



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

March 18, 2009

Port of Grays Harbor

Aberdeen, WA

9:00 am to 4:00 pm

In attendance:

Nancy Allison, Executive Director, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, Program Assistant, WCSSP
Dana Dietz, Administrative Assistant, WCSSP
Lee Benda, NetMap
Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions
John Kliem, Creative Community Solutions
Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
Katie Krueger, Quileute Natural Resources

Quinault Lead Entity Group

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator
Jim Jorgensen, Quinault Fisheries
Tony Hartrich, Quinault Natural Resources

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator
Lonnie Crumley, Streamworks
Mark Swartout, Thurston County

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator
Key McMurry, Key Environmental Solutions
and WBWRCC

Technical

April Boe, The Nature Conservancy
Carrie Cook-Tabor, USFWS
Dave King, WDFW
Curt Holt, WDFW
James Schoeder, The Nature Conservancy
Lauri Vigue, WDFW
David Price, WDFW

ILA Designated Representatives

Peggy Berry, City of Ocean Shores
James Sellers, Quinault Indian Nation
Jack Thompson, Port of Grays Harbor
Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe

ACTION STEPS

- 1. Please send Dana any suggestions you have about our Annual Meeting June 17th.***
- 2. Please consider joining either the Technical Team or the Planning Committee for the Regional Restoration Planning process; contact Nancy. Your input is needed.***

3. Please send to Nancy anything you've written (in grants or for any other purpose) about the benefits of using a Regional Plan in salmon recovery work. If you could provide her with any language or research you've already done about this, it would help her when she goes before the SRFB in May

APRIL REGIONAL MEETING

(Please note: It will be a week later than usual due to RCO Projects Conference in Shelton.)

Wednesday, April 22nd

10 am to 2 pm at the Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen

10 am to noon Business Meeting

Noon to 2 pm

Habitat Work Schedule presentation/discussion

Please encourage your sponsors to come!

(Sorry, WCSSP will not be providing lunch.)

BUSINESS MEETING

Nancy Allison welcomed everyone and introduced the designated representatives of Interlocal Agreement (ILA) signatories who were present: Mark Swartout, Thurston County; Peggy Berry, City of Ocean Shores; Jack Thompson, Port of Grays Harbor; James Sellers, Quinault Indian Nation; and Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe.

Today's Agenda

She reviewed the three major topics of today's meeting: the Board Structure; the Needs Assessment that the Wild Salmon Center is doing in combination with our Regional Restoration Plan; and, a continuation of our discussion from last November about the criteria for sub-allocating funds to each Lead Entity Group. She asked if there were any comments or additions to the Agenda. There were none.

Stimulus Package Applications

Before we got into agenda items, Nancy wanted to comment on what we've been doing with the Stimulus Package. She reported that last week she'd received some guidance and a template from the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) which she sent out to the Lead Entity Coordinators with a request to submit projects that were shovel-ready and permitted.

She asked if anyone had any questions about the Stimulus Package. Phil Miller reported that project submissions from the Coast, and the Upper and Lower Columbia River regions due this afternoon would be screened this evening, looking for any weak points in any projects that could be corrected so as to not jeopardize a package of projects. The criteria are a mix between shovel-ready salmon recovery and job creation. Projects must meet both criteria. This is a national competition, \$170 million for the coastal regions throughout the country. There is tough competition.

Phil wanted everyone to be aware that for those projects that pass these screening criteria, GSRO will be asking for further information within the next week. The deadline to get completed packages to NOAA is April 3rd, so the GSRO's deadline will be March 25th. He's aware that this is all on a fast track, but, as Nancy noted, it is a golden opportunity.

In response to a question about project timelines for Stimulus Package money, Phil explained that the projects have to be started within about 4 months. They want projects to start by August, but there may be a month or two leeway. In terms of completion, they prefer 12 – 18 months for completion, with a maximum of 24 months (that is, August 2011).

Phil explained that entities within the State of Washington can submit within the State's process or independently; they have the right to submit either way. GSRO is trying to create the strongest possible packages with the best projects to get the Governor's endorsement and approval at the federal level.

In response to a question about requirements for EIS, Phil said that GSRO's understanding so far is that NEPA was being satisfied by a programmatic EIS that has a large footprint in terms of types of projects so that every project would be covered by it. There could be exceptions to this. This is documented on the NOAA website about Stimulus Package funding.

