



Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

July 14, 2010

Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, Washington

Attendees

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP, Chair

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Dana Dietz, WCSSP

Mike Johnson, Pacific LE Coordinator

Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions

Phil Miller, GSRO

Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy

Rich Osborne, NPCLE Coordinator (by conference phone)

James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy

John Sims, QIN LE Coordinator

TAIM ROLL UP CHARTS

Miles Batchelder explained that the six TAIM Roll Ups (all except Nearshore and Estuaries) distributed at the meeting were the ones that are closest to being complete. He asked each committee member to look these over during the next week and do their own “heartburn” review. We will distribute them again after today’s meeting with any changes made at today’s meeting.

In addition to filling in the ratings (“Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good”), the other major thing we need to get is the Current Status for each indicator/measure.

Mike Johnson made the point that for many indicators/measures, the “Current Status” is variable, extremely different for different locations in the Coast Region; some places Current Status may be Poor, other places Good or even Very Good. Phil Miller noted that variability of Status needs to be captured so that meaningful strategies come out of the Status evaluation.

Phil pointed out that we're getting to the point where we'll be comparing what we come up with as region-wide strategies with the strategies already outlined in each, more specific Lead Entity Strategy. This comparison will point out where the two don't mesh. Where they don't mesh, it may call for changes to the region-wide strategy, or it may suggest to Lead Entities that they tweak their individual strategies.

During the meeting, it was decided that the following improvements/corrections to the Roll Up Charts need to be made:

BUFFER WIDTHS/all TARGETS: way off according to Bob Burkle and others; although we had previously decided to use the metrics from FEMAT and HCP, they're not correct. Phil suggested calling the Washington Forest Protection Assoc etc. – what are their standards? Also see note under WETLANDS below.

SHADE/all TARGETS: Eliminate from all Targets; shade is taken care with other indicators (Riparian Condition/Composition and Temperature in particular).

HARVEST/wherever it's listed: remains as a measure (Escapement), even though it can also be viewed as a Threat. We need to add a statement acknowledging that it remains here because "..."

LWD/all TARGETS: Table 3-3 has size of "key pieces" which needs to be added. Mike asked why are the ratings so general and subjective? He said that across the coast, LWD is mostly POOR with exception of Queets*, Elsworth Creek, Upper Bogachiel... *

GRAVEL SIZE/Tribs and Headwaters: needs to be readded – not fines, but gravel size for spawning.

MAINSTEMS/ FORAGE ABUNDANCE: Remove because there is no way to measure this. In addition, James Schroeder said that Water Quality, Riparian Condition and Sediment/Embeddedness will get at Forage Abundance adequately.

LAKES: All specific to Sockeye (temp, etc.) Bob said that we need to put back into the Lakes chart the temperatures from Margolis that he had – for JUVENILE SOCKEYE REARING. He pointed out that it is the Sockeye requirements for rearing and adult migration that are different; Sockeye requirements for spawning/incubation are similar to other species.

HEADWATERS: Add "Headwaters processes that affect downstream conditions." That is what we're talking about here, just processes that affect salmon downstream. The Key Species (Coho, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Cutthroat – spawning/inc – juvenile rearing) do spend the most time in Tributaries immediately below Headwaters, so Headwater processes are most important for them.

NUTRIENT STORAGE: Remove; it's covered by other indicators.

Change GEOMORPHIC PROCESSES to SEDIMENT NEEDS - GRAVEL SIZE.

Condition of WHOLE area, not just Riparian, that is important – % natural land cover.

Add WATER QUANTITY: percent natural maturity in the sub basins: Seral –early, middle, late.

Key McMurry: This is one area with dramatic variability of Status across the Coast; generally Poor Current Status, but some headwaters very good, e.g., National Park.

WETLANDS: Key noted that there is a big difference between DNR and DOE buffer widths for wetlands. DOE manages wetlands, so use DOE's widths for Wetlands but use DNR's for other habitats.

OCEAN: Bob suggested we call the most sensitive life stage here “sub-adult foraging” (because “adults” = mature, returning)

Add Copepod Diversity Index that Bob provided; northern high-fat vs southern low-fat.

Don't call it “test fishery”; call it Juvenile Salmon Sampling. Measured number per sq. kilometer: Poor: <10 Fair: 20 Good: 30 Very good: > 40

Add Ocean Acidity/pH: Bob had provided numbers previously. Poor: <7.8 Fair: 7.8

Holes/Blanks:

ESTUARIES: Entire Target needs to be Rolled Up.

NEARSHORE: What Rich Osborne provided needs to be vetted.

Current Status for all

Fill in all blank squares. If it's blank in “Measures” column, at least say “See Ratings” if (like Riparian Condition/Composition) it's a complex item, not just numerical measures. Look in the Ratings text to add appropriate measure, e.g., “Percent Impact” “Percent Natural” , “Percent site potential” or just “Percent”.

