

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

December 6, 2006

Comfort Inn
Tumwater, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Joe Ryan	Seattle
David Troutt	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
Barb Aberle	Designee, Department of Transportation

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair William Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 9:37 a.m.

The Chair reviewed the agenda and noted the importance of this annual funding meeting, highlighting the work that has gone into the process so far.

The agenda was reviewed and approved as presented.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS

Mark Clark, Conservation Commission, let the Board know that he passed out an annual report from the Conservation Commission. The conservation districts all have a story on activities in their area and many of them highlight Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) projects.

The Conservation Commission just completed a report on the water data pilot project. Mark noted that this information is on the web site.

Steve Tharinger talked about the SRFB project highlighted by the Clallam County Conservation District.

Larry Cassidy reported that the Northwest Power and Conservation Commission (NWPPCC) just completed its funding cycle, for the first time, it did not spend all the money, and created a reserve for future needs.

Tim Smith, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and Jeff Koenings just returned from a trip to Washington DC, where they discussed Pacific Coastal Salmon Coastal Funds (PCSRF) funding. They reported that a continuing resolution was passed at the 2006 level of funding, but they need to wait for the final budget numbers to find out exactly what the funding level will be.

Dick Wallace, Department of Ecology, noted that the water quality standards were adopted since the last meeting. Ecology is on the verge of starting Phase 2 of the stormwater permitting. A lot of new cities need to come under the federal permit coverage. This includes water quality and flow control in redevelopment areas.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the importance of stormwater issues in the Puget Sound Region.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 2006 MEETING MINUTES

Steve Tharinger **MOVED** to approve the September 2006 meeting minutes. Larry Cassidy **SECONDED**. The Board **APPROVED** the minutes as presented.

MANAGEMENT STATUS REPORT:

Director Johnson presented this agenda item (See notebook item #2 for details). The Director reported:

- Neil has decided to go into the private sector and this is his last Board meeting.
- In final phase of hiring a Deputy Director.
- The next big legislative and operation item is the announcement of the Governor's budget. Puget Sound is a big issue for the Governor. As we learn more about the policy decisions on the budget, e-mail updates will be provided to the Board.
- There is about \$17.5 million in the Board's checkbook for this grant cycle, which is more than originally expected. The Board will need to decide what to do with the additional funds. Director Johnson discussed a possibility of bringing options for allocating the additional funds, approximately \$2.5 million to the January meeting.
- The next meeting will be in Olympia at the Natural Resources Building (NRB) on January 25 & 26, 2007. It will be a day and a half at most, as the first half of the January 25 will be reserved for a Monitoring Forum meeting.

The Chair suggested to Susan Zemek that the communication plan should display what is happening with the recovery plans and regional strategies so that it shows consistency with the locally blessed plans. Recovery plans are now driving the salmon recovery funding, which treats the plans as living documents.

The Chair also discussed the allocation of the rest of the funding.

GOVERNORS SALMON RECOVERY OFFICE (GSRO) REPORT:

Chris Drivdahl introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #3 for details.)

The Chair discussed the Senate hearing that was held last week, including the possibility of sunsetting the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO). Chris reported on the functions that the GSRO undertakes.

The Chair noted that the functions are very important, although he doesn't have any say in what agency these actions take place as long as they continue to be undertaken. He reported that Chris did a good job on her testimony.

Chris highlighted that the first draft of the *State of the Salmon* report is due tomorrow. The final report will be out by the end of this month. This was the hardest report she has ever had to pull together in her 30 years of state service. She thanked WDFW and Ecology for their assistance in pulling data together for this report.

The GSRO is also working on a federal permit streamlining process. Bob Bugert has been working on the biological opinion for this effort. Bob Lohn has been invited to the January SRFB meeting to present the results of this work.

Steve Tharinger asked if this is just for federal permits or state permits as well.

Chris noted that they are currently working on federal permits. She is meeting with WDFW soon to start work on streamlining the hydraulic project approvals.

Steve suggested using some of the additional funds to work on this issue.

