



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

July 20, 2011

10 am – 2 pm

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

DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS from THIS MEETING

APPROVAL of JUNE 22, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY

Swartout asked if there were any corrections to the meeting summary for the June 22, 2011 Board meeting. . . . It was agreed to change the sentence to read: "On the other hand, in the original RTC discussion, the Board decided that they wanted representation from each of the lead entities within the region that have unique characteristics; if we went . . ." With this revision, Swartout asked if there were any objections to approving the June Meeting Summary. Hearing none, he noted that the summary was approved. It was generally agreed that the composition and directions for the Regional Technical Committee should be revisited by the Board at a later meeting.

NETMAP

Krueger pointed out that, as Ed Bowen observed a long time ago, NetMap is a lot less accessible than we were led to believe, and that is troubling to her. Osborne reported that there is a Google Map component to NetMap, as we were originally told, but neither ESI nor we have put much effort into that component. He thinks that if we got together with ESI, we could get the Google Map component much more functional . . . Osborne agreed to take more of a lead on these issues, in his role as chair of the Regional Technical Committee. Swartout thanked him for taking this on. Batchelder said he would check on the progress in providing the estuary component.

NORTH AMERICAN SALMON STRONGHOLD LEGISLATION

Napier asked Batchelder to report when he finds out the intent of "one representative from each of 3 non-governmental organizations with salmon conservation and management expertise, as selected by the Board" (p. 8). She wondered if they were calling out a role for WCSSP, or, are they working around us when we should have a role? In general, she thinks we should know where we will be able to provide input.

MONITORING MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Swartout said that he wasn't hearing any support for signing this MOU; he was hearing a consensus to not sign it. He asked if there were any objections to not signing the Monitoring MOU; there were none.

ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE/FUNDRAISING

Swartout proposed that the staff bring to the Board a proposal as to how such a sister organization set up would look, what it would take to create it, and other details. He agreed that it would be best if we pursued an alternative organization sooner rather than later, to create a solid foundation for the ongoing existence of WCSSP. . . . Napier observed that when we had these discussions last time, staff had presented a myriad of possibilities, which were difficult to easily discuss. She would prefer that staff present one, perhaps two, models so that consideration might be easier. McMurry reaffirmed that the Nisqually model seems like a good example to begin with, maintaining WCSSP as it is, comparable to the Nisqually River Council, and creating a non-profit sister organization, comparable to the Nisqually River Foundation. After some discussion, other Board members agreed and staff said they would bring a straw-man proposal to the Board in September.

OFFICER NOMINATIONS/ELECTIONS AT SEPTEMBER BOARD MEETING

Batchelder asked everyone to be thinking about nominees for the Vice Chair position. To repeat our previous procedure, Dietz said we would again ask for nominations at the August Board Meeting and set a date, say, 10 days before the September Meeting, for all nominations to be submitted to staff. Then 7-9 days before the September Meeting, staff will distribute the list of nominees to the Board, and the Board can vote at the September Meeting.

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

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group (GHCLE)

Lee Napier, GHCLE Lead Entity Coordinator

Mark Swartout, GHCLE, Thurston County

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group (QINLE)

Dave Bingaman, QINLE, Quinault Indian Nation

Pacific County Lead Entity Group (PCLE)

Mike Johnson, PCLE Lead Entity Coordinator

Key McMurry, Key Environmental Solutions

OTHERS

Justin Hall, Nisqually River Council & Foundation

John Sims, QINLE Lead Entity Coordinator

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Staff

Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP Staff

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

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 additions to the agenda. None were raised; the agenda was accepted.

APPROVAL of JUNE 22, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY

Swartout asked if there were any corrections to the meeting summary for the June 22, 2011 Board meeting. Key McMurry raised a question about the accuracy of the third sentence in the next-to-the-last paragraph on page 10. She thought that it said that the Regional Technical Committee was supposed to have an equal number of members from each of the four Lead Entity Groups, which isn't true. It was agreed to change the sentence to read: "On the other hand, in the original RTC discussion, the Board decided that they wanted representation from each of the lead entities within the region that have unique characteristics; if we went . . ."

With this revision, Swartout asked if there were any objections to approving the June Meeting Summary. Hearing none, he noted that the summary was approved.

