



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

**January 20, 2010**

10 am – 2 pm

A web-based and conference call meeting  
(Participants at various locations, as indicated below)

#### In attendance:

Mark Swartout, Chair, WCSSP (at Montesano)  
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP staff (at Montesano)  
Bob Burkle, WDFW (at Montesano)  
Dana Dietz, WCSSP staff (at Montesano)  
Phil Miller, GSRO (at his office)

#### North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator (at Forks)  
Ed Bowen, Citizen at Large (at Forks)  
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center (at Forks)  
Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe (at Forks)  
Tami Pokorny, Clallam County (at her office)  
John Richmond, Citizen at Large (at Forks)

#### Quinault Lead Entity Group

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator (at Montesano)  
Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation (at Montesano)  
Tony Hartrich, Quinault Indian Nation (at Montesano)

#### Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator (at Montesano)  
April Boe, The Nature Conservancy (at her office)  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County (at Montesano)  
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County (at Montesano)

#### Pacific County Lead Entity Group

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator (at his office)  
Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions  
(at her office)  
Mike Nordin, Pacific County (at his office)  
Faith Taylor-Eldred, Pacific County (at her office)

#### ILA Designated Representatives

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe (at Forks)  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County (at Montesano)  
Faith Taylor-Eldred, Pacific County (at her office)  
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County (at Montesano)

#### **UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

<b>Wednesday, February 17</b>	<b>10 am – 2 pm</b>	<b>Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen</b>
<b>Wednesday, March 17</b>	<b>10 am – 2 pm</b>	<b>Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen</b>
<b>Wednesday, April 21</b>	<b>10 am – 2 pm</b>	<b>Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen</b>

#### Agenda

Chair Mark Swartout asked if there were any additions to the Agenda. Ed Bowen wanted to talk about how the Executive Director speaks on behalf of the region, and the Lead Entities themselves. Miles Batchelder wanted to talk for a few minutes about one issue that we need to address in the near future, the role of the region in the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Implementation.

### **Approval of December 16, 2009 Meeting Summary**

Dana Dietz asked if there were any objections to approving the Meeting Summary of the December 16, 2009 Meeting. There were none.

### **Concern about WCSSP Staff Representing the Region**

Bowen expressed his concern about WCSSP staff serving in representative roles for the region. In particular he wanted to ask the group about staff speaking for the group in public meetings. The example he gave was the recent SRFB Meeting Dec. 10<sup>th</sup> where WCSSP staff were asked several questions by the Board on what was the pulse, what were the ideas coming out of the region, which in his view were not presented correctly and therefore need to be corrected afterwards. Batchelder asked for clarification whether Bowen was referring to his representation of the region or his representation of the Lead Entity Group? Bowen said that it's more of an issue representing the Lead Entity, but it does bring up the issue of regional representation.

Lee Napier said she was confused because she was at the SRFB Meeting and needs to know from Bowen the details of what his issue is. She also acknowledged that perhaps this is not a good topic to discuss at a web- and phone-based meeting. Bowen said he was fine with delaying the discussion; he just wants to get it on the agenda at some point. He agrees that we shouldn't micro-manage WCSSP staff, but on the other hand he doesn't want to have to go back and correct incorrect statements they make on behalf of the region or LEG.

Phil Miller related that when issues like this have come up in a region, the person who has the issue generally speaks directly to the staff person and then, if necessary, if it's a more general issue, brings it up through other organizational units and/or procedures. This is the way, through communication, that these issues are handled in every other region.

Swartout suggested that we postpone this agenda item until our face-to-face February meeting which will also give NPCLE time to weigh in on Bowen's observations and concern. If it's still a concern, we can put it on the February agenda.

### **Position of WCSSP on the Lake Ozette Recovery Implementation**

Batchelder reported that with Lake Ozette moving into the implementation phase, the Lake Ozette Steering Committee was formalized at the January 2010 meeting. He thinks that WCSSP should identify its role more formally and specifically, so he suggests that he invite a representative from NOAA who's been involved (perhaps Rosemary Furfey or Thom Hooper) to our March WCSSP Monthly Meeting to give us a presentation of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan and implementation phase as a way of starting a discussion within WCSSP. Hopefully we would then be able to formally settle on WCSSP's position concerning Lake Ozette. Swartout asked if there were any objections to putting this on the March agenda. Hearing none, he requested that it be added.

