



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

September 22, 2010

10 am – 2 pm

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

In attendance:

WCSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mark Swartout, Chair, WCSSP

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe

John Miller, Clallam County

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group

Coni Wilson, Quinault Indian Nation

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator

Andy Olson, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis

Mark Swartout, Thurston County

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions

OTHERS

Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation

Bob Burkle, WDFW

Mike Nordin, Pacific County

John Sims, QIN Lead Entity Coordinator

Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Staff

Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP Staff

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Wednesday, October 20 10 am – 2 pm Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

Wednesday, November 17 10 am – 2 pm Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

Wednesday, December 15 10 am – 2 pm Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

WELCOME

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone. Dave Bingaman introduced Coni Wilson who, as a member of the QIN Land and Natural Resources Sub-committee, is a WCSSP Board member. She is also on the QIN Business Council.

Chair Swartout pointed out that the gold colored nameplates designate Board members, and the white ones indicate all other attendees. Because there were new attendees at the meeting, he also reminded everyone that the meetings are recorded, for Dana Dietz' use in creating the Meeting Summary, which is then approved by the Board.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was agreed to move Approval of the August Meeting Summary to the end of this meeting to give some members time to review it. There were no further objections to the draft Agenda.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Dietz asked for any questions or comments about the budget-tracking Financial Report.

Concerning finances, John Miller said that on behalf of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC), he would like to thank WCSSP for funding the facilitation of the quarterly LOSC meetings.

ELECTION OF CHAIR and VICE CHAIR

Chair Swartout said he wasn't sure how the Board wanted to carry out election of Chair and Vice Chair – for instance, since he is a nominee for Chair, would the group like him to leave the meeting temporarily? There was no response to this. Lee Napier asked for confirmation that the sheet that was distributed with the Agenda indicated everyone who had been nominated for these two positions: one person, Mark Swartout, for Chair, and one person, Faith Taylor-Eldred, for Vice Chair. Dietz confirmed that was the case and that these two were willing to serve were they to be elected. Swartout added that, for both Taylor-Eldred and himself, this of course depended on the continued approval and support from their respective county superiors.

John Miller asked that this process be formalized; according to Robert's Rules of Order, the Chair needs to ask three times if there are any more nominations. Swartout asked three times if there were any additional nominations. Each time, there were none.

Swartout explained for those who were new to WCSSP Board meetings that the Board makes decisions on a consensus basis. So, for "voting" he asks "Are there any objections?" to a decision or motion. If there are none voiced, the decision/motion passes by consensus and is so recorded in the Meeting Summary.

Key McMurry moved and Andy Olson seconded a **MOTION** to elect Mark Swartout as Chair and Faith Taylor-Eldred as Vice Chair of the WCSSP Board for a two year term. Swartout asked if there were any objections. There were none.

AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

Swartout explained that the decisions about Bylaw language that need to be made today are those that are bolded in the "*Bylaws amendments draft 7 22 10*" document that each attendee had as part of their meeting packet. As has been done in the past, he suggested that the group discuss, edit and approve each item starting at the beginning. He reminded everyone that once this is done, the new draft Bylaws can be approved as a whole by each Lead Entity Group according to its procedures, with final Board

approval at the next Board meeting. Following this process, a final draft of the Bylaws was created; see attached document, *"Bylaws final draft 9-22-10."*

John Miller moved and Olson seconded a **MOTION** that the WCSSP Board of Directors recommends to the participating Lead Entity Groups that they approve these Bylaws dated 9-22-2010 without changes. Swartout asked if there were any objections to this motion. There were none.

BOARD DIRECTION REQUEST FROM FISCAL AGENT re: Staff Work Plan

Since Napier is the one who requested this agenda item, Swartout asked her to begin/lead this discussion.

Napier said that, as the fiscal agent for WCSSP, she wanted to check in with the Board about fiscal agent roles and responsibilities, things that she feels comfortable with and things for which she would like more Board direction. Generally, for day-to-day operations or if something specific has been approved by the Board, she signs off on budget expenditures. But she thinks it is important to bring to the Board's attention how much time is being spent on certain things by staff. She said it's not so much what is being done as the amount of time they involve, about which the Board may want to give staff some direction on prioritization.

