SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

September 25 & 26, 2003	King Street Center, 8th Floor Conf. Room Seattle, Washington

Day 1

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Jim Peters	Olympia
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Tom Laurie	Designee, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission

CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 9:53 a.m.

The Chair introduced new Board designee, Tom Laurie, who will be representing Ecology while Dick Wallace is on assignment.

Steve Mullet, Mayor of Tukwila and chair of WRIA 9 watershed forum, Rebecca Clark, Mayor pro-tem city of Covington and co-chair of the WRIA 9 steering committee, and Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 Lead Entity Coordinator, welcomed the Board and gave an overview of the watershed, coordination efforts, and projects.

The proposed meeting agenda was approved.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF JULY 2003 MEETING MINUTES
Brenda McMurray **moved** to approve the July 2003 meeting minutes. Steve Tharinger **seconded** the motion.

The Chair asked about the effectiveness monitoring statement on page 8 of the minutes. Director Johnson responded that although smolt monitoring and intensively monitored watershed funding was approved at the July meeting, additional information is needed and the Issues Task Force (ITF) is including that subject in its discussions, which is what the minutes are referring to.

The July 2003 minutes were **approved** as presented.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

Director's Report

Director Laura Johnson presented this agenda item.

- The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) would like to have a combined meeting on December 3 in the Vancouver or Portland area. Director Johnson provided the Board some history and goals for this meeting.

- Director Johnson noted the need for a December 5 Board meeting to finalize the ITF work prior to the start of the 5th Round in January 2004. This will be a discussion item under agenda item 3 – December 2003 and 2004 Meeting Schedule.

- Bruce Crawford is on vacation at this time but is working hard on monitoring issues and will provide an update at a future meeting.

- One item was requested to be on the agenda but was not added, the Pend Oreille Cedar Creek project. During the 4th Round Funding meeting, the Pend Oreille Lead Entity presented one project for funding. The Technical Panel for the SRFB had raised several concerns about this project largely related to a question of introgression between two fish species. The Board also asked about the cost of this project and some other issues. The way the Board chose to make funding decisions, the Pend Oreille lead entity list was presented first and it was not clear what the Board's action was. No motion was made to fund this project at the May 2003 meeting. The Board had therefore not approved funding but did not explicitly deny funding. There was a continuing question on the science of the project concerning mixing of species. During the summer there was continued work on this project and the integration question. Although considerable sampling and additional science review occurred this summer, the Technical Panel still has not reached consensus on the science questions.

  Director Johnson noted that this is an excellent example of the opportunity to clarify the role of the Technical Panel and SRFB funding process.

  Chair Ruckelshaus agreed the SRFB decision was not as clear as it could have been, and stressed the need to be clearer in the future. Knows the lead entity been working hard on issues with staff throughout the summer, including the science questions. The effort by the lead entity in Pend Oreille has been substantial and they should be commended for that. It is not possible to bring up for the 4th Round now since so much time has passed and the Chair feels it was clear there was not Board support in funding that project during the 4th Round decisions. But, it could be brought back to a future round. It is up to the lead entity to decide what projects they want to bring to the Board but the Board will work hard with the lead entity to determine if the project or others makes sense going forward through the next SRFB funding cycles.

  Tim Smith noted that the WDFW has been very involved in this project and knows the project sponsors are disappointed in the decision to not fund. This project was very complicated and the ITF work should help with this process in the future. The role of the Technical Panel will need to be clearly identified and what the Board's core principles are in choosing projects to fund. The Board would benefit from a clearly defined process for funding projects.

The Chair noted that more projects in the future will be multi-benefit projects and may not be mainly fish projects. This type of project may have merit but could need to find other funding sources to assist in the funding of projects combining funding sources.

Steve Tharinger reported an ITF discussion on a portfolio of projects using different types of funding such as transportation funding. When looking at a long-term plan this is the type of project that may be put into this category.

