



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

April 21, 2010

10 am – 2 pm

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

In attendance:

Mark Swartout, Chair, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP staff
Bob Burkle, WDFW
Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP staff
Phil Miller, GSRO

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator
Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe

Quinault Lead Entity Group

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator
Terry Willis, GHC Commissioner

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

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

ILA Designated Representatives

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe
Terry Willis, GHC Commissioner

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Wednesday, May 19	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, June 16	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

WELCOME

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone to the meeting.

AGENDA

Miles Batchelder reported that late yesterday afternoon we'd received feedback on our draft Bylaws from the WAACO (Washington Attorneys Assisting Community Organizations) attorney Judy Andrews. Because this might have generated some items to discuss today, it was agreed to proceed as quickly as possible through the first items in the Agenda. Otherwise, there were no changes to the Agenda.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 17, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY

Dana Dietz explained that she had simply recorded the draft Bylaws language as agreed upon by the group, but that Ed Bowen had suggested that there were some Bylaws discussions that needed to also

be recorded. Therefore, she had added these discussions to the February Meeting Summary in a second draft. Chair Swartout asked if there were any objections to the approval of the second draft of the February 17, 2010 Meeting Summary. There were none.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 17, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY

Ed Bowen pointed out a few corrections to the draft March Meeting Summary, which Dietz made. Others at the meeting agreed with Bowen that at the March meeting, it was a formal motion, approved by the IAC, to tentatively accept the draft Bylaws and pass them out of committee for individual Lead Entity Group endorsement. So, Dietz added to the March draft Summary a statement to that effect, as Bowen outlined: *“It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to pass out of committee the draft bylaws as they stand and forward to the Lead Entities for comment, in hopes of obtaining LEG approval to sit a Board by April 2010 regional meeting (normally referred to as the IAC meeting).”*

Swartout asked if, with the Motion (*in italics above*) added to the March Meeting Summary, were there any objections to approving the Summary. There were none.

In addition, the group asked that Bowen’s comment about the Mission Statement section of the Bylaws be added to the meeting summary for today’s meeting in order to preserve it as a future agenda item:

Ed Bowen noted in response to the March Meeting Summary that *“the draft bylaws were passed out of the IAC committee without addressing/discussing the suggested Mission Statement. He said that changes had been submitted through the NPCLE IAC membership and WCSSP director in the days that followed the March meeting; however, no conclusion/amendment to the draft passed out of committee was decided on. Bowen stated that this may become a significant hurdle to overcome to reach a timely lead entity approval of the bylaws, and the desire to sit a board by the April meeting.”*

MEETING SCHEDULE and LOCATIONS

Batchelder proposed that one Monthly Meeting a year be hosted by each Lead Entity, to be held within the Lead Entity area – one a year in Forks, one a year in Taholah or Quinalt, one a year in Chehalis, Centralia or Montesano, one a year in South Bend. Miller asked about the status of the use of web-based meetings. Lee Napier thinks that regular use of web-based meetings is not productive, although it’s good to have the capability for those who would otherwise be unable to attend. Katie Krueger agreed in part (having some web meetings is OK), adding that she thinks this is an effective group partly because we have, and have had in the past, mostly face-to-face meetings. Rich Osborne added that, when we did have a web-based meeting, it just wasn’t the same quality communication as a face-to-face meeting.

Swartout made the point that, although it would be great to include local issues, concerns and information in a Monthly Meeting, it is unlikely that we would regularly have time to add this to our Agenda. However, Krueger said, on behalf of an absent NPCLE citizen, that we need to distribute the traveling responsibilities a little more, and we need to become at least a little more familiar with each other’s regions, even if it’s only by visiting them for a meeting. Several expressed the desire to know more about on-the-ground activities in areas other than their own; it was thought that the idea of doing field trips should be raised in the future. Batchelder thinks all of these are decisions to be made by the Board once it is in place; he was bringing it up today for members to think about.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Dietz pointed out that a separate section has been added to the financial report (in blue) that summarizes in one place all the budget numbers that we have designated for the Planning process (whether they come from the “General” or “Planning” parts of the budget). This will allow us to more easily keep track of our actual planning process budgeting.

