



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

February 16, 2011

10 am – 2 pm

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

DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS from THIS MEETING

APPROVAL OF JANUARY MEETING SUMMARY

The January 19, 2011 Meeting Summary were approved with the correction that the August Board meeting will be August 17th, not the 1st.

USFWS PROPOSED COLUMBIA RIVER ESTUARY PROGRAM

Taylor-Eldred proposed that a draft letter of support be presented to the Board at an upcoming meeting and discussed. She pointed out that, because of the November deadline, this does not need to be at one of the next few Board meetings since there are several more important Agenda items in the near future. It was agreed that this was the way to proceed with this question.

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY CLEARWATER ACQUISITION

There was generally enthusiastic support for this project among those at the Board Meeting.

REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE and SUB-ALLOCATION FORMULA

Napier made a MOTION that the RTC present its recommendations concerning a sub-allocation formula to the WCSSP Board of Directors no later than March 11, 2011. Sellers seconded the motion. Taylor-Eldred asked if there were any objections to the Motion. There were none. Osborne clarified that this will involve two items, a report from the RTC, as well as Bennett's report.

REGIONAL PLAN

Batchelder . . . said that the calendar goal was to have a draft of the Plan to all Board members in time to discuss it at the April Board meeting. At that time, he will be asking the Board to approve the release of the draft Plan so that Public Comment sessions can be held early May, as well as report to SRFB at their May meeting.

INVITATION TO DIRECTOR TO PARTICIPATE IN PANEL DISCUSSION

Batchelder explained that the Environment and Public Policy section of the Association for Conflict Resolution is having its annual conference in Portland at the end of June. Bob Wheeler, principal for Triangle Associates which facilitated the original meetings leading up to the creation of WCSSP, has proposed a panel discussion for this conference. The proposed panel consists of Rosemary Furfey from NOAA Fisheries, Gail McEwen from Portland State University, Phil Trask and Batchelder. The tentative title is "Building Sustainable Agreements in Rural Areas Resolving Natural Resource Challenges: Practical Lessons Learned from the Rural Frontlines in Collaborative Decision-Making and Conflict Resolution." Batchelder's request today is for Board consideration to participate in this panel. The decision needs to go back to the Lead Entity Groups; he said he would send out the final version of the proposal as soon as he gets it from Wheeler. It will then be on the Agenda for the March Board meeting.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Taylor-Eldred asked if there were any objections to delaying this Agenda item to a later Board meeting when there's time available. There were no objections.

In attendance:

WCSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Faith Taylor-Eldred, Vice Chair serving as Chair

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe (by phone)

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator

Tami Pokorny, Jefferson County (by phone)

Quinalt Indian Nation Lead Entity Group

Dave Bingaman, Quinalt Indian Nation

James Sellers, Quinalt Indian Nation

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator (by phone)

Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions

Faith Taylor-Eldred, Pacific County

OTHERS

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Rich Carlson, USFWS

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, 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/QUORUM

Faith Taylor-Eldred reminded everyone that Chair Mark Swartout is out of town, so she will serve as Chair today. After the arrival of Lee Napier, Taylor-Eldred confirmed that there was a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Taylor-Eldred asked if there were any additions to the Agenda. When none were voiced, she asked if there were any objections to the Agenda. There were none.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 19, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY

Dietz asked if there were any corrections to the January 19th Meeting Summary; it was pointed out that the August Board Meeting would be August 17th not August 1st. Besides that, there were no other corrections. Taylor-Eldred asked if there were any objections to approving the January 19th Meeting Summary with that correction made. There were no objections.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Dietz asked if there were any questions about this month's budget tracking report. There were none.

USFWS PROPOSED COLUMBIA RIVER ESTUARY PROGRAM

Taylor-Eldred welcomed Rich Carlson of US Fish and Wildlife Service, who the Board at their January meeting had asked be invited to discuss USFWS' proposed Columbia River Estuary Program.

