



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**January 19, 2011**

10 am – 2 pm

Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen WA

#### DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS from THIS MEETING

The December 19, 2010 and Special January 11, 2011 Meeting Summaries were approved.

\*

Krueger made a MOTION that the RTC present its recommendations concerning a sub-allocation formula to the WCSSP Board of Directors no later than February 14, 2011. Baltzell seconded the motion. Swartout pointed out that the Board could extend the deadline again at the February 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the Motion. There were none.

Osborne thinks the sub-allocation formula should be looked at every year, because there is always improving data and insight. Swartout asked if the Board agreed with this; no objections were raised.

Willis thinks that the Board should definitely make a decision based on the RTC's recommendations, and not turn the decision back to the SRFB. Everyone agreed.

\*

Baltzell made a MOTION that Rich Carlson or Chris Swenson from the USFWS Columbia River Estuary Program proposal be invited to the Board's next meeting to make a presentation and answer questions. Osborne seconded the motion. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the motion. There were none.

\*

Napier made a MOTION to approve the RESOLUTION concerning the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership (see below). Baltzell seconded the motion. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the Motion to approve this resolution. There were none.

RESOLUTION: Be it resolved that the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) Board of Directors acknowledges authorization for staff to coordinate with North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership activities relevant to the Region as stated in the Scope of Work in the grant agreement between Grays Harbor County and the Recreation and Conservation Office on behalf of WCSSP.

\*

Swartout proposed that we identify and discuss potential Bylaws topics, such as Conflict of Interest, one at a time at upcoming Board meetings; Dietz can keep a list of items that come up in Board meetings that may be Operating Procedures. If substantive items accrue, the Board can begin discussing them after this spring's Plan activity subsidies, when we all have more time. Swartout asked if there was any objection to proceeding in this fashion. There were no objections. It was agreed to put the Conflict of Interest discussion on the February agenda "as time permits."

In attendance:

**WCSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**Mark Swartout**, Chair

**Faith Taylor-Eldred**, Vice Chair

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

**Katie Krueger**, Quileute Indian Tribe

**Rich Osborne**, Lead Entity Coordinator

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group

**Dave Bingaman**, Quinault Indian Nation

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

**Terry Baltzell**, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force

**Lee Napier**, Lead Entity Coordinator

**Mark Swartout**, Thurston County

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

**Mike Johnson**, Lead Entity Coordinator (by phone)

**Key McMurry**, WBRCC, Key Environmental Solutions (by phone)

**Faith Taylor-Eldred**, Pacific County

**OTHERS**

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy

John Sims, QIN Lead Entity Coordinator

Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Staff

Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP Staff

**UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

Wednesday, February 16, 2011                      10 am – 2 pm                      Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

Wednesday, March 16, 2011                      10 am – 2 pm                      Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

Wednesdays in 2011: Apr 20 -- May 18 -- June 15 -- July 20 -- Aug 17 -- Sept 21 -- Oct 19 -- Nov 16 -- Dec 21

**WELCOME**

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone, brought the meeting to order and asked everyone to identify themselves. He noted for the record that there was a quorum present.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Swartout pointed out that the times allotted for each agenda item had been changed, but that there were no changes to the agenda items themselves. There were no objections to approving the Agenda.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2010 and SPECIAL JANUARY 11, 2011 MEETING SUMMARIES**

Dietz asked if there were any corrections to the December or Special January 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summaries; there were none. Swartout asked if there were any objections to approving these two Summaries. There were no objections.

Dietz noted that in the Board packet today was a copy of the final letter sent by COR to the Governor. Batchelder also explained that, although the Board's 1-11-11 decision explicitly included that the letter should go to the relevant legislative committee chairs, that did not happen because the legislation was actually being drafted in the Governor's office, and therefore had not yet gone to the Legislature. It was agreed that letters could, and probably would, be sent to the appropriate legislative committee chairs at a future date if the legislation still included elimination of the SRFB.

Swartout said he thought the special meeting via conference call had worked well and could work for us in the future; he thanked everyone for their quick response and willingness to heed a last-minute call.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

Dietz noted that the first page, the overall budget, has been updated with the changes agreed to by the Board at their December meeting, and the additional \$11,000 from RCO for LOSC facilitation has been added to the LOSC line item in the Planning section. She asked if there were any other questions or concerns. There were none.

