



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MEETING

May 20, 2009

US Forest Service Ranger Station

Quinault, WA

10:00 am to 2:00 pm

In attendance:

Nancy Allison, Executive Director, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, Program Assistant, WCSSP
Dana Dietz, Administrative Assistant, WCSSP
Philip Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery
Office (GSRO)

Pacific County Lead Entity Group

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator
Key McMurry, Key Environmental Solutions,
Willapa Bay Water Resources
Coordinating Council (WBWRCC)

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Group

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

Technical

Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy
Dave King, Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
(WDFW)

Quinault Lead Entity Group

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator
Dave Bingaman, Quinault Dept. of Natural
Resources
Jim Jorgensen, Quinault Fisheries

ILA Designated Representatives

Steve Allison, Hoh Tribe
Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe
James Sellers, Quinault Indian Nation
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator
Lonnie Crumley, Streamworks

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <i>Annual Meeting And Anniversary Celebration</i> | <i>Wednesday, June 17th</i> | <i>Log Pavilion, Aberdeen</i> |
| <i>Business Meeting</i> | <i>Tentatively 3 – 4:30 pm</i> | |
| <i>Celebration</i> | <i>5 – 8 pm</i> | |
| <i>Wednesday, July 15</i> | <i>10 am – 2 pm</i> | <i>Port of Grays Harbor</i> |
| <i>Wednesday, August 19</i> | <i>10 am – 2 pm</i> | <i>Port of Grays Harbor</i> |
| <i>Wednesday, September 16</i> | <i>Tentatively our first web meeting</i> | |

BUSINESS MEETING

Director Nancy Allison welcomed everyone and asked that they introduce themselves.

Director's Report

Meeting of Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and 2009-11 Biennium Funding

Director Allison reported that when the SRFB met last week, they decided to reverse their previous decision to reduce 2009-11 capacity funding for both Regions and Lead Entity Groups by 8%. So we will be funded for capacity at the same level we were for the last biennium, 2007-09. (For the current biennium, our Region was funded for only 20 of the 24 months; our funding for 2009-11 was increased by extrapolation to be equal to 24 months of 2007-09.) The reinstated 8% for the Region amounts to about \$39,000, of which \$38,000 will be returned to the Lead Entity Groups to support their participation in standard regional activities. This is in addition to the reinstated 8% that the Lead Entities themselves will receive for capacity. Mike Johnson, Coordinator for the Pacific County Lead Entity Group, led a round of applause in appreciation of Director Allison's work to regain this funding for both the Region and the Lead Entities. She thanked the group for their appreciation.

Allison went on to report that, in addition, the Region received \$100,000 for this biennium for our planning process, to develop a Regional Plan. That is broken out as follows: \$50,000 for technical support for the Plan, \$28,000 to support the participation of the Lead Entity Groups in the regional process to develop a Plan, and \$22,000 to support the development of an Implementation Plan for the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery.

Concerning the \$50,000, she noted that we aren't far enough along in the planning process to know exactly what these funds will be used for, nor do we know exactly what the SRFB will consider acceptable deliverables. However, she's confident that that will become clear as we move along in the next few months. Key McMurry, of Willapa Bay Water Resources Coordinating Council (WBWRCC) and Key Environmental Solutions, asked whether these funds could possibly be used for StreamNet or StreamMap; Allison replied that we don't know yet, but that's a possibility.

Concerning the \$28,000, she again noted that we aren't far enough along to know exactly how these funds will be used to more fully involve all four Lead Entity Groups in planning process, but that she will be talking with the four Lead Entity Coordinators about this.

Concerning the \$22,000, she reported that this will be used to fund professional facilitation of four (4) of the meetings of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee required to create an Implementation Plan. This facilitation will be by Triangle Associates or some other professional facilitators. (NOTE: Please see the addendum "Comments by Partnership Participants" at the end of this Meeting Summary for comments by Ed Bowen.)

Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office, said that everyone should realize that this was a controversial decision within the SRFB; there were a series of three 3-to-2 votes, with Chairman Steve Tharinger being the swing vote. Tharinger saw the value of maintaining the infrastructure, and the momentum of the infrastructure, for developing Regional Plans and Lead Entity Strategies, especially after receiving the reports from the regional directors as to what the 8% budget reduction would eliminate from regional and lead entity activities.

Miller reported that Tharinger has since made it clear to Kaleen Cottingham, Director of the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO; now becoming home to all regional and lead entity funding contracts, as well as GSRO), that there are definite expectations associated with the reinstatement of this 8%. These expectations include careful creation of each contract so that the contract deliverables capture what it means to have the 8% back. Also, the same attention will be paid to the details of the deliverables for the extra funds in support of the planning processes. He noted that the Coast Region was not the only region to receive additional funds for specific purposes such as planning.

Miller also noted that decisions have not yet been made about whether the extra funds will be administered through separate contracts, or integrated into the main contract. He will be working with Allison on this, and he believed that her intent was then to bring back the revised Scope of Work back to this group for review and concurrence (to which she nodded in agreement).

Rich Osborne asked whether now that RCO is taking over the lead entity contracts, they're going to deal with the random, somewhat arbitrary distribution of operating funds between lead entities that has developed over time and currently exists. He noted that since his lead entity was brought into the process most recently, it is by far the lowest funded lead entity in the state. He's wondering if RCO will be looking again at how the distribution works.

Miller responded that although he understands what Osborne is saying, he doesn't think very many people in RCO or the SRFB are aware of the situation. At this point, Miller suggested that this concern and question be raised to RCO again, acknowledging that currently RCO is dealing with the decisions the SRFB made last week. Miller's sense is that probably it would be returned to the Region to decide. He went to say that there would be a lot of resistance to providing additional funding to this, or any other, Region at this time. Miller said he thinks Osborne has a point, a case to make, but he doesn't know how it would be responded to by RCO.

