

# WASHINGTON COAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON PARTNERSHIP

---

## MINUTES OF REGIONAL MEETING

**November 19, 2008**

Montesano, WA

1 pm – 5 pm

In attendance:

Nancy Allison, Executive Director, WCSSP

Miles Batchelder, Candidate for Program Assistant

Phil Miller, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

Bruce Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Brad Thompson, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services

### **North Pacific Coast Lead Entity**

Rich Osborne, Lead Entity Coordinator

Ed Bowen, Citizen

Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center

John Richmond, City of Forks

Jeremy Gilman, Makah Tribe

### **Quinault Nation Lead Entity**

John Sims, Lead Entity Coordinator

Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation

Bill Armstrong, Quinault Indian Nation

Larry Gilbertson, Quinault Indian Nation

Tony Hartrich, Quinault Indian Nation

### **WDFW**

Lauri Vigue, Lead Entity, Watershed

Steward Coordinator

### **Grays Harbor County Lead Entity**

Lee Napier, Lead Entity Coordinator

Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy

Lonnie Crumley, Stream Works

Teri Liomin, Chehalis Basin Fisheries

Task Force

### **Pacific County Lead Entity**

Mike Johnson, Lead Entity Coordinator

Key McMurry, Ecological Land Services,  
Inc.

### **Business Meeting**

Director Allison convened the meeting at 12:46 p.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

There were no changes to the agenda.

***Minutes of October 15, 2008***

*The minutes of October 15, 2008 were approved as presented.*

## Director's Report

### ***New Staff Position***

Miles Batchelder was introduced as the top candidate for the position of Program Assistant. Approximately 100 applications were received for the position from different areas within western Washington. The position has evolved from a basic administrative assistant to a program assistant who will work closely with Lead Entity groups, as well as provide support to the groups. The Program Assistant will also handle basic administrative duties. The position should be filled by the end of the week.

### ***WCSSP Interlocal Agreement***

Members reviewed the most current version of the Interlocal Agreement. Director Allison asked for feedback and recommendations on any revisions to the agreement. Participating governments that have signed the agreement include the Port of Grays Harbor. Positive responses to date have been received from Grays Harbor County, Thurston County, and Pacific County. The Port of Grays Harbor County received a presentation on the proposed agreement. Director Allison asked for feedback on whether to prepare a signature page representing all invited government entities or a signature page of government entities wishing to participate. She noted there has been some contact by other cities expressing interest in becoming involved at a future date. She recommended including all entities to enable future participation.

Phil Miller suggested as the process proceeds, it would be important to know which entities have signed and have not signed. All entities beyond the convening governments are important but they are not in the same category as the lead entity convening governments from the state's perspective.

John Sims asked whether any actions requiring signatures would include those entities that have not signed. He suggested that could be problematic. Lee Napier indicated that as the bylaws are developed, membership and quorum will be defined.

Members agreed with adding addendums to the agreement as required for any additional signatures. Director Allison said she will contact all Lead Entity Coordinators to obtain signatures from all entities. She noted letters were sent to all cities, counties, ports, and tribes inviting each entity to participate. Dave Bingaman asked why the federal government, which has jurisdiction on land within the area, is not included. Mr.

Miller said state and federal agencies are generally not direct participants in the membership of an Interlocal Cooperation Act (ILA) involving local governments.

### **WCSSP Work Plan Through June 30, 2009**

Director Allison reviewed the draft work plan, which was electronically provided to members previously. The work plan is for the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009, the initial start-up period. The work plan focuses on building organizational capacity, supporting collaborative decision-making, developing a regional plan for salmon recovery, coordinating regional salmon recovery functions, and communicating with the public, tribes, and agencies.