WCSSP Board Structure

Nancy started the discussion about WCSSP Board structure by pointing out a chart in everyone's meeting packet that outlines a couple Board structures recommended by the WCSSP staff, and lists the assumptions on which the staff based their recommendation. The assumptions came out of the original report on forming the Coast regional organization. The four assumptions are:

1. Eligible Board members are drawn from Lead Entity Group membership.
2. Equal representation on the Board from each Lead Entity Group.
3. Each Lead Entity Group has one vote in creating the Board.
4. Not cast in stone; can be changed through Board/L.E.G. consideration.

What she hopes is that the proposal agreed upon by the group today will be voted on by each Lead Entity Group in a timely manner and each L.E.G. will come to April's meeting with their nominees, so that a Board will be in place by the end of April's meeting.

To give background on other Regions' modes of decision-making and voting, Phil said that in all cases, the emphasis is on consensus, not voting, which means that there often are not votes taken. In addition, the authority of any ILA signatory is fully retained by that signatory and cannot be affected by the operations of the Region's Board.

Mark Swartout noted that the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) has only voted once in the last 8 or so years, utilizing a super-majority mechanism they had established for just such stalemates when a universal consensus was not able to be reached. He pointed out that working toward consensus needs to be the persistent goal. In other words, a Board can't just revert to a vote if consensus isn't reached immediately.

Nancy outlined the staff's proposed plan, which is based on there being two groups, a Board of Directors and an Advisory Council. The Board would be 8 people, two from each Lead Entity Group. The Advisory Council would provide broad and inclusive perspective to inform the Board's decisions. The rationale behind this arrangement is to have as much official representation and input as possible, but not make the Board too large and unwieldy. Phil Miller commented that there was no reason to hold to 8 people if this would leave out some key people.

The Advisory Council would be made up of the four Lead Entity Coordinators, the ILA Representatives, and representatives from WDFW and GSRO. It was also suggested that the Interim

Advisory Committee consider whether or not to include on the Advisory Council any tribe that chose not to sign the Interlocal Agreement.

Clarification was made that each organization that signs the ILA designates someone to be the liaison with WCSSP. This person is not necessarily the person who actually signs for the organization.

Mark pointed out that one consideration in the decision should be the administrative costs of having two groups. How often will each of them meet, etc.? He also offered the experience that although the Boards of both the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound (SSPS) and PSP are pretty large, their meetings are not unwieldy at all. The point was made that we'd probably want the Board and the Advisory Council to meet together.

Nancy noted that her suggestion for forming committees was so that she could work with them and not have to come back to the full group as often.

Phil raised the question of whether the suggestion of 2 Board members from each Lead Entity Group was acceptable. In response to a question from Mike Johnson, Phil noted that this is the only region based on the concept of a Federation with Strong Lead Entities, and that none of the Boards of other Regions has a designated number of Board Members from each Lead Entity Group.

Mike recalled that the Federation of Strong Lead Entities came about because NPCLE has always had more meeting attendees, and has more tribes and other agencies involved. But, Mike asked, if the agreed-upon method of decision-making is consensus building, would a different number of Board members from each L.E.G. make a difference – say, 6 from NPCLE and 2 from Pacific County L.E.G.?

Nancy noted that, in a consensus building environment, it shouldn't make a difference, but it's a decision that the group needs to make and everyone find acceptable. If the group decides on a different number of Board members from each L.E.G., then it's clear that there will have to be one vote per Lead Entity Group. In practice, the number of Board members wouldn't make too much difference if the aim was always to reach consensus, and, worst case scenario, each L.E.G. had one vote, if it did come to a vote.

Phil said he'd been thinking about this and realized that there were many options for creating a Board that might solve the problem of NPCLE having so many vested interests compared, say, to Pacific County L.E.G. For instance, NPCLE could have three Board members: one tribal position which rotated between the three NPCLE tribes, one local government position which rotated among the local governments, and a third unspecified Board position. Or, NPCLE could have six Board positions, one from each tribe, a local government position seat which rotated among the local governments, and two unspecified positions. Just two ideas.

Mike Johnson noted that just because Pacific County might only bring 2 people doesn't mean NPCLE shouldn't be able to bring more to the Board. But, if it comes down to a vote, he wouldn't feel comfortable if NPCLE had more votes because of that.

Rich Osborne thinks that having an equal number of Board members from each L.E.G. makes more sense because it would be a more direct way to get consensus and votes from the various groups within NPCLE – a more direct way than the additional step of bringing every issue back to NPCLE for consensus or vote.

