



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**August 17, 2011**

10 am – 2 pm

Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen WA

#### DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS from THIS MEETING

##### New WCSSP Board Member from the Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier announced that the GHC Commissioners appointed Mark White, Director of Natural Resources for the Chehalis Tribe, as a new WCSSP Board member.

##### APPROVAL of JULY 20, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY

Swartout asked if there were any corrections or additions to the meeting summary for the July 20, 2011 Board meeting. Hearing none, he declared the July Meeting Summary approved.

##### INTRODUCTION OF MEGAN DUFFY, NEW EXECUTIVE COORDINATOR, GSRO

###### Inclusion of Monitoring Activities in SRFB-Funded Projects

John Sims brought up the issue of including monitoring activities in SRFB projects; SRFB originally allowed it, but no longer does. He suggested that if monitoring activities and results are accepted by other state agencies, for instance when harvest numbers are agreed upon, why shouldn't RCO/SRFB accept them also? In addition, there are some monitoring activities for which the Quinalt, for example, have forty years of data – smolts, redd counts, etc.; this kind of information and continued data collection should logically be able to be included in project activities. Sims' overall question is whether SRFB can revisit the question of including monitoring components in project proposals.

Osborne said that he thinks that instead of waiting for SRFB to provide monitoring funding, we should systematically compile and organize the data that already exists for the region, perhaps getting private funding if necessary to do so. An accurate, historical data set would be very valuable, and, he believes, something we can accomplish ourselves.

###### LEG Audits and RCO Self-Assessment Checklist

{Duffy} agreed with Bingaman that it would be a prudent, proactive step for the LEGs to look at their policies, procedures, Bylaws, etc. in light of RCO's self-assessment checklist.

##### SEPTEMBER ELECTION OF NEW VICE CHAIR

Swartout reminded everyone that Faith Taylor-Eldred is unable to continue as Vice Chair of the WCSSP Board, and therefore the Board needs to elect a new Vice Chair at the September annual meeting. He observed that this will allow us to elect a Chair and a Vice Chair in alternating years, which is a good practice to have in place. For this election, nominations should be sent to Batchelder by September 14, 2011, at which point the nominated names will be distributed to all Board members, with the election on September 21, 2011.

(continued)

## RE-ALLOCATION OF SRFB PROJECT FUNDING WITHIN THE REGION

After further discussion about the possibility of RTC ranking unfunded projects, Swartout said he was hearing consensus that the Board should make the re-allocation decision(s).

. . . consideration of a tentative, “straw dog” proposal for re-allocation of project funds so that the LEGs could discuss a proposal before the September Board meeting. The proposal was to tentatively re-allocate \$54,000 to the Quinault for the Christmas Creek project, and then, depending on the interim Pacific County/SRFB/RCO decisions, re-allocate \$17,500 to GHCLE’s Trib to Steven’s Creek Fish Passage project, and then, if there are more funds available, re-allocate that remainder to phasing of NPCLE’s Hoh Assessment project. He outlined the reasons behind this proposal as follows. First, if the Christmas Creek culverts were corrected at separate times, the costs would be higher because they are nearby one another and there are cost efficiencies in doing them all at once. Second, the \$17,000 for the Steven’s Creek project is a comparatively small amount to complete an important project. Third, it sounded to him like the Hoh Assessment can be broken into acceptable phases, so any additional regional re-allocation funds could be used to at least get some of that project done this year. His hope is that if the Board tentatively approves this proposal today, it could be discussed and tentatively approved by the LEGs before the September WCSSP Board meeting, at which point, knowing exactly funds we have to re-allocate, the Board could make a final decision to go back to the LEGs for approval. This would then allow the Board to approve the final re-allocation of funds at their October meeting.

Swartout restated the proposal, pointing out that it is basically making the best use of public funds by providing comparatively small amounts of money to provide full and most efficient funding for both the QINLE Christmas Creek and GHCLE Stevens Creek projects, with remaining funds for use in potentially phased completion of the NPCLE Hoh Assessment project. There was no objection voiced to the tentative proposal.

## REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (RTC)

Back to the specifics of the RTC currently, Batchelder said that he wants to know who’s on it, and what its tasks are. In terms of tasks, Batchelder said that currently the Committee’s tasks include a review of the draft Regional Plan and a continued improvement of the sub-allocation formula. Osborne added that there are many potential RTC tasks revolving around the Regional Plan: we’ve identified a huge number of data gaps; we have inconsistent data sets to deal with; we need to slowly build up a universal data set for the region (for use in the sub-allocation formula and elsewhere). These data needs will take an enormous amount of work to accomplish, but are essential to what we’re doing; Osborne thinks we need to commit regional funding (and probably seek additional funding) to the Data Steward position now so that we’d have someone consistently working on these issues with the RTC. He proposes that this be on next month’s Board meeting agenda.

