



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

**October 21, 2009**

**Grays Harbor PUD, Aberdeen, WA**

10 am – 4 pm

#### **In attendance:**

Mark Swartout, Chair, WCSSP  
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP staff  
Bob Burkle, WDFW  
John Campbell, Coastal Conservation Association  
Dana Dietz, WCSSP staff  
Philip Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery  
Office (GSRO)

#### **North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group**

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator  
Ed Bowen, Citizen At Large  
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center  
Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe

#### **Quinault Lead Entity Group**

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator  
Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation

#### **Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group**

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County

#### **Pacific County Lead Entity Group**

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator  
Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental  
Solutions

#### **ILA Designated Representatives**

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County

#### **UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

Wednesday, <b>November 18</b>	<b>10 am – 2 pm</b>	<b>Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen</b>
Wednesday, <b>December 16</b>	<b>10 am – 2 pm</b>	<b>Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen</b>

### **BUSINESS MEETING**

#### **Agenda**

The agenda was approved as drafted.

#### **Approval of August 19, 2009 Meeting Summary**

Chair Mark Swartout asked if there were any corrections or additions to the Meeting Summary for the August 19, 2009 Meeting. None were heard. He asked if there were any objections to approving them as they stand. There were no objections.

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

Chair Swartout asked if there were any corrections or additions to the Meeting Summary for the September 16, 2009 Meeting. Ed Bowen questioned whether the decision about the composition and decision-making powers of the Interim Executive Committee had been made, and whether even the term "Executive Committee" had been used.

Katie Krueger wanted it on the record that, although she wasn't at the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, she would object to the creation of an Interim Executive Committee composed of the four LE Coordinators (if that did indeed occur) without discussion and vote by NPCLE. She and Bowen agreed that they had not turned over their decision making authority to their Lead Entity Coordinator, which is what they think the Meeting Summary says.

Krueger also wanted to put on the record her extreme concern about local governments exerting authority over sovereigns, the tribes, which she said is what is happening here. Krueger stated that not only should Nancy Allison have told us what was going on, but that Grays Harbor County, since it signed the Interlocal Agreement, which said that they were to be collaborating with WCSSP, also should have talked to us and didn't. She went on to say that the group did not have a role in hiring the two staff remaining, because Allison hired them. Having never seen their resumes, she simply does not know IF they have the skill sets necessary to complete the tasks required. She summarized by stating a formal objection to the way things have been handled and who has been making decisions, including creation of an Interim Executive Committee. She wants to make sure that all decisions are made openly from now on.

Swartout clarified that the Interim Executive Committee was only vested for one month, through today's meeting, at which it will be reconsidered. He also reiterated what he'd said at the Sept. 16<sup>h</sup> meeting, which is that the agreed-upon Guidelines will continue to be followed, guidelines which specify that each Lead Entity has one vote if consensus isn't reached.

In addition, Swartout clarified that the Executive Session simply means that the two staff people will not be present; all other participants in the group will be present for any decisions.

Miles Batchelder assured everyone that the staff is very cognizant of the decision making processes of the group, and are doing their very best to respect that. Ed Bowen gave the examples of the two letters signed by Batchelder during the past month on which Bowen had no say in WCSSP approval and was, in fact, completely unaware of. He pointed out that two months ago NPCLE had asked the Region to write a letter, and it was decided that the staff didn't have time to do proper research to write an effective letter. So he has serious issue with these recent letters being sent without any formal group discussion or decision, whereas NPCLE had formally asked for such a letter.

Lee Napier made the point that the recent letters did not take staff time to research, because they were researched and written by others. Batchelder clarified that one letter was signed by himself as Director; it clearly stated that the letter did not necessarily represent the opinion of the Region. The letter that Swartout signed was to Senator Murray for continued funding of PCSRF. It was distributed to the Lead Entity Coordinators, who proposed some changes, which were accepted by the other COR members. Bowen clarified that he has no concern with the content of the letters, but instead with the process with which they were approved and signed.

Several people expressed that this was a good discussion to be having, and revolves around all the factors that need to be taken into account as the group proceeds with deciding on organizational structure and decision making. As Rich Osborne put it, there has to be a middle ground between micro-management by the larger group that would grind the group's mission to a halt and presumptive decision-making that disregards the authority of the group to decide.

Krueger stated that, in relieving Allison of her duties, the introductory language of section 8.1 of the Interlocal Agreement had not been followed, as it should have been by signatory Grays Harbor County.

The approval of the September Meeting Summary was tabled.

