



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**May 18, 2011**

10 am – 2 pm

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

#### **DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS from THIS MEETING**

##### **REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE**

What Batchelder is asking the Board today is to approve the release of the draft Plan for Internal Review, that is, review by those involved in the planning workshops, by the planning committee, by the Lead Entity Groups in the manner they choose, and, of course, continued review by Board members. . . .Thinking about this question, Osborne suggested that we restrict this first review phase to a true “internal review,” including the Board, plan workshop participants, Lead Entity Groups and the Regional Technical Committee. And then, he continued, send out the draft approved for Public Review to a list of other stakeholders, in addition of course to making it available to the interested public. Members expressed approval of this idea.

From his experience receiving multiple comments about a document, Swartout strongly suggested that everyone send in a comment sheet that lists their comments from the beginning to the end of the draft Plan, identifying what each comment is about by page, paragraph and line – for instance: “Page 2, paragraph 3, line 3: *comment.*” Napier pointed out that the Lead Entity Groups should agree on and submit one set of comments, although if the LEG can’t agree, the LEG could submit both sides of an argument.

. . . Batchelder outlined how he intends to handle all the comments. If the comment is a spelling/grammar or other wordsmithing improvement, or something small and factual that can be double-checked, staff will change the plan accordingly. If it is an issue, say, between co-managers about which he can possibly get agreeable language, he will do that before submitting it to the Board. If it is a larger policy issue, staff will collate the comments, and ask the Planning Committee to either deal with it or pass it on to the Board to make a decision. Staff will organize the comments so that they can be dealt with as effortlessly as possible by whoever is judging their applicability to plan content.

Dietz commented that a title for the Plan needs to be decided on. Swartout suggested that a choice of titles be sent out via email as a “ballot” to see if we could resolve that question.

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

Osborne summarized what is being proposed: to forward the formula chart (see p. 8) to the Lead Entities for their consideration. This formula divides the first million five ways, with the remainder divided according to the formula which includes freshwater salmonid habitat (weighted 25%), estuarine salmonid habitat (weighted 25%), salmonid diversity (weighted 45%), and ESA listed stocks (5%). In June, the Board will take the input from the Lead Entities and decide on the sub-allocation formula to use for this SRFB funding cycle. Swartout asked if there were any objections to proceeding in this way; none were voiced.

Batchelder asked if the June Board meeting could be changed to June 22<sup>nd</sup> because NPCLE doesn’t meet until June 21<sup>st</sup>. There were no objections.

In attendance:

**WCSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**Mark Swartout, Chair**

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group (NPCLE)

**Rich Osborne**, NPCLE Lead Entity Coordinator

**Katie Krueger**, NPCLE, Quileute Tribe

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group (QINLE)

**James Sellers**, QINLE, Quinault Indian Nation

**Dave Bingaman**, QINLE, Quinault Indian Nation

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group (GHCLE)

**Lee Napier**, GHCLE Lead Entity Coordinator

**Mark Swartout**, GHCLE, Thurston County

Pacific County Lead Entity Group (PCLE)

**Faith Taylor-Eldred**, PCLE, Pacific County

**Mike Johnson**, PCLE Lead Entity Coordinator

**Key McMurry**, PCLE, WBRCC, Key Environmental Solutions

**OTHERS**

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center (by phone)

Jim Jorgensen, Quinault Indian Nation

John Sims, QINLE Lead Entity Coordinator

Terry Willis, GHC County Commissioner

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Staff

Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP Staff

***UPCOMING MEETINGS:***

Wednesday, June 22, 2011	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, July 20, 2011	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, Aug. 17, 2011	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, Sept. 21, 2011	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

**WELCOME/QUORUM**

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone, asked that each person introduce him/herself, and confirmed that there was one Board member representative from each Lead Entity Group present and therefore there was a quorum present.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Swartout asked if there were any other additions to the Agenda. Katie Krueger asked that Batchelder give an update on legislative funding and the status of the SRFB. Swartout suggested that that be done after the Financial Report. He asked if there were any objections to the Agenda with that addition. There were no objections. In answer to a question, Swartout explained that the agenda had been restructured, at Bob Burkle's request, so that Burkle could be present for the sub-allocation discussion in the afternoon.