To be more specific, Osborne outlined the following few examples, all of which will use NetMap as our tool. We need to look at our stream layers more specifically, reassessing and expanding on what was done for this year’s sub-allocation formula in that regard. We need to compile the historical data sets that exist in the region, look at what form they’re in, how to make them useable and accessible, and then evaluate them.

Batchelder said he can look at proposing new RTC members from a regional perspective. Napier said that GHCLE has a replacement nominee for one of the positions, Larry Durham, the new fisheries biologist for the Chehalis Tribe. Burkle wanted to bring forward another nominee for the RTC, Chris Byrnes of WDFW, who is back being a watershed steward in the NPCLE and QINLE areas. Krueger pointed out that Byrnes used to be on the RTC, but had to bow out because of his temporary reassignment.

Bingaman suggested that one solution to some of the problems discussed today might be to hold fewer RTC meetings, perhaps quarterly.

In attendance:

### WCSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**Mark Swartout, Chair**

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group (NPCLE)

**Rich Osborne, NPCLE Lead Entity Coordinator**

**Katie Krueger, NPCLE, Quileute Tribe**

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group (QINLE)

**Dave Bingaman, QINLE, Quinault Indian Nation**

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group (GHCLE)  
**Terry Baltzell**, GHCLE, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force  
**Lee Napier**, GHCLE Lead Entity Coordinator  
**Mark Swartout**, GHCLE, Thurston County

Pacific County Lead Entity Group (PCLE)  
**Faith Eldred-Taylor (???)**, Pacific County  
**Mike Johnson**, PCLE Lead Entity Coordinator

#### OTHERS

**Ed Bowen**, NPCLE CAL2 (on the phone)  
**Bob Burkle**, WDFW  
**Megan Duffy**, GSRO/RCO  
**Wendy Marsh**, Wild Fish Conservancy (on the phone)

**Kathryn Moore**, RCO  
**John Sims**, QINLE Lead Entity Coordinator  
**Terry Willis**, GHC Commissioner  
**Miles Batchelder**, WCSSP Staff

#### **UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

Wednesday, Sept. 21, 2011	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, Oct. 19, 2011	10 am – 2 pm	Conference Room, Forks Office, DNR, 411 Tillicum Lane, Forks

#### **WELCOME/QUORUM**

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone and asked that each person introduce him/herself; in particular, he welcomed Megan Duffy from GSRO and Kat Moore from RCO. Swartout confirmed that there was one Board member representative from each Lead Entity Group present and therefore there was a quorum present.

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Swartout asked if there were any additions to the agenda for today's meeting. None were raised; the agenda was accepted.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

##### **WDFW Call for Nominations for Salmon Advisory Groups, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor**

Batchelder drew attention to the WDFW Call for Nominations for Salmon Advisory Groups, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. Batchelder confirmed that Mike Johnson is a member of the Willapa Bay group; Johnson said that other members are Steve Gray, Andy Mitby, and Dave Hollingsworth. Batchelder reported that Devona Ensmenger of the Wild Salmon Center has expressed an interest in serving on the Willapa Bay group and that the Board might consider nominating her for membership. Mike Johnson thinks that Ensmenger would bring a new diversity and background which would be beneficial to the Willapa Bay group. Katie Krueger asked if there was anyone from the Chehalis Tribe; Johnson said that he thinks Andy Olson used to be a member. Lee Napier said she would ask Mark White of the Chehalis Tribe about this.

Napier reported that the Grays Harbor County Commissioners nominated Mark Swartout to serve on the Grays Harbor group. Bob Burkle asked if there was anyone from the Quinault Nation on the Grays Harbor group; Bingaman said that he thinks having a Quinault member would be a conflict of interest since the Quinault are co-managers. Burkle said that makes sense.

##### **Willapa National Wildlife Refuge Plan adopted**

Batchelder reported that the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge has adopted their Management Plan which includes removal of the Bear River dikes which have recently been so controversial. SRFB put on hold the funding for the dike removal, the dike removal project sponsor has withdrawn the project, and the Wildlife Refuge has expressed somewhat of a preference to not pursue SRFB funding for the project. Mike Johnson said he continues to discuss the matter with the project sponsor, Ron Craig, and the Wildlife Refuge; at this point it is up to them whether to

pursue SRFB funding for the project. He observed that if Ellsworth Creek is funded with last year's Bear River project funds, that would free up \$85,000 that could be used for another 2011 project in the region.

In response to a question, Megan Duffy clarified that SRFB policy is that if a project falls through within a year of being funded, the funds may be used for an alternate project; in this case, if the Bear River dike removal project falls away before December 31, 2011, the funds can be reallocated to the alternate Ellsworth Creek project, with any overage reverting to overall SRFB funds for next year.

