

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 31, 2007
Sekiu Community Hall, Sekiu, WA (www.sekiu.com)
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Goals: To present information about the proposed Peer Review Criteria and seek Steering Committee input; to allow Steering Committee members to present summary statements and to discuss draft Recovery Plan chapter comments, including identification of opportunities for consensus where perspectives differ; to present draft Plan information about costs and the approach for the implementation schedule; and to review and update the ongoing schedule for the year as the road map for completing the recovery plan.

- 10:00 a.m. **Introductions, Review Agenda, Announcements and Purpose**
- Purpose: the primary focus of the meeting is to allow time for Steering Committee stakeholders to present summary statements and to discuss draft Recovery Plan chapter comments, including identification of opportunities for consensus where perspectives differ
- 10:10 a.m. **Review and Acceptance of April 24, 2007 Meeting Notes and Action Items from Meeting** **--(Att #1)**
- 10:15 a.m. **Review Proposed Peer Review Criteria** **--(Att #2)**
- 10:30 a.m. **Steering Committee Comments – Summaries, Discussion, Consensus Items**
- Summary Statements by Stakeholders (maximum 3 minutes each) **--(Att #3)**
Steering Committee stakeholders will have 3 minutes in which to present a brief summary. Where there are multiple parties to an organization, it is preferred the parties choose a designated speaker to present their summary. For example, if there are 3 individuals present from a company, one designated speaker from the company should present the summary (versus all 3 individuals providing a summary each).
 - Discussion/Dialogue by Chapter
 - Recovery Goals (Chapter 3)
 - Objective, Measurable Criteria (Mary Ruckelshaus, Chapter 3.3)
 - Limiting Factors (Chapter 4)
 - Recovery Strategy (Chapter 6)
 - Recovery Program Actions (Chapter 7)
 - Research, Monitoring and Adaptive Management (Chapter 8)
 - General Comments (not specific to Chapters)
 - Summary of Consensus Items Reached during Discussions
- 12:30 p.m. **Lunch Break**
- 1:00 p.m. **Summary of Observations from Discussion Session -- Rosemary Furfey**

Facilitator's Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 31, 2007
Sekiu Community Hall, Sekiu, WA (www.sekiu.com)
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Goals: To present information about the proposed Peer Review Criteria and seek Steering Committee input; to allow Steering Committee members to present summary statements and to discuss draft Recovery Plan chapter comments, including identification of opportunities for consensus where perspectives differ; to present draft Plan information about costs and the approach for the implementation schedule; and to review and update the ongoing schedule for the year as the road map for completing the recovery plan.

Participants for the Meeting

See Attachment I for a list of meeting participants.

Summary of Recovery Planning Tasks/Actions

- The next Steering Committee meeting was tentatively scheduled for Thursday, June 21, 2007 from 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM in Sekiu, WA
- Triangle will distribute a homework assignment via email to Steering Committee members regarding the review of the proposed draft peer review criteria, input about existing projects in the Ozette basin, revisions and updates to the cost information, and specific Clallam County assignments for Ed Bowen and John Miller. The response deadline is Thursday, June 14.
- Doug Martin will send to Rosemary Furfey the magazine article he referenced in discussion that outlines the formal procedure NOAA uses for conducting peer review for possible distribution to the Steering Committee.

Introductions, Agenda Review, Announcements and Purpose

Bob Wheeler announced that Doug Martin, Harry Bell and Derek Poon had missed the ferry and that all three would arrive at the meeting as soon as they could. He explained that the meeting was really a listening day for NOAA Fisheries. He used a quote from the comments received from Derek Poon, as follows: *"This diverse range of opinions puts a premium on the upcoming reviews by the TRT, independent scientists, agencies, and the public for the final Ozette Recovery Plan. It behooves all of us to listen carefully and look for win/win solutions that comports with socio-economic and cultural needs, and ESA regulation."*

Bob noted that the primary focus of the meeting is to allow time for Steering Committee stakeholders to present summary statements and to discuss and bring forth issues. He reminded everyone that NOAA Fisheries receives the comments and differing perspectives and ultimately has the responsibility to prepare the draft Recovery Plan, initiate Federal Register notice and conduct a public process. In listening to Steering Committee members, NOAA Fisheries gains the opportunity to hear various perspectives and to discern where commonalities or consensus might exist.