In particular, Napier said she is seeing lots of Batchelder's time being spent on Lead Entity work and at Lead Entity Group meetings. She acknowledged that, as we create an organization, this can be important; however, in her view, WCSSP's main task right now is writing a Plan. The group can see specifics in the Staff/Progress Reports, in which she thinks the staff does a good job of describing what they accomplish. She explained that a Staff/Progress Report is currently produced by staff whenever Grays Harbor County is about to submit a bill to RCO for reimbursement on the WCSSP contract; sometimes it's bimonthly, sometimes quarterly. If the Board would like a Staff/Progress Report more frequently or consistently, they would need to so direct the staff.

Napier reiterated that her concern is the amount of time Batchelder spends on Lead Entity Group support and meetings. To her the question for Board members to be thinking about is whether this work is key to regional development, or whether it could be reduced as the demands of Plan development increase.

Rich Osborne reported that Batchelder does attend almost every NPCLE meeting, and he thinks it is essential, for two reasons: (1) NPCLE members have lots of questions and concerns about the regional organization and having Batchelder at the meeting answers those questions and alleviates those concerns without bringing them to the WCSSP Board level; (2) Batchelder also constantly reminds NPCLE members of WCSSP activities and the benefits of having a regional organization, which has resulted in a much greater acceptance and commitment to WCSSP by NPCLE members than would be otherwise. If Batchelder didn't come to NPCLE meetings, Osborne could easily see NPCLE saying, "Why do we need a regional organization?"

Napier said these were good points, but she thinks it is unique for each Lead Entity Group and therefore perhaps each LE Coordinator needs to think about whether Batchelder's time is being well spent by attending LEG meetings. It would help the organization if Coordinators and the Board were mindful of

the large number of tasks that staff have in their scope of work, and, if staff presence or assistance isn't critical, let them know.

John Sims agreed with Osborne's perspective on Batchelder attending monthly LEG meetings. But, he also thought that Batchelder would come to the Board asking for direction if he were not completing Plan development tasks because of LEG activities.

Bob Burkle observed that because Napier is the fiscal agent for WCSSP, she can answer questions, etc. at meetings of the Grays Harbor County LEG so perhaps Batchelder's attendance isn't as critical there. Key McMurry said that the nature of Pacific County LEG meetings is such that she thinks Mike Johnson could occasionally ask Batchelder to attend when specific critical issues are being discussed.

Summarizing what she was hearing, Napier said it sounds like generally Batchelder's time is being productively spent. However, she has observed that he also spends a lot of time fielding questions and concerns directly from Lead Entity members. She wonders if this isn't more of a Lead Entity Group function. Is that something the Board wants him to do?

Both Osborne and McMurry disagreed somewhat, saying that their view is that he is fielding regional organization questions and concerns. In response to that, Napier wanted to rephrase more specifically what she meant, that Batchelder had spent time discussing with a Lead Entity member a concern he had about a Lead Entity decision, bringing it to Batchelder as a regional issue. McMurry said that, if she remembered correctly from a past Board meeting, the direction had been that Lead Entity issues should first be dealt with by the Lead Entity, but if that failed, it might come to the Board level; in sum, it should be resolved at the Lead Entity level. Napier said that, because she is the one who sees staff activity reports, she mostly wanted to bring it to the Board as an observation she has had; there may be no easy solutions to what she is observing.

Bingaman asked Napier if there are deliverables that are not being met. She said, "Not yet," but she has concerns. Bingaman agreed with others in that there are times when Batchelder's presence is really needed, so he can represent the Lead Entities to important organizations like SRFB. But if he is coming into Lead Entities to arbitrate LEG issues, that's not appropriate. In his view, Bingaman thinks there are times when it's appropriate for Batchelder to be at LEG meetings and other times when it's not as necessary.