## **BOARD MEMBERSHIP CHANGES**

Since there have been several unavoidable changes to Board membership, Swartout asked each Lead Entity Group to report.

For NPCLE, Rich Osborne reported that John Miller had not been re-elected to his Clallam County position, therefore he was no longer a member of NPCLE or the WCSSP Board. In view of this, NPCLE had elected two new WCSSP Board members from among NPCLE members: Cathy Lear, habitat biologist for Clallam County, and Tami Pokorny, an environmental health specialist for Jefferson County. Krueger pointed out that Lear was a habitat biologist for the Hoh Tribe before she went to work for Clallam County; she has years of experience in the northern area, and wants to actively participate in WCSSP, so she will be a good addition to the Board, as will Pokorny with her expertise and experience.

Faith Taylor-Eldred and Key McMurry reported that the two of them plus Mike Johnson and Mike DeSimone were WCSSP Board members appointed by the Pacific County Lead Entity Group.

Dave Bingaman reported that the five members of the QIN Land and Natural Resources Committee, plus himself, had been appointed as WCSSP Board members. At the moment, there is a vacancy in QIN LNRC which won't be filled until after tribal elections in March 2011. Bingaman said that once all new assignments have been made to the LNRC, a letter will be written to WCSSP affirming the names of those on the QIN LNRC, and therefore WCSSP Board members. He reported that he had delivered to Dietz a resolution naming himself as a WCSSP Board member.

For GHLEG, Lee Napier reported that Andy Olsen had left his position with the Chehalis Tribes to take a position elsewhere; the Chehalis Tribes have asked the GHLEG to wait until Olsen's position is filled to appoint a new WCSSP Board member, which the Lead Entity has agreed to. In the meantime, Glen Connelly and Mark White of the Chehalis Tribes have asked to be kept informed of WCSSP activities.

## **REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE and SUB-ALLOCATION FORMULA**

Osborne reported on the second RTC meeting. So far they have agreed on two metrics. One is salmon life history diversity which has been used in the past. Data is currently being reviewed, and will be further discussed at RTC's next meeting January 27<sup>th</sup>. The second metric developed is taking stream miles up to the 20% gradient and giving them area dimensions. Several ways to do that have been discussed; at the moment, our GIS person, Keven Bennett, is figuring out the best way to produce the area dimensions, given the time constraints we're under; it looks like the best approach will be geomorphic. He is also providing perimeters of the sockeye lakes, and distinguishing between freshwater, saltwater and estuarine waters. Maps and a chart of areas will be provided to sub-committee members. Osborne summarized that, basically, we're trying to map all salmon habitat within the region; it does not include open-ocean marine shoreline because salmon don't use shoreline very much.

Krueger, who is a member of the RTC, commented that Osborne had not reported on the items that have not been approved by the sub-committee; Osborne said she hadn't given him a chance to finish his report. When the Board is deciding on the RTC's recommended formula, Krueger requests a substantial amount of time to present all the items that were discussed for inclusion in the sub-allocation formula, whether they were approved or not, because there were strong objections made by a significant minority of the committee members to leaving some items out, and she thinks that the Board should be aware of them also.

Osborne said that, as the facilitator and perhaps most neutral voice on the RTC, he would present a full report to the Board; he thinks that that is what's most appropriate. Bingaman asked that when he reports items that were discarded, Osborne also report why. Osborne said that it is often the fact that there is no measure of an item that is homogeneous across the region, although there are various issues with different metrics.

Osborne went on to say that he thinks the RTC is doing a good job of coming up with a recommended sub-allocation formula. It is unlikely that they will have finished this year's discussion in time to meet the Board's deadline of February 1<sup>st</sup>; however, he thinks that minimally with one more meeting, the RTC could have a recommendation by the February 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. Krueger added that she thinks the RTC needs to continue working on a sub-allocation formula beyond any deadline this year. Osborne agreed; he thinks the formula should be looked at every year, because there is always improving data and insight. Swartout asked if the Board agreed with this; no objections were raised.

