

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
January 22, 2009
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Hall

Meeting Purpose: to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the April 29, 2008 meeting, review the summarized comments from the 60-day public comment period (ended on June 23, 2008), hear an update from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center's RITT, and explore the next steps and responsibilities for the recovery plan.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements	
10:10 a.m.	Review and Acceptance of April 29, 2008 Meeting Notes	- April 29, 2008 Meeting Summary
10:15 a.m.	Status Updates and activities since the April 29, 2008 Steering Committee meeting	- Updated Recovery Plan Timeline
10:45 a.m.	Recovery Plan: Comments from the Public and Peer Review Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction and overview of public comment review process• Highlights of response to comments and changes to the Plan, LFA, and TRT documents• Steering Committee questions, comments & dialogue• Next steps to finalizing all documents	- Proposed Recovery Plan (CDs, recovery plan summary) - Draft Peer Review Summary - NMFS Comment Responses - draft LFA
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
12:30 p.m.	Recovery Plan: Comments from the Public and Peer Review Committee (cont.)	- See above
1:30 p.m.	Northwest Fisheries Science Center Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report on changes to draft TRT population and viability documents• Report on peer review and RITT review process• Report back on abundance planning targets	- Viability Criteria - Draft Peer Review Summary - See above
2:20 p.m.	Steering Committee Discussion About Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next steps• Implementation	- Updated Recovery Plan Timeline
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

Facilitator's Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 Thursday, Jan. 22, 2009, 10:00 am – 3:00 pm
 Sekiu Community Center, Sekiu, WA

Meeting Purpose

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the April 29, 2008 meeting,
- to review the summarized comments from the 60-day public comment period (ended on June 23, 2008),
- to hear an update from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center's Technical Recovery Team (TRT)/Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT), and
- to explore the next steps and responsibilities for the recovery plan.

Participants at the Meeting

The list of meeting participants is attached to this summary.

Action Items

- Triangle Associates will set a final Steering Committee under the planning stages of recovery planning with meeting participants on potential meeting dates: **March 9** and **13**.
Update: March 9 was chosen.
- John Miller will work with Clallam County staff to get up-to-date parcel information and supply the information to National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).
- Triangle Associates will circulate revised implementation questions electronically.

Update on next meeting presentations with details in parentheses

<u>Presentation attendance confirmed</u> –	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (yes; will additionally provide operational funding info) ▪ NMFS (yes) ▪ Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (yes) ▪ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (yes) ▪ Representatives of the timber industry (yes; Harry Bell and Norm Schaaf will coordinate) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quileute Tribe (yes) ▪ Department of Natural Resources (yes) ▪ Non-landowner and non-agency participant (yes) ▪ Olympic National Park (yes; Pat Crain will inquire about representative) ▪ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (yes)
<u>Presentation attendance to be confirmed/contacted</u> –	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Makah Tribe (will be contacted) ▪ Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (Rosemary Furfey will contact a representative) ▪ Department of Ecology (Rosemary Furfey will contact a representative) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private landowners (Depends on landowner response) ▪ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Rosemary Furfey will contact a representative)

Introductions, Review Agenda

Facilitator Bob Wheeler reviewed the agenda and explained the purpose of the Steering Committee meeting. He also noted that including this meeting, only two meetings remain before current NMFS funding ends.

Announcements

Ed Bowen expressed his concern that there has been a large time gap since the April 2008 meeting. Bob Wheeler recognized that this was also a concern for NMFS and stated that the future Steering Committee meeting would occur hopefully in one or two months.

Ed Bowen inquired if public comment would be accepted at this meeting. Rosemary Furfey responded and clarified the meeting's purpose and goals: to help fill the gaps, and to clarify facts or any previously submitted comments. She wanted to underscore that the public comment period has closed, but this meeting offered people an opportunity to correct any errors or to refine their comments made to the Proposed Recovery Plan.

Harry Bell asked for a clarification about how long people might have to submit comments on their comments. Rosemary replied that there would be two weeks to make comments.

Review and Acceptance of April 29, 2008 Meeting Notes

Following Bob Wheeler's request to the Steering Committee for any comments or clarifications, Ed Bowen clarified a comment that he had sent to Blake Trask about a request for recovery plan development information from NMFS and "attorney-client privilege." Rosemary Furfey explained that two types of information exist. The first, pre-decisional information is part of the determination process when developing the Proposed Recovery Plan and is not available for public review. The second type of information is the administrative record, which includes the various drafts of recovery planning documents. The latter is available and the information in the administrative record could be requested. Ed Bowen asked that the "attorney client privilege" reference be removed from the meeting summary. Bob Wheeler said it would be. In addition, Norm Schaaf asked to correctly spell "Oregon" in reference to Oregon Coho.