Carlson introduced himself, saying that he works out of the Lacey office along with Ginger Phalon. He explained that there is an Oregon coastal program, as well as the Puget Sound Coastal Program which has focused on North

Sound, South Sound and Willapa Bay. For clarification, Dietz asked if any coastal area can apply for funding through the Puget Sound Coast Program; Carlson said yes.

To better serve the lower Columbia and coastal areas, this new program, the Columbia River Estuary Program, is being proposed as part of the upcoming federal budget. The proposal is for about half a million dollars. Carlson provided a handout explaining the proposed Program. It would serve the lower Columbia, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor by providing a local staff person, technical expertise and program funding to restore the natural ecosystem to benefit coastal and marine species.

Carlson was asked how the geographic area was determined. He responded that there was Federal guidance directing USFWS to determine a territorial scope; they worked with parties in the area to decide which areas could be provided the biggest benefit for the least expense. He was also asked how the Program was named; he said that it was felt that "Columbia River" was the most recognizable name.

Carlson explained that there are several other USFWS programs already in place:

- Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program (decisions made in Lacey office);
- Recovery Program for bull trout and other animal listed species (Lacey office);
- National Fish Passage Program (decisions made in Portland office);
- Western Native Trout Initiative;
- Also proposed is the North Pacific Landscape Conservation Partnership Program, which will cover Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon and California.

He provided a handout further describing these programs. In addition, on the USFWS website there is a comparatively simple 2-page info sheet that can be filled out and sent to USFWS staff who will use the information to direct the proposed project sponsors to the most appropriate USFWS program.

Willis expressed concern about easement/acquisition projects because of the work Grays Harbor County has had to put into working with NRCS to ensure that wetlands acquisitions are limited so that wetlands are not unnecessarily removed from possible agricultural use.

Sims asked about the USFWS process for project selection. Carlson said there is a detailed description of the selection process on the website; in the simplest terms, the staff decides based on criteria.

McMurry reported that Chris Swenson, USFWS, who originated the Columbia River Estuary Program proposal, made a presentation recently to the Pacific County MRC. He assured that group that this program is not analogous to the recent Historical/Heritage Areas proposal that met public resistance. However, it was pointed out that the concern raised at WCSSP's January meeting was that the public perception was that the two were analogous, not that they were actually similar. That negative public perception might still hamper USFWS efforts.

Dietz read three questions that had been raised at the January Board meeting:

- Where is the funding coming from; will this Program remove funding from other sources the Coast region uses? Carlson said that those decisions are made in Congress; he can't answer that question.
- Were the tribes consulted since this area includes U&A areas? Carlson wasn't sure about those discussions.
- What might be the Program's effect on dredging, which is necessary for the local economy? Carlson said that the Program has no aim to limit dredging, only perhaps to deal with some of the ecosystem consequences of dredging.

Batchelder asked if the Program would be open to local participation in decision-making. Carlson said basically yes, although it will depend on whoever is hired locally.

Dietz clarified for Carlson that an ongoing concern is that the Coast seems to always be the poor stepchild with the better known area being the focus of attention and funding; this is true both for the Puget Sound Coast Program and this proposed Columbia River Estuary Program.

Carlson asked if there were any other questions. He was asked if a letter of support at this point would help. He said that for this budget cycle, no, but that if one was submitted before November of this year, it would help for the next cycle. He said that he knew the Board wanted to discuss the proposal and writing a letter of support, so he would leave the meeting.

After Carlson left, there was discussion of writing a letter of support. Several people brought up the possibility of individual MRCS and LEGs writing letters if they choose.

About the concerns expressed earlier re wetlands and agriculture, Willis said that there may be a lot in the Program proposal that WCSSP supports, but there may be other parts we don't support.

Batchelder reported that the Strategy Workshops are pointing towards WCSSP being a clearinghouse of funding sources and partnerships. Dietz said that if WCSSP writes a letter of support, it should strongly encourage local participation in decision-making; perhaps WCSSP's support of this program could improve the decision-making process of this Program.