Following the introductions around the room, the following announcements were made:

- Rosemary Furfey reported that the Hood Canal Summer Chum Plan is final and can be viewed on the NOAA web page. Along with the final Puget Sound Chinook Plan, the Summer Chum Plan is another resource for Steering Committee members to review and compare with the Lake Ozette effort.
- Bob Wheeler announced that the new lead entity for WRIA 20 is the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity. He reported that the Planning Group for the Coast Lead Entities project (WRIs 20, 21, 22/23, 24) has one remaining meeting in June. The Planning Group is finalizing its report and moving toward the formation of a regional entity. It is anticipated that a bridge grant will be sought to help craft the details.

- Rosemary reported that she will request an opportunity to make a presentation to the new North Pacific Coast Lead Entity in order to report on the progress of the Lake Ozette effort.

Bob outlined the agenda items and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Rosemary alerted Steering Committee members to the extra hard-copy documents available and noted that the draft document about Peer Review Criteria was also available.

Review and Acceptance of April 24, 2007 Meeting Notes and Action Items from Meeting

Tim Tynan of NOAA Fisheries provided Triangle with copy of the April 24 meeting notes with minor edits. No other corrections were noted. The revised April 24 meeting notes will be distributed with the materials for the next meeting and reviewed for approval at that time.

Review Proposed Peer Review Criteria

Rosemary outlined the information contained in the draft "*Proposed Criteria to Select Peer Reviewers for the Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan (May 29, 2007)*." NOAA Fisheries is working with the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (PSTRT) of the Northwest Fisheries Science Center to coordinate the scientific peer review of the draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan. NOAA Fisheries is also working with the Lake Ozette Steering Committee to identify potential peer reviewers.

At its last meeting, the PSTRT offered to convene and manage the peer review process and to develop the peer review report for submittal to NOAA Fisheries. Rosemary reminded the Steering Committee that it had earlier agreed to proceed in this manner.

Rosemary is working with Mary Ruckelshaus of the PSTRT to further develop and refine the criteria. She noted that the peer review team will carry out its review during the public comment period for the draft recovery plan. A suggestion was made to initiate the peer review process before the draft plan goes to the public in order for the public to review any revisions that were made.

Rosemary explained that the PSTRT is already reviewing the current draft recovery plan and that NOAA scientists are developing the best available science for the Lake Ozette recovery plan. All comments, including those from the Steering Committee and the initial scientific review comments from the PSTRT, will be part of the revised draft recovery plan that is issued for public review. To the question about a second public distribution of the draft recovery plan, Rosemary clarified that there is only one public distribution of the draft recovery plan. Formal responses to comments about the draft recovery plan are prepared as part of the public review process, and public workshops will be held.

Rosemary explained that the workshops provide an opportunity to present the draft recovery plan to the public and an opportunity for the public to present both written and oral comments. Rosemary noted that there will also be a question-and-answer session that will be recorded. She emphasized the importance of submitting comments. Pat Ness noted that the Olympic National Park (ONP) recently used a similar format for the public workshops to present its management plan.

Returning to the draft peer review criteria document, Rosemary outlined each of the listed items for Committee review and discussion. There is a section that describes the peer review process (i.e., what the peer reviewers are asked to do) and a section about proposed criteria for peer reviewer selection. Rosemary consulted with Mary Ruckelshaus in the development of the selection criteria.

Rosemary noted that a revised draft criteria document will be sent, with instructions, to the Steering Committee so that they can submit proposed names for the peer review team. She reported that she is trying to get funds to provide panelists with a small honorarium but doesn't have those funds now. Bob noted that Steering Committee members should send initial review comments to Rosemary no later than June 14.

Rosemary will then work with Mary Ruckelshaus to finalize the draft for re-submittal to the Steering Committee in order to solicit recommendations for the peer review team.

During discussion several questions arose from Committee members. Rosemary confirmed that the panel selection will not be confidential. If the peer review were to result in substantial changes to the draft recovery plan, such that the draft plan was substantially changed from that which was officially published in the Federal Register Notice, the public process would be reinitiated, i.e., legally NOAA Fisheries would have to go back out to the public and publish another Notice. She noted that Mary Ruckelshaus will be the point person for contacting the individuals recommended for the peer review team.

