



WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

WCSSP PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

September 10, 2009

Port of Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, Washington

Rich Osborne, North Pacific Coast Lead Entity
John Sims, Quinault Lead Entity
Mike Johnson, Pacific Lead Entity
Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Bob Burkle, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Kara Nelson, The Nature Conservancy
James Schroeder, The Nature Conservancy
Nancy Allison, WCSSP
Miles Batchelder, WCSSP
Dana Dietz, WCSSP

AUGUST 20, 2009 PLANNING MEETING NOTES

The August 20, 2009 Planning Meeting Notes were accepted with no changes.

PLAN NEEDS

Kara thought it would be useful to have each person outline what they and/or their organization need in order to participate in creating a successful Plan. What are the critical needs that should be looked at by this committee? Are there any hurdles you know of that haven't been considered? What are crucial elements that have to be dealt with in order to produce a final Plan that important stakeholders feel they "own?"

Mike Johnson: Most concerned with the final content of the Plan. How is the Plan going to merge, for instance, the geographical differences between the Pacific County Lead Entity area and the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity area? Concerned that there be a focus on balance. And inclusion of the public viewpoint.

Rich Osborne: Same concern as Mike in terms of combining different geographic areas. Full representation of NPCLE members. Harmony between the Regional Plan and the NPCLE

Strategy currently being rewritten; the basin-by-basin approach of the latter versus the ecosystem, regional approach of the former. How do we rank individual, basin projects that need to be done within overall, Coastal prioritization? How do we deal with the resistance to interference? NPCLE group would be unhappy if regional prioritizing of projects precluded their projects from being funded, because of the recent record of not being funded.

Phil Miller: About interference, large scale funders are more likely to fund projects in a region with a Regional Plan that prioritizes across the Region. If a Plan only identifies the commonalities across a Region, and doesn't prioritize across the Region, the major funders view it as less valuable. So there's a tricky balance to be achieved between creating a regionally-prioritized Plan that attracts funders, but addresses concerns about interference and recognizes the unique nature of each Lead Entity area.

John Sims: Data being scientifically credible. That water quantity/flow be protected; natural resource protection from external geopolitical interests. Acid test of the Plan will be if a member of the public picks it up, reads it, and says, "Yes, this works."

James Schroeder: That the Plan includes an integral Funding Strategy. That the Plan looks good to the funders and improves the chances of obtaining funding throughout the Region.

Phil Miller: That we end up with a Plan that is equivalent to the other ones in the State, on the same par as the others. Give the unique circumstances of the Coast Region, it will most likely be different in content, but needs to be generally similar. Phil thinks that both the similarities and the differences will help as the Region seeks funding – the similarities will meet the needs of the funders, and the differences will appeal to funding sources that want to fund new approaches.

Miles Batchelder: For the WCSSP staff, clear direction for implementation. Phil pointed out that, if the other Regions serve as models, the Plan will provide both prioritization and 'lists' of unfinished business that give clear direction.

Nancy Allison: Salmonid knowledge, fully understanding the resource. Phil commented that that is one of the main functions of the other Plans in the State – they provide a source of specific information for a whole variety of people and organizations.

Dana Dietz: Progress towards truly becoming a Region, towards reaching a balance between the needs of the four Lead Entity Groups such that each of them feel it's equitable.

Bob Burkle: Conserve fish, provide recreational and commercial fishing opportunities, work smoothly with the co-managers, align with the WDFW Strategic Plan, be understandable by all those interested in fish.

Kara: Any good Plan is one that anyone closely involved feels they can go out and support/ implement.

Miles suggested that we capture these Needs just outlined, and then solicit additions via email from other Planning Committee members, and amendments from those here today.

PEOPLE: Categories of People, and Brainstorming Individual People

The Planning Committee gave itself and all of its members the Homework assignment of brainstorming the names and/or organizations of everyone we each know -- or know of -- who "we want to own the Plan."

We gave ourselves until Wednesday, Sept. 16th – or Friday, Sept. 18th at the latest – to get the information to Dana. Those who were at this Planning Committee meeting will also asterisk those people or types of people who they think should, in particular, be invited to Workshop #1.

