



Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

August 3, 2010

Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, Washington

Attendees

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP, Chair

Dana Dietz, WCSSP

Mike Johnson, Pacific LE Coordinator

Phil Miller, GSRO

Lee Napier, GHCLC Coordinator

Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy

Rich Osborne, NPCLE Coordinator

John Sims, QIN LE Coordinator

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda for today's meeting was approved. Miles noted that we need to end the meeting by about 1:15pm so that he and Kara can go meet with Creative Community Solutions in Olympia about facilitating the Threats Workshop.

APPROVAL OF JULY 14, 2010 MEETING NOTES

The Meeting Notes from the July 14, 2010 Planning Committee meeting were approved.

REVIEW OF ESTUARIES & NEARSHORE ROLL UP CHARTS

It was noted that because Bob Burkle wasn't able to attend today, we need to make sure he reviews them as they now stand.

It was decided the "# native vegetation" measurement could be eliminated from the Roll Up Chart because it's taken care of by the "Condition/Composition" indicator.

It was also decided that "Thermal Barriers" is actually a threat, so it could be removed.

It was decided to insert an "ESTUARINE EXTENT" attribute with two indicators/measures within it: "Estuarine Quantity" (now called Estuarine Extent, i.e., habitat quantity compared to historic area)

and “Estuarine Connectivity” (% historic connectedness). Historic connectedness will be a rough estimate; we don’t know if we can find a study that would give us Ratings metrics, and it’s unlikely that we have studies showing trends of percent connectedness. John S. suggested contacting Nisqually to see if they have Ratings metrics, since they’ve been dealing with these issues for several years. Mike also suggested asking the Refuge in Long Beach, and informed us that Pacific County has historic maps back to the 1850’s and apparently the LIDAR flights for Pacific County have been done. However, Rich observed that analyses haven’t really been done of the raw data that’s available, so it’s something we might identify as a data gap. Kara Nelson thought that TNC might also have some information.

Under “Forage Fish Abundance,” surf smelt eggs data hasn’t been found by either Rich or James Schroeder. It was decided to have the indicator “FORAGE ABUNDANCE” with the Mudflat Productivity indicator AND a Forage Fish Abundance indicator, even without data.

Kara made the case that if there’s an indicator that we are never going to get data for, we can probably eliminate it; however, if it’s an indicator that’s important, we need to include it even without data because we may well want to develop a strategy around that indicator.

In response to Kara’s observation that Forage Fish is an important indicator in the estuarine/nearshore environments, Rich related that he’s researching nesting birds (common murre) to capture that because their nesting output would be a fairly good indicator of Forage Fish. Rich thinks that information from the Flattery Rocks, Quillayute Needles and Copalis National Wildlife Refuges through US Fish & Wildlife Service would be a good indicator for our coast, so that’s what he’s been trying to track down through for the NEARSHORE Roll Up. In terms of the ESTUARIES Roll Up perhaps there is a bird species in Willapa and Grays Harbor for which data might be more relevant and more available. Rich said he can’t think of anything else that captures Forage Fish unless we get our own funding to do yearly assessments and capture trends that way.

Mike suggested we tap into all the data from studies that UW does yearly in our estuaries.

It was agreed to put “Eelgrass” and “LWD” under “Estuarine Condition”. It was agreed that these are items that should not be removed from the Charts, even if we don’t have data. Mike confirmed that he should get information on Eelgrass from Brett once he’s back from vacation. However, he could not find metrics on proper LWD loading for estuaries, although perhaps there is a study of some estuary somewhere that would give us Ratings. It was agreed that LWD is important enough in estuaries that we keep in on the Chart even if we don’t have the data; LWD metrics for estuaries would be different than LWD metrics for tribs or mainstems.

Rich added that he is getting kelp and eelgrass information for the whole coast from Helen Berry from DNR at the end of the week, so we'll have that also. According to Rich, if Berry's eelgrass surveys go far enough south, we can have "Kelp" in the NEARSHORE chart and "Eelgrass" in the ESTUARIES chart, but eliminate Eelgrass from the NEARSHORE chart.