Jim Fox reported that another issue the ITF is looking at is early intervention when there is a question on a project by the Technical Panel.

Financial Report

Debra Wilhelmi provided the Board with an overview of financial status. (See notebook for details.)

- Larry Cassidy asked about lead entity funding amounts listed on attachment 4. Debra explained the lead entity funding passes through WDFW to distribute to lead entities.

- Tim Smith asked about the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Association (CBFWA) map. Debra is waiting for CBFWA data and will be able to provide the map after the data is received.

Project Status Report and 4th Round Update

Tara Galuska provided the project management report. (See notebook for details.) Tara explained the "Completed" data is somewhat misleading. Some projects have been completed on-the-ground but are in monitoring status. Staff is working with Debra Wilhelmi on a new definition in PRISM to show and report this new status.

Steve Tharinger asked if extending the 5th Round has helped with getting some of the sponsors' backlog taken care of. Tara reported that it has helped in some areas but that other areas are ready for new projects to be brought forward in the 5th Round.

Tara and Mike Ramsey provided a PowerPoint presentation of three completed projects.

- #01-1306 – Pend Oreille Conservation District Barrier Survey,
- #00-1720 – City of Poulsbo Dogfish Creek Estuary Bridge (Paul Dorn, WDFW, assisted Mike with presentation of this project), and
- #00-1816 – Jefferson County WRIA 17 Salmon Refugia Study.

Project Changes Report

Brenda McMurray presented this agenda item and noted Tom Laurie of Ecology is now serving on the project changes subcommittee.

Brenda updated the Board on projects the subcommittee has looked at and the returned funds policy. A policy document should be presented at the October SRFB meeting for

Board discussion and possible approval. Brenda and Tom will work with the ITF in development of this policy.

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Report

Bob Nichols provided the Board with the GSRO report, first introducing himself to the SRFB members.

The position of Director of the Salmon Recovery Office was eliminated through budget cuts so Bob took on some of the Director duties and Chris Drivdahl took on others.

The regional plans are the central focus of the GSRO to help get projects prioritized. Also working on ways to tell the story of the results. There are fifteen months left of the Locke administration and the GSRO needs to find ways to help with the salmon issues.

Chris Drivdahl is the main author of the report and recommendation under tab 4.

Bob talked about the Governor's support for local, bottom-up actions and explained that the regional boards are a bottom-up approach. The federal government requires a regional plan, so it cannot be done at the lead entity level. The plan must roll up to the ESU level.

Craig Partridge reported, in his experience we need to have a combination of success both quantitative and demonstrative of real results to successfully tell the story.

DECEMBER 2003 AND 2004 MEETING SCHEDULE

Board members discussed the schedules. Members will check calendars and then try to make a final decision before the end of the meeting.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL ORGANIZATION SUPPORT

A panel of Chris Drivdahl, Dick Nason, Jeff Breckel, Steve Martin, Jim Kramer, and Joel Frudenthal presented this agenda item.

Chris summarized the current status of regional planning efforts and history of regional planning.

Chris reported that Bob Lohn, NOAA Fisheries, stated that Washington State is a model for regional planning; no other state is at the same level in watershed planning and regional efforts. (A letter to SRFB was also received from Lohn.)

Steve Martin provided a PowerPoint presentation on regional planning efforts. Steve explained the differences between lead entities, regional organizations, watershed plans, and regional recovery plans.

Regional Organizations

- Work with many local entities and planning processes such as:
  - Lead entities
  - Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups

    - Subbasin planning
    - Watershed planning
- Subbasin specific efforts focus on:
    - Inventory of past and on-going actions
    - Assessments
    - Management plan for ESA listed and other terrestrial and aquatic species
- Develop ESU-level (multi-watershed) recovery plans by building on efforts of other existing processes
- Work with NOAA to define measurable goals and develop scenarios on how to achieve goals
- Bring together authorities to implement actions necessary to achieve goals
- Address 4 H's (Hatchery, Habitat, Hydro, and Harvest)
- Address local government administrative rules

Lead Entities
- Focus on:
    - Non-regulatory habitat protection and restoration strategy
    - Social factors addressed through local committees
    - Project development consistent with a Strategy

Dick Nason informed the Board that this is a different process than used in the past as it is a grass-roots model, bottom-up, has buy-in from federal government, covers an ESU, and addresses the socio-economic needs of the local entities.