Our goal is to create a larger list from which we can, in the future, select those who we think should specifically be invited to a Workshop or a Technical Session, who we might contact about a problem or a question, etc. In other words, this is to be an all-inclusive list of: Who has the most interest in salmon? Who would be able to provide the best input into a Plan? Who needs to "own" the Plan when it's done?

Attached is a revised CATEGORIES OF PEOPLE list, just as an aid in the above process. Also attached is a chart that at this point only includes those who are on WCSSP's Contact List.

The attached CATEGORIES OF PEOPLE list includes additions made at this meeting. It was agreed that if, in brainstorming the individual people, there's a gap in a certain important Category, the staff contact the President of the relevant group organization and find out from him/her who the best person would be to add to our list. Again, who has the most interest in salmon? Who would be able to provide the best input into a Plan? Who thinks regionally? Who does the President think would be best suited for participation? We need to have the list be as inclusive as possible, and it may take some time to have these conversations with industry leaders if our own group doesn't know who to include.

Draft TEAM CHARTER → REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Nancy asked for discussion about the Team Charter, a document intended to outline who we are and what we're trying to do, so that we know that we agree and are generally headed in the same direction. The staff integrated the items discussed and produced a second Draft, attached.

It was decided to change the name of the document from “Team Charter” to REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK. We want the larger group to vet this document, although parts of this document (for example, the Process and the Budget) will evolve and change.

Several people pointed out the usefulness of the Framework to explain to others in their organizations what and how WCSSP is developing its Regional Plan.

WORKSHOP #1

Kara reiterated the importance of inviting all the right people to Workshop #1. If we’re still thinking about having Workshop #1 in November, we have to walk out of the October 6th meeting with a definitive list of who we’re going to invite.

She outlined the two things that should happen at Workshop #1:

1 – A better understanding of the process. Spend a fair amount of time on this. If participants don’t understand the whole CAP planning development process, they won’t be very effective at selecting Targets appropriately. And, of course, what “Targets”, “Focal Targets” and “Nested Targets” mean needs to be explained and discussed in depth.

2 – Target selection itself. Eight is the recommended number of (larger) Focal Targets. This is a critically important step in the process. Targets is “what it is all about”; it is what we care about. Other regions had ESAs as pre-established Targets. We do, of course, have “Salmon” as somewhat of a predetermined Target, but could choose salmon species, salmon habitats, ecosystems, salmon life history stages, processes, etc. We need to figure out before the Workshop how we are going to frame these Target choices—in one way it’s an obvious choice of Targets (salmon), but how are we going to approach salmon in this Plan? And the process of picking Targets is important in getting stakeholders vested in the final Plan.

Phil summarized that Workshop #1 requires two things: get the right people there, and “get it right,” the workshop itself. So, rushing Workshop #1 is not a good thing, although we want to keep momentum going. Perhaps we should consider having Workshop #1 in the first two weeks of December.

Kara outlined what we need to have prepared before Workshop #1. With the invitations, we should send out an exhaustive description of what we’re going to do at Workshop #1.

We need to bring to Workshop #1: “a story,” background information, facts, maps.

We’ll discuss this more at our next meeting, but perhaps we should bring to the Workshop a list of possible Targets drawn from existing WCSSP documents (4 LE Strategies, the ROC document, and results of the January 2009 workshop facilitated by John Kliem), as a place to start. At a minimum, it would be good for the Planning Committee members to be aware of what’s been

brought up before. Phil reminded us that, in addition to these WCSSP documents, there are: 2 ESAs, Lake Ozette and bull trout; the Needs Assessment; the Watershed Plans that exist within this Region; and, a land cover mapping of the area.

Everyone agreed that it was excellent idea that we have a mock, abbreviated Workshop #1 within our Committee setting before having Workshop #1 itself.

NEXT STEPS:

Homework assignment to brainstorm names of people and/or organizations that should be on our master list of People, due to Dana by Wednesday, Sept 16th or Friday, Sept. 18th at the latest.

At Regional Meeting, have a discussion about the REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Dietz

Attached:

Draft CATEGORIES of People as revised at this meeting.

Draft PEOPLE Chart.

Draft TEAM CHARTER → REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK based on discussions at this meeting.