

2016

West Coast Ocean Partnership

STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY
JANUARY 5 – 6, 2016

Acknowledgements

The West Coast Ocean Partnership meeting would not have been possible without the collaborative planning efforts and would like to thank the following individuals/organizations:

- Sea Grant Fellows Morgan Ivens-Duran (California Ocean Protection Council) and Kessina Lee (Office of Governor Kate Brown, State of Oregon) for their note-taking and support of this meeting
- Kearns & West team Eric Poncelet and Annie Kilburg for their facilitation services and drafting of this report
- West Coast Governors Alliance on Ocean Health Project Coordinator Kim McIntyre for her West Coast Ocean Partnership coordination, document drafting, and meeting planning
- Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management (BOEM) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program (NOAA) for providing the resources that made this meeting possible
- West Ocean Partnership Working Group for their continued effort and dedication in this process

The following organizations have expressed interest in and/or participated on the West Coast Ocean Partnership Working Group:

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

CA Ocean Protection Council

Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, CA

Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, CA

Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, OR

Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, OR

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, OR

Elk Valley Rancheria, CA

Environmental Protection Agency

InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council, CA (representing 10 federally recognized North Coast tribes including: Cahto Tribe of Laytonville Rancheria; Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians; Hopland Band of Pomo Indians; Pinoleville Pomo Nation; Potter Valley Tribe; Redwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians; Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians; Round Valley Indian Tribes; Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians; and Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians)

Makah Indian Tribe, WA

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

National Parks Service

Office of Governor Brown, Oregon

Office of Governor Inslee, Washington

Ohlone Costanoan Esselen Nation, CA

Oregon Coastal Management Program

Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe, WA

Potter Valley Tribe, CA

Quileute Tribe, WA

Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, CA
Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians, CA
Stewarts Point Rancheria, CA
Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, WA
Suquamish Indian Tribe, WA
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, CA
Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, CA
United States Navy/Department of Defense
Washington Department of Ecology
Wiyot Tribe, CA
Yurok Tribe, CA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	2
Table of Contents.....	4
Section I: Background and Purpose, Objectives of Meeting and Process Overview.....	5
Section II: Introductions and West Coast Regional Planning Body (RPB).....	6
Section III: Tribal Caucus.....	7
Section IV: Discuss and Finalize Key Sections from the Strategic Framework.....	8
Section V: Discuss Regional Priorities, Objectives and Activities.....	9
Section VI: Governance Structure and Operations Discussion.....	13
Section VII: Next Steps on Launching the Partnership.....	16
Section VIII: Next Steps and Summary	17
Appendices:	
• <i>Appendix 1 - WCOP Attendance List</i>	
• <i>Appendix 2 - WCOP Agenda</i>	
• <i>Appendix 3 – WCOP and RPB Comparison Table</i>	
• <i>Appendix 4 – WCOP Action Items</i>	
• <i>Appendix 5 – WCOP Strategic Framework – Draft Final</i>	

I. BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, MEETING OBJECTIVES, AND PROCESS OVERVIEW

Background and Purpose

This document summarizes the outcomes of a two-day meeting held on January 5 – 6, 2016 in Oakland, California to do strategic planning in support of a new West Coast Ocean Partnership (WCOP) focused on regional ocean health. Participants in the strategic planning meeting included representatives of a volunteer Working Group, including West Coast tribes and tribal communities, state governments from the states of Washington, Oregon and California, and federal agencies concerned with issues of ocean health. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and finalize the draft WCOP Strategic Framework and develop a plan for the official launch of the partnership.

The idea of creating a WCOP grew out of the West Coast Ocean Summit ([Summit](#)) that was held in January 2015 in Portland, Oregon. The Summit brought together 150 participants from West Coast tribes, state governments, and federal agencies to share regional ocean health priorities and discuss regional ocean coordination and collaboration opportunities. A number of Summit participants volunteered to participate in a Working Group to take a leadership role in developing the WCOP. Staff from the West Coast Governors Alliance on Ocean Health (WCGA) and the West Coast Regional Planning Body (RPB) agreed to team with the newly formed Working Group to help move the partnership forward, including planning and participating in an initial strategic planning meeting held on June 30 – July 1, 2015.