Chris reported that four of the five regions expect to deliver draft recovery plans in this biennium (by June 30, 2005). A complete ESU exists in one of the regions – Hood Canal summer chum. The regional board requests were scrubbed for needs and costs and have reached an agreement on the amounts being requested. The Governor's office urges support of the request.

Brenda asked for clarification on timing, noting this is missing in the letter from Bob Lohn. Brenda is hoping the timeline presented in the notebook memorandum meets the NOAA timeline.

Chris reported that NOAA Fisheries will be coordinating with the regions independently and can work with regions on specific rule making and other actions, as the regions are ready. Have had no indication of any problems with the timeframe.

Jim Kramer noted that Bob Lohn sits on the Shared Strategy Council and helped with the development of its timeline. Other NOAA Fisheries staff sits on other regional boards and is actively involved in the timing. Draft subbasin plans will be presented by May 2004, although the formal adoption may take longer as this is a public process.

Discussed the timing and how long it takes to develop a recovery plan. This is something new and first need to have people agree that they need to work on the issue and then decide how to do it.

Chair Ruckelshaus gave his views on the regional planning process and how the process is working. There are two pieces - development of recovery plan and buy-in by locals. The federal government can present a plan but if there is no local support it won't work. Needs to be properly implemented. This is a large amount of money and it will be up to each of the regional boards to prove to the locals that it is a wise use of funds. The deadline is real and we will all need to defend the process and meet the deadlines.

Ed Manary feels there is enough history to lay out the issue and have a pictorial of the events ready for next legislative session since many of the legislators who were in office in 1998, when the process first began, are no longer in office.

Jim Kramer noted that a Council of Regions has been developed. This is a way to learn from each other and figure out the best way to do the process. Have started to develop a PowerPoint on the process. Need help from Board and others on how to show what is progress and how to show progress. In terms of investment of dollars, the council of regions has gone through a process to figure out the budgets.

Jeff Breckel noted the reasons why the costs seem "high" and how important regional planning is.

Larry Cassidy supports subbasin planning and is comfortable with the costs in the budgets presented.

Brenda McMurray agreed that it takes a while to understand what the lead entities do and what they are good at, and what the regional planning boards should do. She agrees the story should be told.

Public Testimony:
Rebecca Clark, Mayor pro-tem city of Covington and WRIA 9 Steering Committee co-chair, noted that she heard Bob Nichols say the regional planning process will be a "top down" process. She reported that there are differences in the WRIAs and some are working on planning in their individual WRIA and this process needs to be a "bottoms up" process. WRIA 9 has been meeting on watershed planning for the last five years and people in this area know what the group has been doing at the local level and do not have buy-in at the regional planning level. The local watershed groups need to be involved in the regional planning process.

Larry clarified that the Governor's office does not want 'top down' but 'bottom-up' approach. What we do not want is the federal government telling us what to do.

The Chair agreed. The process needs to be from the bottom up because if it doesn't work from the bottom up it will be settled in the courts and we don't want that.

Tim Smith noted that regional planning is important and needed but the Board still needs to continue to support the lead entities. Regional planning is evolutionary to salmon recovery. Regional planning should be viewed as an evolution of our state's response to ESA and salmon recovery – not a new phase, but building on previous decisions made by the legislature in adopting a bottoms up process.

Brenda is concerned with Rebecca's comments in that the regional planning does need to be in concert with the local efforts.

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve Resolution #2003-10. Jim Peters **seconded**.