Johnson asked Duffy if the monies originally allocated to the Bear River project could revert to the regional allocation, for re-allocation by the region. She said that the SRFB will be deciding on the answer to that question at their August 31<sup>st</sup> meeting; GSRO/RCO staff have prepared a memo to the SRFB outlining possible options the Board might consider. The memo has not yet been officially sent to the Board, so it is not yet public; however, she roughly outlined the possible options in the memo:

1. Use their existing policy (see paragraph above);
2. Waive their existing policy and allow the Lead Entity Group to use the unused 2010 funds for 2011 projects;
3. Waive their existing policy and allow the region as a whole to determine where the funding should be used; or
4. Hold on to the funds for one year to see if another sponsor comes forward for this specific project, in which case the project would go through the Lead Entity Group approval process, and, if approved, the funds would go to this specific project.

Duffy said that it isn't clear what the SRFB might decide in this regard and that any information that WCSSP members have about, for instance, the inclinations of the Wildlife Refuge and the Pacific County Commissioners would be useful for the SRFB to have before their make their decision on August 31<sup>st</sup>.

Swartout observed that if the SRFB chooses the third option above, then the WCSSP Board at our September meeting will need to decide how to re-allocate the funds.

#### **New WCSSP Board Member from the Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group**

Lee Napier announced that the GHC Commissioners appointed Mark White, Director of Natural Resources for the Chehalis Tribe, as a new WCSSP Board member.

Swartout asked if anyone else had an announcement to make. None were voiced.

#### **APPROVAL of JULY 20, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY**

Swartout asked if there were any corrections or additions to the meeting summary for the July 20, 2011 Board meeting. Hearing none, Swartout declared the July Meeting Summary approved.

#### **INTRODUCTION OF MEGAN DUFFY, NEW EXECUTIVE COORDINATOR, GOVERNOR'S SALMON RECOVERY OFFICE**

Swartout introduced and welcomed Megan Duffy, the new Executive Coordinator of the RCO Governor's Salmon Recovery Office. He expressed the hope that this would be one of many visits by her to WCSSP Board meetings. He reported that he had asked her to present her background.

Duffy thanked the group for inviting her. She reported that she has a legal background, has a law degree, and worked for a judge for awhile, but left that to work for about nine years for an environmental consulting firm in Seattle where she focused on environmental public policy work. She had a diverse portfolio there, working on issues involving salmon, climate change, hazardous waste, and air. In this position, she worked at the federal, EPA

level, the state level and the local level. Then, after a few years raising children, she went to work for RCO as a staff person for the SRFB working on policy issues and research, including such things as large woody debris liability, the RMAP policy, expansion of eligibility of projects for SRFB funding, consideration of biennial funding, and other issues raised at both the SRFB and the regional levels. In her new job as GSRO Executive Coordinator, she will continue to be responsible for these policy and research issues for the SRFB. However, the work she was doing on RCO in-house legal items such as landowner agreements will be done by the Attorney General's Office and another RCO staff person. Her hope is that in her new GSRO position she will be more in touch with issues in the various regions, and be able to bring those issues forward for discussion at the SRFB level effectively so that the SRFB will be able to more fully deal with on-the-ground issues that the regions face.

She also noted that within the GSRO office Jennifer Johnson is working on the biennial State of the Salmon in Watersheds Report (SOS) as well as other data issues like data management and consistency, with the aim of telling the salmon story more effectively. Krueger asked whether Johnson seeks out tribal as well as state, WDFW data when preparing the SOS Report; she observed that the tribes do give their information to the state, so she suggested that Johnson might find out to whom at the state level the tribes are giving their data. Duffy said that this was a topic of discussion with the Council of Regions (COR) at a meeting last week, and she is very interested in doing what Krueger suggests; GSRO would welcome any data that tribes are willing to provide. At the meeting last week, Duffy heard from the regions that there is richer data that would tell the story more fully than has been done in previous SOS Reports; the depth and richness of data is not consistent across and within regions, but it should be accessed to create more effective SOS Reports. Duffy reported that Johnson is beginning the process of identifying data sources, so Krueger's suggestion is very timely and she will convey it to Johnson.

Also at the COR meeting, Duffy learned of the regions' desire to have state and federal agencies "pull more of their weight" (her phrase) regarding salmon protection and recovery. She reported that GSRO has committed to revisiting the 2008 report prepared by Phil Miller identifying key state and federal actions that each of the regions wanted to see in regards salmon protection/recovery work. This will involve bringing this report up to date – removing now-irrelevant items, adding new items, etc. -- and then working with the regions to have regional meetings with the relevant state agencies, bringing the message(s) to higher levels of state agencies in Olympia, and compiling relevant messages for delivery to federal agencies. She will be working with Batchelder, and through him the WCSSP Board, to craft the relevant messages from the Coast, especially recognizing that the realities in the Coast Region are somewhat different than the other regions.

GSRO is also in the process of hiring a monitoring staff position; in the meantime, Duffy is staying abreast of monitoring efforts in each region; in the 2011-13 biennium for the Coast Region, this involves beginning to develop a Monitoring Plan.

