



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**December 15, 2010**

10 am – 2 pm

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

#### DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS from THIS MEETING

**(Note: action items are bolded)**

The August, October and November Meeting Summaries were approved.

The budget proposal was approved to move \$17,180 to the following line items: office supplies, facilitation for plan workshops, NPCLE regional participation, and technical plan writing.

*The Cost Change Amendment: Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Implementation* allocating the \$11,000 from RCO to facilitation for LOSC meetings was approved.

**Before the January Board meeting, each Lead Entity Group is asked to decide its vote on the following 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.***

**On the January Board meeting agenda will also be discussion of the participation of WCSSP's Regional Technical Committee in the salmon stronghold identification process.**

Concerning a letter brought forward by McMurry concerning WRIA 24 retaining eggs and carcasses, it was agreed that this is a local issue and that it is most appropriate for WRIA 24 interested parties to pursue the cause on their own.

**The Board agreed to take the time before the January meeting to review the draft Operating Procedures to highlight any items they think belong in the Bylaws, and forward those items to Dietz who can create a document for consideration at the January meeting.**

The Board agreed to appoint Gavin Glore to the Regional Technical Committee.

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

**James Sellers**, Quinault Indian Nation

**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

**Key McMurry**, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions (by conference phone)

**Faith Taylor-Eldred**, Pacific County

**OTHERS**

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

John Sims, QIN Lead Entity Coordinator

Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Staff

Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP Staff

**UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

Wednesday, January 19, 2011                      10 am – 2 pm                      Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

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

**WELCOME**

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone, brought the meeting to order and asked everyone to identify themselves. [Note: There was a quorum present.]

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

There were no objections to approving the Agenda; Chair Swartout noted it was approved.

**APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST, OCTOBER and NOVEMBER MEETING SUMMARIES**

Dietz asked if there were any corrections to the August, October or November Meeting Summaries. None were raised. Chair Swartout asked if there were any objections to approving the these three Meeting Summaries. There were no objections.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

Dietz asked if there were any questions about the financial report. There were none.

**BUDGET PROPOSAL**

Dietz explained that on the second page of the Budget Proposal, the items that are in bright yellow – per diem mileage, hotel/meals/parking, rent, equipment maintenance, phone, cell phone, administrative temp, website & computers, facilitation for sub-allocation, training/conferences, and postage stamps – are the line items she is certain WCSSP will not totally expend by the end of the biennium, June 30, 2011. The amounts from these line items that can be used elsewhere are also listed on the separate pink sheet, "Recommended Changes to General Budget." They add up to \$17,180.00.

At the bottom of the pink sheet, she explained, is how staff recommends that \$17,180.00 be reallocated to line items where we will need them between now and June 30, 2011. This includes two items where we are already "in the red," \$800 office supplies and \$3,800 facilitation for plan workshops as of the end of November 2010. The remainder is proposed for redistribution as follows: \$3000 for Rich Osborne to facilitate Regional Technical Committee (RTC) meetings, \$2,080 for technical plan writing, and \$7,500 for future facilitation of plan workshops.

Dietz clarified that all of this is within the General side of the WCSSP Budget; the Planning section of the WCSSP Budget is fine as it is.

Osborne wanted to clarify about the \$3000; it's not really for facilitation of the RTC. He requested it because he was concerned that NPCLE's portion of the WCSSP budget is running out and he is worried about his Lead Entity's ability to continue to participate regionally. He has a lot of travel costs to get to regional meetings, and he's been putting in a lot more time coming to meetings. However, he continued, it is also true that he's been asked to facilitate the next RTC meeting, although nothing beyond that has been set. Dietz acknowledged that her label of "facilitation" was her error; Batchelder confirmed that Osborne has taken on additional responsibilities in relationship to the RTC which he had not foreseen, which is why staff recommended that NPCLE receive the extra \$3000 to cover his related expenses.