With the suggested edits, the meeting notes were then approved.

Status Updates and activities since the April 29, 2008 Steering Committee meeting

Rosemary Furfey reported that the two May 2008 public meetings had a good turn out (while overall numbers were not overwhelming, turnout equaled that of open houses for recovery plans that spanned a larger area) and she thanked the Steering Committee members for their attendance, support, and input. Since June 23, 2008 comment period had ended that NMFS staff have been busy and worked to provide periodic progress reports to the Steering Committee.

Rosemary Furfey thanked the NMFS team for their hard work and supporting staff, including Triangle, RITT, and Clallam County staff for their support, review of, and assistance in distributing the Recovery Plan documents.

Recovery Plan: Comments from the Public and Peer Review Committee

Rosemary Furfey referred to the document titled "Updated Schedule and Key Steering Committee Agenda Items." She estimated that the process and finalization of the Recovery Plan would take about two months. It will then be made available on the Clallam County and NMFS Internet sites. Rosemary noted that every comment had been taken seriously and that several comments led to changes to the Recovery Plan. NMFS received comments from twenty individuals (including

tribes, state, and federal agencies), and from five members of the independent peer review process organized by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. All comments were compiled and included in the “Draft Response to Comments” document. In response to a question if peer review comments were separated from the general comments or if they were combined, Rosemary confirmed the latter.

Rosemary requested that the Steering Committee review the “Draft Response to Comments” document and provide her with any clarifications or comments within two weeks. The two-week deadline for commenting on the “Draft Response to Comments” document would end on February 9, 2009.

In response to a question about how the Recovery Plan’s five-year update would interact with the adaptive management plan (which will be written following the publication of the Recovery Plan), Rosemary noted that the adaptive management plan could indeed affect the Recovery Plan, but that a 5-year review is always required by NMFS.

In response to a question on how NMFS addressed and responded to comments, Rosemary explained that public comments were batched by comment topic area. 219 specific comments to the Proposed Recovery Plan were made. The topics were subsequently categorized and NMFS worked closely with Norma Jean Sands and the TRT/RITT to update the viability criteria. The six documents included in this review process included:

- Draft response to comments
- Updated viability criteria
- Peer review of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan
- Redline RP draft
- Draft Limiting Factors Analysis
- Keys to understanding

To clarify what distinguished a redline edit draft, Rosemary noted that such a draft contained strikeouts and that these marked edits offered a useful way for people to track where changes had been made following the previous draft. Phil Miller clarified that the federal register posting included the Proposed Recovery Plan, Limiting Factors Analysis, and Viability Criteria and that these documents formed a combined publication for review and comment by the public.

Rosemary Furfey then reviewed highlights from the Response to Comments document. The following provides a listing of Steering Committee questions and dialogue. Rosemary indicated that she and the writing team would consider the input from the Steering Committee and make appropriate final changes to the Recovery Plan and supporting documents as necessary, as long as there was the understanding by the Steering Committee that such changes would be made to help clarify or correct what is being said in the existing documents:

Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan

Criticisms were made about an overreliance on the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in the Proposed Recovery Plan. A response to this comment explained that NMFS had approved this HCP and NMFS’s view was that taken together with the Proposed Recovery Plan, the Forest Practices HCP represents a path toward sockeye salmon recovery. Don Hamerquist commented on page 96, comment 7.1, “the effects of the implementation of HCP are soon to be satisfactory.” He noted that the water quality criteria have not been met, the requirements for adequate staffing have not been met, and they will likely fall short given current economic conditions. He added he was not sure how the response could assume satisfactory conditions.

Critical Habitat Designations

Comments about critical habitat designations were made. One commenter asked, “why was certain habitat included in that designation?” Based on this comment NMFS sought to clarify what defined critical habitat and its relationship to private landowners. Specifically, critical habitat relates to federal actions, and doesn’t affect private lands unless an explicit partnership exists. The response to comments sought to add language to best clarify this point.