It was generally agreed that the composition and directions for the Regional Technical Committee should be revisited by the Board at a later meeting.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Dietz explained that there were two reports in today's Board packet. One outlines the budget changes that need to be made between various line-items in order to match how funds were expended. The only major change was the addition of funds to the Staff Pay line item, which the Board had approved in June. The other report is the normal monthly budget-tracking which shows that each line item is approximately 100% expended. Swartout asked if there were any questions.

NetMap discussion

Questions were raised about NetMap. Batchelder said he would check on the progress in providing the estuary component. He clarified that NetMap is available on a public portal if you have the GIS software ArcView. It was acknowledged that NetMap is less accessible than we would've hoped. Batchelder commented that, on the other hand, any map created by NetMap can be converted to a .pdf for general viewing.

Osborne pointed out that maps for projects, for instance, can be created using software that's a lot less complex than NetMap; NetMap is intended for use in creating models for WCSSP's work using data sets for our area. Batchelder concurred, saying that NetMap is not a map-generating program; it's designed to interactively test hypotheses and models.

Krueger pointed out that, as Ed Bowen observed a long time ago, NetMap is a lot less accessible than we were led to believe, and that is troubling to her. Osborne reported that there is a Google Map component to NetMap, as we were originally told, but neither ESI nor we have put much effort into that component. He thinks that if we got together with ESI, we could get the Google Map component much more functional; he thinks it hasn't happened because other NetMap users don't have much interest in or use for that component.

Osborne agreed to take more of a lead on these issues, in his role as chair of the Regional Technical Committee. Swartout thanked him for taking this on.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

North American Salmon Stronghold Legislation

Batchelder noted that in today's packet was the North American Salmon Stronghold legislation which is being introduced in Congress today, with some slight revisions to what was passed out today. As requested, he agreed to electronically forward the final version to everyone. Osborne noted that it looked like they were going to try to come up with some funding through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Napier asked Batchelder to report when he finds out the intent of "one representative from each of 3 non-governmental organizations with salmon conservation and management expertise, as selected by the Board" (p. 8). She wondered if they were calling out a role for WCSSP, or, are they working around us when we should have a role? In general, she thinks we should know where we will be able to provide input.

Treaty Rights at Risk: A Report from the Treaty Indian Tribes in Western Washington

Batchelder said that staff had recently sent out to everyone this report from Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, a white paper prepared by western Washington tribes. Krueger said that it points out poor monitoring practices as well as an over-emphasis on harvest, which the tribes depend on. Because we address harvest in our Plan, she thought the observations made in the report might be useful to WCSSP; in particular, we want to make sure we don't make the same mistakes that the report describes. In answer to a question, she confirmed that the report is about Puget Sound chinook; however, the observations have general relevance to our work, especially because Puget Sound is experiencing problems first, due to population expansion, and protocols are developed in Puget Sound that then affect the coast region.

MONITORING MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

Swartout asked Krueger to give her report on this Monitoring MOU which she had researched because of serious concerns she had with it. She pointed out that it is mostly tribes and the federal agencies that do on-the-ground monitoring; the state relies on the tribes' data. This document was driven by the desire to help NOAA de-list ESA-listed species, for which NOAA needs reliable data. The goal, which Krueger considers unrealistic, is to have one set of monitoring protocols which everyone would use.

Concerning the protocols themselves, Krueger reported that some of them are in books that are not accessible online, some of them are outdated, some of them are massive, and some of them have unnecessarily fine detail. Due to these factors, she thinks the MOU does not provide useable monitoring protocols, despite what the document intends. Since different parties will, for instance, be able to pick and choose within the unnecessarily finely detailed protocols, the goal of having consistent monitoring won't happen. Neither the MOU nor the background document provides any guidance as to which protocols in all the documents listed are the ones to be consistently used.

In addition, in the footnote in the background document, Indicators and Protocols for Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health, top of page 3, a direction is given to provide "the methods used to estimate spawner abundance including estimated variance." She discussed this with those who do Quileute monitoring, and they indicated that figuring estimated statistical variances would be very impractical, very expensive and actually not possible in large river systems.

Concerning the policy side of the MOU, she is very concerned with a statement that was made in the preamble to the document Indicators and Protocols for Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health:

Many of the core, ongoing monitoring programs supported by major state, federal, tribal, and local agencies in Washington already are using these methods.