### **Financial Report and Proposed Budget Changes**

There were no specific questions about the Financial Report for this month.

Batchelder outlined the items where we have not and/or probably will not have expenditures as high as the budget allows: Mileage, Hotels etc., Equipment Maintenance, Phone and Conferences. The reduction in Mileage and Hotels etc. is based on pro-rating expenses from the first 6 months of the biennium. Equipment maintenance can be reduced because we had unintentionally budgeted for unexpected computer problems twice - in this line item, but also in the contract with Purple Tree Farms. Our monthly phone rate has been reduced because we went from 3 to 2 phone lines. And, finally, staff don't feel that they'll have a substantial amount of time to attend conferences and trainings. ( It was agreed to rename "Conferences" to "Training/conferences" to be clear about this line item.)

These reductions create an unallocated amount of \$10,000 which Batchelder recommended be reallocated to the Planning Process. Combined with the previously unallocated \$43,195 from the General Budget and the \$50,000 Technical portion of the Planning Budget, Batchelder proposed allocating this \$103,195 as follows:

NetMap	\$25,000
ArcGIS	1,500
GIS/NetMap tech assistance	13,500
Technical Writing – Plan	19,000
Facilitation of Plan Wkshps	16,295
Facilitation of Sub-allocation	6,900
Staff: Dana	14,000
Miles	<u>7,000</u>
	\$ 103,195

He is asking for general assent from the Interim Advisory Committee to develop a formal proposal to be presented next month. This includes a proposal for a multi-part contract with Creative Community Solutions (CCS) (John Kliem and Debbie Holden) to, one, co-facilitate the Planning Process with the Nature Conservancy facilitators, and, second, do some of the technical Plan writing, as well as a contract with CCS for facilitation of the sub-allocation process which will be discussed later in this meeting. In response to a question from Terry Willis, Batchelder confirmed that the revised budget did take into account the reduction of per-mile reimbursement from \$.55 to \$.50 per mile. Swartout asked if there were any other questions; Batchelder said staff would bring a formal proposal(s) from CCS for these items to the February meeting.

Batchelder then drew attention to another chart that outlined all the steps in the Planning Process, and how staff time (in the lefthand column), and contracted time and related expense (in the righthand columns) would fulfill these steps. He noted that we can look at this more closely when staff brings a formal budget reallocation proposal to the IAC next month. Meeting participants did not have any questions at the time.

### **Regional Salmon Plan Update**

Batchelder noted that everyone had received the Meeting Notes from the January 5th Planning Committee Meeting. There were a few things he wanted to point out – first, the review and results of the first Workshop. The Planning Committee talked about what went well, what didn't, and how we might improve it in the future.

One of the “solution” items was a series of individual/small group meetings with technical group participants to perhaps be held before the formal First Technical Session tentatively scheduled for the first week in March. The aim of these small meetings would be to integrate the targets that were not chosen into the targets that were – that is, nesting the life-stage targets within the habitat targets.

The other item of concern about Workshop #1 was the facilitation. The Planning Committee decided that we should consider contracting with Creative Community Solutions for co-facilitation services for the future workshops.

The Planning Committee also looked at the potential integration of the NetMap tool into the CAP planning process. Devona Ensmenger of the Wild Salmon Center organized a very informative meeting held in Portland January 11<sup>th</sup> that included Lee Benda of NetMap developer Earth Sciences Institute (ESI), Gordon Reeves of the Forest Service and Mindi Sheer of the NOAA Science Center, both of whom has used NetMap in planning processes, Kara Nelson and others from The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Wild Salmon Center staff, as well as several WCSSP members and WCSSP staff Batchelder and Dietz.

Finally, he noted that there was going to be a Planning Technical sub-committee meeting in Olympia on Friday, January 22<sup>nd</sup> to begin planning the First Technical Session and essentially run through the process of nesting the life-stage targets into the habitat targets. In addition, there will be a presentation by TNC staff from California who have used the CAP process to develop a coho recovery plan based on life stages. In response to a question, Batchelder listed those who would be attending the sub-committee meeting: James Schroeder and Kara Nelson from TNC, Mike Johnson, Key McMurry, Rich Osborne, Devona Ensmenger, Bob Burkle, Dana Dietz and himself. He noted that anybody who would like to attend is welcome.

