



Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

June 1, 2010

Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, Washington

Planning Committee

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Dana Dietz, WCSSP

Mike Johnson, Pacific LE Coordinator

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe (by conference phone)

Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions

Phil Miller, GSRO

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor LE Coordinator

Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy

Rich Osborne, NPCLE Coordinator (by conference phone)

James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy

John Sims, QIN LE Coordinator

Citizen

Ray Brown, Citizen

Portions of meeting facilitated by

John Kliem and Debbie Holden of Creative Community Solutions (CCS)

Approval of Agenda

There were no additions or changes to the Agenda.

Review of 3/23/10 Technical Session

Miles Batchelder reported that although the main purpose of the 3/23/10 Technical Session was to determine the Measures for the Targets/Attributes/Indicators, we didn't get very far in doing that. A lot of time was spent discussing, explaining and getting feedback about the process from the technical attendees, which itself was a useful and somewhat successful part of the workshop.

He related that a Debrief was held at the end of the Technical Session, summarized by our facilitators, Creative Community Solutions, as follows:

Likes

- Persistence
- Building (Quinault Valley Chapel) good
- Glossary of terms

Dislikes

- Helpful if we got presentation before meeting (lose time)
- TAIM Chart out to everyone with expectations
- Missing key people (experts)

How will the targets integrate?

- Quantum leap from December to today
- Too much time “spinning our wheels” not a good transition from earlier workshop
 - Who (staff) should participate
 - Bring us up-to-date before workshop
- Unfamiliarity with process
 - How will plan rate with other agencies?
- Total confusion
 - How will this help us for future funding?
 - Need more communication

Next Workshop

This is the first of several meetings

- Have discussions
 - How should these pieces actually fit together
- Do we have the right group of people coming together at planning sessions?
 - We encourage more participation
- Need concise set of measurements for Regional Plan (this is why we spent time talking about and removing and grouping indicators)

Batchelder questioned how to better prepare participants, how to encourage participants to do homework before workshops. It was noted that everyone is constrained by time and budget these days, so part of the Planning Committee’s job, in addition to guiding the process, is to educate and motivate participants about the importance of the development of this Plan. In fact, as Lee Napier noted, Grays Harbor County is under contract to produce a Plan and will be pushing for its timely completion. Katie Krueger suggested that one problem is that members’ participation is directed by their supervisors – it’s not always a matter of their own prioritization. Dana Dietz suggested a way of perhaps being more forceful, by sending out the TAIM Chart for review with a self-addressed, stamped envelope for its return by a specific date.

Kara Nelson said that she’s heard several times, “These ratings of conditions already exist in the literature.” She doesn’t know if that’s true, but if it is, perhaps we need to access that to populate the charts and spend less time in workshops trying to populate the charts. Mike Johnson concurred, but reminded us that discussion and resolution is going to be required where there are differing opinions about the ratings protocols that are available.

John Sims suggested that perhaps others, like himself, could be more proactive in preparing participants, checking in with them on homework, having pre-workshop meetings if necessary, etc. In retrospect, Rich Osborne thinks it would have helped to have had the charts populated with the readily accessible ratings, and then get the technical participants feedback about that. He suggested that we do this in the future.

Key McMurry said that we need to agree which protocols and existing ratings are good and which aren't, and then proceed using the good ones. Napier summarized that we are never going to make everyone happy, but that we need to move forward nonetheless. Phil Miller agreed, adding that people will point out when some piece of information just doesn't seem right to them, at which point we resolve that issue, and proceed. Not everyone is going to agree to everything, but if it's acceptable and they're willing to move forward, then we're making progress. If we run into too much resistance, we need to figure that out and respond appropriately, so that we can move forward.

Krueger observed that if, for instance, Nelson's PowerPoint review of the process existed a day or so before the workshop, it should have been distributed so that participants could familiarize themselves beforehand.