Taylor-Eldred proposed that a draft letter of support be presented to the Board at an upcoming meeting and discussed. She pointed out that, because of the November deadline, this does not need to be at one of the next few Board meetings since there are several more important Agenda items in the near future. It was agreed that this was the way to proceed with this question.

NATURE CONSERVANCY CLEARWATER ACQUISITION

Eric Delvin of TNC's Washington Coast Program reported that he had asked to make a short presentation today about the purchase by The Nature Conservancy of 3000 acres of recently-harvested Rayonier timber area along the Clearwater River, to be finalized February 22, 2011. He displayed a map that defined the purchase.

TNC's program for acquisition and restoration, which includes upland areas, aligns with WCSSP goals. In answer to a question, Delvin said that so far all funds for the project have been private. TNC will be working to purchase additional land from commercial landowners, but not from individual landowners.

Like TNC's Ellsworth Creek acquisition, the area will continue to be open to the public for licensed fishing and hunting. Gates that have been open will remain open; gates that have been closed because of garbage dumping and other reasons will remain closed.

Delvin is organizing a meeting on February 28th to announce this purchase to the public in Clearwater and surrounding areas. The meeting will be at 7 pm at the Queets/Clearwater School. Sims asked if Delvin could come to the QIN TRG meeting on March 9th to make a presentation; Delvin said he could.

There was generally enthusiastic support for this project among those at the Board Meeting.

REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE and SUB-ALLOCATION FORMULA

Osborne reported on the most recent RTC meeting, January 27th, Keven Bennett from the University of Washington, who's been working on data for the group, came and reported to the group, which allowed a dialogue. He basically reported on the work he'd done up to that point, laid out the items that weren't working

correctly, and outlined some assumptions that the group might want to revise. Osborne thought it was a good presentation and discussion; other who were at the RTC meeting agreed.

The group is working on the same metrics as outlined previously; Bennett was sent back to do another round of mapping, based on the discussion at the meeting.

Osborne reported that Bennett did that, but ran into some serious issues last week, issues about the way NetMap works. Osborne went on to say that these kinds of roadblocks are fairly common when one is using GIS tools that haven't been used in a specific way beforehand. The real problems, in this case, have arisen because we're trying to apply everything across the entire Coast region at once. Osborne explained that each basin is separate in NetMap and Bennett is trying to sew them together. Bennett has been in constant contact with the NetMap staff, who have fixed little glitches and worked hard to help him accomplish what the RTC wants.

The roadblock occurred when Bennett was plotting out the maps using a certain regression model. He ran it many times, but continued to see results that were definitely not correct. So, he found some other regression models that NetMap recommends, but those also didn't work. He finally sought out a model that the State uses on a larger scale, and that model seems to be working. In addition, as of yesterday morning, he's found at least one and perhaps another that seem to be working correctly.

As Osborne said, this report probably doesn't sound too good to Board members; however, he continued, NetMap is an amazing and very complex tool that is comparatively new, so we really need to expect these kinds of delays. The fact that we have Bennett who is able to take it to the next level, and work with NetMap staff on the problems, is really good and to our benefit in the long run.

Bennett's results with all his metadata and modeling explanations will be out a week before the next RTC meeting on March 2nd so all RTC members can look at them, talk to Bennett, etc. Bennett is very confident that the regression model he is currently using is producing sound results; the only problem Bennett sees at this point is that the results are not going to make any watershed group happy. Osborne observed that the basic guidance that Bennett has really taken to heart is that this has to be equally applied across the Coast region. He understands that this is to be used for a sub-allocation formula, and he has done a good job of giving this equality top importance, which Osborne thinks is correct.

The report that Bennett will produce will probably not be understandable to many here today, but our other GIS experts in the region, Tony Hartrich (Quinalt) and Mike Nordin (Pacific County), have been keeping up to date with Bennett's work as it has progressed, so Osborne thinks we can feel confident that it is good work. Bennett was available at the January 27th RTC meeting to defend his work, "to be torn apart" as Osborne said, and Bennett did a great job of explaining what he'd done and why, to the satisfaction, Osborne thinks, of most of the RTC members. Bennett will be at the next RTC also, to do the same. Burkle agreed with Osborne's assessment, and added that Bennett provides the impartial technical/scientific input that everyone has been seeking. McMurry reported that Bennett is very open to new ideas and suggestions for improvement.