Krueger also pointed out that she thought the group had agreed to have a Public Comment period at each meeting. Batchelder responded that his recollection was that the Board instead wanted to encourage citizens to ask questions and/or make comment whenever it was relevant during a Board meeting. Krueger suggested that an explicit statement to that effect be put on each Agenda for the benefit of citizen participants. Everyone agreed that this was an excellent suggestion.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

Dana Dietz asked if there were any questions about this month's budget tracking report. She said that at the next Board meeting in June, staff will bring to the Board a proposal to adjust line items as needed to properly balance the budget by the end this biennium June 30, 2011. She confirmed that we are on track to balance the budget on June 30th; Miles and she are keeping tabs on expenses expected in the final two months of the biennium.

## 2011-13 DRAFT WCSSP BUDGET

Batchelder reported that we have been told that there's no possibility for any increase in WCSSP's budget for the 2011-13 biennium, unless we have a specific purpose/task for which we could present a case for an additional budget amount. After next Wednesday's May SRFB meeting and after confirmation of federal PCSRF funding soon thereafter, we will know if we've received full funding for the first year of the biennium, at which point the WCSSP Board can make more detailed decisions about line items within this draft budget. This draft budget assumes that WCSSP will have full funding for two years. This is an assumption that may not be correct, but we won't know about that until later in the biennium. GSRO and the Council of Regions are proposing to SRFB that we assume full funding for two years, and deal with any second-year shortfalls if and when they happen.

Batchelder noted that the draft budget proposed to the Board next month will include a more detailed breakdown of the line items.

In the Board packet today is the first draft of the WCSSP budget for the next biennium. It includes hourly raises for staff as well as .25 FTE for a Data Steward. Batchelder explained that both before and during the plan development process, it became clear that we have a need for some data/GIS management. In answer to a question, it was clarified that "Purple Tree Farms" is our website management firm and acknowledged that it should say "website management."

The other item which Batchelder brought to focus was the Lead Entity Groups' funding for regional participation; he's not sure how splitting the \$76,000 will be determined, but that is something the Board and LE Coordinators will need to consider.

After discussion, Terry Willis suggested that, in this tight fiscal climate, it would be best to explicitly state that the staff pay raises are not new ones, but are actually ones that the staff chose not to take when they were promoted to their current positions in fall 2009.

Mike Johnson asked how WCSSP's budget compares to those of the other regions. Batchelder said that we are at the lower end of regional budgets, although not as much as one might think. However, the other regions almost all have additional sources of ongoing funding, which is what WCSSP hopes to achieve in the future.

Osborne reminded everyone that during budget transition periods like this, we are often asking counties to front funding for several months until the funding is finalized. This reminded Dietz that we should thank Grays Harbor County because it is always paying our bills for a couple months before it gets reimbursed by the state.

There was some discussion about the Lead Entity portion of the budget. It was clarified that for the current biennium the Lead Entity Coordinators had settled on an equitable split based on their estimated regional activities; the decision was not made at the IAC/Board level. Several factors to be considered were brought up: the different distances that coordinators have to drive, the administrative work that Napier and the GHC fiscal department does, LE coordinators' time for regional participation on the Board and various committees, and, now, Osborne's regional role as chair of the Regional Technical Committee. Napier clarified that she has contracts with each Lead Entity coordinator's organization (Clallam County, Quinault Indian Nation, and Pacific County) that specifies what LEC expenses she can compensate for, mileage and time. Dietz reminded everyone that this part of the budget is for LEC participation in general WCSSP regional activities; the additional \$7,000 that each Lead Entity has had for participation in regional planning activities goes away after July 1<sup>st</sup>. Everyone agreed that this question needs to be revisited for discussion and decision.

In response to Krueger's request for an update on SRFB's status, Batchelder reported that there is no indication that SRFB will be eliminated by legislative action. The only threat to WCSSP itself would be a temporary shutdown of all state activities if the legislature doesn't pass a budget in the next few weeks.