Terry Willis asked if there was any concern about line items that had been expensed at a faster rate than time was progressing. Batchelder said “basically no.” There were a few items (personnel and office supplies) that had been more heavily spent in the early part of the biennium, so their percentages are high, but are decreasing as time goes on. In addition, some of the Lead Entity percentages are high, but he has talked with those Lead Entities and been assured that participation will not be curtailed.

REGIONAL SALMON PLAN UPDATE

Batchelder reported that at the there was a Planning Committee Meeting in Montesano on April 6th that reviewed the First Technical Session held on March 23rd in Neilton. That latter did not accomplish everything that we had hoped; however, it was a very good session. The Planning Committee Meeting dealt mostly with how to accomplish the tasks not completed at the Technical Session without having another technical workshop. A very detailed schedule for completing the tasks was developed, which is outlined in the Meeting Notes from the April 6th Planning Committee meeting. These Planning Meeting Notes will be distributed to everyone.

Napier asked whether homework assignments from that Schedule were being done in a timely fashion. Batchelder said that we were a little behind because of other tasks, but that he thinks we can catch up.

He did note that each member of the Planning Committee has been asked via email to submit to him names of people who they would recommend as members of the Plan Technical Support Group. He has gotten some responses, but is waiting for further suggestions, so he encourages people to get him that information. We need to establish this Plan Technical Support Group, so please respond as quickly as possible. Rich Osborne asked for clarification about what will be asked of members of this Plan technical group versus the technical team that was discussed at the sub-allocation workshop. Batchelder said that, although there may be some overlap in membership, the tasks of the groups are separate. We are not necessarily going to ask the members of the Plan Technical Support Group to come together in meetings; instead we will send them planning products to review, perhaps even going out and sitting down with them to get input. The Regional Technical Review Team is something that needs to be established once a Board is in place.

Batchelder summarized: The **Plan Technical Support Group** is something that the Planning Committee decided to create at their April 6th meeting. Its specific purpose is to review Plan products and to provide technical information and judgment for the CAP process viability charts that we call the “TAIM” chart; TAIM stands for Targets, Attributes, Indicators and Measures. It is a very specific set of tasks. Then, as the planning process progresses, we’d like to be able to call on them to review future Plan products. Again, this would involve very few, if any, meetings, but instead reviewing documents at their desk.

The other group that we're talking about is a **Regional Technical Review Team**. There is no proposal out there for the creation of this Team, but it has been talked about several times, most recently at the Sub-allocation Workshop held April 8th, as something we need in the Region.

Miller noted that we might find, as we proceed, that these groups become one, but for the moment we need to stay focused on our short-term Plan needs to get help from respected technical experts to provide input to the TAIM chart and then review of it. He went on to say that as gaps in the chart become evident, we can target getting those gaps filled. Once the chart is complete and we have a critical mass of experts who've reviewed it, we can proceed. The Plan Technical Support Group is a short-term need, whereas the Regional Technical Review Team is needed to serve ongoing regional needs. Osborne agreed, listing not only sub-allocation but also QAQC and decisions about what we input into NetMap. He asked what other tasks were envisioned, so that when he talks to potential technical members he's clear. Batchelder clarified that, at this point, we're only asking for Planning technical assistance with specific tasks outlined and these can be technical experts who are not necessarily involved at the Lead Entity Group level.

Napier is concerned that she won't be able to recruit technical experts who know her region because she is so limited within her own LE's technical review group already that she can't "give them up" for regional needs. Osborne concurred with this experience and also pointed out that we haven't satisfactorily defined what we mean by "technical expert." Miller responded by confirming that the sources of technical data will be clearly identified so that others can judge whether it's respectable data/judgment or not. Osborne thinks we need to have a simple discussion about what is the minimal expertise that we need for our Plan. Who do we need: a fisheries biologist, a habitat ecologist, a nearshore expert, an ocean expert? Mike Johnson thinks selection should be by LEG, based on our "Federation of Strong Lead Entities," and hopefully we will end up with the range of expert knowledge we need. Krueger added that there are people, like herself, who do not have a specific credentialed background (for instance, as a salmon biologist) but do have years of salmon experience and knowledge within the region, and therefore can provide valid input even though their title (for instance, natural resources attorney) would not fit within a list such as Rich is suggesting. She pointed out that some of them have experience in fields not reflected in their current title (e.g., she is also a geologist with experience in that profession.) Key McMurry agreed, adding that she thinks there is a lot of technical expertise within our group that tends to get ignored.