- If critical habitat designations were amended, the Recovery Plan would be changed and the Recovery Plan would need to go through an additional public process.
- Pat Crain noted that he did not see anything in the Proposed Recovery Plan about county designations. Critical Area Ordinances are tied to the critical habitat designations.

Fishery and Harvesting

In response to a question about whether the Recovery Plan goals are focused on establishing a commercial sockeye salmon fishery, it was noted that the stated intent was to delist sockeye. If sockeye abundance increased, an evaluation by managers would be conducted to determine if a commercial fishery could be possible.

Pat Ness asked about subsistence harvesting and if that related to this commercial fishery. Pat Crain added that Olympic National Park staff does not see the Recovery Plan affecting the Boldt decision. Kurt Hughes noted that if a fishery were possible negotiations would occur on an annual basis as they currently do. Katie Krueger clarified that the tribes have fishing rights and they need to be brought into the discussion for any actions taken that affect fish.

Pat Ness asked about the segment on tribal rights on page 62, “tribes will be considered when concerning the cultural and social and economic needs.” Rosemary said that NMFS chose to err on the side of inclusivity and the intent would be to hold a broad discussion with stakeholders. Katie Krueger also spoke about the role of the tribe in economics – anything that would affect water quality would ultimately affect the fish and the tribes would be at the table.

Large Wood Placement

While the Proposed Recovery Plan refers to large wood placement at several locations within the basin, the Proposed Recovery Plan specifically states no large wood would be placed in the upper portion of the Ozette River (the upper 1.3-mile portion of the Ozette River was determined as the point that would, from a hydrologic standpoint, likely affect lake levels). The analysis that showed this to be the reach that affects the lake level was from studies conducted by Herrera. Additional discussions, included:

- Pat Ness asked for a clarification about the phrase on page 21 of the Response to Comments document, “paying landowners to move their homes out of the floodzone.” Rosemary Furfey explained that future studies cannot anticipate what research or scenarios would look like. Pat Ness indicated that there is a possibility that following future studies, large wood placement would occur.
- Pat Crain said that for large wood placement either on the lakeshore or in the Ozette River, Olympic National Park would conduct an analysis and evaluation. Olympic National Park would include as part of this and any decisions a public process. Ultimately, the Park Superintendent would make the final decision on large wood placement, and that depending on the impacts determine if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required. Regardless, surrounding property owners would be consulted.
- Pat Crain noted that the Park’s position on wood removal is that the lakeshore and river should be managed for natural processes. One potential exception could be addressing the

sediment plug. If it was determined that the plug was caused by an anthropogenic process, it could be managed.

- Pat Ness expressed a concern about landowner impacts, and that flooding did not address the “take” with the loss of landowner’s property, in addition to their cabins. Rosemary noted that there were several locations in the Proposed Recovery Plan that discussed take and that NMFS legal council had been consulted. Pat Ness noted that research could result in a take, even if it did not occur on her property. Rosemary indicated that that issue might be beyond the scope of the Recovery Plan. Bob Wheeler suggested that a clarifying comment be added to the text of the Recovery Plan stating that landowners be notified if their property was being directly or indirectly affected.

Predators/Predation

Based on comments, various comments and modifications were made to the predator sections and additional research and monitoring suggestions for pinipeds and fish predation were made.

Pat Crain noted that Olympic National Park has management concerns that differ from private lands. He added that some the responses to comments made by NMFS would not pass through the Park’s review process (e.g., a metal weir at the mouth of the Ozette River). Tim Tynan said the responses attempted to provide new solutions. Pat Crain said that this topic also was a concern because the weir would border the Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.

Landowner Issues

Pat Ness pointed out an inaccuracy about the Umbrella Reach research section and noted that her private land is actually referenced as National Park land. In response, John Miller offered to go back to Clallam County to review ownership issues and pass the information to NMFS. Pat Ness said that the county parcel maps were not developed for this type of legal scrutiny. Ed Bowen suggested Rick Wagoner, the Olympic National Park realtor, as an excellent contact for researching property issues.

Research

Pat Crain highlighted that Olympic National Park recently administered a research permit to a University of Washington graduate student, Aaron Brooks. The Park used a landowner permission template developed by the State of Washington for private landowners to enter into agreements with researchers. Pat Ness used this template for Aaron Brooks’ research that would occur on her private property. She also noted that such an approach addressed her liability concerns.