Terry Willis said that although the Staff/Progress Reports document all the things that have been done by staff, it doesn't document the amount of time tasks take and that is what she would like to see. Napier and Dietz clarified that Napier also gets staff's somewhat more specific Activity Reports requesting reimbursement for their time, which documents what they've accomplished in each 8-hour workday. Dietz said that the accomplishments that staff are tasked with are straightforward – develop a regional organization and facilitate completion of a Regional Plan. With these always foremost in mind, and given that everyone seems to think staff is doing a pretty good job, she feels it would unnecessarily consume staff time to more specifically document time spent on different activities.

Napier brought up another related issue, which is when Batchelder helps a Lead Entity with their SRFB submittal or problems on a specific project proposal. Is this something that should be handled by the LE Coordinator, or is this something that the regional staff should be spending time on? Again, she is concerned that the group has underestimated the amount of time it will take to complete a Plan, and

wants the Board to be aware that perhaps there are things staff should not be spending time on. Both McMurry and Osborne said that Batchelder needs to know that he can say “no” and explain that problems need to be dealt with at a Lead Entity level.

Katie Krueger proposed an Agenda item for the next Board Meeting to discuss and better define the role in the regional organization of a member of the public who’s not on the Board. What can the public ask of staff, what is the role of the Board for the public, etc. It also has to do with creating structure in Board meetings. She noted that this is also a discussion that Lead Entities need to have.

Chair Swartout summarized what he was hearing: There is a top priority for staff, which is development of a Regional Plan. They need the flexibility to say “no” when being asked by an individual or a Lead Entity to do something that might jeopardize completion of a Regional Plan, bringing it to the Board if it requires a Board decision.

Krueger disagreed with one part of Swartout’s summary, which is that development of a Regional Plan is the top priority; she thinks it is one of the top priorities, but that presenting projects to the SRFB is another top priority and she thinks that to make a top-notch, intelligent, knowledgeable presentation of projects, Batchelder needs to attend LEG level meetings, project rankings, etc. Sims and McMurry expressed their agreement. McMurry went on to say that it is not Batchelder’s responsibility to fix project proposals or other Lead Entity products.

In response to Krueger, Napier said that, yes, it is Batchelder’s responsibility to do the SRFB presentation; however, that is dependent on Lead Entity Coordinators doing their contractual job is compiling the project proposals, getting them ranked, entering them into PRISM and all other necessary details. Batchelder’s presentation to SRFB is fairly short and is a general, regional presentation, not project specific. For instance, an upcoming SRFB presentation is only for Projects of Concern and it is the project sponsors’ responsibility to make those presentations. Napier said that she talked to Phil Miller of GSRO before this meeting and he reiterated that the Plan is a high priority and that if there are delays past April/May 2011, WCSSP should be concerned.

John Miller said that he thinks and hopes that any complaints that the WCSSP office receives about LEG functioning should be redirected back to that Lead Entity Group. In addition, he thinks that the Board has several responsibilities with respect to WCSSP, including fiduciary, but that one of them is to let the Executive Director act as an Executive Director, which includes knowing when deliverables are due and allocating time and resources appropriately. Napier said she agreed. J. Miller went on to observe that Napier has several hats here, one as representative of the fiscal agent (Grays Harbor County) and another as a member of the Board. He asked that she not let her fiscal agent role leak over into programmatic supervision, because that is a responsibility of the Board as a whole. Napier responded that she is just bringing up items that things she’s concerned about wearing her fiscal hat. The specific examples she’s used are just that, examples only; she has no particular dispute with how any one situation was handled, simply that she has concerns looking at the larger picture.

Swartout observed that perhaps Batchelder has a particular responsibility to “say no” because he is Director of an organization that at the moment has no other funding sources to appeal to for additional staff. Napier added that in her discussions with Batchelder she thinks that he hasn’t felt that he could “say no,” but that what she is hearing today gives him that permission explicitly. Batchelder agreed with Napier’s assessment, and that he finds today’s discussion helpful. Dietz added that she and Batchelder

are also tasked with organizational development, and that is a deliverable that takes time -- involving people, having long discussions, developing a Board within the context of a federation of strong lead entities, etc. She doesn't see as a matter of simply "saying no" at certain junctions.