Napier, Osborne, Batchelder and Phil Miller discussed the revision of the ILA between Grays Harbor County and Clallam County to permit a new, higher maximum, not only for this \$3,000 but also for \$5,000 to hire Keven Bennett as data steward for WCSSP plan purposes. Miller indicated that RCO/GSRO calls these Cost Change amendments, which allow for changing realities in grant agreements and related documents. He clarified that movement of monies between different kinds of line items (e.g., between Staff line items and Professional/Contracted Services line items) triggers the need for formal acknowledgment by the state and fiscal agents involved.

Concerning the additional \$7,500 for facilitation for plan workshops, Batchelder explained that there will be five working groups, each tackling one of the five grouped Plan Strategies as defined at the Strategies Workshop in November. The \$7,500 is to provide \$1,500 for facilitation of each of these working groups with the expected products being in-depth, refined strategies written up. This may also include some technical writing by Creative Community Solutions, so it may involve also committing some of the Technical Writing budget to a contract. Technical Writing allocations exist in both the General and the Planning Budgets, which, Miller confirmed, is what was expected.

Swartout sought assurance that the only new line item in this proposal is the \$3000 for NPCLE; Dietz confirmed that this was true. Otherwise, he thinks the proposal is simply the readjusting of amounts to meet needs as they've arisen, something that similar organizations almost always have to do.

Swartout noted that we had received objections from Ed Bowen, in the form of an email which were in the Board packets today and are part of the Meeting Summary:

-----  
**From:** Ed Bowen  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2010 8:34 PM  
**To:** 'Dana Dietz'; 'John Miller'; 'John Richmond'; 'Katie Krueger'; 'Mark Swartout'; 'Miles Batchelder'; 'Phil Miller'; 'Rich Osborne'; 'Rod Fleck'; 'Steve Allison'; 'Tami Pokorny'  
**Subject:** RE: Materials for WCSSP Board Mtg Wed., Dec. 15

*As a matter of public record:*

*I disagree with the proposed WCSSP rebudgeting. This is even more an issue since there will not be an NPCLE meeting before this comes before the WCSSP board. At the last NPCLE meeting, in November, a WCSSP shortfall was identified, and the WCSSP Director was present and afforded the opportunity to address such shortfalls. The items on this list were not what was briefed, and what I understood was stated as a shortfall had to do with a funding shortfall for the NPCLE coordinator to participate (in the context of travel) in WCSSP efforts. Since there wasn't a quorum, no decision was made as to what this lead entity supported in any case. There wasn't discussion or even notification as what's implied in this list, in particular to "facilitate" technical committee meetings. That appears to be a shortfall for the purpose of hours of his time to facilitate; something this lead entity was not made aware of as the intention, or potential impacts with taking away from primary lead entity duties. Maybe this can be explained by accounting for WCSSP staff time and why that mechanism isn't being used. And who's getting paid, what's the money for in regards to "Technical Writing/Plan"? Is this to pay some NGO or sort to do the writing, who is making that decision on who is going to write the plan and when does the lead entities get to have discussion on such choices? In the main budget spreadsheet, it reflects 0% of the line item funds have been spent; but we're saying there's a shortfall now? With the upcoming budget cuts on a grand scale, serious consideration of spending more money on workshops at the level that's being suggested as a shortfall, there had better be some serious results of those workshops that can be clearly supported/accounted for; I'm starting to have reservations about the hard work that goes in to the workshops has a clear quantifiable result and not just a continuance of "still reaching".*

*In addition, this rebudgeting takes away from two components that should have been used to address public notice/outreach/and involvement: Website and postage. I emphasize that for regional planning to be successful, the public must be highly involved. The bylaws are very weak in directing what/when/how the public will be involved, along with zero attributes within the plans being developed. The website is out of date, especially regarding public notice and current information; maintenance of the website appears to be a "catchup" in itself. Website actions that have been past approved have not been updated. Though no specific line item addressed in this list, public notice in each lead entity sub-regions of just who and what WCSSP is or what's currently going on is not taking place. Are the newspapers even being notified and what record exist to demonstrate such notifications if so? Seems that postage line item could at least be used to send out mailers; WCSSP has been around long enough the citizens should have gotten something.*

