



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

April 22, 2009

Port of Grays Harbor

Aberdeen, WA

10:00 am to 2:00 pm

In attendance:

Nancy Allison, Executive Director, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, Program Assistant, WCSSP
Dana Dietz, Administrative Assistant, WCSSP

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator
Ed Bowen, Citizen At Large
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
Katie Krueger, Quileute Natural Resources

Quinault Lead Entity Group

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator
Jim Jorgensen, Quinault Fisheries

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,
WBWRCC

Technical

Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy
Nicole Hill, Cascade Land Conservancy
Erik Neatherlin, WDFW
Lauri Vigue, WDFW

ILA Designated Representatives

Peggy Berry, City of Ocean Shores
Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe
Mike McGinnis, Shoalwater Bay Tribe

ACTION STEPS

- 1. Put June 17th, 5 – 8 pm on your calendar for our Annual Meeting at the Log Pavilion in Aberdeen. We may have a short business meeting before this evening celebration. Please send Dana any suggestions you have about our Annual Meeting.***
- 2. Please consider joining either the Technical Team or the Planning Committee for the Regional Restoration Planning process; contact Nancy. Your input is needed. Work through your LEG to determine Planning Committee participation.***
- 3. Please send to Nancy anything you've written (in grants or for any other purpose) about the benefits of funding habitat restoration efforts for non-listed species. If you***

could provide her with any language or research you've already done about this, it will help in our efforts to augment SRFB funding.

4. Conference call to discuss sub-allocation weighting factors May 12th, 9 am. Please call Dana to let us know if you will be calling in.

MAY REGIONAL MEETING

Wednesday, May 20th 10 am to 2 pm
U.S. Forest Service's Ranger Station, Quinault

ANNUAL MEETING (June Regional Meeting)

Wednesday, June 17th 5 – 8 pm Log Pavilion, Aberdeen

BUSINESS MEETING

Nancy Allison welcomed everyone and introduced the designated representative of our newest signator of the Interlocal Agreement (ILA), Mike McGinnis of the Shoalwater Bay Tribe. Everyone then introduced themselves.

Nancy explained that because there were parts of the summary of the technical portion of the March meeting that weren't clear to her, she called Tony and asked him to look at it, and provide some comments. Those comments are on a separate handout, which will become part of the March Meeting Summary.

Director's Report

Sub-Allocation Decisions

Nancy wanted to schedule a meeting to finish our discussion on the sub-allocation process for SRFB funding. Because the criteria were decided at the November meeting, this meeting would be to discuss the weighting of the criteria. Rich, Key and several others confirmed that in addition to the criteria, the data sources had also been settled upon.

Jim Jorgensen said that the Quinault Nation considered the criteria an open question, not decided upon. After review of the November Minutes and in consideration of being well into this year's SRFB round, it was generally agreed that the criteria would stand as they were. Nancy was concerned that there had been a misunderstanding since the group is committed to consensus. She said that the criteria will definitely be reconsidered next year and she hopes that the process of developing a regional plan will manifest an improved and tighter process for sub-allocation.

Nancy returned to setting up a meeting. Rich suggested that we have a conference call discussion about the weighting, but he would have to wait for his next NPCLE meeting to bring a decision back. So Nancy suggested a conference call discussion on May 12th, with a final decision to be made at our May meeting on May 20th. Everyone seemed to agree, so she set the conference call for 9 am on May 12th. She will send out an email inviting everyone, particularly the technical group. And certainly the Lead Entity Coordinators need to be involved.

Staff Reports

Nancy noted that the staff will be providing a Staff Report at the end of every month delineating the progress we've made on our Work Plan items. In addition, she will provide a brief WCSSP update at every monthly meeting. The Staff Report coming out at the end of April will be for the period late February through the end of April.

Stimulus Package Submissions

Miles Batchelder gave a report on the Stimulus Package projects submitted from the Coast to GSRO for inclusion in the package endorsed by the Governor before going to NOAA Fisheries. We had 10 projects from the Coast that went either directly from the sponsors or through one of the state agencies for a total of just less than \$9 million. In particular, WCSSP staff assisted three sponsors with submission of their projects.