Board Discussion:
Tim Smith asked if it should be stated in the resolution that funding of this effort will be with federal funds.

Director Johnson stated that the plan is to use federal funds first.

Larry felt this issue was covered in the resolution.

Director Johnson will report back to the Board in October to show what the fund source is and will give the Board copies of the agreements so they can see the scope of work.

Tom Laurie asked about the reporting and if it needs to be in the resolution. Director Johnson responded that reporting is part of the deliverables in the individual contracts. Craig Partridge feels this is critical to reaching the goals.

Chris reported that the regional boards are already figuring out how to implement these plans and will be back to the Board in a year (next October) to report on recovery and implementation plans.

Resolution #2003-10 **approved** as presented.

5TH ROUND ISSUES – POLICY DEVELOPMENTS AND UPDATES

Steve Tharinger presented this agenda item. (See handouts and notebook for details.) Jim Fox provided an overview of the September 11 & 12 meeting and discussions held by the ITF.

Discussed the ITF process and 5th Round needs and changes and lead entity strategies.

Issues Task Force members Jim Kramer, Shirley Solomon, and Doug St. John joined the Board in discussion of this topic.

Jim Kramer noted that the ITF would like to have clear Board direction on both the lead entity strategy development and technical advisory panel role. This would give time to set up the advisory panel and start working with lead entities on their strategies before the end of the meeting immediately after this meeting.

Doug St. John reviewed his understanding of the ITF and why it was put into place. He feels the ITF is addressing the issues in the correct order.

Jim Peters needs certainty that projects are good for the fish. Does not want to fund "low low" projects.

Craig Partridge brought up the issue of distinction between low to medium and to high in the project ratings and would like a clearer definition.

Discussion continued on day two of the meeting.

Meeting recessed at 3:30 p.m. for the Board tour.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

September 25 & 26, 2003	King Street Center, 8th Floor Conf. Room Seattle, Washington

Day 2

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Jim Peters	Olympia
Tom Laurie	Designee, Department of Ecology
Jerry Alb	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Shari Schaftlein	Designee, Department of Transportation

CALL TO ORDER:
Meeting reconvened at 8:30 a.m. Thanks was extended to WRIA 9 and the city of Seattle for the tour.

CONTINUE 5TH ROUND ISSUES TASK FORCE DISCUSSION
The discussion continued from day one on the 5th Round ITF work and direction.

Brenda McMurray does not want to have the Technical Panel look at individual projects but the overall strategy only.

Other Board members and the chair would like the Technical Panel to look at both the strategy and individual projects. Would want the Technical Panel to let the Board know if there is high public support for the project but the Board would still not fund the low benefit low certainty projects.

LEAD ENTITY ADVISORY GROUP (LEAG) REPORT
Shirley Solomon, new LEAG chair, and Brian Walsh, WDFW, presented this agenda item. The last LEAG agenda was focused on the ITF progress and issues.

Much of the discussion at the September 8 LEAG meeting was then taken to the ITF meeting on September 11 & 12.

Questions and comments for the ITF:

- It is critical to review individual lead entity strategies.
- How can lead entity strategies be vetted before application lists are submitted?
- The 12 questions used by the lead entities in strategy development are important and need to be brought before the SRFB.
- The first project barrier to look at is science, is the project scientifically sound? The SRFB needs to set policy to clearly outline a scientifically sound project.
- What changes will occur after recovery planning is implemented? What's the Board's strategy for dealing with that? Need for flexibility in examples of strategies, not all watersheds are using the same approach and there needs to be flexibility in how that is handled.
- If the Board approves the lead entity strategy development outline then the process will be okay – the geographic area seems to be the most controversial item.

Role of Technical Panel:
LEAG feels this is "the never-ending discussion". The Board has had the same discussion for the last four years. The fundamental flaw in the process is at the portfolio level. LEAG would like the Technical Panel to look at the full packet of projects and how they fit into the strategies, not an individual review of each project.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the comparability issue and how the Technical Panel is unable at this point, to rank watersheds.