*I also seem to remember there was great effort put into web conferencing, but that has seemed to take a back seat as being provided to us in the far north. The teleconference is very weak, limited purpose in the web based system of only being able to see what's on staff's computer at the moment. Teleconference hasn't even been made available for this or the last meeting. Is this the sign of the times for cuts within WCSSP? If so, I need to be more particular about all the funding that's going to a questionable technical process. The budget is forgetting about "we the people".*

*So, for the purpose of this meeting's intent, I have a problem with rebudgeting the portion \$5,080.00, as stated. Thank you.*

*Ed Bowen  
NPCLE CAL2*

-----

Swartout asked if there were any other questions, concerns or comments about the budget proposal. No further discussion ensued.

Swartout asked if there were any objections to approving the budget proposal to move \$17,180 between line items as outlined in the proposal. There were no objections.

## LAKE OZETTE SOCKEYE STEERING COMMITTEE

Batchelder explained that this discussion/decision involves the Cost Change amendment between Grays Harbor and Clallam Counties. RCO approved an additional \$11,000 for facilitation of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee (LOSC) between now and June 30, 2011.

Batchelder reported that he had received opposition to the original proposal from Ed Bowen who is a resident of Lake Ozette and a member of LOSC. A copy of his email was included in the Board packet for today's meeting, and is entered into the Meeting Summary:

-----  
*From: Ed Bowen*

*Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 8:34 pm*

*To: Dana Dietz, John Miller, Katie Krueger, Lee Napier, Mark Swartout, Miles Batchelder, Pat Crain, Phil Miller, Rich Osborne, Rosemary Furfey*

*As a matter of public record.*

*I object to the Cost Change Amendment for additional funding for Lake Ozette Steering Committee. It was made very clear to me throughout the WCSSP formation process that WCSSP would not make decisions regarding Lake Ozette sockeye. Yet on this Wednesday's agenda it is clearly a decision action to approve the Cost Change Amendment. If it is a procedural decision only, to implement the process of receiving funding from RCO to fund facilitation, the decision to accept funding from the RCO has not been cleared or approved by the steering committee, let alone the affected lead entity. The process of the RCO to designate these funds did not include vetting/discussion through the steering committee or lead entity either, let alone a public process that adhered to reasonable due process.*

*But to be more specific. Though desires have been expressed by certain individuals/entities in support of certain conditions, the decision to except certain conditions as stated in the document coming before the board I believe is improper and in conflict with the WCSSP bylaws; IT IS NOT WCSSP'S BUSINESS TO DETERMINE WHOM THE FACILITATION WILL BE AT THE STEERING COMMITTEE. That is the sole business of the steering committee to make that determination.*

*I expect this to be remedied, and that remedy be forwarded to me in some form of written text. I expect this objection to be entered as a matter of record at the board meeting. This continues a bad feeling about this whole regional idea, and specifically creates significant distrust of the partnership.*

*Ed Bowen*

*Citizen*  
-----

Batchelder explained that LOSC has not yet decided who it wants to facilitate its meetings in the first half of 2011; he had erroneously assumed that the choice was solely between Triangle & Associates, and Rich Osborne (with additional contracted supportive help, for instance, a meeting note taker). But members of LOSC pointed out to him that they had been given the latitude to select beyond those two. So Batchelder changed the contract amendment language to reflect that, with the caveat required by GSRO/RCO that they be consulted and informed about the decision, which, as Batchelder said, only makes sense since it is their responsibility to make sure funds coming from them are used effectively.

Batchelder said that he had received a complaint similar to Bowen's, concerning the restriction of facilitation options to two, from Jeremy Gilman of the Makah Tribe. For Gilman, the revised proposal satisfied his concern.