Katie Krueger, representative of the Quileute Tribe, asked whether Miller was saying that RCO would likely expect the Region to cut the other Lead Entity Coordinators' salaries in order to give Osborne more. Miller said that wasn't what he was saying. Krueger said that is what he seemed to be saying. Miller said he was saying that it was the Region's decision to recommend such an adjustment, make the case for it, and make the case for where the funds might come from within the Region's current funding. Krueger said that it didn't sound fair because salaries for LE coordinators should be funded equitably across the State. The Region should not have to come up with extra funding; the salary funding should be equitable across the State when RCO allocates it in the first place.

Allison remarked that Rachael Langen, Deputy Director of RCO, will be giving a presentation at our Annual Meeting in June about the transition of not only GSRO but also the Lead Entity Program to RCO. Allison said that she and Langen have talked about some of the funding levels that we have, and that perhaps the Annual Meeting will be an opportunity to raise the question with her. In addition, Allison wanted the group to know that she is very aware of this situation, and hopes to work behind the scenes to see what can be done about it. However, she is also aware that funding in general is very restricted right now.

Krueger reported that Clallam County has been doing everything they can to make Osborne's salary full time, and that she doesn't think it's fair to them. She thinks that something needs to be done statewide so that lead entity coordinators are compensated fairly throughout the state.

Miller encouraged the group to continue making the case on this issue, including the specific amount required, what the funding would provide, and why is it not available from any other source. Krueger said that she doesn't think that that is the argument we should have to make; the true argument is why isn't the same funding available to us as to others in the state, why isn't there parity.

Miller indicated that he's saying that he doesn't think any new request for funds at this point will be well received. Key McMurry made the point that we wouldn't be requesting additional funds, but instead be requesting that they be made equal across the state.

Miller advised that RCO sees this as a year of transition, and there's probably not enough time to change contracts for this coming year, but bringing up the concern during the coming year for possible changes in next years' contracts would be much more acceptable.

Ed Bowen, Citizen at Large of the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (NPCLE) Group, asked for clarification as to whether the regional contract(s) would continue to be with Grays Harbor County as the fiscal agent. Allison said that was correct. Bowen asked whether information about the proposed arrangement (one overall contract, or one for regular funding and another for the \$100,000) could be disseminated before the final decision was made so that the group could provide input. Members of the group should be able to have input on, say, why one arrangement is better than another, or how they might better meet the goals and needs of the Region. In other words, could group members have input into that process, instead of the Director simply bringing the final product to us? Miller responded that you can always make suggestions or express concerns that you have to either Allison or him. Bowen said that they'd have to see the proposed product in order to make suggestions or bring up concerns. Miller said that you will see the revised draft Scope of Work before it's made part of the Contract, which satisfied Bowen.

Allison then reviewed the draft Scope of Work as it stands now, making clear that it was developed before we knew about the 8% being reinstated, or about the additional \$100,000, etc. She reiterated that the new draft Scope of Work that she and Miller were working on based on the SRFB decisions will be brought back to the group for review before it is finalized.

Planning Process

Allison reported that The Nature Conservancy (TNC) did get the decision back from their Board enabling them to provide us about one half FTE to support our planning process. This will include support from Eric Delvin, James Schroeder and Kara Nelson, their Conservation Action Planning (CAP) planner. We're talking about using CAP for our process; we'll learn more about it when TNC staff gives a presentation and answers questions at our July 15th meeting.

Krueger noted that the list of lead entity area commonalities as caucused and agreed upon by the original group is on page 24 in the Appendix of the Report on the Consideration of Forming a Coastal Regional Governance Unit for Salmon Sustainability. The original group spent a lot of time discussing and agreeing upon these lists, and Krueger thinks that it is a good and appropriate starting point for the current planning process.

Bowen asked whether the results from the January 2009 workshop on the Regional Plan are still considered the basis for our ongoing planning process. Allison confirmed that they were.

Allison announced that most likely the August meeting will be devoted to working on the planning process concerning the Needs Assessment headed up by Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center.

The August meeting will be a workshop led by John Kliem of Creative Community Solutions to further garner input on the Needs Assessment, the individual lead entity workshops having already been held in July.

Annual Meeting

Allison noted that Clallam County Commissioner and SRFB Chair Steve Tharinger has agreed to speak at our Annual Meeting on June 17th, as well as Grays Harbor County Commissioner Al Carter and RCO Deputy Director Rachael Langen. Allison will provide a "State of the Region" report.

She noted that we will likely have a business meeting in the afternoon before our formal evening celebratory Annual Meeting. We will let you know as soon as possible.

2009 Sub-Allocation Process for SRFB Funds for Projects

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Program Assistant, reported that there was a conference call meeting on May 12th to determine the weighting factors for the four criteria for the sub-allocation of SRFB project funds for this 2009 round. Essentially the decision was made to use the same weighting as for the last round, 2008, with the recognition that we need to work on improving the data. The weighting for 2009 will be: freshwater salmonid stream miles .6, estuary/lake shoreline miles .1, salmonid diversity .25 and ESA-listed stocks .05. The one change to the spreadsheet from last year that had been agreed upon was to add bull trout to WRIA 24, which had been inadvertently left off previously.

Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation, pointed out that there was one dissenting vote to this decision from the Quinault Lead Entity Group. Ed Bowen asked whether the Quinault Lead Entity Group agreed to move on with the understanding that the sub-allocation data and process would be fully discussed for the coming year, 2010. Bingaman confirmed that they had agreed to move on.