OTHER ROLL UP ELEMENTS

Lee made the point that we need to track every item that we've dropped, so that people know it's been considered and so we can identify indicators for which we really should have a strategy even if we don't have good data. The first element of the strategy would be filling the data gap. Everyone agreed, so, in addition to keeping an historical record of the charts since their inception, Dana said she would begin a more formal list of the dropped items and bring it back to the group for review. Phil pointed out that a prioritized list of data gaps is common to all regional salmon plan. Phil clarified that we can always backfill our Charts with information that we find or becomes available, but we can't get bogged down if we don't have information. Kara felt that there are items like Forage Fish that are so important we shouldn't drop them from our Charts, even if we don't have data.

Kara said that, for an Attributes/Indicators, we need to put what we care about, not what we're measuring. So, for instance, in NEARSHORE, "Forage Fish Abundance" is the INDICATOR and "Trends in Common Murre Nesting Success" is the MEASURE. Similarly, what does Eelgrass or Kelp or LWD provide that is important for Water Quality or Habitat Condition for salmon – e.g., overall water quality or some specific aspect of water quality?

Miles pointed out a Buffer Widths chart he made up to address the concern from the last meeting that the widths we had from FEMAT and the HCP were unrealistically large. This chart, which includes each Target separately, shows riparian buffer widths that are a hybrid of the HCP and Riparian Forest Restoration Strategy measures (DNR), that is, they are based on work in forestry. There was a discussion that concluded that we are simply assessing what would be "Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good" buffer widths given what salmonids and the habitat need, what existed once upon a time; that is, we're not at this stage taking into account recent historical land usage, e.g., forest, agriculture, industry, etc. It was noted that the buffer widths for Wetlands remain unchanged from the previous version because they are in alignment with the new numbers. Phil suggested that we compare the Wetlands widths to DOE standards because someone will raise the question. Similarly, Lee Napier asked whether, for example, agricultural people will worry that these numbers might be used as best available science to encroach on their concerns. It was noted, however, that we're not claiming this is best available science for every mile of every waterway, nor are these numbers prescriptive, but instead they are a reasonable attempt to benchmark buffer widths for the purposes of being able to characterize an issue. When we move into identifying Threats and

developing Strategies, the standards would need to be researched for specific land usages. With these caveats, it was agreed that we should use the new widths on this new chart. It was suggested that a note summarizing these caveats be added.

Kara brought up one more element, an Abundance measure, which is perhaps important to make sure we include Hatchery and Harvest in the Threats discussion. She asked whether we need to have a separate population Abundance item in each Roll Up Chart in order to spur discussions about Threats to salmon themselves, not just their habitats. Wild population abundance – what in all the rest of this have we not addressed? -- human predation and human mitigation of predation. Don't put a Current Status on it. Have it in each Habitat (except perhaps Headwaters-Uplands) so everyone has opportunity to provide input.

COMPLETION OF ROLL UP CHART REVIEWS

Staff reported that they have yet to obtain Current Status designations; however, they do have a plan to complete the task, which is to individually pursue Current Status from individuals as follows:

Mainstems, Tributaries, Headwaters-Uplands, Wetlands: Bob Burkle, Kirt Hughes, Dave King, Chris Byrnes?, Mike Johnson, Key McMurry, Mike Johnson, Devona Ensmenger. Wetlands only: Chris Hempleman. Lake Ozette: Jeremy Gilman. Lake Pleasant: Roger Lien. Lake Quinault: Bill Armstrong. Estuaries: Bob Burkle, Mike Johnson, Key McMurry, Eric Delvin. Nearshore and Ocean: Rich Osborne, Ann Shaffer, Joe Shoemaker, Andy Olson, Eric Delvin.