Funding from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program and the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management (BOEM) provided meeting costs and travel support for the 45 participants and supported facilitation services (Kearns & West).

The facilitators worked closely with the Working Group, WCGA, and RPB staff to develop the meeting agenda and to address logistics and outreach needs.

Meeting Objectives

The objectives for the strategic planning meeting included:

- Develop plan for official launch of the WCOP by April 2016
- Discuss and finalize the WCOP Strategic Framework
- Identify appropriate activities for the WCOP

Process Overview

The meeting was an intergovernmental workshop; participation was limited to the Working Group representatives from tribal, state and federal governments (for full list of attendees see *Appendix 1*). The first day of the meeting focused on: introductions; confirming and finalizing sections of the Strategic Framework; adding any new proposed activities; and discussing, revising and coming to agreement on the governance language in the Strategic Framework. The second day of the meeting focused on clarifying next steps and specific tasks for launching the partnership, continuing to address outstanding issues on the governance structure and regional priorities from the first day, incorporating any final edits, and confirming next steps for the partnership. The meeting agenda is included below as *Appendix 2*.

II. INTRODUCTIONS AND UPDATE ON THE WEST COAST REGIONAL PLANNING BODY (RPB)

Introductions

Eric Poncelet, *Kearns & West (K&W) facilitator*, invited participants to introduce themselves with their name and affiliation. The facilitators welcomed the group, walked through the proposed agenda and provided process reminders including ground rules.

Eric described a proposed decision-making process for the January 5-6 meeting that was based on the draft decision making text in the governance section of the Strategic Framework document. In the proposal, full agreement of the group at the meeting would take place when everyone is in either full consensus or general concurrence. He defined full consensus as when every member is in full agreement with a given decision, and general concurrence when the entity agrees that the WCOP members understand their point of view, understand others point of view, and support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly. Working group members agreed to use this decision making process for the meeting.

West Coast Regional Planning Body (RPB)

John Hansen, *West Coast Regional Planning Body (RPB) Coordinator*, explained that the RPB began working in the fall of 2013 to determine federal agency coordination, tribal assessment, and data coordination and state outreach. The RPB had its first in-person meeting in January 2015. He added that the RPB is currently: finalizing its charter; developing a work plan and an outreach plan on how to engage outside audiences; working on regional issue mapping; and coordinating data with the West Coast Ocean Data Portal (WCODP). The RPB's goals include: continuing to develop the RPB's activities, and linking the RPB and WCOP conversations to increase regional efficiency and effectiveness. See <http://www.westcoastmarineplanning.org/> for more information.

Eric encouraged meeting participants to begin thinking about appropriate synergies between the RPB and the Partnership with the hope to create some linkages to help move forward the activities of both the RPB and the Partnership together. However, he explained that the WCOP and RPB are not intended to be a single body. Participants responded to the update with the following comments, concerns and questions:

- One participant expressed the desire to better understand the overlap between the RPB and the Partnership, as convergence into a single body is not desired. Meeting attendees responded that this meeting will help to develop where the two groups' work could be combined in order to make the most of limited resources. It is difficult to request resources for two ocean entities; if efforts are combined, resources might be more available.
- Another participant asked about the timeline for establishing chair and co-chair leads for the RPB and the Partnership. Attendees responded that there is no set timeline to choose chair and co-chair leads for either body. Any tribe, federal or state partner can choose to do it. It might make sense to have multiple tribal co-leads since there are multiple tribal members.
- One participant asked about the status of the funding resources for the RPB and Partnership. Meeting attendees said that there is no direct funding right now; part of this meeting is to discuss where we might be able to look for resources. It is common for executive orders to call for actions that are not

funded. We need to identify a short list of entities that we can make persuasive recommendations to invest and commit to funding the Partnership.

III. TRIBAL CAUCUS

On Day One of the meeting, several participants requested that a tribal caucus be called to discuss sections of the Draft Strategic Framework and on the topic of RPB and WCOP convergence. The tribal representatives agreed to meet on the morning of January 6, from 8:30 – 9 am and provide a report-out to the full group.

