



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

WCSSP PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

August 20, 2009

Aberdeen Public Library, Washington

Katie Krueger, North Pacific Coast Lead Entity
John Sims, Quinault Lead Entity
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor Lead Entity
Mike Johnson, Pacific Lead Entity
Mike Nordin, Pacific Conservation District
Key McMurry, WBWRCC and Key Environmental Solutions
Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Chris Byrnes, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
Nancy Allison, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP
Dana Dietz, WCSSP

BENEFITS TO REGION OF A PLAN

- Looking at broader scale
- See common issues across the region
- Will be able to take this to funders

The four LEG Strategies deal with the unique circumstances and conditions in each LEG area, whereas this will be a Salmon Plan from more of a regional perspective.

Phil Miller added that the development of a Regional Salmon Plan will bring the Coast Region up to par with other Regions in the eyes of funders; it will create a level of expectation among funders that hasn't existed beforehand. In fact, it will allow the Coast Region to capitalize on its advantages and uniqueness when dealing with funders. James Schroeder thinks that using All-H Analysis will put us above par in the eyes of funders and others.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The group made corrections and additions to the draft Roles and Responsibilities chart for the members of the Planning Committee.

Facilitating Workshops: Generally agreed that facilitator(s) must have no specific geographic interest within the Region: Kara and James of TNC; if needed, staff Nancy, Miles and Dana. Kara mentioned that TNC could possibly provide additional TNC facilitator if group decides it would be helpful.

RESOURCES:

Katie expressed concern about whether Devona has the resources to complete the technical work she is doing. Devona concurred that this is a concern, and that any help would be appreciated. Phil suggested that when appropriate, Devona give the Planning Committee updates on the resource limitations to her technical work.

Nancy asked that if anyone becomes aware of a possible funding source, please let her know so staff can research it.

TIMELINE/CALENDAR:

Tentative Calendar distributed. It is a timeline that will be revised whenever required .

Discussion seemed to indicate we think Workshop #1 will likely be in early November, but we can aim for late October. Will require further discussion.

Phil, speaking as contract administrator keeping tracking of deliverables, clarified: Keeping momentum is good, but rushing early steps in not good. Delays early in the process are understandable.

CAP PROCESS - Kara Nelson

Kara reviewed the first half of the CAP process with an eye towards how it might specifically develop for our purpose, including the next steps we need to accomplish.

Where we are “at” right now and what we’re working on today: Defining the project, and who needs to be involved. The Scope of the WCSSP Plan is a specific geographic area. It is also important to have the Vision Statement and Team Charter so that the members of the Planning Committee are in common agreement on them.

In addition to the above, before Workshop #1 (Focal Targets, that is, what's important to us) we need to have data, maps and other informational materials for the Workshop participants. And a very clear structure/purpose for the Workshop so that it stays on track.

We can do some of the ground work for developing Focal Targets, although we do not want to come to the Workshop saying, "Here's the Focal Targets we have selected," because those decisions needs to come from the Workshop participants.

What we can do is go through existing documents (in particular, the Report on Consideration ... ("ROC"), the January Workshop Minutes and Concept Paper, and the four Lead Entity Strategies) and bring a list of what have been delineated as targets from those documents. That would give us a starting point in the Workshop.

As Phil summarized, we need to clearly frame the Targets concept so that Workshop #1 can progress to identify the Targets, with buy-in from the Workshop participants.

Katie made the point that we need to make sure terms such as "Focal Targets," "Targets," etc. are clearly defined.

Kara noted that we should send invitations to potential Workshop participants four to six weeks beforehand, including not just date-time-and-place, but also information and purpose of Workshop for them to review. She also noted that it's a good idea not have the Workshops too far apart so people forget what happened at the previous one.

The purpose of Workshop #1 is to come to agreement on what Focal Targets for the Plan are. The goal of Target selection is to create a list of eight (8) or fewer: ecological systems, communities of species, and/ or individual species.

