



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

WCSSP PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

July 23, 2009

Ocean Shores, Washington

Nancy Allison, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP
Dana Dietz, WCSSP
Rich Osborne, North Pacific Coast Lead Entity
Katie Krueger, North Pacific Coast Lead Entity
John Sims, Quinault Lead Entity
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor Lead Entity
John Kliem, Grays Harbor Lead Entity
Debbie Holden, Grays Harbor Lead Entity
Mike Johnson, Pacific Lead Entity
Bob Burkle, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Chris Byrnes, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy
April Boe, The Nature Conservancy
Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center

TWO PHASES TO OUR PLANNING PROCESS - Nancy

- 1) **Needs Assessment - Data gaps, quality of data, agreement on data**
Technical Lead: Devona Ensmenger with Creative Community Solutions and technical advisors
- 2) **Regional Salmon Plan development - using CAP (Conservation Action Planning) process**
Process Lead: Nancy Allison with Planning Committee and staff

DISCUSSION

Katie: The word “conservation” seriously concerns tribes, who are harvesters. How is “conservation” defined here? Does it include harvesting?

Kara: It’s just a word; we can call it Management Action Planning. CAP is just the name of the process, not the name of our plan.

John K: His experience is that “conservation” is normally defined as “wise use of the environment.”

Katie: We need to define “conservation” and make all this clear up front, so it’s the first thing people see. If we do this, then I’m OK with it.

CAP PROCESS - Kara

Kara handed out :

- 2-page CAP process

- Generic outline of the process

- Her draft of specific WCSSP workshop schedule to get discussion going

- Printed Powerpoint presentation on CAP

She then reviewed the process:

CAP was originally a project management tool, developed about 15 years ago. It has been used a lot since then, for large processes and small processes, environmental processes and economic processes and social processes.

It’s a process that leads you to strategies that you can measure.

The process itself is important because it brings everyone together, an essential part of then implementing the plan. It brings us to common ground. CAP gets all of our thoughts, knowledge and assumptions out on the table. It’s rigorous. It’s science based.

CAP leads us to the best strategies for what we think is important in our area, based on values and science.

It is completely flexible; it’s a tool. It’s something that guides us, but it’s also something we can change, we can adapt to what we want to get out of it.

It enables us to prioritize around actions we can agree upon and work together on to achieve common goals.

It establishes a measuring system at the end which enables us to realize whether our actions are achieving our goals.

There’s software we can use, if we choose, to provide templates for various steps as we proceed, and capture our process to more easily enable us to later modify our Plan

CAP ensures that steps won't be overlooked, even if some of the questions are already answered. For instance, in WCSSP, the geographic scope is already defined, but it's essential that we all review, understand and agree upon what we've already decided.

The process is:

- Identify the people to be involved
- Define our scope and our focal targets (establish a common vision, define our geographic scope, scale, what we care about)
- Develop strategies
 - Assess the viability of our chosen targets and define what "healthy" would look like
 - Do a situational analysis
 - What are the underlying causes of current unhealthy status?
 - What are the threats to the health of our targets?
 - Define strategies
 - How do we abate the threats to our targets?
 - How do we enhance the viability of our targets?
 - How should we rank the importance of the threats we've defined?
- Decide "what does success look like?" and how we measure that
- Implement our strategies and how best to bring that about, perhaps develop Work Plans
- Determine whether we need to adapt our Plan in response to what we've learned during implementation

DISCUSSION

For each workshop tentatively outlined by Kara, we could have

- one workshop with everyone; or
- four workshops, one per LEG; or
- two workshops (one for 20 and 21; another for 22, 23 and 24); or
- one workshop that then includes breakout group meetings; or ...?

Kara noted the importance of first agreeing on a one- or two-sentence Vision. That Vision Statement will then help direct us as to how we structure workshops.

To determine how many locations each workshop is held in, we need to determine for each workshop topic:

- What do we want to accomplish with the workshop?
- Who needs to be there to do that?

For instance, everyone really needs to be in one location for Workshop 1 in order to reach common ground before further planning.

Another question will be: How will prioritizing be done -- within each LEG, or across all LEGs? This discussion is part of the process.

Katie pointed out fourteen targets already identified by the group in the Report on Consideration..... This needs to be used as an initial list so work is not repeated unnecessarily; p. 24, Appendix 3. We copied that page for everyone.

Katie had the idea of a “place-holder”, unnamed Target in the Regional Plan that each LEG would then fill in with their unique, additional Target(s). James suggested that one or more Targets might be overarching ones that would then be dealt with by different strategies per LEG. Phil pointed out that in some ways that what the four LEG strategies already were.

Documents that capture group thinking and decisions so far include - Nancy

Report on the Consideration of Forming a Coastal Regional Governance Unit for Salmon Sustainability

Facilitation Minutes of January 009 Forks workshop meeting

Concept Paper by John Kliem based on January workshop

Four Lead Entity Strategies

2009-2011 Scope of Work

Interlocal Agreement

And: Conservation Action Planning Process

Washington State guidelines for salmon recovery planning

(Phil makes sure that when they're relevant to WCSSP process, they're followed; some parts are irrelevant to WCSSP; Lee said there's a handout so one can easily keep these guidelines in mind.)