Pat Ness reiterated that many landowners are supportive of the Recovery Plan, but have liability and ownership concerns. She felt good about Aaron Brooks’ research and saw this as a big step in bridging the divide between research and landowners. She complimented Pat Crain on his help. Ed Bowen said that this has been a huge success story and said that he hoped it would be a model as the Recovery Plan moves forward. The Steering Committee discussed Aaron Brooks presenting his research at the next meeting, and Ed Bowen requested that Aaron Brooks present any preliminary results.

A suggestion was made to help determine historical abundance by looking at lake sediment core samples. This has been added to the research topics section. Ed Bowen asked that this topic be included as an educational activity at a future Steering Committee meeting. Mike Haggerty noted that the chances of success would be about 10% because of the high nitrogen rates in Lake Ozette (Alaskan lake core samples are more successful because there is less nitrogen present).

In response to a question about acidification and its effect on Lake Ozette, Rosemary said that NMFS would encourage partnerships with other agencies monitor parameters like Ph levels. Pat Crain noted that some monitoring occurs now. For other water quality concerns, high mercury concentrations in Lake Ozette were mentioned as an issue. As a result of this discussion, Rosemary indicated that she would consider adding a section titled “other additional research topics” to include actions related to emerging issues, such as mercury contamination.

Additional research discussions at the meeting included:

- Ed Bowen discussed the sediment plug and mentioned that the assistant deputy director of the Northwest Region of NMFS, Rob Walton, had previously said that NMFS would develop research to address the plug. He added that he did not believe a model is research.
- Another topic raised in the Proposed Recovery Plan public comment period was to use river camera data to identify the hatchery fin clip ratio. NMFS staff wants to follow up on the viability work.
- One commenter wrote that beach spawning should be reviewed. NMFS agrees.

Limiting Factors

Pat Ness had asked about the apparent difference between the Olympic National Park Management Plan, which said the sockeye salmon had crashed before significant timber harvesting, and the limiting factors in the Proposed Recovery Plan. Don Hamerquist noted that the factors that limit sockeye recovery now are not the same issues that resulted in the overall fisheries decline in the 1950s. Tim Tynan said that something happened in the 1950s that led to a crash of sockeye salmon. He noted that this crash was coincidental with the removal of wood from the rivers, but no data exists to confirm or refute this hypothesis.

In addition, several limiting factors not originally included were identified in the public comment period. Some new research topics have been added based on these suggestions.

General Questions Related to the Recovery Planning Process

In response to a question about commenter anonymity, Rosemary explained that it was standard NMFS protocol. Phil Miller added that it would be important to publish the final version of the response to comments along with the final plan.

Ed Bowen asked about which documents were included in the comment review process. He wanted to be clear to the public what documents these comments addressed. Rosemary recognized some confusion existed, but explained that a specific protocol was followed. The documents were noticed and comments were received and responded to.

Ed Bowen asked if all comments received an adequate response. He noted his concern was that NMFS “cut and paste” one group of comments and addressed them as a single comment. He expressed concern that the context of one comment could be confused with the context of another comment. Rosemary noted the NMFS team had painstakingly worked to respond to the content of all comments, and that while they had consolidated comments, she felt that responses to all comments were adequately covered.

Norm Schaaf thanked NMFS staff for their work. He said he saw a clear trail related to the rationale for how the Recovery Plan was developed and he appreciated it.

At the conclusion of the Steering Committee comments and discussion on this agenda item, Rosemary thanked the Steering Committee for their input, reminded everybody that the official public comment period had ended, and expressed her interest in incorporating Steering Committee recommended changes, focused on clarifications and corrections, after she and the writing team had time to consider each specific comment. She also reminded Steering Committee members that she would consider any additional thoughts provided that they would be submitted by February 9.

Northwest Fisheries Science Center Update

Norma Jean Sands, from the NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center presented the two documents written by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT) – population identification and viability criteria. There were no comments on the population identification document which will now become a technical memo. Kit Rawson, a member of the TRT, then presented the November 2008 viability criteria report. He provided an explanation about what viability means: essentially that in the future the sockeye will be here. The TRT guidance for sockeye viability for 100 years in the future and the certainty is 95% to 99% of the time sockeye salmon will meet those viability criteria. He explained the guidance included four aspects of sockeye salmon viability: 1) abundance; (2) productivity; (3) spatial distribution; and (4) diversity.