Batchelder went on the report that there had been some question about the estuary/lake shoreline miles from 2008 being incorrect. He went back and looked back at all the data and determined that the shoreline miles used for 2008 were actually correct, that is, marine shoreline miles were not counted for any WRIA, whereas estuary miles for WRIs 22 and 24 were counted, as were lake shoreline miles for WRIs 20 and 21.

SRFB is awarding \$1.2 million to the Region this year, so, using the criteria and weighting amounts decided upon, Batchelder generated the amount each Lead Entity Group will receive. He will email all of this information out to everyone.

He also noted that we are starting the sub-allocation discussions and process early this year; June 23rd is the first meeting.

Phil Miller noted that there are quite a few ways of weighting that can be justified using best available science, and that all the possible perspectives on weighting that the Coast has discussed are within the acceptable range of having been based on best available science.

Jim Jorgensen, Quinault Indian Nation, remarked that he thinks there are valid practical factors that can be considered in the sub-allocation process, like past funding levels and numbers of projects that

are shovel-ready versus not shovel-ready within an area. He added that he thinks the technical aspects need to be kept separate from the policy aspects, and he doesn't think that has always happened. He'd like to see a clearer, stiffer protocol in that respect.

Miller pointed out that the region does have the flexibility to do 'trade-offs'; that is, when a project in one area is considered more important to fund this year than a project in another area, the first is funded, with the understanding that funding balance between areas will be achieved over time. Miller noted that this can be a formal arrangement or an informal one. Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner, pointed out that this is done quite a bit among local governments, even across Conservation Districts statewide.

Website

Batchelder demonstrated the website in its multipage draft form and explained some of the subject that will be covered on different pages. He noted that any suggestions are welcome. Dana Dietz, WCSSP Administrative Assistant, made the point that the website will be constantly improving; it is not set in stone. Batchelder and she will be able to make as many changes, corrections and improvements to it as we want. It will be linked to any site that a Lead Entity already has, as well as the Habitat Work Schedule. Each Lead Entity can ask Batchelder or Dietz to make changes to their page. In addition, regional documents as well as, for instance, Lead Entity Strategies will be available in a Library. Batchelder indicated that we will have a 'trial run' of the website so everyone can comment before it is published on the World Wide Web for the public. Bowen suggested that a mini-drawing of each Lead Entity's boundaries be used along with their name.

Web Meetings

From Dietz' research, she reported her conclusion that a two-layer integration of web meeting technologies would work best for us. The first layer is Microsoft Live Meeting. It creates a computer-to-computer linkage between all of us with graphic presentations on our computer screens (or on the wall via a projector), a setting for internet dial-up users that enhances their speed, and recording of our meetings with the ability to put a link on our website to the recording. It does not include the use of cameras; we decided at our last meeting that we don't need to see each others' faces.

The cost of MSLM is \$63 per month which will be paid by the Region. This fee will give us an unlimited number of meetings held any time, which would allow LEGs, planning committee and other WCSSP sub-groups to also utilize MSLM.

Bowen wanted clarification that showing graphics can be done by anyone attending the meeting. Dietz confirmed that yes, it does, even if it means a remote participant emailing their document during the meeting to a moderator in Ocean Shores, who then could display it for the group.

Krueger wanted clarification about how a participant would 'raise their hand' or be identified. Dietz described MSLM's on-screen "Q&A" box that allows participants to 'raise their hand' and be specifically identified by the other participants and the moderator by a raised hand on screen. All of this would be included in the \$63 per month to be paid by the Region.

The second layer of our system would be to enhance the voice clarity. This would be done by adding an audio bridge which would connect everyone by phone, in addition to the MSLM computer connection. Although regular phones or computer headsets could be used by individuals to utilize this

audio bridge, in general each of our four or five locations would need to have a conference phone (a “bat phone” or other) to best take advantage of the audio bridge.

The audio bridge is billed on a per-minute-of-use basis, 6 cents per minute. So, a 4-hour meeting would be \$14.40 per location (that is, per conference phone). While the Region would pay for the basic set up cost of 12 cents per minute (\$28.80 per 4-hour meeting), each Lead Entity would be billed (via their GHC account) \$14.40 per number of locations they choose to have.

Dietz suggested a basic arrangement of having a central location at the Ocean Shores Regional office (where we now have a conference room available to us), plus at least one location for each of the Lead Entity Groups (Forks?, Montesano?, South Bend?, and Taholah? unless the Quinault group chooses to drive to Ocean Shores.). Any participant could attend the meeting by driving to any location, whatever is most convenient. The coming together of folks in one area (e.g., NPCLE) to one place (e.g., Forks) would be to save money – it would only cost NPCLE \$14.40; whereas, if NPCLE folks each sat at their own computer and attended the meeting, it would cost NPCLE \$14.40 x number of people.

Lee Napier pointed out that having a majority of each Lead Entity Group at one location might also be very useful for purposes of caucusing during regional meetings.

Bowen said that he thinks this is a great idea if for no other reason that encouraging public involvement. Each of the Lead Entity and Regional locations could be advertised to the public as a place to attend. He did, however, want to ask the group to consider two things. One is that the Q&A identification be clearly included in a set of meeting protocols, so that anyone who wants to speak is easily recognized. Secondly, he would encourage us, either as a region or as individual lead entities, to seek other funding sources or procedures for web meetings. For example, perhaps NPCLE could fund three locations for each meeting, since even driving to Forks is quite a distance for some NPCLE members.

Krueger described her experience with web meetings at the Northwest Fisheries Commission. Despite the fact that they have all the best equipment, she feels that the interpersonal connection of the group can be lost and often is. She suggested that we intersperse in-person meetings with web meetings in order to maintain the interrelationships, camaraderie, networking and sense of teamwork we’ve built up over time. Everyone seemed to agree that this would be a good idea.