Larry Cassidy discussed the monitoring efforts and limited funding for monitoring efforts. He asked if Chris was working with Tony Grover on this?

Chris reported that she is working with Tony. The Monitoring Forum has put together a budget packet for monitoring efforts. Steve Leider is working through the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Program (PNAMP) process on standardization of monitoring guidelines.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Chris to explain why the report was so hard to put together.

Chris reported that the agencies were very gracious and helpful, but the data were in different locations and different formats, so at times she got three different answers to the same question. Deadlines were missed by all of the agencies.

The Board discussed how difficult it is to get answers and the need to translate technical data into understandable answers for the public.

LEAD ENTITY ADVISORY GROUP (LEAG) REPORT:

Jeanette Dorner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

Jeanette provided an update from the last two LEAG meetings.

- Would like to see Round 8 (Calendar 2007) start earlier than June 15.
- Working with SRFB staff and lead entities on ways to identify policy issues to start working on them.
- Will need to include this in the January 25 & 26, 2007 meeting.
- Discussing organization and structure of LEAG.
- Figuring out how LEAG can best represent the different organizations across the state.
- Agreed to a membership representing all 25 lead entities with an executive group of nine.
- Will be working with WDFW to do a presentation at the February LEAG and March SRFB meetings.
- LEAG is working on ways to help with the streamlining of state permits. There is very strong support for looking at the state permitting process. Jeanette will talk to Chris about the GSRO to coordinate their efforts.
- Thanked the WDFW for organizing a Lead Entity Day at the Legislature. This will be on March 23, 2007. This is a good opportunity for lead entities to highlight their efforts, including what is happening around the state.
- Thanked Neil Aaland for his good work and efforts to help out the LEAG. They will miss him.

The Chair agreed with the importance of this work. He suggested that LEAG also look at federal permitting. He asked staff to pull together groups involved with this to help coordinate the efforts (federal, state, and local). He wants staff to structure a larger effort with the LEAG efforts so they are the most efficient.

Barb Aberle reported that Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) spent a lot of time on this issue with the Transportation Permit Efficiency and Accountability Committee (TPEAC) process and suggested looking at this effort to see what can be gleaned from it. Barb volunteered to help Jeanette with this effort.

Dick Wallace also suggested going to the Governor's Office of State Permitting Assistance and encouraged them to work on this.

Steve Tharinger believes that the LEAG can get feedback from the project sponsors and local entities and provide this information to the federal, state and local agencies involved in the permitting efforts.

Chair Ruckelshaus wants to identify a process to help LEAG and agencies involved to work through this using existing processes as much as possible.

Steve Tharinger asked for Jeanette's comments on the lead entities to regions and SRFB allocation process. Is it more a lead entity-to-regions issue or are the concerns more at the SRFB level?

Jeanette noted that it is both. She will be coming to the Board with a joint suggestion to help coordinate these efforts. There will be a lot of issues before the Board in order to start the process earlier and to stick with a December funding meeting for 2007.

Steve hopes it is only a tweaking of the SRFB process and that most of the adjustments will be at the regional level.

Jeanette agreed that it is probably just a bit of tweaking of the SRFB process. It is still a challenge to get everything in place and to start the process early.

Director Johnson agreed that the January and March meetings will be quite a challenge to get everything done, but believes it is doable. She also wanted to remind everyone that the March meeting will be held during the middle of the state budget cycle. Staff will not be able to provide exact numbers. Percentages might be provided, since the federal budget will still be underway.

David Troutt believes hearing a commitment from the Board on the major policy decisions by the March meeting would be helpful, so that things are ready to go once the budget is finalized.

Dick Wallace discussed that this was a transitional year. Issues will be identified to work on for this next grant round. Timing is an issue, so the Board may want to minimize other changes for the next round, so that can stay with the earlier grant date.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about how important the legislative day of March 23 is and how this is an opportunity to brief legislators on how the process works. Many of the legislators don't know how the lead entity process works, since they weren't in office when the process started.

Jeanette reported that Neil and Susan had put together talking points for the lead entities. Steve Martin and Alex Conley have drafted a template for lead entities to send to legislators in their areas as well.