Ed Bowen wanted to remind the group that when we accepted using of the CAP process for development of our Plan, it was with the caveat that we could adjust it as we felt necessary. So, he’s somewhat concerned when there’s such a short discussion of what, for instance, the California TNC folks might be injecting into our process. As a member of the Planning Committee, Bob Burkle assured Bowen that he was very cognizant of this possibility, and Batchelder expressed appreciation for the reminder from Bowen, and also noted that we had already adapted the CAP process quite a bit to meet our needs. The California salmon plan is one of only two salmon plans done using the CAP process, and the California TNC folks are simply giving a one-hour informational presentation, not actively participating in the sub-committee meeting.

### **NetMap Purchase**

Batchelder noted that everyone had received two documents concerning the purchase of NetMap: a letter from Lee Benda of Earth Sciences Institute (ESI) describing what we would be receiving for the \$25,000 (“ESI NetMap Proposal”), as well as a “NetStream vs NetMap” document that lists the tools we will obtain as part of NetMap. In addition, he displayed the relevant budget reallocation proposal. It includes \$25,000 to ESI to complete the NetMap mapping of all of the 4 million acres in the Coast Region. In addition, it includes \$1,500 for purchase of ArcGIS software for the WCSSP office so we can access this NetMap information, as well as \$13,500 for GIS technical services to add additional data (as yet to be determined) to the NetMap tool.

Rich Osborne pointed out that one of the issues with NetMap is that it does not currently include the estuary component. However, adding estuaries and appropriate tools is a very high priority of ESI for this spring. He reported that he has gotten Benda in touch with Miranda Wecker and Kevin Bennett from UW Olympic Natural Resources Center (ONRC) who are very interested in working with him on developing that component using the Willapa Bay layers that they've already developed. He wanted to let everyone know that this is a very important component that may be taken care of outside of our budget.

In discussion, it was clarified that NetMap training is included in the \$25,000, but that we may need to use some of the staff Training/Conferences line item for ArcGIS software training. It was also clarified that the ArcGIS software we are proposing to purchase will not allow staff to add data layers, but will allow staff to run NetMap tools. Tony Hartrich questioned the \$1,500 price for ArcGIS; Dietz responded that we only need the simplest form of ArcGIS/ArcVIEW 9.2, which is \$1,500, and that this had been doublechecked with Benda and software developer ESRI. Hartrich said we'd also need the Spatial Analyst extension.

Batchelder noted that this NetMap purchase would be for the basics; however if we can provide ESI with additional information such as roads, barriers, and salmon distribution, they will be included as layers in our initial purchase at no additional cost. (Salmon distribution is of course a controversial subject that we may not be able to agree to send to ESI in a timely fashion.) We have budgeted the additional funding to be used to add data layers that we may not be able to provide in time or have yet to be determined in the planning process.

Devona Ensmenger reported that the Wild Salmon Center had just received a \$25,000 grant from the Carolyn Foundation for WSC staff time to work on spatial tool development in the CAP process. This could potentially be used as matching funds for future WCSSP/NetMap funding. In addition, Osborne shared that the Olympic Natural Resources Center (ONRC) is going to be hiring a new GIS technician in Forks. Since the entire coast is the venue of ONRC, there's a good chance that WCSSP will be able to get some help uploading, etc. from this technician.

There were several questions. In answer to one, Batchelder explained that once we have NetMap and if we have the more advanced software, we can upload/adjust data that's specific to a particular area. John Sims asked who/how were we going to control what data goes into NetMap. Batchelder said he hopes that WCSSP will develop a regional protocol to review data and get agreement on what data to input.

Ensmenger pointed out that once a NetMap tool is created by ESI, it is automatically available to everyone, and can be used for a specific locale. Hartrich clarified that there are only a limited number of data sets that will be universal for all 4 million acres of WCSSP area (USGS 10-meter. model, perhaps some precipitation data, State of Washington's 250,000-scale geology layer, maybe the DNR roads layer as the best proxy for roads). Ensmenger added that the layers discussed as priority layers with the most standardization across the region are roads, vegetation layers through IMAP, barriers and fish distribution if we can agree on it.