Napier clarified that now that the Board has had this discussion and directed Batchelder, she is no longer -- as fiscal agent -- going to report on any potentially time-consuming Lead Entity involvement trends she sees; that will be Batchelder's responsibility. Swartout did say, however, that if she sees other things that bother her as fiscal agent, he does still see it as her responsibility as fiscal agent to speak up as she did today. Terry Willis added to this, saying that as a Commissioner of the fiscal agent, she would say that Napier is required to bring forward any problems with meeting deliverables, because this is only one of several contracts that Grays Harbor County has with RCO and the County does not want a delay in meeting deliverables of this contract to reflect poorly on the other contracts. John Miller expressed his agreement with Willis, that is only the responsible thing to do when working with public resources, for the fiscal agent to bring forward concerns.

Osborne reported that he thinks WCSSP is making good progress towards developing a Plan. Dietz agreed, saying that she didn't want the conversation today to give people, especially new Board members, the impression that we weren't making good progress on the Plan; it's a constant "push," but we're getting there.

Swartout said that connected to these issues is a letter that he signed as (then Interim) Chair of the WCSSP Board. He is sometimes not sure what his authority as Chair is in situations like this, so he wanted to describe the situation and get feedback from the Board. Batchelder was asked by QIN to write a letter of support for a project proposal. He called Swartout who, after some consideration, told Batchelder that he felt comfortable signing such a letter in support of Lead Entity activities even though there wasn't time to have the Board approve it, and recognizing that the names of all Board members is on the letterhead.

Bingaman clarified that this was an application for a USFWS grant aimed at building tribal capacity. Specifically, the grant would fund two QIN coordinators, one for salmon habitat restoration and the other for invasive species. Since these are both primary concerns of WCSSP, they felt it appropriate to ask for a letter of support from WCSSP. The quick turnaround was requested because an application deadline was approaching.

Kruger said she would like to create some guidance for situations like this, especially because her name is on the letterhead. Normally the Quileute also apply for these grants, in direct competition with, for example, the Quinault; as it happened, the Quileute did not apply this year. However, if they had, and Batchelder had sent a letter of support for the Quinault, it would've created a conflict of interest and a huge problem for her. She pointed out that the RFP for these proposals was sent out months ago, and there was lots of time for letters of support to be requested, which would've given the WCSSP Board time to consider this support letter. In any case, she thinks that this letter could've at least been emailed out to all Board members for feedback, before sending it.

McMurry outlined a possible solution to this kind of problem, which is that WCSSP write support letters for all the tribes involved in WCSSP who are applying for a competitive grant such as this one. Krueger said that this is an interesting idea, however, it won't always solve the problem because these particular grants aren't always about salmon. In fact, next round the Quileute will be writing a grant concerning

elk. So there would still be conflict of interest because one tribe might be writing a salmon proposal, while a competing tribe might be writing an elk proposal. So, Krueger said she was registering a serious complaint. Swartout acknowledged her valid concerns about conflict of interest.

John Miller concurred that this was definitely a learning lesson. However, in the spirit of learning from it and moving on, he made a **MOTION**: That the WCSSP Board of Directors ratify the action taken by then-Interim Chair Swartout in signing this letter of support for a Quinault USFWS grant proposal on August 27, 2010. Krueger said that she is willing to retrospectively ratify it, but wanted it clearly noted that she is not willing to do so in the future. The motion was seconded by Lee Napier. Swartout asked if there were any objections to the motion. None were heard.

Krueger clarified that if judiciously considered letters of support were sent for non-competitive grant proposal processes (of which there are many), she would not have a problem with supporting them. However, the Board needs to carefully consider approving letters of support within the context of competitive grant processes. It was acknowledged that these are the kinds of conflicts of interest that WCSSP's as-yet-to-be-written Operating Procedures need to address. Krueger said that, in particular, these kinds of issues need to be addressed in a timely fashion. Bingaman said that as these situations arise, he thinks WCSSP, as a regional salmon recovery organization, could support all related proposals, even if they're competitive and several entities within WCSSP are applying for the same funds.

