



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

May 19, 2010

10 am – 2 pm

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

In attendance:

Mark Swartout, Chair, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP staff
Dana Jo Dietz, WCSSP staff

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator
Mark Swartout, Thurston County
Terry Willis, GHC Commissioner

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator
Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe
Ed Bowen, Citizen at Large (by conference phone)
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
(by conference phone)

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator
Key McMurry, WBWRCC,
Key Environmental Solutions
Faith Taylor-Eldred, Pacific County

Quinault Lead Entity Group

Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation

ILA Designated Representatives

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe
Mark Swartout, Thurston County
Faith Taylor-Eldred, Pacific County
Terry Willis, GHC Commissioner

(WCSSP Board members as designated during the meeting in bold above)

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Wednesday, June 16	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, July 21	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen
Wednesday, August 18	10 am – 2 pm	Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

WELCOME

Chair Mark Swartout welcomed everyone to the meeting, and asked them to introduce themselves.

AGENDA

Ed Bowen wants to add a Public Comment at the beginning of the meeting. Swartout recommended that we put a Public Comment item on every Agenda. Lee Napier noted that she thinks that whenever a topic is being covered in a Meeting that a member of the public would like to comment on, they should

be able to do so whenever that discussion is occurring, not just during a designated Public Comment period. The group agreed.

Swartout asked, with the addition of a Public Comment, were there any objections or other additions to the Agenda? There were none.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ed Bowen explained that his comment as a citizen was in the form of a question to each of the four Lead Entities, "Are you prepared to seat a Board today?" Lee Napier from Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group answered that she has one Board member that is authorized to be seated today, but her group is still in process of nominating other Board members. Dave Bingaman from the Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity Group said, "Speaking for the Quinault Nation, no." Mike Johnson of the Pacific County Lead Entity Group said, "Partially; similar to Lee." Rich Osborne of the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group reported that Katie Krueger, John Miller and he (Rich Osborne) have been designated as the Board members from NPCLE. Hearing these responses, Bowen stated that he will continue to participate as an IAC member today.

Krueger brought up the procedural question of how Board members will introduce themselves, for example, "Katie Krueger, Board member from the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group," or "Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe," as she has in the past. She and Batchelder agreed that, at a minimum, the former designation is critical. Swartout observed that in other groups members identify first their Board affiliation and then "who pays them," e.g., "Thurston County" in his case, or "the Quileute Tribe" in Krueger's case.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 21, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY

After a discussion of the use of underlining and the inclusion of direct quotes in Meeting Summaries, the Summary for the April 21, 2010 meeting was approved by consensus.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Dietz asked if there were any questions or concerns about the financial report. A few clarifications were requested, which were provided by Dietz.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE –ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOINT BOARD

Swartout noted that there were two parts to this Agenda item, formal adoption of the Bylaws and a discussion about next steps.

Concerning formal adoption of Bylaws:

Rich Osborne confirmed that the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group has approved the Bylaws;

Mike Johnson confirmed that Pacific County Lead Entity Group has approved the Bylaws;

In John Sims' absence, Dave Bingaman reported that the Quinault Lead Entity Group has not approved the Bylaws; and,

Lee Napier of the Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group has had the GHC attorney review them and they are OK; she didn't know if WCSSP would want a formal action by the County Commissioners.

Swartout asked Bingaman to explain more fully the Quinault LEG's concerns about the draft Bylaws that has kept them from being approved by QIN. Bingaman said that he thinks one problem is that the IAC gave no opportunity to the Lead Entity Groups to provide feedback during the draft/approval process. The Quinault LEG has an issue, which is the lack of a dispute resolution process in the Bylaws. This is why the Quinault LEG did not approve them. In his discussions with Batchelder, the latter proposed approving the Bylaws as they stand now, with the promise that this issue of dispute resolution would then be brought up in the discussion of possible amendments. Bingaman said this is not acceptable to the Quinault.

Several members noted that this issue actually had been discussed over the past several months and that there was a process put into place in the Bylaws in the event that consensus was not reached: to formally vote with each LEG having one vote.

Bingaman said he also wanted to take the opportunity to report that there have been multiple discussions within the Quinault LEG about not participating in the region any more, not being the Lead Entity. He has had discussions with Phil Miller about this, about the consequences both to the Nation and to the Region. A final decision about this has not been made, but he wanted to alert the group about this possibility.

