

**Southeast Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership
Strategic Planning Session Summary
October 16-17, 2012**

Meeting Participants:

- USFWS - Neil Stichert, John Hudson, Bill Hanson
- USFS –Sheila Jacobson
- NOAA – Cindy Hartmann Moore
- The Nature Conservancy – Christine Woll, Dave Albert
- ADF&G – Roger Harding, Jeff Nichols, Sue Rodman, Kate Kanouse, Charlie Swanton
- Southeast Alaska Watershed Coalition – Jessica Kayser
- CCTHITA: Kate Jensen
- UAS GIS Library – Kim Homan, Jason Seifert
- SEAKFHP Technical Adviser – K Koski

Meeting Facilitator:

- SEAKFHP Coordinator: Debbie Hart

Meeting Objectives:

- Kick off SEAKFHP strategic planning effort, build momentum among partner representatives and others to engage in the planning process
- Share information among SEAKFHP partners and others, identifying and elevating current conservation planning resources and strategic planning expertise
- Create tangible work products and future actions that inform the SEAKFHP strategic planning process and begin to populate the SEAKFHP Strategic Action Plan

Presentation highlights: (PowerPoint presentations provided as attachments):

- Sheila Jacobson, Fish Biologist (USFS – Tongass National Forest) – USFS Watershed Condition Framework (see attached USFS_WCF_10162012.pdf)
 - Background on where/how the USFS Watershed Condition Framework came about – A nationally consistent, comparable and credible approach
 - Watershed Condition Framework – an 6 step process
 - Classify watershed condition
 - Prioritize watersheds for restoration
 - Develop watershed action plans
 - Implement integrated projects
 - Track restoration accomplishments
 - Monitor and verification (start process over)
 - Watershed Condition indicators/ratings
 - National decision was made not to rate non-federal lands
 - The default on the maps show these areas as “green” or in a good condition when that might not be the case
 - Local USFS staff have been able to alter some of this data for SE AK providing more accurate information for non-federal lands in SE
 - Feedback from meeting participants was to recommend the USFS use a category 4 or other color to represent unknown condition on non-Federal lands
 - Feedback from group also recognized that any comparisons between regions would down play some of the condition issues that are present in SE AK

- Current Tongass Priority Watersheds
 - Twelvemile – Prince of Wales Island
 - Luck/Eagle – Prince of Wales Island
 - Saginaw – North Kuiu Island
 - Staney – Prince of Wales Island
 - Sitkoh – Chichagof Island
- USFS is looking to perform a comprehensive effectiveness monitoring assessment with meetings beginning in November/this may be an area where the SEAKFHP can play a role and help inform this effort
- Dave Albert, Conservation Science Director (The Nature Conservancy – Alaska Field Office) – A Conservation Assessment for the Coastal Forests and Mountains in Southeast Alaska (see [TNC_Salmon_Priorities_Framework_10-19-12.pdf](#))
 - Overview of conservation process - setting priorities, designing strategies, implementing conservation action and measuring success
 - Overview of ecoregional assessment methodology – How do we measure ecological values?, Data development and Analysis, Current condition and management status, Multi-objective planning, Expert review
 - Measuring biodiversity values – focal species, ecological systems, incorporating data sources (ADF&G data, anadromous floodplain model)
 - Creating a spatial framework for conservation priorities and decision making – identifying top 20 watersheds within the Tongass needing restoration focus (based on freshwater salmon distribution and condition of riparian forests)
 - General feedback from participants is that this methodology and assessment outcomes are highly relevant to the SEAKFHP strategic planning efforts and can help focus priority efforts of the Partnership
 - TNC's Conservation Action Planning – general overview
- Charlie Swanton, Sport Fish Division Director (ADF&G) – ADF&G's Sport Fish Division Strategic Plan (see [ADFGStrategicPlan2010.pdf](#) or via the internet at: <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/fishing/PDFs/sport/StrategicPlan2010Final.pdf>)
 - Strategic Planning Tips
 - Incorporate full breadth of organization in process to build buy-in and maximize utility/outcomes from planning effort
 - Utilize survey information
 - Use easy to understand language, eliminate jargon, forgo technical terms
 - Incorporate good visuals in plan – include people doing stuff
 - Focus on what is realistic (Sport Fish Division took their Core Services and turned them into specific strategic goals)
 - Build prioritization based upon consideration of funding streams
 - Create a short version (ex. executive summary, post card)
 - ADF&G Sport Fish Division Strategic Plan Goal #6: Fish Habitat – Conserve habitat to sustain recreational fisheries resources
 - Includes 4 objectives with specific activities, proposed new activities and performance measures
 - Protect fish habitat to sustain recreational fisheries
 - Improve or restore degraded fish habitat
 - Develop and cultivate partnerships to conserve fish habitat
 - Inform the public about the division's habitat conservation efforts

