



## WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

### WCSSP PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, November 3, 2009

Montesano City Hall, Montesano, Washington

Bob Burkle, Washington Dept of Fish and Wildlife  
Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center  
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor Lead Entity Coordinator  
John Sims, Quinault Lead Entity Coordinator  
Mike Johnson, Pacific Lead Entity Coordinator  
Key McMurry, WBWRCC, Key Environmental Solutions  
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy  
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy  
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP (Chair)  
Dana Dietz, WCSSP

#### **AGENDA**

The Agenda for today's meeting was accepted with no changes.

#### **OCTOBER 6, 2009 PLANNING MEETING NOTES**

The October 6, 2009 Planning Meeting Notes were accepted with no changes.

#### **DISCUSSION NEEDS ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK**

Feedback which Lee Napier received after the Needs Assessment White Paper and e-Library URL were distributed seems to indicate that there is confusion about the relationship of the Wild Salmon Center's Needs Assessment (data e-Library, data gaps, and stock/population refinement) to WCSSP's Regional Plan.

The comments Lee received were:

- *"I see no mention of harvest reform or impacts which is the primary problem with escapement for the basin."*
- *"Some of the suggestions are good, but many pie in the sky goals that would be impossible to achieve without a lot more money."*
- *"I will go through and write up a critique of each item."*
- *"It would be nice to have some concrete suggestions that we can actually achieve."*

- *“Some are very good and totally agree with, but many are not achievable, but it is good to list them.”*
- *“I was under the impression there was going to be a work group to develop this document. Was I mistaken or did I miss the meetings?”*
- *“I was on the tech advisory for this and never heard of a meeting or had an inquiry from Devona.”*

It was decided that we should prepare a chart, calendar and/or description of the steps and their interrelationship within the overall Regional Planning process. We should distribute these items periodically as Updates, both to explain the various (but related) parts of our planning process and to keep everyone apprised of where in the process we currently are. In particular, everyone liked the idea of a chart and timeline that would provide a very graphic picture of our current status and the interrelationship of the parts. The staff agreed to prepare a draft and send it to everyone on the Planning Committee for review, comment and editing. We'll then send it out to our larger group and everyone who was involved in the Needs Assessment workshops. In particular, we'll again ask the latter group for their feedback.

### **WORKSHOP #1 – Invitees**

In order to add more of the agricultural community, it was agreed to add Terry Willis (Grays Harbor County Commissioner) and Bob Amrine (Lewis Conservation District) to our list of invitees. (See updated list attached.)

### **WORKSHOP #1 – Lake Quinault Lodge Logistics**

Dana reviewed the logistical arrangements for holding Workshop #1 at the Lake Quinault Lodge. There will be coffee, tea and bottled water all day, muffins and fresh fruit and cheese cubes in the morning, and a buffet lunch of ½ sandwich, chips, a hearty soup and a soda for lunch. The question came up of generator. The lodge does have a generator for the lobby, the dining room and all the guest rooms; however, it doesn't work in the ballroom, but we could make do in, for example, the dining room.

### **WORKSHOP #1 -- Draft Agenda**

Kara distributed a draft agenda to review, discuss and modify. (Copy attached and used as headings below.)

#### **Welcome and introductions**

- Welcome
- Introductions
- Overview by WCSSP
- It was agreed that a good idea would be to have Phil Miller do a short intro on the importance of this Plan, the standard the Plan needs to achieve to be analogous to other regional plans in the State. (Miles said he would ask Phil about this.)

## Overview of CAP Process and the Importance of Target Selection

Kara noted that she's committed to finding commonalities among and translating between CAP terminology and salmon recovery plan" terminology so that participants can understand the CAP process more quickly. She asked for suggestions, indicating that she'd been studying the Lower Columbia Plan. Also suggestions on what words might throw up red flags for participants. She will send out a list of terminology in the next few weeks and ask everyone to review it and give her feedback on red flags, suggestions, improvements, etc.

Kara suggested that during the overview presentation, we should display the graphic timeline/parts chart we talked earlier about creating, in order to give participants of sense of where we are in the overall process.

### What are Targets? Process for Selection ----- Break Out Groups and Synthesis

Next, Kara will again define Targets and give examples. It was agreed that it would be best to have a Target example that was something from everyday life, because if we use an ecological target of any sort, participants might think we're *suggesting* a Target and/or it might confuse the discussion. In addition, it was noted that it might be good to have an example that's funny, to set a good tone for the day and be an icebreaker.