Katie brought up the scenario of the Board inadvertently making a decision that in effect inappropriately tells a co-manager or other agency, county or other local government what to do, or deprives a tribe of their treaty rights. She pointed out that the Board may not be composed of people with salmon recovery experience. Her point was that there has to be some veto policy, some way to stop such actions, a mechanism in place that stops the Board from making a decision they'll regret. Katie clarified that since there's a possibility that not every tribe will be represented on the Board, the Board needs to have a veto mechanism in place in order to ensure that all authorities are respected. She noted, for instance, that although the Quileute Reservation is relatively small, the tribe's area of responsibility for co-management is large, including many miles up and down the coast, out into the ocean, and about 1000 square miles of land area.

Phil agreed that there has to be a provision for **veto with cause**. Specifics of this would be fleshed out by the Board during the creation of bylaws and operating procedures.

Nancy made two points in relation to this: one, the existence of the recommended Advisory Council will hopefully go a long way in providing assurance of input from everyone; second, once the Board is in place, it needs to develop a very explicit set of Bylaws that clearly details voting, vetoes and solutions to similar potential problems.

John Sims pointed out that the Puget Sound Partnership has many tribes covered by the Boldt decision, and asked how that Partnership solved this problem. Mark Swartout said that they solved it through their ground rules, which provide a mechanism whereby IF an issue comes to a vote, the Lead Entity Groups have a majority of the voting power, but all the jurisdictions are part of the super-majority also required. As he noted earlier, only one issue in the last 8 years or so has ever come to an actual vote with their Partnership. It's the discussions behind the scenes that help build consensus by airing concerns and coming up with solutions that satisfy everyone, so that agreement can be more easily reached at formal meetings.

Jim Sellers observed that for the committees and boards he's sat on over the decades, a major problem has been apathy, people not showing up, and therefore problems with establishing a quorum at meetings. So, it's critical to take the time to properly set up the Board structure, define "quorum," get the right people involved as Board members and establish a system of having an alternate for each Board member.

Mark Swartout agreed that the idea of designating Board Alternates was a good one, but to prevent alternates from being appointed at the last minute, they need to have been appointed well in advance. Lonnie Crumley added that Board Alternates also need to be kept well informed so they can step in.

Rich Osborne suggested that having three Board members from each Lead Entity Group would, he thinks, work for NPCLE with their greater number of governments, and also create a Board with equal representation from each L.E.G. so that effective decisions could be made at Board meetings. NPCLE could perhaps work out a rotating system to accommodate their greater number of governments.

Phil pointed out that the quorum issue can mess up Boards and organizations, so he'd suggest establishing a clear policy on what constitutes a quorum. Is it having at least one representative from each Lead Entity Group? Or having at least one representative from at least three of the L.E.G.s? Or a majority of Board members overall with at least one member from each L.E.G.? Or ...?

Nancy thought she was hearing two main suggestions: The one Phil had put forward of having a variable number of Board members from each Lead Entity Group, from one to five or six (with the decision up to each L.E.G. as to how many), with each L.E.G. having one vote at the Board level. The other is the idea of having the same number from each L.E.G., say three, with a system of rotating Board members. She wanted to get comments from the group about this, starting with comments about the first option. She asked if there was anyone either totally against or totally for this option. No one seemed to respond strongly one way or another.

Mark Swartout wanted to ask “before he voted” (!) whether the Board Agenda would be distributed early enough that any Lead Entity Group could meet and discuss the issues before its representatives came to a Board Meeting. Nancy said, yes, her assumption was that issues could be discussed beforehand.

Katie said that she just foresees problems for NPCLE if a rotating system is established. Nancy suggested that perhaps, then, the idea of a different number of representatives from each L.E.G. is really the one that’s going to work better.

Katie also asked, what if NPCLE as a group decides they don’t like an idea, but the other three L.E.G.s do like it ... would NPCLE simply be outvoted? Noting that hopefully the emphasis will always be on coming to consensus, Phil suggested that the bylaws would have to specify whether a 3-1 vote is possible or not. If a 3-1 vote is deemed possible, then it would have to exist in conjunction with the provision of **veto for cause**. But Katie pointed out that it’s possible that the new Board might not approve a provision for **veto with cause**. Nancy said one way to ensure such a provision would be to include it as an integral part of the initial Board structure agreed upon by this group now. The group was in support of **veto with cause** being an integral part of the Board structure from the beginning; what that veto would look like, for what reasons and the specifics of how it would work will not be decided until a governing body is in place, and the group is working on creating operating procedures and bylaws.

Nancy asked whether the following summary was accurate: a Board structure calling for between one and six Board members per Lead Entity Group, this number to be determined by each Lead Entity Group for itself; a focus on coming to decision by consensus, first within each Lead Entity Group as they consider Board issues, and then within the whole Board. If, however, a vote ended up being required, there would be one vote per Lead Entity Group; and a provision for **veto with cause**.