Kit Rawson also noted that the TRT looked at past numerical data, and compared data at Lake Quinault for variability (Remember that because data did not exist for Lake Ozette on sockeye salmon that the TRT decided to use Lake Quinault as a comparable situation for sockeye salmon evaluation in Lake Ozette). He explained that fundamental differences exist between sockeye in Lake Ozette and Lake Quinault: one of those likely being that there is increased variability in Lake Ozette. He added that the viability criteria questions that the TRT sought to respond to were (1) what is the capacity for smolts and (2) what is the capacity for spawners? The TRT determined that minimum numbers for viability are around 30,000 for a 5% extinction probability and 100,000 for a 1% extinction probability. Kit provided an explanation of some report highlights and answered questions from the Steering Committee:

- Phil Miller asked about the time relationship of viability and how it would change given different growth rates. Kit said that this would be an interesting question to further explore, but that without more specific information he felt that variability probably would conflict with the linear growth rate that such a statistic would show.
- Pat Crain asked if there was any discussion about benchmarks. Kit responded because of the data uncertainty the report was more focused on the general population growth rate.
- Rosemary Furfey was asked by Bob Wheeler about how the viability criteria were included in the Proposed Recovery Plan. Rosemary responded that this information with the two viability numbers was incorporated into the Proposed Recovery Plan and in the comments.
- Ed Bowen asked for additional narrative in the “Keys to understanding” document describing the differences between Lake Quinault and Ozette and how the differences between the two sockeye populations were addressed. Rosemary indicated that she would look at this.
- Katie asked about the use of the term “incorporated by reference” versus “reference.” She noted that a legal difference existed.
- Pat Crain raised the issue of a need for a time/growth rate projection for Lake Ozette sockeye salmon and that this task should be included as an implementation task. Kit said it would be up to the Steering Committee, or another entity to determine when the goal should be realized. Pat Crain said that some interim goals should be stated and that the Recovery Plan should include goals, and/or interim goals.

- Norm Schaaf asked about the three tributaries that are currently being used for spawning and if there is an assumption on whether spawning can occur in the other tributaries. Kit responded that there can be spawning based on Mike Haggerty's analysis, but the capacity analysis just includes the three tributaries.
- In response to a question if the TRT, and now the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT), is part of NMFS, Norma Jean Sands answered that it was a separate entity even though it was organized by NMFS.

Steering Committee Discussion about Next Steps

Bob Wheeler noted that one more meeting – likely in March – is left before the current NMFS funding runs out. NMFS has sponsored the Steering Committee meetings for several years now as it has been preparing the Recovery Plan and supporting documents. Now that the plan is moving into implementation, the group would need to create an approach to implementation and for the future of the Steering Committee. He presented a possible agenda for the next meeting, which would focus on implementation issues.

Bob Wheeler also commented that while implementation is not addressed in great detail within the Proposed Recovery Plan, it is an important next step if actions and ultimate recovery of Lake Ozette sockeye salmon are going to be successful. He suggested the idea that different groups/organizations/agencies/governments come to the next Steering Committee meeting to discuss their ideas and roles related to implementation, following a template of questions brought up in the document entitled, "implementation discussion guide." The suggested groups included:

- | | |
|---|--|
| ▪ Governor's Salmon Recovery Office | ▪ Makah Tribe |
| ▪ NMFS | ▪ Quileute Tribe |
| ▪ Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership | ▪ Department of Ecology |
| ▪ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity | ▪ Department of Natural Resources |
| ▪ Olympic National Park | ▪ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |

In addition to the proposed list of participants, Steering Committee members suggested additional speakers from:

- Representatives of the timber industry
- Private landowners – whether or not they speak will need to be determined later
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Non-landowner and non-agency participant

In response to the proposed approach, Ed Bowen suggested the adding one more question to the implementation discussion document: "*how will your agency respond to inquiries about the planning and implementation process?*"

The Steering Committee discussed holding a "next steps" conversation following the presentations to ask (1) "what does the Steering Committee want/need to do?" and (2) "who will convene this process and what is the agenda?"

The Steering Committee discussed several additional ideas and issues regarding the future of implementation, including continuing without funding, different models for consensus building, and seeking facilitation services.

