

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
January 14, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the November 16, 2009 meeting, receive updates on other relevant plans/programs, dialogue about steering committee structure, discuss Implementation Plan, and where pertinent make decisions/recommendations.

Special Action Item: entities/individuals will develop their top 3 implementation actions for sockeye recovery and will bring them to share at the January 2010 Steering Committee meeting.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements	- Jan. 14 Meeting Agenda
10:05 a.m.	Review and acceptance of Nov. 16, 2009 meeting summary; confirmation of June 29, 2009 meeting attachment	- Nov. 16, 2009 draft meeting summary; June 29, 2009 meeting attachment
10:10 a.m.	Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on actions to implement Recovery Plan• Monitoring update: what is the status of sockeye, preliminary sockeye return data and DIDSON monitoring update (Jeremy Gilman)• Presentation on dissolved oxygen study (Aaron Brooks)• Identify topics for new presentations	
11:00 a.m.	Steering Committee Purpose and Organization <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recap of November 16 meeting• Discuss and decide Option 5• Steering Committee clarification and decision on logistics and administration sub-group<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whom? Future meeting support?	- Decision making options; Revised Option #5
12:15 p.m.	Lunch	
12:45 p.m.	Developing a Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of preferences• Action prioritization• Discussion and recommendations by Steering Committee	- 3-year Implementation Action Table with initial preferences included; Attachment 2a & 2b; Recovery Plan; Steering Committee top 3 preferences
2:30 p.m.	Introduction to Research, Monitoring, & Evaluation Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction	
2:45 p.m.	Next Steps and Future Meetings – March 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summary of meeting action items• Review of potential meeting topics	
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, Jan. 14, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Sekiu Community Hall
Sekiu, WA 98381

Meeting Purpose

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the November 16, 2009 meeting;
- Receive updates on other relevant plans/programs;
- Dialogue about steering committee structure and decision making process; and
- Discuss the Implementation Plan next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan, and where pertinent make decisions/recommendations

Introductions, Agenda Review, Announcements, and Meeting Summary Review

The meeting Facilitator, Bob Wheeler from Triangle Associates, welcomed the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee went around the table making introductions (see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees) and reviewed the agenda.

Prior to reviewing the November 16, 2009 meeting summary, the Facilitator finalized the attachment to the June 29, 2009 Steering Committee meeting summary. As was noted at the November 16 meeting, a gap of discussion existed in the meeting summary when Triangle staff had stepped out of the room for a “closed door session” about next steps and facilitation services. At the meeting a representative from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) agreed to use her notes, augmented by an audio recording to draft an attachment, to complete the record of this portion of the meeting. The Steering Committee reviewed the attachment and approved it as an attachment to the June 29 Steering Committee meeting summary.

Then the Committee reviewed the November 16, 2009 meeting summary. One member expressed concern about whether the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) had been included as a member of the Co-Leads or not. The Steering Committee agreed to further clarify the role of WCSSP later in the meeting’s agenda. Following this discussion, the Steering Committee approved the November 16 meeting summary.

Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation

The Steering Committee then reviewed updates on actions to implement the Recovery Plan. An Olympic National Park representative reported that the Park Service is examining developing a water quality index within the Olympic and North Cascades Park Complex. He noted that the protocol is due by June 1, 2010 and the index will be reviewing 303(d) and 305(b) water bodies to see if they warrant listing. This index will be limited within park boundaries, but in some cases when waters outside affect park waters, there could be some additional review. Some Steering Committee members expressed interest for additional updates on this process.

It was noted that the Big River land acquisition project funding was accepted by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), but that approval is still required.

A Makah Tribe fisheries representative then presented on the preliminary Lake Ozette Sockeye return data. He noted that survey efforts are just now being wrapped up. Surveys were completed on Umbrella Creek, Big River, Crooked Creek, and Siwash Creek. Sockeye were seen in good

numbers in the first two tributaries, but were non-existent in the latter two. Surveys also were conducted at both Allen's and Olsen's Beaches, but because of turbid water conditions it was hard to tell how many redds might actually exist in the lake. Overall, the preliminary numbers appear to indicate a good year. While indications are positive, the Makah Tribal representatives noted that more information (e.g., whether the good returns are primarily due to hatchery salmon) will need to be gathered and analyzed before making definite conclusions on the Lake Ozette Sockeye returns. Another Steering Committee member noted that Quinault Sockeye returns were lower-than-normal.