Proposals from Washington State totaling \$90-plus million were submitted with the Governor's endorsement. Plus there were additional project proposals that were submitted directly to NOAA, without endorsement. There's a total available of \$170 million nationwide. Apparently the total of the proposals submitted to NOAA is in the billions; Mike Johnson thought it was about \$6 billion. Obviously, the competition is intense. Miles has heard that decisions will be made by May 8th.

Ed Bowen reported that he made a request to Rob Walton, Deputy Regional Administrator, NOAA NMFS Northwest Region, to provide a list of all projects from the Coast, regardless of whether the projects were endorsed by the Governor or not. NOAA has agreed to provide this list; once Ed receives it, he will forward it to everyone.

In terms of Invasive Species/Knotweed programs, Eric Delvin made the point that no one should step out of the Dept of Agriculture funding programs just because it looks like there might be funding from NOAA.

Ed also wanted to make sure that everyone was aware that Title 2, RAC projects (compensating for the effect of declining timber industry on rural schools) have to be submitted by May 1st.

ILA Update

Nancy outlined which signatures we have:

Counties: Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Pacific and Thurston have signed; Lewis, Mason and Cowlitz declined.

Tribes: Quileute, Quinault, Chehalis and Shoalwater Bay have signed; we have positive indication from Hoh that they will sign; Makah has declined, at least for the time being, but Nancy hopes to talk with them more.

Cities: Ocean Shores, Montesano, Elma, Forks, and Centralia have signed; Tumwater and Bucoda declined. Nancy has met with McCleary and will meet with Westport on April 28th; she thinks it's likely they will both sign. Hoquiam turned the matter over to their watershed committee. Mike Johnson said he would be meeting with Raymond and South Bend in the next few weeks.

Ports: Port of Grays Harbor has already signed. Mike indicated that he thinks the Port of Willapa Harbor will sign.

Nancy reconfirmed that any jurisdiction can sign the ILA at any point in the future, if they change their mind.

Annual Meeting

Nancy informed everyone that we are in the process of planning our first Annual Meeting, more of a celebration than a business meeting. She hopes that every June we can have such an Annual Meeting. For this year we've reserved the Log Pavilion in Aberdeen, for an event June 17th from 5 to 8 pm. There will be hors d'oeuvres. We hope to have a short business meeting beforehand, but still haven't worked out the details.

In terms of the program, Nancy will provide a "State of the Region" presentation reporting on WCSSP's progress over the last year. She's also talked with Steve Tharinger about being a speaker; he's penciled it in, but not confirmed. If anyone has any other ideas or thoughts, please let her know. Ed said he'd like to see someone from RCO talk about the GSRO and Lead Entity Program transition into RCO. Eric Delvin suggested Kaleen Cottingham.

Marine Resources Committee Kick-off Event

Eric Delvin, Key McMurry and others wanted everyone to be aware that the kick-off event for the local Marine Resources Committee is on June 20th, 10 am to 2 pm, at the Log Pavilion in Aberdeen.

Lake Ozette

Nancy reported that at the last meeting of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee in March, WCSSP, along with three other entities (Clallam County, Olympic Nat'l Park, and NOAA Fisheries), tentatively agreed to be the interim co-leaders to initiate the process of implementing the Recovery Plan. NOAA will write the implementation plan.

Since there had been issues in the past about this, Mike asked Katie Krueger whether she was OK with this arrangement. Katie said that she's OK with it as long as what we're doing is helping. Her understanding was that at this point the committee was looking at the projects that are out there, making a project list, not deciding who's going to write an implementation plan. If it goes beyond making a list, she will be concerned.

Katie reminded everyone that these four interim 'co-leads' must by law keep the three co-managers (DFW, the Makah Tribe and the Quileute Tribe) fully informed as the process unfolds.

Ed confirmed that when he left the Lake Ozette meeting, his understanding was that these four interim "co-leads" were in place only for the purpose, as an interim body, to help put together and facilitate the implementation planning process, to get the ball rolling, the process organized.

Katie said it's wonderful if these four co-leads can commit time and money to the process, but no substantive decisions can be made without the three co-managers.