In order to explain the Current Status designations that we're requesting, staff will need to give a brief summary of what the Roll Up Charts represent. This will most likely result in each expert doing somewhat of a "heartburn" review of the Roll Up Chart they're looking at, which is a good thing – one more vetting of the Charts. Staff's aim is to have the Current Status obtained by August 13th. It was agreed that if experts give different Current Status depending on their particular location, we record those differences in the Current Status column, per location.

It was agreed that the Roll Up Charts should go to technical participants of previous Workshops three weeks in advance of the Threats Workshop, with a request that they review it and get any feedback to us within a week. We don't have time at the Threats Workshop to rehash the TAIM/Roll Up Charts themselves. The attendees need to be ready to move forward into Threats analysis at the beginning of the Threats Workshop.

In addition, we need to have the Quinault scientists to review the completed Roll Ups, as per our earlier agreement with them.

Summary: Reviews of Roll Up Charts to be completed are:

VIA EMAIL AUGUST 9th or 10th at the latest: One more quick “gut check” review by Planning Cmtee members, individually via email.

BY FRIDAY AUGUST 13th: Completion of Current Status, individually, by experts selected by habitat knowledge. (J. Gilman, B. Armstrong, R. Lien, K. Hughes, B. Burkle, D. King, C. Byrnes?, M. Johnson, K. McMurry, D. Ensmenger, C. Hempleman/DOE, E. Delvin, R. Osborne, A. Olson, J. Shoemacher)

BY THREE WEEKS BEFORE SEPT 14th (AUGUST 23rd): “Heartburn” review by broad range of experts, including QIN scientists as agreed with them previously. (B. Thompson, M. Plumb, T. Hooper, C. Smith, S. Leider, M. Haggerty, F. Geyer, K. Northcutt, R. Lien, S. Allison, J. Gilman, L. Gilbertson, B. Armstrong, J. Jorgensen, A. Olson, G. Pess)

ON AUGUST 23rd, THREE WEEKS BEFORE SEPT 14th, WITH ONE WEEK TO GIVE FEEDBACK:
Informational review by all technical experts who have or will be participating in Workshops, both
- those who have been involved -- to keep them on board, see products that have evolved, maintain their ownership, and
- those who haven't been involved – so they understand the role of the Charts as the basis for threats assessment, which they will be involved in.

WHENEVER THE CMTEE DECIDES, send materials to all Workshop participants.

Reminder for all scheduling: Labor Day Holiday is Sept. 6th and many state agencies are also not working Sept. 7th.

THREATS WORKSHOP CONSIDERATIONS

Kara passed out a draft agenda for the Threats Workshop, although she said that she, John Kliem and Miles have not yet met so the agenda may change before the Planning Committee's August 31st meeting. She noted that, although we may do a short review of “how we got here,” we need to focus on the expectations for results coming out of the Threats Workshop.

To review, the Threats identification procedure is to focus on Indicators/Measures where the Rating is “Poor” or “Fair”, and specify the Stressor for each of those. The next step is to identify the Threat(s) that cause that Stress. The final step is to rank the Threats according to Scope, Severity and Irreversibility. After the Workshop, these rankings will be brought together into one ranking for each Threat, which will be sent out to all the attendees.

She observed that one of the problems with Threats identification is vocabulary. She passed out a document outlining standard nomenclature for Threats, which we could perhaps use. Or, we could perhaps come up with a standard list for salmon. None of these should be viewed as limiting attendees, but they do assist in bringing it all together at the end. As well, it reminds participants to be specific – for example, what kind of development do they mean? Although it was agreed that it is a good list, it was also agreed that we don't want to overwhelm participants with things to absorb; we'll come out of the Workshop with a degree of roughness that is OK. We could perhaps use the nomenclature chart in our own process of lumping and splitting the Threats after the Workshop. It was also suggested that perhaps break out group facilitators have the nomenclature chart to help them bring clarity in a break out group. Kara warned that if the facilitators don't equally probe the conversation to get exactly what participants mean, we might end up with less specific Threats, a lot more lumping than splitting.