Katie Krueger said that she's a member of LOSC also, and her recollection was different than Bowen's. The last LOSC meeting was facilitated by Batchelder at LOSC's request. At the meeting, she commented that the fiscal agent might have concerns about him spending his time doing this, so it would be good if LOSC could come up with a different facilitator. Her recollection is that it was agreed by LOSC that Osborne would be an effective facilitator, if WCSSP and NPCLE both agreed. However, Rosemary Furfey didn't capture this last part of the discussion in the Minutes, about Osborne facilitating. Krueger sent Furfey a correction, but Krueger never saw a correction made by Furfey, so Krueger sent out the correction to everyone. This was almost immediately after the meeting Minutes came out. As far as she is concerned, Krueger recalls that this issue has already been decided by LOSC.

Miller clarified that RCO/GSRO allocated the additional funds based on the need, knowing that LOSC had not yet decided who it wanted to facilitate.

Batchelder said that he knows one of Bowen's concerns about the proposal that originally went out was the lack of having the additional option of LOSC choosing facilitation from someone besides Osborne or Triangle & Associates. He did his best to address the concern through revision of the proposal, which he sent to Bowen this morning. The revision involved the addition of the following language: "or another suitable facilitator. . .the decision is subject to consultation with RCO." This change did not satisfy Bowen's concern, which is the subject of the email Bowen sent this morning, which was then put on the screen for Board members to read and entered into this Meeting Summary:

-----  
**From:** Ed Bowen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2010 8:59 AM  
**To:** Miles Batchelder  
**Subject:** Re: Lake Ozette Facilitation

*My comments and as a matter of record:*

*I object to this language and these conditions and again, who is this board to make any decisions regarding Lake Ozette. The Board is not authorized to do so and that's a point of order.*

*"Subject To", what kind of hogwash is this? Wasn't in the prior draft but now the LOSC has a foot in the set of conditions someone feels the need to legalize the agreement....pretty clear to this citizen the faith and confidence whomever has in the LOSC versus the WCSSP; I have less faith in the WCSSP and that's where the legalize seems to be a matter of convenience. And who ever told this organization that NPCLE or Triangle were the prime candidates in this mode; I disagree!*

*I cannot develop something constructive at this late witching hour, another objection because the Lake Ozette Stearing Committee was never brought into the discussion, it is certainly all done behind the LOSC's back in closed doors. No, not right, complete lack of accountability.*

*Better take a look at the LOSC acronym, that's wrong too.*

*Never received any call in information, advertised and that requested.*

*Keep taking the pathway this organization is taking and you'll find more and more citizens taking our taxes someplace else. I know I will. You can expect a formal complaint to be filled with the Governor and the RCO if this document gets approved today.*

*Ed Bowen  
Citizen*

-----

Napier noted that, as fiscal agent, Grays Harbor County also needs to be kept apprised as a decision is being made. GHC has/had contractual relationships with both Clallam County and Triangle & Associates, so neither of those should cause any problems or delays in setting up new contracts. If, however, a third choice was made with which GHC has not had a relationship previously, that could cause delays or glitches along with way; it could even result in a relationship that wouldn't work for GHC. She feels the need to be kept timely informed so that contract finalization can proceed as quickly and easily as possible.

Napier went on to say that she's fine with the language as it stands; she just wants to make sure that she, as representative of GHC, is kept up to date, which Batchelder assured her he would do. She added that it is also important for GHC that the WCSSP Board of Directors approve this expenditure of funds and contract, since GHC does not itself have a direct relationship to the LOSC; Grays Harbor County's only relationship to the Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee is through WCSSP.

Napier asked if there was any formal LOSC chain of communication; for example, is there a Chair? Krueger answered by saying that basically LOSC is made up of those who care about the salmon. Since the recovery plan was completed last summer, LOSC has had no funding support. She characterized it as "an orphan" among groups addressing listed species. Osborne reiterated that LOSC needs a facilitator.