Osborne is fairly confident that the RTC will be able to make a recommendation on the sub-allocation formula in time for the March Board meeting; this, however, requires that the Board approve an extension of the deadline to the March meeting. Bingaman pointed out that the previous Motion had February 14th as the deadline; he questioned whether the fact that that date has passed needed to be dealt with.

Osborne recalled that the Board had had a discussion about the absolute last date at which the Board could consider a sub-allocation formula; he took away from that discussion that there was some extra time, perhaps through May or June. He thinks that the RTC can make a recommendation by the March Board meeting, but of course he's not sure.

He also reiterated what had been emphasized at previous Board meetings, which is that this is just a recommendation by the RTC; the Board is the body which needs to take into account all elements of the question

before making a decision. In particular, the questions of listed species and weighting need to be considered by the Board itself, although he said that the RTC will be making some basic recommendations about weighting.

Napier made a **MOTION that the RTC present its recommendations concerning a sub-allocation formula to the WCSSP Board of Directors no later than March 11, 2011.** Sellers seconded the motion. Taylor-Eldred asked if there were any objections to the Motion. There were none. Osborne clarified that this will involve two items, a report from the RTC, as well as Bennett's report.

REGIONAL PLANNING UPDATE

Batchelder pointed out a document that had been distributed to the Board, outlining the Plan process up to this point. He reported that there has been positive response to it at the State level. Phil Miller sent it to all the regional directors because there are two areas that are attempting to use the Open Standards procedure, but are having problems. He was happy to report that our effective use of the process is being touted; the document has even reached the Governor's office. Everyone seemed pleased with these developments, since, as Batchelder said, we're getting attention even before the Plan is finalized and it bodes well for our Plan.

Batchelder's aim is to extend this document to become, essentially, the Executive Summary for the Plan. The process that it currently explains is what he's reviewed at previous Board meetings. He asked that if anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to talk to him about it.

We're at the point now, he reported, where we're holding Strategy work sessions, one for each of the five Strategy Themes, in which we intend to bolster and clarify the Strategies as well as define Action Steps for the different Strategies. Three of these work sessions have occurred, just in the last week. He can't at this point provide full reports on these sessions, but he did describe them somewhat.

They've all been fairly small groups of participants who we specifically targeted for their expertise in the different Strategy Themes, "Education," "Habitat," and "Hatchery and Harvest." He thinks they've been invaluable sessions – the participants have really dug into the material; they are experts with lots of experience; and, they've worked hard to help us fill out the Strategies and provide effective Action Steps. He reviewed with the Board the participants in each of the three workshops. Creative Community Solutions has done a really good job of facilitating each session, working the groups hard to get through tough questions, especially in the Hatchery and Harvest workshop where there was lots of disagreement. Despite the disagreements, everyone was excited about the possibilities of working regionally on harvest and hatchery reform issues. That is, WCSSP will be able to bring a regional perspective on hatcheries and move the hatchery reform process forward, as well as perhaps look at, on the harvest front, a certification program for sustainably-harvested salmon that might bring a higher price for the benefit of local communities.

In the Education workshop, Batchelder thinks he was hearing the request for WCSSP to become a bigger voice in decision-making at the local planning level, and to become more vocal about what's working in salmon recovery, habitat restoration and hatchery reform, that is, a more positive voice than has existed previously.

Upcoming are the "Economic Tools" and "Regulatory" workshops. Again, he's very impressed with the quality of experts we're attracting to these workshops, as well as the fact that each group, of its own accord, is reaching across the boundaries of these five "Strategy Themes" to acknowledge the interconnectedness of strategies. In particular, the importance of education, outreach and developing partnerships has come to the fore in all the workshops so far.