## **Interim Personnel Arrangements**

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION: approximately 10:45 am – 11:00 am**

*Staff persons Miles Batchelder and Dana Dietz were asked to leave the room while the group discussed personnel issues.*

Swartout relayed the decisions that had been made. The first was that the group accepted Batchelder's salary request and that the contract would be through December 30<sup>th</sup>. In Executive Sessions at upcoming meetings, the group will be discussing whether to renew contracts January 1, 2010 or do further interviewing.

The second was that the group would encourage both Batchelder and Dietz to attend training as time and the budget allows. Members are encouraged to forward to the staff any announcements of relevant trainings and workshops. It was also noted that the staff and Napier need to work out the details in the contract to allow for sufficient notice of termination, if such occurs.

### **Proposed Changes to Work Plan**

Batchelder directed everyone's attention to the Report [see attached version revised after this meeting] requested by the IAC and prepared by staff outlining what they thought they could and couldn't do as a two-person office in the near future. He reviewed and explained each item.

There was some discussion about how best to keep the IAC informed of WCSSP ↔ Grays Harbor County communications, issues, procedures. It was generally agreed that, in addition to being very aware of keeping the IAC "in the loop," the following things will help achieve this transparency: monthly Staff Reports handed out at IAC meetings; monthly financial reports at IAC meetings; IAC approval for all contracts before they go to GHC; IAC approval of conference/workshop fees and related travel expenses before they go to GHC; and an informal write-up of Dietz' understanding of GHC procedures. Batchelder said that we should add another bullet to Miles and Dana joint responsibility list, which is Open and Transparent Communication with IAC.

It was also suggested that we need to be open to doing more Outreach, and therefore Dietz should be the point person for that. It was clarified that "MRC" means that Dietz will stay informed of MRC activities in the Region, not proactively participate.

Under Batchelder's responsibilities, it was clarified that WCSSP is solely supporting the facilitation of the decision-making process for the Lake Ozette Sockeye Implementation, and has no actual decision making participation. He will participate in the conference call meetings of the co-leads, and will attend Lake Ozette Steering Committee meetings as observer. Bowen also specifically asked if Batchelder was the point person for any facilitation billing that comes from that group; Batchelder said that he was. Bowen asked if there were any other roles or duties that Batchelder saw himself fulfilling as a co-lead; Batchelder said none, unless he was asked. Bowen stated that if Batchelder's role goes beyond those tasks listed here, that the IAC members involved in Lake Ozette be informed.

In answer to a question from Mike Johnson, Batchelder clarified that there is a contract with Triangle Associates for facilitation for the Lake Ozette Steering Committee. Napier further explained that that contract has been executed; Nancy Allison had told her that the use of Triangle had been approved. Both Bowen and Krueger said that to their recollection, no such contract had been approved by the Steering Committee and that the Co-Leads had not been empowered to contract on behalf of the Steering Committee. This needed to be discussed. It was agreed to do so outside this meeting.

Batchelder continued his review of the staff's outline of a new proposed Work Plan. Bowen asked that the IAC be kept more informed of Council of Regions issues and discussions. Batchelder did report that there was progress with COR in the past month, in that they agreed and put into writing that PCSRF funds are for more than listed species. Everyone was glad to hear that.

It was requested by the group that documents to be discussed at a meeting continue to be sent out as far before the meeting as possible, at least a week. If there are draft documents that come into existence right before a meeting, the request was to email them out and make hard copies for distribution at the meeting.

It was clarified that in relationship to the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership (NASSP), Batchelder's task is to stay informed. Also, he will no longer be able to assist the LECs with posting all projects to the Habitat Work Schedule, so that work is now totally the responsibility of each Lead Entity.

Batchelder also discussed the benefits, from the staff perspective, of having subcommittees to go to for such things as: between-meeting, low-dollar decisions that need to be made; personnel reviews so he and Dietz know where they stand; and, a smaller group to go to IF there are disconnects such as happened between Allison and Grays Harbor County. These committees can then bring relevant items to the larger group in a more objective fashion.

Swartout summarized that, with some changes noted above, it seems that the group agrees with the proposed changes to staff tasks. When those approved changes have been integrated into the detailed Work Plan, Batchelder said it would be distributed to everyone.

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

Chair Swartout asked if there were any objections to the Meeting Summary for the September 16, 2009 Meeting. Hearing none, he declared the September Meeting Summary accepted as drafted.

### **Financial Report**

Concerning the \$7000+ expense under Office Supplies, staff explained that Allison's understanding was that she could expend excess '08-'09 funds in the month of July '09. The Grays Harbor County Commissioners came to a different conclusion, and posted the expense to the 2009-11 budget. Dietz noted that we do have a large supply of paper, cartridges, and pens for the upcoming biennium.