Capacity Budget Proposal for the Region and the Lead Entity Groups for the next Biennium

Nancy reported that at the quarterly SRFB meeting in February, the Board implemented an 8% reduction in capacity for regional organizations and lead entity groups. The region was tasked with

figuring out how capacity funding (not project funding) would be allocated, and then providing a list of what would not be done because of the reduction. She and the Lead Entity Coordinators worked together on this.

She has also been working with GSRO on how best to request holding over some of our current funding from this biennium. It looks like we'll have approximately \$100,000 left. We're making a pitch to retain some of that to fund the Lead Entity Groups to participate in the Regional Plan process, as well as funds for technical support for the planning process.

Mike asked when we will know about the \$100,000 carryover. She said we won't know until May. Mike asked if we had a plan for that money if the carryover is not approved. It was noted that several of us have asked RCO if we could buy NetMap, and the answer has consistently been "no."

However, staff has started to explore possible grant possibilities for funding capacity if we don't get the carryover.

Devona reported that she and Nancy had put together a pre-proposal to the Wildlife Conservation Society that includes at least \$10,000 to go towards NetMap plus other funds to support our planning process.

Board Structure

Dana pointed out the handout which was the writeup of what Nancy and she understood to be the Board structure option discussed and generally agreed upon at the March 18th meeting. By the end of the March meeting, the group had decided to delay the Board structure decision until we reached "critical mass" of ILA signators. Nancy noted that although we don't have critical mass quite yet, we're very close and she is hoping that we'll be able to elect a Board by next month. So, she suggested that we talk about this option again. If this is the option everyone generally agrees on, then attendees at today's meeting can go back to their Lead Entity Group with the option and decide who in your group would be appointed to the Board.

Nancy noted that we need to think about what the functions of the Board will be, and that, for her, she would like to have a "go to" group when issues come up. She needs to have a smaller group of decision-making representatives; they could then bring issues back to the Lead Entity Groups and, if necessary, we would discuss at monthly Board meeting.

Katie was concerned about the small size of the proposed Board. She explained the need to have more than a small number of folks. We need a Board that has a lot of people so that we have sufficient numbers who are experienced in salmon recovery, technically knowledgeable, and fully aware of all relevant laws so as to prevent the Board from making flawed, troubling and/or illegal decisions. She also noted that we not only need to include treaty tribes, counties (the fiscal managers) and other jurisdictions, but also a variety of skill sets. These items had been discussed at length at the NPCLE meeting the day before. If the Board isn't composed of a sufficiently diverse group of people, issues will come up that the Board won't even realize are 'hot buttons' and we'll get bogged down in controversy and legal issues.

Rich wanted clarification that, if a decision came down to a vote, there would be only the four (4) votes of the Lead Entity Groups. Nancy confirmed that that was her understanding of the agreed-upon option developed at the March meeting.

Katie made the point that NPCLE is much more of a Swiss democracy, not a representative democracy. The other Lead Entity Groups tend to have one person who speaks for their group, but NPCLE doesn't. And, from NPCLE's discussions yesterday, she doesn't think they will settle for having representatives on the Board as opposed to everyone being directly involved. Ed pointed out that none of the 6 governments involved in NPCLE offered to give up a Board position (so that, for instance, a citizen member could be selected) if the limit of Board members from an LEG were six (6) as had been discussed last month. Katie added that those in NPCLE saw no reason to limit to 6, as had been suggested last month.

John Sims reminded us that we are one of only two or three regions that deal with these co-management situations. These issues that have co-management ramifications have to be carefully considered.

Mark Swartout suggested another approach: Just have one group. Have the Advisory Committee as delineated on the back of the handout. That group chooses a Chair and a Co-Chair who Nancy would work with. If the group doesn't like something that happened, the group replaces them with someone else. In Mark's experience, this has worked pretty efficiently. If an issue comes up, you appoint a subcommittee that can deal with that issue, they report back to the Council, and then the committee goes away until the next issue comes up.

Mark added that the advantage of having one group, the "Council," is that at this stage of the game you'll have fewer communication problems. Communication is clear; accountability is clear. It's very transparent because everyone is at the table at the same time.

Rich thought that on this kind of body even the Lead Entity Coordinators would be more advisory, more ex-officio. But, of course, they'd need and want to be present.

