



Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

DRAFT

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

October 5, 2010 10:15 am – 2:15 pm
Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, Washington

Attendees

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP, Co-Chair
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy, Co-Chair
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center (by
telephone)
Kristy Gallitsky, The Nature Conservancy
Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe
Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environ. Solu.
Phil Miller, Gov. Salmon Recovery Office
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy
Nicole Brandenburg, WCSSP (filling in for Dana
Dietz)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda for today's meeting was approved.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 31, 2010 MEETING NOTES

The Meeting Notes from the August 31, 2010 Planning Committee meeting were approved.

THREATS WORKSHOP REVIEW

Batchelder asked Nelson to lead the follow-up discussion on the Threats Workshop, held September 14th at the Ocean Shores Convention Center. She suggested that the committee talk through the overall ranked threats chart which came out of the workshop. One of the big questions is whether to lump and/or split the items on the chart, and, if so, how to do that.

Krueger pointed out some disparities between the results from different groups; the ranked chart seems to her to be incorrect. It was discussed how some groups in the workshop split their answers and some groups lumped their answers. Miller suggested that the committee go over the chart and Batchelder and Nelson can explain how they got from the votes at the workshop to the sheet that ranks the threats as very high, high, medium, and low.

Nelson explained that they entered the ratings as they came out of the workshop, with some challenges to overcome: When threats have very similar names, are they the same? There's not always an easy answer to that. For example, concerning invasive animal species and invasive plant species, most workshop groups split them, but the Mainstems group lumped both together. Nelson suggested a few ways of remedying this issue: We could go through the chart as a group to decide, or have a sub-group do it, or do it at a separate meeting.

Miller asked if the right-hand column is a ranked column where the top is the most high. Nelson said that it should be; where there was a tie, they were listed alphabetically. Some of the items seem to be flipped within the categories, so Nelson is going to correct that.

Nelson stated that we need to make sure we have categories right, then look for omissions, and then deal with parking lot issues. Batchelder suggested that mergers go first as that will help fill some of the omission gaps. It was suggested that the committee work on these issues as soon as possible. The group decided to hold a two hour conference call on Monday Oct. 11 from 10:00-12:00 to work on omissions, rankings, and mergers, and parking lot issues.

CORE SALMON STRONGHOLD IDENTIFICATION

Batchelder introduced the salmon stronghold identification section of the meeting. He observed that this provides a great opportunity to integrate some of the protection concepts of the plan development; it's a timely opportunity and something that he thinks the planning committee should consider integrating into the plan.

Ensmenger had a slideshow presentation to explain the process: As part of the NASSP process the Wild Salmon Center is working on identifying the key salmon strongholds in the coastal region. Over 20 local and regional experts provided expert ratings on populations. The resulting product was a series of 29 maps of the ratings for 133 salmon populations. With feedback it became clear that WSC needed to have additional layers of data to inform decision making. A few of the elements being added are habitat integrity and future security. The tool is a decision support model, followed by Marxan analysis. Both of those tools were used to develop the North American Salmon Stronghold final map. This has been done by California and WSC would like to do the same for the Washington Coast by the end of December 2010. WSC would like some input from WCSSP and its Regional Technical Committee on the best way to structure the rest of the process.

Ensmenger explained how the decision support model works: when evaluating populations each expert was asked to give a score between 1 and 5, with 5 being a strong population, and 1 being weak. Anything lower than 3 was considered weak. The purpose of this model is to provide certainty that populations that come up as strong are, in fact, strong based on the logic curves.

McMurry brought up an issue regarding some gaps in information in the upper Chehalis and other areas where there are no fish listed and asked how those gaps are being handled. Ensmenger explained there may be some issues with watershed boundary lines; if there is a red flag or a difference in opinion, WSC will go back and follow up. McMurry brought up a couple places where there was a large difference of opinion in fish populations. Ensmenger replied that if there is a huge disparity in the opinion of the experts regarding the number of fish, WSC will do a call-back to the experts and ask them to review the rating. If the experts each believe that they gave an accurate rating, but the ratings still significantly disagree, WSC will average the population ratings.

STRATEGIES WORKSHOP

The next task of the planning committee was to develop the Strategies Workshop to be held November 3-4 at the Shilo Inn in Ocean Shores. Nelson had a slide show that presented the situation analysis foundation used to identify drivers and opportunities leading to strategy development. She also discussed prioritizing regional strategies and developing goal statements.

She suggested that the workshop contain these sections:

- Welcome (Summary of info to date, background)
- Goals
- Strategy development
- Prioritization
 - Basic impact, feasibility, cost factor assessment
- Special sessions?
 - Key unknowns/information gaps/climate changes.

Nelson suggested we have some skeleton goal statements so that people can give input without starting from scratch. It is really important to prepare a document that states all of the core information that the group needs to participate in strategy development.

Nelson suggested that after the workshop we might want to hold small technical sessions to fine tune the strategies.

Nelson stated that a goal is the desired future condition of our targets based on a roll up of the viability assessments. She came up with examples of goals we might have. Miller suggested that we not only have goals, but we have benchmarks based on the measurable data we are able to collect.

Nelson discussed the items that should be prepared and sent to participants before the workshop, including a summary of the key information, agenda, and quick summary of strategy development.

Nelson suggested that we get the information out before the next planning meeting so that it can be reviewed beforehand by the planning committee. The committee decided to have another follow-up conference call between the October 11th conference call and the Oct 26th planning meeting, date and time to be determined.

Nelson explained that our objectives for the workshop includes prioritizing strategies across the region, some synthesis of the strategies, input on goal statements, and special sessions on key information, information gaps, and unknowns. Kara asked the group if there is anything else that should be included in the workshop.

Nelson said that on the first day of the strategies workshop we need to get input, generate draft strategies, work on the goals. And then begin the second day with special sessions to hone the information received from the first day. Miller suggested that we do special sessions in smaller groups so that we can touch all the subjects.

The people who will be invited to the Strategies workshop are participants/invitees from previous workshops and other professional contacts suggested by members of the planning committee. Miller suggested that we should work at promoting interest in both attendees of the last workshop and the invitees who did not make it to the last workshop. Some names brought up were: Jim Sellers, Bob Metzger, Dave King, Michelle Culver, Sarah Laborde, Julie Dieu from Rayonier. Miller said he would like to see Kirt Hughes, Michele Culver, and Bob Burkle from WDFW. McMurry suggested that we should invite someone from NOAA to attend. Krueger suggested that the group invites anybody they can invite because only a certain percentage will actually attend. Because of space in the hotel they should be asked to commit by a certain date. It was suggested that each person on the committee contact 10 people that they have a relationship with and encourage them to attend the workshop.

Nelson suggested that if people attending the workshop can only come for one day, they need to come on the first day as the second will be too confusing to jump into. The group agreed that the first day is the most important for people to attend as that is where the raw strategy development is going to occur. Nelson suggested that we not put this information on the invitation, but let people know individually if they indicate they can only attend one day of the workshop.

Batchelder thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Nicole Brandenburg
Edited by Dana Dietz