Rosemary confirmed that a Steering Committee member could be a peer reviewer assuming that they met the selection criteria. That determination would be made by the PSTRT. She confirmed also that the peer review is a technical review process. A question was raised regarding internal NOAA review for legalities. Rosemary explained that the internal NOAA review process is done through both its Seattle office and at NOAA Headquarters, and that NOAA legal counsel reviews the draft Recovery Plan.

It was noted during discussion that the peer review process is designed to be separate and anonymous. If the peer review team is identified, there may be a possibility of losing a potentially good reviewer. The process is important, and the selection is unbiased. Rosemary noted that she will discuss the concerns raised with Mary Ruckelshaus. Doug Martin referenced an article in *Fisheries* magazine that outlined the formal procedure NOAA uses for conducting peer review. He will send the article to Rosemary for distribution to the Steering Committee. It was also suggested that the peer reviewers could be identified without having to identify who made the specific comments.

Mike Haggerty noted there had been questions about reconciling the different versions of the Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA). Rosemary explained that last June the PSTRT formally reviewed the LFA. It was that review that gave the "green light" to proceed in development of the draft recovery plan.

A question was then raised about why a peer review process was being conducted for the Lake Ozette recovery plan if a peer review is not a normal process for recovery planning. Rosemary confirmed that a peer review process has not been conducted for all recovery plans. It was done in the Lake Ozette effort because technical questions were raised regarding the LFA, and other good questions were raised about the whole process.

A question was raised about whether the extraordinary speed with which the Lake Ozette effort was proceeding was a reason to have a more rigorous review. Rosemary explained that it is more related to the scale of the Lake Ozette effort (i.e., a smaller geographic area versus a large one) and the advantage of years of prior work.

A question was raised as to whether a proposed peer review team candidate would have to meet all six of the currently proposed criteria. Rosemary noted that although a candidate does not have to meet all 6 of the criteria, meeting more of the criteria is better than meeting less.

Steering Committee Comments – Summaries, Discussion, Consensus Items

Bob noted that the materials for the meeting had been previously distributed via three emails to Steering Committee members. He outlined the process for the summary and discussion session. He noted that summary statements would be taken from Steering Committee members and recorded (flip charts, electronic record).

Following summary statements, Bob explained that the Committee would have the opportunity to discuss the various review comments and issues related to the draft recovery plan chapters. Rosemary noted that NOAA Fisheries wanted to hear if there are points of consensus and agreement in addition to those items where there are noted differences.

The compilation of summary statements provided by Steering Committee members is contained in Attachment II. Below are summary discussion items raised or announcements made as Committee members gave their summary presentations:

- **Disagreement about Seeking Consensus:** Because Committee members have received and are familiar with the various, prior review comments, disagreement by a Committee member was expressed about the need for consensus. Although the Committee could get to agreement relatively easily, it was felt that there was a need to confront the difficult issues (e.g., timber lands, adequacy of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and Forests and Fish Rules (FFR), etc.). It was felt that the Committee should deal with the difficult issues *because* there are disagreements about them.
- **Plan Format and Continuity:** There is a lack of continuity regarding components of the draft recovery plan. Because sections were written by more than one person, there are different rhetorical styles, items that don't match in sections, and similar problems. It was recommended that one person go through the tie it all together and provide the needed document clean-up.
- **Prioritization:** Mike Haggerty noted that prioritization is a clear, next step in starting to see how important one thing is to another within the draft recovery plan. He noted that the plan development process is at the cusp of taking the next step into prioritization. Rosemary reminded the Committee that they haven't yet seen the Chapter 9 information about implementation, costs and schedule. She reiterated that this stage of draft plan development represents the "30,000 foot view," and it will be Year 2008 before NOAA Fisheries arrives at the detailed level for implementation, costs, schedule and monitoring.
- **Common Themes and Prioritization of Strategies and Actions:** Bob noted that there were common themes that need to be explicitly called out in the draft recovery plan, and that there appeared to be a strong consensus from the Steering Committee to prioritize Strategies and Actions.
- **Historical Aspects:** Mike Haggerty has contacted (and attempted to contact) others who worked on Ozette many years ago.
- **Future Meeting:** Rosemary noted that NOAA Fisheries and the Washington Forest Protection Association hope to schedule a meeting in the future. The meeting would be in one of the watersheds in order to observe on-site projects, especially in regard to HCP requirements.