Krueger asked if Bingaman had a sense of the time that it will take to make this decision, because WCSSP is somewhat "stuck" while the Quinault's decision is being made. She didn't expect that Bingaman could actually answer her question today, but asked that he take the concern back to the QIN group. Bingaman said he couldn't provide a timeline, but he felt the region could proceed without the Nation's final decision. He related that part of the problem is that recent Quinault elections have changed some personnel on the Land and Natural Resources Committee, which is the citizen's committee for the Quinault LEG. This involves both "bringing up to speed" those who haven't been involved before, as well as differing opinions. He acknowledged that it is probably no secret that over the past few years there have been differing opinions within the Nation about involvement in WCSSP. Up until now, there's been a balance between the negatives and the positives, but probably the sub-allocation process/debate has done the most to unbalance the opinions about Regional/WCSSP involvement. Although QIN realizes that WCSSP is in its formative years, this change in outlook is based, he said, on a cost-benefit analysis of the increasing QIN resources that have been going towards Regional involvement versus the comparative lack of benefits the Nation gets from Regional involvement. The need for a dispute resolution process came directly from the QIN experience with the sub-allocation process this year.

SUB-ALLOCATION

Swartout observed that perhaps the only meaningful discussion at this point is for the group members to express their thoughts and concerns, which Bingaman can take back to the Quinault discussions. Swartout asked if a QIN decision to "pull out" would have an effect on their SRFB involvement.

Bingaman said, “Not necessarily.” Bingaman said that Phil Miller from GSRO has agreed to come to a meeting of the QIN Land and Natural Resources Committee Meeting to discuss the matter, explain pros and cons, and answer questions such as that one. In his discussions with Miller so far, it is clear that it would not particularly bode well for funding for QIN. However, the amount of time QIN spends seeking SRFB funding would be better used seeking larger sources of funding. QIN has spent a lot of time defending projects to the SRFB which the latter just basically don’t understand. Many QIN projects are “outside the box.” Perhaps QIN time would be better spent seeking other, larger funds.

Bingaman reported that Miller asked him if the QIN were hypothetically looking at this possibility, or were they serious. Others at the meeting today asked the same question – were the Quinault posturing? In all cases, Bingaman made it clear that the Quinault were seriously discussing this decision. As he said previously, there’s been a balance within QIN up until now, but the disagreement over the sub-allocation process has tipped that balance. As Bingaman said, “We do things based on science and reason and we don’t think there’s reason involved; there’s not respect for the data that’s out there... If we’re going to continue spending a lot of time bringing science in that’s ignored – same with the Regional Plan.” Mike Johnson strongly disagreed that this has not been a scientific process; the data we have, for whatever reason, is not always level, but this is true for other WRIAs besides WRIA 21. Johnson continued, “We’ve gone through this process for four or five years now, discussing what was important to the Coast in terms of the ranking criteria for allocating the funding. That was based on science. When it came to WRIAs 22, 23 and 24 where there are large estuaries, political things came into play and that is the weighting system of how funds are allocated. So as a group we decided to go with a high percentage of stream miles, with estuaries getting a low percentage in the weighting system.”

Krueger pointed out that the proposal this year to split the funding 4 or 5 ways came from the Quinault. The science may be less than perfect with the allocation formulas, but cutting it 4 or 5 ways is the least scientific way of all. So she was having trouble with QIN’s representation of themselves as the most scientific. She knows QIN does a lot of good science, but QIN is the one that came up with the non-scientific split. She also pointed out that the Quileute, for example, have assessed stream miles in very thorough and scientific ways; she’s feeling defensive because the Quileute for one have spent several years getting as accurate information as possible.

Key McMurry recounted that every year that the Quinault has proposed basin area, the group did listen and consider their proposal, but decided against it. She is concerned that the regional group is being held hostage by these current QIN undecided issues, and that both the Bylaws and the sub-allocation process should’ve been decided/voted on several months ago.