We need to always remember that we can add Threats after the Workshop. The important thing to get by the end of the Workshop is the ranking. We don't want to and don't need to bog down in identifying the Stresses, and Kara said that usually identifying the Threats goes quickly; it's the ranking of the Threats we need to make sure we get done.

In fact, it was suggested that we go into the Workshop with the Stresses listed, get quick general agreement for each one that it indeed is the Stress, and move on to what's causes that Stress, the Threat. To facilitate approval of the Stresses, we should communicate that we've identified these Stresses with the best, most technical expertise we could muster; it's the best we have right now, it can be improved later if necessary, and of course conditions may also change in the future. We also need to communicate that it is the Threats that give rise to the Strategies, which will produce action (and which people need to buy into if we're going to produce action). The Threats – the causes of the Stresses - are what we need your (the attendees') help in identifying. The Stresses are a small and fairly simple step to get to the Threats. It was suggested we have a simple table with the Targets, the Attributes/Indicators and the Stresses, with the Threats column blank.

Similarly, we need to get the Threats ranked according to Scope, Severity and Irreversibility, which are defined on the second page of Kara's rankings handout. Afterwards, WCSSP and TNC staff will combine the three rankings for each Threat into one overall ranking for each Threat according to the algorithm defined in the CAP process, all of which will then be reviewed by the Planning Committee. It was agreed that the definitions of Scope, Severity and Irreversibility need to be more straightforward and simple than on the handout.

It was agreed that all feedback should be openly accepted and recorded, but only "dealt with" either before or after September 14th Workshop. We won't have time to discuss it at Workshop. Phil reminded us that all regional plans are living documents, always subject to change.

Phil also emphasized that John Kliem needs to understand that one of his main tasks will be to keep the Workshop on track, to quickly deal with things that could take the Workshop off track, including using a “Parking Lot” of items raised to be dealt with later. Kara reminded us that we can add items in the Workshop, and include them in the Workshop threats analysis. If afterwards the group decides that item needs tweaking, elaboration or even elimination, that will be possible. John Sims made the point that we need to make sure we respect and record participants’ concerns.

Kara noted that good information to have when we move into developing Strategies is how specifically does the Threat affect the salmon, connecting our work back to the salmon. Perhaps consider including the Salmon Life Stages on the Target (a habitat) – Attribute – Stress chart to make sure the connection back to Life Stage is clear. But integrate it as simply as possible so we don’t add confusion for attendees.

Concerning the questions of Scale, guidance to facilitators should be: be accepting of variability, capture it, so we can address it in Strategy development. Rich: take the worst case scenario and the best case scenario, these are our boundaries. A Threat should be added to our list even if it’s not a Threat across the Region.

We need to make sure participants remember that this is a Regional Plan, the Targets have been Regionally identified, we’re looking at Regional Threats. The Region is the scope at which writing this plan, which includes recognizing local variability. Perhaps make clearer in definition of “Scope”? Every participant is from somewhere specific, and so will tend to thinking locally; we need them to think regionally. When we do the Scope-Severity-Irreversibility ratings, we’re rating regionally. There can be differences of opinion about regional Threats/ranking, but we will likely also have differences of opinion due to thinking locally, not regionally.

Need the facilitators to be consistent across break out groups. Kara agreed that we should have a meeting of the facilitators. Her list so far includes John K., Debbie, James S., Eric, herself. She also noted that, like at previous Workshops, we’ll distribute the Planning Committee members so that at least one of us is in each group, to also help keep the discussion focused.

John S. asked that Kara be on a microphone so her voice isn’t lost in a large room.

Kara said she is going to revise the generic documents handed out today specifically for our Workshop, simplifying definitions, adding “WCSSP”, emphasizing regional planning, etc. She will send them out to this group for feedback.

There was a discussion about how to get the right people into the right Target group – i.e., get those with real expertise in Tributaries in the Tributaries break out group, without having a huge

Tributaries group and a tiny, e.g., Headwaters-Uplands group. The idea of a procedural combination of assigning those who we know are experts with a “lottery” procedure.