Director Allison reviewed the status of the major activities:

- **Develop Administrative Capacity**
  1. Recruit and hire Executive Director – *Completed*
  2. Set up initial WCSSP Office – *Completed*
  3. Procure administrative services – *In process*  
*Members recommended removing “part-time” from the description.*
  4. Identify and pursue funding sources for WCSSP capacity and Board activities – *In process. Members suggested capitalizing “Board” within the description.*
  
- **Support Collaborative Decision Making**
  1. Develop WCSSP Work Plan – *In process, which will guide the activities of the Partnership*
  2. Conduct regular meetings of the WCSSP organization – *Ongoing*
  3. Develop and Execute Interlocal Agreement – *Final distributed for signature among participating entities*
  4. Define and establish the governing unit for WCSSP - *The description was changed to read, “Define the form/structure for the WCSSP governing unit. The Interim Advisory Committee will work to determine the direction for the organization, e.g. will there be a Regional Board or some other type of structure as the decision-making authority for WCSSP? Once the form and structure are determined, the Interim Committee will determine the process of how the individuals will be chosen that will populate the governing unit seats.”*
  5. Establish general operating procedures for the governing unit - *Lead was revised to reflect “Regional Board/Executive Director.” Lead should be corrected throughout the document as well to reflect the change.*

6. Develop mission and vision statements - *Lead was revised to reflect "Regional Board/Executive Director."*
  7. Explore 501(c)3 non-profit status
- **Develop a Regional Plan for Salmon Recovery**
    1. Determine commonalities across the Coast Region – *Commence the process in December 2008.*
    2. Assess Data Gaps – *Commence the process in November 2008*
    3. Implement initial phases of drafting a Regional Plan – *A major deliverable is to draft the Regional Plan with an outline due by June 2009*
  - **Coordinate Regional Salmon Recovery Functions**
    1. Coordinate WCSSP sub-allocation process for Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) funding – *It was noted the sub-allocation process was completed for the ninth funding round but not for the tenth round. Members agreed the status should reflect "ongoing" and include the completion of the ninth round to show progress.*
    2. Submit annual list of project to the SRFB – *Completed September 2008*
    3. Monitor and assist with coordination of the Community Salmon Fund (CSF) project solicitation and review for the Coast Region – *Director Allison advised that she will actively engage with CSF staff to ensure all lead entity groups are aware of when the funding application announcement is released and the application deadline. Mr. Bowen asked that the issue be referred as a discussion point to the Regional Board after its formation. Members agreed to add, "The Regional Board will determine the scope of work by the Executive Director to work with the Community Salmon Fund."*
- Members discussed the CSF funding sponsor and funding match requirements. Mr. Sims inquired about including other possible organizations that might interface with the organization as a potential funding source. Director Allison said there is another category for the Executive Director to work on identifying other funding sources. She suggested including it within the other category to "work on finding other funding sources."*
4. Explore the pros and cons of establishing a regional technical review group – *Mr. Bowen supported the activity and suggested federal representation could also*

*occur at the subcommittee level. Members agreed to form a subcommittee to work with WCSSP staff on the issue.*

5. Explore the possibility of using HWS to identify all projects within the Coast Region – *It was suggested to invite Erik Neatherlin to a future meeting to help members flush out the activity. Mr. Sims asked whether there are budget constraints associated with the activity. He suggested including the budget as a topic of the discussion.*
6. Explore WCSSP role in the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan – *On-going*
7. Coordinate with the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership (NASSP) - *The title was changed to reflect, “Explore with the North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership (NASSP). Revise the description to state, “Explore with Lead Entities to evaluate stronghold projects.”*
8. Coordinate with the Marine Resource Committees (MRC) – *The title was changed to reflect, “Communicate with the Marine Resource Committees (MRC).*

- **Communicate with Public, Tribes, and Agencies**

1. Coordinate Outreach – *Form subcommittee to work with WCSSP staff on the issue.*
2. Develop Outreach Materials – *On-going work by WCSSP staff.*
3. Create WCSSP logo – *Initial concept of a logo created by local artist for submission to the Interim Committee at its December meeting.*
4. Develop and maintain WCSSP website – *To be initiated by WCSSP staff. Mr. Bowen offered a suggestion of working with a web designer to develop the organization’s website. The State Department of Veteran Affairs can cover the designer’s time and costs except for the designer’s travel costs. Rich Osborne suggested adding the topic to the December meeting agenda for further discussion.*

Director Allison advised that she will electronically provide an updated copy of the work plan to members. She asked members to provide any additional comments for finalization during the December meeting.

### **Technical Meeting**

Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Director Allison reviewed the agenda for the technical discussion and distributed a copy of the WCSSP 2008 Sub Allocation document.

1. What criteria will be used to determine the individual Lead Entity Group sub-allocation funding level from the SRFB?
2. What data sets will be used to determine the value for each criterion for each Lead Entity Group?