Swartout said that perhaps we didn’t define Consensus fully enough in the Bylaws. Consensus is generally assumed to include a lot of time trying to come to agreement. It’s not just, “Oh, we’ve spent a couple meeting discussing this and we don’t agree, so let’s take a vote.” With that understood, a dispute resolution procedure is not typically part of Bylaws, from what he’s seen, because if consensus is truly sought after, you don’t need formal dispute resolution. But Swartout wasn’t sure if clarifying that would make any difference to the Quinault in the current situation. Bingaman said he didn’t know.

Bingaman hopes that Phil Miller will be able to provide input about the pros and cons of remaining within the Region. He said that his own belief that QIN should continue on within the Region has been shaken, so first he needs to come to a prudent decision as to whether it’s worth the Quinault’s time to continue to be involved.

In terms of the comments about the use of science, Bingaman said he suggested a five way split because it is no more based in science than what we're doing now. The debate is not just about stream miles, and he didn't think it made sense to spend more staff time on determining stream miles. He said, "So, to let the process move forward, let's just divide the funds five ways, four ways originally, but, OK, five ways, in order to get our funding amounts to work on projects."

Concerning the scientific nature of our sub-allocation procedure, Rich Osborne commented that, from what he can tell, it's about as scientific as anyone else in the State uses. In addition, having done cost benefit analyses himself of the SRFB funding versus time spent, Osborne totally agrees with Bingaman. Perhaps in the Puget Sound, they get more funding for the time spent seeking funding, but for those of us on the Coast and elsewhere, it is not a very fruitful use of time. The SRFB processes need to be streamlined.

Bingaman pointed out that one of the things that the QIN have been advocating, and that Miller has pointed out, and that has been talked about quite a bit in the Region, is protecting and enhancing existing strong runs, as opposed to focusing on saving almost-extinct runs. If we were a solid Region behind this idea, it would bode well for all of us, especially the QIN with the Queets-Quinault Rivers currently being the only designated Salmon Stronghold in the coast area. One question is whether QIN would have access to Salmon Stronghold funding if they weren't part of the Region.

Lee Napier appreciates that the metrics are not sound; she recounted her frustrations about this since 2007 when we first all sat down. She remembers being hopeful that the technical people understood the issue and would take it up and do something. The only one who has is Devona Ensmenger. So, Napier is still frustrated: here we are several years later with no science metric. She can accept the five way split this year; it makes sense. But even if we go with the five way split this year, where is the science going to come from next year, and the year after that?

Krueger made a suggestion: The group as a Region put aside some of their differences and create a Regional grant application process where we hire a contractor who has expertise in doing exactly this type of thing, for example a stream degradation matrix, so that we approach this from real salmon habitat needs. As long as we function as separate Lead Entities in this arena, we're going to have this divisiveness. We need to either set aside some of each of our funds, or otherwise get funding for a contractor or contracted team of experts that everyone agrees upon, similar to the NOAA scientists at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. There will always be differences of opinion and approach, but there are experts out there like the NOAA team. We need to set aside our differences for at least some subset of our money and agree to pool it and do a regional process that's technically acceptable. Krueger thinks this is the only way we're going to overcome our disagreements.

In addition, since Miller is clear that the SRFB would only perhaps give us a one-year moratorium on developing an improved procedure, Krueger related that NPCLE is very concerned because the group cannot demand that Quinault drop everything else and get the data they think is acceptable within a year. She thinks the only way to solve the problem is to hire a contractor acceptable to everyone.

Swartout said that he's had a similar idea. However, all the parties would have to agree up front that whatever came out of a third party contractor's sub-allocation work would be accepted by all. So Swartout suggested that for this year we propose a five way split as part of a longer-term plan to engage

this independent contractor to develop a sub-allocation process for future years, beginning on a certain date, perhaps March/April 2011, when the next round of project reviews begin.

Bingaman clarified that QIN is not balking at developing a sub-allocation process based on science, created by a scientific team, but the metrics have been faulty for several years now even though the original model was acceptable.

Swartout suggested that, although they're obviously interrelated, we try to separate the two issues: the Bylaws and the sub-allocation process. We need to come up with a process that Bingaman can take back to the Quinault.

Osborne thinks that Krueger's suggestion, which also speaks to the email suggestions that Bill Armstrong proposed a couple weeks ago, is a viable way to resolve this and at the same time begin practicing what we're suppose to be doing. Osborne also thinks that if we went this way, we'd end up with the most scientifically-based sub-allocation process in the State.