This is the statement that spurred her to look into this matter. Her observation is that some tribes use some of these protocols some of the time; she was not able to find any tribal government representation in the Monitoring MOU; nor were tribal governments consulted during creation of the MOU, or in creating the framework or Forum Report on which it depends. She contacted Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) staff and Schuett-Hames, a monitoring expert, confirmed that he was only tangentially consulted. In addition, he agrees that in many cases the protocols put forward are not going to work. When Terry Wright was asked to sign this MOU, he objected, correctly stating that he could not represent the tribes. She summarized by pointing out that the tribal governments were never players in the development of this MOU or its underlying documents, even though they are co-managers of the fishery.

Krueger summarized that she could not support signing this MOU. Dave Bingaman said that he too had asked his staff if they'd been consulted on the MOU, and none had. His staff agreed with many points that Krueger made. The Quinault are not interested in signing it; it is voluntary, but Bingaman observed that many times things that are voluntary become required. Mike Johnson agreed with what Krueger and Bingaman outlined as serious concerns. Swartout said that he wasn't hearing any support for signing this MOU; he was hearing a consensus to not sign it. He asked if there were any objections to not signing the Monitoring MOU; there were none.

ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES:

Presentation by Justin Hall, Nisqually River Council and Nisqually River Foundation

Swartout introduced Justin Hall, Director of the Nisqually River Foundation and long-time staff person of the Nisqually River Council. By way of background, Batchelder indicated that there are many things that WCSSP is going to want to start doing in the next two years for which we do not have funding. We need to have an appropriate organizational structure to receive funding. He thought that a good way to begin the discussion would be to have Hall make a presentation on how and why the Nisqually River Council decided to create a sister organization, the Nisqually River Foundation, to fulfill those same needs. At the same time, Hall can tell us how it has been working, and answer questions we might have.

Hall began by explaining the history of the Nisqually River Council. During the Evans administration, a lot of legislators drove by the Nisqually Estuary on their way to the Capitol. It was realized that if left unprotected, the estuary would suffer from urbanization and development. So a Plan was developed, although it did not bring into the planning process residents of the Nisqually area. Nothing much came into being as a result of this plan, except

that a young legislator Norm Dicks became interested and was instrumental in the creation of the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge.

In the late 1980's Jennifer Belcher, as a state senator, encouraged the creation of a Plan based on stakeholder input, including a wide variety of governments, agencies, industries, organizations and citizens. In 1987 the state legislature approved the Plan. The Plan called for the creation of the Nisqually River Council to be funded by \$100,000 per year through the Washington State Department of Ecology. This Ecology funding has gone up and down over the years, but has provided core funding for personnel who have then been able to obtain hundreds of thousands of dollars for project activities.

The Council is currently made up of representatives from: Lewis, Thurston, and Pierce Counties; Washington Departments of Ecology, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Transportation, and Fish & Wildlife; Washington Parks and Recreation Commission; Washington Conservation Commission; regional Conservation Districts (Thurston, Pierce, Lewis); Washington Secretary of State; Nisqually Indian Tribe; US Dept of Defense; Mt. Rainier National Park; Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge; Gifford Pinchot National Forest; Tacoma Public Utilities; University of Washington (Research Forest); the municipalities of Yelm, Roy and Eatonville; and, a very active Citizens' Advisory Committee. At the beginning the citizens' committee was mainly local industry representatives (timber, dairy, etc.) who were suspicious of government interference. As they came to realize that their suspicions were unfounded, the citizens' committee has come more to represent local citizens who are interested in the watershed.

From 1989 to about 1997, Peter Moulton was the first full-time staff person. In the 1990's when the state was going through a budget crisis, funding was reduced, which essentially eliminated any funding for projects, and the Council was not staffed for a couple years. In the early 2000's, the Nisqually Tribe received a grant from WDFW to provide staffing; in addition, there was assistance from Stewardship Partners. In 2003 Hall was hired by the Tribe to provide staffing for the Council; he worked for the Tribe for about 9 months. One concern at that time was that, although he had health insurance for himself, his family was not covered. So, one benefit of the formation of the non-profit Nisqually River Foundation was that it provided him with full health insurance.