Phil just wanted to point out that this will require caucusing before meetings, and may sometimes require a **call for caucusing** during a meeting. This would need to be provided for in the rules. Jim Jorgensen thinks there should also be the ability to **call for a hold** on an item until the next meeting to allow for caucusing, unless it’s a real emergency. Another solution to this would be to specify that no issue is decided until the second time (second meeting) it is brought up. Everyone seemed to think this would be a good idea. As Rich pointed out, he can’t just call the members of his Lead Entity Group; he’s concerned that there won’t be enough lead time for making L.E.G. decisions.

However, Mike Johnson said that if NPCLE has 6 representatives including all the area governments, they could go into caucus at a Board meeting for less intense issues, and **call for a hold** on more intense issues which required going back to the whole L.E.G. Katie pointed out that this wouldn’t work

for the NPCLE Group because, while they have 6 governments, they also would want citizen representatives, which would exclude some government(s).

Referring to Mike's idea of more intense versus less intense Board decisions, Nancy pointed out that Board members are chosen as those entrusted to best represent their L.E.G. She asked whether the group and L.E.G.s would feel comfortable letting the Board members make less important decisions without a two-meeting minimum. There was no objection raised to this idea from the group.

Phil pointed out an omission in the Advisory Council composition, that is, citizens. There may well be citizens voted by the L.E.G.s to a Board position, but there may also be citizens who want to serve on the Advisory Council.

Katie reminded everyone that the Lead Entity Groups also have very adamant and involved citizen representatives. There was a discussion as to whether a maximum of 5 versus 6 would make it easier; the final conclusion seemed to be 6. Also, Mark suggested something used by other organizations, an open microphone, question-and- comment period at the end of each meeting.

Nancy said she would write up the option that has come out of this meeting, have the Lead Entity Coordinators review it for accuracy, and then make it available so each L.E.G. can decide their vote on this matter by next month's meeting. The recommendation is for a Board of up to 6 members from each Lead Entity Group, with Alternates; there will be a strong emphasis and attempt at consensus, but each Lead Entity Group has one vote if it comes to a vote with **veto for cause** an available option.

[As a sub-note, Nancy asked about her distribution of information. She wanted to clarify that she has been sending items through the Lead Entity Coordinators to be distributed, and that she does rely on the L.E.C.s to get it out. She asked whether that has been working OK for them. Rich said the only thing is that she needs to clearly mark items for distribution, as opposed to items she is sending only the L.E.C.s.]

Katie brought up the fact that the ILA hasn't been signed by everyone who might sign it eventually, and how does that affect this decision? Phil said he thought the question should be whether we have a critical mass of signatories on the ILA. Do we have a majority of governments within each Lead Entity signed on? Once we do, then he thinks it would be appropriate to vote on Board structure, etc. It was not precisely decided by the group who would constitute a "critical mass." Nancy said she will provide information on which governments have signed at the April meeting for further discussion.

John Sims asked whether we were keeping the non-signatories of the ILA informed of our activities. Nancy said that if they are a member of a Lead Entity Group, then yes they are kept informed. If they are not an L.E.G. member, then no they are not added to our Contact List until they sign the ILA. John suggested sending out a monthly list of who's signed and who hasn't, which might encourage some of the non-signatories to sign.

Nancy said that once we reach that critical mass of signatories on the ILA, then she will write up the Board structure recommendation and proceed as outlined previously. She asked whether May or June meeting would give the Lead Entity Groups enough time to come to a consensus, and by June have Board member nominees named. This is of course assuming that the critical mass of signatories is reached by the end of April or so.

Ed Bowen made his presence known over the conference speaker phone, saying that he'd heard some of the Board structure discussion, but not all. In particular, he'll need clarification on the **veto with cause** part before he would join a consensus agreeing to it. Katie explained her concern, and clarified that **veto for cause** would be used when the issue involves a problem with US v Washington, the Boldt decision. It would have to be a serious legal issue to call for **veto with cause**. Ed said he had to go, but that he needs to better understand **veto with cause** before he concurs.

Annual Meeting June 2009

Nancy noted that this timing for a Board decision goes along nicely with having an Annual Meeting in June, which is what she's been thinking. Phil pointed out that it also dovetails nicely with WCSSP request for continued funding from SFRB; WCSSP won't be able to tell the SRFB that it has a Board, but that a decision has been reached on Board structure, and voting will be at the June Annual Meeting. That would be a good message to send.