Pat Crain noted that there could be a meeting or two without facilitation, but that the group needs a centerpiece organization for moving forward. With another situation –the Dungeness River Management Team - paid staff provided by the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe keeps the Management Team moving along. He concluded that he felt there was no way the Steering Committee would be here without the help of NMFS and the facilitation it provided.

Funding Future Steering Committee and Recovery Plan Activities

Nancy Allison remarked that it was clear that a passion exists amongst members of the Steering Committee and that there are many different opportunities to move forward. She added that the Lead Entity program is good at obtaining funding for such efforts. She added that an ad hoc group could also propose funding. Additional funding discussions included:

- Nancy Allison commented on her understanding that the Steering Committee had reservations about receiving support from the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP). Pat Crain said he was unaware that the Steering Committee had expressed its reservations about receiving support from WCSSP. Katie Krueger noted her concern, of the possibility of having someone in Pacific County being involved in management decisions for Ozette sockeye.
- Nancy Allison also indicated that while the WCSSP may not be desired for a leadership role, that funding could still flow through the organization.
- Katie volunteered to draft an interlocal agreement. She noted that multiple governments cannot share the funding without an interlocal agreement. The public does not need to participate in this agreement, but it's an option. She volunteered to draft the agreement.
- Pat Crain mentioned that the federal government was funding the Puget Sound Partnership, along with the state government for Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal summer chum. He said that implementation at Lake Ozette would not take same amount funding that the Puget Sound Partnership receives, but it will require similar types of funding from federal sources.

Pat Ness asked about how the state was funded, and would it be possible to acquire funding from the State. Phil Miller explained that (1) state funding to the lead entity was occurring; and (2) the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office was funding WCSSP. Additional comments, dialogue, and suggestions included:

- Katie Krueger presented the idea of forming a 501(c)3 and asked the Steering Committee members to consider this as one option.
- John Miller said the federal government could also be involved in the interlocal agreement.
- Phil said the WCSSP operates as a group with Grays Harbor County as the fiscal agent. WCSSP is under a state statute as a regional salmon recovery board. Phil noted that if a group wished to administer funds, then it would need to proceed through an organizing process. He offered to provide information about operational funding in his presentation at the next meeting.
- John Miller explained that for the WCSSP all four counties with real estate in play have developed an interlocal agreement where Grays Harbor County serves as the fiscal agent for the WCSSP.

In closing the meeting, Steering Committee members representing the different implementing perspectives agreed to present their perspectives, based on the implementation discussion guide, at the next meeting. In addition, other groups not in attendance will be contacted by Triangle for their participation in the final Steering Committee planning phase meeting.

Bob Wheeler thanked Steering Committee members and adjourned the meeting at roughly 3:00 p.m.

Attachment 1 Attendance:

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Carol Johnson	North Olympic Timber Action Committee	(360) 452-6645	notac@olympen.com
Coleman Byrnes	Citizen	(360) 428-1032	swampdog@olympen.com
David Levin	Resident Property Owner – Big River	(360) 963-2304	Dalev_11@yahoo.com
Don Hamerquist	Citizen	(360) 963-2413	janeen@olympen.com
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		rockypt@olympen.com
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 452-3325	harry@greencrow.com
Herb Yancy	Green Crow	(360) 461-1337	herb@greencrow.com
Jim Springer	WA DNR	(360) 374-2818	jamespringer@wa.dnr
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 963-2378	pysht@olympen.com
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe – Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
Kit Rawson	Tulalip Natural Resources		
Kurt Hughes	WDFW	(360) 249-1204	hughekmh@dfw.wa.gov
Michael L. Blanton	WDFW	(360) 417-3301	BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov
Nancy Allison	Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	(360) 289-2499	nancya@wcssp.org
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-2367	nschaaf@merrilring.com
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3075	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Pat Ness	Landowner – Ozette	(360) 928-0266	bobandpattness@gmail.com
Phil Miller	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	(360) 902-2219	Phil.Miller@esa.wa.gov
Rich Osborne	Salmon Recovery Funding Board/ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	(360) 417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
Rob Snyder	The Lost Resort	(360) 963-2899	lostresort@hotmail.com
Roy Morris	Stream Keepers	(360) 963-2442	able@olympen.com
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Thom Hooper	NMFS	(360) 753-9453	thomas.hooper@noaa.gov
Tim Tynan	NMFS	(360) 753-9579	Tim.tynan@noaa.gov
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov
Michael Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olympen.com
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bwheeler@triangleassociates.com
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com