2006 GRANT ROUND REPORT- Introduction

Neil Aaland presented this section of the report. (See notebook item #5a for details.)

- a) Introduction
- b) The 2006 Process
- c) SRFB Allocation Decisions

Neil reviewed the introductory portion of the report.

2006 GRANT ROUND REPORT – Review Panel Comments on Regional Processes and Evaluations of Strategies and Projects

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

- a) Reviews of Regional Processes
- b) Strategies and Fit of Lists to Strategies
- c) Evaluation of Projects
- d) Projects of Concern

After Steve reviewed this portion of the report he invited members of the Review Panel to provide their comments on this grant round.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Steve if the Review Panel attended the local meetings.

Steve noted that the Review Panel was invited to a couple of the local review meetings and that it was helpful for them to listen and learn about the local process. Some of the regions did not invite the panel to their review meetings. Steve thought this was due to a combination of not realizing this option was available and scheduling difficulties.

The Chair asked if it would have been helpful to have more interaction with the local scientific review panels.

Steve thought that it might be, and suggested the Chair ask this question to the review panel members. Steve reported that most of the Review Panel's time was spent on the evaluation of projects. There were three subcommittees that reviewed special projects including passage, marine nearshore, and assessment projects. The assessment subgroup was added for this grant cycle.

Dick Wallace asked how the projects of concern (POC) were resolved, either by withdrawing the projects or by making changes to the project?

Rollie Geppert reviewed how the projects were changed, noting that most of the potential POC labeling was removed through better understanding of the projects, adjustments to the projects, or conditioning the projects. Only a small number of projects were actually withdrawn from the list.

Steve Tharinger asked about the number of projects changing from 187 to 115.

Steve Leider suggested asking various lead entities to report on this as many of them were working through the preliminary submittal of projects. Projects may have been removed due to not being ready for this grant round or receiving funds from other sources.

The Review Panel members came forward to provide their comments. All of the review panel members were in attendance at this meeting except Paul Schlenger.

Steve Leider thanked Neil, Rollie and staff for their work in this process and he also thanked the Review Panel for their work.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the Review Panel for their work.

Steve Toth is a hydrologist in Seattle. He served on the SRFB's Technical Panel in rounds three through six and has expertise in watershed analyses, evaluating surface water and groundwater hydrology, surveying channel morphology and fish habitat.

Tom Slocum is a district engineer for the conservation districts of San Juan, Skagit, Whatcom and Whidbey Island. He has expertise in engineering, permitting, project management, construction inspection and project monitoring related to salmon habitat restoration, erosion control and stormwater management. He served on the Review Panel in round 6.

Tom Robinson is a consultant in Olympia. He was a Department of Natural Resources regional manager based in Forks. He served on the Review Panel in round six.

Scott Nicolai is a consultant in Ellensburg. He works as a habitat and water coordinator on fisheries projects in the Yakima Nation. He served on the Review Panel in rounds four and six.

Pat Powers is an engineer for Anchor Environmental in Seattle. He is nationally recognized as an expert in aquatic habitat restoration and fish passage. He also was a prime contributor to the recently published WDFW report titled, *Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines*. He served on the Review Panel in round six.

Jeanette Smith is a consultant in Seattle. She served on the SRFB's Review Panel in rounds three through six and has expertise in aquatic ecology.

Paul Schlenger was unable to attend today's meeting. This was Paul's second year on the panel. He is an engineer for Anchor Environmental in Seattle. He is a fisheries scientist with expertise in salmon ecology, forage fish, instream flow incremental methodology, and salmon conservation and restoration work in Puget Sound nearshore. He served on the panel in round six.

The Chair asked the panel members to give their impressions of this process. Do they have the right assignments or is there something the Board should be considering doing differently?

Steve Leider reported that as part of the panel's work, they will be providing the Board with a report on their observations and findings.

Steve Toth fully supports more interaction with the federal Technical Recovery Team (TRT) and the SRFB Review Panel. Many comments have been made on this work being duplicative, but he found that the reviews are very different and very important.