Nancy said she was looking at June for a 1/2-day event with speakers, possibly Steve Tharinger, SRFB chair and Clallam County Commissioner. She asked for any ideas that anyone has; please let her know your ideas .

2009 – 2011 Budget

Nancy said she wanted to give everyone a summary of what's been happening in the budgetary arena. As everyone is aware, at their last meeting the SRFB decided on an across-the-board 8% reduction, for Regions and Lead Entity Groups alike. So the Region has been tasked by RCO to work with the Lead Entity Groups to come up with a budget that's going to work. The deadline for this is April 3rd, so she'll be working with the Lead Entity Coordinators on this.

The guidance she's been given from RCO is for both the Region and the L.E.G.s to not only work out restricted budgets by April 3rd, but then formally tell RCO what we WILL be able to do and what we WON'T be able to do within these budgets.

One of the budget issues is that of the possible carry-over from this biennium to the next of the unused funds allocated for development of the regional restoration plan. So a big part of that "what we WON'T be able to do" discussion will revolve around whether we'll be allowed to carry over those dollars and actually do a restoration plan.

Nancy requested that if at all possible any organization involved with WCSSP write a letter of support emphasizing the importance of the development of a coast regional restoration plan over the next two years. She explained that these letters would add a lot of credence to her defense of needing these carry over dollars in order to develop the regional plan.

As a matter of clarification, Mike Johnson asked whether she was talking about carrying funds over into the 2009-11 biennium budget. Nancy said yes. Mike asked about how feasible this would be? Phil Miller noted that GSRO will support this request, and is so far very encouraged with the clear progress that has been made. As long as progress continues and what the carry over dollars would be used for is clearly defined, GSRO would strongly support this request. It is very consistent with how the other Regions have been treated in terms of plan development, and it's a critical factor here,

and GSRO will make these points in budget discussions. He noted that in general carry over is discouraged, but this is a particular situation that deserves special consideration for this Region. A few other Regions may be making a similar case, although they revolve around finalizing their plans, bundling with other Washington State plans, as well as plans from neighboring States.

John Sims reemphasized that we need to be able to say and show that we are working towards the development of a solid, detailed plan that will allow us to do x, y and z to benefit salmon. And that without a plan, we won't be able to do x, y and z. In other words, we need to be able to say that when we complete this plan, we will have solid tools to move forward. And that if we can't show and say this, we won't be able to defend carrying over dollars.

Phil Miller agreed. He said that GSRO is encouraged about plan development in the Coast region because of several things, including the Wild Salmon Center Needs Assessment work, the work identifying data gaps, looking at data that can be generated across the Region, and, potentially, improving how everyone looks across the regional area. Also, the focus on how the Coast intends to look across the 4 Hs at the co-managers' authority and strategies. How do you relate habitat to hatchery and harvest strategies of co-managers? There's some very interesting potential work here that is trailblazing and could be of unique significance. It is extraordinarily interesting, and is something GSRO can "sell" as critical to salmon recovery and sustainability in the State of Washington. Summarizing, Phil noted that these are the things that are already signaled in the Coast's discussions and concepts so far. Assuming we can flesh that out a little, and cost it out, he thinks the Coast is in excellent shape to argue for the carry over funds.

Nancy said that this is precisely what she wants a Planning Committee to help her to do with the tremendous amount of expertise within WCSSP, and among those organizations involved with WCSSP. We want to continue along these lines in the development of a Coastal plan. We have such a wonderful opportunity out here NOT being restricted by having to have a "recovery" plan because of listed species. There are so many options, including working to maintain the healthy stocks that we have and benefit the stocks that are listed yet, but certainly can't be called healthy.

She reemphasized her request to all those who've signed the ILA, and also those who are otherwise involved with Lead Entity Groups, to write a letter of support for the WCSSP to carry over budget dollars into the new biennium for the purpose of completing a Regional Plan.

The other thing that would be useful is sending to Nancy anything you've written (in grants or for any other purpose) about the benefits of using a Plan in the type of work we're trying to do. If you could provide her with any language and research you've already done about this by May when Nancy will be defending this to the SRFB, that would really help her.

Devona asked who the letters of support should go to. Phil suggested SRFB Chairman Steve Tharinger, copies to Kaleen Cottingham, Director, RCO and Chris Drivdahl, Director, GSRO or himself. Nancy said she would send out contact information for these folks.

Approval of February Meeting Summary

Nancy called for approval of the February Meeting Summary. There were three corrections: use of the word "Minutes," clarification of TNC's role if group decides to use CAP process, and clarification of sentence about TNC helping WCSSP attain Partner status within National Fish Habitat Action Plan.