Lloyd Moody of GSRO will continue his work as Lead Entity Program Manager, working with each Lead Entity Group on process, contracts, etc.

Duffy said that, in general, the direction from her director, RCO's Cottingham, is that GSRO's work plan should primarily support the work plans of the regions, since that is where the actual work is done and that GSRO should do whatever it can to support regional work. She asked that no one hesitate to contact her with a question or concern; she's always available via email or phone.

Swartout thanked Duffy and reiterated his hope that she will be able to attend future WCSSP Board meetings to keep WCSSP's direct connection to GSRO and the help it can provide.

There was some discussion of Phil Miller's 2008 paper, which Duffy said is posted on the GSRO website. Batchelder clarified that in regards the Coast Region, the paper only talks about Lake Ozette. Krueger pointed out that it should perhaps be updated to include consideration of bull trout, since SRFB has more recently added bull trout to its scope of responsibility.

Rich Osborne asked for confirmation that Kat Moore is the RCO manager for all of WCSSP's LE projects; Moore confirmed this but added that she is also manager for Lower Columbia projects. She can attend WCSSP Board meetings whenever that would be appropriate and/or helpful.

John Sims brought up the issue of including monitoring activities in SRFB projects; SRFB originally allowed it, but no longer does. He suggested that if monitoring activities and results are accepted by other state agencies, for instance when harvest numbers are agreed upon, why shouldn't RCO/SRFB accept them also? In addition, there are some monitoring activities for which the Quinalts, for example, have forty years of data – smolts, redd counts, etc.; this kind of information and continued data collection should logically be able to be included in project activities. Sims' overall question is whether SRFB can revisit the question of including monitoring components in project proposals.

Duffy responded to Sims that it is reasonable to raise the question with SRFB; others have raised the same question, so she knows that it is not an isolated concern. Unfortunately, there are funding issues that would need to be considered in answering the question because monitoring activities can require sums of money that SRFB might think are better spent elsewhere. Sims expressed his support for beginning some kind of dialogue about this issue. Duffy related that Monitoring is one of seven topics set out by the Council of Regions as priorities for attention.

Terry Baltzell said that he wanted to echo what Sims said. There are many groups that carry out many projects with no monitoring component; this means that when some of those projects fail, there is little or no learning from the failure because the project had no monitoring component. He understands that having monitoring components in a project can inappropriately expand to create what's a research project, not a recovery project; this needs to be controlled. However, it's a waste not to include monitoring as part of on-the-ground projects. In addition, monitoring needs to be long term and consistent; two or three years of monitoring is nothing statistically and does not add anything to our knowledge base. Things are happening that are not monitored that, basically, are counterproductive to what SRFB thinks its funding is being used for.

Osborne said that he thinks that instead of waiting for SRFB to provide monitoring funding, we should systematically compile and organize the data that already exists for the region, perhaps getting private funding if necessary to do so. An accurate, historical data set would be very valuable, and, he believes, something we can accomplish ourselves.

Krueger pointed out that all SRFB-funded restoration projects are required to carry out effectiveness monitoring thereafter, even though funding is not provided. Project sponsors find a way to fulfill this requirement, but it doesn't seem very equitable to her; if monitoring is important and is going to be required, then SRFB funding should support it.

Sims clarified that what he was talking about was the ability to use monitoring activities and costs as match for SRFB-funded projects. Duffy said that others have brought up this point also.

Mike Johnson said that to fund monitoring for every project across the state would add up to a very large amount of money, and this is one of the reasons it's not well funded in project grants. He suggested that perhaps there is some way to reasonably limit funding for monitoring, while still supporting effective monitoring in a more selective way. He struggles with this question because, like others, he would ideally like to do monitoring for all projects, but he doesn't want funding taken away from actual project activities. Sims agreed, perhaps criteria such as the existence of historical data could be used; he is simply proposing that this question should be discussed. Duffy said that it is definitely an item up for consideration and discussion these days. Last year monitoring was identified as the number one gap in non-capital costs. If we're to have good adaptive management, we have to have monitoring data. To her, there are two questions: one is the funding; the other is how to structure monitoring so that data from different projects in different watersheds can be brought together to create an accurate overall picture for the state.

Krueger pointed out for the record that there are some landowners who do not support monitoring on their properties.

#### **SEPTEMBER ELECTION OF NEW VICE CHAIR**

Swartout reminded everyone that Faith Taylor-Eldred is unable to continue as Vice Chair of the WCSSP Board, and therefore the Board needs to elect a new Vice Chair at the September annual meeting. He observed that this will allow us to elect a Chair and a Vice Chair in alternating years, which is a good practice to have in place. For this election, nominations should be sent to Batchelder by September 14, 2011, at which point the nominated names will be distributed to all Board members, with the election on September 21, 2011.