Pat Powers stressed the need to have a site visit. When there has been a site visit and a complete application has been submitted the process proves to be much easier.

Jeanette Smith noted that when they were able to make the site visits it was easier to assist the project sponsors with the projects.

Tom Robinson was uncomfortable with his role and found some of the strategies were 70 pages long. He only had time to analyze answers rather than to look at the questions the Board had asked him to answer. He later looked for anomalies. He didn't analyze the information because there wasn't time for this. He did attend one citizen committee meeting. At the time he didn't see the benefit of this, but later found this to be a very valuable process. He wanted to voice his frustration with the process. If the Board wants him to look at the recovery plans, then what is he supposed to be looking for?

The Chair noted that the Board does need to rely on the TRT and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) process to review the plans and to use the correct process to continue from where they are. He is not sure what the added value is for the additional review either.

Dick Wallace asked what scale the TRT's are working on, regional level or project level?

Steve Leider reported that depending on the area, some are reviewing at the regional level where others are at the project level.

Scott Nicolai believes the real benefit is the site specific review that the panel is doing.

Jeanette Smith would include that they don't usually talk about how the project fits into the strategy or plan. Maybe that is the question they are supposed to ask, or that may be the TRT's role. She thought this might be one of the problems.

Tom Slocum saw a theme year after year, which is that the projects are developed at the local level and then the Review Panel comes to review the projects on a statewide basis. Tom believes that preallocation helped to limit the number of opportunistic projects submitted. Most of the lists have better projects through this preallocation process. He believes the projects have improved since he began working on the panel.

Larry Cassidy asked if the first step the panel takes is to identify whether the projects are on the ground or not? He looks harder at these projects as he is a strong believer in getting them on the ground.

Jeanette Smith noted that yes, they are more concerned with the assessment type projects. They still need conversations with the applicants so that they can understand the intent and approach for the assessments.

Steve Tharinger understands Tom's frustration and believes the definition of the Review Panel may be focused more on the ground since that isn't what the TRT does. Is that what the panel is saying?

Jeanette Smith agreed, except for in areas that are still working on strategies. She believes the areas need to know that they can ask for review and assistance with their strategies.

Steve Leider noted that "on-the-ground" means the Review Panel is more involved in the local process right up front.

Steve Tharinger wants to make sure the panel isn't seen as overseeing the details.

Steve Toth has heard from several of the lead entities that they would like to see more technical assistance on the projects and process but that not all lead entities feel this way.

The Chair believes we need to identify the roles of all these different groups and make sure we aren't creating a gap in assistance. This needs to be worked out before the next round starts.

Steve Leider commented that teams are working on projects as they are trying to work towards recovery plan implementation. Shortly, we'll be seeing more implementation plans and habitat work schedules. Some of us have questions that we have not worked through yet. For instance, what is the SRFB interest in those if they become the basis for transitioning from the plan to the project list? Where and when are those reviewed to your satisfaction, so that you know how they relate to the recovery plan?

The Chair believes that it would be useful to have a conversation between technical people at all levels. However, if the TRT also has the responsibility of making sure things are consistent with the work plans, when would it become redundant?

Joe Ryan wants to see a chart that shows who does what and identifies redundancy or gaps as it relates to TRT, the Review Panel and locals.

Tom Robinson noted that all lead entities and regions are at different levels. What works in Puget Sound may not work on the Coast or in Upper Columbia. The needs are different. Basing the identity and role of the group on each area is important.

Mark Clark had a lot of thoughts although some may be for future rounds. He thanked the panel for their work. Mark would like to see if the projects that have had site reviews have fewer amendments are done on time, within budget, and more efficient than the

ones that were not site reviewed. They need to identify how much more needs to be done. How much has been spent so far and how much more is needed. What are the expected costs? Were the projects that were funded the right projects? It is important to come up with realistic measures for the best projects. During a transition period there needs to be help for regions and lead entities to have an open process.

The Chair noted that this is something the Board needs to do rather than the Review Panel.

2006 GRANT ROUND – Staff Report

Neil Aaland introduced this agenda item. (See notebook item #5c for details.)