Nancy asked if, with these three corrections made, there was any objection to approval of the February Meeting Summary. There was none.

Regional Recovery Plan and WSC's Needs Assessment

Nancy asked Devona, along with John Kliem, to summarize and update us on the Needs Assessment. Devona said that a committee was being formed, mostly by phone. In addition, most of the participation of committee members will be by phone. Her timetable is to, by June 2009, have an exhaustive annotated bibliography of all available data for the Region, and to then take three (3) months to synthesize this data.

Nancy pointed out that there were several Regional Plan items that WCSSP could be working on simultaneously while the Needs Assessment was being completed. In order to speed up the process of creating a Regional Plan, she strongly urged those present to form a WCSSP committee to explore these possibilities, which include but are not limited to looking at common assessment tools and working on refinement of the L.E.G. Strategies to address harvest and hatchery and how they fit in with habitat.

John Kliem said that he thinks that an important first step for this committee would be studying other models and plans so that when WCSSP has the results of the Needs Assessment, we can quickly fit them into the developing Regional Plan. Phil noted that there are a dozen or so modeling tools; this Region does not need to come up with its own. Mike Johnson asked if currently there is one model that is accepted and can be used throughout the Region. Curt Holt of DFW said, "No."

John Kliem said that although hatchery and harvest are the purview of the co-managers, they are very interrelated with habitat. Phil said that if this issue were addressed by the Coast's Regional Plan, this would be unique and very good. Lauri Vigue said that perhaps Sara Laborde's 4H Integration work that was used in Puget Sound to get the discussion going could be used here.

So as not to do duplicate work, Katie wanted to point out that data gaps analyses have already been done in the *Report on Consideration of Forming a Coastal Regional Governance Unit for Salmon Sustainability*; as part of the four Lead Entity Strategies; and, as part of the Washington State Limiting Factors Analysis.

TECHNICAL MEETING

Purpose of Technical Session

Nancy indicated that we were now continuing the discussion to determine what sub-allocation formula and what data should be used for this year's round of SRFB funding. She reminded the group that the discussion began at last November's meeting in Montesano, at which time the members agreed on four criteria:

- 1 ESA listed stock;
- 2 Salmonid Diversity List (inclu. Bull Trout for WRIA 24);

- 3 Estuary/Lake Shoreline Miles (exclu. coast shoreline miles); and
- 4 Freshwater/Salmonid Stream Miles

One of the issues left pending at the November meeting was how to measure the four criteria, what weight factor to associate with them, and what, if any, region-wide equality of data is available. The intent coming out of the November meeting was to determine if there was a more equitable way to calculate the sub-allocation for this round.

(NOTE: Please see the addendum “Comments by Partnership Participants” at the end of this Meeting Summary for comments from Tony Hartrich about the following section.)

Assessment/Analysis of Available Data

Tony reported that for the GIS datasets involving estuary/tidal influences, he didn't locate any data after searching all available public and other databases. The criteria are basically consistent and mapped regionally across the WRIAs. Not considered were localized datasets created for specific projects. Many datasets are mapped, but not finalized. Another issue is reviewing metadata associated with GIS datasets to ascertain when they were created and updated.

Tony reminded everyone that in the prior allocation process, much weight was given to salmonid stream miles. Essentially, the Washington Lakes and River Information System (WLRIS) database was used. Part of the problem is that much of the fish data from WRIA 21 doesn't appear in WLRIS.

Mike Johnson asked whether it was ascertained how data on estuarine shoreline miles was determined for WRIA 24. Tony said that he added up all the shorelines of the estuaries rather than using a 'centerline' as often appears in stream networks to show the principal path through a large body of water.

The analysis considered standard 24 hydro datasets published by various agencies, and comparisons to determine whether there was any significant variance in terms of total stream miles. There was no significant difference. The variances were less than 5%.

Mike asked whether the stream miles calculation was broken into similar gradients across the region for not exceeding a specific value. Tony said it would involve much work and clever programming. Basically, the 10 meter Digital Elevation Models (DEM) is used, which is based on 50-year old USGS flight data. The error in elevation is plus or minus 25 feet.

Dave Price (WDFW) suggested the Washington State Department of Natural Resources' (DNR) screen typing layer, a fish habitat model. Tony verified that he's reviewed the data. Dave said much of the error in the data has been verified and validated. In terms of a tool, it wouldn't be biased from one region to another. Tony said the numbers were calculated and presented as part of the original dataset spreadsheet in last year's funding round. He offered to provide copies of the spreadsheet to members. Dave said the model accounts for much of the upstream and should be considered resident inclusive rather than an anadromous layer.