We need better communication between the SRFB, Technical Panel, lead entities, and communities.

Jerry Alb discussed the HCP process, changes to the process, and what it's like being on the permittee side versus the permitting side. He commented on the transportation concept, where the feds certify the process and the states spend.

The Chair believes the Board will get to the same point when the recovery plans are in place.

Shirley Solomon noted that the ITF meeting summary on page 4 reads "This allows the Panel to be in a collaborative and consulting role"; this should read "collegial", not "collaborative". This is the type of relationship that LEAG would like between the lead entities and the Technical Advisory Panel.

The Board discussed with LEAG representatives ideas about the next Technical Panel.

- The composition of Panel is critical
- Panel needs to be in place by December

It was decided to have several lead entities present their strategies at the next two Board meetings to help the Board understand the strategies and how they work with the project lists. Shirley Solomon volunteered the Skagit Watershed Council to present at the October SRFB meeting.

The Board will form the Technical Panel as soon as possible.

Brenda McMurray discussed the need for weighted criteria and need to make policy decisions on the various issues presented to the ITF.

LEAG has adopted a new meeting cycle to help with communication and agenda development.

Brenda noted that one thing not included in the strategy documents is "How does the local entity propose to measure the results of the projects?" She is not sure how to do that but when effectiveness monitoring is in place the Board should be asking the project sponsors for result data.

The Chair agreed that having goals is crucial to knowing where we are going and what we are trying to achieve.

Steve Tharinger noted that the ITF had a presentation on the small grant matching pilot proposal and that the ITF recommends approval of this proposal. This is a separate agenda item.

Summary of 5th Round ITF decisions and direction by the Board:

Strategies

- The Board approved as a working draft the diagram showing the technical foundation for lead entity strategies and how community issues are combined with the technical foundation to establish priority actions, subject to further ITF discussion and lead entity comments.
- There was some question whether the proposed strategy guidance should be prescriptive. This will be resolved after the Board reviews the guidance at the October meeting and reviews lead entity comments.

Role of the Technical Panel

- The Board wants the Technical Panel (or its successor) to be able to assess whether a project has low benefit to salmon or low certainty of success and, if so concluded, advise the Board accordingly.
- The Board supported the concept of early contact with each lead entity regarding its strategy, project list and individual projects. It also expressed concerns about the cost and the ability of panel members to commit this amount of time.
- There was support for moving more towards evaluation of strategies and project portfolios and away from evaluating the technical benefits of individual projects. However, questions were raised about how to maintain sufficient review of individual projects so that the panel could identify a project with low benefit or certainty.
- There was concern about how to allocate funds across lead entities without benefit and certainty ratings for individual projects, especially since the TRTs have not yet been able to identify priority watersheds.
- If the Technical Panel (or its successor) is going to evaluate strategies, criteria are necessary.
- The Board was comfortable with the concept of a new Advisory Panel to review both technical and non-technical elements of strategies and technical and non-technical benefits of projects, and changing the composition of the Panel accordingly.

- The Board agreed to invite a presentation of several lead entity strategies at the October or December meeting.

REPORT ON LEAD ENTITY CONTRACTS

Debra Wilhelmi presented this agenda item. Debra reviewed past funding of the lead entities and how the funds have been distributed.

Director Johnson presented the Board with Resolution #2003-12 for lead entity program support.

Steve Tharinger **moved** to adopt Resolution #2003-12. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Board **approved** Resolution #2003-12 as presented.

FAMILY FOREST FISH BLOCKAGES PROGRAM

Debra Wilhelmi introduced this agenda item and introduced the panel of Jed Herman, DNR, Dave Whipple, WDFW, and Brett Demond, WDFW.