Batchelder asked if there were any questions, and said that the calendar goal was to have a draft of the Plan to all Board members in time to discuss it at the April Board meeting. At that time, he will be asking the Board to approve the release of the draft Plan so that Public Comment sessions can be held early May, as well as report to SRFB at their May meeting.

Osborne was a little concerned because he will be having Public Comment sessions concerning the NPCLE Strategy at about the same time, and he'd like to have enough time between the NPCLE sessions and the WCSSP sessions so as not to confuse the public.

Napier is concerned that so few regulatory people are attending the Regulatory session; she sees only herself and Steve Kalinowski from WDFW on the list. Batchelder said that there's room for more participants if a Board member has any suggestions. Taylor-Eldred said that she would ask at Pacific County for someone. Sims pointed out that Mark Mobbs is very knowledgeable about regulations also. Osborne suggested that Chris Byrnes would be excellent.

In answer to a question from Sellers, Batchelder explained that the strategies that came out of the two-day Strategy Workshop held in Ocean Shores were the ones that have been brought forward, organized at that two-day Workshop into the five themes. The current set of five workshops are meant to refine those strategies and create action steps.

INVITATION TO DIRECTOR TO PARTICIPATE IN PANEL DISCUSSION

Batchelder explained that the Environment and Public Policy section of the Association for Conflict Resolution is having its annual conference in Portland at the end of June. Bob Wheeler, principal for Triangle Associates which facilitated the original meetings leading up to the creation of WCSSP, has proposed a panel discussion for this conference. The proposed panel consists of Rosemary Furfey from NOAA Fisheries, Gail McEwen from Portland State University, Phil Trask and Batchelder. The tentative title is "Building Sustainable Agreements in Rural Areas Resolving Natural Resource Challenges: Practical Lessons Learned from the Rural Frontlines in Collaborative Decision-Making and Conflict Resolution." Batchelder then read a short description of the panel discussion. His request today is for Board consideration to participate in this panel. The decision needs to go back to the Lead Entity Groups; he said he would send out the final version of the proposal as soon as he gets it from Wheeler. It will then be on the Agenda for the March Board meeting. As Batchelder discussed with Wheeler, WCSSP offers the example of some interesting solutions to decision-making, both in the creation of WCSSP as a federation of four strong lead entities, as well as in our planning process. Batchelder thinks his participation would be beneficial in getting the word out about WCSSP and its message, as well as educating professionals about the need for dispute resolution in rural areas where it is often thought not necessary. Taylor-Eldred and others thought it would be a great opportunity to get WCSSP known more widely.

From her experience, Napier said that these kinds of events are a great opportunity for exposure. She went on to observe that what this proposal is asking, she thinks, is whether the Board trusts Batchelder to go out and share his experiences, thoughts and opinions. Batchelder agreed, saying he thought that the Board discussion next month might tackle some of the issues about what his job entails/allows as director of a federation of strong lead entities; where is the balance between Board responsibility and micro-management? As it is, he thinks that we're moving in the right direction, but that it takes time to build up the trust necessary within a diverse group like WCSSP and we have to honor the process as the trust evolves. Sims said that his observation is that it takes about three years for organizations such as ours to solidly gel; we need to produce as good a product as we can, but we also need to be patient with ourselves.

Napier said she's a little concerned about whether Batchelder has the time at this point to prepare any kind of presentation that's requested. He said he didn't think there would be much a presentation required beyond perhaps five minutes to explain what WCSSP is and what it's done. But he's not sure and he will take into consideration Napier's concern and report to the Board if any of his time beyond attending the conference is required.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Taylor-Eldred noted that the next Agenda item was discussion of Conflict of Interest language for the Bylaws. Because of today's bad weather, however, she's wondering if we should perhaps delay this Agenda item so folks can have additional daylight driving time. Sellers said that because Krueger has done work on these revisions and she's no longer on the conference phone, he thinks we should wait to discuss them until she's present at a future Board meeting. People agreed with Sellers, so Taylor-Eldred asked if there were any objections to delaying this Agenda item to a later Board meeting when there's time available. There were no objections.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Taylor-Eldred adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Jo Dietz