Sims noted that the plan outlined would be about \$77 per meeting. He said that for \$100 per (mid-week, middle-of-the-day) meeting we could rent the meeting room at the Quinault Lodge, as centrally located as possible.

Miller suggested that, since there are no long-term cost commitments involved, we could experiment with interspersing web meetings and face-to-face meetings for a year and then reevaluate. Several people said they thought this would be a good plan. Allison asked if anyone objected to this idea of experimenting with web meetings interspersed with physical meetings for a year. There were no dissensions.

Regional Action Planning Committee

Allison noted that last month we talked about each Lead Entity Group designating a representative to the planning committee. She reported that, before adding these representatives, the planning committee consists of: members from The Nature Conservancy, probably Eric Delvin, James

Schroeder and/or Kara Nelson; Devona Ensmenger because of her work with the Needs Assessment; herself (Allison), Batchelder and Dietz because of staff involvement in compiling and writing of the non-technical parts of the plan, and Phil Miller. She emphasized that this committee will not have decision-making authority; the committee will always bring information and proposals back to the larger group.

Miller noted that WDFW may also request to have a member on that committee because of what they will be offering to the planning process. Bowen asked when we would know that; Miller said within two or three weeks. Bowen also asked whether WDFW had come to us, or had we gone to them; Miller said both, kind of simultaneous.

Bingaman asked what is the actual purpose of this action planning committee, what will they produce. Allison answered that they will be the working group, strategizing on what the plan might look like, how it will go together, figure out what technical expertise we need, how the Needs Assessment will inform the plan, and then bring these ideas back to the larger group.

Bowen asked whether, before the Plan comes up for final approval, it will be vetted by the entire group. Allison said yes, absolutely. Bowen raised the question of what would be a productive way for that interaction. His concern is that there be ample opportunity for the ideas of the planning committee and contents of the plan to be explained to everyone. He wants to request now, before the process of developing a plan has been developed, that such an educational component be included in that process. He clarified that he needs more than a "rough draft" sent to him; there needs to be a time and place for the contents to be talked about, explained and, if necessary, questions answered.

Jim Sellers, representative from the Quinault Indian Nation, suggested that one way to do that is to have a Technical Review completed, which could be emailed out. Allison suggested that another idea would be to have the group together in Q&A sessions, which Bowen said he liked. Miller said that his guess was that every monthly meeting of this group would have one or more agenda items about the regional plan until it is completed. Those would provide a lot of educational opportunities; that would be one of the purposes of such monthly agenda items.

Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy, pointed out that using the Conservation Action Planning (CAP) process, he can't imagine parts of a plan just being written and then sent out for review. That's not how CAP works. The plan will only be as good as the involvement of everyone; the planning committee will expedite the CAP process by identifying everyone who needs to be involved – in a workshop, in a one-on-one interview, etc. The main function of the CAP process is to help us ask all the right questions and include everyone who needs to be involved, to make sure we're hearing everyone in informing the plan. Delvin said, and Allison later repeated, that the planning process will never be the creation of some written part of plan which is then disseminated for vetting; it will always be an ongoing, interactive, inclusive process that includes all ideas and seeks out all participants, anyone who would be affected by or is interested in the plan.

Allison noted that James Schroeder and Kara Nelson, both of The Nature Conservancy, will be coming to our July meeting to discuss the CAP process, so a lot of these questions can be discussed and answered then. John Sims asked who is going to pay mileage, per diem, etc. costs for Lead Entity participation in planning committee activities. Allison reminded him of the additional \$28,000 granted to the Coast by SRFB specifically to support the involvement of the Lead Entities in the planning process.

Allison returned to the question of who the representatives from each of the four Lead Entities will be. Rich Osborne confirmed that NPCLE had voted that Katie Krueger be their representative to the planning committee, with himself as basically an alternate, acknowledging that another of their members, Devona Ensmenger, will also be serving on the committee anyway.

Allison confirmed that she expected each representative to take information from the committee back to their Lead Entity, which in NPCLE's case will meet their need to exercise a "Swiss democracy."

Miller raised the question of whether there is, or will be, a technical committee in addition to a planning committee, since Lead Entities may want to have a different representative on those two committees. Allison answered that the Needs Assessment involved some kind of technical group, but that a more formal technical committee for the whole plan will need to be formed.

Ensmenger suggested that the TNC team go through a case study, to give folks a concrete picture of how the CAP process works. Delvin pointed out that it happens that the CAP process is currently being used for a salmon recovery plan in California, so that could also be helpful as an example. Dietz said that Nelson is going to email us some case studies that we can forward on, and Ensmenger said that the Wild Salmon Center has a couple of examples of using CAP for salmon plans with their Russian colleagues.

Jim Jorgensen said that he thinks that we should keep technical representation wide as the plan is being developed, but that once we get to the stage of different groups buying into the final plan, the technical representation needs to be tighter.

Lee Napier indicated that she would be the representative from the Chehalis Lead Entity Group, at least until such time as the level of commitment and knowledge required is clearer. At that time someone more appropriate may agree to be the representative.

Bingaman said that they would select a representative at their meeting tomorrow. He didn't know if they wanted to appoint a technical person, or someone else. Osborne pointed out that he thinks the most useful characteristic for someone being appointed to the planning committee is the width of their knowledge of resources and people in their area, that is, who are the people in their area who need to be included in this planning process. **(NOTE: Please see the addendum "Comments by Partnership Participants" at the end of this Meeting Summary for the decision May 21 by the Quinault Lead Entity Group.)**

Mike Johnson said that he would be the representative from Pacific Lead Entity, with Key McMurry as alternate.