Discussion of Tasks To Be Done with Roll Up Charts: (See also “To Do” List at end of these Notes.)

STAFF: Make corrections agreed upon today to Roll Ups.

SMALL TECHNICAL GROUP: Current Status. Give out according to a person’s habitat or expertise: for Tributaries, it might be three people. Clarify our directive to those people: include variability, what’s the latitude we’re expecting them to take.

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS: do “gut-check” review of resulting Roll Ups.

TECHNICAL TEAM: “Heartburn review” of Roll Ups. John Sims made the point that we need to make clear to the Technical Team that these Roll Up sheets DO NOT deal with Threats, which will be dealt with at the Threats Workshop. So tech guys don’t need to consider Threats when they’re reviewing these sheets. Also, these lists are only concerned with anthropogenic activities, not natural activities. Make clear that the TAIM Roll Ups are subject to refinement as we progress in the Planning process.

All of these reviews will give us a confirmation that we’ve selected the right attributes to base our assessment of stresses & threats on.

THREATS WORKSHOP

In response to a question, Kara said that the Current Status should be about 80% solid by the time of Threats Workshop.

Phil suggested that to have a successful Threats Workshop, we’re going to need a sample/strawman for each Target. Use the example for each Target that’s obvious, important, generally agreed upon, and an example that interests people. We need to show them what the Threats Workshop will look like. It addresses the acceptance of CAP as good planning process – they’ll see in real terms where the process has brought us in terms of identifying Threats according to Roll Up Charts, show that it is an effective process. Kara agreed to do a draft for each Target so the Planning Committee can review them at the August 3rd meeting. We need to clearly signal whether the example completes the stress/threat work for that attribute, or it will need additional work. Kara said she intends to remove all the “CAP terminology” from the examples and the process; OK words are assessment, strategy, current status. Phil suggested using Harvest and/or Hatchery in one of the examples.

Key reminded us that we also need to provide a clear, simple writeup of the planning steps that have been taken up to this Threats Workshop, in order to get everyone up to speed since last December’s workshop.

We need to talk about the Threats Workshop structure at later Planning Committee meetings, but Kara sees it consisting of break-out groups working by Target, with some coming together of everyone for review.

Kara outlined the Threats Workshop as follows: The key outcomes of the Workshop will be Stresses, which are altered Indicators, e.g., High Temperature caused by x human activity. It will address the Indicators that are in Poor or Fair status, or perhaps Good but we expect they will drop out of Good soon. The reason to list the Stresses is to review all Habitats to assess the Threats.

Stress = the effect (e.g., high temperatures)

Threat = the human –based cause of the effect (e.g., x human activity)

Threats Workshop Process:

1. Review Roll Up Charts and identify Stresses;
2. Then identify the sources/causes of those Stresses, i.e, Threats;
3. Then rank the Threats according to the following three criteria: Scope, Severity and Irreversibility;
4. Using the algorithm in Miradi, this will then give us an overall ranking for each Threat.

Kara showed us an example chart of the results of this Process.

The Threats Workshop will identify for us the major Threats across all habitats and all species/ life stages. We'll also have low and medium Threats identified; for instance, a Threat may not be important region-wide, but may be very important in certain places. So all of this will then inform the Strategy Development workshops.

Phil suggested that we don't lose WHICH criteria a Threat was mainly ranked according to, because those distinctions might give signals for Strategy development. Kara said that that will be captured: there is ranking for Scope, a ranking for Severity and a ranking for Irreversibility.

The Threats workshop is where we need to bring in all H analysis – Harvest, Hatchery. Everyone agreed. We need to make sure that Harvest and Hatchery are considered in Threat identification for each Target, if relevant. Phil suggested using Harvest and/or Hatchery in one of the examples.

The other thing that might come up is Climate Change. Kara suspects that what will come out of the Threats workshop is that we'll need to do a more indepth analysis of Climate Change as a Threat,

more than can be done at this initial Threats Workshop, because it's so complex and it's on a longer timetable than we would normally be considering for Targets. Climate Change will come up many places as Threats are identified, but the Strategies that we develop at our Strategy Development workshops will probably be more traditional, shorter-term ones. Longer-term, Climate Change factors will probably require a separate, more indepth look, at a later date. Once we've done the Threats Workshop and, most likely have Climate Change as a major Threat, Kara can show us examples of different ways to specifically address Climate Change beyond our Strategy Development workshops, more complex, interacting factors that we don't get directly/immediately: e.g., storm frequency, ocean pH, temperature, different responses of different species, toxic algae blooms, etc.

Threats Workshop Invitees:

Concerning Workshop invitees, Dana and Miles will compile list of all those who've attended one or both of first Workshops (Dec. 09 Targets Workshop and Mar. '10 Technical Session) plus others (e.g., who couldn't come to either of these two workshops) and distribute to Planning Committee by tomorrow for review, comment, etc. The committee agreed to review this list and get any comments to Dana.