#### **2011 SRFB PROJECT LISTS BY LEAD ENTITY GROUP**

Batchelder pointed out that in the Board packet today are the PRISM listings of project proposals, organized by Lead Entity Group.

##### North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group (NPCLE)

Osborne reported that the previous day NPCLE had ranked three of its four projects for funding, as follows:

1. Coal Creek Culvert Replacement (\$169,300)
2. North Fork Calawah Culvert Replacement (\$86,500), and Hoh River Knotweed Control Project (\$43,000)

With these funded, there is only about \$34,000 remaining in NPCLE's 2011 sub-allocation, which is not enough to cover their fourth project, the Hoh River Feasibility Study and Project Design (\$153,334), so this reach assessment is on the table as an alternate.

##### Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group (QINLE)

The following projects were ranked for funding:

1. QIN South Fork Salmon River Culvert Replacement (\$197,030)
2. QIN F-17 Road Impounded Pond Enhancement Project (\$33,500 updated to \$38,600 per RCO request)
3. Christmas Creek Drainage Restoration, an RMAP project (\$219,368), which may be broken up into the removals of the three lower culverts: culvert one (\$64,356), culvert two (\$32,124), and culvert three (\$37,044). This year's QIN sub-allocation would allow for completion of work on culvert one, but is \$18,000 short of also being able to do culvert two, and is \$54,000 short of completing both culverts two and three.

In addition to extra funding needed to complete this Christmas Creek Drainage Restoration, the following projects are alternates, in this order:

1. QIN Trib to Moses Prairie Fish Passage (\$71,948)
2. QIN F-15 Road Impounded Pond Enhancement (\$33,500)
3. QIN Lunch Creek Fish Passage (\$6,991)

##### Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group (GHCLE)

Napier reported that five projects can be fully funded, and were ranked in July, and subsequently approved by the GHC Commissioners as follows:

1. Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Use Assessment (\$187,352)
2. Cedar Creek Road Barrier Culvert Correction (\$79,000)
3. McDonald Creek Restoration (\$66,528)

4. Chehalis Watertype Assessment – Phase II (\$117,000)
5. Grisdale Fish Passage Restoration – Save and Pig Pen Creeks, the first of three project components (\$116,008)

The sixth ranked project, Trib to Steven’s Creek Fish Passage Improvement, an RMAP project (\$65,650), would require an additional \$17,521 beyond GHCLE’s sub-allocation to complete. However, the project sponsor is willing to go forward with the entire project even if the additional funding isn’t forthcoming.

Napier added that there is seventh, alternate project, the second part of the overall Grisdale Fish Passage Restoration – the Wye Creek (\$168,011).

#### Pacific County Lead Entity Group (PCLE)

Johnson reported that last night PCLE ranked three projects, for full funding, as follows:

1. North River Knotweed Control Project (\$150,000), ranked #1 by the citizens’ committee and #3 by the technical committee
2. Ellsworth Creek Fish Passage (\$85,989), ranked #2 by both the citizens’ and technical committees
3. Willapa Bay – North Nemah River Conservation Project (\$100,000), an acquisition project, ranked #3 by the citizens’ committee (which voted down a motion to withdraw the project by a vote of 4-4) and ranked #1 by the technical committee

These rankings have yet to be approved by the Pacific County Commissioners. PCLE’s 2011 sub-allocation will cover all three of these projects, with about \$22,000 left over. In addition, depending on how the 2010 Bear River project evolves, there may be excess funds remaining from that.

Batchelder said he wanted to commend Johnson for doing all the work necessary to getting these projects ranked after the creation of whole new citizens’ and technical committees in the last month.

#### **REALLOCATION OF SRFB PROJECT FUNDING WITHIN THE REGION**

Swartout noted that Batchelder was displaying a chart proposing how the WCSSP Board might re-allocate regional SRFB funding, given the Lead Entity Groups’ project rankings and costs. Batchelder explained which Lead Entity Groups might be returning funds to the region for reallocation, and how the outcome of the 2010 Bear River Project might affect current funding.

Ed Bowen noted that NPCLE has asked the project sponsor for the Hoh River Assessment Project -- Wendy Marsh of the Wild Fish Conservancy (WFC) -- whether the project can be phased, thereby allowing part of the project to be completed with available funding this year. Osborne said that Marsh will hopefully join the meeting via conference call soon; his understanding is that at this point is that WFC thinks it can phase the project. However, Kat Moore added that RCO/SRFB’s acceptance of phasing may depend on the nature of the phasing, whether it’s by splitting up the stream into segments to be assessed, or by splitting up the assessment tasks, which could result in an unacceptable data-only project. She said she needed to discuss the possibilities with Brian Abbott, RCO, as well as the project sponsor.

Swartout asked when any re-allocation decisions need to be made by the WCSSP Board. After discussion and input, it was generally agreed that re-allocation decisions could be made at the September 21<sup>st</sup> WCSSP Board meeting, which would allow time for all the components to settle into place (the status of flagged projects, the SRFB decision on the 2010 Bear River Project, and decisions by the Lead Entity Groups guiding their Board members).