- Neil Stichert, Habitat Restoration and Coastal Program Biologist, Juneau Fish and Wildlife Field Office (US Fish and Wildlife Service) – An overview of a strategic planning approach: USFWS Coastal Conservation and Partners for Fish and Wildlife Programs 2012-2016 (see USFWS Strategic Planning 2012.pdf)
 - General guidance for planning purpose, process, and plan development
 - Overview of specific plan elements (goals, objectives and outcomes) for the Coastal and Partners programs
 - Planning Lessons for the SEAKFHP:
 - SEAKFHP should review effective plans and find existing guidance documents, but convene a robust process to determine its role, course, and partnerships.
- Bill Hanson, Juneau Fish and Wildlife Field Office Supervisor (USFWS)/Alaska Coastal Rainforest Center Coordinating Committee Chair – Overview of the Alaska Coastal Rainforest Center with insights to strategic planning
 - Sees two general types of partnerships
 - Partnerships directed at specific services or resources: SEAKFHP = fish habitat conservation; SE GIS Library: GIS services
 - Partnerships that provide more general coordination, with a broader (yet defined) mission: ACRC, North Pacific LCC
 - Strategic Planning Tips
 - It's a thrash in the beginning, so don't get discouraged
 - Especially hard for product oriented people like the people on the FHP steering committee to generalize upward. There's a tendency for us to think in terms of projects and deliverables. These will show up during the strategic planning process. They don't usually belong in the Strategic Plan, but you need to be sure to retain them for other purposes. When you encounter an item in this category, do the following: 1) Document it for future use in annual work planning; 2) Ask yourself, why is this project or deliverable important to me and to the FHP? You need to capture the importance and underlying value as goals and objectives in the strategic plan. In ACRC strategic planning, in the 4th-5th-6th drafts, we were still sorting between projects and strategies. If you feel it is important, it belongs in the strategic plan. It may or may not belong in the 2012-2013 work plan, depending on its priority.
 - Strategic plans usually cover 3-5 years. They can be revised. They should be checked each year, but shouldn't require major revision. Can accommodate new needs.
 - Consider why you need a strategic plan at all? 1) Important to have a view of your goals and objectives over several years to help you sort out the big priorities and ensure continuity between projects; 2) Assuming that your group sees itself continuing long term, you will inevitably have changeovers in representatives as well as changes in partners-- It's enjoyable to be a representative partly because you can actually help drive the goals, objectives, and deliverables, but you don't want the focus of the group to change from year to year just based on who is engaged; 3) You need a good communication tool when people ask what the FHP is and what it does. With a Mission Statement, Fact Sheet, Strategic Plan, Work Plan, and Examples of Deliverables, you can quickly explain this-- all of these except the Strategic Plan should fit on a one page fact sheet, 4) a strategic plan may be required as a part of organizational recognition.