Jed reviewed the process and how House Bill 1095 laid out the needs of the program. He has been working on the Forest Practices Rules that the Forest Practices Board will adopt in October. Not inventing any new programs but will work with lead entities on how to get the people who are interested in this program signed up. They have started the outreach process - some forest landowners have already called in and are on the contact list. The plan is to also contact the people who come in to get a forest practices permit.

Dave reported that WDFW's responsibility is to provide evaluation criteria for ranking the barriers. Priority Index (PI) will be used where able; may need to use other methodologies in some areas. WDFW will coordinate closely with lead entities across the state on the work.

Barrier prioritization and assessment being done by WDFW. Information is generally lacking at this stage. There are some areas that the data is available. Two WRIAs have the information: one west side and one east side (WRIA 23 and WRIA 49). Still gathering data in the rest of the state and looking for ways to plug holes where data is missing. WDFW role is more on technical side of the bill.

Debra reviewed the proposed timeline for this grant program.

Unknown if there will be interest by 20 landowners or 2000 so workload is unknown. Will match data with landowners and then go to them and talk to the landowner to see if they are interested in being part of this process.

The Chair asked about the cost share match. Jed reported that up to $5000 can be matched depending on profit from timber harvest.

Jim Peters asked about the need for road maintenance and abandonment plans (R-maps) and if this process will include road abandonment issues as well as culverts. Jed reported that this is for blockages only. Tom Laurie noted that one change is that small landowners don't have to do R-maps, just a simplified plan.

Jim Peters asked how the lead entities are fitting in. Brett has been contacting lead entities. The Chair is pleased to know that Brett has been contacting the lead entities early in the process and how crucial it is. Dave noted the need to meet with the two priority watershed lead entities and to talk through the plans.

Brenda McMurray asked about the Forest Practices Act (FPA) permitting process and whether it is a programmatic process to allow project completion within the timeline outlined. It was reported that a team is looking at the permit requirements and how to streamline them. Brenda asked to have the permitting process outlined at the October SRFB meeting.

NFWF – SMALL GRANTS MATCHING PILOT PROPOSAL

Jim Fox introduced this agenda item and outlined the proposal. (See notebook for details.)

Krystyna Wolniakowski, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), and Dennis Canty, Evergreen Funding Consultants, were available for questions.

Board Discussion:
Steve Tharinger reported that the ITF did look at this request on two separate occasions and Krystyna and Dennis took suggestions from the ITF and made revisions to the proposal.

Brenda McMurray thought this would be worthwhile to fund as a pilot project. Small grant funding is an area the Board has struggled with and she appreciates the proposal being more widely spread throughout the state and would like to see eastside involvement in the future.

Chair Ruckelshaus appreciates the NFWF sticking to this proposal and its salmon recovery efforts. The SRFB has the authority to make block grants although it has struggled with how to do this. This proposal may help.

Brenda McMurray **moved** adoption of Resolution #2003-11 Small Grant Program funding. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** adoption of Resolution #2003-11 as presented.

2004 SCHEDULE

The Board decided to have Tammy Owings confirm the 2004 meeting schedule and bring a revision back to the Board for final adoption at October SRFB meeting.

PROJECT CHANGES

Brenda McMurray and Tom Laurie presented this agenda item. Brenda explained that the Nisqually Basin Land Trust has requested a project transfer. The original project approved in 4th Round was the third ranked project #02-1479A, Weyco Ohop Shoreline Acquisition. The Land Trust is seeking to relocate the acquisition funding to the fourth ranked project #02-1535A, Weyco Mashel Shoreline Acquisition. This land is adjacent to the Nisqually area previously approved. This project was reviewed by the 4th Round Technical Panel and was rated medium benefit, high certainty. The subcommittee believes this project does deserve to be funded.

The acquisition of the Weyco Mashel property does cost more money but the Nisqually lead entity has a project that was funded in 1999, project #99-1731A Camp of the Cascades, but was never started. The recommendation is to transfer funding allotted for Camp of the Cascades and Weyco Ohop Shoreline Acquisition projects to fund the Weyco Mashel project. The match from the sponsor is equal to the original request. As this project involves Weyerhaeuser, Nisqually Basin Land Trust, and State Parks the agreement would need to require that the land be acquired by the Nisqually Basin Land Trust and would need to be used for salmon projects.