Batchelder noted for the record that the Yakima region put out a request for \$50,000 in 2011 from another region that they would “pay back” in a future year.

In response to a question from Osborne, Napier and Johnson both confirmed that their County Commissioners (Grays Harbor and Pacific, respectively) have always had to approve the rankings of their respective Lead Entity Groups before projects were submitted to SRFB. Osborne noted that since NPCLE's citizens' committee includes all local governments (2 counties, 1 city and 3 tribes) in addition to citizens at large, the ranking approved by the NPCLE citizens' committee is analogous. Mike Johnson noted that RCO is still reviewing the new PCLE bylaws.

Swartout proposed that the Board re-allocate \$54,000 to the Quinault for the Christmas Creek project, and then, depending on the interim Pacific County/SRFB/RCO decisions, re-allocate \$17,000 to GHCLE's Trib to Steven's Creek Fish Passage project, and then, if there are more funds available, re-allocate that remainder to phasing of NPCLE's Hoh Assessment project. There was push back on this proposal, and discussion about whether the one QIN project that's \$54,000 short is really several smaller projects that could be separated, or not. It seemed that the answer was that they shouldn't be separated, for cost efficiency reasons, for habitat results, and because they were originally ranked and considered together.

Osborne said he had no problem with waiting until the October WCSSP Board meeting to finalize any re-allocation, in part because then the SRFB TRG process would be complete by then and we'd know the outcomes of all of the factors that are currently up in the air. However, he said he also had no problem with putting forward a tentative re-allocation today, which could go back to the Lead Entity Groups for their consideration, thus accomplishing a little ground work.

Mike Johnson suggested perhaps having WCSSP's Regional Technical Committee (RTC) rank the unfunded projects on technical merit; Baltzell objected to this idea because the membership of the RTC is not equally balanced between the LEGs. Johnson acknowledged the point Baltzell made, although he thought that the RTC worked on the same decision-making principles as the larger Board. Osborne said he didn't think that at this early point in the development of RTCs, it made sense to ask them to basically override decisions made by LEGs according to well-established procedures. At this point, any re-allocation should be the prerogative of the WCSSP Board according to Lead Entities' guidance and decision-making, that is, one vote per Lead Entity.

Bingaman asked for clarification on how the RTC operates, since his direction to QIN staff has been that their participation and 'voting' at the RTC should be based not on QIN interests, but on what is best for salmon in the whole region. Osborne noted that the Board is going to discuss some of these conflicting perceptions about the RTC later in the meeting today; right now, the RTC basically operates on consensus and there is no clear decision-making procedure beyond that. He reiterated that at this point in organizational development, he thinks the Board needs to make any re-allocation decisions. There was some intense discussion about this view, some (e.g., Sims) agreeing that the projects have already been through technical review and we're now at the political phase of making decisions, while others (e.g., Johnson) thought that a RTC technical review and ranking of the un-funded projects at this point is exactly the kind of input that the Board needs to make good decisions.

After further discussion about the possibility of RTC ranking unfunded projects, Swartout said he was hearing consensus that the Board should make the re-allocation decision(s). Johnson said he agreed with that consensus; he was mostly describing a different way of viewing the situation. Osborne wanted to say that he actually agrees with Johnson about the potential role of the RTC; he just doesn't think that RTC procedures for decision-making have been sufficiently developed to fulfill that role at this point in time, nor, he reminded everyone, does WCSSP have a Plan in place to guide RTC decisions on hot-button items like this. Bob Burkle added that the RTC would be reviewing the projects solely on paper, without the advantage of site visits. Additionally, it would take a lot of preparation – agreement on a RTC ranking procedure, for instance. It was generally agreed that at this point the Board should make the re-allocation decision(s), with an eye towards involvement of the RTC at some point in the future.

Bingaman suggested that there are many factors that the Board should consider in re-allocating project funding, for instance, looking at which LEGs have returned funds to the regional pool in years past.

Terry Willis asked Moore for clarification on a comment Willis thought she had made about County Commissioners not having the authority to re-rank the projects before finally submitting them to RCO. Moore related that Pacific County is currently undergoing a procedural audit by RCO because of the Bear Valley controversy, which has resulted in new bylaws, procedures, and re-creation of PCLE's citizens' and technical committees. Duffy added that RCO has looked into what, in particular, RCW 77.85.050 says about this issue. The particular section of the statute that speaks to the project lists says that it is a specific task of each citizens' committee to rank their projects, create a project list and forward it to their Lead Entity; the language regarding each Lead Entity says that the Lead Entity is to submit the project list. This is the interpretation of the statutory language of RCW 77.85.050 by RCO. Willis said she was talking about the contracts themselves, not the lists. Napier clarified that the counties do not sign the contracts themselves because the contracts are between RCO and the project sponsors. Willis said that this answered her question.

