



## Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES**

August 31, 2010 10:15 am – 2:15 pm  
Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, Washington

#### **Attendees**

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP, Co-Chair  
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy, Co-Chair  
Bob Burkle, WDFW  
Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP  
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center  
Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions

John Kliem, Creative Community Solutions  
Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environ.Solutions  
Phil Miller, GSRO  
Rich Osborne, NPCLE Coordinator  
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy  
John Sims, QIN LE Coordinator

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Agenda for today's meeting was approved.

#### **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 3, 2010 MEETING NOTES**

The Meeting Notes from the August 3, 2010 Planning Committee meeting were approved.

#### **THREATS WORKSHOP**

Kara Nelson led the committee through a draft of the Threats Workshop agenda. The workshop will start with a simple overview of how we've gotten to this step in the process, which is identifying and ranking Threats. The emphasis will be on how the information collected in the past will be used as the basis for the workshop tasks. So, the summary will be a quick reminder of the habitat Targets (the definitions of which will be posted in the workshop room), how the life stages and salmon species were nested within these habitat Targets, without any discussion of planning terminology. Just "this is where we're at; this is what we're going to do today," followed by an example of how Stresses come out of the work we've done so far, how they give rise to the identification and ranking of Threats, and how the Threats ranking leads us into Strategy and Goal Development. We will have handed out a chart for each habitat Target that

summarizes its definition, life stages and species, plus its Key Salmon Attributes, related Indicators and 'strawman' list of Stresses for that Target.

After much discussion, it was decided that we should send these charts out before the Workshop, so that those who want to familiarize themselves with the information can do so. The chart will not include the "Scale" or "Current Status" columns because, although we will probably revisit these assessments in the future, at this workshop we need to work with the input we have and not be distracted by revisiting those two aspects.

It was decided that Stresses and Threats that are different for different local areas will be easily enough identified during the workshop because participants will be thinking of specific examples/locales that exhibit a certain Stress and/or Threat. When we gather Stress and Threats information from participants, we need to solicit from them the Scale of each piece of information – ask them if this is a region-wide Stress/Threat, or specific to certain locales.

It was agreed that to make clear what we're going to do at the workshop, workshop leaders should go through an interactive example of finalizing Stresses and identifying Threats in front of the whole group.

The committee agreed that a simple narrative of "Where we are," "How we got here," "What's to be done at this workshop", and "We'll work on strategies next" should go out to participants in advance of the workshop in a simple email with:

1 - a one-page attachment that Kara drafts with straightforward, simple explanation of the terms we'll be using, the process and a "We are here" arrow. Also have this as a handout at the workshop, with perhaps more detail on the back of the sheet for those who want to delve further.

2 – the eight stress charts, one per habitat/target.

Miller urged us to keep this very, very simple so that people get the important basics, unencumbered with having to figure out terminology, etc.

Dietz wanted everyone on the Planning Cmtee to know that we will have copies of the most recent, full Roll Up Charts at the workshop *just in case a need for them arises or somebody asks for them.*

If a workshop participant has more detailed questions that would take the group off task, tell them that we'll explain further and/or answer their questions at the break or lunch and then follow through with that. And/or put their topic on the "Parking Lot" easel sheets.

Next on the workshop agenda will be the review of the "strawman" Stresses that we've brought to the workshop, along with brainstorming the Threats that cause each Stress. This will be done using a wall

chart for each Target that has the Attributes and Stresses listed, and columns for each Threat to be added by hand.

Each wall chart will in effect be a “station” where attendees will add the Threats they identify. [Note: Between this meeting and the workshop itself, it was decided to have four stations as follows: (1) Mainstems; (2) Tributaries; (3) Estuaries, Nearshore and Ocean; and (4) Lakes, Headwaters-Uplands, and Wetlands.]