Before the Foundation was formed, the Council looked at a lot of organizational alternatives, including working through a government agency. In the end they realized that creating a non-profit foundation opened up many funding streams that hadn't been available to them before. In addition to grants, it allows them to accept individual donations, which are about \$5,000 a year at this point; this has been accomplished with very little active fundraising, but could be more substantial if they worked at it. Given decreasing funding available through government grants, they will probably start seeking private donations more aggressively, especially since private, individual donations are starting to increase again in general. They intend to start having a fund-raising event every year. Hall thinks that it is better to encourage a lot of smaller (say \$100) donations than seek out very rich benefactors. He also pointed out that there are businesses and corporations to approach about larger donations and grants.

Hall's long-term vision for the Foundation is that it can serve as an umbrella funding source for several watershed project-oriented Nisqually organizations in addition to the Nisqually River Council. As is already the case, the Foundation can employ project workers if other organizations can't or don't want to have more employees; this lowers their health insurance rates and helps projects move forward.

Hall described a variety of grants and funds that the Foundation has accessed or is applying for. They work closely with the Nisqually Tribe; sometimes the Tribe gets a grant and the Council does the work, other times it's the opposite. This creates flexibility when, for instance, there are government grant monies that can only be administered by another government (the Tribe – or one of the other governments involved in the Council) and cannot be administered by a non-profit foundation. Another advantage of having a private foundation is that it can act quickly to take advantage of opportunities.

Hall outlined a few factors which influenced the way the Foundation was formed. The Council is not a legal organization as far as Hall has been able to tell through research; it is simply a group of twenty governmental

agencies that decided to meet regularly, and have been doing so for twenty years. It does not have Bylaws, nor require a quorum; this loose structure has worked for twenty years, so they haven't felt the need to formalize it.

Stewardship Partners provided \$35,000 to the Foundation to help them get started as they created the Foundation. Staff completed the application work; a small part of the funding from Stewardship Partners paid the necessary state and federal filing fees to apply for non-profit status, which are currently about \$1,500. They were granted non-profit status after about six months. They have eight hours per year of pro bono attorney services through one of their Board members, which Hall has only used once, to create a reusable contract form.

The Foundation is a completely separate entity from the Council. The purpose of the Foundation is to provide funding, staffing and project management for the Council as it implements the Nisqually Watershed Stewardship Plan; however, a Foundation Board could change its purpose. To tie the Foundation in closely with the Council, the Foundation's Board consists of up to twelve members:

Three members who are Board members of the Council:

- #1 – Chair or designee of the Council
- #2 – Chair or designee of the Citizens' Advisory Committee
- #3 – An at-large member of the Council

Two members who are not related to the Council; Hall said this provides outside perspectives, and the opportunity to have on the Board people with access to large funding sources:

- #4 & #5 – Persons who are not members of the Council or related to any organization that sits on the Council

Up to six members can be anybody; this provides the opportunity to have additional Council members, others with specific expertise (project or funding), and others with local ties (businesses, etc.):

- #6 through #12 – Can be anybody.

Because policy is set by the Council, it isn't clear to Hall what the Foundation Board can do in addition to approving the budget once a year, fund-raising and related activities.

Hall asked if there were any questions. Osborne asked if they had a "rainy day" fund. Hall said basically no; however, they do have about \$45,000 from left over, unused overhead.

Krueger asked about the amount of staff time involved in documenting accountability to the federal government for non-profit status; her experience is that it is a burden. Hall hasn't found it to be excessive; the 990 forms (annual tax reporting comparable to 1040s) have gotten longer over the years, but accounting practices haven't become more complex. The Foundation staff originally did the everyday bookkeeping, when they just had one grant. Since they've had more than one grant, they've had individual bookkeepers (at about \$35 per hour), but have found the best solution to be the more experienced Non-Profit Center in Tacoma (also at about \$35-40 per hour; about \$300 per month). The Foundation does have a CPA who does the annual tax forms and such. The CPA costs about \$350 a year. So on a budget of about \$500,000, they spend about \$4,000 on bookkeeping/accounting.

Krueger asked if this \$4,000 accounting cost would be the same even if their budget was a lot smaller. Hall said it would be proportionately less; they currently have 15 funding sources and 7 employees, which requires fairly extensive bookkeeping. If their budget was a lot smaller, there would be many fewer funding sources and employees, and Hall himself would be doing the bookkeeping as he did originally. Hall said that he's sure that the Non-Profit Center's Christine Garst would be willing to come to a WCSSP Board meeting to better answer questions like this.