Criteria from the 2008 sub-allocation include:

- Freshwater salmonid stream miles
- Estuary/lake shoreline miles
- Salmonid diversity list
- ESA listed stocks

Members discussed the second criterion of “Estuary/lake shoreline miles.” Members shared opinions on the definition of an estuary. The Department of Ecology (DOE) has a GIS layer identifying the location of estuaries, which is defined by limited saltwater intrusion. It was noted that there are pocket estuaries. There was some skepticism associated with DOE’s GIS layer if pocket estuaries are included. Director Allison asked whether The Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Project (SSHIAP) has a definition for the estuarine layer. Bruce Jones advised that it’s a state definition. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) recently completed an exercise to classify nearshore and Puget Sound for its Action Agenda. He said he doesn’t recall an estuary dataset, but that there may be a local one. Tony Hartrich said that of the list of GIS datasets publicized by DOE, estuary is not included.

Director Allison said it appears that estuarine miles are a criterion to use. However, the definition will be a much broader conversation. There is also the question of the potential of double measuring.

Members discussed Grays Harbor and whether the harbor is considered an estuary because of both freshwater and saltwater influences. Director Allison said it appears there is agreement to use estuary miles as a criterion, but the issue is how to define estuary miles. She suggested we wait and see on this issue, and take it up again at a later date. Mr. Jones offered to provide additional information to assist in determining a definition.

Members discussed restoration activities planned along the coast shoreline and determined not to include coastal shoreline miles.

Director Allison confirmed the intent of the criterion for “Estuary/lake shoreline miles” is to:

- Differentiate between the different types of shoreline miles.
- Not double measure.
- Include estuary miles; however the definition of estuary requires more work.
- Include lake miles – Lake Quinault, Lake Ozette, Lake Pleasant, which are defined as critical habitat for sockeye.
- Exclude coastal shoreline miles.

Director Allison reviewed the criterion for “ESA listed stocks.” The first issue is whether to include ESA stocks. She suggested including ESA stocks as a criteria. There are two listed stocks within the region – sockeye and bull trout. Sockeye is specific to WRIA 20.

Members discussed whether ESA projects receive a ranking preference. Director Allison said last year, the weighting was only 5% for the criterion. Mr. Miller commented on the difficulty of ascertaining the historical weighting of ESA projects during previous funding allocations.

Key McMurry referred to the source of the estuarine data downloaded as a 1:24,000-scale dataset from the Regional Ecosystem Office, Pacific Northwest Hydrography Framework at <http://hydro.reo.gov/>.

Ms. Napier asked whether there are any projects benefitting ESA. She suggested in the long-term explaining how projects are ranked on the list to justify the rankings/criteria and distribution of funds. Director Allison said another issue is not basing projects only on ESA listed stocks but to protect stocks from potential ESA listing. Including ESA listed stocks as a criterion might counteract the message. Ms. Napier replied that was the reason for the weighting. Mr. Gilman suggested that removing the criterion might defeat the whole process. Director Allison suggested retaining the weighting of 5%.

Members agreed to retain “ESA listed stocks” as a criterion.

Director Allison addressed the criterion for “Salmonid diversity list.” The weighting is 25%, which is substantial. She asked for input on whether to include it in the next funding round.

Devona Ensmenger reported she originally proposed including the criterion because previously there was no consideration for species diversity or ecosystem approach on how to address recovery. There wasn't any consideration within the allocation formulas.

She explained why she suggested including it during the 2008 funding round. Mr. Miller said he believes it was a substitute or replacement for Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory (SASSI) derived criteria previously used. There were various discussions about SASSI critically depressed, healthy, and the relationships and concerns about the status of those listings. Ms. Ensmenger added that it wasn't necessarily a substitute because the database was used for the process, but it did not determine the status, which will need to be addressed at some point.

Director Allison asked for input on information contained in a handout on notes to the main table under item #3 and whether the information stating, "Criterion captures coarse-scale stock/life/history diversity and includes: Coho, fall Chinook, spring/summer Chinook, chum, sockeye, winter steelhead, summer steelhead, bull trout, and cutthroat (excludes whitefish and non-natives) should be included."