But there will be localized data sets, for example culvert inventories, Chehalis Flood Authority data, that could be used locally for making decisions, but it won't be universally useful data. One WRIA could enter local data to be used for their specific planning purposes, which means that if there is superior

data for one specific area, it could be used (and supersede) the more universal data in NetMap. Mike Johnson said that the major set of questions is going to remain – how do we plan, prioritize and work as a region when we’re (inevitably) going to be using different data sets in different WRIAs. He’s comfortable with the whole NetMap tool, but it’s not going to remove this basic ongoing question.

Swartout asked what discussion is still needed in order to make a decision about purchasing NetMap. Lee Napier said we need more discussion, including how we implement and use NetMap. She has concerns about how much it’s really going to cost, factoring in the unknown hidden costs. With all of those concerns, she’s reluctant to acquire it.

Osborne remarked that for the planning process, at a bare minimum, we’re going to need some GIS tool to map our targets, etc. So, to him, it makes sense to get a tool like NetMap that will do a lot more, and will do it into the future. He doesn’t know of another tool that would have the layers as uniformly across the region as NetMap.

Miller concurred, pointing out that he’s sure that regions like the Lower Columbia wish they’d had this tool when they were developing their Plan. NetMap is being actively used by NOAA in the Lower Columbia, as evidenced by Mindi Sheer’s presentation at the Portland NetMap meeting. Miller pointed out, and several others agreed, that NetMap is a tool, and, like any tool, decisions will have to be made about how to use it, and care will need to be exercised to make sure it’s used appropriately.

Batchelder summarized that we can get a lot of use out of the basic NetMap we’d be purchasing (for \$25,000 plus the ArcGIS/ArcVIEW software \$1,500). Then, as we decide what other data we want to input into NetMap, we’ll be able to determine how much more that will cost. He said he hoped that by that time, we’ll be in the Implementation development phase of our planning process and will be seeking additional outside funds.

Examples of work using NetMap, for example for the Hoh River, can be accessed on the website, [www.netmaptools.org](http://www.netmaptools.org).

Bob Burkle observed that WCSSP folks had “grilled” Lee Benda fairly intensely at the Portland meeting about questions and concerns, and he thinks that everyone came away thinking it would be a good purchase for WCSSP. Miller pointed out that there is some time sensitivity here; the sooner we have the tool, the more usefulness it will have in the planning process.

Swartout said he wanted to take at least a straw vote to see if we can reach consensus on the purchase of NetMap, or whether we need more discussion. He asked if there were any objections to the purchase of NetMap such that anyone would vote “no” if it came to a vote. Napier responded that as the representative of WCCSP’s fiscal agent, she has stated her serious concerns about budget, but she’s not going to stand in the way of moving forward. She elaborated, saying that all of the members of WCSSP, not just the staff, are going to have to make sure that we deliver a Plan per our contract. Miller put forth that, as the state manager for that contract, he wouldn’t be recommending the purchase of NetMap if he didn’t think that it would substantially support that Plan. Napier clarified that her concern is the expense of NetMap perhaps cutting into the funds we’ll need for facilitating and writing the Plan. Swartout reiterated Napier’s concern about completion being everyone’s responsibility by suggesting that perhaps there be a timeline that the group can use to keep themselves on track.

Dave Bingaman asked Hartrich whether there were other tools available comparable to NetMap and his general assessment of NetMap. Hartrich reported that there are many models and tools available, but that NetMap has the advantage of being GIS-based so as to provide visual output for the analyses done, which is important in getting folks to understand. He is not aware of any other GIS-based system available with the level of tools that NetMap has. He pointed out that ten years ago, the GIS input for a single area necessary for a single watershed analysis would've cost more than this NetMap purchase, which already has the tools developed and will be applicable to any area in our region. It will be a time saver. Mike Nordin concurred; tools such as those in NetMap can be recreated using ArcGIS, but it will save a huge amount of time using NetMap. Bob Burkle reported that he was involved with Puget Sound Recovery Plan development where EDT was used, which was difficult and cost a lot of money. From what he can see, NetMap will provide superior results for less money.