## REGIONAL PLANNING UPDATE

Batchelder reminded the Board that development of a salmon plan is a primary deliverable for this biennium, the other deliverable being the creation of a decision-making body. The planning process started with a scoping meeting in Forks in January 2009. The Wild Salmon Center took on one of the first recommendations from that meeting, the regional data Needs Assessment. Our planning committee was formed. The Nature Conservancy agreed to assist us using the Open Standards/CAP process. The process then determined what indicators and measures were most appropriate to use to determine the status of our salmon habitats. From that analysis, the threats to salmon viability were determined and strategies framed to address those threats. The results of all this work is the basis of our salmon plan, a draft of which we are presenting to the Board today.

Batchelder went on to report that, as a result of questions being raised about the descriptions in the Hatchery and Harvest Strategies, a very fruitful email discussion has occurred between those who were at that workshop. What he is asking the Board today is to approve the release of the draft Plan for Internal Review, that is, review by those involved in the planning workshops, by the planning committee, by the Lead Entity Groups in the manner they choose, and, of course, continued review by Board members. This is part of the review process agreed to by the Board at their April meeting when we set up a Plan review timetable.

All members of the Regional Technical Committee attended one or more of the planning workshops; whether the Board wants formal RTC review of the plan is up to the Board.

To answer a question from Krueger, Batchelder clarified that staff have integrated into today's version of the plan many of her suggested language improvements while retaining her more substantive questions for the upcoming round of review. For instance, she made the point that the discussion of LWD at the workshop got so focused on wood in the streams that it forgot about the necessity of having large wood available in the riparian area to provide LWD in the streams. In addition, she thinks we should include outreach to local officials about all areas of concern, not just water pollution. Batchelder assured her that these excellent points will be retained as we move into the upcoming review period.

Johnson asked if we have a process for handling serious disagreements coming out of this internal review. Batchelder responded that, first of all, we have time to resolve them, as outlined in our Plan review timetable. Secondly, staff will collate all such questions, present them to the Planning Committee and ask them to resolve the issue in draft form, for final approval by the Board.

From his experience receiving multiple comments about a document, Swartout strongly suggested that everyone send in a comment sheet that lists their comments from the beginning to the end of the draft Plan, identifying what each comment is about by page, paragraph and line – for instance: “Page 2, paragraph 3, line 3: *comment.*” Napier pointed out that the Lead Entity Groups should agree on and submit one set of comments, although if the LEG can't agree, the LEG could submit both sides of an argument. Batchelder agreed but acknowledged that there are also individual workshop participants and Board members who may wish to submit comments individually. In addition, he commented that each Lead Entity should themselves decide how they want to submit comments, whatever is most appropriate for them. Osborne, however, observed that without the Lead Entities carrying out some of the discussion at the LE level, the quantity of comments coming to staff is going to be unmanageable. Batchelder responded that staff are enlisting the help of Creative Community Solutions to organize the incoming comments.

In response to a concern expressed by Krueger, Batchelder added that one person might send in comments representing, say, the tribe they work for, but might also participate in Lead Entity comments. Sellers made the point that the draft Plan should also be reviewed by others who have Plans dealing with the same area, for instance, the Park Service. Dietz said that the way she sees it, getting input from, say, the Park Service would be part of the implementation phase, not this current phase; this review phase is to make sure we've captured what the planning participants intended, and dealing with some of the more volatile issues so that the interested parties can live with what is proposed in the plan. Willis pointed out that any group that's mentioned in the plan as

possibly carrying out some of the strategies should also have the opportunity to comment; in fact, they should have the opportunity to say whether they can take on additional work. Batchelder responded by saying that any other organizations and programs mentioned in the plan already have such work ongoing; that is, we're not presuming that they can take on additional work, but instead we intend to support work they already do. So he thinks that their input is more part of the next, implementation phase.

Swartout suggested that the request for comments should go out with a letter describing exactly what we're asking of reviewers, that is, a process letter.

Thinking about this question, Osborne suggested that we restrict this first review phase to a true "internal review," including the Board, plan workshop participants, Lead Entity Groups and the Regional Technical Committee. And then, he continued, send out the draft approved for Public Review to a list of other stakeholders, in addition of course to making it available to the interested public. Members expressed approval of this idea.

