



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

WCSSP PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, January 5, 2010

WDFW, 48 Devonshire Rd, Montesano

Miles Batchelder, WCSSP , Co-Chair
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy, Co-Chair
Bob Burkle, WDFW
Dana Dietz, WCSSP
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
Mike Johnson, PCLE Coordinator

Katie Krueger, Quileute Indian Tribe
Key McMurry, Key Environmental Solutions
Phil Miller, GSRO
Lee Napier, GHCLE Coordinator
Rich Osborne, NPCLE Coordinator
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy
John Sims, QINLE Coordinator

Agenda

There were no changes or additions to today's Agenda.

November 3, 2009 and December 1, 2009 Planning Committee Meeting Notes

There were no changes or corrections to the Nov. 3, 2009 or the Dec. 1, 2009 Meeting Notes.

Review of Workshop #1

Kara Nelson led a review of the planning Workshop #1 held December 8, 2009:

The positives were:

- the number of participants;
- the diversity of interests they represented;
- beginning the process of building trust and participation in creating a good plan;
- meeting all the objectives that we as a Committee had set out; and
- ending up with the two sets of targets that make the most sense.

The areas needing improvement were:

- Focus and drive, i.e., need more consistency in style between facilitators (in particular, Kara was more demanding of her group (a good thing), pushing them to come to consensus with detail);
- Time before decision to vote between final two lists of Targets, facilitator's decision to bring it to a vote did not allow further discussion/compromise/possible consensus;

- Lack of buy-in resulting from “us versus them” mentality that developed between the two groups who’d come up with habitat “versus” life-stage targets;
- Focal Targets should have been fleshed out at the workshop to include nested targets, some folks think the chosen Targets are too general;
- Level of understanding within group of the *whole* process in relation to the *individual steps* of the process, and vice versa;
- The facility itself, the layout, especially the poor acoustics; and,

Solutions (What would make the next workshop better?) outlined by the group were:

- Improved and more extensive facilitator training for break-out group leaders so that they’re more consistent in approach (because the inconsistency may be part of what led to dissatisfaction with the final results and the process);
- A process diagram that’s a simplified version of the “Process and Partners” timeline we currently use (which would show participants that we’re paying attention to the whole and show them where we are in the process at each step);
- Technical outreach groups to work out details and resolve issues, which will both bring in the nested targets that need to be included and build trust among participants that the process will create a good plan;
- Use of terminology that participants understand more readily, not the CAP jargon;
- Making sure the facilitators are very aware of terminology and emphasize to participants where we are in the process;
- Clarifying to the participants that they are going to get what they want, that the two lists are not contradictory, and that, if they’re not getting what they want, we’ll talk about it; and,
- Use of microphones for the main leaders/speakers.

Facilitation

Phil Miller said he thought it was important to know what TNC wants and needs in terms of facilitation support. Kara responded that since she is serving both as overall process organizer and chief workshop (co-) facilitator for such large groups, she really feels the need for another workshop co-facilitator in order for her to continue to do a good job in both roles. The group agreed that we need to find a facilitator who can work with Kara closely so that their facilitation style/guidance is similar.

Devona Ensmenger pointed out that if John Kliem is amenable to working within the CAP process, he would be a good choice because of his involvement and knowledge of this region, and also his facilitation of the Needs Assessment which is really Phase I of this Plan.

It was agreed that staff would explore the possibility of contracting with Kliem for future Plan facilitation, and perhaps technical writing. James Schroeder said that the main thing that needs to happen with a new facilitator is the ability to spend the necessary amount of time working

with Kara before a workshop so that he and Kara are facilitating similarly. It was also noted that if Kliem helps with the Regional Salmon Plan, he will be a better position to work with the Lead Entities as they revise their Strategies, as that comes up.

Socioeconomic Targets

Miles Batchelder suggested taking the socioeconomic targets to the Lead Entities Groups for discussion and feedback. The group decided that first we need to figure out when the socioeconomic targets should be more actively brought in to the CAP process. It needs to be after there is some substance to the Plan, when strategies are beginning to be considered, but not at the tail end of the process. Kara said she would forward some descriptions of where such Targets have been brought into the discussion in other CAP planning processes, as well as comments/proposal on a good fit here. It was agreed that Kara and Miles would bring back to the group a proposal on this question.

It was agreed to not take the target lists to Lead Entity meetings because of the time it would take, the fact that many LE members did not participate in the CAP process, and the likelihood that we'd end up with four more lists – not our intent. James agreed that, although there's a lot to add to the lists that came from Workshop #1, we don't want to change them too much outside our structured process workshops; we don't want to undermine our own process.

Devona noted that the Cascade Land Conservancy is currently working on the Olympic Agenda, which might supplement other feedback we get on the socioeconomic targets. Bob Burkle also brought to our attention the work being done in the Chehalis Basin by David Batker on ecosystem valuation; this work will be done soon and might provide some valuable comparisons.

It was agreed to combine "Industrial (ports), infrastructure and development" in the list, and to describe what each socioeconomic target means in relationship to a Salmon Plan. We don't want stakeholders reading an unannotated list, and saying, "Oh, we're a target now?!!"