Having had substantial discussion about NetMap, Swartout formally asked if there was any objection to purchasing NetMap. Terry Willis, as a Grays Harbor County Commissioner, expressed her agreement with Lee Napier that she was not going to stand in the way of this decision, but that we need to all stay very attentive to the fact that the group has a contract deliverable that needs to be met. So Swartout divided the question into two connected parts to be agreed upon together: One is that everyone at the meeting agree to do their part to meet the deadline to produce the deliverable, a regional plan. The other is for the region to purchase NetMap. Napier requested that the *January 20, 2010 Proposed Budget Allocations* sheet be put back up onto the screen, so that everyone knows exactly what they're agreeing to, and she can authorize Grays Harbor County to proceed with the purchase. Batchelder clarified that we are currently discussing the three items: "NetMap \$25,000; ArcGIS \$1,500; GIS/NetMap tech assistance \$13,500." Ed Bowen requested inclusion of one caveat which is that when we discuss the funding for Technical Writing, we also discuss what other technical services we may need to complete the Plan. Johnson asked what Batchelder had in mind for the \$13,500 "tech assistance." Batchelder said it was for GIS technical assistance in bringing additional data layers into NetMap to allow us to do analyses we would not otherwise be able to do. In addition, one concern he has is that WRIAs 20, 21, and 24 all have some GIS support they can draw upon, whereas 22/23 do not, and that to make NetMap useful region-wide, we need to make sure 22/23 are not excluded from those region-wide analyses for lack of GIS technical support. In answer to a question from Willis about what appears to be a low dollar amount for Technical Writing of the Plan, Batchelder confirmed that contracted Technical Writing will be combined with 62 days of staff time devoted to non-technical writing and otherwise putting the plan together.

It was agreed by consensus, with caveats mentioned above, to purchase NetMap.

### **Contract for Sub-Allocation Facilitation**

Batchelder defined Sub-Allocation as the process by which the region decides what portion of the annual SRFB project funding should go to each WRIA. It has been a difficult process in past years, and he is proposing (see his "MEMORANDUM re CCS proposal.doc") hiring John Kliem and Debbie Holden of Creative Community Solutions to facilitate the process this year. Batchelder summarized Project Outcomes from Kliem's proposal (see "Proposal – Suballocation.docx"):

1. *Identification of short term allocation approach that is equitable given the available information and data.* This will serve the short term needs of 2010, possibly 2011.

2. *Outline general long term allocation strategy.* This may also inform the Plan, and potentially identify data resources we can use in the future.

Since writing this proposal, Kliem and Batchelder considered further and added a third item:

3. *Develop a standardized process for review of data sets by each Lead Entity to determine their acceptability and consistency across the Region.* “Acceptability” speaks to an issue Willis raised earlier, quality of data. This is a process we need in place as a region to review data.

Kliem suggested a two-fold process to achieve these outcomes:

1. *Key informant interview: one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders.* Kliem offered three options for doing this; Batchelder is proposing the third, which is to do individual interviews in participants’ offices, which would take much less of their time. This means, of course, that the facilitator has more travel time, and therefore this option is more expensive.

2. *A workshop.* The workshop would bring together the results of the interviews. The outcomes of the interviews will dictate the design of the workshop, but it will involve reviewing, discussing, synthesizing and building upon those interviews to create short- and long-term allocation models, and, hopefully, a standardized process for review of data sets.

Proposal for the group to decide on today: Interviews \$5400 plus Workshop \$1500 = \$6900.

Burkle expressed concern that the scope of this is too broad given our immediate need to get the Plan done and decide on a short-term resolution to the sub-allocation question. He thought that we should save the long term items until Plan is done, at which time everyone should be on a much more equal data footing to determine long-term allocation protocol. Miller commented that although he saw a long term component, it mostly looks short term to him, especially given the decision we just made to purchase NetMap as well as development of the Plan.

Miller’s question was what is the relationship of this process to the processes that occurred last year and the year before – will this build upon that, will this be different? If so, how different?