Consensus Items

Issues from the Steering Committee member summary presentations and attendant discussions were captured on flip charts. Bob led the Steering Committee members through consensus votes on each item, and summary notes were captured from the discussions. The key categories discussed were:

- Large woody debris (LWD) in selected tributaries
- Sediment from roads
- Prioritization of recovery plan Strategies/Actions:
- Harvest
- Monitoring, data acquisition and evaluation
- Incorporation of the FFR and HCP into the recovery plan more thoroughly
- Lake level concerns and issues
- LWD in Ozette River
- Lake level concerns and issues

Detailed discussion highlights and the consensus votes for each of the key items listed above is contained within Attachment III. Additional discussions, if needed, were deferred in order to allow the Cost presentation to proceed first.

Costs

Mark Plummer noted that his presentation would provide an overview followed by details and a question-answer session. He encouraged Steering Committee members to interrupt him for questions during the presentation. Copies of Mark Plummer's information were distributed. Mark encouraged everyone to also email him with specific cost questions as soon as possible.

Mark noted that it is a specific ESA requirement to provide the time and costs necessary to carry out the recovery plan measures. He noted that the focus is on particular measures, i.e., specific actions that give some idea of how the plan will be implemented over time and an identification of the associated costs.

He noted that it is not the intent to do a benefit/cost or effectiveness analysis. Instead, there is a table with specific actions to which estimates (to the best extent possible) are attached. Ideally, there would have been a group of recovery practitioners with good, local knowledge of what these actions cost. Where that information exists, it makes his job easy. For the cases where it doesn't exist, he attempts to estimate numbers based on similar work costs from other areas. It is his process to admit that the numbers given may not be very good and to note that the numbers are available for review and change.

He noted that he provides the best information possible in an attempt to get the reviewers to provide comments and recommendations. The value in such an exercise is that it forces the writers of the recovery plan to think about the on-the-ground actions. He noted that early recovery plans contained actions that were visions or goals. The early plans didn't say what they were going to do where, and why. Actual cost estimates therefore forces the recovery plan process to make that leap (e.g., you need 3 LWD projects in Stream X, etc.). He noted as the plan identifies actual projects, then he can provide information on typical costs.

A question arose as to whether Mark was implying that the Steering Committee members do the cost benefit analysis themselves. As part of the discussion, it was noted that, in theory, costs can be used to prioritize actions. An example of using the life cycle model to inform the setting of priorities was noted. Such an example is very data intensive (bringing in different projects at different states and comparing biological currency, economic costs). It was noted that doing so could be misleading if one has minimal biological data but a lot of other data.

Mark provided an overview of the table, noting how the numbers were generated and identifying what he is doing next. The table translates Section 7 of the recovery plan into a bulleted list of specific actions. He noted that the narrative will be revised in the future and updated to language typical of recovery plans.

Mark emphasized that he hasn't broadened his search for information to include beyond Section 7 of the draft recovery plan. He asked that Steering Committee members let him know if there is additional information to be incorporated into the table.

In reference to the last column of the table, he noted that he has provided narrative where he has information. He noted that if there is a time schedule, the information comes from the recovery plan. He mentioned that the categories of costs on the front page need to be specific enough in describing an action, with information on costs (locally or regionally are OK for scale).

In further explanation of cost categories, Mark explained that there is no cost estimate that corresponds to baseline action per NOAA Fisheries policy (i.e., the policy is to account for costs of actions called for in the recovery plan incremental to current actions and under current plans). The "unknown" category is a type of action with no cost data available or no scale specified. A per-unit cost, however, could possibly be provided.

Mark explained that his goal is to continue to gather information and noted that the tables frequently have "TBD" (to be determined) noted. For voluntary actions, no costs are provided since it is impossible to forecast such discretionary items. In some cases, however, a cost range may be possible to provide.

In reference to the estimated cost methodology, Mark noted that he started with a database of 6-9 months for Oregon, Washington and Idaho. With the cost and scale data, if it can be tied into the database, he can show how others determined and experienced costs. These data can be considered a starting point, and he emphasized that local feedback is very important. Mark noted that he rounds off the amounts.

Mark noted that the problems involve unknown costs. He explained that the two levels of Section 7 of the recovery plan (i.e., broad scale, site-specific) are problematic in that there is a danger of double-counting costs when presenting costs at both of those levels. There are also duplicate projects across or within the categories. He noted that he is working with the plan writers to resolve the issue.