Krueger said that because the planning committee folks know each other fairly well, she feels that the committee could meet in web meetings without fearing a loss of camaraderie and teamwork. Everyone seemed to agree.

Delvin pointed out that it seems like we have sufficient resources now available to create a thorough plan, but that if we needed some small additional resources to complete it, he thinks that The Nature Conservancy would definitely consider providing them. Allison thanked him for that.

Miller noted that the Scope of Work contains a tentative completion date for the Regional Plan of December 2010. This contract deliverable date can be flexed, but the aim is to create a timeline for the process that will have the Plan completed by then.

Krueger mentioned an effective tool to make sure that no ideas are lost as we go through the process, that is, the creation of a 'bin.' Whether the idea is used or not used in the final Plan, it is always in the bin, to come back to later.

2009-11 Work Plan and Scope of Work

Bowen asked for clarification about part of the Scope of Work where it talks about one of the Plan goals being "protecting existing healthy habitats". He asked, "Is it correct that we're protecting healthy habitats and does that mean the upland environment also?" Sims noted that upland projects are eligible for SRFB funding, so it's within the realm of possibility. Everyone seems to agree that 'everything is on the table until it's taken off,' as Allison put it.

Allison noted that the Scope of Work, and the more finely detailed Work Plan, will be changed a little in the next few weeks because of our Region's and SRFB decisions. She reviewed it quickly, noting that the five overall activities are the same throughout the state for all the Regions, although the Coast's specific deliverables are different than other Regions.

During her review, several clarifications were made. One was that our aim is to have an outline of our Regional Plan by November 2009 (approved by the group), and a completed Plan by July 2010. Another concerned keeping the whole group abreast of the details of the regional involvement in Lake Ozette Implementation Plan; Bowen asked if everyone was comfortable with not hearing about Lake Ozette unless someone specifically requested a report. There seemed to be no objection to this protocol.

Bowen said that he had a bone of contention with item # 5 in the Scope of Work, and the corresponding C7b in the Work Plan. These items are currently phrased to indicate that we've already established a definite aim to establish a relationship with the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership (NASSP), whereas he thinks that this would be a decision that a policy body would make once it is established. We can "explore" such a relationship all we want. But C7b says we should "encourage" participation, which he thinks is inappropriate at this point. The whole question of NASSP participation needs to be phrased as we did with the Community Salmon Fund, in Work Plan item E3g: "The WCSSP Board will determine a scope of involvement." Allison asked if anyone objected to making that change; no one did.

Bowen asked that we request the RCO speaker at our annual meeting to talk about the Governor's Monitoring Forum, so that public begins to become aware of how the Forum connects to the monitoring elements that will be in our Plan.

Bowen pointed out that the legislative staff asked to be made aware of larger or more expensive projects that we haven't been able to tackle yet, being out here on the Coast. Terry Willis agreed, reminding everyone present that you don't want to just show what you've accomplished, but also what needs to be done, what legislators can help with.

Bowen pointed out that a previous version of the Work Plan/Scope of Work said that WCSSP staff "coordinates with other government agencies through the Council of Regions", as if we can't or don't

directly related with other government agencies. He suggested it be changed to “networks with other government agencies including the Council of Regions.” Allison concurred.

Bowen said he requested a change to item D1b: either change “National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)” to “National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)”, or “NMFS” to “NMFS and Olympic Coast Marine Sanctuary.” Allison said she’d make executive decision to change it to “NOAA.”

Staff Contracts

Lee Napier said that, as the representative of the Region’s fiscal agent Grays Harbor County, she need to ask the group how they want to proceed with WCSSP staff contracts. When Grays Harbor signs the contract with RCO, they then sign/renew a contract with each staff person, which includes a scope of work. These come due July 1, 2009. Questions she had, she said, included whether the group wants to renew them, for how long, and any other guidance from the group. Mike Johnson suggested that before WCSSP has a policy board and operating procedures, it doesn’t easily have a way to conduct staff reviews. So, he recommends we renew the contracts, and in the future create a standard yearly review for staff.

Napier said she was hearing that renewing the staff contracts was acceptable to everyone. There seemed to be no objections. She then asked, “For how long, one year or two?” After some discussion, it was agreed to renew the contracts for one year only, since State funding is not actually contracted for more than a year at a time.

Advisory Council

Allison summarized the group’s current situation with regard to creating a policy body for the organization, as follows: The idea of a formal Board of Directors was replaced at last month’s meeting with the idea of a more general Advisory Council, made up of the designated representatives from each signatory of the Interlocal Agreement. Members of this Advisory Council would be eligible to be nominated as Chair or Vice-Chair. Once we have a Chair and a Vice-Chair of the organization, we would start working out the details of operating procedures, bylaws, and, for instance, rules about who else might be eligible to be Chair/Vice-Chair. As has been decided by this group previously, we would strive to reach agreement by consensus, but if an issue came to a vote, each Lead Entity would have one vote on the issue. She pointed out that a summary of all this is in a handout that everyone received. She reminded everyone that at last month’s meeting, each Lead Entity as asked to talk about this format and, if they chose, nominate someone to be Chair.

Allison asked if the Lead Entities had discussed this. Osborne said that his understanding was that nominations would be made at this meeting, which could then be taken back to the individual Lead Entities for their caucus decision, with the final election to take place at our Annual Meeting in June.

Mike Johnson urged the group to proceed quickly with creating this basic structure and electing a Chair. He nominated Mark Swartout, who Johnson thinks would be an excellent Chair because Swartout is objective and has experience with similar organizations (such as the Puget Sound Partnership and the Chehalis Basic Partnership). Swartout is the designated representative from ILA signatory Thurston County.