Krueger felt it important to express her worry that the Quinault will demand an unworkable level of perfection. Such a level of perfection is appropriate for assessing projects within a WRIA, but she doesn't think that that level of perfection is appropriate for the regional sub-allocation process, where a more general, rougher set of standards is what is needed to sub-allocate the funds.

Bingaman responded that he thinks the Quinault want something with a sound scientific basis, not something that is perfect science. He suggested that we focus on what's going to most effectively help the salmon throughout the region, both from the perspective of the salmon as well as cost effectiveness – that is, what are the best projects in the region.

Mike Johnson said he had no problem with having a technical team, but instead of ranking projects within each Lead Entity, let's just look at all the projects in the Region and rank them as a whole. Or, Swartout suggested, combine allocating a basic amount to each Lead Entity, with the remainder of the regional funds allocated according to a regional ranking of all projects. As he's pointed out before, in his career, he's never seen perfect science and his experience is that salmon biologists rarely agree. With that said, he proposed taking the following to the SRFB this year: divide it five ways this year with an accompanying process plan laid out for next year. Would all four Lead Entity Groups, including the Quinault, agree to this?

Osborne reported that NPCLE did not approve the five way split, but instead agreed to ask the Quinault to look at the stream miles again, and improve them to the point that satisfied them, to be used within the current formula. NPCLE wanted to explore that option one more time.

Bingaman responded that it's not just that metric; there are other things involved that we've been arguing about for a long time. Since a resolution of those arguments wasn't going to happen in the near future, it's easier this year to simply use a five way split so everyone can proceed with projects.

Osborne added that NPCLE did not think it was a good idea to go the SRFB with the five way split proposal because it looks like we're going backwards. NPCLE thinks it would be better to go forward with something we have been using that's at least partially scientific, and that time-wise we don't have

enough time to come up with a process plan for next year that meets Quinault's high scientific standards.

Bingaman said, "It's not so much a high standard; Carl Sagan made the comment once that if you don't have any understanding of quantum mechanics, you can't even hold a conversation. We're almost at that level related to the salmon science, related to the politics that are going on. So it's not just metrics; it's the understanding of the whole thing." He reported that he'd done quite a bit of analysis using different metrics and he found that a five way split ended up expressing some fairly decent averages of all the other ways of looking at things.

Swartout then observed, "So what I heard you just say is that there's a scientific basis to a five way split; so why can't we do that?" Mike Johnson said, "Are you serious?" Osborne and Krueger said they didn't see any science in a five way split. Bingaman explained that it's a simple placeholder because there's not accurate metrics and there's not agreement on the metrics.

It was clarified that SRFB does examine the way the region proposes splitting the funds. Although Miller had said at our last meeting that he didn't think the SRFB would look favorably on a five way split, Batchelder shared (via the PowerPoint) Miller's email from yesterday, which everyone had received:

"I spoke against a 4-way split based solely on LE boundaries. A 5-way split based upon WRIA boundaries at least has a rough correspondence to the relative total areas covered by the intra-regional allocation. An allocation within the region based upon WRIA area is acceptable as a further interim approach. I don't know what specific scrutiny that approach may get from the SRFB, but I will recommend that the approach be accepted. I would be hopeful that the plan and planning tools you are developing this year for use within the region, will help in further refining your allocation criteria in future years."

Krueger pointed out that her observation is that it's actually the technical committee from the SRFB who has the most say in which projects are approved; they are going to be scrutinizing how we do things and they may not like the five way split.

Swartout wanted to make sure we didn't lose what Krueger said earlier, that there are different levels of science that apply to different levels. He thinks that the regional sub-allocation process needs to take a broader picture than the specific science applied at the WRIA individual project level.

Napier said she liked Krueger's idea of a regional process using a contracted expert. She has concerns about completing such a process by next year's SRFB cycle, but she'd like to see us start it. In fact, perhaps the SRFB review team (technical team) just mentioned is a resource that could help us with the sub-allocation formula. So, we accept the five way split this year and indicate this as our next step, not our long-term plan, but our next step. Several people agreed with this idea. Osborne asked Bingaman if this sounded reasonable. Bingaman said, "Yes, it sounds reasonable." But of course he'd have to take it back to QIN for actual approval.