Hall said that one of the great advantages they have right now is that the Nisqually Tribe provides them with offices, land-line phones, internet access and copying at no cost. If this wasn't the case, they would have to find about \$15,000 a year for these basics.

They have not yet gone through an audit; a non-profit is required to go through an audit if it receives more than \$500,000 in federal funds. An audit is expensive, but is good to have available for grantors as one applies for large grants.

Dietz wanted the Board to know that she has several years experience as head bookkeeper for a non-profit corporation, working with an accountant who did the yearly taxes; so WCSSP has the ability to move between in-house bookkeeping and, as funding increases, utilization of, say, the Non-Profit Center.

Krueger said that it is not just the documentation of accountability that takes time for a non-profit, but also insuring that all funds raised, all funds expended and all activities carried out are for the stated (public) purpose of the organization and that you can demonstrate this is true.

Krueger also pointed out that Board members of a non-profit organization are liable for the activities of the organization; therefore, the organization should provide liability insurance for its Board members. Hall agreed; their liability insurance (\$2 million coverage) costs the organization about \$1,000 a year. In addition, as they've hosted more public events, they got general liability insurance which costs about \$700 a year.

Hall said that they were very willing to share all the information they have that's relevant to creating and maintaining a non-profit corporation, including their Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, forms, etc. McMurry asked if he would send those items to us. He agreed.

Swartout thanked Hall for his report and hoped he could stay for more questions after the group's lunch break. Hall said that he could.

After the break, Swartout opened the floor for discussion. The possibility of a foundation board changing its purpose to something other than the original intent was discussed. It was generally agreed that having a direct connection like the three Council members being Foundation Board members, plus a general atmosphere of trust between participants, was the best that can be done to prevent this from happening. Osborne said that he's only known of one instance where this possibility actually occurred in a fractious way. Swartout made the point that it's the name and the logo that are important to protect.

Krueger said it's clear that we need a vehicle for bringing in additional funding, and the concept of a sister non-profit organization seems like a reasonable one. Osborne pointed out that there have been some examples recently, most notably the Northwest Straits Commission, where the existence of a sister non-profit has saved a long-standing organization from extinction when funding unexpectedly went away. As far as he knows, Nisqually is probably the example that is most similar to WCSSP and the cleanest organizationally.

Swartout said that he had written a paper looking at the different ways to deal with these same problems. Currently the Chehalis Basin Partnership is also dealing with these issues; they have decided not to form a non-profit, but instead use the funds they have, plus ask each of their member agencies to provide some funding for organizational maintenance. Their goal is have a yearly budget of \$100,000 per year from these efforts; \$50,000 from the legislature and \$50,000 raised internally. The Partnership was awarded \$15,000 by the Chehalis Tribe which certainly has helped with the internal funding. In addition, the watershed coordinator is researching outside funding and has found that there are private foundations which will fund governmental bodies like the Partnership.

Batchelder reminded the Board that solving this organizational/funding problem is part of the Scope of Work for the new biennium. On paper WCSSP has been funded for the full biennium, but there is an understanding that funding for the second year of the biennium is not guaranteed because of possible, some would say likely, state and federal funding cuts. SRFB is encouraging us to create a more permanent organizational structure that would allow a wider range of funding possibilities, beyond the money we get from them. Staff decided it would be best to add this to the Board agenda early in the biennium, since it will take some time to carry out whatever the Board decides and it would be best to have something in place before the second year of the biennium beginning July

2012. He said he is getting some hints at the state level that the entire salmon program is at some risk; Napier said she is hearing the same hints. Krueger said that she thinks the tribes as co-managers will stand up to the state on that, so we shouldn't lose hope; Bingaman concurred, adding that tribes are a major factor in the continuation of PCSRF funding from the federal government. Everyone agreed that we should at the least take the situation as motivation to move forward on organizational planning.

Because everyone may not be aware, Batchelder also related that one of Allison's top priorities in hiring the original staff was their experience and expertise in non-profits and grant writing, which both he and Dietz have. Although their focus has been on the Salmon Plan, staff has been talking a lot about these organizational questions over the last few months, and thinks that the Nisqually model of sister organizations, one being a non-profit, is the best solution.

Osborne asked whether the benefits of having two organizations outweighed the extra work that it entailed. Batchelder said that he thought the biggest advantage would be the ability to recruit a Board that included members with money, or with access to others with money. Osborne agreed that that was a good point.