However, Kara was concerned that in order to explain some concepts about Targets, she also needs to use some kind of ecological example. Lee suggested that Kara present an ecological Target by saying, "I've been working with the Planning Committee and here is an example they thought is appropriate for our area." Lee felt that this would then allow people to say "yes" or "no" to the Planning Committee's example, and hopefully avoid the problems that might otherwise happen. The Planning Committee could provide Kara with a good example to use. Everyone agreed that this was a good idea.

### Break-Out Groups

Break out groups will be determined randomly, by counting off around the room. Each break out group will have approximately 6 participants plus one facilitator and hopefully one member of the Planning Committee. The latter will only be representing their regular interests and opinions, but hopefully Planning Cmtee members will also have a better understanding of the CAP Process and terminology which might help the group stay on course. The small group facilitators will be the contracted facilitator, Kara, James, Eric, April, Miles, Dana and one or two others from TNC, perhaps Tom Kollasch.

Each group will have, say, 30 minutes, to come up with up to 8 Targets. Then two groups would 'merge' and reduce their collective 16 Targets down to 8. Repeat the process again twice, and we will have culled to 16 biological Targets.

This would break down as follows, assuming we have 48 participants:  
Eight groups of approx 6 each + facilitator.  
Then four groups of 12 each.  
Then two groups of 24.  
Then whole group of 48 could discuss the 16 Targets still listed and reduce to 8.  
(Obviously it'll be modified depending on actual number of participants and the number of Targets they define.)

Kara explained that the reason this works well is that people discover the similarity of Targets they're coming up with, but, if their lists aren't similar, they're forced to talk about it and do trade-off analyses.

It was agreed that the groups "start from scratch" to develop their lists of eight Targets, instead of us providing a huge list of possible Targets. Kara thought that this made sense for several reasons: Targets are already somewhat defined ("salmon"), the geographical area is already defined (WRIAs 20-24), and there is sensitivity in the area to being "told what to do."

#### Socioeconomic and Cultural Targets Beginning Viability Analysis of Biological Targets

It was agreed to involve everybody in both of these discussions/tasks; that is, don't have them going on at the same time as Kara's draft Agenda outlines, but instead one after the other: an hour brainstorming Socioeconomic and Cultural Targets, then an hour and a half doing a coarse, initial viability analysis on the Biological Targets.

#### Socioeconomic and Cultural Targets

The group liked the idea, for socioeconomic and cultural Targets, of identifying up to eight "natural-resource-based values and livelihoods that are community priorities," things that are:

- 1) salmon-related and/or might affect salmon viability, and
- 2) need to reconcile favorably with any Salmon Plan strategies.

#### **WORKSHOP #1 -- Information Materials to Provide for the Workshop**

Maps, charts, etc. on the walls around the room – Kara asked if a few Planning Cmtee members could help her with this. Updated WSC regional map; species distribution; land ownership; TNC ecoregional maps.

Documents to be familiar with: Staff to put together list and send out, e.g,  
Lead Entity Strategies  
Watershed Assessments/Plans

USFWS Review of National Fish Hatcheries, HSRG  
Climate Change Analysis out of UW  
State Outline for Salmon Recovery Plans

### **WORKSHOP #1 -- Getting People There**

Miles and Dana assured everyone that they would be working on this, calling, sending out reminders, etc.

### **MOCK WORKSHOP #1**

Kara started to present three types of approaches the larger group might choose for salmon Targets: species, life cycle stages, and/or habitats. There could be others; they could be used in combination. It was also clarified that Nested Targets are those that would be fully taken care of by addressing the Focal Target under which they fell.

-----  
**Goals**

Developing a clear idea of what you would like to accomplish is the essential first part of putting together your action plan.

For example, a goal statement for a forest corridor target might be:

By 2025, the forest corridor linking the Blue River watershed to Los Grillos is unfragmented and at least 5 km wide.

In CAP, goals are typically set during the target viability assessment, as desired future status determined after the current status is established.

More specifically, they are a rating of an indicator for the key ecological attribute that describes the viability/integrity that the project intends to achieve for that target.

The goal statements are then formalized during the strategy development stage, as objectives with associated strategies to meet those objectives.