Miller expressed hope that we keep the Planning process and the sub-allocation process clearly separated, clearly differentiating the kind of information each process is looking for. Batchelder observed that it's unfortunate that they are happening simultaneously because this causes unnecessary confusion. Johnson asked Miller if he had any suggestions. Miller said he yes, he did -- reduce the sub-allocation process to as simple a process as possible. WCSSP and everyone who is part of WCSSP will be much better off with a Plan in place that, over time, helps refine the sub-allocation process.

Napier expressed her concern, both as a LE Coordinator and as fiscal agent, that technical assistance won't come forward in a timely fashion. What are we going to do then? Batchelder said he shared her concern.

Johnson observed that our strategic plans have come a long way in the last ten years, and he thinks perhaps we're making this planning process too complicated. His original thoughts about a plan were that we would look at the four LEG strategies, leave the specific technical parts to them, and create a

broad-based, overall plan that recognized each area, what was important, what was similar, what are the main projects we should be working on.

Swartout said he thought this was a good discussion, but one that perhaps is more appropriate for the Planning Committee. Osborne just wanted to encourage us to create a small Plan Technical Support group that can get the task done, perhaps like Bob Burkle and Dana Dietz did the original draft of the TAIM chart. Many people expressed agreement with this.

NETMAP TRAINING

Batchelder reported that the list was complete of those who will be attending the NetMap training on April 29-30, starting at 9 am at the US Forest Service in Quinalt. About 36 will be attending. He will put out an email in the next few days with specifics of what you need to bring, etc. Everybody who has requested to attend has been given a spot. Bob Burkle said he will not be able to attend.

LAKE OZETTE SOCKEYE RECOVERY

Batchelder reported that the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC) met recently and made a specific request to WCSSP:

“The Lake Ozette Steering Committee requests WCSSP to consider increasing the weight of the ESA listed criterion used to develop the sub allocation formula for the region.”

Krueger wanted it noted that she could have vetoed this, but chose not to (i.e., abstained) in order to allow the position of the majority of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee to be heard. It is very much against what the Quileute believes is best for the fish, including within WRIA 20. Both WCSSP and NPCLE have espoused over and over again that we want to “Protect the Best”. Rather than give special emphasis to the sockeye population in Lake Ozette, we want to address concerns of all runs in WRIA 20 and elsewhere, lest the runs that are not yet listed but are on the brink become ESA listed. Phil noted that whichever way this group decides on this request is consistent with State policy.

John Sims suggested that we respond with a statement:

“Be assured that when SRFB project grant applications are submitted from the Lake Ozette area, they will be given appropriate consideration.”

Sims doesn't think we should get any more specific than that, but he thinks that this will tell them that they were listened to. Krueger pointed out that, indeed, last year, a Lake Ozette project was chosen and is being funded. The group agreed to send such a statement on its behalf to the Lake Ozette Steering Committee in response to their formal request.

Batchelder raised a second item concerning the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC), which is that Grays Harbor County's contract (on behalf of WCSSP) with Triangle Associates for LOSC meeting facilitation ends June 30, 2010 even though all of the funds may not yet be expended as of then. There may be funds that could be “rolled over” into an extended/new contract. He asked the group how they wanted to handle this situation. Miller said that GSRO requests that the group extend the contract with the remaining funds. Napier asked whether LOSC wants the contract extended; Batchelder said “yes.” There were no objections to extending the LOSC contract past June 30, 2010.

Napier asked and Batchelder confirmed that the recent LOSC meeting was facilitated by Triangle Associates, so a draft meeting summary will be produced shortly. Another LOSC meeting date has not been set.

SUB-ALLOCATION PROCESS UPDATE

Batchelder reported that the sub-allocation workshop held on April 8, 2010 did not result in a recommendation to this group for the sub-allocation for this year, so we still have to make that decision and do not have a clear procedure to do that. What he wants is a decision about sub-allocation; he'd like to get as close as possible to a decision, with a procedure in place for finalizing the decision. Terry Willis asked for clarification, that "sub-allocation" concerns the funds that come through SRFB for projects on the ground. This was confirmed.