On the morning of Day Two, tribal participants caucused on key issues involving the relationship between the WCOP and the RPB. They also addressed other necessary questions and concerns in order to move forward with the partnership. The caucus, report-out, and discussion that ensued helped to inform the decisions and conversation throughout the meeting and as outlined below.

Key outcomes from the tribal caucus were presented as follows:

- Allow for tribal caucusing at future meetings.
- More guidance is needed on how WCOP and RPB will “merge.”
- There is a need for more balance between the tribes, federal and state agencies in the WCOP.
- What does the outreach plan to the tribes look like?

The group agreed that time for caucusing should be built into future meeting agendas.

Other tribal representatives expressed their concern of merging the WCOP and RBP because this would limit the participation of non-federally recognized tribes. These participants could not agree to be a Partnership that would merge with a body that does not recognize them. Other participants responded that it is not their intent to merge the two bodies; however, alignment is desired to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the two bodies. The tribes agreed that the term “alignment” instead of “convergence” makes them more comfortable moving forward.

AGREEMENT: The full group supported using the term alignment rather than convergence moving forward.

One participant suggested that a one-page document be created to show where the WCOP and RBP align on certain activities and efforts, including membership issues and funding. Kim McIntyre and John Hansen offered to put this together; Sarah Allen, Katie Wrubel, Katie Krueger and Sam Ziegler offered to review this before it goes to the Working Group. This document can be found in *Appendix 3*.

Kim agreed to share the listservs of tribes that have been contacted in the planning of both the Summit and Partnership with Megan Flier and explained that the WCOP outreach plan will be a task for the Working Group to develop. She said that it has been her intent to be as open and transparent as possible throughout this process, and that she will continue this practice as the Partnership moves forward.

One participant asked whether the state and federal agencies have a directive to participate in the WCOP. The federal and state representatives responded that they do not have a direct order to participate; however, their participation offers a way to stay involved in regional ocean health issues, be involved with influencing

the group's direction, and go back to their respective agency or government to make a case for continuing participation.

IV. DISCUSS AND FINALIZE KEY SECTIONS FROM THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

The intended purpose of this discussion was to confirm sections of the draft Strategic Framework that have already been well vetted through previous working group meetings before moving into sections of the document that call for a more thorough dialogue. With this in mind, participants walked through each section, discussed issues and clarified content that needed to be included in the Strategic Framework document. They asked questions and refined the draft language for the: Vision, Introduction and Background, Goals, and Guiding Principles (see comments below). Eric explained that the Resources section will be discussed on Day Two of the meeting. An updated draft version of these sections, based on the participants' comments, can be found in *Appendix 4*.

Vision/Mission Statement

Participants discussed the Vision section and requested to reframe it as a mission statement or call it the "Purpose" to more clearly define what the partnership intends to do (i.e. to protect natural resources for future generations' utilization).

AGREEMENT: The group agreed to this suggestion and confirmed this section with that change.

Introduction and Background

This section describes why the WCOP formed and the process by which this occurred. Participants suggested that the following revisions be incorporated into the document:

- Acknowledge that ocean resources are finite; it is a long-term interest for the tribes and states for future generations.
- Define what a regional ocean health issue is (i.e. ocean acidification).

AGREEMENT: The group agreed to these suggestions and confirmed this section with these incorporations.

Goals

This section should describe what the WCOP wants to achieve by its actions. Participants refined the language and requested additional text as follows:

- Remove the statement that WCOP is, "not a decision-making body", and focus on what it is; recast it in a positive way.
- Update the third bullet to, "maximize, leverage, and improve our ability to manage the use of resources, capacity and expertise."
- Add text to reflect promoting informed action on ocean health priorities for future generations; consider combining the first two bullets and include, "establishing a collaborative voice."
- Add "strengthen the use of science to inform policy and drive action to improve ocean health."
- Consider adding a purpose statement to help clarify the goals.