BYLAWS and SUB-ALLOCATION

Swartout proposed that both the Bylaws discussion and the sub-allocation discussion need to be revisited once Miller has met with the QIN, because QIN needs to make the fundamental decision about regional participation before we proceed. Swartout suggested that Bingaman can take back to QIN

some of the ideas discussed today, but Swartout also hears and thinks Bingaman should take back to QIN that the other three Lead Entities want QIN to be part of the Region.

Bingaman reported that part of his discussion with Miller was that the Quinault could pull out as the Lead Entity and somebody else take over as Lead Entity; just because QIN pulled out as the Lead Entity doesn't mean that the whole WRIA wouldn't be part of the regional organization. Several people said this was a whole new idea they hadn't thought of. The problem is finding another government that would take over as the Lead Entity.

Ed Bowen asked how QIN is going to make their decision considering other stakeholders who are outside QIN but within WRIA 21, for example, Jefferson and Grays Harbor Counties, private landowners outside the QIN reservation, and those within federal jurisdictions. Bowen asked how they get represented in this decision. He clarified that these comments are not made to question the procedures or organization of the QIN Lead Entity, nor the question of the sub-allocation process, but instead the general question of representation within the regional organization, Board seating, etc.

Swartout acknowledged that he hadn't thought of the option Bingaman just described of another government becoming the Lead Entity in WRIA 21. Bingaman said he didn't know what QIN's participation would be if they weren't the Lead Entity, perhaps a scientist sit on a board or committee. He doesn't know what level of participation QIN would have in the sub-allocation process or the Plan; it just hasn't been discussed yet. But the main concern for QIN now results from a cost benefit of participating in the regional organization and accompanying frustrations of QIN staff and policy people.

Batchelder asked whether it was possible to come to some resolution on the sub-allocation proposal (which was displayed on the PowerPoint):

“2010 SRFB Project Funding Sub-Allocation Proposal:

To divide the Regional SRFB allocation equally by five, with 20% going to each WRIA.

- As an interim, one-year-only compromise
- Each Lead Entity commits to working to resolve the issue next year”

It was agreed that no Lead Entity could accept this Proposal at this time. Napier suggested that instead of simply delaying the decision for another month, the group ask staff to come back with a specific plan on how to resolve the issue next year. Let's have a specific picture of what that commitment might look like. Everyone agreed that we can't just trust, as we have trusted in years past, that we're going to come up with and agree upon a new, improved sub-allocation procedure next year. Ask staff for a picture of what a resolution might look like, and a time line for coming to resolution, including the request for help from the SRFB technical team so that contracts with the SRFB technical team members includes their help next year. Each Lead Entity would be asking the SRFB technical team to commit part of their time to helping the region come up with a sub-allocation formula.

It was generally agreed that these ideas about how to proceed would be taken back to each Lead Entity for their consideration. In effect, the group agreed to table the Sub-allocation decision until next month, both to consider this five-way-split-with-specific-procedure for next year and also to give the Quinault time to talk to Phil Miller and decide about QIN regional participation.

BYLAWS

Swartout refocused the group on the Bylaws decision which needs to be made, at the same time recognizing that it is intertwined with the Sub-Allocation discussion the group has been having. He noted that at the April meeting, it was agreed to add one clause to the previously draft-approved Bylaws, ask for approval by each Lead Entity by today's meeting along with designation of Board Members from each Lead Entity Group, all with the understanding that the new Board of Directors would then consider other changes, for example, those proposed by our pro bono lawyer. Reiterating the results of these Lead Entity votes from the beginning of this meeting:

Johnson reported that the Pacific County Lead Entity Group, both the Pacific County Commissioners and the Willapa Bay Water Resources Coordinating Council (which serves as the citizen committee), approved the Bylaws. The Board of County Commissioners will sign the Bylaws when they have been approved by the region. Key McMurry and Mike Johnson have been appointed as Board members at this point.

Osborne reported that the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group, with six governments being voting members of the Lead Entity Group, approved the Bylaws according to NPCLE procedures. Katie Krueger, John Miller and Rich Osborne have been appointed as Board members.