Kliem's assessment as a facilitator was that actually a lot of information was garnered. Dietz noted that CCS' summary document includes the name of the person who provided the source, thus giving us direct access for completing the chart.

Miller described the workshops as providing important check-in points and ownership, but the technical workshops are not where the Plan is created. Several people made the point that perhaps we need to better describe to the participants the overall process and who's doing what.

Miller also noted that there needs to be some credibility to information with which we tentatively populate the chart so as to avoid unnecessary "churn," and that one way to do that would be to have a standing, agreed-upon technical subcommittee that does the preliminary work.

Where we are and what's to be done: Viability Analysis

Batchelder explained that the packets handed out today include:

1. The letter-sized packet is the CCS summary directly from the 3/23 Technical Session; it includes all eight habitat Targets and all information gathered on 3/23.
2. The legal-sized packet is the Mainstem portion of CCS' summary experimentally reformatted by Staff to hopefully make it clearer exactly which Target-Attribute-Indicator is being covered.

Both Miller and Schroeder reminded the committee that we need to simplify the TAIM chart as much possible without losing any target, attribute, indicator or species that's critical for the Plan. We need to include everything that's important to the Plan but only the things that are important, in order to simplify it enough to be able to complete the Plan. Miller also pointed out that it's a policy

recommendation by the Planning Committee whether to include, for example, a certain species; it's a policy call as to what's most important to the Plan, not a technical call.

Nelson summarized tasks to be completed: first is to fully populate an acceptable TAIM chart, obtain a technical review of it, and then create a rolled up version of it before proceeding into strategy development. Also handed out today is a sample of a roll-up chart, *Table 3.3 Habitat Objectives*. She reminded us that details can be added back in during strategy development if they need to be. Several committee members emphasized that we need to focus on the key elements as we proceed in order to create a manageable TAIM chart.

Miller observed that it looks like we had a major vetting of the measures at the 3/23 workshop; that is a significant accomplishment that allows us to proceed. Both Batchelder and Kliem said that they think some more fine tuning and vetting of the measures needs to occur, but a major portion has been accomplished.

Sims suggested that each chart be more clearly dated and titled.

Burkle reminded us that there are actual differences between north and south within the region which the Plan needs to include while also planning for region-wide commonalities.

How do we accomplish Viability Analysis (Facilitated portion of the meeting)

Sub-Agenda: Prepare an Action Plan for moving from the March 23 First Technical Session to completion of the Viability Analysis:

- Listing Action Steps needed to get through the viability analysis
- Sequence of action steps
- Tasks needed to implement action steps
- Resources needed for tasks
- Timelines for action steps & tasks
- Identifying coordinators for action steps

Timeline and Assignment for completion of tentative Viability Analysis

See charts on following pages.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Jo Dietz

OVERARCHING / ONGOING TASKS

Planning Committee is the "Gatekeeper" to determine when task is complete; time to move on	Progress Briefings to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Planning Committee • Lead Entity 	Lead Entity Technical Committees are kept up-to-speed on process
Make sure we have all Bibliography (WSC library) needed to complete TAIM	Updated Technical Information	Always Obtain/ Provide Technical Basis for Objection
Special Resources: May be need for intern Or Carol Smith may volunteer thru TNC		

TASKS, WHO IS COORDINATING, WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

TASK & DEADLINE	WHO WILL COORDINATE TASK	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE
COMPLETE TAIM WORKSHEETS 4/16/2010	Dana, Miles	Update TAIM charts with data provided at First Technical Session on 3/23/2010
ESTABLISH PLANNING TECHNICAL TEAM WITH THE RIGHT PEOPLE 4/16/2010	Miles, LECs	Formalizing and/or Expanding List type of expertise needed / Figure out who to invite / Credentials Send email out to invite with options about tiers of involvement with varying ways to participate (email / conf calls, provide input, "heartburn" reviews) 2 Paragraph summary of what this group does/may do Planning Committee has an obligation to talk to co-workers