Dave Bingaman asked for clarification: were these ILA designee individuals appointed by each ILA government? Allison said yes. He pointed out that he needed a list of these ILA designees and

background information in order to potentially nominate someone. Allison said that there is a list that historically people know, but that she will send it out to everyone later today.

Allison clarified that the proposal up for decision was whether we create an Advisory Council made up of ILA representatives, from which a Chair and a Vice-Chair be elected. It has already been decided by the group that we strive for consensus, but if a vote is required, each Lead Entity has one vote.

As a point of clarification, Phil Miller pointed out that there are two issues being discussed here. One is the structure of the Advisory Council; the other is the nomination procedure for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions.

Krueger said that at last month's meeting, everyone agreed on the concept of the Advisory Council . Then, however, Krueger continued, NPCLE said they had to take this concept back to their whole group to get consensus for or against the idea. NPCLE, at their next meeting, did approve this whole concept.

Bowen asked for clarification on what was voted on by NPCLE. Krueger answered that they voted not on the components of the Advisory Council, but on its functioning: the Advisory Council and everybody who shows up at a meeting will be able to speak (in order to get every kind of input - legal, technical, policy, etc.- and no view left off the table); if the group of everyone present couldn't reach consensus, then we would go to a vote, that is, the Lead Entities would go back and caucus for their single Lead Entity vote.

Bingaman asked for clarification of why this group in the room is making decisions when it seems to him that the ILA designees should be the decision-making body. Allison clarified that when the original decision was made to form this organization, it was decided that it would be a "Federation of Strong Lead Entities," that the Lead Entities were to be the decision-makers. Bingaman didn't think that the Quinault Lead Entity had voted for this structure. Allison clarified that there was no vote taken; it was a consensus reached.

Jorgensen said that his understanding from the last meeting was that all Lead Entities could go back and decide on this issue. Allison said, yes it did. Napier quoted from the April Meeting Summary: that we talked about the concept of Advisory Council, we were all given the assignment to go back to our Lead Entities and come back today to talk about it.

Bingaman again pointed out that he didn't have a list to make nominations from. Key McMurry pointed out that the April Meeting Summary contained a list of each government who had signed the ILA as of the April meeting. To which Dietz added that Bingaman is correct in that we do need to provide the actual designee's names.

Sellers encouraged the group to attach a time line of, say, 90 days, to the existence of the Advisory Council. His experience has been that if there's not a time limit to a "temporary" structure like this, the "temporary" structure evolves into the permanent one without real consideration by the group. Miller said he thinks 90 days might be a little short for making a decision about a more formal policy board. Sellers said it might not be 90 days, but it needs to be a reasonable time frame.

Osborne and Johnson brought up the issue of whether it is appropriate for a Lead Entity Coordinator to be the designee from an ILA signatory government. Allison noted that this has been discussed in

the past, but not decided in general across all Lead Entities. Osborne himself thinks and NPCLE agreed that it is not appropriate.

Ensmenger pointed out that the creation of some kind of policy board is an important issue right now, especially as we move forward with creation of a Regional Plan. She said we really need bylaws in place so that if we have a significant issue as the Plan develops, we can deal with it.

Sims suggested that whoever is nominated be queried beforehand as to whether they are available for the position. Allison confirmed that Swartout was asked, and he agreed to be a nominee. She started to enumerate the three possibilities on the table right now, the first being to accept the nomination of Mark Swartout as Chair, noting that we still a nomination for Vice Chair. Johnson nominated Krueger for Vice Chair.

Allison reviewed the three choices: The group could accept the nominations of Swartout for Chair and Krueger for Vice Chair. The second option is leaving these two nominations on the table for a week before nominations are closed. The third would be to leave it alone, come back next month and start over.

Bowen said he had several issues right now. One is that the April Meeting Summary had not yet been approved, so it can't be quoted as fact.

He also needed an answer from his Lead Entity: did NPCLE at their meeting yesterday approve the idea that the designees from the ILA signatories would constitute the Advisory Council? Osborne responded that the item was shown on the screen, the item was discussed, and there was no dissent. Bowen replied that he had a serious problem with that; that, in fact, he had a veto with cause right now because he was not made aware that this decision was going to be considered and decided. He added that this issue is one that he has with his Lead Entity Group, not this larger WCSSP group.

Bowen also had an objection to the ILA representatives being the basis of the Advisory Council: there are three segments of the population on the Coast that are not represented at this table by the ILAs: Lake Ozette, Lake Quinault and the Hoh River. They are under exclusive jurisdiction of the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Park is their representative form of government, but Olympic National Park has never been brought in as a ILA signatory. Allison confirmed that it will so noted in the Meeting Summary.

Allison reiterated that one of the tasks of the whole group after we have a Chair is to determine, for example, who else is eligible to be nominated to be Chair, what will the form and composition of the policy body be, and other details. But, that in order to move the process forward, we need to start by electing a Chair.

Bowen asked what check-and-balance exists to prevent a temporary Council becoming a permanent policy body? Allison said the check would be Sellers' idea of a time limit. Napier added that in addition to the time limit, the concerns as expressed by participants in the Meeting Summary of this meeting would also serve as a check.

Allison said that, although she is not an expert, her understanding is that an ILA is among local governments only. Bowen said if Olympic National Park is not able to sign by law, or is unwilling to sign, that is a problem that needs to be dealt with because then the citizens they represent are not

represented here. He continued by saying that O.N.P. has constitutional requirements because they have citizens they're representing. If they're not going to represent these citizens, that needs to be made part of the record, because if any process goes forward that influences those citizens and they're not represented, that a constitutional failure, in Bowen's opinion.

Krueger noted that WCSSP needs to get it in writing when a government consciously chooses not to sign the Interlocal Agreement. Allison agreed. Bowen added that he needs to know when that letter goes out.