Both Osborne and Batchelder asked the Board to extend the deadline closer to the February Board meeting. Krueger made a **MOTION that the RTC present its recommendations concerning a sub-allocation formula to the WCSSP Board of Directors no later than February 14, 2011.** Baltzell seconded the motion. Osborne said that he thought even this deadline is tight; however, Swartout pointed out that the Board could extend the deadline again at the February 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the Motion. There were none.

As several others had said earlier, Willis reiterated that this Board should definitely make a decision based on the RTC's recommendations and not turn the decision back to the SRFB. Everyone agreed.

Osborne noted one additional aspect, which is that the RTC has not dealt with weighting, and he doesn't think that will happen, so an additional amount of Board time will need to be allotted for that discussion and decision here at the Board.

Baltzell wanted to note that since Osborne has been facilitating the meetings, they have been going very well. Osborne is unbiased, open to all comments, elicits thorough explanations of input and keeps the group focused on task. Baltzell agreed that the committee is doing a good job. Johnson and McMurry agreed.

#### **USFWS PROPOSED COLUMBIA RIVER ESTUARY PROGRAM**

Batchelder reported that USFWS is proposing a Columbia River Estuary Program, which would include Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor; they currently have a program for Puget Sound which includes the Washington Coast and another for the Oregon Coast. Handed out in the meeting packet was a short description of the proposed program and answers to questions that Batchelder had asked Rich Carlson yesterday in a phone conversation. USFWS is asking for letters of support to include with the 2012 budget package.

Napier asked where the funding for this program is coming from: is it new money, or is it going to take away from existing programs in our area? No one for sure knew the answer to this. Willis, Johnson and Taylor-Eldred agreed that a lot more research needs to be done on this question.

Burkle pointed out that scientifically this grouping of the Columbia estuary, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor makes sense because many salmon go from the lower Columbia to Willapa and Grays Harbor for juvenile rearing and foraging. He thought that perhaps the funding was coming from the huge amount of money the lower Columbia has, because its well-being really has to do with Willapa and Grays Harbor also; it might be a good opportunity for our region to get some of that funding. He also reminded everyone that this is a US Fish and Wildlife proposal, so they are focused on not only fish, but birds, etc. And that, until the subduction quake in 1701, Willapa Bay was a tributary of the Columbia River.

Sims and Bingaman brought up another question to be explored – whether there's been consultation with the tribes for which these are U&A areas. Bingaman also pointed out the only salmon that USFWS addresses is the ESA-listed bull trout. Krueger said, however, that USFWS will grant funds to tribes for any salmon that a tribe thinks are important.

Johnson added to the discussion about the politics of this proposal by observing that this proposal appears to be similar to an NHA (National Heritage Area) proposal that was recently rejected locally; people don't want

somebody else controlling their area; people will want to know why this combination of areas has been proposed. Willis described her research into the Puget Sound's proposal to add Grays Harbor to their Marine Resource Heritage Area, which revealed that they proposed it because they needed additional acreage to justify their funding; residents of Grays Harbor, of course, fought this proposal because they felt that they needed to make their own local decisions about wildlife and related issues.

Willis thinks there are some serious questions that the Board needs to consider before writing a letter of support, the ones already outlined, plus questions about activities listed on the proposal summary sheet, e.g., "large-scale watershed protection" – what does that mean? Napier observed that it seems from what people have said that there are many possibilities for this USFWS program to create problems for ourselves, so, again, we really need to research this; we're at a sensitive time right now in developing our region – so we need to answer the funding questions, find out what the program actually is, who/what situations is this program catering to, whether it includes outreach, etc. From Batchelder's phone conversation notes, Baltzell and Willis also questioned the mention of dredging; we definitely don't want somebody else overseeing the dredging of Grays Harbor; Batchelder didn't think Carlson was talking about overseeing dredging, but habitat restoration needed as a result of dredging, but the exact meaning wasn't clarified in their conversation.

At one point or another, each LEG expressed its inability to vote on this issue without at least going back to their group, if not doing lots of research to answer questions.