In response to further discussion, Swartout proposed that the staff bring to the Board a proposal as to how such a sister organization set up would look, what it would take to create it, and other details. He agreed that it would be best if we pursued an alternative organization sooner rather than later, to create a solid foundation for the ongoing existence of WCSRP. He noted that it takes time to not only create a non-profit, but build it up to become a solid one. It's unsure what future federal funding is going to be, and the state is struggling also. As in business, the best approach in these uncertain times is to diversify as in this model of two sister organizations.

Napier observed that when we had these discussions last time, staff had presented a myriad of possibilities, which were difficult to easily discuss. She would prefer that staff present one, perhaps two, models so that consideration might be easier. McMurry reaffirmed that the Nisqually model seems like a good example to begin with, maintaining WCSRP as it is, comparable to the Nisqually River Council, and creating a non-profit sister organization, comparable to the Nisqually River Foundation. After some discussion, other Board members agreed and staff said they would bring a straw-man proposal to the Board in September.

Everyone thanked Hall for having worked through this model for the past 7 years, and spending time today to provide us with his experiences.

REGIONAL PLAN: PUBLIC REVIEW EVENTS

Batchelder outlined the immediate upcoming Plan Review events. Staff is currently collecting comments from Internal Review (including Katie Krueger, Key McMurry, Bob Burkle, Miranda Plumb and others at USFWS, TNC); these are being reviewed by the Planning Committee, after which a new draft will be distributed to everyone, including the Lead Entity Groups for their review and the RTC. The Planning Committee would like to have a joint review session meeting with the RTC in early September. After that meeting, our goal is to have a new draft Plan to the Board by September 15th so they can review it again, and hopefully at the September 21st Board Meeting approve its release for Public Review.

Batchelder said that today he wanted to ask the Board their thoughts on how we should structure the Public Review; staff proposes perhaps four public review meetings, in Forks, Aberdeen, Centralia/Chehalis, and somewhere in Pacific County. Staff's plan is to have these meetings during the Public Comment period, probably late October, early November.

Swartout suggested that instead of Centralia/Chehalis, we approach the tribe about Great Wolf Lodge or the Lucky Eagle Casino; Napier agreed that there's usually more interest closer to Thurston County and/or the Rochester area. She also observed that if we had meetings in locations to which the public was coming anyway (e.g., the casino, public events), we might draw more public involvement and feedback. Swartout also suggested Swede Hall in Rochester; it's large and open. Sims said that the Quinalts might want to do one at the Quinalt School or in

Taholah. Batchelder said we can definitely do more than four; four was just a goal to get started. Napier said we could do a display at the Chehalis Watershed Festival on September 17th and get some feedback there; use it as a pilot session to get ideas on how best to present it to the public.

Osborne suggested that we're going to need to have a really good presentation about the Plan since many people at public review sessions will not have read the Plan. We need to think about how best to digest it down to understandable and short summaries of the important points.

Swartout described what has worked well for public review meetings he's organized, which is, first, having an explanatory presentation like Osborne is describing, then have listening posts where each listening post is a chapter of the Plan. There could be an expert at each post who would answer questions and write down public comments on an easel (or have cards on which comments can be written, with the possibility of mailing them in.) Or, structured another way, you can have an open reception at the beginning where folks could go around to different posts, then have the formal presentation, then allow people to again go around to different posts.

Swartout brought up the question of whether to have an open Q&A period at the end of the presentation; the problem is that this is where some people might grab undue attention and disrupt others' ability to contribute. His solution has been to structure it so that all questions come forward to the presenter or panel written on a card. The card also has a mailing address if the questioner doesn't feel his/her question has been answered; we could then answer the questions on our website.

Batchelder really liked the listening post format; however, he said that would require a lot more participation by Planning Committee members than staff was expecting. Swartout suggested another idea was to have the listening posts be more self-explanatory with comment cards and a drop box available. Dietz proposed that if we had, say, 4 listening posts, she and Batchelder could each stand between 2 of them; Swartout added that each meeting would probably also have attendance by local WCSSP members, so that might fulfill staffing needs for listening posts.

No matter what the format, Batchelder said that all public comments will be in the Plan Appendix by location and date; names are not required, according to Swartout.