Osborne wondered if one, partial solution to these concerns might be the removal of WCSSP Board members' names from WCSSP's letterhead. Krueger said that that would not solve the conflict of interest concerns, but Osborne noted that it might solve other concerns. Swartout asked if there were any objections to removing Board members' names from WCSSP letterhead. There were no objections.

In an informal conversation about developing WCSSP Operating Procedures, Coni Wilson related her experience with a national group of 65 tribes who had been tasked with writing complex rules related to some federal housing regulations. In the end, they instituted a rule that no one could object to what was otherwise a consensus-based decision unless they were able to put forward alternate wording for consideration.

REGIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Swartout reminded the Board that at their last meeting they had edited and tentatively approved the description, tasks and parameters for the Regional Technical Committee (RTC), asking the LEGs to approve this subcommittee outline as well as nominate members for the RTC.

Bingaman had several changes to propose to the activities of the RTC listed in the document. However, he had received some clarification just the previous evening, so he said he probably couldn't propose actual changes today. He did, however, read through some of them: "provide technical responses to questions raised by the SRFB, IAC, Board of Directors, Lead Entities, Lead Entity governments as needed; provide technical responses to dissenting opinions of committee participants regarding official recommendations."

Swartout reminded the Board that we have a timeline in place such that if we don't have the RTC up and running, and recommending sub-allocation formula(s) to the Board by February 1, 2011, we then default to having a technical group from RCO/GSRO determine a formula for us. If we start discussing major

document changes now, we probably wouldn't have final approval of the RTC outline until November. That will give the RTC only two months to come up with sub-allocation proposals. Given this timeline, Swartout asked whether bringing forward new language at this point was worth jeopardizing making our own decision about sub-allocation. He proposed that the Board tentatively accept the RTC outline as it stands now, in order to get the RTC up and running.

Bingaman said he had no problem with that; he just thinks that there are lots of questions about "regional" projects, about RTC members representing or not representing the Lead Entity Group that nominated them, etc., that he thinks need to be addressed. Swartout agreed, although he thinks that the clause describing members as having "technical and geographical diversity" was the Board's statement about RTC members not representing LEGs, but instead having knowledge of the different geographic areas within the coast region as well as varied technical knowledge.

Osborne reemphasized the need of the Board to have the RTC focus exclusively on the sub-allocation question for the near future. As an ongoing, standing subcommittee of the Board, the RTC will have many tasks and issues to work on over the long haul, about which Board discussion will be required. But for right now, the Board needs them to focus on recommending sub-allocation formula(s). Even if we move forward immediately with the actual formation of the RTC, Osborne thinks that there is barely enough time to complete this one task.

Swartout asked if there were any objections to accepting the Interim Operational Plan (see below) of the Regional Technical Committee as crafted at the August 2010 Board Meeting, in order to put the RTC in place, with the understanding that the outline of tasks, etc, may be modified in the future. There were no objections.

Regional Technical Committee

Interim Operational Plan

Purpose: To provide scientific and/or technical expertise to support decision making of the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Activities: At the direction of the Board of Directors:

- Recommend 2011 SRFB (round 12) sub-allocation formula by February 1, 2011
- Recommend regionally consistent metrics to support WCSSP Board decisions
- Develop and/or review QAQC of regional data and/or metrics
- Participate in technical support and review of the WCSSP Salmon Plan
- Provide technical recommendations of regionally supported projects as needed
- Call in other experts for specific technical advice as needed
- Other....

Membership: As approved by the Board of Directors:

- Contributors will be nominated by the Lead Entities or by WCSSP staff as directed
- Contributors will provide both technical and geographic diversity
- Other contributors from NGOs, state and federal agencies or professional consultants may be nominated by staff

Qualifications:

- Education: Degree in relevant Natural Sciences
- Experience: Work history demonstrating knowledge, understanding and current involvement in technical issues relevant to WCSSP
- Exceptions: Non-degreed experts may be approved by the Board of Directors

