

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

## MINUTES – JOINT MEETING WITH OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD

As amended at June Meeting

April 29 & 30, 2004

Water Resources Education Center  
Vancouver, Washington

Day 1

---

### **SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

---

### **JOINT MEETING OF THE WASHINGTON SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD AND THE OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD**

The joint meeting was opened at 1:45 p.m. by the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) Co-Chair Dan Haegerty.

All those sitting at the table introduced themselves.

### **WELCOMING REMARKS – MOVING AHEAD AS A REGION TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION EFFORTS**

SRFB Chair Bill Ruckelshaus provided his welcoming comments, including information about the President's National Ocean Council of which he is a part. The Chair discussed the need to break down political and geographic boundaries to coordinate salmon recovery on an eco-regional basis. The Ocean Council suggested organizing a regional structure around the eco-regions. It will be two to five years before this is put in place, giving local governments and citizens a chance to provide input. Today's meeting is very symbolic and a first step in coordinating issues in a joint manner.

### **MONITORING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RESTORATION EFFORTS – THE POWER OF REGIONAL COORDINATION**

Bruce Crawford, SRFB Monitoring Manager, provided a PowerPoint presentation giving an overview of SRFB monitoring efforts.

Hugh Barrett, US Bureau of Land Management, asked Bruce a question concerning Washington's monitoring methods and whether the effectiveness of a project is based on fish return.

Bruce replied that reach scale project effectiveness is determined by measuring a control

against an impact area for significant change. Bruce said that he would also like to implement the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) approach where water quality, habitat, and fish are measured at the same time and location over broad scale areas of Washington. Looking into coordinating efforts with the Forest Service Aquatic Conservation Strategy that uses upland indicators in monitoring of watersheds.

Kemper McMaster, Oregon Fish and Wildlife, asked what type of fish are monitored – ESA or all fish species. Bruce answered that the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund is specific toward listed or candidate salmon and steelhead species and, in some instances, bull trout.

Kelly Moore, OWEB Monitoring Policy Advisor, provided a PowerPoint presentation giving a broad overview of OWEB monitoring efforts. Kelly also discussed coordination efforts between Washington and Oregon.

It was asked how often it is reported when a project was a failure or what restoration efforts didn't work. Kelly responded that, while there is technical feedback on what worked and what didn't, in terms of what percentage of our investments paid off, we don't have the information to answer that question yet.

Larry Cassidy, SRFB member, asked about the change in hatchery efforts in Oregon. Kelly explained that because of restrictions on ocean fishing and limited hatchery production, they are finding more wild fish returns.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about how monitoring is important to the SRFB as a means to see what the results are from the money being spent. Congress needs to know what we are getting for the funds spent and how long the funding needs to continue.

Dave Powers, EPA, talked about the information being gathered and sharing efforts starting to be put in place in the past couple years. How to gather and share information is one of the key questions the group needs to answer.

Jen Bayer, US Geological Survey, provided an overview of Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP). Jen asked members of PNAMP in the audience to introduce themselves.

Steve Waste, Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC), feels this is the right group to coordinate the monitoring efforts. Would like to see this group move from an ad hoc committee to a more formal effort.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the PNAMP group and expressed how important their efforts are. Developing pilot projects such as PNAMP at the regional level was recommended in the ocean conditions report and we need to be sure there is funding to keep this effort going.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS FOR THE NORTHWEST – THE POWER OF A SINGLE CURRENCY FOR COMMUNICATING RESULTS**

Gail Achterman, Director, Institute for Natural Resources, Oregon State University, provided a PowerPoint presentation giving an overview of the development and use of indicators. She explained how indicators are used to make comparisons and perceive trends and patterns,

which enable us to make changes. Need to reduce the 15 basin condition indicators to four indexes – water quality, biological integrity, riparian characteristics, and fish abundance and distribution. Gail has a larger view of the Pacific Northwest Region – not just Washington and Oregon, but also Idaho, Montana, Alaska, Northern California, British Columbia, and a bit of Nevada and Wyoming.

Chris Drivdahl, Washington State Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), provided a PowerPoint presentation overview of Washington's Salmon Recovery Indicators. The Salmon Recovery Scorecard, which began with 39 biological indicators, has been reduced to 12 of the highest level indicators called the Dozen Dials. GSRO staff is working on a State of Salmon in Watersheds report due to the Legislature in December, 2004, which will include the Dozen Dials, current status of indicators, and what is being done to address problems.