Nested Targets are those that are protected because the Focal Target within which they're nested are protected. That is, nested targets are a positive by-product of protecting Focal Targets, or "what else do you get" when you protect a Focal Target.

Next phase: Developing Strategies and Measures, the heart of the whole process.

First, determine Viability of Focal Targets, that is, the status of what's important to us. Kara suggested working in Technical Workshops as the most efficient and productive way to determine Viability. Obviously, this is also what the Needs Assessment is addressing.

These Technical Workshops determine: what is important for the health of our Targets? How do we measure that? How do we rate them? We might organize Technical Workshops around individual Targets, or around issues, or whatever the Planning Committee thinks would be most effective.

Phil added that there's a model that has been used in the other regions in the State for Viability, which this group may choose to use, or modify; he noted that it is for Plans (unlike ours) that deal with ESA Listed Species. The model is called VSP – Viable Salmon Population criteria, which consist of abundance, productivity, diversity and distribution measurements.

Kara continued: then we move into Threats Analysis, determining what's broken in the system. And continue with Situational Analysis of the Threats to determine all the underlying factors that are contributing to the Threats.

Phil noted that there is also a model for this step called All-Hs Analysis (Habitat, Harvest, Hatchery and Hydropower). Devona pointed out that we need to leave adequate time for the Threats Analysis since she can foresee we will have serious disagreements about what those Threats might be, especially when we get into H-Integration.

Kara continued: once we've defined, through Situational Analysis, the important causal drivers of the Threats, then we can begin to develop Strategies for solving the problems.

PEOPLE and CATEGORIES OF PEOPLE

Phil: "The people who we want to own the Plan."

The first iteration of a list of People was handed out; as a starting point, this draft contains everyone who's on the WCSSP Contact List. We need to add other key people. At this point, we're not specifying when or in what capacity we'll invite them to participate, but simply who needs to "own the Plan."

Also handed out was a tentative list of the Categories of People we need to complete this Plan. We need to make sure we've included all the Categories of People we need. The group agreed to change "Citizens" to "Concerned Citizens" and eliminate "Landowners."

Nancy proposed that this be a homework assignment for everyone, to review the list of Categories for any additions or corrections. And then to add the names of specific People who should be at the table, "the people who we want to own the Plan."

SCOPE

The following draft Scope was agreed upon:

All of Washington's watersheds which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Flattery in the north and Cape Disappointment in the south, together with their inland, estuarine and nearshore environments, lying within all or parts of Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Pacific, Cowlitz, Mason, Lewis and Thurston Counties.

VISION STATEMENT

The following draft Vision Statement was agreed upon:

All watersheds in the Washington Coast Region contain healthy, diverse and self-sustaining populations of salmonids, maintained by healthy habitats and ecosystems, which also support the ecological, cultural, social, and economic needs of human communities.

The draft Scope and Vision Statements need to be vetted by the larger group at a Regional Meeting. James pointed out that this should be done before Workshop #1 so that Workshop time is not taken up and the Workshop has a clear focus.

The Vision Statements and Scope and other Planning Committee draft documents can be distributed to people within each of our constituent groups, but not outside.

NEXT STEPS

Too many people unable to come September 1st, so we decided to change the date of the next meeting. Nancy will do doodle poll.

For next, September meeting of Planning Committee: PEOPLE

Review the list of Categories for any additions or corrections. And then to add the names of specific People who should be at the table, “the people who we want to own the Plan.”

Attached:

Draft ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES as revised at this meeting.

Please send corrections/additions to Dana.

Draft CALENDAR through June 2010

Draft SCOPE as agreed upon at this meeting.

Draft VISION STATEMENT as agreed upon at this meeting.

Draft CATEGORIES of People as revised at this meeting.

Draft PEOPLE Chart as revised at this meeting.

Also attached is electronic copy of Kara’s tentative Workshop Schedule distributed at our July meeting.