



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

WCSSP PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, December 1, 2009

Hoquiam Timberland Library, Hoquiam, Washington

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP , Co-Chair
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy, Co-Chair
April Boe, The Nature Conservancy
Bob Burkle, WDFW
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe
Phil Miller, GSRO
Rich Osborne, NPCLE Coordinator
John Sims, Quinault Lead Entity Coordinator
Dana Dietz, WCSSP

AGENDA

Miles Batchelder suggested adding to today's Agenda a discussion of the Technical Budget Subcommittee. John Sims suggested talking about how many future workshops will need to be co-facilitated and will therefore cost WCSSP. Batchelder noted that we will talk about this in particular after Workshop #1, after our experience then.

NOVEMBER 3, 2009 PLANNING MEETING NOTES

The acceptance of the Meeting Notes from the November 3, 2009 Planning Committee Meeting was delayed until next month in order to integrate into them Kara's writeup on Goal setting as part of the CAP process. Phil Miller commented that in the Timeline, it should be clarified that goals be proposed at the Technical Workshops, but then further considered at the more general workshops.

TECHNICAL BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Batchelder reported that a subcommittee met after the last Regional Meeting to discuss how we would decide to use the \$50,000 Technical part of the Planning Budget allotted WCSSP. This subcommittee will submit its proposal to the Planning Committee, which then will submit a proposal to the larger group at a Regional Meeting. For several reasons, we really should get the Planning Committee's proposal to the larger group at the December Regional Meeting so that the larger group can make a decision by the January Regional Meeting.

Although the subcommittee isn't excluding other input, it decided that the primary input to our decision should be the results of the Wild Salmon Center's Needs Assessment. The four needs identified as having top priority across the region were: Update SaSI, Use of a common tool, Data steward services, and Completing additional watershed analyses. It was acknowledged that updating SaSI is far too large a task to take on now, whereas if the region had a common analytical tool, and data steward services to support that tool, we could have improved input into the Regional Salmon Plan, as well as ongoing utility.

With that in mind, Devona Ensmenger is developing a chart of the all four of the options from the Needs Assessment which will give us critical information about each need, its cost, how it can inform the Plan currently under development, etc. The chart will include all the tools prioritized during the Needs Assessment workshops. Once this chart is complete, she will distribute it to the Planning Committee. It was decided that we would have a conference call meeting, perhaps an hour, sometime before the December 16th Monthly Meeting so that we could hopefully make our recommendation to the larger group.

The tentative decision seems to be leaning towards the choice of NetMap. So there was some discussion of how NetMap could fit into our schedule of Plan development. Devona said it would take Lee Benda a month to do all the net trace layers, which is the first step. This cost has lowered to \$25,000 because of other parties getting layers done in NetMap also (although there would be additional costs to further validate the tool and run the analyses requested by the group). Ensmenger said that she thought NetMap could definitely be informing the Planning Process by the time we work on Strategies. In the future it could also be used for Lead Entity Strategy development. It has a cross-talk function that allows it to interact with other analytical tools.

Miller summarized that the inclination towards NetMap seems to be based on several things: the cost is reasonable for WCSSP's budget, it would help all areas of the region, it would be timely enough to contribute to the quality of the Plan, and it has flexibility for future use. He said that he was comfortable with that possible decision. All he would need is the decision-making process written up, from subcommittee through Planning Committee to agreement by the larger WCSSP group, to document how expenditure(s) were decided upon.

CO-FACILITATION OF FUTURE WORKSHOPS

Sims pointed out that if we have every workshop co-facilitated, it's going to get expensive. Kara Nelson responded that she thinks we'll only need co-facilitation for the workshops involving larger groups of people, not all of them. Batchelder said that he thought we could have a better conversation about this matter after Workshop #1, once we've had the experience.

REVIEW OF WORKSHOP #1 AGENDA

Nelson reviewed the Agenda for Workshop #1:

Open with a welcome, from Batchelder and Miller, about 10 minutes each.