Miller commented that the interrelationship of LOSC, NPCLE and the regional organization is evolving, and he and RCO/GSRO will continue to work with these three entities to support recovery of the ESA listed sockeye species of Lake Ozette.

It was discussed and agreed that Batchelder had responded in writing to Bowen's first email, as Bowen requested. Batchelder was encouraged to forward to Bowen tomorrow the results of today's meeting so that Bowen wouldn't have to wait for the Meeting Summary to come out.

Swartout asked Batchelder to put up on the screen the revised proposal:

-----  
**WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP**  
**July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2011**

**Washington Coast Salmon Recovery**  
**Implementation**

**Agreement Cost Change Amendment**

**Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Implementation**

**To support implementation of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan, the Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) has approved an additional \$11,000 for meeting and facilitation costs through June 30, 2011. These funds will be directed through the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership to support Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee meeting facilitation from the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity, Triangle Associates, or another suitable facilitator. The final selection of a facilitator will be made by the Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee at its January 2011 meeting; the decision is subject to consultation with RCO. These funds are expected to be adequate for at least two additional meetings through the end of the biennium.**

Bingaman asked Miller if there was any concern on the state's part about the expense of hiring Triangle & Associates. Miller said no, that the state funds were involved in the past to hire Triangle & Associates for work on the Lake Ozette recovery plan. Osborne asked whether, if the funds were not fully utilized, would they roll over to the next biennium? Miller said no, they would disappear. He added that they are a one-time special supplement and should not be viewed as an increase in the normal amount allotted for Lake Ozette; in fact, all funding amounts through WCSSP will be up for discussion for the upcoming 2011-2013 biennium.

Napier again wanted to point out that "another suitable facilitator" would need to meet Grays Harbor County's ability to contract with them, which could potentially run into problems. She said that she's saying this only to caution that this may be misleading to LOSC; it may not be possible to contract with someone else they choose. Miller stated that the phrase "the decision is subject to consultation with RCO" means that all such contracting issues would need to be worked out for RCO to approve the expense. Both Napier and Miller confirmed that LOSC does have three options for facilitation (Triangle & Associates, Osborne through NPCLE, or someone else) but if "someone else" is chosen, contract arrangements need to be able to be made.

Swartout asked if there were any objections to the *Agreement Cost Change Amendment: Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Implementation*? There were no objections.

In answer to a question from John Sims, Miller clarified that funding for Lake Ozette activities will be part of the discussions to create the 2011-2013 contract, Scope of Work and funding for WCSSP, which will begin soon. A preliminary discussion of 2011-2013 funding occurs at the March SRFB Meeting, with final decisions at the May SRFB Meeting. He said that even if the SRFB itself is eliminated, there will be funding for regional organizations since those funds come from the federal PCSRF and there has been no proposal to not accept this federal funding. SRFB will exist in May and has shown solid support for continued funding of regional organizations; he would be surprised if that support does not continue into the 2011-2013 biennium, based on the principle that if the infrastructure of salmon recovery is destroyed, it would be very difficult to recreate it effectively. That infrastructure supports salmon recovery funding from other sources besides the state, although, because of its youth, that is not yet the case for WCSSP. This region is one of the least funded, but the regional organization needs to continue to exist in order to garner outside funding for projects.

## **NORTH AMERICAN SALMON STRONGHOLD PARTNERSHIP**

Batchelder reminded the group that he had brought this subject to the Board last month, for several reasons. One is that it could provide additional project funding for the coast region; it is possible that the bill before Congress may pass this year. In addition, in his discussions as representative of WCSSP, it would be useful to be able to say that we are in support of NASSP. He recommends that the Board, in whatever form they choose, approve a statement articulating its support of NASSP.

In addition, the Wild Salmon Center, which is conducting the process of identifying core salmon strongholds in the region, has asked that WCSSP's Regional Technical Committee participate in that process. A proposal for that involvement is part of the Board packet today. This was discussed at the October meeting when Devona Ensmenger of WSC explained the process they are going through.