In closing, Mark requested that Steering Committee members provide feedback and data wherever possible. If there is disagreement with numbers he has provided, he requested that the reviewer provide alternate information (e.g., actual experience, other data, etc.).

Discussion following the presentation included the following items:

- John Miller offered to provide information on what resources (e.g., staffing, resources, etc.) are needed to implement the Clallam County actions recommended in the draft recovery plan. Ed Bowen offered to contact the Clallam County Public Works Department to obtain cost information associated with the actions for road construction and repairs (specifically for the western area of the County). Regarding Section 7.3.1 of the draft recovery plan, some errors exist in the Makah information. A question arose as to why not include as a baseline action something that is already taking place.
- It was explained that items crossed out in Mark's document are those that are recognized duplications or items not a part of NOAA Fisheries authority.
- Mark clarified that in reality, it is a bit of a shell game. Any of the baseline actions (no matter what the related statute, regulations, program) are not working at 100% effectiveness. Existing programs separate from recovery (even if the program isn't working well) that can be identified as important to recovery can therefore be included as a recovery cost.
- Regarding tributary spawning, it was recommended that the Makah proposal with its beach spawning component be added in.
- It was clarified that the question of "who does what" will be specified in the Implementation Plan. Priority actions and details will be specified. At that point, grants can be prepared and funds received to carry out the plan items. It was noted that the National Park Service has a national pool of funds to tap into for those entities with an adopted recovery plan. An adopted recovery plan provides high priority for funding requests. The Implementation Plan provides the road map for what needs to be done.

An initial deadline of June 14 was determined for Steering Committee members to provide information to Mark Plummer related to projects and costs.

Approach for Implementation Schedule Section of Chapter 9

Rosemary outlined the approach for Chapter 9, which includes the implementation schedule and costs. She reminded the Steering Committee that there will be a detailed plan in 2008 after there is agreement on the plan actions. The next steps include the mechanism to implement in the future, including options for funding.

As the recovery plan moves from its draft phase to its final iteration, actions are being refined. Rosemary will work with the internal NOAA Fisheries project team to review and generate priority actions. She noted that Chapter 9 with the costs and discussion of the future detailed implementation plan provides information about priority recovery actions.

Questions were raised regarding the structure needed to be the vehicle for fostering and implementing the plan. Included are questions about the research monitoring and adaptive management component: how would that be accomplished, coordinated and tracked? How would the data be managed? Concern was expressed that

oversight responsibility for implementation should be assigned (versus simply assigning responsibility to the various project implementers).

Given the discussion about implementation, it was noted that there seemed to be interest in having an Implementation Committee formed. It was noted that there is precedence for doing so and it is certainly within the Steering Committee purview to do so.

It was generally agreed that it would be useful if implementers could provide a list of projects that are currently underway. Reference was made to the draft plan conservation chapter.

A question was raised as to how NOAA Fisheries would go forward in fitting all the information together, i.e., Steering Committee input from the discussions at its May 31 meeting, written comments received to date, etc. It was explained that the internal NOAA Fisheries project team is in attendance at the day's meeting listening and capturing information from the Steering Committee. The internal team also reviews every comment and the draft recovery plan is revised or updated accordingly. The April 12 draft recovery plan is currently scheduled for review by the PSTRT in July. The draft plan will be revised, as needed, and then become the draft that goes out for public comment.

Rosemary noted that the Steering Committee has provided good direction through its discussions. Triangle will distribute an email to the Steering Committee that includes the "homework" assignments discussed at the meeting for input by the June 14 deadline.

The question was raised as to whether or not the Steering Committee would have a chance to review and comment again on the draft recovery plan currently under revision before it goes out for public comment. As the timeline is currently scheduled, the Steering Committee won't see the draft again before it goes out as a public draft:

1. In June, NOAA is taking all comments and determining how to respond. There will be more specific information for Mark Plummer's cost tables, with a revised version due at the end of June. The draft recovery plan should go to the PSTRT in July for a review of the technical aspects of the plan.
2. In August there will be final revisions to the plan related to the PSTRT review. For the NOAA internal process, it first goes to the technical managers and general counsel; then it goes to NOAA Headquarters.
3. There will be a Federal Register Notice (i.e., notice of the availability of the draft recovery plan) anticipated in early October. This iteration represents the public draft for review and comment.
4. Public workshops and workshops with landowners will occur at the same time that the scientific peer review is occurring.
5. The draft plan will be revised based on public comment; and, there will be formal response to public comments.
6. Thereafter the plan will be finalized. It was noted that if significant changes come forth during the public review of the draft plan, a second public notice and review phase would be required.