McMurry asked what procedures other regions use for the sub-allocation process, all of which seem to cause a lot less struggling than we go through. Swartout responded that the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) actually had a huge problem resolving this issue. The procedure and formula for the original sub-allocation was the only item that has ever come to an actual PSP vote; that is, it couldn't be decided by consensus. In fact, the proposed formula only won by a fraction of a vote.

Puget Sound Partnership issues included: whether each LE gets some funding so they can continue to exist; how to factor in the existence of listed species in some Lead Entity areas, none in others; how to factor in the fact that each area has different amount of marine shoreline and different amounts of freshwater streams/rivers. Terry Wright of NWIFC came up with an allocation formula that took all these factors into account which the group approved. The formula includes: giving an equal partial percentage to each LEG, plus a percentage based on miles of freshwater habitat used by salmon, plus a percentage of nearshore miles, with the remaining percentage distributed based on Puget Sound studies of how threatened different salmon stocks are. He noted that this formula only deals with Chinook because it was the only listed species at the time.

From his PSP experience, he recommends making sure to keep both technical and policy people in the development and decision making.

Krueger reiterated something she'd said at the sub-allocation workshop, that there is a problem with the formula we've been using; however, she's willing to table reconsideration until next year when we'll have a Plan in place. One problem she sees with the current formula is the simplistic use of stream miles because streams are in different states of degradation which isn't reflected by simply using stream miles; therefore, we're not responsibly allocating funds if we simply use stream miles. We need to develop stream degradation metrics, which obviously we're not going to accomplish this year.

Sims extended apologies from Dave Bingaman and Jim Sellers for not being able to attend today due to a meeting in Albuquerque. They did, however, develop a Quinault position statement concerning sub-allocation, which Sims read into the record:

Since we cannot agree on metrics based on science and consistency across the region with which to base the allocation formula upon, and the original scientific approach was never finalized and past decisions have been based upon political decisions and the lack of time to come to consensus, and errors in process have continued to be promoted, and again we find ourselves against a deadline, WRIA 21 proposes to

just split the regional allocation evenly among the four Lead Entities. This method is no less fair than methods used in the past.

Osborne asked Miller and Swartout if there are other regions where there are multiple WRIAs within one Lead Entity, and, if so, how do they deal with the sub-allocation process? The answer was yes, there are Lead Entities with more than one WRIA. Swartout related that Pierce County Lead Entity, which has two WRIAs, was given only one part, not two, in the formula he outlined previously. However, only one of those WRIAs has Chinook, so it's not really a good comparison to the Grays Harbor LE where both WRIAs have salmon.

Napier pointed out that in terms of land area, the Grays Harbor Lead Entity, which encompasses two WRIAs, is twice as big, so she questioned how the Quinault proposal is equitable. Grays Harbor chose to work as one LE on one watershed, even though it's split into two WRIAs. They would be penalized for this if the funding was based on splitting it only four ways. That would not be equitable in their view.

Miller said that the State would not support the Quinault proposal; it has no basis in its relationship to the physical circumstances of fish in the Region. In his discussions with Dave Bingaman, the latter indicated that he did not expect a final decision to be made at today's meeting. Miller's assumption is that positions can be changed until the final decision is made. It is not until December when the Region's proposal goes to the SRFB and the final decision is made. In response to a question by McMurry, he said that the State would find it disappointing if the Region's recommendation was based simply on dividing the funds 4 or 5 ways, and he didn't think it would be received very well by SRFB. He suggested that they would have to start second-guessing what projects are worth funding.

Napier related that when she was part of the Regional Allocation Task Force in 2006-07, they declined to allocate funds to the Coast Region because they needed to reward those who had gone through a planning process and had some accomplishments under their belt. She thinks that an unintended consequence of not giving SRFB a sub-allocation proposal and project prioritizations would be a loss of funding. She didn't hear Miller say this, but, given her experience, she thinks this is a possibility. Krueger commented that, if SRFB did this, it would be irresponsible because it would be political and not relate to fish well-being.