Miller summarized what Batchelder was asking as two separate proposals to this Board. One is a basic support statement from the WCSSP Board concerning NASSP generally, authorizing him to be publicly supportive of the general NASSP effort. The other decision is how this Board wants to relate to any proposal to identify strongholds within the region.

There was a discussion about whether WCSSP could write a letter of support for the NASSP legislation to Washington's senators, or whether that is considered lobbying, which WCSSP is not allowed to do. Miller responded by saying that he sees writing a letter as a third potential Board action beyond a general statement of support of NASSP. He observed that there is a fine line in writing such a letter. He thinks that providing

information and WCSSP's perspective on such legislation would be fine, short of saying "WCSSP endorses passage of the NASSP legislation," which would be lobbying.

For the record Krueger said that the Quileute Tribe has already sent letters of support for NASSP, in fact reviewed the legislation before it was finalized. However, she wanted it noted that there is not unanimity within NPCLE about NASSP. There are watersheds within the region that are not proposed as strongholds; therefore, she thinks it would be more appropriate for individual entities within the region to write their own support letters, if they choose. In fact, she thinks it might be more impressive for separate entities to write letters of support, rather than WCSSP. She thinks that it might be awkward for WCSSP as a whole to support NASSP in letter form. As board members from NPCLE, she and Osborne are not authorized to approve a WCSSP statement or letter of support for NASSP. However, it was pointed out, NPCLE's vote could be outvoted by the other three lead entities.

Miller said that more important than a letter, he thinks, is a general statement of support for the concept of NASSP, that there are salmon strongholds that should be protected. He hears Batchelder asking for the authorization to act and speak in support of that concept and involve WCSSP in identifying strongholds in the region. In fact, WCSSP participation in support of NASSP is in the WCSSP current biennial contract with the state. Batchelder is asking that that this be explicitly acknowledged by the Board, since the grant agreement existed before the Board was seated. Batchelder agreed that this was the nature of what he was asking.

Several present suggested that a statement be drafted and taken back to the Lead Entities for their vote, since it cannot be approved by consensus today.

#### **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 asked if there were any objections to this resolution. On behalf of NPCLE, Osborne said that NPCLE could not agree with the resolution. As part of WCSSP's consensus process, Bingaman asked NPCLE to outline what the objections were; for example, was it an overall objection to NASSP, or were there specific points of objection? Osborne responded by saying it was both. There were several objections, including: objections to how NASSP deals with hatcheries, objections to losing autonomy, objections to the perceived lack of rigor in the identification process as it was carried out, objections that there wasn't enough interaction, "face" time with the NASSP identification process, and some others. So, Bingaman said it sounded like they don't simply object to the basic concept of NASSP. Krueger corrected him, and said that there are some of the 11-person NPCLE citizen's committee who do object to the NASSP concept; some of them see it as a group from outside their area trying to tell them how to run their fisheries.

As part of this discussion, Krueger related that although the Quileute supports NASSP, the tribe has lodged complaints that some of NASSP's salmon assessments seem incorrect, and as far as she knows, the tribe has not received any response or revisions concerning those complaints.

In terms of process as outlined in WCSSP's bylaws, Swartout asked if this is an action that requires an immediate response from the Board. None was brought up, and Taylor-Eldred of Pacific County Lead Entity agreed with NPCLE that she would like to take the resolution back to her lead entity. So, Swartout asked if there was any objection to asking each lead entity to consider and decide on this resolution before the January 2011 Board meeting so that it can be voted on at that time. There was no objection to this plan of action.

The second part of the NASSP agenda item concerned the participation of WCSSP's Regional Technical Committee (RTC) in the stronghold identification project, as outlined in a handout today, originally brought up at the Board's

October meeting in different format. In his view, Batchelder said that he sees this as a very useful part of our overall Planning process.

Swartout and Osborne pointed out that the RTC has priority work they are doing between now and February, the development of a sub-allocation formula to recommend to the Board; we shouldn't be diverting their attention away from that right now.