- ACRC Experience
 - We did not create a strategic plan until the second year of operations.
 - At our first Coordinating Committee (same as Steering Committee) meeting in 2010, Mike Goldstein (or director) led us through a discussion of potential priority workloads for the center and for himself. We eventually grouped these into four topic areas: 1) Leadership in Education and Training; 2) Leadership in Scientific Research; 3) Link Community Interests in Conservation, Management, and Policy; and 4) Create a Framework (governance, funding, etc.) to Accomplish the Long-term Mission and Vision.
 - For the first year, within the above four goals, we identified a small subset of priority work items. We focused on: 1) Selecting a couple of easily accomplishable deliverables that would showcase the ACRC and could be used as examples of our interests; 2) Identified one large project to accomplish within the first two years that would carry us forward (Symposium). The four goals essentially became the four goals of our Strategic Plan in year two, although reworded and thought out much more fully.
 - We discussed several underlying drivers and needs for the years that would be roughly equivalent to work plans. Although they weren't all stated this way, I would categorize them as follows: Year 1-Seek a critical mass of contributing members, establish operations and governance and funding, produce smaller deliverables; Year 2 (2011-2012) - Ensure accomplishment of our star project (international conference), refine governance including Strategic Plan, gain additional members; Year 3 (2012-13) - Consolidate our successes, further define our range of deliverables, concentrate on delivering work -- still in planning process for specifics.

Strategic Planning Work Products:

1. Developed SEAKFHP Strategic Planning Process and Milestones (see strategic planning process map attached Strategic Planning Process_SEAKFHP.jpg)
 1. SEAKFHP Planning Vision
 - Development of an articulated plan complete with:
 - executive summary
 - history of partnership formation
 - governance and organization
 - identification of regional threats
 - geographic scope
 - vision, mission, guiding principles
 - core functions, measurable goals, objectives, and actions
 - description of partnerships (how SEAKFHP fits with NFHAP/coordination with FHPs in Alaska and other adjacent FHPs), SEAKFHP Partner roles and responsibilities
 - regional scientific assessment
 - budget
 - appendices (SEAKFHP Bylaws, Procedures and Organization document, Partner Agreement Form)
 - Strategic Differentiation – incorporate data sources into planning effort such as Summer 2012 SEAKFHP Partner interviews, SEAKFHP

SWOT, SE AK regional conservation plans and resources (USFS Watershed Condition Framework, TNC's SE AK ecoregion assessment, Tongass 77 Campaign, SE AK Estuaries and Nearshore Marine Preliminary CAP by K Koski, ADF&G Strategic Plan, AKSSF Gap Analysis, NFHAP 1st and 2nd Editions, etc...),

- Organizational Engagement – goals, objectives and actions cascaded throughout the Partnership
- Organizational Transformation – plan broadly shared both through Partnership activities and discussions and also by SEAKFHP Partners helping to link plan to decision making processes for the Partnership, SEAKFHP Partners and others.
- Information sharing provided as a service as part of the SEAKFHP strategic planning process

2. SEAKFHP Planning Process – cycle of steps and activities that will lead to completion of the SEAKFHP Strategic Action Plan (includes information on where we are at in this process currently)
 - Draft SEAKFHP vision statement (completed summer 2012/revised Oct 17, 2012)
 - Analyze strengths and weaknesses, Identify opportunity and threats (initiated summer of 2012/revisited Oct 17, 2012)
 - Reflect on purpose and values, Draft SEAKFHP mission statement (initiated summer of 2012/revisited Oct 17, 2012)
 - Draft Partnership Core Functions (initiated Oct 17, 2012)
 - Consider critical issues including:
 - Outreach to new partners
 - Outreach to other NFHPs and others
 - Consider NFH Board Guidance and NFHAP Priorities
 - Consider critical threats to region (Utilize TNC CAP Process)
 - Define geographic/species scope of Partnership/strategic plan timeframe
 - Add additional data sources/incorporate information sharing
 - Consider possible goals, objectives, and actions
 - Utilize TNC CAP process
 - Finalize Partnership Core Functions, Goals, Objectives and Actions
 - Include targets and measures
 - Cascade goals, objectives and actions throughout Partnership
 - Form a draft action plan
 - Identify individual/subcommittee writing/editing tasks
 - Use draft to outreach to new partners
 - Request review from NFHPs (Mat-Su/Kenai/SWAK/PMEP/WINTI) and Others (WAFWA)
 - Form a final action plan
 - Request approval from SEAKFHP Steering Committee
 - Request approval from National Fish Habitat Board
 - Implement action plan
 - Monitor implementation of action plan
 - Evaluate success of action plan