Dietz noted that the financial report for upcoming meetings will include not only the WCSSP core operating budget of approximately \$488,000, but the additional \$100,000 for planning.

Staff asked whether the financial sheet, report and opportunity to ask questions meets the needs of the IAC for a monthly Financial Report. Dave Bingaman made the suggestion that there be an additional column indicating how far through the biennium we are, and what percentage of each line item has been spent so far, so that these two can be compared for tracking purposes. The group liked Bingaman's idea, and was otherwise satisfied with the Financial Report, with the addition of the \$100,000 Planning budget.

### **Proposed Budget Changes**

Swartout recommended to the group that we discuss and approve each line item sequentially, from top to bottom. [See attached Revised Budget 2009-2011 for changes approved at this meeting.]

### **Staff**

#### Staff salaries

No objections.

Travel (mileage): In view of the encouragement staff were given to attend trainings, workshops and other professional development, it was decided that the overall Travel (mileage) should be increased to \$20,000 and that, if there is a good, daytime presentation (e.g., drive to Olympia and back), the group is comfortable with staff

making the decision to attend and charge mileage for such. In this case, staff were asked to send out an email to the IAC beforehand asking if anyone has a major concern about them attending.

Hotels, meals, parking: Bowen proposed increasing it to \$3,000. No objections heard.

### **Professional Services**

Swartout pointed out that these are all new line items. Batchelder said that these were all outside services that would help the organization operate with a 2-person staff.

Administrative Temp: 4 weeks (160 hours) per year; \$5,600.00. Frees up Batchelder and Dietz time, allows flexibility, without adding a third staff person. No objections heard.

Purple Tree Farms, our website designer: \$4200.00 both for website improvement and for computer repair, based on 5 hours a month at \$40 per hour for the remaining months of the biennium. No objections.

Napier pointed out that in the future the GHC BoCC wants more input from the IAC, preapproval of contracts such as these. In addition, Krueger offered to review contracts, look for things that might be a problem. Napier said she'd like to take Krueger up on the offer, since Krueger is not only an attorney but also knows WCSSP and its history.

Batchelder summarized the remaining new line items, saying they all involved facilitation services: for the Plan Workshops; for the SRFB sub-allocation process; perhaps for the process of deciding upon an Organizational Structure; to obtain legal assistance and advice in setting up a new organizational structure; and, to retain an accountant if we do so. Krueger stressed that, if we become a non-profit, it is of critical importance to hire an experienced accountant and meet all reporting requirements. In addition, all of the Needs Assessment workshops spoke to the need for a Data Steward, so that perhaps that is one way the Region could support the Lead Entities.

In particular, The Nature Conservancy has asked us to consider hiring an outside co-facilitator to work with them and us in our Planning Workshops. In general, the group approved of the idea of supporting TNC's request to hire a co-facilitator. Before they give final approval for a specific contract, the group asked the staff to get a total of two or three bids for Planning co-facilitation services for Workshop #1, and ensure that all those who bid are certified in the CAP planning process, but are not currently TNC employees.

Swartout recommended that, after we've reviewed and perhaps altered the rest of this Proposed Budget, that staff put the excess/remainder in overall Professional Services. No objections.

Staff asked permission to continue to pursue free assistance from Washington Attorneys Assisting Community Organizations (WAACO); they would likely be able to clarify for us the legal ramifications of creating a "sister" non-profit corporation, but also what facilitation services are available and needed, for example, to create bylaws. No objections.

Swartout mentioned the presentation at the Chehalis Basin Partnership this coming Friday by Nisqually Foundation's Justin Hall and Hood Canal Coordinating Council's Scott Brewer. They will be addressing these issues

.

### **LEGs**

The amounts have historically been different, and were previously agreed upon. One clarification: Sims used to be representative to the Council of Regions (COR), so when that stopped, the Quinault amount was reduced.

## **Office**

Mostly straightforward expenses, for example rent is on a month-to-month agreement at \$1000 per month. It would be \$750 for two offices. Dietz recommended that we keep three rooms for right now. Until the group decides future staffing, it was agreed to keep the three offices. Batchelder noted that if we get rid of the third office, we'll have some furniture to deal with. No objections heard to Office expenses as outlined in Proposed Budget.

## **Technical**

It was recommended that Technical be combined into "Professional and Technical Services." No objections.

## **Miscellaneous**

Conferences: McMurry and Bowen proposed increasing it to \$5,000. No objections heard.