Mr. Jones said he wouldn't recommend using SASSI, as there is a limiting factor analysis. The state did not include all data into the dataset, which is why the NW Indian Fisheries Commission and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) are merging datasets to ensure fish distribution in a single dataset. The Commission's dataset includes the full extent of the 2003 survey from biologists, but it's not within the WDFW system. Ms. McMurry said the survey was completed by area habitat biologists who reviewed the data for errors on where fish are located or not located through the Habitat Program and local fish files.

Mr. Gilbertson said he doesn't recall being part of that effort. The issue is confirming, for example, that there is fall Coho and spring Chinook in the Quinault River, which would require some interaction to identify stocks at that level. The problem with numerous attempts at defining stocks including SASSI is really putting an artificial, manmade construct on top of a genetic continuum. There could be an all-day workshop about the proper definition of stock with members still ending up with different points of view. Without a workshop, the current process is likely the best approach.

Lonnie Crumley said within Grays Harbor and the Willapa there have been hatchery stocks since 1895. He questioned what's to be accomplished. Director Allison said she asked both Mr. Jones and Mr. Hartrich to attend the meeting to help determine if there are alternatives to SASSI that can be used. Short of having a major workshop, which may be necessary, the best course of action to make a determination is whether to include it in the criteria and then have a workshop to attain consensus. The issue is to have the information in time for the funding allocation next summer. She suggested members should determine the criteria and then schedule a full-day workshop. Mr. Osborne pointed out that even with a workshop; there still might not be consensus.

Discussion followed on whether the criterion is applicable to the regional matrix or to the Lead Entity where a project identifies six or seven species. Mr. Sims added that in project applications entered into PRISM, there is an opportunity to list all species affected by a project, which carries additional weight when reviewed by the SRFB.

Brad Thompson referred to the list of species and indicated that some species are missing. He said he managed the SASSI program when employed at WDFW and that he is not aware of any native summer steelhead near the coast. He noted there is much discussion and struggle within the scientific community about what is a group of fish. He recommended a modification by including only Coho, Chinook, chum, sockeye, bull trout, and cutthroat.

Mr. Osborne asked if the revision will impact any of the values within any of the Lead Entities. Ms. Napier said the Chehalis River and Willapa do not have sockeye, which would reduce the respective value total.

Members discussed the impact caused by reducing the species list of each Lead Entity. Mr. Gilbertson said the current value works well for WRIA 21. Mr. Osborne said the current value works well for WRIA 20. Mr. Johnson said bull trout is missing from WRIA 24 for last year's process.

Discussion ensued on retaining the same level or considering a coarser scale.

After an exchange of opinions and information, members agreed to retain the nine species and change WRIA 24 to include bull trout to reflect a value of six.

Director Allison referred to the criterion of "Freshwater salmonid stream miles" with a weighting of 60% last year. The criterion was one of the most difficult to determine last year. Questions to ask are what is the available information, what is accessible, and are there gaps that can be identified. There is no consistent database source for the region to determine freshwater salmonid stream miles.

Mr. Crumley reported DNR has maps of stream miles, which are being updated.

Mr. Hartrich referred to the 2006 Washington Lakes and River Information System (WLRIS), which includes all identified salmonid species and all stream miles existing within WLRIS for each of the species. The maps provide relative density by WRIAs to provide a WLRIS distribution of the salmonid miles in each of the five WRIAs. The least density was reflected in the data for WRIA 21, which was of concern. This led to some discussions about updating the database and working with tribal partners. The issue is

whether any information was exchanged and if any of the information was added to the WDFW database. As of 2006, there's likely much data pertaining to salmonid miles missing for WRIA 21. When the calculation of salmonid stream miles occurred for the given species, every distribution type that is listed in WLRIS was used from documented, presumed, and artificial presumed. There is an extensive definition available. Mr. Hartrich said since the original request was made by John Sims to provide salmonid miles without further direction for certain documented types, all were taken into consideration. There is likely variation in terms of the map of miles classified by given distribution type across the five WRIAs. Mr. Hartrich said he essentially downloaded the 2006 WLRIS database and included all distribution types. He noted the latest version of WLRIS does not reflect additional data for WRIA 21.

Director Allison said one of the major concerns last year was that within the presumed category, WRIA 21 was not represented equally as the other WRIAs. She asked about the difference in the data if the presumed category is excluded and only the documented category is used, and whether it would be a better way to measure the information.