- a) Introduction
- b) Role of the Responses to the Homework Assignment
- c) Criteria for Success
- d) Projects of Concern
- e) Adjustments to Submitted Project Lists
- f) General Observations and Conclusions

Rollie reviewed two new handouts (Table 6a. Summary of Regional Requests – Dec 5, 2006, and Attachment 7 SRFB Dec. 5, 2006) which replaced the corresponding pages in the final staff report. He explained the changes and reasons behind these differences. Rollie noted that we need to change the number of projects under Lower Columbia from 13 to 12. He then went through both handouts and explained the numbers.

Neil then discussed the role of the homework assignment and how this worked. Staff believes the processes for this worked well. For the most part regions did what they said they would in the homework assignment and if they didn't there was a good reason for it. He then reviewed the Criteria for Success and how this worked in the process. Staff believes the Criteria for Success worked fairly well this year and better than in past rounds.

The Chair noted that the Board has changed this meeting from a competition to a meeting where decisions are already made. It is more about presenting the information to the Board for approval.

Neil reviewed the general staff observations and conclusions from this grant round that was presented in the staff report section of the 2006 Grant Round Report.

Neil presented some of the major decisions before the SRFB.

- Should "alternates" be allowed on longer lists?
- Should SRFB fund any POC? Or is this no longer relevant as the one remaining POC was withdrawn from the list.
- How should SRFB use "Criteria for Success?"
- Should SRFB exercise any role in oversubscribed lists?

Board Discussion:

David Troutt hasn't seen a copy of the review by the TRT's or local review teams. He is wondering if the Board is to assume that these projects received approval from the local and regional TRTs or not?

Steve Leider noted that all the projects are part of the regional recovery plan or lead entity strategies.

COMMENT PERIOD

- a) Regional Organization and Lead Entity Comments
- b) Public Comments

Regional Organizations

Lower Columbia Region

Jeff Breckel, Executive Director for the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, noted that his board has had a couple of follow up sessions with their sponsors, their Technical Board and the Lower Columbia Board. These groups have been happy with this grant round. The Lower Columbia Region has had better projects and more of an extended process, which allowed local sponsors to spend more time with each of the groups. They used a pre-proposal process starting with around 30 proposals. They narrowed it down to the final list of 13 proposals. The Review Panel process was one of the major changes this year and worked very well. They were able to have Review Panel members in from the beginning to the end of the process. He liked having projects conditioned when there were concerns. He thinks this was a positive addition from past years. They presented projects over the allocation amount, which allowed for other projects to drop out. This happened to one of their projects, although the last project on the list would have only been partially funded. He requested full funding for this final project or for an additional \$15,000 in funding for two other projects, so they could do a little more work.

Larry Cassidy asked what the amount of the nutrient project was.

Director Johnson noted that the Puget Sound has a several year plan. She asked Jeff if their plan is year by year, farther out or a combination of these.

Jeff noted that it is a combination.

Middle Columbia Region

Alex Conley, Dave McClure, Richard Visser, and David Bowen presented this information.

Alex reviewed the Mid-Columbia Region and explained the process used during this grant cycle. They are different in that they have three separate areas. Yakima and Klickitat both have a lead entity process whereas Rock Creek does not.

Dave explained the Klickitat process. He believes they made progress this year. He wanted to thank the SRFB Review Panel and Tom Slocum in particular, for their assistance.

David Bowen, Kittitas County Commissioner, explained the process in getting the regional entity up and going. He appreciated the consistency and believes the Board is going in the right direction.

Alex explained the process that the Yakima lead entity used for project review. They also liked the pre-application process although they didn't use it as much this year as they hope to in the future. They ended up with seven projects on the list and are happy with the distribution of projects. Alex reviewed the different projects on their list and explained how these projects fit into the plan.

This process fully funds six of the seven projects on their list. They would like to have the seventh project approved as a back up, in case one project in the fully funded list can't be accomplished for some reason. Approving this full list would also provide them with the ability to let other fund sources know that all their projects were approved by the SRFB.