It was re-clarified that the decision to use consensus as the main decision-making process has already been made. This consensus would happen within the larger group of all attendees, including as many stakeholders, lead entity and technical participants as possible, so that if some group's authority was being abrogated or some law ignored in a certain discussion, that fact would quickly be pointed out. Nancy noted that clearly this is a public organization and anyone can attend and speak. It was further clarified that if consensus is not able to be reached and an issue has to be actually voted upon, then the Lead Entity Groups would have time to caucus on the issue, and each Lead Entity Group would have one vote on a disputed issue. Included will be a provision for **veto with cause** by any affected authority.

Nancy commented that, for a variety of reasons, it looks like we need more time to make this decision. She suggested that Mark reiterate what he is suggesting, so everyone is clear. Then everyone can take this idea back along with the other option.

If approved by the group, the "Advisory Council" would be made up of the representatives from the ILA signatories. From this group a Chair and Co-Chair would be selected giving Nancy her "go to" individuals. Further, it was suggested that we may want to have the GSRO and WDFW representatives as ex-officio members, but those details can be decided at a later date. Nancy reminded everyone that our intent is to make decisions by consensus at our regular monthly meetings as we do now, but under this proposal, if a vote is necessary, sufficient time would be allowed for each Lead Entity Group to caucus with its membership (including the signatories within their respective WRIs) and come back to the regional table with one vote each. Nancy offered the opinion that, this

way, the ILA representatives have a role in providing community input, but the ultimate decision-making power still lies with the Lead Entity Groups.

Nancy suggested that the folks at today's meeting take this concept (outlined above) back to their Lead Entity Groups. We will finalize the concept next month based on the input from each Lead Entity Group and, in June, make a decision on what structure to move forward with. Is everybody in agreement with that? Several said "yes." No objections.

Planning Process

Devona gave an update on the Needs Assessment. An ad hoc technical group is being formed, Creative Community Solutions has been contracted to facilitate the process, and she hopes to meet with each Lead Entity Group once sometime in May, June or July. Then we'll reconvene regionally to assess the information that has been collected. She said we should have an annotated bibliography by late June, early July.

Nancy explained that once the Needs Assessment is done, and even before it is finished, she wants to start the process of developing a regional plan. She proposed the idea of using The Nature Conservancy's Conservation Action Planning (CAP) process as the way to facilitate developing our Plan, and asked what the group thought about this. She asked if anyone objected to using TNC and the CAP process to develop the plan. No one expressed an objection.

Secondly, she needs a smaller group of people with whom she can get the planning process going. Her idea is that this Planning Committee would be the Lead Entity Coordinators, whomever else from your LEG you want on the committee, Devona Ensmenger from the WSC, someone from The Nature Conservancy and herself. She wanted to make it clear that this planning committee will not make final decisions about the content of the Plan, but rather work to facilitate its development by everyone in the Region. Eric Delvin confirmed that the CAP process is an exhaustive one in order to make sure everyone and all aspects are included in the planning process. No one expressed an objection to the idea of a Planning Committee, although Ed added the caveat that the North Coast folks will have to talk to their Lead Entity Group about it.

PRESENTATION ON THE HABITAT WORK SCHEDULE (HWS)

Miles introduced Erik Neatherlin, who has primary responsibility for the Habitat Work Schedule for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, among other responsibilities.

By way of background, Erik said that the program is called the Habitat Work Schedule because that's the language used in the Salmon Recovery Act to outline one of the responsibilities of the Lead Entity Groups. The genesis was particularly in response to the increasing complexity of projects as salmon recovery progressed from the easy, obvious projects in the early years to the harder, more sophisticated ones. Both the science and the citizenry involvement have become more sophisticated, and as that has happened, the projects have become more expensive. That has required attracting funding from on a wider range of sources. Therefore, being able to communicate the nature of the projects and goals to potential funders has become more important.

From the beginning, HWS has been seen as primarily a tool for the Lead Entity Groups to help them be successful. Its goal is to communicate to the public and others what you're trying to do in salmon recovery, whereas PRISM was designed as a project management tool. PRISM answers, "What have

you done? Where have you spent your money?” Whereas, HWS answers, “What are you trying to accomplish?”