We want 40-50 people for Workshop. It was agreed that we could have 70+ invitees and probably end up with 40-50. Geographic and interest distribution in addition to previous attendees.

Concerning the longer "People" list, which the Committee prepared as a list of everyone who might be invited to a workshop, Phil observed that it needs fine tuning. For example, list staff of high ranking legislators and department directors instead of the legislator, etc.

Kara offered to work with Dana on the Save Date notification – need to get people interested.

Phil suggested that we be ready as of end of August Planning Cmtee meeting to send out invitation with Workshop place, etc specifics and then about two weeks before the Workshop (Sept 1st) send out repeat of specifics and "How we got here?" and examples.

Between invitation going out between the August 3rd and Aug 31st Planning Cmtee Meetings, perhaps make a few phone calls to people we REALLY want to attend. Shows them we're interested. Also prepares them to jump in. Answer questions beforehand.

STRATEGY WORKSHOPS

Phil asked: Besides this information coming out of the Threats Workshop, what else do we need before the Strategy Development Workshop? Kara: Not too much. You can have people review the results of the Threats Workshop (including perhaps some people who weren't at the Threats

Workshop) for anything missing. Phil said he was thinking of the timing of the two workshops, that again we may need to skillfully create some Strategy examples to prime the pump for the Strategies Workshop so that the group doesn't get bogged down. Kara explained that to develop Strategies one uses a conceptual model called Situational Analysis that leads one from Threats to Strategies. This takes into account the socioeconomic background causes of the Threats, at what points can intervention actually take place to change the causal factors (e.g., are the laws not in place or are they being disregarded/disobeyed?) The situational analysis sets up the Strategy identification. Before the Strategy Workshop, we can provide good examples, provide context through situational analysis, show how picking different Threats to address would look.

MEETING AND WORKSHOP DATES:

The Committee set the following dates:

Planning Committee Meeting: Tuesday, August 3 at the Port of Grays Harbor.

Planning Committee Meeting: Tuesday, August 31 at the Port of Grays Harbor (to replace our normally scheduled September 7 Planning Cmtee Meeting which is cancelled).

Threats Workshop: Tuesday, September 14, location TBD

Planning Committee Meeting: Tuesday, October 5, location TBD.

another Planning Committee Meeting before Strategy Workshops, TBD

Strategy Workshops (2 days): Wed and Thurs, November 3 – 4, location TBD

NETMAP

Miles passed out NetMap map examples we had done for the Coast watershed. We used Shorelines of State Significance from Shorelines Management Act, because we had defined Mainstems as greater than 1,000 cfs. However, seeing them mapped out, we see that there are gaps – eg, within tribal lands, other? How correct? What's a new convention to use to define Mainstems? We could get 1,000 cfs data (point where it's no longer 1,000 cfs) from Park and tribes and correct what's on the NetMap maps. This is what was agreed upon.

Ideas for use of NetMaps for workshops, to also be discussed at August Planning Cmtee Meetings:

Create maps with all the Targets.

Maps to go with examples? Phil cautioned that on examples we should only include measures that we're using – e.g., DO, so as not to confuse workshop participants.

Maps that will speak to the Scope rankings?

Miles reported that we will get ESI to make region-wide maps for the Workshop, which only ESI can create. We don't want workshop participants thinking in watershed "parts", so we don't want to give them partitioned maps. He said we'd need a month to get these from ESI, so we'll need to decide what maps we want by mid-August.

Miles also noted that we intend to have region-wide Intrinsic Potential maps for Chinook, Coho, Steelhead and Chum (the latter if we can get the model created in time). Phil said we need to be careful about using something that's going to generate controversy in the region. That is, if it's not critical to the explanation of an example, don't produce it.

TO DO LIST

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| STAFF | Send to Plan Cmtee the proposed Threats Workshop invitee list. |
| CMTEE MEMBERS | Review the proposed Threats Workshop invitee list. |
| STAFF/KARA | Prepare and send out "Save the Date" Announcement for Threats Workshop |
| STAFF | Update the Roll Ups with today's input. |
| CMTEE MEMBERS | Do a "gut-check" of the six Roll Ups. |
| STAFF | Fill in holes and errors (e.g., Buffer Width) with expert input.
Get ESTUARIES and NEARSHORE Roll Ups completed.
Get CURRENT STATUS. |
| CMTEE MEMBERS | Do a "gut-check" of final two (all eight?) Roll Ups. |
| KARA | Draft Threats examples for each Target for review by Plan Cmtee. |
| STAFF | Send out Roll Ups for review by Technical Team.
Prepare "What's happened since Dec. '09 Workshop" for Plan Cmtee Review.
Send out Threats Workshop invitations after August 3 rd Plan Cmtee Meeting.
Have NetMaps prepared after August 3 rd Plan Cmtee Meeting. |

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Jo Dietz