Mr. Miller said there appears to be a disconnect between reality and that fact. Given that, there is also an apparent inability to reflect better data. There was an effort to obtain better data, but the data is not available within the database. If that continues to be the case, then removing the presumed category would result in a better outcome. Mr. Osborne suggested using the simplest database that is equivalent across all WRIAs because using a more detailed dataset for any of the WRIAs will result in inconsistency and is unfair to the other WRIAs.

Mr. Hartrich said removing the presumed category will likely not equalize data for all WRIAs.

Director Allison said the issue is whether to use a different criterion, determine the lowest common denominator for freshwater stream miles, or determining whether it's possible to obtain the information in time for the next funding round. Mr. Hartrich described possible scenarios that could be considered.

Mr. Thompson said the important aspect is protecting the water supply for fish and that a common denominator easy to calculate is agreeing stream density is acceptable and calculate the total amount of stream network present regardless of whether it bears any fish because water is needed to eventually reach downstream where fish are located. That aspect should be fairly easy to calculate depending on the scale available. It's consistent and eliminates the need to try and find alternative and additional information that may not be available across the WRIAs.

Mr. Jones commented on the data and tools available for the WRIAs except for WRIA 24.

Director Allison said Mr. Thompson's recommendation is to consider the stream network regardless of fish presence. Mr. Jones has indicated it's possible to obtain the information for WRIAs 20 – 23, but not for WRIA 24. Mr. Jones advised that it's possible for WRIA 24, but the information needs to be developed. Director Allison asked whether the information would be available by summer 2009. Mr. Jones advised that it would be available. Mr. Hartrich added that if the data pertains only to stream density, the dataset is downloadable from the state. Director Allison questioned the accuracy of the data. Mr. Hartrich indicated it's possible to compare representative databases between DNR, DOE, WDFW, and USGS to see how they align while providing some sense of confidence that density is represented accurately.

Mr. Osborne agreed with the proposal and suggested having another meeting to refine the method to use. Director Allison confirmed that she will work with Mr. Hartrich, Mr. Jones, and Ms. Vigue, who offered to act as the liaison for SSHIAP data, to determine the best way to represent the information.

Mr. Osborne mentioned that another category to consider is land use, because of the difference in land uses between the WRIAs.

Mr. Gilman said it would be beneficial to include potential impacts related to land use. One of the ideas considered is providing a level of accountability for the entities within the watershed to consider critical areas ordinances, zoning, and protections to ensure projects completed within the watershed have a higher success rate.

Mr. Gilbertson said it would be beneficial to develop a metric that somehow captures the probability of success in the larger picture. Valuable resources are expended on salmon habitat restoration and there should be some measure on the impact the project will have in terms of the overall trends in the watershed. There are limited resources to expend on salmon restoration in the Northwest and there should be some kind of mechanism or some metric for determining the location of the most benefit gained in watershed production through restoration efforts.

Mr. Hartrich said the dataset that covers all five WRIAs is the 2002 National Landcover Dataset available through the USGS. There is a similar dataset developed in 1992. The classification schemes are somewhat different. DOE has completed a crosswalk between the two datasets. They are available on the web through DOE.

Mr. Miller said the datasets will not provide a current picture but will provide a snapshot over time. However, it may lead to a retractable argument about whether it's more

valuable to protect or restore. Funding is weighted more to restoration rather than protection. He commented that he will be surprised if the group is able to resolve the question.

Mr. Gilman said one of the major drivers of funding from the SRFB is proof of the project's success.

Ms. Vigue commented on the recent release of PSP's Action Agenda. One key action item is protecting existing, intact habitat. PSP is also considering climate change, which will impact restoration projects in Puget Sound.

Ms. McMurry suggested land use could be better addressed by planning departments within each jurisdiction through proper land use planning involving critical areas ordinances and zoning.

Members offered differing opinions on the merits of including land use as a criterion.

Director Allison suggested monitoring the efforts of the PSP and WDFW.

Mr. Thompson referred to a potential data source from The Nature Conservancy, which is undertaking freshwater assessments. He described the benefits the data could provide as well as other potential sources of information to consider such as impervious surface impacts to watersheds. He offered to assist in providing additional resources.

Director Allison questioned whether using data on impervious surface would suffice for the land use question. Mr. Osborne said it would supplement the data but not necessarily provide all the information surrounding land use. Miles of dikes and riprap would be more meaningful than impervious surface. There are other land uses of importance as well.