The two major tasks to accomplish when the recovery plan is finalized are the Implementation Plan and the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Rosemary noted that there is still a lot of work ahead, and the recovery plan represents the beginning. She emphasized that one of the key steps in the timeline schedule is the hosting of public workshops.

Concern was raised during discussion that the Steering Committee won't have an opportunity to review the prioritization information before the draft goes to the PSTRT for review. It was suggested that the Steering Committee have an additional review step to provide review and comment on prioritization. A question was raised as to whether or not the timber companies have a list of what is being done in the Ozette watershed. Reference was made to the Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans (RMAP) information completed in

2005 and submitted for all private lands. Other questions were related to harvest plans currently in place and information about future plans that might be important to the draft recovery plan effort.

The discussion returned to the earlier discussion on the consensus items. Bob Wheeler noted that two positions regarding the Forest Practice Rules and the HCP have been very clearly laid out. From the discussions, nobody is moving toward agreements from the two perspectives. NOAA Fisheries now has the information from the various perspectives on the issue.

Because concern was raised that there hadn't been a thorough discussion, Bob asked that specific detail be provided to frame the discussion. It was noted that NOAA Fisheries' position is currently not known (i.e., where does NOAA stand on the issue and what is its responsibility with regard to recovering an endangered species). Bob asked if the referenced discussion items currently exist in the draft recovery plan or if there are additional items for inclusion. It was clarified that some of the discussion items exist in the draft plan (and some of these are challenged) and some of the items aren't in the draft plan. A request was made that a clear outline of the HCP obligations be provided and that there be discussion about the willingness to explore voluntary actions beyond those the forest industry is obligated to do.

It was acknowledged in discussion that the HCP is mandatory by law. The question coming forward concerns NOAA Fisheries' position if there is a difference between what is currently mandated and what is needed for recovery. It was noted, too, that fiscal impact needs to be clearly defined. It was suggested in discussion that adaptive management may provide the vehicle to resolve these issues.

Given the discussion and time, Bob sensed an overall desire from the Steering Committee to schedule another meeting. He noted that given the discussion, the tentative agenda items coming forward were:

- Implementation
- Costs
- Remaining Issues – HCP, etc.
- Landowner Mitigation Agreements
- Priorities for Strategies and Actions
- Public Involvement

The Steering Committee agreed and tentatively scheduled its next meeting for June 21 from 10 AM to 3 PM in Sekiu.

NOAA Fisheries responded that Steering Committee members can make recommendations that go beyond the HCP if the recommendations are intended to help recover the salmon stocks. A concern was raised about recovery plan recommendations that might be inconsistent with the HCP. It was suggested that the complete tool box of actions, including voluntary actions, be more clearly identified.

It was suggested that the recovery plan include a more thorough discussion of the HCP and how it interfaces with recovery. With that information, it was suggested that perhaps some of the existing concerns might disappear. A suggestion was made to include in the recovery plan a discussion of all the laws overlying the effort, i.e., CWA, HCP permit, Forest and Fish, etc., perhaps as an Appendix that provides a summary of what each regulatory item does and what is currently going on now.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