Bingaman summarized what he perceived as the three options on the table: "vote" today (would be by consensus), keep nominations open for a week, or keep nominations open for 30 days. He was having difficulty with idea that the group at the meeting, who were "not totally representative of the ILAs", make a decision to elect a Chairman of the ILA. If we'd made a decision to have the ILA designees constitute the Advisory Committee, then he thinks the ILA designees should come together and decide who their Chair would be.

Allison stated that the vote would be through the Lead Entities, which is why we were taking nominations today, so that that list could be taken back to each Lead Entity Group which would caucus and come back to June meeting with a vote. Bingaman again made the point, which Allison agreed with, that everyone needs to have the list of those eligible to be nominated. Allison said she will send out a comprehensive list of the individuals who have been designated by the ILA signatories as their representative. She then summarized that the decision so far seemed to be that we not close the nominations at this meeting, to which there was no objection heard.

Allison continued that the two options still on the table were: keeping nominations open until 5 pm, Friday, June 5th, or keeping them open for a month, through our meeting on June 17th. In both cases there would be a 6 month sunset placed on this structure. A couple of people expressed a preference for keeping nominations open longer.

In response to Willis, who asked for clarification on what group a Chair was being chosen for, Allison explained that we have this ad hoc group of people that has no formal designation besides the Interlocal Agreement. However, it is this group that meets every month and needs a Chair and Vice-Chair to facilitate it. What was proposed last month was that, at least for interim, ILA designees be the pool of folks from whom we nominate candidates to be the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Allison summarized the proposal currently on the table as follows: nominations close June 5th; those eligible would be anyone who regularly attends meetings plus all ILA representatives; a 6-month sunset clause on the structure; and we would elect a Chair and Vice Chair at the June meeting.

Bowen declared that he cannot personally agree with any of this: he does not agree to yet another temporary structure, he does not agree to an Advisory Council made up of just ILA designees. He said that the group can go ahead and do what they want, but he cannot agree. He has serious issues with his own Lead Entity and whether the group actually did agree to an Advisory Council made up of just ILA designees. If so, he thinks that they violated their own bylaws. Rich Osborne responded that the second agenda he sent out (to NPCLE) did identify those two topics under the WCSSP section of the agenda.

Johnson observed that this kind of structure just doesn't seem to be agreeable to everyone. Dietz suggested that the group, just for now, drop the idea of the Council and simply choose a Chair and

Vice-Chair. She pointed out that from the very beginning of the formation of this group, it was decided that decisions would be made by consensus but if that was not possible, by a vote with each Lead Entity having one vote. The group is made up of those who show up. Allison proposed a revision that would open the list of those eligible to be a list of participating members, that is, the consistent group of people who attend these meetings.

Miller observed that the group is the Advisory Council de facto; it is self-selected, with everyone having a relationship to a Lead Entity Group and/or to an organization that has an interest in the success of this organization. The staff is asking that the group choose a Chair and Vice-Chair to assist in operations of this group, the idea of which it seems the group has agreed upon. A second question is whether the list of those eligible to be nominated be opened up to also include anyone who actively attends meetings.

Willis made the point that, from her perspective, the affiliation of a Chair is a lot less important than their ability run a meeting, keep the decision making process moving forward, make sure everyone has an opportunity to speak, etc. She also pointed out that one can use a combination of decision by consensus and Robert's Rules of Order.

Allison reviewed that the new proposal on the table was for nominations to be left open for two weeks, until June 5th; eligible for nomination are the standard group of people who come to these meetings plus the ILA designees; that we put a 6-month sunset clause on this structure; and, that we will elect the Chair and Vice Chair during our annual meeting June 17th.

Osborne asked why nominations have to be closed June 5th. Allison said because we've got to have elections in June, to which Osborne responded by asking why we couldn't keep nominations open until we actually vote on June 17th. He explained that he was trying to have a meeting of his Lead Entity on this topic.

Krueger pointed out that the sunset clause hadn't yet been discussed or agreed upon. Allison said that was what she was currently asking to be discussed.

Jorgensen said that if the only alternative to a time limit is no time limit, he definitely thinks the 6-month time limit is the way to go.

Miller reminded everyone that there are deliverables in the group's contract with the State. He said the State can be flexible about the mechanics of developing the organization, as long as the group's progress on things like the Plan, reaching critical mass of buy-in to the Plan, and organizational development continues to move forward, which he thinks is happening.

In the spirit of moving forward, Devona Ensmenger said she was nominating James Sellers, noting the extensive experience he's had with organizational boards and policy bodies.

Before listing all nominations as they stood, Allison asked if Krueger was accepting the nomination.

Krueger said she was ambivalent about her nomination because of potential conflicts between her participation as representative of the Quileute Tribe and serving as Chair or Vice-Chair. It is very important that she be able to present something as the representative of the Quileute. Sellers noted that this can be handled through acceptance of parliamentary procedure and Roberts' Rules of Order. It is not an unusual process; it happens a lot and is covered by Robert's Rules of Order. The Chair

calls to be excused from the Chair position and he designates who will sit in his place. He then goes away from the Chair position and states whatever he needs to. Then, when he is done, he returns to his Chair position. Sellers said that all these problems were taken care of using Robert's Rules of Order, and have been successfully practiced meeting after meeting. It does work. He has found a lot of strength in someone's ability to bring back from a meeting what they came to the meeting for with knowledge of Robert's Rules of Order. It gives you power in not only conducting meetings, but participating in meetings. It is a formal way of bringing control to your meetings. The end product is that you get more done.

Krueger said that she was withdrawing her name from nomination, in particular because of the kind of expertise with Robert's Rules of Order that Sellers has that she doesn't, as well as her concerns about being able to represent the Quileute.