#### Table Discussion:

Dick Wallace, Washington State Department of Ecology, discussed what that agency is doing with the monitoring efforts and explained some of the indicators they need to measure.

Tim Smith, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), noted that the status and use of indicators is critical and a challenge for WDFW is the difference of life cycles of the different species.

Craig Partridge, Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), reported that public and elected representatives are demanding information on what is being presented. Need to decide what kind of stories we want to tell.

Michael Tehan, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), discussed the need to collect information to show how productive recovery efforts have been. Will be difficult to find a common set of measurements for both Oregon and Washington. We should look for indicators on both scales that we could come together on.

Jim Brown, Oregon Governor's Natural Resources Policy Director, asked whether the average person would understand what we are trying to say. We now focus more on technical and policy issues but need to answer the questions that the common person will be asking, such as: Can I take my family fishing?; Will fish prices be reasonable?; Will my drinking water cost more?, etc. May use different indicators to answer the average person's questions, and that is okay. Need to answer the right question at the right level.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted there is a need to make sure the public is asking the right questions. Need to answer questions on the minds of people but need to educate the legislators on questions that should be asked and how to answer.

Dave Powers, EPA, made the point that regardless of which indicators we choose, we need to pick something that can use the data that we're already collecting, rather than creating indicators that we won't be able to generate answers for.

Hugh Barrett, BLM, talked about cause and effect and how specific measurements, when turned into useable data, can have a big influence.

OWEB Co-Chair Heagerty commented that there are multiple views and multiple agency

objectives and that clear and effective communication is critical. It is important to remember the difference between indicators and monitoring.

## **OPEN DISCUSSION OF WORKING PRINCIPLES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION BY SRFB, OWEB, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES**

OWEB Co-Chair Jane O’Keeffe called on several attendees to comment on the value of a combined effort from the perspective of their entity’s role in the region and whether there is any potential value of this combined effort to their agency’s role and mission.

Melinda Eden, NWPC, discussed the need for a pilot project in the Walla Walla area.

Kemper McMaster discussed his thoughts on indicators and asked where the corporate world is in this discussion.

Joe Scordino, NOAA, is pleased to see the states coming together and discussing coordinated monitoring efforts and common indicators. Still unable to answer all the questions about performance measurements – hopeful this discussion today will move us toward the answers. In Fiscal Year 04 appropriation markup, a statement made by the appropriators reads “The committee remains concerned that it lacks assurances that funding provided for Pacific salmon will contribute to the recovery of species listed.” Validation monitoring is what congress wants but recovery doesn’t happen overnight. The Office of Management and Budget plans to increase requirements on the states with projects funded and results. Joe gave a challenge to also engage California and Idaho to make this a comprehensive cohesive effort.

Cal Joyner, USDA Forest Service, would like to see the joint boards’ attention and energy focus on what data is gathered so that the information is usable. He feels the PNAMP efforts are successful and we should offer to help guide and finance their activities.

John Iani, EPA Regional Administrator, is in awe of what Alaska has in fishery resources and how Oregon and Washington are working together. We’ve got to be able to show that the money is having a measured benefit, and we can’t do that if we’re not taking measures and putting in protections based on the science and monitoring that you all are providing. We have a responsibility to provide examples of the good work we’re all doing.

Elaine Brong, Oregon State Director, BLM, is excited to see the two states coming together to get answers and make a difference.

Bob Nichols, Washington State Governor’s Senior Natural Resources Policy Assistant, noted the importance of telling a clear story that isn’t too technical. One concern is if the data cross walks with what is being done in Oregon and with the federal agencies.

Jim Brown is concerned about the questions that need to be answered at the top of the pyramid.

OWEB Co-Chair Haegerty would like to have the SRFB and OWEB meet again in six months and continue working together on monitoring and indicators.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about how important today’s meeting is. The policy questions and

scientific questions are critical to identify. We need to work closely with both the policy makers and the scientists.

George Brown, OWEB member, commented on the need to include the congressional delegation – at least keep their staff involved in what is happening to make sure they know what both groups are trying to do and listen to what they are telling us. We need to put a strong group together to go to Washington, D.C., to tell our story. There is also a need to start an educational program.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that Tim Smith is the one that is responsible for that in Washington State.