Napier reported that the attorney for Grays Harbor County has approved the Bylaws, and although he had a few suggestions, he said they could be addressed after the Board is seated. She has not taken them directly to the Grays Harbor Commissioners because she was hoping to take a "package" of the Bylaws and the recommended WCSSP Board appointees, and that hasn't all come together yet. So far, Mark Swartout has been appointed as a Board member.

Bingaman reported that the Quinault Lead Entity Group wants a dispute resolution procedure included in the Bylaws before they are finally voted on. He also suggested that, since there are other proposed amendments, perhaps it would be best to review all the proposed changes and finalize the draft Bylaws before taking a final vote on them.

Batchelder explained that all the proposed changes were reviewed at the April meeting and only one was deemed important enough to include immediately. In the interests of seating a WCSSP Board, which is a GSRO/WCSSP contract requirement that was supposed to be met in 2009, the group decided to table these additional suggestions and consider them as amendments to the Bylaws once the Board is in place. Batchelder has received some suggested dispute resolution language from our pro bono lawyer, but again would urge the group to consider a dispute resolution procedure as a proposed amendment to the Bylaws after the Board is formalized. Terry Willis recalled that at the April meeting Miller was very emphatic about the need to seat a Board soon, without continuing to consider Bylaw details that can be settled after a Board is in place.

Krueger pointed out that we have discussed the specific content of the Bylaws for several of the past meetings. Her question and complaint is why are we only now today hearing about the Quinault's need to have a dispute resolution clause in the Bylaws, which is creating a time crisis for the larger group. She asked that Bingaman take her question and concern back to the Quinault group.

Bingaman said he could perhaps explain some of the reason. The issue didn't come to a head earlier partially because the Nation was considering withdrawing from the region and that was a confidential discussion at that point, and partially because the sub-allocation question was still being settled regionally and the Nation didn't realize until recently that dispute resolution was needed. He apologized for the timing and he realizes the difficulty it might be creating, but that is how things have evolved.

Bingaman suggested that the group can go ahead and adopt the Bylaws, as the three Lead Entities. He thinks that he could present such action to the Quinault by explaining the process, contract and time crunch such that the Quinault would understand that the region needs to proceed but is also waiting for the Quinault to validate the Bylaws. He thinks QIN would understand that as a reasonable progression, not a snub to QIN's right to continue their decision-making process.

Swartout asked the group how they would like to proceed. Napier asked if we do as Bingaman suggests, do the Lead Entities plan on bringing their designated Board Members to the June meeting? She will have her Board members designated by then. Osborne says we should proceed since three Lead Entities have already approved the Bylaws.

Swartout summarized what he was hearing: Three Lead Entities have each approved the Bylaws and we have one abstention. The hope is that Bingaman goes back to QIN, describes the pressure the group feels to get the Board seated and also explains that there will be ample opportunity for the Quinault Nation, if they choose to stay in the region, to propose any changes or additions they would like to see in the Bylaws. At the same time, the Board can consider proposed amendments by other entities' attorneys and our pro bono attorney.

Bingaman brought up the question of the how the larger group makes decisions with only three of the Lead Entities having approved the Bylaws. Several things were generally agreed in response to that. One is that the crux of the answer lies in whether QIN as a Lead Entity agrees to continue as part of the region. Another is that until QIN accepts the Bylaws, they are not part of the Board of Directors, although they are part of the regional organization. A third is that if a voting situation arises in the near future, the group will deal with the problem then.

So, Swartout outlined a time line of what could happen. A proposal for a dispute resolution procedure would put out to everyone. At the June meeting, the three Lead Entities who at that point will have sitting Board members approve the amended Bylaws. The QIN would then take the new Bylaws back for consideration and hopefully approval, at which time they'd be part of the Board and need to designate their Board members. Swartout clarified that the QIN could propose the dispute resolution language without having sitting Board members. In fact, Krueger strongly encouraged QIN to send out proposed wording for a dispute resolution procedure. Bingaman pointed out that the QIN could conceivably make a conditional decision by the June meeting – that is, if the dispute resolution revision of the Bylaws is accepted by the Board, then the QIN approve the Bylaws and would immediately be seated on the Board. The alternate would be that the 3-LEG Board does not accept the amended Bylaws, in which case the QIN do not accept the Bylaws, and we're at the same standstill as currently.