- Commitment: Volunteer time to WCSSP, recognizing restrictions on experts' time

Swartout noted that the next task at this Board meeting is to populate the RTC with specific members. Swartout asked if there were any other nominations besides those listed on Batchelder’s PowerPoint list. Krueger nominated Dave King from WDFW, although she hasn’t checked with him on his availability to serve. He has been a fisheries biologist with WDFW for a long time, is extremely knowledgeable and would be a real asset. McMurry nominated Rob Allen, a hatchery expert from WDFW, and Dan Guy, NOAA. Osborne said that we needed to remove Thom Hooper of NOAA who is no longer working in this area. Bingaman said that Quinault were also nominating Ensmenger, Hughes, Metzger, Crain, King in addition to QIN scientists Armstrong, Mobbs (with Conklin as alternate), Jorgensen. In addition they nominated Jean Caldwell; however, she couldn’t serve unless it was a paid position, which it is not. Burkle wondered if there was a technical expert from Nature Conservancy staff who might provide additional knowledge.

In summary the names of those nominated were:

Nominated by NPCLE:

- Mike Hagan, Hoh River Trust
- Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe
- Jeremy Gilman, Makah Tribe

Nominated by PCLE:

- Mike Johnson, Pacific Conservation District
- Key McMurry, Key Environmental Solutions

Nominated by QINLE:

- Bill Armstrong, Quinault Indian Nation
- Mark Mobbs/Chris Conklin, Quinault Indian Nation
- Jim Jorgensen, Quinault Indian Nation

Nominated by GHLE:

- Andy Olson, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
- Terry Baltzell, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force

Nominated by staff and others:

- Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
- Bob Burkle, Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
- Dave King, Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
- Kirt Hughes, Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
- Rob Allan, Wa. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife (hatcheries); President, Pacific County Anglers
- Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service
- Brad Thompson, US Fish & Wildlife Service
- Dan Guy, NOAA Fisheries
- Bob Metzger, US Forest Service
- Pat Crain, Olympic National Park

Swartout stated that his assumption was that those who nominated these individuals were assured that each nominee meets the education, etc. pre-requisites for RTC membership. He asked if there were

any objections to approval of those in the left-hand column. There were none. It was also agreed that we should keep all those listed in the right-hand column as RTC members, since it is likely that several people would not be able to attend a given meeting.

Swartout asked who was going to bring this RTC together, given limited WCSSP budget and staff time. He asked if there is anyone who could effectively serve as sub-committee facilitator in addition to their technical input. Ensmenger was named as one possibility. It was suggested that perhaps someone from The Nature Conservancy might fill that role. Krueger said she objected to this idea because of their method of facilitation. It was also pointed out by staff that they could arrange scheduling, a venue, meeting particulars like that. Swartout said that he does think that the Board needs someone to produce written RTC meeting notes. Krueger said that she takes notes at committee meetings; she wants to also participate in the meetings, but she would be willing to provide her notes. Napier observed that if Krueger provides notes and the staff can arrange meetings, the larger question still remains who will facilitate the discussion and decision-making at RTC meetings? As a first step, it was agreed that WCSSP staff would arrange the first meeting, with the first agenda item being how the RTC will organize itself. If no one agrees to be the RTC facilitator, that will be an agenda item at the next Board meeting.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 18, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY

Bingaman asked that, on page 4 of the August 18th Meeting Summary, his response to Ed Bowen's comment about "fluid" Board membership be added. Dietz said she would do so and bring the August Meeting Summary back to the group for approval. From rereading the Meeting Summary, Krueger was reminded that staff needs to get formal letters from each Lead Entity Group indicating who their designated Board members are.