We’ll bring everyone together for a few minutes at the end of the Threats Workshop to tell them the nature of the products of the Workshop that they’ll be receiving, our openness to getting any feedback on those products, the next steps in the planning process, the Strategies Workshops November 3rd and 4th. Then, soon thereafter, send out a “SAVE THE DATES” for the November Strategies Workshops.

Concerning invitees to the Threats Workshop, if a Plan Cmtee member knows them, call them to encourage their participation, both before the RSVP date and after. Staff to send out invitee list to Plan Cmtee for that purpose.

Mike asked whether we should invite the SRFB TRT members who are very knowledgeable about our region, its habitats and salmon issues. Phil suggested that the LEG Coordinators call and invite those that they know; see what they say. At the same time, Miles and Phil can talk to Brian Abbott, who directs their activities and budget, about them attending. They may be able to come independent of RCO. If we got one or two, that would be good.

Concerning invitees to the Strategies Workshops, it was agreed that we’d like as many participants as possible from the Threats Workshop plus perhaps a few folks selected specifically because of certain Threats identified at the Sept. workshop.

Maps

Regional maps will be at a fairly small scale, without much detail. Phil pointed out that we don’t want to be viewed as trying to program participants’ input. Which types of maps would be good for perspective? Miles noted that we do already have regional maps, done by TNC and the Wild Salmon Center. Rich said having regional maps would be best because that in itself would reemphasize the regional nature of the planning we’re doing. It was agreed that combining the Netmap 11 watersheds into the four WRIA/LEG areas would work; people already identify by LEG areas and this scale would allow enough detail to be meaningful.

Miles asked what information should be on the maps: 303D temperature, DO, other key attributes? If it’s information about something besides a key attribute, don’t include it as it will cause confusion. As Phil said, “If you can’t tie it into Targets, don’t use it. If you can, use it.” We won’t have all key attributes mapped. Intrinsic potential of different salmon species mapped? We still have to develop a model to do intrinsic potential for chum. Poor habitat?

Mike J. suggested that we simply have a regional map (or broken into four WRIA/LEG areas); if we were to include 303D data on a map, it would appear that we're attaching greater importance to 303D temperature info as a Threat, for example, than LWD. He suggests we just have regional maps with watersheds and WRIA/LEG areas identified. Miles reminded us that we have TNC maps which include land cover, major land usage, ownership, etc. Everyone agreed that these would be very useful for this Threats Workshop. It's for the later Strategies Workshops that we'll really need to have maps with the Threats mapped, in order to work towards Strategies. So it was agreed that hold off on having Keven do NetMap maps until after the Threats Workshop. Rich said that Keven will be gone in October, so we'll need to have him do the Threats maps immediately after the Sept 14th Threats Workshop if we have to have them by the November 3rd-4th Strategies Workshops. So we need to have a contract with Keven in place by Sept. 14th.

Between now and the Planning Committee Meeting, August 31, 2010:

- As soon as they're fairly final, Staff send to Plan Cmtee members drafts of documents that Threats Workshop participants will be receiving, including agenda, documents we've discussed today that will be revised for the WCSSP Threats Workshop.

At the Planning Committee Meeting, August 31, 2010:

- Final review of documents that Threats Workshop participants will be receiving, so that they can be sent out soon after August 31st.

Summary of Documents at Workshop:

Beforehand send out Roll Up Charts, but in the end we want a document that tells people "We need Threats for this, this, and this."

Chart of Target – Attribute/Indicator – Stress – blank column for Threats

Definitions of Scope, Severity and Irreversibility – perhaps on the wall

There will be a recorder for each break out group, who will have:

- Blank recording sheet for Threats

- Chart to mark down Scope, Severity and Irreversibility rankings

- Blank "Parking lot" sheet for all ideas, questions and concerns brought up that we won't have time to address at the Workshop itself.

In lieu of a "To Do" list, Dana constructed a chart, attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Jo Dietz