Johnson pointed out that within the coast region, we have never agreed on a sub-allocation process. Using acreage was proposed; Johnson thinks this just isn’t science. He thinks that at some point we need to come up with a sub-allocation process that isn’t acreage or historical spending, but is based on science and is agreeable to everyone. He doesn’t know if we can do that this year, without a Plan and without NetMap in place. Bingaman pointed out that acreage was the only common metric that we had across the entire coast, and that’s why it was presented. He sees this proposed process as basically polling each Lead Entity on what it thinks is appropriate and important, and then coming together. Bingaman thinks that this is a good proposal to hopefully overcome the difficulties that the coast Lead Entities have had every time they come together to try to agree on the sub-allocation process. Johnson clarified that he was saying that he thinks that the process that’s in place now is better than using some arbitrary criteria like acreage, or historical funding.

Responding to Miller’s questions, Batchelder said that he and Kliem would be getting together soon to review all the details of the decision-making process in previous years, so that Kliem will have a clear, detailed picture of the participants’ experiences and issues.

Bowen asked whether the option proposed could also include a general interview with a Lead Entity at one of their meetings; he said he needed his Lead Entity to have the opportunity as a group to be part of an interview. Batchelder said he would take that to Kliem; it might mean cutting back on the number of individual interviews. He confirmed that he and Kliem had talked about group interviews as a possibility but that Kliem listed several reasons why he thinks that individual, confidential interviews would be better, including the fact that interviewees are really free to speak their minds if it's an individual interview (for example, who said what would be confidential, and the process might get at what's under the surface of past disagreements).

However, Batchelder observed that a group interview might work effectively in a group like NPCLE where everyone speaks their mind, and that he will talk to Kliem about that. Osborne agreed that the group format would probably work best for NPCLE. Bingaman said he thinks that Kliem should also interview the Quinault as a group (including scientists, citizens, etc.). Batchelder said we can adjust the proposal to reflect this. Swartout asked whether changing the process as we've been talking about would change the price of the contract. Batchelder said no; it would probably just limit the number of individual interviews.

Burkle observed that in his work with the Lead Entity Groups, he sees each group as being pretty much of one mind on this question. He doesn't think that Kliem would get different responses from different members of any one LE's TRG. Bingaman for WRIA 21 and Osborne for WRIA 20 concurred. Napier said that her observation is that in a facilitated group situation, one person may bring up a topic or idea which then dominates the session, whereas if you do individual interviews, you might get more and different ideas.

Swartout summarized what he was hearing and asked if there were any objections to having Batchelder move forward with a Kliem contract containing the input just provided about meeting with the groups. Unless Kliem has any significant problems with that, we will go ahead and move forward with the contract. Any objection? There were no objections heard.

### **NASSP Letter**

Batchelder reported that he has been asked by NAASP to weigh in on two fronts. One is on the proposal at the Dept of Interior level to put \$2mil into the 2011 USFWS budget for salmon strongholds. The other is on the salmon stronghold legislation itself. He wants to defer the latter question to a major discussion at an upcoming meeting where we might bring a NASSP representative, perhaps Sara LaBorde. However, concerning support of the \$2mil proposed appropriation currently in Congress, he would like discussion, opinion and hopefully approval of writing a letter to Congressman Norm Dicks, Chair of the House Interior Appropriations Committee, in support of appropriating \$2mil to USFWS for salmon strongholds. The letter would contain the following:

- *Express support for inclusion of \$2 million in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service budget of the FY 2011 Interior Appropriations bill for salmon strongholds*
- *Background on the WCSSP partnership and coast region*
- *Statement of need: the challenge of obtaining funds for salmon projects in the coast region and need for conservation of healthy wild salmon populations as a preventive, proactive approach to*

ensure their long term viability. **Note this strategy as a complement to existing recovery efforts.**

Batchelder is asking for a nod of approval to draft such a letter, and send it out for final review before sending it. Krueger asked if the word “protection” could replace the word “conservation.” Batchelder said, “no problem.” Bowen said he wanted a vote of his Lead Entity; Osborne said NPCLE’s next meeting was next week, so Batchelder said he’d try to put together a draft before then. Willis asked what a “salmon stronghold” was. Ensmenger responded, “ An area where salmon populations are still relatively abundant, diverse, and have a fair percentage of natural-origin spawners and intact habitat.” Swartout asked if there was any objection to having Batchelder draft a letter of support as described above. No objection was heard.