Tony said he's comfortable using the information as provided.

Dave asked whether the criteria will include resident or anadromous streams. Nancy said the description refers to "salmonid," which includes both resident and anadromous.

Discussion followed on what measurements should be considered for the desired outcome. Dave added that other salmon recovery regions are considering WLRIS data for anadromous stream miles. However, it should be considered in a watershed context as what occurs upstream affects downstream conditions. In terms for competition for grants, resident-water only proposals without a link to downstream and anadromous reaches are at a disadvantage.

Nancy said that it appeared there wasn't an actual, accurate dataset covering the entire region. It may be necessary to undertake a modeling exercise rather than relying on empirical data. Katie said she has raw data for her entire basin and is concerned with a proposed modeling exercise. Dave Price clarified that raw data is fed in to the model, and where actual data exist, it prevails over projections created by the model.

Jim Jorgensen suggested that the only parameter that makes sense in this situation is basin area. Dave agreed that watershed area could be used in place of stream miles, saying that exact data will not be available for this round of funding no matter what the approach. He suggested utilizing weighting stream miles to level the criteria among WRIAs. Nancy advised that weighting will be added, but has not yet been decided upon.

There was a discussion about the differences between and biases within the Department of Natural Resource' (DNR) and WLRIS data. Dave added that WLRIS data had a known bias because the data represent where we have observed salmon in those reaches where we would commonly expect fish to occur. Small coastal streams are under-represented in the database because we simply haven't looked in those streams as we have in larger streams. In contrast, DNR data are not substantially biased up- or downstream, and model performance has been made public. Additionally, most of the data used to inform the DRN model were collected in the coast range by the Quinault Tribe, which may improve precision in these WRIAs.

Tony clarified that the spreadsheet included stream miles from WLRIS and stream miles from DNR's fish typing. Both numbers are reflected in the spreadsheet; data was obtained from WLRIS and a modeling exercise was completed for WRIA 21, as it was otherwise under-represented.

Tony reviewed stream miles based on his analysis:

	WRIA 20	WRIA 21	WRIA 22/23	WRIA 24
Freshwater	1294.6	618.7	1528.9 (22)	1501.2
Salmonid present in River and Streams			1198.2 (23)	

Lonnie Crumley commented that the numbers will change yearly, and that basically it's a moot issue. DNR's numbers will be on the conservative side. Where there are known areas with fish, that data should be included.

Lee Napier noted that there will never be totally accurate datasets and that it's preferable to utilize the current information and move forward. Key McMurry reminded the group that it needs to decide and use the least biased way to sub-allocate across the region.

Jim Jorgensen suggested that the amount of work involved in modeling for accuracy is greater than the amount for grant funds. Weighting will have much more impact. There's been too much emphasis placed on the allocation between WRIAs based on stream miles.

Nancy said the goal is not to determine a hard number but to determine the numbers for this year's grant round of SRFB funding. That is one reason for creating a regional plan; it will help fill some of the data gaps and in subsequent years will result in more accurate data. Lonnie agreed that over the course of years, the data will improve and stream miles will be more accurate. So, for now, there shouldn't be an issue as long as the figures are proportional between the WRIAs. Rich Osborne noted that we know that the QIN had the main concern because their river miles were so underrepresented.

Mike questioned whether the figures reflect apples-to-apples comparison. Tony indicated they are actually more apples-to-oranges in the sense that 618 is the number that was originally included in the WLRIS dataset that was downloaded as a snapshot in time for all WRIAs. From that point, those parties negotiating on behalf of WRIA 21 addressed the issue. Subsequently, a proposal was offered to use stream typing data from the Forest Management Plan instituted for the reservation only. Tony said he took all the miles that hadn't been counted on the reservation that met criteria for having fish presence and included those miles, which accounted for approximately 400 plus miles.

Rich asked about the next steps. He said it appears the process used last year is likely the best process at this point: Tony completed an analysis to determine if there was a better method and it appears that it's unlikely the process can be improved at this point. Rich acknowledged that the members made the policy decision based on available best science. Lonnie added the importance of documenting how the figures were developed for each grant funding round.

Nancy said if members agree with the process used last year to establish the numbers, then the process can move forward. But, she said, if all L.E.G.s want to change criteria at this late date, the conversation can be opened for possible changes.

NetMap

Nancy introduced Dr. Lee Benda of Earth Systems Institute.

He made a presentation on NetMap, an integrated suite of numerical models and analysis tools created to develop regional-scale terrain databases in support of watershed science and resource management. He demonstrated a sample database involving the Hoh basin, the only area within the Coast Region that is part of the NetMap database.