Burkle and Sims talked about whether the region defined in this proposal was drawn politically or scientifically; in either case, we need to find out which one. Burkle thinks that USFWS is basically a scientific entity, and that collaborating with them might strengthen our actions based on science. In his view, these are three very important and unique estuaries in close proximity, especially as a fish swims or a bird flies. Therefore to him it makes perfect sense scientifically to look at them together, something that hasn't been done before.

Krueger pointed out that there's nothing stopping any group within Willapa Bay or Grays Harbor from partnering with USFWS in this program. That is an alternative to WCSSP as a whole partnering. WCSSP has had so many other issues on its plate that we've never discussed how we will deal with requests that involve a more local section of our region.

Krueger agreed with others who had spoken that we're probably trying to make a decision prematurely, before we've investigated further. Perhaps the best action right now would be to have someone from the USFWS project come talk to us. McMurry suggested that we invite Carlson or Swenson to a Board meeting; however, she thinks this proposal is more of an MRC issue than a WCSSP issue.

Baltzell made a **MOTION that Rich Carlson or Chris Swenson from this USFWS proposal be invited to the Board's next meeting to make a presentation and answer questions.** Osborne seconded the motion. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the motion. There were none.

## **NORTH AMERICAN SALMON STRONGHOLD PARTNERSHIP**

Batchelder reminded everyone that this is the resolution that was drafted at the last meeting of the Board; it was agreed at that time that the Board would consider it for approval at this meeting. Swartout read:

**RESOLUTION: Be it resolved that the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) Board of Directors acknowledges authorization for staff to coordinate with North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership activities relevant to the Region as stated in the Scope of Work in the grant agreement between Grays Harbor County and the Recreation and Conservation Office on behalf of WCSSP.**

Swartout also read the relevant section of the 2009-2011 Scope of Work: “In addition, WCSSP is participating in the exploratory efforts for Marine Resource Committees (MRCs) in the coastal counties, and in exploring options for a potential relationship with the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership (NASSP).”

Swartout asked if there was any discussion. There was none. He asked for a motion. Napier made a **MOTION to approve this RESOLUTION**. Baltzell seconded the motion. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the Motion to approve this resolution. There were none.

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

McMurry read an announcement she had received that Lee Napier had been awarded the Department of Ecology’s Environmental Excellence of the Year Award. She thinks WCSSP should congratulate Napier. There was a round of applause. Everyone agreed that it was well deserved.

## **REGIONAL PLANNING UPDATE**

Batchelder said that his aim today was to give the Board an overview of the whole Planning process up to today, so that as the Board considers the Plan more explicitly in the upcoming months, it will have context and background information.

The Plan is being built using the Open Standards for Conservation process, a cooperative venture and format used by many conservation organizations internationally. Adaptive management, monitoring and versatility are built into it.

The process begins by describing the project, people, scope, and focal targets. The scope was a given, the Coast Region. The focus targets selected were the habitats salmon use or are influenced by (headwaters-uplands); each of these were specifically defined. We then added, within each habitat focal target, the salmon life stages/species that use that habitat focal target. Our next task was to assess the viability of each of these habitat focal targets to define its best condition to support appropriate salmon life stages. To assess viability we defined the most important attributes which affect a habitat’s health, and the measures for those attributes, defining “Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good,” mostly using work that has been done in the past.

Then, using “Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good” as defined by the measures, our experts from throughout the region rated the current condition of each habitat focal target. Some of the targets were broken down further; for instance, each of the three sockeye lakes (Quinault, Ozette and Pleasant) was individually rated. When called for, the “north” (WRIAs 20 and 21) was rated separately from the “south” (WRIAs 22, 23 and 24).

All of the habitat focal targets that were rated in “Poor” or “Fair” condition were brought forward to a workshop, where we asked for input on what stresses had caused the less-than-healthy conditions and what threats were causing those stresses. Each of these threats was rated separately for scope, severity and irreversibility. These ratings were entered into an algorithm in the Open Standards software, Miradi, which then produced an overall threat ranking for each habitat. That was then compiled into a region-wide threat ranking based on how many habitats a threat existed in. This resulted in a list of twelve critical threats to salmon sustainability.