Andy Dickerson and Kara Nelson will do informational segments on the CAP process in general, as well as Focal Targets in particular.

Q&A will be held at the end of these introductory segments.

Eight breakout groups, one each facilitated by Eric Delvin, Miles Batchelder, James Schroeder and Kirsten Evans from TNC and two each facilitated by Andy Dickerson and Kara Nelson. Each of the latter four groups will have a Planning Committee person assigned to them to make sure the group stays on track when the facilitator (Andy or Kara) is at the other table. These four people are: Rich, Devona, April and Dana.

Each breakout group will be 6 or less people, chosen by counting off around the room (that is, it will be random.) Each of the 8 groups picks up to 8 Targets. Then the group pairs up (so that there are then 4 groups of up to 12 people each) and reduce their combined 16 Targets down to 8. Then the groups pair up again (so that there are two groups of up to 24 people each) and reduce their combined 16 Targets down to 8. Each of these three “rounds” is scheduled for 30 minutes.

After that, the “Synthesis and Decisions” is when everybody is back together and reduce the final 16 Targets down to 8.

Nelson clarified that she sees the afternoon time to focus on Socioeconomic Targets as more of a brainstorming session, not the last discussion about Socioeconomic Targets.

She thinks that a beginning presentation about Viability is important so that the whole group has an idea of what assessing Viability is all about. “Consideration of how does Viability Assessment works for our initial Biological Targets”, mostly transmitting information about Viability Assessment, not actually doing a Viability Assessment. We currently have the Needs Assessment as a foundation for the Viability Assessment. Those who aren’t familiar with the Needs Assessment need to know what’s been done. Put URL of Needs Assessment on some piece of paper participants will get.

Katie Krueger pointed out that each term needs to have a clear definition, so we don’t spend the time arguing about definitions. In relation to that, it was agreed not to use the term “cultural” since it has different meanings to different people, and, as Krueger pointed out, WCSSP and the LEG process certainly doesn’t have a say in Quileute culture. It was agreed that values will be reflected in the discussions and decisions, and that if we need to use the term, we

use “cross-cultural.” Both April Boe and Bob Burkle pointed out that, although they understand what Krueger is saying in relation to tribal cultures, that people and “cultures” in general are very important in the world of salmon sustainability.

It was agreed to display the draft Vision Statement and provide a means for participants to comment on it.

MOCK TARGETS WORKSHOP

Nelson handed out the write-up from our last meeting outlining the example Target we took all the way through the CAP process. Dietz noted that this handout includes the Goal setting, so it is what she will integrate into last month’s Meeting Notes.

Workshop itself:

“Our goal is at the end of this half hour have a list of up to 8 Targets that capture the entire Coast Region for salmon ecosystems.

“We’ll start by identifying the broader, coarser scale of ecosystem, habitat and life stage Targets that capture a lot of needs of salmon species across the region, and then fine tune as we go along, including adding any Targets that aren’t taken care of in our original list.

“For the first 15 minutes, let’s simply brainstorm ideas for Targets. Then step back and ask, “Do we have everything listed that needs to be?” If so, proceed.

“Now we’re going to whittle this list down to eight maximum. The first step is to combine Targets that make sense to combine, or figure out how to combine them, or recognize that one suggested Target is really a Nested Target of another, overarching Target. Then it’s a matter of picking Targets that are more important, more central, and/or more feasible to repair.

“The final step is to review the whole list and make sure that some important Target hasn’t been left out.”

Note from Miller: It’s easy to start splitting Targets. A major downfall of “splitting” is that you’re adding complexity and creating more work for yourself down the road. Anything that can be “lumped” combines work tasks down the road. The group will need to drill down to the critical specifics that need to be fixed, but it has to be a very disciplined process in order to not split unnecessarily and thereby create multiples of your work load later.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Dietz