Larry Cassidy asked if the focus on steelhead was new. He also asked why they don't just link Rock Creek into the process.

Dave noted that Klickitat County has tried to include them for several years but have not been successful.

Commissioner Bowen also noted that there are political issues blocking these efforts. He also wanted to thank WDFW and GSRO for their work helping with this process.

Steve Tharinger thanked Commissioner Bowen for his work on salmon recovery.

Chair Ruckelshaus encouraged the Mid-Columbia to continue working toward a combined regional plan.

Alex Conley noted that the Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) also includes other states.

Upper Columbia

Bob Bugert and Julie Morgan presented this information.

Julie explained their structure and how they conducted their process. She reviewed their list, noting that a couple projects have been submitted to other fund sources and may be funded through another source. Due to this, Julie is requesting the Board to approve the full list, so they can move down the funded list if projects higher on the list are either funded through a different fund source or are not implemented.

Larry discussed the list of grants.

Snake River Region

Steve Martin thanked the Board members for their work. He specifically thanked Chair Ruckelshaus for his support and for being a keynote speaker at their recent banquet. He also thanked Larry Cassidy for his role on the NWPCC. He believes this grant cycle was as good as could be expected. He noted the process played by the Department of Ecology's watershed planning work. He also thanked Neil Aaland for his work and wished him well.

Steve reported that the preallocation process worked well and caused them to work closer with sponsors to get the best projects for funding.

Dick Wallace talked about the water planning links to salmon recovery that are happening in the Snake River Region.

Steve discussed the water management initiative and how the groups are working together.

Dick noted that this information needs to be shared among the others working on salmon recovery and water issues.

The Chair suggested Dick pull this information together for sharing.

Northeast Region

Sandy Dotts and new Pend Oreille lead entity coordinator, Kathleen Werr presented this information.

Sandy thanked the Board and provided an update on the regionalization efforts going on in Northeast Washington. By the March meeting, they plan to be prepared for the stages of Phase 1.

Tim Smith noted that he and Mark Clark had a chance to meet with the District last week and that things are going well. Both he and Mark are optimistic.

Coastal Region

Lee Napier, Mike Johnson, John Sims, and Cheryl Baumann presented this information.

Lee reviewed the funding allocation process they used for this grant round. This year they have \$4,220 left over from the original allotment. Although they have left over funds this year they hope this does not cause the Board to decrease the percentage of funding for the region. In fact, they would like to go back up to the original allocation amount of 11 percent.

Lee then provided an update on how they are working through the regionalization process. They expect to have their first meeting with all the groups in December.

Director Johnson discussed the Prairie Creek Knotweed project and how it fits in with the IAC's newest board, the Invasive Species Council. The cost of this project had also caught Steve Tharinger's eye. This is also a big problem in his area.

Tim Smith and Steve Tharinger both complimented Cheryl Bauman's efforts to get up to speed for this grant cycle.

Hood Canal Region

Richard Brocksmitth presented this information.

Richard provided his thoughts on this year's grant process. He found that it worked quite well. They have an additional project on the list in case one of the upper projects doesn't make it through the process.

Puget Sound Region

Margee Duncan and Jeanette Dorner presented this information.

Margee provided an overview of the Puget Sound Regional process.

Jeanette then provided an overview of the 7th Round process in the Puget Sound.

Margee highlighted several projects on the list and shared process comments on the regional process and funding cycle. Some of the concerns are the SRFB Review Panel roles versus the NOAA's TRT; Project eligibility criteria, policy guidance and how this information is communicated; needs a mechanism for appealing the decision made by the SRFB staff to streamline the process. These issues will need to be discussed in more detail with the Board in January. Jeanette also discussed the project eligibility issue.

Individual Lead Entity Comments

Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Indian Tribe, pointed out from a policy perspective that if you decide to approve an "alternate" list you will be assured to have longer lists. Some regions provided an exact amount of projects to funding, where others added additional projects to their list.

The Chair asked how this would happen, as some regions moved the allocation between lead entities.

Larry Cassidy **MOVED** to approve the list at the funding level of 95 projects. David Troutt **SECONDED** the motion.