- Start process over
 - Revise action plan
3. Timeline – anticipated deadlines/target dates
- SEAKFHP Strategic Action Plan time horizon – 3/5 years (2013 to 2017)
 - Draft Plan available for Partner/public review in time for spring symposium (March or April 2013)
 - Final Plan available by early summer 2013
2. Initiated SEAKFHP SWOT and developed information base to create a follow-up SEAKFHP SWOT Survey – On October 17th meeting participants participated in an activity to gather data on the strengths and weaknesses of the SEAKFHP and also identified key opportunities and threats impacting fish habitat conservation in Southeast Alaska. This information will be used to develop a more comprehensive SWOT through a survey to a broad distribution of current SEAKFHP Partners and potential partners.

The comprehensive SWOT data will be used to inform development of the SEAKFHP Strategic Plan both in the identification of critical threats impacting the region and also in the development of core functions of the partnership. Participants highlighted their 3 top points for each category. The summary below lists each category with similar entries included together or grouped under an entry that captures the general theme for many entries. The check marks reference where participants noted their top entries.

1. Strengths (internal – strengths of the SEAKFHP)
- Facilitated coordination of services/dedicated coordinator keeps this partnership on track/enthusiastic competent coordinator/2-years of funding to support coordinator (w/11 check marks)
 - Forum for communication/coordination on fish habitat issues specifically (w/ 5 check marks)
 - Representation of diverse land ownerships and interests with some common goals (w/ 5 check marks) /Diverse background of participants/lots of regional expertise/roots in SE AK communities (w/ 3 check marks)/multiple party interest in habitat health/Provides a collective voice (w/ 2 check marks)/ Lots of local and regional expertise/cultural diversity with broad representation (Government, NGOs, tribal, education)/Ability to concentrate on common mission/Whole is stronger than individual partners
 - Creates ability to improve success of restoration efforts across land ownerships (w/ 4 check marks)/opportunity to “get it right” the first time with respect to future impacts to habitat (w/ 2 check marks)
 - Creates ability to capitalize on limited expertise (skills/resources) to address issues and flesh out ideas/concepts (w/ 2 check marks)
 - Creates ability to leverage funds (w/ 1 check mark)/creates ability to leverage resources within individual partners/Creates

environment to do things without the normal constraints of an agency

- Can do meaningful things to benefit fish habitat
- Ability to invite/include new partners
- Access to variety of data sets, management plans, other resources (information portals) regarding fish habitat conservation efforts/processes/practices/etc...
- Strong support for the partnership
 - National support through the NFHP
 - Lots of FHP support in Alaska (Mat-Su/Kenai/SW-AK)
 - Strong support by agencies, FWS, ADFG, NOAA (via advisers/MOU)

2. Weaknesses (internal – strengths of the SEAKFHP)

- Current capacity of Partnership
 - No industry representative currently on Partnership, ie. Timber, Commercial Fisheries, etc... (w/ 4 check marks)
 - Lack of cultural and socio-economic expertise on Partnership (w/ 4 check marks)
 - Expanding interest of various Partners beyond original intent of formation of the SEAKFHP. (w/ 5 check marks)
 - Lack of marine expertise on Partnership (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Lack of partner representatives with experience outside of salmonids and freshwater
 - Regional “burnout” on collaborative (weakness and threat)
 - 2nd biggest SE landholder not involved (Sealaska)
 - Tribal representation is unclear: true tribal representation is difficult to achieve, CCTHITA is an executive govt, SEALASKA is a corporation, tribes and villages have unique needs, individual tribal members have strong opinions and needs
 - Few at-large seats on steering committee
 - No scientific subcommittee as advisers
- Time commitment (w/ 3 check marks)/individual Partner representatives are spread thin
- Lack of long-term dedicated funding to continue Partnership (w/ 3 check marks/weakness and threat)
 - Limited funding for outreach and coordination meetings (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Potential of competition for limited funds (weakness and threat)
- Disagreement on priorities (w/ 2 check marks)/Inherent challenges on building consensus and agreeing on Partnership priorities among diverse groups/ challenges in working with industry in a non-threatening way
- Limited awareness and support of upper/middle management of Partner organizations (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Individual Partner’s mission conflicts with other Partner’s in Partnership