- Include specific text that describes a goal as protecting ocean resource for future generations; this is a specific aspect that should be stated.
- Replace the text in the second bullet with, “present a collaborative and unified voice to exert influence on national policy issues and use it to achieve those outcomes”; this is more action oriented.
- It is important to distinguish goals from tribal and state priorities (i.e. natural and cultural resources); revise the language to incorporate that perspective.
- Update language to embrace the tribal perspective such as, “strengthen the use of natural and social science to inform policy and drive action to improve ocean health.”

AGREEMENT: The group agreed to review revised language incorporating these suggestions.

Guiding Principles

AGREEMENT: Participants confirmed the Guiding Principles section without any changes.

V. DISCUSS REGIONAL PRIORITIES, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

During the June 30 – July 1 Strategic Planning Meeting, participants developed an *Initial Regional Priorities, Objectives and Activities Table* to identify regional priorities that are important for all partners and fit into the purpose and intent of the WCOP. Eric reminded participants of this process and how they arrived at the top three priorities.

The group discussed whether to include marine debris as a WCOP priority as was requested by the West Coast Marine Debris Alliance on a prior Working Group call and agreed that deciding whether or not to include marine debris as a priority will be one of the partnership’s first decisions. Details are captured in the sections below.

The group also discussed potential activities that the Partnership could consider to pursue after it is formally launched. This discussion built on the draft list of activities listed in the *Initial Regional Priorities, Objectives and Activities Table*. Participant comments are described further in the sections below.

Marine Debris Alliance

Eric informed participants that the Working Group had invited Eben Schwartz, *Marine Debris Program Manager of California Coastal Commission/Co-Chair of the West Coast Marine Debris Alliance (MDA)*, to make a presentation on the topic of marine debris. Eben described the history of the MDA and explained that the MDA Steering Committee strongly requests the marine debris to be included as a priority for the WCOP. Forging connections among state and federal representatives is one of MDA’s highest priorities, and inclusion in the WCOP would facilitate and strengthen these partnerships. The MDA is a good example of the power of regional collaboration to advance common goals cooperatively and efficiently. Marine debris is a highly visual issue facing the West Coast region, and addressing marine debris shows measurable results and outcomes. MDA’s current projects include derelict fishing gear, marine debris source reduction policy and marine debris data.

If marine debris were to become a priority of the WCOP, the benefits would include:

- A forum for communication and collaboration on a regional level
- Combined capacity to make a bigger impact on the issue of marine debris

- Share lessons learned with others working on marine debris issues
- Assistance in securing funding for collaborative projects

Discussion of Marine Debris as a Potential Priority

Eric thanked Eben for coming to present at this meeting and asked participants to consider whether marine debris would be an appropriate priority for the WCOP to move forward, with the recognition that the Partnership's resources are limited. Participants asked questions and received clarifying responses as follows:

- Has the MDA considered reducing permitting obstacles for those trying to remove marine debris?
 - Eben said yes; however, he explained that the current MDA projects are brought from its members. A MDA member must recommend streamlining processes and reducing permitting fees as a project before progress can be made on this by MDA.
- Can we obtain a list of MDA members?
 - Eben said that they are currently working on solidifying and then expanding the alliance; he will share the member list.
- What challenges arise from tension between local groups and the MDA, and where can a regional approach add value?
 - Eben explained that the MDA's primary objective is to avoid impeding current work on marine debris; the MDA is meant to be additive.
- Does the MDA share the West Coast Ocean Data Portal (WCODP)?
 - Eben explained that yes, there is a lot of cross-over especially since the Portal used marine debris as its first case study and also hosts the marine debris database.
- What is the current status of the WCGA's involvement in the WCOP?
 - Kim responded that the WCGA's members are phasing out and becoming partners in the WCOP as the WCGA funding will end in April 2016. The WCOP will become the new regional ocean partnership for the West Coast.
- Given the challenges of limited resources for the WCOP, are there any ideas on how to get things done given the limitations?
 - Eben explained that the MDA has worked repeatedly with volunteer groups and unpaid employees; he anticipates that continuing even without further funding. However, if the MDA is not a part of the WCOP, the alliance may not have credibility as an ocean health priority.