NetMap is a multifaceted model focused on natural resources involving forestry, habitat, conservation, roads, restoration, and fire. The numerical models are linked to a set of analysis tools. There is universal access. The concept is to have a region-wide tool with a technical suite of analysis tools for habitat, roads, vegetation, erosion, woody debris, and a universal watershed database that will simplify watershed and landscape analysis. The database is self-correcting and renewable, so it increases in smartness over time. Automated tools address erosion risk, habitat indices, channel classification, habitat core areas, habitat diversity, and sediment and wood supply, among others.

NetMap is GIS-based, but is user-friendly for non-GIS experts. Access requires ArcGIS 9.2 software. Information cannot be viewed by an ArcGIS reader at this time. More information is available at www.netmaptools.net. Information is accessible on the website, through registration, to access universal stream layers, watershed databases, NetMap tools, forums, and advisory groups.

Lee B. demonstrated NetMap and the mapping system. Users can perform their own customized analyses using NetMap tools and databases. Applications of NetMap tools can be used to conduct a series of watershed assessments. He demonstrated how one could, for instance, enter specific circumstances/conditions at one location upstream, and the system will tell you the consequences downstream. He addressed questions on the capabilities of the system, data layers, accuracy of data, and spatial analyses of watershed and land use parameters. He described the library of 50 watershed parameters and tools available to users.

Members offered the following comments and questions:

- Are data field verified? Some field data that have been verified are published. Data are provided on a relative scale. It's possible for users to update databases.
- What is the program cost and is it user friendly? The one-time cost of the program is scaled and can range from \$80,000 to \$240,000 depending on the analysis of each watershed, the extent of field verification and the training desired. If the region only wants data layers without field validation, the cost would be closer to \$80,000 to \$90,000 for the 4 million acres of the Coast Region. As new tools come online, they become available to users automatically.
- Another tool available is NetStream, where the user can create a stream layer that includes channel gradient, drainage area, width, etc., which is used by federal agencies as well.
- An advisory group is available on the website.

Lee B. described how the program is designed to run on the user's desktop. Users can add different parameters from their desktop, which doesn't affect resident data within the program. There is no ability at this point to upload data to the website. Advisory groups are guiding the future evolution of the system.

Katie questioned the difference between NetMap and DNR's program. Lee B. said NetMap is a state-of-the-art program, whereas the state's program is not designed for process-based watershed analysis. Tony clarified that NetMap is not just layers, but also a system that interacts and provides analysis tools and interpretation of data layers in a user-friendly environment for those lacking GIS expertise.

April Boe said the tool would assist greatly in watershed prioritization efforts.

Nancy asked whether the program can assist the region to look at causes rather than effects during its restoration planning process. Lee B. affirmed the program would be effective in such a planning effort.

Discussion ensued on different datasets available through various agencies and companies. Lee B. confirmed that those datasets could be added to NetMap. Katie commented that all culverts have been mapped within the state.

John Sims inquired about licensing requirements for multiple users. Lee B. said access to the program is available to all stakeholders. If the private sector is involved in the analysis, they have access. If they are not actively involved, they are requested to contribute, to improve databases to a higher level of accuracy. After the Coast Region is created, anyone could access the information.

Members discussed potential funding sources for purchasing the program. Dave commented that WDFW could help the region implement and use the tool.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Dietz and Valerie Gow

COMMENTS BY PARTNERSHIP PARTICIPANTS in response to this meeting summary

The following comments about “Assessment/Analysis of Available Data” were submitted by Tony Hartrich and are considered part of this Meeting Summary:

Given the short time provided to respond, I have [the following] comments to make concerning the technical minutes portion of the summary minutes that were sent out for review yesterday.

- 1.) *“Tony completed an analysis to determine if there was a better method” – I completely dispute that this was the basis of the work I was charged to do. Please review the scope of work that has been sent to you previously. This statement implies that I performed an exhaustive analysis of all available datasets to make that determination with a maximum 50 hour budget to do so. I respectfully submit that the members have much work to do to arrive at a ‘better method’, including looking at major factors that negatively impact salmon habitat which can be measured broadly across the region, and which too can be reflected in the allocation formula.*
- 2.) *WLRIS is, by Dave Price own statement, principally populated by the limiting factors analysis (LFA) that was performed for each WRIA. The salmonid data collected and reflected in each WRIA’s LFA varies greatly in terms of how, when, where and by whom it was collected, and provides little information on error or bias. It also does not presume to be exhaustive across each WRIA. Using it is certainly convenient to those whom it favors, but is it equitable.*