Sellers also pointed out that the Chair and Vice Chair would not only be running the monthly meetings, but also working with the Staff between meetings to, for instance, develop the Draft Agenda, disseminate information, etc. In other words, there is time and work required of those two positions that the nominees need to be aware of and agree to.

Osborne suggested we simply have nominations for Chair, with the one who gets the most votes becoming Chair and the one who gets the next most votes becoming Vice Chair. It seemed that everyone thought this was a good idea. Ensmenger said that in that case she needed to rephrase her nomination of James Sellers for Chair.

Allison declared that it sounded like everyone was in agreement with leaving nominations open until our June 17th meeting. If the staff receives a nomination, we will immediately forward it to everyone. Nominations can be made during the June 17th meeting. But then she noted that nominations would have to close in advance of June 17th if the Lead Entities were going to have an opportunity to meet and come to their one-vote decision.

Miller pointed out that if everyone agrees to a vote by the people at the annual business meeting, and that results in the election of a Chair and Vice Chair, that would work. If, however, there was not acclamation for a candidate, then you would revert to the procedure of one vote per Lead Entity.

Osborne said he still had to have it open all the way through June 17th. Allison noted that the problem with that was that it would then take another month for everyone to make their decision. Osborne said, no, we could still vote at the June 17th meeting.

Allison recapped as follows, asking for consensus. Nominations will close June 17th up until we vote at our annual business meeting. We will then vote for a Chair and a Vice Chair. She asked if she could have assurance from the group that on June 17th we'd have an election, and that we won't wait for another month after that. She asked if there were any objections to this? There were none.

(NOTE: Please see the addendum "Comments by Partnership Participants" at the end of this Meeting Summary for comments by Ed Bowen.)

Approval of April Meeting Summary

Krueger noted that on p. 8, there was the statement, "In response to a concern raised by Katie, ..." but it didn't explain what the nature of her concern was. She asked that if in the future someone states a concern, please preserve what the concern was. Dietz said she understood and would do so.

Sellers pointed out that in the future full names and affiliations should be used in the Meeting Summaries since they are formal documents.

Bowen pointed out that on, p. 7, first paragraph, last sentence, there appears to be an opinion that is not identified as such. It was agreed to add an introductory clause so it reads: "Allison offered the opinion that, this way, the ILA representatives have a role in providing community input"

Allison asked if there were any objections to the April Meeting Summary with two changes above made? There were no objections.

Approval of March Meeting Summary

The March Meeting Summary includes comments from Tony Hartrich, Quinault Indian Nation, as an addendum. About this, Dietz explained that the staff thinks it would be a good idea to allow anyone who was at a meeting to make comments about the Meeting Summary, which would be added as an addendum to the Summary without changing the Summary itself.

Allison asked if there were any objections to the March Meeting Summary? There were no objections.

Lee Napier, Coordinator of the Grays Harbor County Lead Entity Group, asked that the group be given more advance notice from staff as to where meetings will be held so they can plan. Staff said they would.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Dietz

COMMENTS BY PARTNERSHIP PARTICIPANTS in response to this meeting summary

The Quinault Lead Entity Group chose John Sims to be a member of the Planning Committee on May 21, 2009.

From: Ed Bowen, NPCLE CC Citizen-At-Large #2

- In an effort to clarify on the issue regarding the makeup of the WCSSP Board or Advisory Council, I do not agree to an Advisory Council made up of just ILA designees. Whereas if this was the result over the long term I would consider this a veto with cause. After the fact, it appears the meeting's goal was more focused on just ILA designees for the primary purpose of establishing a Chair and Vice-Chair for this point in time. Whereas I have grave concerns with continuing a trend of a temporary board or interim organizational structure, at this time it's just that, a concern and not cause for veto. If the process was not able to solicit potential candidates for the positions outside the ILA pool I am one to believe it is in the best interest to move forward with the election*

of the Chair and Vice-Chair even if the choices are just ILA designees; I believe there is reliable conversation and a matter of record in this meeting summary that demonstrates an acceptable check and balance.

- The meeting summary may lead you to believe that NPCLE on the day prior had voted/approved the concept of the Advisory Council being comprised of ILA designees. Given there is language in the summary to support the makeup of the AC should be diverse, there was strong enough non-verbal's at this meeting and language provided in the summary to have you believe NPCLE CC had approved the Advisory Council makeup, and that makeup being just ILA designees. Looking into the matter since the meeting, and unless an NPCLE Citizens Committee member can show otherwise, a vote was not held nor was there a call for vote in either the NPCLE public agenda or even when relying on the concept of coming to consensus. It is hoped that important regional matters such as this will be addressed in a more complete and efficient manner in the future. I consider this to be a lesson learned, including on my part.*
- In an increasing manner it appears to me the WCSSP process has pursued establishing a partnership with the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership. The WCSSP staff was provided guidance to look into other funding sources to operate the WCSSP and for project support. But looking into such is exploratory only and no expectations should be preconceived NASSP is an acceptable or desired result, at least not until the IAC/soon to be Board has openly had a discussion on the possibility, along with formal comment back from each LEG. It's with this purpose I would hope the different planning products (to include the scope of work/dual contracts) will limit their language to "explore"—at least until further direction or consensus has been reached.*
- In considering the news that came out at the meeting regarding the funding to WCSSP and now scope of work component of recovering the ESA listed Ozette Lake Sockeye, I take this opportunity to suggest for the near term WCSSP agenda to discuss establishing a sub-committee to address WCSSP-Ozette Lake Sockeye matters. As a first step in the discussion and given the discussion that has already taken place on the sockeye, I further suggest the sub-committee be comprised of watershed related initiating Governments and stakeholders of NPCLE, with a staff function of the WCSSP Executive Director.*