These twelve critical threats were brought forward to the strategies workshop in November, in order to create strategies to overcome them. At this workshop, we asked for input on what negative factors make each one of these twelve a threat and what positive factors are already in place to diminish the threat that we might support. From this were brainstormed over 75 potential strategies, which were then reduced in number by small group decisions as to which were most critical. We ended up with 1-3 strategies for each threat across the region. The group was then asked to lump like strategies together into strategy themes; we ended up with five themes: educate the community to protect, restore and maintain ecosystem values; restore and protect salmonid habitat function; support hatchery and harvest practices that are compatible with wild salmon sustainability; use

economic tools to protect, restore and maintain ecosystem values; and, improve regulatory effectiveness to achieve salmon sustainability by identifying conflicts, impediments and gaps in current regulations.

Batchelder then displayed on PowerPoint the conceptual model for all the strategies as they affect the targets, as well as a conceptual model for each of the strategy themes. In the near future there will be a work group session to address each of the strategy themes, provide more focus, and develop more specific actions. The dates of the strategy work group sessions are February 8, 9, 14, 17 and 23. We don't want to limit the plan to action steps we can easily accomplish. Deciding which steps to take first, which steps will require us to seek out more capacity – this will be part of the phasing/action process we will undertake once the plan is in place. Also built into the process is tying action steps back into results they produce that improve the viability of a target. This directly leads us into adaptive management, reassessing the plan, etc. Carrying out actions and adaptive management are our tasks for the next biennium.

Based on our work to date, we have a Plan Outline. Several people on the Planning Committee will be helping staff write the plan; in particular, Creative Community Solutions will provide the drafts of Chapters 9 and 10 concerning strategies, after each strategy work group session that they are facilitating in February. Staff has also set out a calendar of work to be done between now and April/May; Batchelder asked the Board to note that staff will not have much time to complete other tasks beyond the essentials. Staff's intent is to send a completed draft of the Plan, approved by the Planning Committee, to the Board a week before the April Board meeting to get the Board's approval for release of this draft Plan, which can then be brought to SRFB in May. In addition, we plan on having public comment meetings, probably one "north" and one "south," in early May so that public comments can be included in the draft that goes to SRFB later in May. In response to a question, Batchelder clarified that the SRFB does not need to actually see the Plan in their pre-SRFB meeting materials; the important point at the May SRFB meeting is that WCSSP has completed its contract deliverable of producing a plan, since this is when they determine regional capacity funding for the next biennium. Batchelder added that at the March SRFB meeting, all the regions are giving SRFB an update on their Plan activities, at which point he will give them an update as to where WCSSP's planning process stands.

Staff reported that they were double-checking what had been entered into Miradi, but also asked that if anyone sees an error in materials they are reviewing, please let them know. This includes some arrows that are missing between strategies and habitat targets that ARE related. Dietz relayed that the aim is to have about 100 pages of Plan narrative, but with a complete appendix of all Plan content development, whether it ended up in the final Plan or not.

Napier advised the staff to think how they might present a Status Report to SRFB, since that is what SRFB is actually looking for. This would allow some leeway on the schedule to produce a final Plan to SRFB at their May meeting, as well as perhaps provide SRFB more useful information in a condensed form (rather than hundreds of pages of a Plan). Batchelder said this was a good suggestion.

Napier noted that Batchelder had made a presentation similar to today's to her Grays Harbor group; she asked if he had or intended to make presentations to the other LEGs. She thought it was very helpful and a good way to do some outreach. He said that he'd made one to NPCLE the day before and would be giving similar presentations to Quinault and Pacific County in the next month or so, as they have meetings.

## **OPERATING PROCEDURES**

Swartout proposed a new way to work on Operating Procedures. We have identified one topic, Conflict of Interest, that needs to be discussed, edited and brought into the Bylaws themselves. There may be others. He proposes that we identify and discuss these Bylaws topics one at a time at upcoming Board meetings. Then, Dietz can keep a list of items that come up in Board meetings that may be Operating Procedures. If substantive items accrue, the Board can begin discussing them after the Plan activity subsides, when we have more time.

Swartout asked if there was any objection to proceeding in this fashion. There were no objections. It was agreed to put the discussion “as time permits” on the February agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Swartout thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Jo Dietz