In answer to a question from Moore, Mike Johnson said that there is nothing in the PCLE Bylaws that speaks to the Pacific County Commissioners being able to re-rank (or delete, Willis pointed out) projects within the list. Bingaman wanted to make sure he correctly understand what Duffy had outlined; his understanding from what she said is that RCO's interpretation of the law is that the Lead Entity, whatever government it is, cannot change a project list before submitting it to SRFB/RCO. Duffy said that that is correct. Faith Taylor-Eldred noted that this is RCO's interpretation of the statute. In answer to a question, Osborne clarified that NPCLE's citizens' committee is comprised of citizens plus six "implementing" governments (3 tribal, 2 county and 1 city) that have equal footing; these implementing governments agreed through an ILA that Clallam County would serve as the fiscal agent for NPCLE, but the Clallam County Commissioners do not review the project list before submission.

Bingaman said he had recently talked to Lloyd Moody of GSRO/RCO about the recent LEG self-assessment checklist sent out; Moody had indicated that there was consideration of RCO doing more audits of LEGs, and Bingaman wondered if Duffy had any information or guidance about this. Duffy said that she thinks it would be premature for her to speculate on any expansion of audits by the SRFB beyond the one of Pacific County specifically directed by the SRFB. She can report that Moody assessed PCLE based on three establishing criteria: RCW 77.85, SRFB's standing policies, and the PCLE's contractual obligations with the state. She agreed with Bingaman that it would be a prudent, proactive step for the LEGs to look at their policies, procedures, Bylaws, etc. in light of RCO's self-assessment checklist.

Swartout acknowledged that this had been a very good discussion, but he wanted to bring the Board back to the issue of consideration of a tentative, "straw dog" proposal for re-allocation of project funds so that the LEGs could discuss a proposal before the September Board meeting. The proposal was to tentatively re-allocate \$54,000 to the Quinault for the Christmas Creek project, and then, depending on the interim Pacific County/SRFB/RCO decisions, re-allocate \$17,500 to GHCLE's Trib to Steven's Creek Fish Passage project, and then, if there are more funds available, re-allocate that remainder to phasing of NPCLE's Hoh Assessment project. He outlined the reasons behind this proposal as follows. First, if the Christmas Creek culverts were corrected at separate times, the costs would be higher because they are nearby one another and there are cost efficiencies in doing them all at once. Second, the \$17,000 for the Steven's Creek project is a comparatively small amount to complete an important project. Third, it sounded to him like the Hoh Assessment can be broken into acceptable phases, so any additional regional re-allocation funds could be used to at least get some of that project done this year. His hope is that if the Board tentatively approves this proposal today, it could be discussed and tentatively approved by the LEGs before the September WCSSP Board meeting, at which point, knowing exactly funds we have to re-allocate, the Board could make a final decision to go back to the LEGs for approval. This would then allow the Board to approve the final re-allocation of funds at their October meeting.

Mike Johnson reported that he'd just gotten a call from Charlie Stenvahl of the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge, sponsor of the Bear River project, who said that they are not going to make a decision until October 31<sup>st</sup>, but that they decline going through the PCLE citizens'/technical committee processes again to get the project funded. Duffy confirmed that the only way Bear River might be funded through SRFB would be to go through the PCLE processes. Johnson therefore summarized that the 2010 PCLE funds for Bear River will not be so utilized, so it's up to the SRFB as to what will happen to them.

Napier said that her only reservation about Swartout's proposal was that if PCLE had some project to be funded, she would want them to have first priority on the funds. However, from what Johnson just said, it sounded to her that that wasn't going to happen.

As outlined in Swartout's reasoning, Osborne said that he thought it was a really good rule of thumb for re-allocation decisions to use small amounts of money to fill out funding for projects, and one that the Board should use now and in the future.

Ed Bowen said he agreed with the tentative proposal as it has been discussed.

Swartout restated the proposal, pointing out that it is basically making the best use of public funds by providing comparatively small amounts of money to provide full and most efficient funding for both the QINLE Christmas Creek and GHCLE Stevens Creek projects, with remaining funds for use in potentially phased completion of the NPCLE Hoh Assessment project. There was no objection voiced to the tentative proposal.

### **REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (RTC)**

Swartout asked Batchelder to lead this discussion. Batchelder reported that we have lost three members from the RTC: Jeremy Gilman, Makah Tribe, and Andy Olson, Chehalis Tribe, have both taken jobs elsewhere, and Dan Guy, NOAA, retired. He doesn't know if there are other membership changes.

In addition, since the RTC's 2011 work on the sub-allocation formula has ended, Batchelder thought the Board might want to discuss and assign new tasks to the RTC: things that have been discussed at this meeting, continuing work on improving the sub-allocation formula, working on regional data for the State of the Salmon Report, reviewing the next draft of the Regional Salmon Plan, and/or others.