Scott Reed, OSU Extension Service, encouraged greater SRFB work with the WSU Extension Service. The extension services are already connected with thousands of landowners and both Oregon and Washington need to work with the them to get the story out.

OWEB Co-Chair Haegerty discussed the need to demonstrate to congressional funders what is being done. We're a much stronger voice if we're combined and have a focused, pro-active approach.

Bobby Brunoe, OWEB member, noted that the tribal council shares the same views as this group. Important to tell the stories so the tribal members understand the issues. Fisheries are very important to his tribe. Culturally it may be different, but a lot of commonality exists.

OWEB Co-Chair O'Keeffe thanked those who put today's meeting together for all their work.

OWEB Co-Chair Haegerty asked for a commitment to meet again as a group. Chair Ruckelshaus agreed to the need for another joint meeting.

The formal meeting ended at about 5:10 p.m.

## **PRESENTATION OF WESTERN DIVISION AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENT AWARD TO SRFB AND OWEB**

Keith Wolf, President-elect of the North Pacific International Chapter, American Fisheries Society (AFS), provided a PowerPoint presentation giving a brief overview of the AFS and what this group does. He offered an invitation to attend a conference in November in Skamania, hosted by the Chapter, covering the same topics as presented at today's meeting.

Keith presented this year's Western Division Conservation Achievement Awards to the OWEB and the SRFB for their contribution to aquatic resources conservation. The Boards and staff were recognized for their work in this effort.

Keith thanked the Board Chairs and Agency Directors for their direction and leadership. Bruce Crawford and Kelly Moore were highlighted for their outstanding performance in tackling regional issues and ability to bring people together.

An Award of Merit was presented to Bruce Crawford for his significant contributions to fishery resources.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked Keith on behalf of the members of the SRFB. He noted the staff effort behind this and that the plaque will be displayed in the Olympia office.

OWEB Co-Chair Haegerty expressed his thanks to Keith on behalf of the OWEB members and recognized staff for their work.

Joint meeting recessed for the evening reception and dinner at 5:25 p.m.

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

## MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

April 29 & 30, 2004

Water Resource Education Center  
Vancouver, Washington

Day 2

---

### ***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Jim Peters	Olympia
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Stu Trefry	Designee, Conservation Commission

---

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 8:25 a.m.

### **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 2004 MEETING MINUTES**

The Chair had one change to the minutes on the last page, third paragraph, from "he" to "the Development Committee of the Shared Strategy".

Minutes were **approved** as amended.

### **MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS**

#### ***Director's Report***

Director Laura Johnson discussed the OWEB/SRFB joint meeting. The next meeting of the combined group will be scheduled sometime in the fall, possibly in the Walla Walla or Hood River area. This may mean an additional meeting for the Board.

Staff will continue to work on monitoring issues and will look to the Board for direction on other staff priorities.

The Chair said one of the Oregon members suggested hearing from watershed groups at the next joint meeting to see how they are working.

Larry Cassidy feels SRFB needs to play a very direct role with OWEB on how the monitoring goes forward. He is concerned about using the hatchery fish less but keeping the hatcheries open.

Director Johnson discussed the changes coming for IAC due to Debra Wilhelmi's departure from the agency. The agency will continue to follow Debra's example in technology, accountability, and data management efforts.

IAC is currently recruiting for a Public Information Officer. Hope to announce selection at the June meeting.

The June meeting is the Board's last chance to make any changes to the 5<sup>th</sup> Round.

The Chair asked about the timeline for the Board to begin discussion on the ways to rate the projects for funding allocation. Director Johnson replied that this, and other 5<sup>th</sup> Round issues, would be discussed under Topic #4 of today's agenda.

### ***Financial Report***

Director Johnson presented this agenda item.

SRFB received final approval from NOAA on fiscal '04 funding – still don't know exactly what the amount will be but should be between \$19 million and \$20.7 million. Federal funding for '05 will be a challenge.

Larry Cassidy discussed the need to work with Oregon and Idaho on salmon recovery efforts. He is concerned with some of the ways the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PACSRF) money is being spent on items that don't fall under the ESA.

Director Johnson reported the good news is that the Pacific Northwest is working much better together.