In response to a question, Batchelder outlined how he intends to handle all the comments. If the comment is a spelling/grammar or other wordsmithing improvement, or something small and factual that can be double-checked, staff will change the plan accordingly. If it is an issue, say, between co-managers about which he can possibly get agreeable language, he will do that before submitting it to the Board. If it is a larger policy issue, staff will collate the comments, and ask the Planning Committee to either deal with it or pass it on to the Board to make a decision. Staff will organize the comments so that they can be dealt with as effortlessly as possible by whoever is judging their applicability to plan content.

Dietz commented that a title for the Plan needs to be decided on. Swartout suggested that a choice of titles be sent out via email as a "ballot" to see if we could resolve that question.

## **REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT and SUB-ALLOCATION DECISION**

Swartout turned the discussion over to Osborne, who led off by presenting what he sees as context for the sub-allocation decision. The amounts of money sub-allocated through this process need to be fair to all the Lead Entities and they need to be adequate for each Lead Entity to, for instance, fund at least one project. Based on these contextual assumptions, Osborne proposed that the Board come up with one, or perhaps a few, different formulas which can then be sent out the Lead Entity Groups. Everyone seemed to agree that was a good objective.

Osborne also pointed out that, beyond allocating funds every year, WCSSP needs to be able to assess projects in science-based ways, both before and after they're completed. This immediately confronts us with the problem of not having uniform data across the region. Osborne thinks that the process that the RTC has been going through is a good beginning to solving these data problems; it established some basic variables the data for which can be improved over time. It has entailed the first steps to creating a solid scientific basis for WCSSP's work; he doesn't, however, think that it's good enough at this point to be the entire basis of the sub-allocation decision. So, for this year, he proposes that the Board take into account its imperfections and tweak it so that it meets the standards of being fair and being adequate, as discussed previously.

Having said that, Osborne asked if there were any questions or comments about the report from the RTC which Board members have now received. As he outlined at last month's Board meeting, the RTC recommended three variables, weighted equally, to include in a sub-allocation formula:

--- **salmonid diversity**, the number of different runs in each WRIA, numbers which we've used in the past and is considered fairly accurate;

--- **habitat potential**, which is what we're calling the modeling for stream miles done by Keven Bennett, described at last month's Board meeting; and

--- **estuary area**, which includes the major estuaries in the south as well as the pocket estuaries in the north, figured by Keven Bennett more accurately than we've had in the past.

The RTC decided that these were the best set of variables to use for sub-allocation and, after some discussion, that they should be weighted equally in terms of importance and forwarded to the Board for further refinement and weighting based on policy. Bingaman noted that his staff reported to him that there was not agreement on weighting the variables equally. Bob Burkle tried to clarify by observing that the RTC didn't think there was any scientific way to weight the three variables, but they came to the consensus that they could generally agree that each of the variables was generally equally important, and that the RTC would defer to the Board for further weighting. Burkle agreed with Bingaman's staff that the RTC had agreed that there was no scientific basis to weight any variable any higher than another, therefore they deferred to a neutral weighting and that the Board should make any further decisions.

There was further discussion about science-based assessments, but Osborne said that the RTC did come up with the beginnings of three valid variables which is all that our data currently allows, and encouraged the Board to start figuring out how best to refine what the RTC recommended.

Osborne displayed the results of the RTC's work, and directed the Board to what he thinks is the first question for them: do we include ESA listings in the formula? Krueger asked if Batchelder had made any progress in obtaining for Lake Ozette Sockeye a portion of what normally goes to Puget Sound listed species; he responded that for this year there is no possibility of this, but that he will continue to press for a separate fund stream for Lake Ozette Sockeye. In her role as Board member from NPCLE, Krueger related that NPCLE very much wants some funding to go to Lake Ozette Sockeye; they are a listed species, but have no federal funding for projects.

Swartout stated that he thinks we need to include ESA listings in the formula in order to at least recognize the existence of these listings; it is the basis of federal funding to the state. Several others seemed to agree with this. Osborne showed a chart that included ESA listings.