Eben thanked the meeting participants for the invitation to attend their meeting and the opportunity to present on marine debris. He left the meeting so that Working Group members could discuss and decide on whether to include marine debris as a priority for the WCOP.

Participants discussed the pros and cons of making marine debris a priority and came up with several proposals. They agreed to table this discussion at the end of Day Two of this meeting and to make a decision at that time.

On Day Two, participants continued and offered the following three proposals around how to involve marine debris in the WCOP Strategic Framework:

1. Create a fourth priority focused on marine debris as requested by MDA: marine debris
2. Insert marine debris and/or supporting the MDA as another activity under priority number two
3. Insert marine debris and/or supporting the MDA as another activity under priority number three

Participants provided the following comments and questions while discussing these proposals:

- We are afraid that if we add marine debris as a priority other entities will make similar requests and we will not be able to accommodate them all.
- We should use WCOP as a way to engage stakeholders, and make sure that others are aware of MDA and support it.
- What are the expectations of the WCOP versus MDA?
- We want to see MDA supported in this document.
- If we include a fourth priority, this may cause issues since the first three priorities were developed from the WCOS and during the first strategic planning meeting.
- Support MDA in the activities section, not as its own priority.
- Putting marine debris as a priority is an early win; even without a coordinator for the WCOP, the MDA will be able to move this activity forward.
- The WCOP can consider recognizing MDA if we can determine that marine debris is something we can work on regionally.

AGREEMENT: The meeting participants were not able to come to full consensus or general concurrence as described by their decision making protocol on this topic. As such, the Strategic Framework will not be updated to include marine debris at this point, although the participants agreed that the Partnership should return to the topic once the partnership is launched; Kim agreed to follow-up with Eben and let him know.

Discussion of Appropriate Activities Under the Existing Regional Priorities

The group discussed appropriate new activities under the existing three priorities that should be included in the Framework. The three existing priorities that were developed during the June 30 – July 1 WCOP Strategic Planning Meeting include:

- Climate resilient coastal communities
- Responding to changing ocean conditions
- Increasing discovery and connectivity of ocean and coastal data and people to better inform regional resource management, policy development and ocean planning (subsequently edited to “Improving Ocean Data and Coordination”)

The participants were asked to use the following criteria to consider identifying appropriate activities:

- Is the activity appropriately regional in scope?
- Does the activity address a current gap or need (i.e., is this activity already being addressed by another entity or organization)? In other words, is it value-added?
- What is the anticipated impact of the activity regarding the regional priorities and objectives?
- Does the activity leverage or complement member organizations' projects/mission/objectives?
- Can the activity be addressed with current staff and resources?
- Does the activity require new staff and/or funding resources to accomplish (i.e., longer term)?

The facilitators requested that participants also identify whether a particular activity is: (1) something that can be done now with current resources, or (2) something that is longer term that will require additional funding/staff. Once the WCOP has been officially launched, there will be a ranking exercise of the activities followed by a decision of which ones to pursue first.

Participant comments on activities to be included under the existing three regional priorities are summarized below.

Priority One: Climate Resilient Coastal Communities

While reviewing the Draft Regional Priorities and Activities document, participants discussed the value of climate resilient coastal communities to the Partnership and potential activities by providing the following comments and suggestions:

- One participant said that the current draft implies that there is regional homogeneity in the way activities would be pursued; however, we need to clarify that this is not going to be homogenous approach.
- A few participants recommended adding an outcomes column; this will help the WCOP seek funding sources by identifying what the outcomes will look like for each activity and concrete ways to implement them on a regional level.
- One participant suggested including an awards program for climate coastal communities.
- Add a tools or resources column to the table; we need creative ideas to obtain more funding (i.e. hosting webinars).
- Add a new activities bullet: “Working Group to develop and carry out a plan for policy briefings for high level tribal, federal and state entities.”
- Use work groups to identify more specific activities; consider creating a work group to determine how to finance these activities.
- The document needs to create a clear link to tribal trust responsibility.