Resources (and people) - Nancy

SRFB Funding for technical support (\$50,000) including some technical writing ??

SRFB Funding for LEG involvement in planning process (\$28,000)

SRFB Funding for WCSSP staff involvement (part of the SOW) inclu non-technical writing

Nature Conservancy involvement through James, Kara, Eric and April (approx. ½ FTE)

Wild Salmon Center through Devona (8% of her time for next 18 months).

WDFW through Bob and Chris, and through them to Kurt, his team of biologists, and all the hatchery and harvest data

GSRO through Phil Miller

Many people through Lead Entity Groups

Documents listed above outlining work already done toward this Plan

Other people/organizations/sectors?

John K. suggested as good resource: harvest component: Mark Cedergreen

TECHNICAL/NEEDS ASSESSMENT - Devona

One component of Needs Assessment is stocks and stock status: It's come up repeatedly in the Needs Assessment workshops that we need to have agreement on our stocks and their status PRIOR to generating this Regional Plan.

If we can't agree on those stocks, we're not going to develop an effective Plan. This is a part that I've taken responsibility for, and for which I have some funding. I'll be working with both of the co-managers and have a series of one-on-one conversations and workshops as needed. We'll develop a micro process to come to that agreement. I'm looking at September/October for completion. It's come up in Needs Assessment workshops that we even need to go back and agree on what "stock" means. And agree on what is the accurate number of stocks?

DISCUSSION

In terms of timing for all the Needs Assessment work, all of which feeds into the Workshop 2: mid-August @ John Kliem, so with Stock Status component, all should be done October.

Kara: I see Workshop 1 being more likely in October –
This cmtee needs to meet to finalize Vision, Scope, etc.
This cmtee needs to meet to decide who to invite to Workshop 1.
Then we need to set the meeting up, invite those people, etc.

Her experience is that it's very important to make sure you've invited everybody you need to invite, that you make sure you don't leave anybody out. If you do, it gets the whole process in a lot of trouble.

SCHEDULING - Nancy

Lee – really needs to know schedule and task/time commitment required as soon as possible so she can carve out time.

Deliverable Dates and work backwards for timeline

November 2009	Plan Outline : outlines main content headings <u>and</u> process to be used
July 2010	Draft Plan
December 2010	Final Plan
December 2010	Draft Monitoring Plan component of the Plan
May 2011	Final Monitoring & Adaptive Management Plan component of the Plan

DISCUSSION

Being the one responsible for tracking deliverables, Phil noted that the three most important products are the first three: Plan Outline, Draft Plan and Final Plan. It's the products that are the drivers of this process, not the dates.

For instance, Phil thinks that we can and we should aim to have an Outline before November 2009 to give ourselves maximum time to develop Draft Plan.

Lee noted that she sees the work done at the January 2009 workshop as a good beginning on the Outline.

Phil: We have to answer: How far do we have to get on Vision, Scope and Targets before we're comfortable creating an Outline?

Kara response: It would be highly beneficial to have a Vision, a Scope and a list of People before defining draft Outline.

Phil: Spend next hour brainstorming Vision, Scope, People; then staff bring back drafts of these items to next meeting.

Planning Committee Schedule

First Tuesday every month beginning in September (September 1st)

In August, Nancy will do doodle poll – August 20th, 9/10am – 2pm, Aberdeen Library

NEXT STEPS - Nancy

To be distributed as drafts to Planning Cmtee before next meeting, for finalization of draft at next meeting:

(It was agreed not to brainstorm on each item at meetings – it's too time consuming.)

- 1) By Katie, through Nancy: first draft of Vision Statement
- 2) By staff: Draft of scope for Planning Committee to review
- 3) By staff: Draft list of people for Planning Committee to review – who are the key partners who have to buy into the Plan, probably largely made up of people in LE participants and ILA governments, plus all co-managers. But are there also other players, like Timber, Ports, Commercial Fishers . . . other private sector people. And also scientific expertise.
- 4) By staff: Time commitment and calendar
- 5) By staff: Draft Team Charter/Work Plan for Planning Committee:

The Planning Cmtee is planning out entire process, including each workshop, doing background and follow-up work.

The Planning Cmtee needs to develop framework within which workshops happen. All real substantive input into the planning process and Plan will come from the workshops. We need to develop the proper framework so that everyone who needs to be is involved and feels comfortable with the framework.

The Planning Cmtee needs to create real clarity, content and organization for the workshops, especially for the first Workshop, so people know why they're attending. For that clarity, content and organization, we need more time as a committee.

- 6) By staff: For all of the above, distillation of Basic Documents (Report on Consideration ..., January 2009 workshop Facilitation Minutes and Concept Paper, commonalities among and differences between four LEG Strategies) to determine **what the group has already vetted for the Planning Process.**
- 7) Draft Plan Outline for Planning Committee to review - September or later meeting.

These notes assembled by Dana Dietz