Follow-up Meetings with Technical Participants

Miles proposed that in order to add the specificity and species/life stage targets as nested targets within our habitat targets, we have a series of small meetings with technical participants. He thinks these meetings would serve several purposes:

- overcome some of the disappointment in the results of Workshop #1
- better prepare participants for our First Technical Session, get some ground work done
- include technical folks who were not able to attend Workshop #1
- continue to "sell" the CAP process
- begin to create future core of technical advisors

He proposed four small meetings, and asked for input as to those to invite:

- North Coast (Pat Crain, Steve Allison, Phil Decillis, Jeremy Gllman, Chris Byrnes,others?)
- Quinault (QIN staff, Dave King, others?)
- Chehalis (WDFW, Lonnie Crumley, Nicole Hill, Andy Olson, Tom Kollasch, Charlie Stenvall, others?)
- Olympia (Brad Thompson, Thom Hooper, others?)

Before these meetings, he thinks a sub-committee should create a draft version, to include the alternate life stage target list and the high-level indicators as identified by the State. Phil pointed out that these high level indicators are going to be used at many levels, from local projects through the scale of Pacific Northwest, so it would be good to harmonize with this general trend. Kara said that she was going to talk about creating such a sub-committee in preparation for the First Technical Session. Phil encouraged the core committee and staff to take the initiative in clarifying the Targets; not changing them, but clarifying, expanding on them for reaction from others. James concurred, saying that this committee is “the engine on the train” and we’re responsible for keeping momentum going.

Mike Johnson asked whether we have access to any of the SRFB Technical Board members for this process; Phil asked that Miles send him an email asking this question and he will explore the possibility. Devona reminded us that George Pess of NOAA has offered to review our work as we go along, and that in addition to the help he can provide, it would be good to get further buy-in by NOAA. Same is true of Brad Thompson of USFWS, and Thom Hooper of NOAA.

Phil encouraged the group, after the first technical session, to consider how it’s going to organize and utilize its technical resources, not necessarily a Technical Committee that meets regularly, but a core group who are willing to review materials, participate in conference calls, occasionally meet, etc. We need to define the role of this core group.

Integrating Netmap, CAP and WCSSP’s Planning Process

The group brainstormed all the questions that need to be answered about NetMap before we can fully recommend it to WCSSP IAC for consideration of purchase.

- What can NetMap provide in the CAP process?
- What salmon species does it cover?
- What would the basics of NetMap provide us?
- What do we need beyond that?

- What is the gap between what we expect and the reality?
- What data would we need to provide to NetMap? In what form?
- What were ESI's standards/protocols for data put into NetMap?
- Are there forms of data that cannot be entered into NetMap?
- How much work to put data into NetMap? Who'd do it? How much would it cost?
- How long does uploading take?
- What is the timeline for all this – that is, at what point could NetMap begin inputting into the planning process?
- When LIDAR for an area is done, would it be another cost to update NetMap with that data?
- What is Earth System Institute's (ESI) projected timeline for inclusion of estuarine component of NetMap?
- What are the specifics on training provided? Cost of additional training?
- What are the "hidden" costs beyond the \$25,000? For supplemental needs we have? For support/personnel needs we'd have?

Devona explained that NetMap is accessible on your computer if you have GIS capability. We need to do inventory of who has GIS capability, and find out from ESI what minimum computer requirements are.

Phil related that if we obtain and utilize NetMap, at some mix of the two scales (watershed and regional), we will score a lot of points statewide. The technical core group needs to have a role and responsibility in approving NetMap, whereas it's the responsibility of the Planning Committee to recommend and the IAC to approve purchase of NetMap.

The concerns about NetMap were:

- Do LEs have funding available to pay personnel to use NetMap for local projects?
- The main area in Pacific County is the estuaries, and NetMap doesn't include estuaries yet. Ensmenger said she doesn't know what Benda's expected timeline for the estuarine component is. Question to ask.

- There have been other data systems that were purchased in the past, but didn't live up to expectations over the long haul, so there's cynicism out there. Before we purchase it, we need to make sure we fully understand the "hidden" costs after we've purchased it.

Planning for First Technical Session

The upcoming First Technical Session is to assess Viability, determine Key Ecological Attributes, and Indicators, current status and desired status.

The first concern expressed was the confusion between the use of the terms "viability" here in the CAP process and "viable" in VSP -Viable Salmonid Populations. It was generally decided to change this CAP step to "Habitat Condition."

As discussed earlier, Kara recommended an expanded core sub-committee work on this technical session by meeting to flesh out the nested targets, include the alternate targets list, bring in the high level indicators, start to gather the data for the viability analysis, gather appropriate materials, discuss and plan for any challenges we might face, etc. We would then have something to take to the four preliminary, smaller meetings for them to react to, improve, etc. The group agreed and the subcommittee formed was: Miles, Kara, James, Devona, Mike, Key, Rich, Bob and Dana.

Both the last week in February and the first week of March were discussed as potential dates for the First Technical Session. We need to send out to participants beforehand: CAP process summary, and data for their review. Phil suggested that we create a CAP process summary/timeline that's a simpler version of our blue Timeline. Staff agreed to bring a revised one to our next Planning Committee meeting.

In discussing who should be invited to this technical session the group agreed that it should be both the highly technical types as well as those who are a mix of technical and policy, but not those who are strictly policy. It needs to include both expertise and representation. The group carefully reviewed both the list of those who attended Workshop #1 as well as the larger list of potential Plan participants in order to create a tentative list of invitees.

Adjournment

Miles adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Dietz