Tim Smith said the challenge he sees is that some believe that we are getting too much money.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the recent news release on how hatchery salmon will be counted with wild salmon. He provided the history behind this decision and possible outcomes. Discussed how the news release may not have all the facts straight.

Larry reported that this is the biggest policy change since he's been working on the hatchery issue. Will need to do a good job of educating the public and media on this issue.

Director Johnson discussed the need for the SRFB to work on the budget in June. Both operating and capital budgets need to be prepared in late summer so will need an approval in concept of the 05-07 budget request to present to the Governor. Some suggestions are:

- Lead entity program
- Support for transition to regional recovery plans
- Continuation of FFFP Program
- Programmatic support – as in the past
- Sponsor support efforts (technical and permitting assistance) by hosting a biennial conference for sponsors

Director Johnson, Jim Fox, or Rollie Geppert will make follow-up phone calls to the Board members for additional ideas.

Director Johnson would like to have the SRFB and IAC Board meet jointly since there are many similar projects being funded. Probably be a half-day meeting within the next year.

Director Johnson discussed several of the items that both Boards are working on and overlap between.

Craig Partridge noted that acquisition and permanency are two issues that are of interest to both boards.

Brenda McMurray believes it is a good idea to have both boards meet together and that a combined story would be a good way to make a bigger impact.

Craig asked whether staff are working together to match projects with better funding sources. Director Johnson said yes, in an informal way, but that schedules don't always match.

### ***Projects Report***

Rollie Geppert introduced this agenda item.

Rollie provided an update on status of GSRO funded projects – last meeting 46 projects were active, now down to 29.

Application workshops have been completed with good attendance.

The Chair asked again for addition of a new category of completed projects within the 5-year monitoring.

Barb McIntosh and Brian Abbott provided a PowerPoint presentation of three completed projects:

- #00-1912 – Lewis County Public Works Skook Creek Barrier Removal,
- #02-1506 – Fish First Doty Habitat Restoration Project, and
- #00-1845 – Tacoma Water White River Pipeline Crossing

### ***Legislative Report***

Jim Fox presented this agenda item.

Jim gave a review of 2004 legislative action. The proviso that was put on our 2003 budget, which restricted spending for acquisition projects, was removed.

Reported that the Snake River bill to formalize the Snake Regional Recovery Board in statute died in committee. The language was placed in the supplemental capital budget and, therefore, was enacted, but is only valid until the end of the biennium. The Snake Board will be seeking to replace the bill with a more permanent version. Lower Columbia and Snake River are now both statutorily authorized regional entities.

Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, discussed the Milton-Freewater long-term entity in Oregon. He feels the Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council area would be a great opportunity to pilot a coordinated monitoring approach across state boundaries.

### ***Subcommittee Report***

Brenda McMurray presented this agenda item.

Brenda reported that the Subcommittee had nothing for the Board at this time but will be bringing two items to the Board at a future meeting:

- What to do with returned funds.
- Report to the Board on activities to date that the subcommittee has worked on.

### ***Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Report***

Chris Drivdahl, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), presented this agenda item.

- Had briefing from NOAA Fisheries on April 28 on hatchery policy and learned that two stocks will be down-listed.
- State to state policy committees to develop cross-state ESU issues and recovery planning. Should have agreement in place for mid-Columbia soon. Idaho is very reluctant to join in this effort. NOAA has said we will receive some benefits. Snake Board is receptive of a few conditions and the negotiations have begun.
- Regional quarterly reviews – full status report at June meeting.
- Federal review of Biological Opinion of Columbia River Power System is that it will be used as environmental baseline of existing conditions. This will change obligations required of power companies and other entities within the system.

Larry Cassidy commented that the Biological Opinion is a dramatic policy shift and believes there will be lawsuits before this is finally in place.

Discussed the possible effects of the Biological Opinion on the ESA and fish loss.

On a positive note, the Executive Order on monitoring should be completed by next week.

### ***Lead Entity Advisory Group Report***

Brian Walsh presented this agenda item.

Brian discussed the LEAG Retreat held on April 16, 2004. Handouts of the LEAG Retreat Survey Results Summary and a Current Policy Framework diagram were provided. Next step is development of work plans with a follow-up session.

### **MONITORING ISSUES UPDATE**

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item.

Bruce provided a status report on the effectiveness monitoring efforts.