-----  
**EXAMPLE OF TAKING ONE TARGET THROUGH WHOLE CAP PROCESS**

However, the group decided that instead of doing the mock Targets Workshop today, we should do it at December 1<sup>st</sup> Planning Committee meeting. At this meeting, the group decided to take one potential Target (just as an example) and quickly run through the whole CAP process (that is, all the Workshops), in order to better understand the whole process.

Sample **Focal Target:**

***Spawning Habitat***

**Key Ecological Attributes:** What are the most critical aspects of this target's biology or ecology that, if missing or altered, would lead to the loss of the target over time?

The Viability Analysis is the sum of the Key Ecological Attributes and the ranking of current status/health.

Sample **Key Ecological Attributes** for *Spawning Habitat*: ***In-stream structure***  
***LWD***  
***Water quality***  
***Water quantity***  
***Gravel***

Indicators are used to measure the status of the key ecological attributes.

Sample **Indicator** of the Key Ecological Attribute **water quality**: ***Water temperature***

Sample **Measurement** for this indicator: ***Actual water temperatures:***  
***Current average temp. is: x degrees***

### *What is the desired status? - Setting **GOALS***

Goals are linked to your project's conservation targets and represent the desired status of the targets over the long-term – they directly inform objectives which are formal statements of the goal/the ultimate impacts you hope to achieve. A good goal-based objective meets the criteria of being ***linked to targets, impact-oriented, measurable, time-limited, and specific.***

***Ideal average temp. would be: y degrees***

***GOAL: Average temperature in streams of Area A will be y degrees by 2025.***

Let's say the current water temperature is too high and our goal is to reduce the temperature. The fact that it's too high means that the target is stressed. So **high temperature** in stream spawning habitat is the **Stress**.

Now we need to figure out why it's too high. What is the cause of this? We determine the source of the stress, or the **Threat**.

Sample **Threats Analysis** (What are the causes of the stresses?)

e.g. **Logging, Climate Change**

Sample **Rolling Up:**

If, for example, Logging came up as 'cause' for several stresses, we'd roll up all the causes from across all Targets to show that Logging would be a good place to focus on developing strategies for change. It's a common issue across many elements of the region, and therefore we get a lot of return from working to resolve or improve the issue.

Sample **Objective Statement based on Goal**, for stresses caused by Logging:

***"Riparian areas across Area A to be restored by 2022."***

Sample **List of all Strategies** to achieve Objective Statement.

Sample **Ranking of these Strategies**, basically a **Cost-Benefit Analysis** –

What are the best things to do that produce the most for the least expense/effort?

At this point we will also **crosscheck** the Strategies from the **Biological Targets** and the Strategies from **Socioeconomic/Cultural Targets** – where do we find "win-win" situations? Do the Strategies from the Biological Targets harmonize with the Socioeconomic and Cultural values, and vice versa? Do they conflict?

### **Workshop #1 – Facilitation**

Miles explained that, although the IAC had asked that we get bids from a few facilitators before deciding on a contracted facilitator, we realized that it would take a minimum of 6 weeks because we would need to follow the Grays Harbor County bid process guidelines. That would, of course, delay the Workshop into January. So, he thinks we should trust the judgment of our TNC partners and contract with the facilitator recommended by them, Andy Dickerson, for one Workshop and then re-evaluate. Miles will be asking the IAC to approve this within the next week.

Kara described the excellent references she'd gotten for Dickerson when she called people she knew who had worked with him. She referred us to his resume which includes extensive work with large and diverse groups, which she thinks we need to have a successful Workshop #1.

Lee observed that to get him here for a December 8<sup>th</sup> workshop, the Commissioners would need to approve his contract on Nov. 23<sup>rd</sup> or (hopefully not) Dec 7<sup>th</sup>.

**UPCOMING TASKS and CALENDAR:**

***Put Tuesday, December 8<sup>th</sup> on your calendar for Workshop #1.***

***Planning Committee meetings:***

***Tuesday, Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> 10 am – 2pm Hoquiam Library, 420 7th St., Hoquiam***

***See full descriptions of items noted in red in Notes:***

***Kara ( kara\_nelson@tnc.org) asked for suggestions about “salmon recovery plan” terminology that parallels CAP terminology. Also suggestions on what words might throw up red flags for participants.***

***The Planning Committee agreed to provide Kara with a good example of an ecological target that Kara might use.***

***Study documents deemed as Core Material, which will be listed and distributed from the WCSSP office.***

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Dietz