Secondly, the question remains whether the lead entities would approve expenditure of time by a sub-committee of the Board on identifying salmon strongholds, per the previous discussion. He suggested that this ties back into the decision to be made in January about the NASSP resolution; the Board can then, in January, have a discussion about the RTC's involvement in identifying strongholds. Everyone agreed that for the moment the RTC needs to focus on developing a sub-allocation formula.

### **PROPOSED LETTER IN SUPPORT OF WRIA 24 RETAINING EGGS AND CARCASSES**

Key McMurry explained the letter (in the Board packet today) which she is asking WCSSP to sign. After discussion, it was agreed that this was a local issue for WRIA 24 and that it was most appropriate for WRIA 24 interested parties to pursue the cause on their own. Terry Baltzell gave a helpful explanation of what has been developing concerning eggs and carcasses state-wide; it sounds to him from the letter that the WRIA 24 RFEG has unfortunately not been kept informed of developments. There was also disagreement between Baltzell/Burkle and McMurry as to whether individual hatchery managers decide on retention, or whether those decisions are made at a higher level state-wide. Baltzell made two friendly suggestions to McMurry. One is that her group talk to Lonnie Crumley who's been intimately involved in the state-wide developments; the other is that they talk to the state agency about recusing themselves from the larger state-wide agreement and therefore be able to put in place a better arrangement. Swartout also suggested that the names and committees to whom the letter is addressed be double-checked because he's fairly sure some of them have changed, or will change in January. McMurry thanked them for their help.

### **OPERATING PROCEDURES**

Swartout asked Taylor-Eldred to start the conversation about the Operating Procedures since he knew she had some ideas about how we might proceed. Instead of immediately getting into the details of the Operating Procedures language, she suggested that the Board might want to talk about the purpose and value they serve, how they're approved and the mechanics of creating them. In particular, if, like the Bylaws, the Operating Procedures are going to need to be approved by the Lead Entities, perhaps instead some Procedures could be integrated into the Bylaws so there would just be one document for Board process. In this scenario, the less policy-driven Procedures could then simply be part of the WCSSP Office Manual procedures. In her view, this would be less cumbersome for the Board. She asked what other Board members thought.

Krueger said it makes sense to her. Osborne said that if we're going to have Operating Procedures, they will have to be approved one way or another, which ultimately would require approval by the Lead Entities. Bingaman agreed. Napier suggested that to her the Operating Procedures could be agreed upon by the Board itself, without Lead Entity approval, because they're about internal Board functioning. Osborne felt that would be a problem because it would be perceived as inappropriate, in contradiction to our own Bylaws. Krueger pointed out that she and Osborne serve at the pleasure of NPCLE, representing NPCLE; they are not representing themselves at Board meetings.

Sellers suggested that the Board could give authority to the Executive Director to capture the procedures as part of Administrative Procedures. Krueger felt that this also wouldn't solve the problem. However, she did say that if, as we review them in detail, they are all simply extensions of decisions approved in the Bylaws, then it shouldn't be a problem getting NPCLE's approval. On the other hand, if there are more substantive procedures, then Taylor-

Eldred would be correct in saying that we'd simply end up with two procedural documents, which would be cumbersome.

Willis suggested that we firmly agree on the purpose of the Operating Procedures. Are they for new Board members to refer to for procedure (e.g., who sits at the table and what color name plate they have)? Are they to provide more detail in implementing the Bylaws? Are they to specify how we, for instance, comply with the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) so we don't have to go back to OPMA each time to figure out how to proceed?

Swartout asked Dietz whether she'd repeated parts of the Bylaws in developing the draft of the Operating Procedures. She said her guidance had been to follow the structure/outline of the Bylaws; she did acknowledge that at the beginning of the Operating Procedures there are a few items that restated the Bylaws in an attempt to make them crystal clear and provide context for what followed.