Jim Peters asked why the 1999 project was never started. Response: This was a case of a non-willing landowner to sell the Camp of Cascades Land.

Combining the funding from both the Weyco Ohop project and the Camp of the Cascades project will have an overage of about $38,000. Once the property is acquired and the project closed, the extra funding will come back to the Board for distribution in another grant cycle.

Mashel project request amount is about the same. These two parcels are very similar and the Board could have funded either parcel but, due to fiscal restraints, had to limit to one of the projects.

Steve Tharinger made the **motion** to approve the project change request transferring funding from project #02-1479, Weyco Ohop Shoreline Acquisition to project #02-1535, Weyco Mashel Shoreline Acquisition. Jim Peters **seconded**. Chair Ruckelshaus recused himself from the vote. Board **approved** the project change request.

PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed a recent legislative hearing and reviewed the handouts that were provided to the legislative committee.

Both Jim Fox and Chair Ruckelshaus felt it was a good session and that there will be other opportunities to present before the committee.

The Chair also attended a congressional meeting that discussed the Pacific Coast salmon funds. Talked about the need to show what we are getting for the money. State legislators are asking the same questions. Working on laying out the entire program and telling the story of what has been done and what effect the money makes.

The legislators do change and have other issues to think about so the Board needs to continue to show them the progress being made and how things are being accomplished.

Need to be very clear about SRFB priorities and SRFB policies.

Steve Tharinger reported he served on the Biodiversity Task Force; the report will be submitted in October. They are proposing a standing committee of this group.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

_____ _____

William Ruckelshaus, Chair Date

Future Meetings: October 29 & 30, 2003 – Sequim
December 2003 – date and location TBD

RESOLUTION #2003-10

Regional Salmon Recovery Organizations' Grants

WHEREAS, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) has previously provided funding to regional recovery organizations to begin development of ESU-wide salmon recovery plans, and

WHEREAS, the SRFB believes regional salmon recovery plans will help Washington achieve measurable progress towards substantive regional salmon recovery, and

WHEREAS, the SRFB has considered comments from NOAA-Fisheries' Regional Administrator Bob Lohn that "support for regional organizations is critical," and

WHEREAS, the SRFB has considered the recommendations of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office to continue supporting development of these plans; and

WHEREAS, the SRFB has considered available state and federal funds in the 2003-2005 biennium, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board approves $5,101,926 for the 2003-2005 Biennium to fund development of draft recovery plans by salmon recovery regional organizations. These funds are to be distributed as follows:

- $986,500 to the Snake River Salmon Recovery
- $1,352,850 to the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
- $230,000 to the Yakima Sub-basin Fish and Wildlife Planning Board
- $300,000 to the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
- $2,232,576 to the Puget Sound Shared Strategy and Hood Canal Coordinating Council.

Resolution moved by: _____Larry Cassidy_____

Resolution seconded by: _____Jim Peters_____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: __September 25, 2003_____

RESOLUTION #2003-11

Small Grant Program

WHEREAS, lead entity participants and other people involved in salmon habitat restoration have indicated the need for a grant program that has a simple and fast application and evaluation process that can be accomplished by small volunteer groups and other organizations that do not have the expertise or resources to compete for SRFB grants through the traditional lead entity process, and

WHEREAS, lead entities participants and other people involved in salmon habitat restoration have also indicated the need for a grant program that will help build local community support for salmon recovery and help foster the participation of volunteer groups and other local entities that might not otherwise have access to adequate funding, and

WHEREAS, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) has proposed to conduct a pilot small grant program in four areas of Washington to evaluate the value of such a program, and

WHEREAS, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation has proposed to provide federal funds to match the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) funds for the pilot small grant program, and

WHEREAS, the SRFB Issues Task Force reviewed the NFWF proposal and unanimously recommended that the SRFB approve the proposal and provide to NFWF $300,000 in state matching funds, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board approves $300,000 to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to be matched by NFWF with $330,000 of federal funds, to design and administer a pilot small grant program as outlined in the attached proposal, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that up to $30,000 of SRFB funds may be used by NFWF to administer the pilot small grant program; the remaining $270,000 of SRFB funds and $330,000 of NFWF funds will be available for grants.