Before getting into further discussion, Swartout wanted to capture a few things he'd heard from previous discussions about the RTC. He thinks we have done well to invest a lot in development of the RTC, and it will serve WCSSP well in future. For instance, perhaps ranking unfunded projects for re-allocation funding each year as was suggested earlier, by having the RTC members travel together on site visits to the unfunded projects, learning more and more about each others' LEG areas and projects from a scientific perspective. In addition, Swartout hopes we can move towards perhaps funding projects of regional significance, which could also utilize the expertise of the RTC members.

Krueger disagreed with what Swartout said; in her dozen years of experience sitting on technical committees in this region, she thinks it is very difficult to be able to accurately assess projects in areas other than one's own no matter how many field trips or how much time one devotes to studying those projects because one has to be fully immersed in the details, history, realities and understanding of what any one project is trying to accomplish in order to properly judge project. She thinks that once the projects have been reviewed and ranked by the LEGs, it is a political process to determine re-allocation of regional funds, and that it would be unfair to both the RTC and WCSSP as a whole to task them with ranking those projects.

Bingaman commented that what Krueger described is one of the reasons that he approved and proposed three different QIN scientists to be on the RTC, each of whom has experience and expertise in different geographic areas of the region in addition to their scientific expertise. That having been said, he reported that he is now in a position where he has to pull a lot of their time away from RTC participation; he doesn't want to totally cut off their RTC participation, but reduce the number of meetings they attend, etc.

Osborne said that he agrees with a lot of what Krueger and Bingaman said. He thinks we can over time increase the region-wide knowledge base of RTC members so that they could look at project outside their area, but it will take time and effort. This will not be easy because RTC members are basically volunteers; many of them work for

agencies or governments who are willing to cover their expenses to participate, but that is asking those agencies and governments to stretch their resources to do so. In fact, we're asking people to volunteer to be on LEG-level technical committees, and then also asking some of those people to also volunteer on the regional RTC; this is really stretching what we're asking people and organizations to do. He pointed out that there are 22 people on the Board-approved list of RTC members, but only less than 10 have participated. So he thinks that the Board needs to look closely at these committees that we're creating, and what the Board is asking them to do. He thinks that perhaps the RTC should be looking at more general policy issues from their scientific perspective, rather than specific ranking of projects. He thinks this might be a better use of their time, both from their perspective and ours.

In response to what Osborne and others said, Swartout suggested that perhaps we need to talk to individual members and nominees and ask them what they are able to commit to.

Terry Baltzell said that there is a wealth and diversity of scientific knowledge and experience on WCSSP's RTC. He thinks that one reason the RTC has trouble coming to consensus is that members have such different, intense backgrounds, educations, and professional experience. He wanted the Board to know that Osborne has done a very good job of facilitating the RTC given this, and that the Board chose well is asking Osborne to chair it. He does think that losing some members, such as Chris Conklin, will create large gaps in the richness and depth of the group. And that assigning the RTC to get into the specifics of, for instance, proposed projects isn't the best guidance for the RTC to accomplish WCSSP goals.

Back to the specifics of the RTC currently, Batchelder said that he wants to know who's on it, and what its tasks are. In terms of tasks, Batchelder said that currently the Committee's tasks include a review of the draft Regional Plan and continued improvement of the sub-allocation formula. Osborne added that there are many potential RTC tasks revolving around the Regional Plan: we've identified a huge number of data gaps; we have inconsistent data sets to deal with; we need to slowly build up a universal data set for the region (for use in the sub-allocation formula and elsewhere). These data needs will take an enormous amount of work to accomplish, but are essential to what we're doing; Osborne thinks we need to commit regional funding (and probably seek additional funding) to the Data Steward position now so that we'd have someone consistently working on these issues with the RTC. He proposes that this be on next month's Board meeting agenda.

To be more specific, Osborne outlined the following few examples, all of which will use NetMap as our tool. We need to look at our stream layers more specifically, reassessing and expanding on what was done for this year's sub-allocation formula in that regard. We need to compile the historical data sets that exist in the region, look at what form they're in, how to make them useable and accessible, and then evaluate them.

Batchelder said he can look at proposing new RTC members from a regional perspective. Napier said that GHCLE has a replacement nominee for one of the positions, Larry Durham, the new fisheries biologist for the Chehalis Tribe. Burkle wanted to bring forward another nominee for the RTC, Chris Byrnes of WDFW, who is back being a watershed steward in the NPCLE and QINLE areas. Krueger pointed out that Byrnes used to be on the RTC, but had to bow out because of his temporary reassignment.

Bingaman suggested that one solution to some of the problems discussed today might be to hold fewer RTC meetings, perhaps quarterly.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Swartout thanked everyone for their participation, in particular Duffy and Moore for their time today. There being no further business, he adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Dietz

*Note: This Meeting Summary was compiled from the voice recording made of the meeting in Dietz' absence.*