Osborne and Swartout suggested that perhaps the best thing to do would be to take the important, relevant substantive parts from these draft Operating Procedures and put them into the Bylaws, which could then be approved as one guidance document. For instance, Swartout said he had learned a lot from the email discussion that included Rod Fleck about the Open Public Meetings Act; it might be helpful to everyone to include more of those procedures and standards in the Bylaws, beyond "we shall conform to the Open Meetings Act." Can we outline in the Bylaws exactly how we deal with time-sensitive (but not emergency) issues and still conform to the OPMA; what can we do between meetings?

Swartout is interested in hearing what our WAACO attorney has to say about what kind of organization is according to OPMA; he thinks that perhaps we are not as strictly covered by it as we may think. Krueger said that there's no doubt in her mind, since we are solely funded by the state; we are a state group that must strictly conform to OPMA.

Osborne suggested that perhaps we should rename it to make it clear that we're just spelling out the specifics of what is already in the Bylaws, "Administrative Guidance," or something to that effect. Dietz agreed that perhaps there are a few important things, like Conflict of Interest, that might effectively revise the Bylaws, but that the remainder of the items could be staff's document, more of an internal document. This would be the document that explains how staff is interpreting the Bylaws and other Board procedural decisions. Krueger reiterated that it doesn't make any difference what we name the document; it's the content that will determine whether it needs Board approval – and therefore Lead Entities' approval – or not.

Willis was concerned about restricting it to staff guidance because she thinks it is an important document about how the Board conducts itself; it is guidance for Board members also. She needs the group to decide the purpose of the document before she can review individual items. Baltzell agreed with Willis, suggesting that perhaps each Board member should go through the draft and identify items that should actually be in the Bylaws. Then Dietz could bring draft amended Bylaws to the next meeting, as well as, perhaps, a draft document of what's "left over" for a decision as to what to do about the latter.

Taylor-Eldred said thinks that three different documents have been mentioned: staff procedures, a handbook for new Board members, and, what she thinks this document should be, a procedural interpretation of the Bylaws. Swartout suggested that we first all take the time to review this draft Operating Procedures for items that need to go into the Bylaws. We can then look at what's left and decide what form it should take; he suggested that many items might be part of an Office Manual that the Board needs to know is in place, but doesn't need to see. We may not need a separate Operating Procedures. Everyone agreed that Swartout's suggestion was a good idea.

So Swartout tasked the group with taking the time before the January meeting to review the draft Operating Procedures to highlight any items they think belong in the Bylaws, and forward those items to Dietz who can create a separate document for consideration at the January meeting.

Dietz pointed out that in today's meeting packet was the last final version of the Bylaws, with signatures, etc., so Board members may want to keep it to refer to.

#### **REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Swartout said that there is an additional person proposed to be a member of the RTC, Gavin Glore. He asked for confirmation that the Board had approved the RTC membership list previously. Dietz answered in the affirmative; the Board approved the RTC membership list at the September meeting. Concerning Gavin Glore, Napier said that he is with the Mason County Conservation District, has done a lot of barrier project and LFA work, is very familiar with both the Mason County areas of the region as well as the whole Chehalis basin, and is interested in being a member of WCSSP's RTC. Baltzell added that he knows Glore has a relevant academic degree.

Bingaman pointed out that we have never individually vetted RTC members according to the standards we set; Osborne responded that the assumption was that each LEG and staff knew their nominees' qualifications before nominating them. He went on to say that, given the time constraint we're under to produce a sub-allocation formula, it seems to him a waste of effort at this point to ask for curriculum vitae, set up a review committee and process, etc. Others said that they were comfortable with the known level of expertise, education, and years of experience of the RTC members agreed upon. Swartout suggested that perhaps after their February deadline, we could put in place some verification of qualifications, if only asking each member for their curriculum vita.

Swartout brought the group back to the question at hand, whether to approve Gavin Glore as an additional member of the RTC. He asked whether there were any objections to Gavin Glore being appointed to the Regional Technical Committee. There were none.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Jo Dietz