- Hard to get and maintain support from Partners/agencies when conflicts are present
 - Partnership may be too Juneau centric (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Lack of focus on cultural and socio data
 - No process for how to synthesize data (during CAP process, pulling together resources in general, many management plans and divergent goals ie. Economic vs. Natural Resource gain)
 - No strategic plan in place
 - Travel for meetings is expensive and difficult/lack of technology available to Partners in rural Alaska
3. Opportunities (external – those opportunities happening outside the Partnership impacting fish habitat conservation/can also consider individual Partner strengths)
- New engagement of local perspectives and knowledge beginning to be brought to the table
 - Known fishing technology and monitoring that proved to be low impact for thousands of years (w/ 3 check marks)
 - Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) being recognized as valid, in turn, Western science confirming TEK and agreeing in what is important in an ecosystem cross-culturally (w/ 2 check marks)
 - LTK and TEK is available
 - Cultural importance is gaining significance
 - Many organizations and agencies to partner with for leveraging resources to further improvements or protection of fish habitat (w/ 2 check marks)
 - Many agencies, NGOs, tribes and public concerned about salmon resources
 - Many organizations out there we have not yet reached, ie. SEAPRO (SE AK Petroleum Resource Organization – does oil spill response and planning)
 - Many skills and information resources available to address fish habitat issues in SE AK (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Shared resources to design habitat improvement projects (w/1 check mark)
 - Available information on anadromous streams and key watersheds
 - Shorezone data set for nearshore habitat
 - FS GIS Database
 - ADF&G anadromous waters catalog
 - SEAK GIS Library (new advancements in story telling through maps)
 - Existing prioritization strategies (FS/TNC/TU)
 - Potential for increased funding (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Organizations that can provide non-federal match to grants, ie. Mining companies, forestry companies, marine transportation groups, oil companies, cruise industry (w/ 1 check mark)

- Process or means by which to place/park new funding opportunities
 - Overall ecosystem of the SEAK archipelago is relatively intact
 - Generally pristine habitat
 - Existing impacts to fish habitat somewhat less intense than other parts of the Pacific North West
 - Relatively low human population levels in SE AK
 - One major land owner to deal with/A lot of federal land in SE AK
 - CCTHITA has government to government relationship
 - EPA's "Environmental Justice" focus starting in 2014
 - Potential Canadian allies
 - Southeast (Juneau) is located so close to policy makers – easy to include them in discussions/events and target
4. Threats (external – threats happening outside the Partnership impacting fish habitat conservation)
- Primary risks to fish habitat
 - Climate change/Environmental Threats/Ocean Conditions
 - Regional economic growth and community development/Urban development
 - Roads/stream crossings
 - Contaminants from abandoned (or private in-holding) industrial sites
 - Catastrophic events (ex. tsunami debris)
 - Mining/Lack of environmental monitoring of mine sites
 - Shoreline dredge and fill
 - Marine Vessel Transportation
 - Energy development/Hydro and tidal projects
 - Fishing
 - Timber harvest and logging activities
 - Invasive species
 - Mariculture, aquaculture, hatcheries
 - Backsliding on fish passage improvement practices/poorly implemented attempts at "restoration"/MOU with DOT on fish passage is not working (w/ 3 check marks)
 - Human development with no planning around watershed resources (w/ 4 check marks)
 - Current lack of coordination among Partners
 - Weak regulatory climate protecting fish habitat/federal, state and local laws and policies that either conflict with fish habitat needs or take resources away from habitat improvement (w/ 2 check marks)
 - Unclear responsibility for who is responsible for healthy habitats (overall)?
 - Lack of relevant (state and local) policies on aquatic resources
 - Lack of enforcement for state and federal laws/regulations
 - AK Forest Practices Act not doing enough to protect resident fish
 - Challenge of coordinating across international boundaries