ATTACHMENT I: List of Meeting Participants May 31, 2007

* Name	Organization	Phone No.	Email Address
* Derek Poon	EPA	206-553-4497	poon.derek@epa.gov
* Don Hamerquist	Citizen	360-963-2413	janeen@olypen.com
* Doug Martin	Martin Environmental	206-528-1696	doug@martinenv.com
* Ed Bowen	Ozette Citizen	360-452-8008	rockypt@olypen.com
* Harry Bell	Green Crow	360-452-3325	harry@greencrow.com
* Janeen Porter	Citizen	360-963-2413	janeen@olypen.com
* Jim Springer	WA Department of Natural Resources	360-374-2818	james.springer@wadnr.gov
* Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	360-963-2378	pysht@olypen.com
* John Miller	Clallam County	360-417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
* Katie Krueger	Quileute Indian Nation	360-374-2265	katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
* Mike Haggerty	Contractor	360-928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
* Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	360-452-2367	nschaaf@merrillring.com
* Norma Jean Sands	NOAA Fisheries	206-860-5607	norma.sands@noaa.gov
Pat Ness	Ozette Citizen	360.963.2581	chitobch@olypen.com
* Seth Barnes	WA Department of Natural Resources	360-902-1396	seth.barnes@wadnr.gov
* Randi Knox	Citizen	360-769-8623	randi@kennerud.com
* Rob Snyder	Lost Resort at Lake Ozette	360-963-2899	lostresort@hotmail.com
* Rosemary Furfey	NOAA Fisheries	503-231-2149	rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
* Seth Barnes	WA Department of Natural Resources	360-902-1396	seth.barnes@wadnr.gov
* Thom Hooper	NOAA Fisheries	360-753-9453	thomas.hooper@noaa.gov
Tim Tynan	NOAA Fisheries	360-53-9579	tim.tynan@noaa.gov
* Bob Wheeler	Facilitator Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	rwheeler@triangleassociates.com
* Vicki Shapley	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	vshapley@triangleassociates.com

Note: If entry has an asterisk () by the name, it means that the individual is included or has been added to the current Lake Ozette email distribution group.

ATTACHMENT II: STEERING COMMITTEE SUMMARY STATEMENTS

1. Ed Bowen, Ozette Citizen

- a. He noted that he is interested in an up or down vote on lake levels.
- b. LWD sources to the Ozette River: He wonders whether LWD should remain in the plan or not; wanted to add it as a new agenda item for a Steering Committee vote [Bob clarified that the discussion will come back to that idea].
- c. He stated that if LWD stays in the plan, he's a "dead duck" (i.e., he'll be washed down the stream)

1. Pat Ness, Ozette Citizen

- a. Pat referenced her email comment dated February 3, 2007 and noted that she did not believe it was distributed. NOAA Fisheries and Triangle will check the email record and re-send the email.
- b. Pat stated that she agrees with Doug Martin regarding the need for more specific studies. She expressed concerns regarding the optimum lake level and private property issues.
- c. She referenced the modifications planned and recommended for Umbrella Creek and Umbrella Beach. She noted that nobody has ever talked with her about it. She expected that it might be a "take" issue and therefore against the law. She emphasized the need to work together.
- d. She reported that she has pictures of the lake levels taken in May 2007. A photo taken on Monday, May 7 shows the lake level up to her door; and a photo from January 2006 shows the lake level up to her door.
- e. Every winter the lake covers the 400 feet between the beach and her cabin. She has 7 years of documentation that the lake level already comes up to her door naturally now. If the plan adds LWD, therefore, she will be flooded out.
- f. She would like a discussion about how LWD will be addressed. She emphasized that the discussion will happen, whether it is in a Committee meeting or in court.
- g. She emphasized that it is a serious issue that nobody is dealing with and it is now time address the issue.

2. Katie Kruger, Quileute Indian Nation/Environmental Attorney

- a. Katie referenced her earlier comments and said Committee members could review those for the specifics. She noted that now she was going to provide brief summary comments only.
- b. Regarding geography, Katie clarified that the usual and accustomed fishing areas are for both tribes, i.e., for the Makah Tribe and the Quileute Tribe. She asked that the draft plan reflect this information.
- c. She noted that the Quileute Tribe had earlier voiced concerns regarding the HCP and FFR. Although the tribe may not have liked certain aspects, at some point it was necessary to accept the result and move forward.
- d. Every document needs to make the distinction that tribes are governments and to clarify that tribes are governments and not just sovereign. Her written comments explain this point more fully.
- e. She noticed inconsistencies with regard to water quality and the impact to Lake Ozette sockeye, especially in regard to the phase of life history:
 - i. Every phase of their life cycle is affected by water quality
 - ii. Temperature, sedimentation, dissolved oxygen – these are issues at every stage and relate to water quality
 - iii. Suggestion: do a global search in the draft recovery plan document in order to address the issue throughout the plan
- f. References to RONI:
 - i. While useful, the Roni information shouldn't be relied upon
 - ii. She noted that Roni worked on the restoration processes of the river systems, but not on water quality. Water quality is integral to restoration.
 - iii. She suggested that the draft plan document be reviewed for changes in this regard, as well.

3. Jim Springer, WA State Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

- a. DNR is here to support the recovery effort and is happy to note that a lot of the thoughts are based on science.