Napier clarified that any overnight travel requires GHC Board of County Commissioners' approval, which means that the IAC needs to approve any overnight travel of WCSSP staff. In addition, any conference fee over \$100 would require GHC BoCC, and therefore IAC, approval.

### Meeting Space

Batchelder explained that this \$1000 is for renting space to hold meetings, for example Planning Workshop #1 tentatively scheduled for December 8<sup>th</sup> will cost \$250 for Lake Quinault Lodge.

### Professional Materials

This has zero budget because we bought brochures, etc. in '08-'09 budget year.

### Web Meetings and Conference Calls

Dietz said she needed to get IAC approval for a web meeting contract, \$56.80 a month (\$2820 for the remainder of the biennium) for as many web meetings as we want. The enhanced audio \$.05 per minute per connection is pay-if-we-use.

Any objections? None heard.

### Refreshments/meals

This \$4000 is to provide working lunches at the all-day planning workshops, \$9–10 per person. No objections.

## **Needs Assessment**

Devona Ensmenger gave a quick overview of the current status of the Needs Assessment.

She asked everyone to review the 11-page Report and the online e-Library [http://wcssp.org/WCSSP\\_library/index.html](http://wcssp.org/WCSSP_library/index.html) between now and November 18<sup>th</sup> when it becomes public.

Staff agreed to distribute the Microsoft Word version of the 11-page report to everyone. This is first draft; there are some typos, there are some corrupted files and there are document files not yet uploaded into the e-Library. Please submit all corrections and additions to staff. Any documents suggested for inclusion need to be in the form of the complete document in electronic form.

Are any core documents missing? The e-Library is a living library which will continue to grow. It currently has 20,000 pages. There is a file for each LE, with a bibliography, then an annotated bibliography, and links to the complete documents.

Phil Miller pointed out the discrepancy between the 14 Quinault documents actually in the e-Library versus the statement in report that the Quinault workshop did not identify any documents.

Miller also noted that there are several data needs identified in this project report. Since WCSSP needs to expedite a process soon to determine the best way to use the \$50,000 Technical part of the Planning budget, it would make sense to determine which of these identified data needs would be best to address with the \$50,000. A small committee was identified to bring recommendations back to the group by our December monthly meeting: Devona, Key, Katie, Rich, Miles, Dana and Phil (for the purposes of guidance about contracts over \$20,000). Criteria for this assessment might include: Is it something that can be done in a timely fashion and valuably used in the current Planning process? Is it currently affordable? Is it of a nature or scope that it might better be added to the Plan as something to do in the future as part of implementation? The recommendation should probably include only a couple items, but should include the committee's rationale for its choice(s).

Ensmenger related that Dr. Gordon Reeves of the Pacific Northwest Research Station for the Forest Service, based out of Oregon, has received stimulus package funding to complete all NetMap layers for all coastal watersheds that contains federal land. This would not be all watersheds, but would be perhaps half of them. She suggested that this might be one option to consider supporting.

Bob Burkle asked if SalmonScope was not mentioned because it was toxic because SaSI is in it – or was it just not mentioned? Ensmenger said it was just not mentioned, perhaps because it's an online tool, not an electronic document.

## **Planning Workshop #1**

Batchelder said that a decision is needed by this group to sanction Planning Workshop #1 tentatively being held December 8<sup>th</sup>. In response to a question, he said there was no dissention within the Planning Group for proceeding with Workshop #1. Bowen asked that the invitee list be sent out to the IAC for purposes of their oversight responsibilities. Sims suggested that a short paragraph explaining Workshop #1 be sent with this list. Batchelder noted that, although there's an invitee list, no one would ever be excluded from participating.

## **Meeting Logistics**

Swartout noted that the group needs to address some logistical problems. One is that we're not getting through our agendas, and this is slowing up action on items for which we have deliverables. Another is getting beyond micromanaging. He asked for suggestions. Shorten agendas? Put critical topics first on the agenda? Make agendas more realistic? Have additional meetings? Create partial bylaws that outline the nature of decisions that sub-groups (Planning Committee, staff, the Chair and Co-Chair) can make?

It was agreed that if staff has decisions that need to be made in next 30 days, they consult with Swartout, who can say "go ahead," or send out request to everybody via email, with tight deadline for responses. [This latter option has since been nixed by Krueger's observation that decision making in this fashion would violate the Open Meetings Act.]

Krueger recommended that all documents be sent to the entire IAC, not just Coordinators. No objection. Swartout directed staff to do this for the next 30 days.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Swartout.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Dietz