete projects in four years. Conservation Commission has a two-year cycle.

Dick is now acting regional manager for the SW Regional Office and although he will continue with his SRFB duties he has asked to be able to step down from the Administrative Subcommittee. Mark Clark has volunteered to take Dick's spot.

### **GSRO REPORT**

Chris Drivdahl presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #8 for details.)

Chris invited the Board to the Lower Columbia Regional Recovery Plan hand-over event on December 15 in Vancouver. Many dignitaries will be invited to this event.

Chris then highlighted the State of the Salmon Report and what will be in this report. Since the Governor always wants to know if the report will be understandable to "Aunt Betsy," Chris has been working with Susan Zemek to make sure this report is understandable. The other question he asks is "What is success and when will we know we have reached recovery?" This is a hard question to answer but this report will have charts showing where we are.

Chris then discussed implementation and funding of salmon recovery and watershed health efforts. This is a proposal being discussed with the groups involved in salmon recovery and watershed health. There is a lot of work to do but this is a recommendation for taking the next steps in recovery.

Jim Peters suggested adding some of the tribal projects that were funded through other sources besides the SRFB.

The GSRO is required to provide a report every two years and the SRFB also needs to provide a report every two years. Susan is working on the SRFB report.

### **REGIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION - UPDATE**

Jim Kramer presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.) Joel Fruedenthal joined Jim in his presentation.

Jim discussed the handout.

Jim Peters asked that they be sure that they are sensitive to the tribal efforts and not portray this as another group taking over the co-management activities.

Dick noted that this is really talking about governance at different scales – what he tries to talk about is shared governance – no one wants to give up their level of governance but need to coordinate efforts and get others involved.

The Chair reported to Jim that the Board has received a request from the Lower Columbia Board for funding to implement its plan. He would like to get Jim's feedback on this request.

Jim reported that they would discuss this issue at the next regional recovery group. Although the Puget Sound Recovery Region is slated to go away after presentation of the plan, they believe they will still need six months to get things underway.

### **NEXT FUNDING CYCLE PREPARATION**

Jim Fox presented this agenda item.

- What influence will recovery plans have?
- Should the ITF be called upon?
- Should we form a workgroup of lead entities, RFEGs, and others?
- Or, should it be just a staff decision?

Need to include comments from all the groups.

Doug Osterman wants to discuss with lead entities again what impact regional plans will have on the 6<sup>th</sup> Round, even though LEAG's preliminary opinion stated that "the regional plans would have no significant bearing on the lead entity lists of projects, priorities, and strategies."

Jim Kramer's information was a new piece and the LEAG would like to have time to review this information and bring the thoughts back to the board at a later date.

Public Testimony:

Richard Brocksmith asked to provide testimony but due to time constraints graciously decided not to.

On October 29, SRFB members took a tour of several Whatcom County projects.

The business meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m. on October 28.

SRFB APPROVAL:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Ruckelshaus, Chair

12/3/04  
Date

Future Meetings:                    December 2 & 3, 2004 – Tumwater, Washington

**RESOLUTION SRFB #2004 - 10**

*2005 SRFB MEETING SCHEDULE*

**BE IT RESOLVED**, the schedule for 2005 Regular Meetings of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board is hereby adopted as follows:

January	6, 2005	Thursday
February	10 & 11, 2005	Thursday-Friday
April	14 & 15, 2005	Tuesday-Wednesday
May	12, 2005	Thursday (IAC/SRFB)
June	9 & 10, 2005	Thursday-Friday
July	18 & 19, 2005	Monday-Tuesday
October	27 & 28, 2005	Thursday-Friday
December	1 & 2, 2005	Thursday-Friday

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, staff is directed to publish notice in the State Register accordingly.

**Note:** Unless otherwise announced, all sessions of the Board adopted above shall be regular sessions of the Board, and may include from time to time site tours and workshop format sessions.

Resolution moved by: Brenda McMurray

Resolution seconded by: Jim Peters

Adopted / Declined (underline result)

Date: October 28, 2004