Osborne thinks this is a good plan, showing that the current Board is making every effort to reconcile differences and satisfy the QIN requests. And, with the idea of a conditional QIN decision as described above, the QIN could designate their Board members so we'd have a complete Board at the June meeting.

Swartout suggested to Batchelder that, since he has the proposed dispute resolution language from our pro bono attorney, he send that out immediately and then the QIN can look at that to see if it meets their needs and/or propose other language. Bingaman said he wasn't sure about the QIN process for things like this, but he's hoping that the QIN lawyer can make a recommendation to the QIN committee in a timely fashion.

Ed Bowen said that it seemed the group was ready to make a decision. Swartout said that the Bylaws had already been approved by the group. Bowen protested that he hadn't heard a call for that vote, and that he thought we were still in session as the IAC, and that the first act of the new Board was to be the approval of the Bylaws. He's heard the needs of the QIN outlined, but he hasn't heard the opportunity for the rest of the group to express their needs. He understands that NPCLE approved the Bylaws. However, as an IAC member, he has four conditions to present to the group, which he requires in order to move forward today: the approval of the Bylaws and the appointment of Board members has to occur today, the determination that there's a quorum of the Board present today, the dissolution of the IAC, and the approval of the Bylaws by the new Board.

Dietz clarified that the agreement had been that the LEGs would approve the Bylaws and, sitting as the IAC, the IAC would approve the Bylaws. This would then create the Board. The first action of the Board would then need to be for it to approve the Bylaws.

Osborne outlined where he thought we stood at the moment: The Bylaws have been accepted by the IAC, there is a quorum of Board members from three Lead Entities (at least one Board member from each Lead Entity -- Pacific: Mike Johnson/Key McMurry, NPCLE: Rich Osborne/Katie Krueger, and Grays Harbor: Mark Swartout). So, Osborne asked Bowen if what he wants is for the new Board to pass a motion to dissolve the IAC; Bowen said, "Yes."

So, to clarify, Swartout reviewed that there had been a vote of three approvals (NPCLE, Grays Harbor and Pacific) and one abstention (Quinault) in approving the Bylaws. So as of now we are the Board of Directors of WCSSP with a quorum present.

It was agreed to make a motion that included three intertwined, simultaneous decisions:

MOTION: The IAC adopts the Bylaws, the Directors adopt the Bylaws and the Directors dissolve the IAC.

Krueger so moved. Johnson seconded the motion. Bowen was given the opportunity to provide an honorary second to the motion, which he did.

Swartout asked if there was any discussion. Devona Ensmenger thanked the group for the opportunity to sit on the IAC. Krueger said that Ensmenger was welcome to come caucus any time. Ensmenger said, "I'll be here."

Swartout clarified that this motion does not change any of the previous discussions or tentative plans laid out earlier in the meeting, including the possibility of amending the Bylaws at the June meeting. Everyone agreed with his clarification.

Swartout asked if there were any objections to this motion. There were no objections.

Bowen said he wholeheartedly supports what Ensmenger said, and he has appreciated the opportunity to serve on the IAC.

REGIONAL SALMON PLAN UPDATE

Batchelder reported that we continue to gather the technical data we need to complete the Viability Analysis. Ensmenger and he are meeting with the Quinault staff tomorrow to review some materials with them. The technical sub-committee (Osborne, Krueger, Johnson, McMurry, Ensmenger, Burkle, Schroeder, Nelson with Batchelder and Dietz as 'scribes') of the Planning Committee meets next Tuesday, and the full Planning Committee meets June 1st, at which time we hope to set the next Planning Workshop, probably sometime early July.

NETMAP TRAINING

Batchelder reported that the contract with Earth Systems Institute (ESI) for NetMap was approved by Grays Harbor County. ESI should have the basic maps done by the end of the week, at which time it will be available to anyone with ArcView software. He thinks we should plan training for the 'casual' user over the summer. Osborne noted that ONRC has a computer lab that he's pretty sure we could use.