Mr. Crumley suggested that if are discussions on protection versus restoration, it's important to look at fish management within the watersheds, harvest theories and principles, and listed species. The discussion needs to consider the entire spectrum of issues. Director Allison responded that part of the restoration plan for the coast includes harvest, fisheries, and those types of issues.

Mr. Delvin commented on his organization's work on freshwater assessments as well as regional assessments that will provide good information. Habitat is an important issue and it's important to consider the value in terms of protection versus restoration. The method used in the freshwater analysis involved selection of 10 locations that would

provide the best benefit. The selections included decisions on land use and not necessarily from a salmon perspective but from a diversity perspective, which is something that also should be considered. The habitat question is an important issue and should be included in the criteria. The issue is the scale to consider. There are some good data layers available.

Mr. Miller said many of the balancing questions are addressed during a recovery plan process in the state. Many of the issues will be addressed during the recovery plan process. The question is how many of the issues should be considered for the purpose of establishing criteria for the funding allocation. Some of the issues may not be possible to address and resolve within the time allocation.

Director Allison agreed and indicated it may mean simplifying the criteria for the next round of funding. After the planning process has been completed and issues have been addressed, it may be possible to use different criteria for future funding allocations.

Mr. Osborne said he wanted to bring the land use question forward as there was a discussion during a Lead Entity meeting. It's not necessary to include it in this funding round.

Mr. Miller referred to the criterion of "Freshwater salmonid stream miles" and recommended using gradient miles rather than freshwater salmonid stream miles, and having the technical committee identify the salmonid species.

Discussion followed on possible data sources and interest in reviewing the difference between the two methods.

Mr. Hartrich shared information on the best available datasets covering all five WRIAs. He cited the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) by USGS as a comprehensive set of digital spatial data that contains information about surface water features such as lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, springs and wells. Within the NHD, surface water features are combined to form "reaches," which provide the framework for linking water-related data to the NHD surface water drainage network. These linkages enable the analysis and display of these water-related data in upstream and downstream order.

Members agreed with Director Allison's assessment of looking at the various datasets and conducting a modeling exercise to develop information that is consistent across the WRIAs on stream networks, consider specific criteria regarding gradient, and use that process for the 2009 allocation process. Later, additional meetings can be held to determine how to identify the number.

Mr. Miller added that members also want to view a comparison of the information and then determine how to use the information.

Mr. Hartrich said the request implies some work in advance of the next meeting. Members discussed contracting with someone to complete the work. Ms. Napier advised members of the procurement process a potential contractor must undertake.

Mr. Jones advised that if the Quinault Indian Nation and the Makah Tribe want the Commission to participate in the process, the Commission will participate; otherwise the Commission will not participate.

Director Allison offered that there are existing databases that cover the entire region. She offered the suggestion of scheduling a technical meeting to determine whether existing databases can be used, and if not, how can the information be accessed, which might be a better time to discuss the specific details for contracting the work. There is some time to work on the issue. Mr. Miller suggested the Director may have a mandate to seek the best way to obtain the data layers and then schedule a meeting when the information is available. Director Allison advised members that she will contact them for additional information and for scheduling another meeting.

Ms. McMurry asked about the availability of complete WRIA stream net data as well as gradient data. Mr. Hartrich said that based on information from Mr. Jones, SSHIAP data for WRIs 21, 22, and 23 includes the slope component based on a 24,000 scale stream network, which is the same one used by WDFW. Director Allison said she also believes there are existing databases covering the entire region, such as DOE. Mr. Hartrich advised that it involves downloading the data and comparing the numbers for each WRIA to see if there is a large discrepancy between the datasets. If there is a gap in the data, then there is likely some problem.

Director Allison recapped the consensus to:

- Agree to use ESA Listed Stocks as used in the last funding round
- Agree to use the Salmonid Diversity List and include Bull Trout for WRIA 24
- Agree to use Estuary/Lake Shoreline Miles and exclude coast shoreline miles (however the datasets for supporting the estuary were not defined and deferred as a topic for the next meeting).
- Continue to work on Freshwater Salmonid Stream Miles based on either the existing method or whether to create a new database.

### **Adjournment**

Director Allison adjourned the meeting at 4:26 p.m.

Prepared by: Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services