Dr. Bill Ehinger, Department of Ecology, and Dr. Bob Bilby presented information on their progress with Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) efforts.

Timothy Quinn, Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Steve Butkus, Department of Ecology, will provide a detailed presentation on status and trends monitoring at the fall SRFB meeting.

The Chair would like Bruce to make sure the Board is able to fund the status and trends monitoring efforts before too much work goes into it. Director Johnson noted that this could be part of the programmatic funding that the Board will be making a decision on in June.

Brenda McMurray reminded the Board that monitoring data needs to be helpful to the local groups but not add anything to their workload without additional resources.

## 5<sup>TH</sup> ROUND ISSUES

Director Johnson gave a brief introduction of the topics to be covered under this agenda item.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the programmatic process outlined in the memo was acceptable with Board members.

Craig Partridge said in the past the Board had left a door cracked open in case a project came forward so the Board could address it at any time during the year.

Dick Wallace asked if this covered all types of monitoring or just effectiveness monitoring. Director Johnson responded that it would be monitoring with a big umbrella approach. Will need to come back to this issue at the June meeting.

Jim Fox pointed out a letter of request from David Montgomery to discuss the river history project. Kurt Fresh has also submitted a request to testify on a nearshore project proposal.

Director Johnson explained that staff would like to get general direction from the Board today and bring a Request for Proposal to the Board in June for final approval.

### *Public Testimony*

Kurt Fresh, NOAA Fisheries, asked the Board to consider a programmatic Puget Sound nearshore information gathering project. This would be an assessment project covering 20-25% of the Puget Sound – mostly in the San Juan Islands.

Brenda McMurray asked about the programmatic projects funded in the past and how many will come back before the Board for continued funding.

Jim Fox reported on past programmatic projects and those that may come back before the Board for additional funding include Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP), IMWs, WDFW Smolt Monitoring, and WDFW Aquatic Restoration Guidelines.

The Chair would like options developed for decision at the June meeting. Some suggested options were:

- Bias toward funding projects
- Funding cap guideline
- Multi-WRIA projects

Steve Leider, GSRO, updated the Board on Review Panel activities.

Director Johnson complimented Steve Leider and Review Panel members on their good work during the first round of meetings.

The Chair would like to get feedback from the lead entities on how the process is working.

Brenda liked the format in which Steve presented the information and would like to continue to get updates in this format. Would also like to have more feedback from the lead entities and the Review Panel members.

Steve Leider reported that he inadvertently left out one paragraph in the memo. He will update the memo and send the final version to the Board.

Director Johnson noted that the issue of allocation will be challenging and will need to have more sideboards developed. She asked if the Issues Task Force (ITF) would be willing to regroup to help with this issue in an advisory capacity.

Steve Tharinger said he would be willing to pull the ITF together to develop some criteria for the Board.

Steve Leider discussed the strategies and need for the lead entities to clearly answer the questions the Review Panel will be asking to help with rating of the strategies. Another issue for the Review Panel is the progress made from the last round to this – there is currently no way to evaluate this.

Steve Tharinger suggested the ITF meet with the Review Panel to address these issues. The Chair agreed and recommended the two groups get together prior to the Board's meeting in June.

The Board also discussed trying to find a time to have the Review Panel meet with the Board.

### **FAMILY FOREST FISH PASSAGE (FFFP) PROGRAM UPDATE**

Brian Abbott – SRFB staff, Jed Herman – DNR, and Kirk Hanson – DNR Small Forest Landowner Office, presented this agenda item.

Brian gave a PowerPoint presentation on the FFFP Program, highlighting the early success of this effort. In this early action cycle, 35 sites were approved for funding which will open up more than 58 miles of habitat at a cost of \$941,253. There is enthusiasm and support at the local level for this program. The FFFP Program could potentially be a model for a statewide fish passage program.

Jed expressed his appreciation to the regional fish enhancement groups (RFEGs) and the conservation districts that did the necessary fieldwork to gather the information to help make the funding decisions.

Jim Peters asked, if additional restoration projects were found when doing this work, would those come under the lead entity process? Brian answered that it is a possibility, as many of the RFEGs and conservation districts will be working with the landowners. Craig Partridge's impression of this is that there is a lot of fish benefit coming through this small, but efficient, program. He is hopeful the success continues.

Steve Tharinger asked how much demand there might be for this type of funding.