Krueger asked Sims to take back to his group the idea of this year using estimates of stream miles that approximate a total, since the completion of mapping seems to be the problem. She is willing to live with a good estimate, and others in the group should think about it also. Osborne pointed out that last year Tony Hartrich did some figures based on extensions, and the group accepted those numbers. It's just that some additional precise measuring hasn't been completed. Osborne thinks that Hartrich would provide credible estimates that the group would accept, and that that would be a good solution for this year. McMurry agreed that this would be an acceptable solution.

In order to come up with a process for deciding the sub-allocation formula, Swartout strongly recommends first deciding on the broader criteria and metrics, then deciding the percentages for each criterion. He said that if the group gets to the point of arguing about percentages, you've actually come a long way. (He noted that sometimes, if you get to the point of arguing about percentages, and work with the actual numbers, you'll find that the amounts of money aren't that different.)

Miller agreed that deciding on two or three metrics that are most important is a good way to proceed; it “passes the test” that you’ve thought about what the allocations should be based on. The other part of the test is whether it is fair and therefore acceptable to the parties. He thinks that the issue of stream miles is, for the Quinalt LE, a matter of fairness, and residue from past unfairness. The unfairness can be corrected, but you may not be able to make up for it. It strikes him that there’s a fairness issue that needs to be resolved now and as the group moves forward. Once current fairness is achieved, then the group can deal with LEGs accepting the allocation. If, for instance, a formula is thought to be unacceptable because an LEG didn’t get enough – Miller says, “No one ever gets enough.” Or is it something that’s seriously skewed, in which case that needs to be examined. Beyond this type of analysis, the Region is “getting too far in to the weeds,” spending unnecessary time in relationship to the outcome.

Krueger related something that the NOPL policy group has done which she hopes this group will consider in the future: recommending to fund projects in areas that in the past have not been funded, to balance out rewards regionally, assuming that the project is, of course, technically qualified.

Miller added that the Coast Region in the future will be developing tools that will improve the allocation process and will convince funding sources to give it additional funds. In the larger picture, he noted that the State is currently working on two types of funding information: one is an overall strategy for salmon recovery project funding, both statewide and regionally, based on things like cost information, current funding sources, and preferred options for filling funding gaps in project allocations. The State will create a placeholder in that process for the Coast, even though it doesn’t yet have a Plan, so that information can be plugged in once it’s gathered. The State will be asking Coast leaders in salmon recovery for their thoughts on preferred funding based on assumptions about recovery costs. Since the Coast is the least funded region in the state, it has gaps to be filled and leaders will be interviewed about their thoughts and preferences for funding. This information may result in reconsiderations by SRFB for the 2012 project funding grant round.

The second analysis being done, according to Miller, is of all operating costs, from whatever sources, that maintain the salmon recovery organizations – the Region, each Lead Entity, the planning process and groups. A report will be required by September 2010. This will provide an overall picture of current funding. This will be available to SRFB for their May 2011 decisions about funding. This will open up the possibility of again asking whether SRFB has the right allocations across the state. What WCSSP is doing here, both in its planning work and its interim sub-allocation decision, is paving the way for its influence in this discussion and resulting decision. This is true for not only SRFB discussions, but national discussions. We hope to have stronghold funding in the not-too-distant future across the Pacific Coast; the Coast Region is the stronghold in Washington State. There are other funding sources that would be interested in stronghold support, and are in fact more interested in stronghold work than ESA work. You would have more influence working as a Region than working as individual LEGs. If you are Balkanized and are fighting with each other as Lead Entities, you will have less influence. Swartout asked that his last statement of Miller’s be underlined in the Meeting Summary. Miller pointed out that there are private foundations that care more about WCSSP than any other area in the State – why do you think The Wild Salmon Center is contributing so much, why do you think The Nature Conservancy is contributing so much, why do you think north coast watersheds have been designated as Salmon Strongholds and areas in the south coast are being considered?

As a planner, Swartout noted that he learned a long time ago that disagreement in a group is critical to its success, whereas everybody getting along is not. It is part of developing good working relationships. Osborne also pointed out that it increases critical thinking.

Sims related that the Quinault were just very disappointed at the progress made at the sub-allocation workshop.

To wrap it up, Swartout said he thought this was a very good discussion, and provides a good foundation for coming up with a sub-allocation decision by September based on both a technical input and policy considerations. Johnson expressed his appreciation for Swartout and Miller's perspective having worked elsewhere in the State, giving examples of how our process is not that different than others in the State.