Margee asked to add a fourth project on the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA9) list, which includes an additional \$300,000 for the Duwamish Gardens project.

Larry Cassidy noted that his motion did not move to approve any of the projects below the funding line or to add any additional projects to the list presented to the Board.

Board Discussion:

Steve Tharinger asked if the full list was approved under Larry's motion.

Larry noted that no, his motion was for the projects on the list that are funded. Larry reiterated that his motion only approved the funded list.

Chair Ruckelshaus understands that the Board approved funding of the shaded areas of the list and the other projects would be approved as "alternates".

Motion **APPROVED** unanimously by Board.

Neil Aaland then discussed the issue of how to handle a significant change in scope. He emphasized that project sponsors should not be able to make significant changes in scope without coming back to the Board.

The Chair hoped this had been the process all along. Administrative changes should be monitored by staff.

The Board stated its understanding that alternate projects need to be brought back before the Board for funding approval.

The Chair discussed the process the Board has gone through over the last five years to reach the point they are currently at.

Larry Cassidy was really impressed with the cooperative process the lead entities and regions have gone through to share the money in the last grant round. It is very impressive.

The Chair discussed how there will be a new Legislature next session and that the organizations need to let their legislators know how well this process is going.

Steve Tharinger reflected back to the last meetings of the Issues Task Force (ITF). No one thought the process would be as smooth as it was. It really shows how much hard work has gone into this effort.

MONITORING EFFORTS

Tim Smith, Eric Neatherlin, Steve Leider, and Greg Volkhardt presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

Tim noted that WDFW is requesting SRFB funding to monitor smolts at four locations. The request is for the current fiscal year of 2007, including work done in the current

fiscal year. The request is for about \$350,000. Tim went over a brief history of SRFB funding. In the next biennium, smolt monitoring will be apart of the request for the Governor's monitoring forum.

Tim reviewed a map of Chinook in the Puget Sound salmon recovery region. He discussed the details of a major population group.

Public testimony:

No public testimony request

Board discussion:

Chair Ruckelshaus asked what they will be able to get from this information?

Greg explained what the monitoring efforts would show and how this information helps in decision-making.

The group discussed how this funding would help and how it is linked to the monitoring efforts and the monitoring plan.

David Troutt has some concerns on what the data needs are.

Director Johnson noted that at the last meeting the Green River representatives hadn't heard about this. What is the status on coordinating with this group?

Eric noted that there has been work done with this group and they support the request.

Margaret Duncan and Jeff Breckel both support this funding request but heard several good questions raised during this discussion. She confirmed Doug Osterman's support of this request.

David is happy that the agency is working on this. He encouraged the agency to start discussions with the watershed and tribes in the areas. He's not sure smolt trapping in the Nisqually will do much good, but may get a long way in answering some questions.

Larry Cassidy **MOVED** to approve funding of \$358,044 for WDFW smolt monitoring. Steve Tharinger **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED**.

Larry asked if there is an estimate for filling all the gaps in the smolt chart?

Keith Wolf answered that the estimate is \$1.7 million with continued monitoring sites being funded by the Power Council.

Larry noted that the Council is trying to put together a presentation like this for four states and it is very complicated. He believes it will be more than \$1.7 million.

Steve Leider noted that the \$1.7 million was for filling the gaps only. The estimate for all of the monitoring was \$6-10 million.

AGENDA TOPICS FOR 2007

Director Johnson discussed some of the issues that will be on the January board meeting.

- Final thoughts on this grant cycle
- Next grant cycle
- Legislation
- Conservation Commission Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) update

Director Johnson let the Board know that they have about \$.25 million. There are requests already for some of this money, so staff will come to the Board with various options.

Steve Tharinger talked about the possible need for an April meeting, since the Board may not be able to make decisions in March.

Joe Ryan suggested a chart on what decisions are needed in January and in March to be able to start the cycle early.

Adjourned:

Meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:



William Ruckelshaus, Chair



Date

Next meeting: January 25 & 26, 2007
Natural Resources Building, Room 172
Olympia, WA