Makah Tribal representatives then reported on efforts to acquire a DIDSON (Dual-frequency Identification SONar) fish counting system for future monitoring activities. Currently efforts are underway to reach out to other governments and agency staff for ways to partner in using one for 2010. Efforts to borrow a system (because Lake Ozette Sockeye return at a time when other salmon runs do not, it could be possible to use one DIDSON for multiple basins) have so far been unsuccessful. Now the Makah Tribe plans to investigate renting a DIDSON from Sound Metrics. One Steering Committee member requested that NMFS and Olympic National Park work to help assist in funding for a DIDSON. A representative from the National Park Service explained he was very interested in helping and noted that funding to borrow a system aligned well with the National Park Service Threatened and Endangered (T&E) funding program. He added that it would be a competitive proposal for the national T&E funding pool. It was noted that analysis of the data generated could be the most expensive portion of operating the DIDSON. NMFS also expressed interest in coordinating, but noted that the current funding environment is challenging.

Some Steering Committee members mentioned that other federal government efforts could assist the analysis and identification of fish for DIDSON monitoring. One Committee member suggested that inquiries be made to the Indian Island Navy Base and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratories who are working on similar software design efforts.

University of Washington graduate student, Aaron Brooks presented his Master's thesis research titled, "A Hydrological Assessment of Sockeye Spawning Habitat in Lake Ozette." One of the key conclusions of Brooks's research to-date has been that with 21 sampling points at different sites around Lake Ozette, only Olsen's and Allen's Beaches contained enough oxygen (but a statistical difference did exist between the two beaches) to be viable spawning locations. Another conclusion was the observation of a high level of materials, or "fines," that reduced oxygenation levels in lake gravels.

Steering Committee members' discussion and comments about the research and presentation included:

- Members felt that it was a good idea to analyze the level of organic substances in anoxic situations.
- One member noted that he was very pleased at the level of data acquired for a relatively small investment. He said that the National Park Service is looking at potential projects to expand this research. They are also looking at the removal, or flushing, of the gravels to improve the oxygenation of the beaches. He also noted that concerns exist if this is a viable strategy, noting a concern that salmon could be attracted to new habitat that might quickly decline, thus limiting spawning success.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the perforated pipe locations were located at the same elevations along beaches.
- Also, conductivity data was collected, but that problems with the sampling gear inhibited acquiring a usable data set.

- Members discussed additional issues related to sediment, core sampling, and depth levels related to Brooks's research.

The Facilitator thanked Aaron Brooks who volunteered to provide Triangle his PowerPoint presentation for distribution to the Steering Committee.

Steering Committee Purpose and Organization

The Facilitator recapped the conversation from the November 16, 2009 Steering Committee meeting. He then presented the revised Option #5 for Steering Committee structure that was proposed at the November 16, 2009 meeting. Using Option #5 the purpose at the January 14 meeting was to come to agreement on how Steering Committee members wished to organize and structure the Committee for the future.

Steering Committee members discussed whether or not a new structure could trigger a more formal process, such as what is required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). A representative from Olympic National Park noted that he was checking with an attorney to be certain that the proposed structure would not trigger something akin to FACA. Another member noted that the Steering Committee had not triggered an analogous process during the recovery planning stage, but that the implementation phase may be slightly different. One Steering Committee member said that the proposed structure did not appear to trigger a FACA or NEPA process. She noted that it appeared that only when a committee was sponsored by a federal agency would such a process be triggered. Steering Committee members discussed how other recovery planning processes regularly noticed meetings in local papers and that the Steering Committee could do the same. Based on the discussion, it was agreed that future meetings would be publicized in the *Forks Forum*, *Peninsula Daily News*, the Clallam County website, and the WCCSP website.

Based on the ambiguity of WCCSP's Steering Committee role in the past, Steering Committee members clarified the organization's role for future Steering Committee activities. A representative from the Quileute Tribe wanted to make sure that while, WCCSP could fund meetings, it was not authorized to be involved in decision making. She felt that other counties and tribes with no relationship to Lake Ozette Sockeye should not interfere via WCCSP (just as the Quileute Tribe would not expect to influence decisions made in the Quinault Basin or Pacific County). Another Steering Committee member noted the role of WCCSP to not actively participate in decision making was decided in an interim agreement based on concerns stated by the tribes. A representative from the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office commented that he was supportive of WCCSP not taking a lead role, but instead a supportive or partnering one in the processes. The representative noted that one of the important relationships currently is to pass funds through WCCSP to support facilitation services for the Steering Committee. The Committee agreed that the role for WCCSP should be an administrative one and that they could participate in logistical activities that do not involve decisions on sockeye recovery.