Schroeder, Osborne and McMurry felt that if we organized the morning groups by LEG, it would save a lot of time that would otherwise be spent talking about “this WRIA” versus “that WRIA” (“my WRIA” versus “your WRIA”). In addition, people will be putting forward information about their area, something they feel comfortable doing; if you asked the same people to say whether it’s a regional threat, they’ll say, “I don’t know.” If there were four colors of dots, one per LEG, then we would capture what Threats are multi-WRIA, i.e., region-wide. There will be quite a few people who DO have a regional perspective/knowledge. So perhaps have a fifth group and a fifth color dot. Have attendees self-identify as to which LEG they identify with – or are they “Regional.” [Note: Between this meeting and the workshop, this set up was finalized as the best way to organize the morning part of the workshop.] These groups will cycle through the stations so everyone has the chance to identify Threats for each habitat Target.

There will be a Planning Cmtee person or two at each station who perhaps (if we have enough Plan Cmtee people) has some knowledge of that Target, and can help facilitate discussion, answer procedural questions, etc.,

In the afternoon, workshop participants would self select into four break-out groups, one per station, based on their expertise. If the numbers are out of balance, we can ask people to move to another group. These groups will take the morning’s input (list of Threats), finalize it and rate it according to Scope, Severity & Irreversibility. Groups would be mix of people across LEGs.

From the morning dots, we may have good sense of Scope (scale). Ask that specific question consistently in the afternoon. Make sure to record where Threats are distinct to a locale and not regionally true. This is important to strategy development. If there’s variability within the region at the WRIA level, we capture that. If variability at a finer scale than WRIA is brought into the discussion, we inform attendees that that will be captured in Strategy Development work.

There is a sheet we will pass out with definitions of Scope, Severity and Irreversibility, as well as definitions for each rating (Very High, High, Medium, Low). After assessing Scope, then move into rating Severity of each. Then Irreversibility, which is probably the same across the region.

The same facilitator will be at the same station as they were in the morning. Besides leading the group through the process and recording results, it's their job to keep the focus and process going, bring compromise, use Parking Lot and Comments columns.

Kliem said he thought it would expedite the afternoon work to have people work alone for a few minutes on ranking the Scope, Severity and Irreversibility of each Threat on an individual sheet. Then the station facilitator can identify the rankings where there is NOT consensus and focus the group work on those, trying to come to consensus rankings. The facilitator will record the consensus rankings, as well as differences of opinion about ranking if that occurs.

Miller asked if there can be a Threat with a High rating in the North and Low in the South? That is, can we capture differences and not insist that it be resolved to a single rating; this would prevent time being spent on disagreement. It also seems like it's important for Strategy Development; we don't want to lose important distinctions/differences. Maybe we summarize the information differently than Miradi algorithm does. We have to catch those that might end up being "Medium" scope because, let's say, it's significant in the North only. Miradi would probably play that out to a "Medium" Threat, but we have to catch that actually it's HIGH in a significant part of the region. Schroeder made the point that Miradi will not catch it; we have to. Miller concurred, stating that this is where we should step outside the boxes of Miradi. Kara repeated that we should have a place for comments.

Kara reminded us that, although Miradi will do an overall ranking of Threats, it will be done after the Workshop. There won't be any overall calculations made during the workshop.

It was agreed that if people start leaving the Workshop midafternoon, it's OK to let them go. They've self-selected out. But we also need to make clear that the results of the workshop will be sent out to everyone for review.

A conference call date/time was set to identify "straw" Stresses which will be distributed to the Planning Committee people for review before using/presenting them at the Threats Workshop. Identifying Stresses is a fairly straightforward step because Stresses are simply degraded Indicators, that is, the opposite of healthy Indicators.

Things for Planning Committee members to remember:

--We're asking people to identify the most important Threats. The goal of the day is what are the biggest threats across the largest and/or most significant areas, and how does the group rank them?

--Burkle reminded us to use less controversial words, so for instance instead of "logging", specify "poor logging practices." Kara emphasized that we don't want to get into the small specifics at this workshop – that's what we do at the Strategy Workshops later. In sum it was agreed that we do NOT

want to identify a whole industry as a Threat but neither do we want a super-specific list of threatening actions from that industry.

--Remember that we need to reinforce that we're asking for expert opinion.

--Use a Parking Lot sheet for things that participants bring up that we haven't dealt with so far but want to retain/consider in the future.

--Severity is a judgment of how severe the problem is WHERE THE PROBLEM OCCURS; it has nothing to do with how geographically widespread it is.