Dietz asked Board members whether they thought meetings should be in the evening, during weekdays, on Saturdays, or ...? Mike Johnson asked whether a 2-3 hour evening time slot was enough time. McMurry thought we would have more participation on a Saturday morning. Osborne related that during their recent Shoreline Management process they had an afternoon session, and then repeat with a somewhat shorter evening session on the same day; surprisingly, the afternoon session had the higher attendance. Napier said weekends work if there's another reason for people to be there. Batchelder asked if there were any piggyback events that might work for our purposes; Napier suggested that staff check with event calendars in each County. Osborne asked if there was room in the new WCSSP budget to get extra staffing for the listening posts, e.g., Creative Community Solutions; staff said there was some money allotted to Plan Implementation.

Swartout asked if there were restrictions on the use of that money; another idea he's seen work is to have meetings start at, say, 5 pm and provide pizza and daycare with an environmental educator occupying the kids at a table off to the side. Dietz said she liked that idea; however, staff's original idea was that we would not have food because that tends to attract people who are only interested in the food. Napier suggested the idea of getting food items that can be used at more than one meeting, for example, crackers, cheese, nuts.

UPCOMING BOARD MEETING LOCATIONS

Batchelder reminded the Board that we have repeatedly been asked to have Board meeting at locations in the region other than Aberdeen and he thinks we should do so. His feeling is that we should be having at least two meetings a year in Forks; staff suggests October and April would be good months to do this, given weather

conditions. It was agreed that we need to have phone service for those who want to call into meetings. Osborne offered to see if WCSSP could use the ONRC facilities at no charge.

Swartout said he was hearing agreement that we should meet a few times each year in Forks. His perspective is that we should consider what is best overall for salmon, for the environment, given the number of people driving to different locations. He suspects that our current Aberdeen location is the most efficient in that respect. He went on to acknowledge that this doesn't take into account the social, political and individual considerations. Osborne said that he thought it would be important to have meetings in Forks both to acknowledge those who have been participating in WCSSP despite the distances and to bring an awareness of WCSSP to the general Forks community; he thinks having a couple meetings a year in Forks would really help. Krueger said that once they get cell phone service in La Push, that might be a good place to have one of the meetings; it's an additional 20 minutes from Forks to La Push. Members seemed to think this was a good idea.

Swartout summarized what he was hearing, that the Board would like to have two meetings a year in Forks or thereabouts. Everyone seemed to agree; there were no objections voiced. Everyone also agreed that October and April would be good months for these meetings.

Batchelder also suggested that in October we consider having a Public Plan Review session in Forks in the evening after a Board meeting during the day.

OFFICER NOMINATIONS/ELECTIONS AT SEPTEMBER BOARD MEETING

Batchelder announced that with the reorganization of the Pacific County Lead Entity Group (PCLE) and Faith Taylor-Eldred's recent promotion to a more time-consuming position, she is no longer going to be a member of PCLE, and therefore isn't eligible to be a WCSSP Board member or Vice Chair. So the Board will need to elect a new Vice Chair. It was generally agreed that the Board could wait until their Annual Meeting in September to elect a new Vice Chair; an acting Chair could be appointed if Swartout is unable to chair in August. Batchelder said we'll need to get nominations for Vice Chair before the September Board Meeting. Johnson asked if there was anyone who would like to be nominated; Osborne said he would serve as a back-up nominee if no one else comes forward, but that he would prefer not to serve as Vice Chair since he already has other responsibilities that the Board has asked him to do.

Batchelder confirmed with Mike Johnson that by the end of July PCLE will have many new members, who will be eligible to be appointed by PCLE as WCSSP Board members. However, Johnson said that PCLE probably won't immediately appoint new WCSSP Board members from PCLE. Napier said that she too is expecting a new Board member from the Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group.

Batchelder asked everyone to be thinking about nominees for the Vice Chair position. To repeat our previous procedure, Dietz said we would again ask for nominations at the August Board Meeting and set a date, say, 10 days before the September Meeting, for all nominations to be submitted to staff. Then 7-9 days before the September Meeting, staff will distribute the list of nominees to the Board, and the Board can vote at the September Meeting.

Batchelder noted that Swartout was elected in September 2010 for a two-year term as Chair. Swartout said he thought having the terms of Chair and Vice Chair offset is a good idea, which everyone seemed to agree with.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Jo Dietz