The Steering Committee then discussed the meaning of consensus as it relates to decision making for sockeye recovery activities. One member noted he was generally supportive of the Option #5, but asked for further clarification as to what consensus meant in this context. The Committee discussed that consensus could span a range in levels of agreement. It was noted that if consensus is not available, advice could still be provided, but that the lack of consensus would signal some concern to other groups/agencies. The Facilitator then offered to provide various models of consensus for future discussion, if necessary.

The Steering Committee discussed the decision making structure of the Steering Committee. A Steering Committee member started off by expressing several concerns about the structure and nature of how governments would report back to the Steering Committee. One member clarified that that he didn't view the proposed structure as a top-down model, but instead a bottom-up (or inverse pyramid) process that begins with the Steering Committee advising all participating entities. A Steering Committee member suggested that the authority, or "boss," of the process was the power of consensus. Another member reiterated the strength of a consensus-based process and noted that the Steering Committee would offer a forum to come together to coordinate and confirm based on the issues at-hand. The Steering committee is not formed by a specific government action, but instead through a shared interest in voluntary participation for sockeye salmon recovery. For reporting, one member noted that Steering Committee agendas and meeting summaries form the basis for reporting out and a record of past and current activities.

Following lunch, the Steering Committee then transitioned to collaboratively editing the Option #5 document and ultimately approving the revised document. Based on the discussion and edits made to the Option #5, the group designated an administrative team made up of volunteers (WCSSP, NMFS, Olympic National Park, Quileute Tribe, Makah Tribe, the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, and one citizen representative) to handle logistics and Steering Committee meeting planning. Each of the major sections of the document now titled, *Steering Committee Function + Structure* (see attachment 2 containing the final approved organizational structure document), were voted on. In successive 13 in favor and none against votes, the Steering Committee adopted *Steering Committee Function + Structure* for use as a guide for future Steering Committee activities.

Developing a Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan

Because of the lack of time remaining for the meeting, the Steering Committee agreed to hear a brief introduction on progress for the Three-Year Implementation table, and to wait on further discussions until the next Steering Committee meeting.

A NMFS representative then introduced the revised spreadsheet containing actions to be prioritized in the first three years of recovery plan implementation. She recounted that based on discussions held by the Co-Leads and input from Steering Committee members, the Three-Year Implementation table was sorted based on values generated by the recovery action hierarchy. She noted that the dot exercise was included as a record of the meeting, but that the dots did not influence the latest rating effort.

After reviewing the tables, Steering Committee members made several comments and suggestions to the Three-Year Action table. One Committee member requested additional background explaining the methodology of the Three-Year Implementation Plan table. Another member expressed a concern that this ranking system could distort important recovery plan activities by placing a large emphasis on the "low hanging fruit." He also noted that some actions – notably larger planning processes (e.g., the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Review) and public involvement – lacked criteria to be scored equally with the other actions, and thus scored poorly. He suggested highlighting the actions that lacked some ranking scheme. One member observed that some of the actions could be packaged together and that other actions appeared to be relatively duplicative to each other. One Committee member noted that the columns in the Three-Year Implementation Plan table were too busy to take in all of the information available. He recommended simplifying it, if possible.

Based on the discussion, the NMFS representative explained she would take the feedback acquired and would revise the Three-Year Implementation table for the next Steering Committee

meeting. She also said she would provide additional background information about how the numeric order was developed. The Facilitator asked all Steering Committee members to again review their organization/entity's top three implementation actions, and to come ready to explain any concerns about how their priorities were ranked in the Three-Year Implementation table.

Some Steering Committee members raised concerns about a delay in getting started with implementation actions. They also inquired about whether or not a delay would result in missed salmon recovery funding opportunities. Specifically mentioned were SRFB funding opportunities for 2010. A representative from WCSSP noted that the pre-application for SRFB funding will be in May 2010. Representatives from WCSSP and North Pacific Coast Lead Entity agreed to bring a list of application dates to the next meeting and the Committee agreed to place this on the agenda for the upcoming Steering Committee meeting.

Introduction to Research, Monitoring, & Evaluation Planning

The NMFS representative provided a quick update on the Research, Monitoring, & Evaluation (RM&E) planning effort. She noted that she is still waiting to hear about her funding request to enable progress on developing the Lake Ozette RM&E Plan. Additionally, she offered a quick explanation about its purpose and noted that at future meetings, the Steering Committee would discuss RM&E planning in greater depth.