### **STRATEGIES WORKSHOP PREPARATION**

Batchelder raised the question of the venue for the 2-day Strategies Workshops. He suggested ONRC in Forks. McMurry said that despite the fact that we should make up for having made it difficult for those from the North, she thinks having it in Forks would reduce attendance. It was generally agreed that having these important workshops in Forks would be too far north for good attendance.

Batchelder noted that, although we'll leave the Threats Workshop with threats identified and lots of input about their ranking, the overall ranking will be done from that input after the workshop. The software Miradi takes the ranking input from the Threats Workshop and combines it into both rankings within each Target as well as an overall ranking of all Threats across all Targets. This will be sent out to all participants after the workshop.

Nelson further explained that for each Threat within a Target we will have, from the workshop input, a ranking for Scope, Severity and Irreversibility. From this, the software will then figure a ranking of Very High, High, Medium or Low for each Threat within a Target, and then consider all the Threats across all Targets together to come up with an overall ranking for each Threat in the region, Very High, High, Medium or Low. Some "Very High" ratings, for example, might be higher than others (because they're a threat in more than one Target), so it lists the higher "Very Highs" above the lower "Very Highs." The goal is to identify which Threats are the most problematic, the most severe, that cover the most area, are the most difficult to get rid of if we don't tackle them soon. We can all then look at the overall rating but also look back at the raw data so we can tweak the analysis if necessary. Comments can also be added. Miller said he thinks that there is another product from the Threats Workshop which is a synopsis of the "dots" exercise, to identify how many and which LEGs acknowledged each Threat as a problem. This will also give us an idea of which problems appear to be region-wide and which are more local. We can look for correlations and anomalies with the Miradi output.

Nelson noted that we're going to have to do some synthesizing of terminology because workshop participants will use different words and/or different scales when they identify Threats. For example, someone might identify "vacation homes" as a Threat whereas elsewhere someone might identify "residential development." This is somewhat of a challenge because we don't want to lump too many

things together, but we also don't want to end up with lots of little Threats that actually are one Threat when we get to strategy development. If participants disagree with the way we combined threats, we can go back to the raw data and make adjustments.

Creating these products from the Threats Workshop should take a week or two, at which time we can look at them at our October 5<sup>th</sup> Planning Committee Meeting and then send them to participants for review. These products will also be used as the basis for the Strategies Workshops, which will address the top Threats.

### **All-H ANALYSIS**

Batchelder noted that we need to address "H" issues in strategy development. One idea that he's had, which he would like feedback on, is to have a meeting of all the co-managers, separate from any planning workshop, to discuss harvest and hatcheries. Perhaps the best time to have this would be in October. This would hopefully garner input from them about the best ways the Plan might serve their needs in these arenas. It was agreed that this meeting would be a good idea to encourage communication, avoid misunderstandings, and promote inclusive strategy development.

Miller noted that, like identifying "logging" as a Threat, it is an insensitivity to simply identify "harvest" or "hatcheries" as threats. These items need to be approached with care and very specifically. On the one hand, for example, "harvest" is a goal of a salmon plan; on the other hand, there are unsustainable harvest practices and there are unsustainable hatchery practices.

Burkle noted that strategies have already been developed in these arenas, and we should probably take our lead in considering harvest and hatcheries from the co-managers as we develop our Plan. Miller agreed, pointing out that everyone needs to understand that the co-managers are "in the driver's seat", so to speak, when it comes to harvest and hatcheries, and no one else is. Where indepth studies have been done, they have shown that there is a synergy between improved harvest and hatchery programs and improved habitat. Ensmenger wondered if we can determine from the co-managers which documented strategies they would/will use so that our strategy development is in harmony with them. As Miller said, this is new ground, including all-H analysis and input about the H's from non-co-managers in a regional plan, so we need to proceed carefully and patiently. It's not a good idea to assume we know what will be acceptable to co-managers.