Priority Two: Responding to Changing Ocean Conditions

Participants discussed the value to the Partnership of responding to changing ocean conditions and linked activities by providing the following comments, questions, and suggestions:

- Include the harmful algal blooms (HABs) issue under activities; address how we will detect issues more quickly. Suggested text: “improved detection and absence of harmful algae in the ocean.”
- One activity could be to engage people on new topics through convenient mechanisms (i.e., webinars).
- Will the outlined activities get us to where we need to be in terms of communication? One suggestion is to develop modeling or forecasting to help with this.
- Add “diagnosing phytoplankton”; detect what is in the water column before it is in fish.
- In trying to find a niche between science and policy, it is not only the decision makers that have the right science; maybe we foster that iterative conversation among natural resource managers.
- Network with the West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel and Pacific Coast Collaborative (PCC); two robust networks for these kinds of activities.

Participants said that an outcome from some of these suggestions might be to transition the conversation on ocean acidification. Funding for monitoring could potentially be coordinated with other partners helping the voice on this issue become more inclusive and powerful. One product (i.e. outcome) might be synthesized data including all sensory data and translating it so that it is synchronized.

Priority Three: Improving Ocean Data and Coordination

Participants discussed the value of increasing discovery and connectivity of ocean and coastal data and people to better inform regional resource management, policy development, and ocean planning. The group agreed that the lengthy title could be reduced to “improving ocean data and coordination”. They asked Todd

Hallenbeck, *West Coast Ocean Data Portal (WCODP)*, the author of many of the draft activities, to explain what the outcomes of the activities might look like and whether they are short-term or long-term endeavors for the WCOP. Todd provided the following clarifications about the draft activities listed for this priority:

- The proposed activities are geared at informing the issues of the Partnership or other bodies.
- Once the particulars of the other two priorities are identified, the WCODP's focus could help develop them further.
- The goal is to make new data available to the Partnership and to the public to inform decision-making and identify funding.
- One of the first activities identified is to make connections to other data systems; identify what data systems are out there that we need to connect to and how we can connect to them.
- The new data published through the WCODP that fills the priority gaps will be funded by the RPB; however, they can apply to the Partnership's activities and gaps as well.
- Building capacity and coordination amongst people managing the data sets.
- Creating best practices for data sharing.
- Responding to priorities and needs that come out of the WCOP is very valuable; however, there is no funding for this, so it is a medium to long-term task.
- Increasing the use of the WCODP could be one potential outcome; this could be a document that identifies what the needs are and how the portal could fill them.
- Developing functional improvements could be one endeavor; however, this is costly due to the engineering and programming needs.
- Improving stakeholder use of the WCODP is one potential outcome.
- Data exist that still need to be put into the WCODP; it might be helpful to talk about the things that have already been created to make them more tangible.
- Other potential outcomes include: utilizing a search-and-find function.
- Maintenance of the WCODP is a necessary outcome; attract funding by creating a useful tool.

AGREEMENT: Participants agreed for staff to incorporate the revisions informed by the above discussion to the regional priorities, objectives, activities section.

VI. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS DISCUSSION

Participants discussed, revised, and came to agreement on several elements of the governance text of the Draft Strategic Framework.

Structure, Membership and Roles

Participants walked through the Governance document section by section and engaged in facilitated discussion to review the text, addressing the remaining questions and issues to be resolved. Below specific questions that were highlighted for the Working Group in the agenda are addressed.

Do we want the Co-Chair Committee to be the same body/people as the RPB Executive Secretariat?

Participants considered whether they want the Co-Chair Committee to be the same body/people as the RPB Executive Secretariat, and they provided the following suggestions, responses, questions and comments:

- Non-federally recognized tribes are not part of the RPB Executive Secretariat so they would be excluded. How do we best align the bodies when there is this issue with membership? We understand

having the same people might be efficient; however, tribes are often very limited in staff, and it might be difficult to use the same people for both.

- As for the suite of roles for the WCOP and RPB, how much will they overlap, and can one person do it all?
- One-90 minute call every other month would be sufficient.

On Day Two, participants continued to discuss the governance structure and specifically the membership of the Co-Chair Committee. Several tribal representatives responded that they need to check in with their tribal councils prior to agreeing whether or not one co-lead can represent all tribes in the WCOP.