A discussion about the whole 2011 sub-allocation process ensued. Mike Johnson said he thought the exercise of having the RTC try to come up with a scientific foundation for the sub-allocation was a waste of time because the result is, as in the past, the Board adjusting numbers so that the sub-allocation would seem more fair. Osborne agreed that it appears that way; however, he argued that the process taught us some important lessons:

- (1) science is not instantaneous -- in fact, it's a very slow process;
- (2) this is especially true in a region that's never been unified nor had any uniform data;
- (3) this RTC work was a good foundation for defining where we want and need to go with effective data development.

Bingaman observed that we basically have two variables, species diversity and habitat, which is further broken down into freshwater and estuarine habitats. Osborne said, however, that freshwater and estuarine numbers were derived differently, so in his view to clump them together wouldn't be good science. Batchelder interjected that Bingaman was making a conceptual point; Osborne agreed. Bingaman asked how the estuarine numbers were calculated; he thought it was important to understand as we begin to tweak the formula. Osborne said that the estuary numbers include the whole expanse of the estuaries, not just the shorelines.

Burkle observed that what the Board is trying to do is bring balance to the sub-allocation amounts. He proposed adding the ESA listings to the species diversity numbers, which would produce higher numbers (for diversity) for the North which would balance the higher numbers (for habitat) for the South. Bingaman pointed out that this is basically just politically figuring out how we want to split the funds, and then making the scientific numbers fit that split. McMurry agreed, and then asked why have we had the RTC spend so much time coming up with a scientific basis; she thinks it was a waste of time. Burkle and Osborne reiterated that we've gone through this process in order to provide a foundation for coming up with more scientific bases for our decisions in the future.

Swartout again brought up the idea of taking a certain part of the regional allocation and dividing it equally among the 5 WRIAs, and then allocating the remainder according to the formula. This would provide a base administrative amount to keep the Lead Entities strong. Bingaman thought this was a good way to proceed. He asked whether we are making a final decision today. Osborne responded that our aim is to have one or perhaps two proposed formulas which could then go to the Lead Entities for consideration in the next month. After some discussion, it was realized that the Board needs to decide on the funding formula at next month's meeting in order for Lead Entities to decide which projects they can fund.

Osborne asked if anyone objected to the basic concept of dividing some amount or percentage five ways between the WRIAs, with the remainder divided according to the sub-allocation formula. No objection was voiced. He then led the group through consideration of various amounts or percentages to be divided five ways.

But before that discussion occurred, members expressed concern and confusion about why this decision was going back to the Lead Entities since that could bring up an additional round of debate. Bingaman suggested that we first agree on the decision process, and then agree on the formula/funding process.

Bingaman said he'd like the opportunity to have his staff look at the percentages; in addition, he has another idea on how to proceed numerically which he hasn't had time to get down on to paper. He began to explain it, but said he really needed to put it down on paper to be able to explain it. Osborne said it sounded like a good possible approach, but should be explored next year. Napier asked why it didn't come out at RTC meetings. Bingaman and Jorgensen said because they didn't have time. Napier said she could appreciate that, but that it's getting frustrating from a Board position to keep hearing of new ideas; the Board needs to cut off discussion and make a decision. Bingaman said it's not about the metrics, but about how the numbers are weighted. He'd like to be able to get it out to everyone in the next few days and have everyone look at it. Osborne interjected that, at this point in the year, the Board needs to make a decision; he said that we're done with those considerations for now; we'll have to look at that next year, we don't have time now. Bingaman insisted that it was simply an additional way to weight the numbers, not an additional way to come up with the numbers.

Swartout said he would like to remind the group that the Board had tasked the RTC with having a proposed sub-allocation formula to the Board by February 1<sup>st</sup>, and that if they didn't meet that deadline, the Board and/or the SRFB technical committee would decide. He noted that the Board gave the RTC several extensions beyond February 1<sup>st</sup>; it's now time for the Board to decide. The formula is never going to be perfect, but he thinks that the RTC has given WCSSP a really good foundation for improving the formula each year. Therefore, he proposed that the formula and chart currently under consideration be approved by the Board, to now go out to the Lead Entities for their review, with a final decision to be made by the Board at their June meeting. Bingaman responded that what he's saying is that he doesn't know if he agrees to the weighting yet. Swartout said that he can come back in June with a different weighting suggestion; what we're doing now is simply approving this formula to be forwarded to the Lead Entity groups for their consideration.