Johnson also wanted to say that, although we're at a bump in the road right now, no one should think that we've haven't worked our differences out many times in the past and won't in the future. Swartout again recommended that the group come to agreement on the general criteria – e.g., partial percentage based on five WRIAs, stream miles, nearshore miles, perhaps the existence of a listed species. Once you have this overall agreement, you can settle on percentages. You can argue forever on the percentages, but based on the agreement on general criteria, you can come to a compromise on percentages.

Batchelder noted that the issue of fairness that Miller outlined is fundamental to the problem we're having right now. In particular, the Quinault Lead Entity has received less in the last few years and we have to be honest about that.

BYLAWS

Batchelder said that the first thing he wanted was for each Lead Entity Coordinator to report the current status of Bylaw approval and designating Board members from their Lead Entity. Late yesterday he did receive suggested improvements, but no red flags, from Judy Andrews, the pro-bono attorney in Seattle. Before he presents those changes, he wants to get reports from the LEGs to see where everyone is in the process.

Osborne reported that he had sent the draft Bylaws out to his NPCLE group as soon as they were passed out of the IAC March Meeting. However, NPCLE's meeting yesterday sort of "lost its agenda" so the Bylaws were not acted upon. In addition, he had heard that we might need to revisit the draft Bylaws. He clarified that the separate approval of each of the six governments of NPCLE is not part of the NPCLE approval process. Krueger did note that, once NPCLE approves the Bylaws, she will take them to the Quileute Council for approval.

Napier identified the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) as the citizen group for the Grays Harbor Lead Entity; the GH County Commissioners will rely on their input for consideration/approval of the Bylaws and Board member designation. Because of an overcrowded CBP agenda in March, she will not be presenting this issue to the CBP until their meeting this Friday, April 23rd, at which time she expects approval, plus their recommendations concerning Board membership.

Johnson reported that the Bylaws had been approved by the Pacific Lead Entity and the County Commissioners.

Sims reported for the Quinault Lead Entity that the Bylaws are in review by the legal staff. He apologized that he didn't have anything further to report. Based on the legal review, QDNR will make a recommendation to the Tribal Council for approval. He has not heard of any major opposition to the Bylaws.

Batchelder and Miller reminded everyone that there are two pieces to the Bylaw issue: the approval of the Bylaws themselves, and the designation of their Board members.

Batchelder showed on a PowerPoint presentation the suggested changes that the attorney sent him yesterday. After reviewing each suggestion, it was proposed by Terry Willis and agreed by consensus that all the changes except for one should be tabled until the Board is in place. That is, the suggestions might be improvements, but they are not essential and their consideration could easily cause this process to be unnecessarily delayed. We're late already. The group asked that Staff bring the lawyer's suggested changes to the Board at a future date for actual consideration.

The one change that was agreed to be made to the draft Bylaws immediately was the addition of "and its Interlocal Agreement" at the end of Section 1. of Part II – Board of Directors:

"II – Board of Directors

*SECTION 1. GENERAL POWERS – WCSSP shall be managed by its Board of Directors, subject to any limitations set forth in these Bylaws **and its Interlocal Agreement.**"*

It was felt that this was something essential which had been overlooked in the original development of the Bylaws. (Batchelder confirmed that the lawyer has also reviewed the Interlocal Agreement.)

It was acknowledged that, although the Bylaws may have been approved and the Board members selected by each Lead Entity by WCSSP's meeting May 19th, all of the Board members may not be able to attend because of previous commitments. Batchelder strongly requested, however, that each Lead Entity send at least one Board Member on May 19th so they can submit their Lead Entity's one vote to approve the Bylaws. Only one designated Board member needs to be at a meeting to cast a LEG's vote. Batchelder pointed out that we'll also have web capability in place, so they could attend remotely. Napier emphasized that we all need to work as hard as possible to have our first Board meeting May 19th. Everyone agreed to this.

Miller pointed out that the group needs to complete this process and seat its Board for several reasons, mostly importantly to reduce distraction from focus on Plan development. The Plan is what will do all of us – the Region and individual Lead Entities - the most good and we need to get it done.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Swartout.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Jo Dietz