Batchelder had a related announcement which is that WCSSP has invited Julie Faulkner, who is the majority party’s staff person for the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, to attend our February Monthly Meeting and explain the “ins and outs” of Interior appropriations so that we understand the process better. She has not responded yet to our invitation; staff will let everyone know when she does. [Note: She has since respectfully declined the invitation, citing time constraints.]

### **Organizational Structure: Bylaws**

Before continuing with review of the Bylaws Sections begun at previous meetings, Krueger had an edit that she observed definitely needed to be added to *Section 3. COMPENSATION*, under *II. Board of Directors*, the addition of “by WCSSP” in the first sentence, as follows:

*SECTION 3. COMPENSATION – Members of the Board of Directors shall not receive compensation by WCSSP for their service as board members, but by resolution of the Board of Directors, may be reimbursed for her or his expenses for attendance at each meeting of the Board of Directors or for expenses incurred on behalf of WCSSP. Nothing herein precludes a member of the Board of Directors from being compensated for their services by other entities.*

This edit was agreed to by all present.

Swartout then suggested that, as we have done previously, we discuss and edit each of the Sections, then he’ll reread what he thought had been agreed upon and asked for any objections. In each instance, there were no objections to the following language (in italics) agreed upon for those sections.

### *III – Meetings of Directors*

*SECTION 1. COMPLIANCE – All meetings will be held in accordance with Chapter 42.30 RCW, the Open Public Meetings Act.*

*SECTION 2. ANNUAL MEETING – The annual meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held during each September beginning in the year 2010. The annual meeting shall occur at such time and place as specified by the Board of Directors for the purpose of making changes to the Bylaws or Operating Procedures, and for the transaction of other business as may come before the Board.*

*SECTION 3. REGULAR MEETINGS – The Board of Directors shall set the time and place for regular meetings.*

*SECTION 4. SPECIAL MEETINGS – Special meetings of the Board of Directors may be called at the request of the Chair or a majority of Lead Entity Groups, by 24 hours notice.*

*SECTION 5. PLACE OF MEETINGS – Locations of meetings shall be set by the Board of Directors.*

*SECTION 6. QUORUM – A quorum for voting shall be at least one Director from each Lead Entity Group.*

*SECTION 7. VOTING PROCEDURES – WCSSP shall take action through consideration and passage of motions or resolutions during meetings of the Board of Directors, provided that each Lead Entity Group has been given the opportunity to caucus during or in advance of the meeting and come to a decision on the motion or resolution.*

*Consensus or unanimity is the preferred method of making decisions and all Directors will act in good faith to reach consensus. Consensus is defined as 100% agreement by the Lead Entity Groups represented on the Board. Consensus votes may be qualified and shall be recorded as follows: Endorsement (“I like it”), Endorsement with a minor point of contention (“basically I like it”), Agreement with reservations (“I can live with it”), Abstention (“I have no opinion”), or Stand aside (“I don’t like this but I don’t want to hold up the group”).*

*If the group is unable to reach consensus, passage of a motion or resolution requires the affirmative votes of at least three lead entities. Any Director opposing the motion or resolution who is outvoted or chooses to allow the motion or resolution to go forward may also include a statement of explanation in the meeting minutes.*

*SECTION 8. VETO FOR CAUSE – If a motion or resolution proceeds to a vote, and a Director feels the proposed action is unlawful or infringes upon co-management jurisdiction, each board position has the right to veto a decision or action for cause. Such cause shall include a statement of justification to be included in the meeting minutes.*

Note that the old SECTION 5. NOTICE OF THE TIME AND PLACE OF EACH ANNUAL, REGULAR OR SPECIAL MEETING was totally deleted.

#### **Assessment of Web-meeting Experience**

The overall rating of using Microsoft Live Meeting for web-based meetings (as we did for the first time at this meeting) on a scale of 1-10 with 10 being “excellent,” was about 6.5. Feedback included the need to get the hand raising capability working, the reminder that we shouldn’t hold web meetings all the time, and the fact that John Richmond and perhaps others didn’t get the log-on information until late last night. It was agreed that it’s a good option when bad weather precludes a face-to-face meeting.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Swartout.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Jo Dietz