- SE Alaska is located “downstream” of Canada
 - Lack of ability to impact laws and policies, no advocate or adviser within the legislature to influence change/legislature not involved
 - Lack of clear definition of restoration – “what do we restore to? Pristine? Old Growth? Healthy riparian?”
 - Industry compromise with lack of protection of resident fish habitat
 - State not recognizing tribal governments, hence indigenous concerns of habitat not always heard on same level
 - High tribal staff turnover in small villages
- ii. Data Gaps - Lack of comprehensive list of streams, watersheds, salmon stocks that are definitely at risk (w/ 2 check marks)
- insufficient distribution and archive of regional fish habitat plans, research, projects/scale, quality and completeness of GIS data pertaining to fish habitat and restoration projects (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Insufficient data for prioritization, risks, threats to fish habitat
 - No database of local and traditional knowledge
- Alaska being targeted globally for resource development/Economic conditions that favor resource extraction (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Alaska’s political development agenda (w/ 2 check marks)
 - Competing community values: bio, eco, socio, cultural
 - Lack of knowledge, skills and awareness on local level (citizen base) to address Fish Habitat Partnership priorities
 - Insufficient funding (declining) for fish habitat conservation (w/ 1 check mark)
 - Competition for resources between residents and foreign fisheries that both tread on fish habitats (w/ 2 check marks)
 - Potential for competition for limited funds (weakness and threat)
 - Regional “burnout” on collaborative (weakness and threat)
3. Revised SEAKFHP VISION Statement as follows:
The Southeast Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership’s vision is to “ensure healthy, thriving habitats that support all life stages of Southeast Alaska resident, anadromous, estuarine and marine dependent fishes across their historical range.”
4. Revisited SEAKFHP Mission Statement with the following changes still under consideration:
The ~~mission of the~~ Southeast Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership’s mission is “to ~~foster and facilitate regionally relevant strategies to~~ support cooperative fish habitat protection, conservation, restoration, ~~and management~~ and sound stewardship in freshwater, estuarine and marine ecosystems across Southeast Alaska ~~and includes with~~ consideration of economic, social, and cultural interests of ~~Southeast Alaska~~ local communities ~~in its endeavors~~.”
5. Developed 4 broad CORE FUNCTIONS for the Partnership to concentrate on over the next 3-5 years, these include:
- Grow diversity and capacity of the Partnership (People)

- Develop organizational strength & perseverance of the Partnership (Internal Processes/Long-term funding support)
 - Provide services to Partners (Customers = SEAKFHP Partners, SE communities)
 - Develop regionally relevant fish habitat conservation strategies (Financial = Measures of success to the SEAKFHP ex. Healthy fish habitat in SE AK, Improved policies and procedures, Broad regional use of best practices, etc...)
6. Developed lists of possible goals, objectives and activities for two of the four Partnership Core Functions:

Provide services to Partners:

- Bring training to region (Fish Habitat practices / professional training)
- Foster interagency coordination
- Provide symposium
- Facilitate funding
- Provide technical expertise (focal / expert panel review, subject matter experts)
- Share data
- Prioritization strategy for region
- Recommend best practices management strategies
- Communicate partner project updates
- Threat / risk analysis for region
- Event facilitation
- Clearing house on fish habitat information (look to categorize)
- Project endorsements
- Facilitate networking, routing key contacts
- Inform environmental justice “process”

Develop Regionally Relevant Fish Habitat Conservation Strategies (protection / restoration / enhancement)