Erik has an Advisory Group that represents Lead Entities, who are always providing input on what direction HWS should be taking. From our region, both Lee Napier and Miles Batchelder are part of this Advisory Group. HWS is a public-private venture, housed at Paladin Systems in Poulsbo.

Erik then walked us through some of the features of the Habitat Work Schedule, both those that are available through the public portal, and those that are user/password protected. The Lead Entity Coordinators control their user/password and are able to distribute it as they see fit, at various levels of security. There are unlimited log-in licenses for anyone working in salmon recovery, so an LEC can give log-in abilities to as many folks as he or she thinks appropriate.

All information and documents can appear in just the user/password protected section of HWS, or in the public portal also. This allows many things, including, for instance, sharing files with colleagues without making them available to the public. In addition, you can search in the log-in area with a lot more sophistication, utilizing for example the four levels for projects: conceptual, proposed, active and completed, or choosing projects with only certain Limiting Factors, etc.

On both sides, you can search for projects by many keyword factors, or you can search using a map. Once you click on a project, it gives you a lot of different type of information including maps and photos, depending on what information has been entered by the sponsors and Lead Entities. You can also search for files and documents.

In addition the Upper Columbia Region is working to create a way to summarize information at the regional level, beyond the lead entity level that exists now. Once this regional capability is complete, all regions will be able to use it.

Erik said that he thinks there is overwhelming support at RCO for HWS and its uses.

Each Lead Entity Group has a home page which lists the projects in its area, but has many other capabilities as well, including a folder structure that can be used to organize and show the interconnectedness of the actions being taken (or can organize and show another kind of aspect that the Lead Entity wants to).

Once you have all this information in HWS, you can export data to Excel, to Access and to an HTML file that can be posted to your website. Someone on your website can then click on a link and they're taken directly back to the HWS page for that item.

HWS also allows you to make a pie chart showing how much of a project, or an overall initiative, is done versus not yet done. Erik believes this can be a powerful tool for communicating with the public. A pie chart is on the same page as other information/photos of a project, so the public can see other project facts at the same time.

Ideally, the lead entities provide the structure within their section of HWS, and the project sponsors enter the data for their project(s).

Someone asked about the inclusion of RMAPS from timber companies. Erik said that on the log-in side you can upload such a map as a file, but it wouldn't be translated into a map layer with the existing maps.

After Erik confirmed that information can be transferred from HWS to PRISM, Miles made the point that Lead Entity Groups could have their project sponsors start the process in HWS, export that info into PRISM with the click of a button, and then complete the process in PRISM, thereby eliminating the need to enter data twice.

There are several kinds of training available: in-person, one-on-one training; webinars and web forums; and/or you can visit Paladin and work on their computers.

March Meeting Summary

It was agreed that we would delay approving the March Summary until our next meeting, in May.

Web Meetings

There was overwhelming agreement that the most important factor is clarity of voice, whether it's for web meetings or call-in participants. Folks didn't seem to care too much whether they saw faces or not, but they did want everyone to be able to see on-screen presentations.

Various other factors and problems were also brought up:

1. Identifying voices can be a problem, which would be solved by being able to see faces.
2. If attendees (at any location) bring hard copies of information they want displayed to everyone, how do we accomplish that? Ed said that for ITV courses at Centralia Community College, there's a scanning/overhead-projector-type device that works well. Nancy suggested that if folks would get a hard copy to Dana by the day before a meeting, that would solve the problem. Jim Jorgensen suggested the use of a digital overhead projector hooked up to the computer, utilizing email and the web, to communicate with remote attendees might also be a solution.
3. From her experience, Katie related a serious pitfall that will have to be resolved. That is, she's out in Forks "raising her hand" to speak, and Olympia (for instance) doesn't know she wants to speak.
4. The annoyance of constantly hearing rustling papers was also raised. Again, we'd need to establish meeting protocols, including use of your mute button if you're not speaking.
5. Nancy clarified that regardless of the technology we use for web meetings, there will be the ability for anyone to call in to the meeting using only a phone. Katie asked who would pay for the call ins, WCSSP or the callers? Dana said she was still researching this aspect, and was hoping to find a less expensive mechanism for call-ins. Nancy made the point that with our tight budget for the next biennium, WCSSP can't pay for extensive/expensive call-ins (such as conference calls through AT&T have been).

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Dietz