Napier noted that the GHC Commissioners commented on NetMap's potential use outside WCSSP. The GH Council of Governments is having discussions about standardized GIS. Napier doesn't know if NetMap would be an appropriate tool or not, but she thought that others at the meeting today may wish to mention NetMap to jurisdictions in their areas as a possibility for, perhaps, a Critical Areas tool.

Bowen thanked everyone who was at the NetMap training late April, who showed hospitality to a veteran, Mike Farnum, who attended. Bowen asked to enter Farnum's written comments sent to Bowen after the training: "Thanks for the opportunity to go to the NetMap training. Wow!!! I was really impressed with some of the watershed analysis capabilities of the different tools in the software." Bowen said that Farnum went on to make some comments based on his GIS training and perspective, which Bowen would like to also enter into the record since WCSSP is now working with NetMap: "Unfortunately because of glitches, bugs and unfinished tools, it's not 100% ready for deployment." But once those are solved, Farnum sees great hope for its use by the group.

CURRENT POTENTIAL SRFB PROJECTS

Batchelder asked each Lead Entity Coordinator to give a short report on the projects that were coming forward for SRFB funding this year.

Osborne noted that all projects have not yet been submitted to NPCLE because their deadline is June 5th, so he doesn't know everything that's coming in. However, there's a bridge project in the Sol Duc with Merrill and Ring Timber; a LiDAR of the Hoh River (plus, independently of SRFB, a LiDAR project from last year); a private landowner on the Hoh who has a small culvert that needs to be replaced so they're looking at a reach assessment of that section of the Hoh. In addition, they're redoing the Mill Creek project from last year as a design project. In response to a question, he said he doesn't think there are any proposals coming out of the Ozette basin.

Osborne also wanted to announce that NPCLE has completed and approved its updated Strategy, which will be on the WCSSP website by next week.

Johnson reported that, after last year's design project for removal of Bear River estuarine dikes which will open up 758 acres, the first phase of the implementation will be a project this year. There's another estuarine project on Ellsworth Creek that will remove a culvert; this project is a collaboration of TNC and WBWRCC. Pacific County Anglers have a project to remove an old fish ladder. Plus there's a knotweed removal project, and potentially another design project.

Because QINLE Coordinator Sims was not present, Batchelder gave a report on Quinault projects. The barrier assessment is complete, so they're moving into the priority indexing phase. There are several really good barrier removal projects coming out of the assessment. Also, the Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition is putting forward a project on the Clearwater's Donkey Creek.

Napier reported that the GHCLEG received eleven projects as early applications in March. They were reviewed on site last week. Among those are five barrier corrections; two of them are identified as High on their basin wide Barrier Correction List. There's an acquisition project which is a resubmittal where the price of the property has dropped by half because the landowner is committed to keeping it intact. Another one may end up as a design project for water quantity improvement instead of a bridge replacement project. There is a Humptulips knotweed removal project that is being scaled back to an outreach project and combined with a restoration outreach project by the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium and TNC. The other two projects are assessment/project development types: one for the East Fork of the Satsop, the other concerns juvenile fish use of Grays Harbor estuary.

Ed Bowen brought forward two other items: One is that he's looking forward to the Community Salmon Fund (CSF) round that is coming up and, as a Lead Entity member, he's thrown his name in the hat to serve on the Review Panel for the region. He made the same request at NPCLE yesterday, but he's not sure what the process is for establishing the Review Panel, so he's asking his Board members to make this an Agenda item in the near future. Osborne asked, "What is the status of the Community Salmon Fund Review Team?" Batchelder said that the IAC had agreed to a proposal to create a review team by the appointment by each Lead Entity Group of two people. He said he'd be hearing from CSF in early June when they put out their RFP. When the projects are pulled together, CSF will set up a meeting for everyone to come together to rank the projects. Napier asked if that was two people in addition to the Lead Entity Coordinators. Batchelder said that the proposal simply said two people from each LEG. Osborne said that when the selection of those two people is decided at the next NPCLE meeting, Bowen's name will be put forward and likely approved.

Bowen also wanted to point out to his Board members that the new Board of Directors hasn't yet chosen a Chair and Vice Chair. Osborne acknowledged that that was a good point. Swartout said that he was willing to facilitate the June meeting so elections could occur then. Everyone agreed to this plan.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Swartout.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Jo Dietz