AGREEMENT: The group agreed that the tribes would discuss this with their councils and respond to Kim with their revisions and decision by February 1, 2016 (this date has since been changed to February 15, 2016). Eric reminded the group that they will also have to incorporate what the co-chair is doing and determine that it is not the same as the Executive Secretariat.

Is the term “Executive Committee” appropriate?

Several participants requested that the term “Executive Committee” be changed as every member of the Executive Committee is a member of the Partnership. One suggestion was to change the term Executive Committee to “Delegates.”

AGREEMENT: the group agreed to use the term Delegates rather than Executive Committee.

Do we want to formalize the senior staff in the Governance document (i.e., should they have their own meetings, etc.) or just invite entities to have other support staff involved?

Participants moved on to discuss the second question posed. One participant explained that this idea came from the notion that having senior staff in addition to senior leadership is to bring other people into the Partnership with some bounds; it is helpful to have support and technical staff on hand. The proposal to limit staff to three individuals was chosen so that all entities had the same amount of people involved. Participants provided the following suggestions, responses, questions, and comments:

- We need to weigh the administrative burden versus the benefit gained of this approach.
- One suggestion was to invite the senior staff to all WCOP meetings; there is not a need to hold separate meetings.
- Each entity should be welcome to participate in the WCOP calls with as many staff as they choose; facilitators will help participants’ speaking time.
- We need to ensure that there is at least one proxy available for each member entity to make informed decisions on the entities’ behalf.
- Senior staff could draft documents and then give them to those who are on the call; we want to ensure that the function is recognized and measured before it goes for approval.

AGREEMENT: The group agreed that there would not be separate meetings for senior staff and that each Partner would have the flexibility to bring senior support staff according to their needs. Future meetings would be managed in such a way to ensure that each entity would have the same opportunities to participate regardless of the number of staff present.

What constitutes “consistent” participation in WCOP meetings? How much participation is required?

- We need to make sure that we are not penalizing entities that cannot make meetings because they do not have sufficient staff.
- Future meeting planning needs to consider the need to convene caucuses governing counterparts.
- How do we deal with non-participation?
- We want to ensure that people are coming to meetings prepared.
- Participating in half of the meetings does not sound workable.
- If people are not showing up, we need to ask ourselves why; their interests might not be getting met.
- Is this group is going to compete with others in the organization for funding? A few participants responded that they are under the impression that the WCOP partners will not compete with each other. We do not want to hurt or impede work that is already being done by members.
- One suggestion was that every one-to-two years, those that have not participated in half of the policy decisions are flagged; then they are contacted for re-commitment or re-engagement. This would ensure that when we are speaking on behalf of the West Coast, it is inclusive.

Eric explained that participation will be discussed later more on Day Two of the meeting.

On Day Two of the meeting, participants were asked to consider whether the participation of WCOP members should be tracked. They considered a proposal where the group would designate the coordinator or co-chair committee to track participation to make sure that everyone is engaged and their needs are being met. If participation is inconsistent, the coordinator would contact them to see if they are still interested in participating in the Partnership. Participants discussed offering a recommitment option every few years.

AGREEMENT: Attendees discussed the pros and cons of recommitting every one-to-five years and decided that encouraging participants to reaffirm their participation every year if desired is helpful for each entity; however, that the Partnership would only ask that partners reaffirm their participation every five years. This helps to accommodate small-to-large entities with various support and administrative processes.

Administrative Decision Making Process

Kim McIntyre described the protocol used in the past for WCGA and Partnership Working Group administrative decisions. She explained that after a meeting or call, decisions are circulated via email with a period of time for members to confirm or speak up if they do not agree with the decision. If she hears nothing, participants forego their participation; lack of participation means agreement. Several participants voiced their concern that some decisions are therefore made by default; she assured them that this practice is only for administrative decisions.

AGREEMENT: Participants agreed that the practice described by Kim is okay for administrative decisions only. Eric explained that consensus-based decision making would be discussed later in the meeting.