Resolution moved by: _____Brenda McMurray_____

Resolution seconded by: _____Steve Tharinger_____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: __September 26, 2003_____

RESOLUTION #2003-12

Lead Entity Program Support

WHEREAS, the 2003-05 Biennial Operating Budget appropriated to the SRFB (via the IAC) the sum of $3,250,000 for distribution to lead entities, as follows:

> ESSB 5404, Sec. 304(3)
> "$812,000 of the general fund--state appropriation for fiscal year 2004, $813,000 of the general fund--state appropriation for fiscal year 2005, and $1,625,000 of the general fund--federal appropriation are provided to the salmon recovery funding board for distribution to lead entities. …"

WHEREAS, the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) has administered operations of the Lead Entity program since 1999, using funds appropriated from time to time directly to WDFW as well as by a program support grant by the SRFB in 2002 (SRFB programmatic grant #02-1374), and

WHEREAS, the WDFW proposes to continue the support of the lead entity program under contract with the SRFB/IAC in a manner consistent with Sec. 304 (3), and

WHEREAS, the WDFW has identified the need for up to $125,000 in further continued support for lead entity program functions;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board approves a program support grant of not more than $125,000 to the WDFW for operations of the lead entity program in the 2003-05 biennium in conjunction with Sec. 304(3) funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the director shall enter into contracts with the WDFW identifying the scope of work and deliverables under the Sec. 304(3) appropriation and this program support award.

Resolution moved by: _____Steve Tharinger_____

Resolution seconded by: ____Brenda McMurray_____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: __September 26, 2003_____

Other Board Decisions

Summary of 5th Round ITF decisions and direction by the Board:

Strategies

- The Board approved as a working draft the diagram showing the technical foundation for lead entity strategies and how community issues are combined with the technical foundation to establish priority actions, subject to further ITF discussion and lead entity comments.
- There was some question whether the proposed strategy guidance should be prescriptive. This will be resolved after the Board reviews the guidance at the October meeting and reviews lead entity comments.

Role of the Technical Panel

- The Board wants the Technical Panel (or its successor) to be able to assess whether a project has low benefit to salmon or low certainty of success and, if so concluded, advise the Board accordingly.
- The Board supported the concept of early contact with each lead entity regarding its strategy, project list and individual projects. It also expressed concerns about the cost and the ability of panel members to commit this amount of time.
- There was support for moving more towards evaluation of strategies and project portfolios and away from evaluating the technical benefits of individual projects. However, questions were raised about how to maintain sufficient review of individual projects so that the panel could identify a project with low benefit or certainty.
- There was concern about how to allocate funds across lead entities without benefit and certainty ratings for individual projects, especially since the TRTs have not yet been able to identify priority watersheds.
- If the Technical Panel (or its successor) is going to evaluate strategies, criteria are necessary.
- The Board was comfortable with the concept of a new Advisory Panel to review both technical and non-technical elements of strategies and technical and non-technical benefits of projects, and changing the composition of the Panel accordingly.
- The Board agreed to invite a presentation of several lead entity strategies at the October or December meeting.

Project Change:

Steve Tharinger made the **motion** to approve the project change request transferring funding from project #02-1479, Weyco Ohop Shoreline Acquisition to project #02-1535, Weyco Mashel Shoreline Acquisition. Jim Peters **seconded**. Chair Ruckelshaus recused himself from the vote. Board **approved** the project change request.