Burkle explained that WDFW's hatchery perspective aims to identify (1) systems that will be in wild production (refuges); (2) systems that will be in conservation mode (hatcheries exist but wild salmon are integrated into each hatchery generation) – the most common situation; and, (3) systems that will be in production mode (hatchery only because the system is unproductive otherwise for whatever reason). He reminded us that hatchery fish need habitat too – hatcheries only replace the early stage of salmon life.

## **FURTHER STRATEGY WORKSHOP PLANNING**

In terms of the Strategies Workshops themselves, Batchelder asked what they might look like both process and content, how do we want to structure them. Nelson said there are many different ways to structure them, depending on what our key outcomes to be. The traditional organization is to have strategies be the heart of one day, and measures the heart of the second day. “Measures” at this point are a combination of measures that come from the viability assessment we’ve done, measures of the threats we’ve identified, and measures of strategies effectiveness. In sum, benchmarks and metrics. It will involve both stakeholders and technical experts, but how we organize the workshops depends on what we want to produce out of the them.

Nelson continued, we want to get into the social context driving the Threats. We diagram the details of why detrimental actions are taking place, which shows us where we can change the outcomes, change them from negative to positive. We then integrate that information with our goals and objectives in order to build a set of strategies. We should link into these diagrams the “Socioeconomic Targets” that were determined at the December workshop.

The workshops are a combination of brainstorming and consensus building. Nelson suggested that we do some of the diagramming before the Workshops so that those diagrams can be peer-reviewed and edited, and provide models for other diagrams that might be developed by the participants at the Workshops as part of brainstorming. Providing “strawman” diagrams would speed up the brainstorming process, so we would have time to spend on building consensus around strategies. The strategies will be within different categories, which the Planning Committee can talk about before the workshop; traditionally they’re around restoration and abating threats that are most problematic. But we might also have capacity categories. As part of consensus building, we can do strategy prioritization, determining the highest impact, most feasible strategies. So that would be a really full first day.

The second day we could wrap up the first day’s work and develop action items within the strategies. In addition, Nelson thinks it would be good to get started on results-chaining, which involves the measures for strategy success, which we talk about at our next Planning Committee meeting. From that, we can set up technical workshops later, perhaps one in the North, one in the South, to work on those more specifically. Miller observed that, to him, this involves both technical metrics but also getting a sense from stakeholders of which strategies they would most likely pursue, a sense of the group’s emphasis and ambitiousness, which is a basis of beginning to draft the Plan. Nelson pointed out that the group needs to decide what level of detail they want the strategies to be created at – for example, high level strategies that have lots of detailed actions specified, or simply high level strategies that are fleshed out later? What level of implementation and actual implementation involvement do we include at this point? Miller suggested that for the Strategies Workshops we stop at strategy prioritization.

Osborne asked how the Lead Entity Strategies fit into this process. At what point do we send the strategies out to the Lead Entities for implementation development, etc.? Miller commented that Lead Entity Group leaders will also be bringing their Lead Entity Strategies into these workshops, so there's feedback both ways.

Nelson noted that you can design Strategies not only directly based on Threats, but also Restoration Strategies, as well as Strategies around the drivers of the Threats. In response to a question, she said we should diagram four to ten, probably somewhere in the middle of that number. The rule of thumb is to diagram the threats rated Very High and High, but it's really up to this group to decide. She sees the Planning Committee doing this at our next meeting, October 5<sup>th</sup>. Once we've sent the Threats out after Oct. 5<sup>th</sup> and gotten feedback, we can tweak these decisions based on responses we get from the wider group.

Dietz reminded the group that we don't want to forget "Protect the Best" strategies. The group seemed to agree and Schroeder pointed out that it is part of Threats Abatement to pay attention to that which is in comparatively good shape, in addition to that which is in the worst shape.

Miller pointed out that we currently have a Planning Committee Meeting scheduled for Nov 2<sup>nd</sup> which is the day before the Strategies Workshops, so that meeting was changed to the previous Tuesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>. So, before the Strategies Workshops, we have two Planning Committee Meetings:

Tuesday, October 5 <sup>th</sup>	10:15am – 2:15pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Tuesday, October 26 <sup>th</sup>	10:15am – 2:15pm	Montesano City Hall, 112 N. Main, Montesano (upstairs)

Batchelder adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Jo Dietz