Consensus Based Decision Making Process

On Day Two of the meeting, Eric provided an overview of a consensus based decision making approach. He explained that full consensus is when every member is in full agreement with a given decision and general concurrence is when the entity agrees that the WCOP members understand their point of view, understand others point of view, and support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly. Agreements come when

everyone is in either full consensus or general concurrence. Participants considered the proposed language and continued their discussion regarding the decision making process.

Participants discussed the benefits of consensus-based decision making and weighed the pros and cons of this with a voting majority option. Majority votes were a high concern to several participants due to potential impacts on treaty rights.

AGREEMENT: Participants believed that in order to have full support amongst the partners and to move forward as a cohesive unit, they must use consensus to come to decisions. They made the following comments in support of a consensus based decision-making process as additional suggestions:

- Add text to include a legal review of decisions at the beginning of the process.
- Administrative decisions would still follow the same decision-making process discussed previously; consensus-based decisions would be for any substantial decisions; examples of each type of decision are outlined in the Strategic Framework.
- A caveat for the federal partners to step out of the process to allow the freedom of the states and tribes to move forward when lobbying needs to be included in the framework as an ‘abstention’ option in decision making .
- Allow enough time for decision making; the timeframe for tribes to get ratification from their councils can take up two months. This is already reflected in language in the decision making section of the Strategic Framework.

One participant asked if there will be a record of who did not agree, abstentions or recuse, and Kim responded that will be recorded in the WCOP meeting notes.

Stakeholder Engagement

Participants considered possible changes to the stakeholder engagement section of the Governance document, and one attendee asked that the language be revised to include a few small language updates.

AGREEMENT: The group agreed with the requested revisions and confirmed the language as a group.

VII. NEXT STEPS FOR LAUNCHING THE PARTNERSHIP

Tasks and Timeline

Participants engaged in a discussion to clarify the next steps and identify specific tasks for launching the Partnership. They worked to revise the *Tasks and Timeline* while K&W took notes of their comments and revisions in the document as reflected in *Appendix 4* as a list of Action Items.

Resources

Kim explained that the WCGA currently has funding from the FY13 NOAA Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program to support a part-time coordinator position through April 2016, travel support for an in-person meeting (this current one), and website hosting. The WCGA Coordinator working with the RPB Coordinator will manage efforts to launch the WCOP, including coordinating the Working Group, outreach efforts, meeting planning, drafting documents, strategy development and fundraising. She asked participants if they are aware

of any new funding sources that the WCOP could apply for or any ideas on how to maximize their current resources. Participants responded with the following comments:

- One suggestion was to apply for grant money and partner with a 501(c)(3) to hold the funds; however, grant money is difficult to get unless you have a specific project.
- Another suggestion was to use the Sea Grant programs; however, they are already assigned to entities and the WCOP currently borrows them, this may create a capacity issue. We have not gone back to ask for additional funding received from the national Sea Grant program; however, even if we have students to help, who is going to coordinate?
- One suggestion was to consider a paid membership; however, other entities did not support this notion.
- Following the November election, there will be a real opportunity to engage; whatever the Partnership decides to work on needs to be high on the national priorities list.
- Bringing in non-profits, industry, and academic stakeholders might offer financial resources.

The Makah Tribe agreed to work on the objectives, priorities and vision to see what rises to the top and see if it aligns with their work plans and budgets.

VIII. MEETING NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

In the final agenda item, the group discussed the deliverables from this meeting. The facilitators explained that there will be raw notes, a meeting summary, a one-page comparison on the WCOP and RPB, and a revised Strategic Framework document from this meeting. They outlined the next steps for developing and distributing the meeting summary and revised documents for review to the Working Group, incorporating the comments, and finalizing the documents by January 26. They also explained that the raw notes will be kept on file if anyone wishes to see them.

The Working Group agreed to review the meeting summary and revised documents simultaneously and requested ample time for review.

Eric thanked everyone for their efforts over the course of the past two days. He noted that the group had established a clear vision for the WCOP, developed a shared understanding of focused regional priorities and activities, and established a firm Strategic Framework to review and launch the Partnership.