- Coordinate efforts to expand the ADF&G's Anadromous Waters Catalog (AWC), ADEC's reservations of water
- Encourage restoration effectiveness monitoring
- Best Management practices for restoration
- Protection of intact watersheds
- Integration of TEK (traditional ecological knowledge) into fish habitat conservation strategies
- Prioritize intact watersheds for higher level of protection (define value parameters)
- Align organizational approaches to fish passage (protect levels)
- Promote / foster / endorse outreach / education on Fish Habitat Conservation
- Coordinate with other FHPs

(Consider verbs: Promote, Foster, Facilitate, Coordinate)

Future Actions:

1. Summarize Oct 16/17 Strategic Planning Session (*Debbie will route draft to participants for review*)
2. Provide copies of presentations to meeting participants (*Debbie will include them with the draft summary/Jess will post them on the Southeast Alaska Watershed Coalition web site*)
3. Develop and distribute SEAKFHP SWOT survey (*Debbie will compile SWOT survey questions and route to SEAKFHP Partners and others for in depth SWOT/Debbie will compile results and distribute to meeting participants – anticipate SWOT survey to be available for input by Nov 9th/Data available for December strategic planning meeting*)
4. Contact Dave Albert for guidance on use of TNC CAP process as part of SEAKFHP strategic planning process, how/where/when. (*Debbie will contact Dave and schedule follow-up as needed*)
5. Request review of National Fish Habitat Board guidance to FHPs developing strategic plans/review National Fish Habitat Action Plan priorities (*Debbie will contact Cecil Rich (USFWS) and John Curland at NOAA for guidance and look to schedule input from them via email or at a follow-up strategic planning session.*)
6. Possible dates for follow-up strategic planning sessions include future SEAKFHP steering committee meetings (Nov 9th next scheduled SC meeting/December SC meeting) and additional strategic planning sessions or webinars (*Debbie will coordinate follow-up Strategic Planning sessions that may include brief presentations/webinars or workshop sessions; she will draft associated agendas as needed and route to meeting participants for feedback*)
7. Specific discussion/actions needed between now and the end of December:
 - Partnership's guiding principles (*anticipate discussion at next SEAKFHP SC meeting, November 9th*)
 - SEAKFHP mission statement (*anticipate discussion at next SEAKFHP SC meeting, November 9th*)
 - Geographic scope (*Cindy will provide information on "marine" boundary definitions/potential SEAKFHP marine related goals/Jeff will help outreach to ADF&G marine folks for broadening capacity for this discussion/anticipate discussion at next SEAKFHP SC meeting November 9th, Jeff will also begin creating maps representing the SEAKFHP geographic scope*)
 - Species scope (*Continue discussion if there is focus by species for the Partnership over the next 3-5 years/anticipate discussion at next SEAKFHP SC meeting, November 9th*)
 - Identification of regional threats/assign drafting the "Overall health of SE AK fish habitat" section of the strategic plan (*look to using available information, K Koski outline/TNC ecoregion assessment, NOAA shore zone information/anticipate discussing this during December meetings*)
 - If possible incorporate presentation from Peter Bangs on AKSSF Gap Analysis/Mark on TU Tongass 77 Campaign (*Debbie will contact Mark and Peter about availability to provide updates on these*)
 - Continue discussions on CORE FUNCTIONS/considering goals, objectives and actions (*Debbie will draft goals, objectives and actions for the partner capacity building and organizational strength and perseverance CORE FUNCTIONS for group to review. Debbie will incorporate the mini SWOT completed during this meeting to begin this effort. Anticipate group discussion on these during a December meeting.*)

8. Other short term tasks:

- Encourage participation on strategic plan development *(As part of the SWOT survey effort Debbie will provide Partnership outreach to industry representative, cultural representative, socio-economic expert, municipality representative, marine representatives)*
- If possible incorporate input/feedback from adjacent FHPs *(Debbie will update adjacent FHPs on recent SEAKFHP efforts, specifically beginning strategic planning effort)*