Osborne summarized what is being proposed: to forward the formula chart (below) to the Lead Entities for their consideration. This formula divides the first million five ways, with the remainder divided according to the formula which includes freshwater salmonid habitat (weighted 25%), estuarine salmonid habitat (weighted 25%), salmonid diversity (weighted 45%), and ESA listed stocks (5%). In June, the Board will take the input from the Lead Entities and decide on the sub-allocation formula to use for this SRFB funding cycle. Swartout asked if there were any objections to proceeding in this way; none were voiced.

Batchelder asked if the June Board meeting could be changed to June 22<sup>nd</sup> because NPCLE doesn't meet until June 21<sup>st</sup>. There were no objections.

## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP 2011 SRF BOARD SUB ALLOCATION w/ESA

	Weight	Value by Lead Entity (Hectares)				Total
		20	21	22/23	24	
Freshwater salmonid habitat	0.25	13625.02	14,018.76	58,352.50	15,793.67	101,789.95
Estuarine salmonid habitat	0.25	1567.81	1695.82	24492.83	36280.03	64,036.49
Salmonid diversity list <sup>c, 3</sup>	0.45	8	7	5	4	24
ESA listed stocks <sup>4</sup>	0.05	2	1	1	-	4
		Percentage				Total
		20	21	22/23	24	
Freshwater salmonid habitat	0.25	0.134	0.138	0.573	0.155	1
Estuarine salmonid habitat	0.25	0.024	0.026	0.382	0.567	1
Salmonid diversity list <sup>c, 3</sup>	0.45	0.333	0.292	0.208	0.167	1
ESA listed stocks <sup>4</sup>	0.05	0.5	0.25	0.25	0	1
		Weighted percentage				Total
		20	21	22/23	24	
Freshwater salmonid habitat	0.25	0.033	0.034	0.143	0.039	0.250
Estuarine salmonid habitat	0.25	0.006	0.007	0.096	0.142	0.250
Salmonid diversity list <sup>c, 3</sup>	0.45	0.150	0.131	0.094	0.075	0.450
ESA listed stocks <sup>4</sup>	0.05	0.025	0.013	0.013	0.000	0.050
Allocation percentage of total		0.215	0.185	0.345	0.255	1.000
Allocation in dollars:						\$1,620,000.00
		\$	\$	\$	\$	
		133,042.29	114,576.70	214,015.67	158,365.34	\$ 620,000.00
First \$1 Million five way split:		\$200,000	\$200,000	\$400,000	200,000	\$1,000,000.00
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total:		<b>333,042.29</b>	<b>314,576.70</b>	<b>614,015.67</b>	<b>358,365.34</b>	<b>1,620,000.00</b>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$1,620,000 five way split:		324,000.00	324,000.00	648,000.00	324,000.00	1,620,000.00

Devona asked if there'd been discussion of having a regional allocation, perhaps once every three years funding a large project through a regional "competition." Several answered that that has been discussed as a possibility for the future. Swartout explained how it developed and is handled in the South Sound. Each of the four Lead Entities in the South Sound gave up what they could from their funding to fund a large, regionally-determined project; this is what led to the Nisqually Estuary Restoration Project and to the Devil's Head acquisition project. He reported that this had just evolved from being done once to being considered whenever appropriate; there are no set percentages or other parameters. Swartout reminded everyone that a regional project benefits everyone in the region, and he thinks doing this should simply be considered each year because it depends on what large projects might exist in the region that year. Osborne commented that he thinks we need to have our Plan finished before we consider doing this because the Plan will give us guidance for judging regional projects. Everyone seemed to agree that we should consider funding regional projects in the future, but wait until the Plan and Implementation are further along.

Sellers wanted to express his appreciation for the work that the RTC has done; everyone agreed with him.

### **BEAR RIVER ESTUARY PROJECT**

In answer to a question, Batchelder clarified that if by some chance the funding for the Bear River Estuary Project is rescinded, the funds will go back to the SRFB as "returned funds." Returned funds are then reallocated by SRFB as they see appropriate, for instance, last year we received \$11,000 from returned funds for additional Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee facilitation. WCSSP could ask that the funds "stay in the region;" however, that is not what automatically happens.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Jo Dietz