TASK & DEADLINE	WHO WILL COORDINATE TASK	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE
<p align="center">REVIEW of INDICATORS AND MEASURES BY PLANNING TECHNICAL TEAM</p> <p align="center">4/23/2010</p>	<p align="center">Staff</p> <p align="center">Planning Cmtee</p> <p align="center">Planning Cmtee</p>	<p>Send out to Planning Technical Team and ask for Response by a certain date. Prepare Responses for Planning Committee review..</p> <p>Planning Committee will: Analyze responses Make recommendations</p> <p>Planning Committee decision to move forward</p>
<p align="center">GET THE CHARTS POPULATED BY TECHNICAL EXPERTS</p> <p align="center">5/7/2010</p>	<p align="center">Staff, LECs, TNC volunteer?</p>	<p>Staff work with LE Tech Cmtee members and other technical individuals to populate charts; that is, assign ratings, current status and desired status; Identify/resolve technical and data gaps.</p> <p>Utilize Technical Team</p>
<p align="center">REVIEW OF POPULATED WORKSHEETS</p> <p align="center">5/22/2010</p>	<p align="center">Planning Cmtee</p> <p align="center">Staff</p> <p align="center">Larger WCSSP Technical Group (3/23 participants, Tech Team & others)</p> <p align="center">Planning Cmtee</p>	<p>Recommend what measures we keep (simplify).</p> <p>Mail out (with a specific Response date) request to: Look over; a "heartburn" review Give us your comment Review data gaps Expert review / input</p> <p>Planning Committee decision to move forward</p>
<p align="center">DEVELOP THE ROLL-UP WORKSHEETS</p> <p align="center">5/30/2010</p>	<p align="center">Staff & Core Group Bring to Planning Committee</p>	<p>Develop Criteria for the Ratings</p> <p>Determine Process for the Criteria</p> <p>Identify basis as "Best Professional Judgment" when necessary</p> <p>Technical Group Review Planning Committee decision to move forward</p>

TASK & DEADLINE	WHO WILL COORDINATE TASK	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE
POPULATE THE ROLL-UP WORKSHEET 6/12/2010	Available sub-set of Technical Team & Staff Plan Cmtee	Populate Roll-up of TAIM chart with info in TAIM chart Planning Committee decision to move forward
TECHNICAL REVIEW OF ROLL-UP WORKSHEET 6/30/2010	Dana Staff Plan Cmtee	Send out and ask for comments Specify reply date Collate comments from Technical Acknowledge people who contributed technical information Planning Committee recommendation to move forward
VIABILITY ANALYSIS IS COMPLETE 6/16/2010 Board Meeting	Miles	Special Briefing to Board

TIMELINE:

Completion date:

April 16, 2010
 April 16, 2010
 April 23, 2010
 April 23, 2010
 May 7, 2010

 May 22, 2010

 May 22, 2010
 May 30, 2010
 May 30, 2010
 June 12, 2010
 June 30, 2010

 June 30, 2010
 July 16, 2010

Task:

Complete TAIM Worksheets *by Staff*
 Establish Planning Technical Team *by Miles etc*
Review of TAIM/TAIM Outline *by Tech Team*
 OK to proceed *by Plan Cmtee*
 TAIM chart populated with rating scales, Desired Status and Current Status *by Tech Team*
 Review of completed TAIM chart *by 3/23 Tech Session participants and other Technical*
 Review and OK to proceed *by Plan Cmtee*
 Outline roll-up TAIM chart *by core Plan sub-cmtee*; bring to Plan Cmtee
 OK to proceed *by Plan Cmtee*
 Roll-up of TAIM chart completed *by Technical & Staff*
 Review of completed Roll-up of TAIM chart *by 3/23 Tech Session participants and other Technical*
 OK to proceed *by Plan Cmtee*
 Special Briefing to Board on completion of Viability Analysis *by Miles*