Next Steps and Future Meetings

A request to government entities was made by a timber representative to coordinate/work with timber companies regarding SRFB funding for road maintenance activities. He noted that timber companies would likely need a commitment prior to the next Steering Committee meeting. One Committee member suggested that Clallam County look to the Conservation District as a sponsor for this effort. The timber company representative noted that some funding from the sponsor agency would also be required.

Steering Committee members outlined next steps to prepare for the upcoming Steering Committee meeting. Based on discussions, the Steering Committee approved that Triangle Associates be retained under the current WCSSP contract to help organize and facilitate a meeting to be held in mid- to late-March. The Steering Committee also authorized Triangle to help with the logistics for organizing a call for the new Administrative Team.

Adjourn

The Facilitator thanked the Steering Committee for its input and adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	(360) 289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
Aaron Brooks	University of Washington	(360) 963-2080	acbrooks@u.washington.edu
Chris Byrnes	WDFW	(360) 417-1426	Chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		rockypt@olypen.com
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe		jeremygilman@centurytel.net
Mike Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
Thom Hooper	NMFS	(360) 753-9453	Thomas.hooper@noaa.gov
Randi Knox	Lake Ozette landowner	(360) 769-8623	randi@kennerud.com
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe	(360) 374- 2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
Phil Miller	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	(360) 902-2219	Phil.miller@esa.wa.gov
Roy Morris Jr.	Stream Keeper	(360) 963-2442	able@olypen.com
Rich Osborne	Salmon Recovery Funding Board/ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	(360) 417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
Cynthia Rossi	Makah Fisheries Management	(360) 640-3175	rossi@centurytel.net
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-3325	nscaaf@merrilring.com
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bwheeler@triangleassociates.com

Attachment 2: Steering Committee Function + Structure

Steering Committee Function

The focus of the Steering Committee is to:

- Develop an Implementation Plan and Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (R, M, & E) Plan (Adaptive Management Plan) that meets the needs of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and members of the Steering Committee;
- Be informed of activities;
- Recommend roles and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan;
- Identify and obtain sources of funding for implementation and projects;
- Communicate with all the parties and the public;
- Proactively inform and educate the public about Lake Ozette Sockeye salmon and related issues;
- Monitor the status of the Lake Ozette Sockeye salmon;
- Provide input to agencies and entities on actions that impact the Lake Ozette Basin;
- Recommend changes to the recovery and implementation plans (as provided in Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon Recovery Plan sections 3-14 and 3-15); and
- Appoint subcommittees as needed and supported.

Steering Committee Structure

The Steering Committee structure places an emphasis on open membership, an advisory role for the Steering Committee, and for a delegated administrative team that will help coordinate logistical and administrative matters. Components of this approach include:

- 1) The Steering Committee provides advice to government entities, to entities taking voluntary actions, or regulated entities that are required to act on projects that directly or indirectly are related to the Recovery Plan:
 - a. The Steering Committee will attempt to reach consensus decisions on its advice, where feasible, understanding that there may be a range of agreement in a consensus decision. If consensus is not reached, differing positions by whom and intent will be recorded.
 - b. Governments, entities taking voluntary efforts, or regulated entities will ultimately make their own decisions on what they will do, but with the understanding and good faith that they will consider the input provided by the Steering Committee.
- 2) For funding requests and/or additional correspondence to legislature/Salmon Recovery Funding Board/other government entities, the Steering Committee would seek:
 - a. Consensus.
 - b. If consensus is not possible, individuals or entities could send letters or provide input on behalf of themselves (it would be acceptable for them to note they serve on the Steering Committee, but that their current correspondence is only representative of their position).
- 3) Steering Committee Logistics – The Steering Committee delegates an administrative team to carry out administration and logistics for the functioning of the Committee with

the understanding that it seeks input from the general Steering Committee membership. The Administrative Team’s tasks includes but is not limited to:

- a. When to meet
- b. Where to meet
- c. Utilize contracted resources
- d. Agenda
- e. Communications
- f. Advertising meetings

The initial members of the Administrative Team include representatives of (assuming their willingness to serve): Quileute Tribe, Makah Tribe, Olympic National Park, NMFS, Clallam County, Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP), citizen at-large (appointed by Steering Committee), and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).

- 4) Consensus decision making: Decisions of the Steering Committee will be based on consensus. Consensus is defined as general agreement of the proposal among all members. Members of the Steering Committee will develop recommendations and advice on the following consensus-based process continuum:

Consensus Decision				Block
“Fully agree”	“Can live with it”	“Abstain”	“Disagree for the record, but support the decision”	“Veto the consensus”

- 5) Adjustments to the Steering Committee structure can be proposed, discussed, and decided as future conditions warrant it.