

Kenai Fish Habitat Partnership

Meeting Notes

1/9/2012, 10am-4pm

Attendees: Jeff Anderson, Cecil Rich, Robert Ruffner, Lisa Beranek, Brent Johnson, Sue Rodman, Doug Limpinsel, Sue Mauger, Megan Murphy, Marie McCarthy, Steve Zemke, Peter Micciche, Ginny Litchfield, Ricky Gease

Meeting start: 10:20am

Agenda

Letters of concern

Roles (Coordinator, committee members, partners)

Timelines (Review 2011, discuss 2012)

NOAA/EVOS Grant Introduction

Conservation Action Plan (CAP) Overview

CAP Discussion

Adjourn

Robert: Welcome, overview of agenda, attendee introductions, introduction of facilitator (Megan Murphy)

Megan: Overview of facilitators role and ground rules (confidential, respectful, honest conversation). Notes are only for the steering committees use unless the committee votes otherwise. Notes will not be posted on the website at this time.

Survey

Open discussion on survey that was sent out to steering committee members.

Timeline—interest in clarifying process, setting expectations and formalizing conflict of interest policy.

Symposium--1) major interest in a neutral, unbiased entity to coordinate to maintain partnership credibility. The partnership will host the symposium. 2) concern expressed about whether the symposium will strengthen or fracture community support. 3) suggestion to partner with other organizations to do symposium. 4) suggestion to put on a symposium each year. 5) suggestion to include a topic area of funding opportunities.

Steering Committee—1) request for a bigger role in prioritizing need and strategic actions, especially for proposal priorities. 2) concern about point of contact for meetings (agenda items & coordination of subcommittees). 3) suggestion to have committee bring up issues, provide input about agenda items, & provide deadline reminders. 4) suggestion for a strong committee presence & process to increase effectiveness.

Project Proposals—1) concern about fine tuning proposal priorities in self interest (loss of objectivity) 2) suggestion to improve clarity on focus areas (prioritize where to spend limited resources &/or complete a survey of all peninsula issues for organizations). 3) suggestion to prioritize projects by "Protection" & "Restoration". 4) concern about realistic possibilities of prioritizing projects due to increased time commitment. Suggestion was made to put the onus on the proposing entity to prioritize in lieu of time steering committee time commitment and lack of expertise. Suggestion to use a logic model was made. Note: in the past the committee decided not to complete a prioritization.

KFHP Marketing—Suggestion was made to create partnership communication/marketing tools.

Subcommittees—1) concern about whether or not subcommittees will exist and how they would function. 2) interest in seeking out new partners for new input & increased

involvement. 3) suggestion to form subcommittees & reduce steering committee meeting frequency. 4) concern that Robert is involved in all committees & will be overburdened.

Cecil/Sue's Role—1) concern about Cecil & Sue's roles & resources (funding, communication with national board). Steering committee can help frame their roles. 2) Suggestion to increase the workload of FHP paid positions (Jeff, Cecil & Sue).

Policies & Procedures—1) suggestion for committee members to familiarize themselves with the contents. 2) concern about the document as it has not been formally adopted. 3) suggestion for an agenda item at the next meeting (formalization).

Coordinator Role—1) concern that coordinator does not have a vote in committee matters. This concern is due to who the coordinator currently is, due to wealth of endemic knowledge. Suggestion to have coordinator on the steering committee like the Mat-Su does with a rotating chair who facilitates 1 of their steering committee meetings (meeting frequency: once ever 2 months).

Jeff's Role—Jeff's job description includes FHP work so he is able to take on projects & tasks. Suggestion to increase the workload of FHP paid positions (Jeff, Cecil & Sue).

Lunch (12:20pm)

Discussion Outcomes

- Implement subcommittees—to meet monthly or as needed
- Steering committee to meet once a month (after 1/17 meeting)
- Reschedule meeting dates/times
 - Not available: 1st & 3rd Tuesdays, Fridays, 2nd Thursdays
 - Robert will follow up with a Doodle poll to schedule (by Friday)
- In the absence of steering committee input, the coordinator (Robert) will choose priority.
- Coordinator role is well defined in the Strategic Plan & Policy & Procedures documents.
- Strategic Plan is comprehensive, not strategic. Needs review & completion after CAP is created. NFHP requires a strategic plan.
- Policies & Procedures will be reviewed and updated by Peter, Marie & Ricky. They will send out discussion points a week before the next meeting.
- Suggestion of ad hoc, task based subcommittees with a request to clarify tasks for subcommittees.
- Suggestion to gather a science/technical committee to create CAP (per KFHP Strategic Plan). To begin ASAP due to its high priority. A draft should be done by February 2013 to present at KFHP Symposium in April 2013.

Subcommittees/Timeline

2011

Most timeline items were completed with the exception of sending out the Request for Project Ideas in May & recruitment of full proposals in August.

2012

- CAP—Chairs: Jeff, Doug, Steve, KWF staff
Start: Jan 2012 Finish: Feb/Mar 2013
- Symposium—Chairs: Ginny, Ricky, Sue, KWF staff
Start: Jan 2012 Finish: Apr 2013
- Ranking RFPs—Chairs: Brent, KBRR (?), Jeff (?)
Start: Jan 2012 Contact Robert in Aug, Put pre-call out Finish: Aug 2012
- Website (stand alone)—Chairs: Marie, Katrina
Start: Jan 2012 Finish: Aug 2012
- Formalize planning process & documents—Chairs: Peter, Marie, Ricky
Start: Jan 2012 Finish: Feb 2012

NOAA/EVOS Opportunity

Doug introduced a funding opportunity (handouts)

Suggested a presentation from coworker for more information

CAP Process Overview

Robert presented information on The Nature Conservancy (TNC) template

See presentation for more information, found online at www.conserveonline.org

Very important to document assumptions, sources & thinking

Points of interest: incorporate Mat-Su in planning (marine) to streamline use of “potential” threats verses threats.

Concern about doing CAP is a step back

It was suggested that the CAP gives credibility to FHP work as it is a revered & known process

Concern about lack of marine expertise on committee

Potential CAP partners include: Mat-Su professionals (D. McBride, M. LaCroix, Phil North, Coowe, Walker), Kenai Fjords National Park, Kachemak Bay Research Reserve, NPS.

2 tracts confirmed: Freshwater terrestrial & Marine/Estuary (each needs a team leader)

Kachemak Bay Research Reserve is doing a vulnerability study on the Kenai Peninsula. She coordinates marine scientists on Kachemak Bay.

Next meeting

January 17, 11am

Following meeting will be in accordance with the Doodle poll

Agenda items include: discuss consistencies/combine 3.1, adopt “policy & procedures”, discuss project targets, scope & people.

Robert’s personal annual review is available. Evaluations are available as well.