REGIONAL SALMON PLAN UPDATE

Batchelder reported on the Threats Workshop which was held September 14, 2010, to which were brought the Stresses on salmon viability as identified in previous workshops and Plan work. He explained that Stresses are simply the degraded versions of Indicators of salmon viability. For example, low dissolved oxygen is the Stress related to the Indicator of proper dissolved oxygen levels required for salmon viability. From these Stresses, Threats (the causes of Stress) were determined in the workshop for each habitat, and then ranked according to Scope, Severity and Irreversibility. After the workshop, these rankings are entered into a software program, Miradi, which uses an algorithm which ranks all the Threats across the entire region. The Threats that rank Very High and High are the ones around which Strategies will be developed at the Strategies Workshop in November, although the group can tweak the results based on their knowledge, the realities of being able to actually change a Threat, and other factors. Krueger also pointed out that, at the workshop, different WRIA groups generated the draft Threats for different habitats and, because they have different vocabularies, we will need to sort that out. She also noticed that what some groups called a Stress, other groups were calling a Threat, so the results also need to be reviewed for those discrepancies. These issues need to be settled before we can equitably input the results of the Workshop into Miradi. Batchelder said that he and TNC were carefully tweaking the workshop results to compensate for these factors.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Swartout.

NOTE: There was not enough time at this Board Meeting for the **ANNOUNCEMENTS** agenda item, so Batchelder sent out an email September 23, 2010, with the following announcements that he would've presented at this Board meeting:

The Cost of Salmon Recovery in Washington State

The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office has been compiling information for a report on the cost of salmon recovery (or restoration in Coast parlance) across the state. For the other regions this involved calculating the costs of implementing Recovery Plans. Our Restoration Plan is still being developed so many of the projected costs in the Coast region are derived from estimates from other regions with similar circumstances. Each of our Lead Entities was asked to give us a picture of what funding is available in their WRIAs and staff compiled that information and provided it to Evergreen Consulting who has been contracted to prepare the report for GSRO.

Dennis Canty from Evergreen Consulting would like to meet with any salmon recovery "leaders" in the coast to discuss the information we have on funding sources and the identified funding gaps crucial to salmon recovery. That meeting will be held either October 1 or October 8 depending upon the level of interest and availability of those wishing to attend. Batchelder will be preparing a more detailed package of information which will be distributed through the Lead Entities, but if any of you are interested in participating in this discussion, please let Batchelder know which day you prefer and he will make sure you have the background information. The meeting will likely be held in the Grays Harbor area unless there is particularly strong interest from one part of the region – we can meet wherever is most convenient for the most attendees.

Regional SRFB Review Panel Presentation

On Monday, September 27, 2010, the Region will be meeting with the SRFB Review Panel in Olympia to review and discuss Round 11 Project Proposals. This year the meeting will be focused primarily on the projects that have been flagged with unresolved concerns or that need more information. There are four projects at issue in the Coast – the Sol Duc River Assessment and Outreach, Green Creek Weir Removal (WRIA 24), Mill Creek Fish Passage Project (WRIA 23) and Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Use Assessment. All Lead Entity Coordinators and affected Project Sponsors will be there to discuss the projects and answer the Review Panel questions.

Salmon Stronghold Designations in the Coast Region

The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office has tasked WCSSP Staff with conducting an analysis of coastal salmon stocks recently completed by the Wild Salmon Center to determine which basins may be identified as salmon strongholds. We will be working closely with the Wild Salmon Center using a MARXAN analysis. Batchelder will be attending a preliminary meeting in Portland on September 29th to review the stock information, learn a bit more about MARXAN and begin the work of identifying the criteria and parameters for the analysis. This analysis will be conducted statewide over the next year or more but GSRO wants us to have the opportunity to proceed as quickly as possible considering we have the majority of the state's strongholds in our region. The results may also dovetail particularly well with the completion of our Regional Salmon Plan in the spring.

Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee

The next quarterly meeting of the Steering Committee will be held in Sekiu on October 6. Because all the available funding for facilitation services has been expended, the Administrative Team asked Batchelder to stand in to chair the meeting. The Administrative Team includes a representative from each: Citizens at Lake Ozette, NOAA, Olympic National Park, Clallam County, the Makah Tribe, the Quileute Tribe, WDFW, and WCSSP. Because WCSSP is the only member of the Administrative Team that neither has regulatory responsibilities nor vested interests in the Lake Ozette watershed that can be impacted by Lake Ozette Sockeye recovery actions, Batchelder agreed to take on this role for the meeting. We hope additional funding will be available to continue professionally facilitated meetings in the future

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Jo Dietz