- b. That strategies are focused on a priority basis would be one of the strengths of the recovery plan, and DNR wants to promote that aspect.
- c. He noted consensus in a couple of areas:
 - i. There is a need to increase the LWD in selected tributaries. He emphasized “selected tributaries only” and noted that Umbrella was not one of them
 - ii. There appeared to be a consensus to minimize sediment delivery from roads.
- d. One of the noted plan weaknesses is that there is a focus on past logging practices versus a focus on the new practices:
 - i. He noted that there is a big difference, going from the southwest to the north.
 - ii. The southwest was logged in late 1970's through the 1990's. It was logged with the forest practice rules that required some sort of buffer.
 - iii. The result was healthy kokanee.
- e. Another plan weakness is that current enforcement efforts are not recognized:
 - i. Last year, there were 3 significant storms with potential for damage
 - ii. They shut down one operation (e.g., a landowner cooperative)

4. Rob Snyder, Citizen

- a. Rob agrees with Mike Haggerty about the need to prioritize. There are some items that are minimal actions and costs. We need to get going on prioritization in order to move ahead.
- b. Rob agrees with having LWD in selected tributaries
- c. He asked about the coordination between the Lake Ozette recovery effort and the National Park Service Management Plan. He was disappointed that a representative from the National Park Service wasn't at the table for the day's meeting.
- d. On the issues of sockeye and timber harvest, he stated that “everybody has to bite the bullet.” Regarding salmon harvest, he asked about the percentage of harvest that is Ozette sockeye.
- e. He suggested that the 1952 Kramer report be thrown out. In 1955, LWD only went as far as ½ mile down river.
- f. Peer review candidates to consider include Chris Dugokinski (original biologist in 1982), John Blum, and Jim Eagleton. It would be interesting to have them come back and see what they have to say.
- g. LWD in Ozette River: he agrees with landowners, e.g., the Kramer report was produced 55 years ago and the system should have fixed itself.
 - i. The goal should be to do no harm.
 - ii. Sometimes it is better to do nothing.

5. Doug Martin, Martin Environmental

- a. The approach is habitat centric and that presumption is in diagrams, decision trees, and the Roni approach
 - i. There is some biology but it is 3 tiers down. It needs to be brought to an equal level.
 - ii. There are huge biological issues. Without that acknowledgement and without therefore addressing it, the recovery plan starts with a bias.
- b. Passage: if fish can't get there, then worry about obstruction issues first
 - i. Do they get to the lake to begin with? (e.g., problems with predation, etc.)
 - ii. Biological questions also need to be brought up; then proceed through the matrices
- c. Strategies
 - i. What is more important, less important? More bang for the buck?
 - ii. There is little information in the recovery plan as to which strategy should be approached first:
 - 1. First section (lake section) -- 16 strategies; don't know what to approach first
 - 2. Later, predation is a single key issue. There is nothing there that brings the reader back to the key issue of predation and no way to discern what was already evaluated
 - iii. Need to determine which components are more important than others; then put into a context. Once that is done, then the second question is how effective is recovery for that component (i.e., how effective is the recovery strategy)?
 - 1. There is nothing in document that gives that information
 - 2. What is the level of effect? How effective is the strategy?

- iv. Doug thought that the life cycle model (re: survival) was going to be used as a tool to make those decisions.

6. Derek Poon, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

- a. Derek emphasized the need for the baseline (biology versus degradation)
- b. With baseline information, one can assess the importance of the biological fixes.

7. Don Hamerquist, Citizen

- a. People are familiar with everyone's prior comments, and he disagrees with the consensus idea:
 - i. He noted that the emphasis should not be on consensus and finding out what we agree on.
 - ii. He noted that the Steering Committee does not deal with issues where there is disagreement, and that is a problem with the draft recovery plan document.
- b. If the Steering Committee is looking at restoring processes, our approach should be that these processes are continually being degraded, and the issue becomes how to reverse that.
- c. Can get agreement relatively easily; but we need to confront things that are difficult to deal with:
 - i. Timber lands: his position is that it is not adequate to say that everything that has to be done is already being accomplished by the FFR, etc. That is not adequate. He gave the DNR Olympic Experimental Forest experiment as an example (e.g., balancing sustainable timber harvest with protection of other resources)
- d. We need to deal with issues *because* we disagree.

8. Harry Bell, Green Crow

- a. The Recovery Plan does not discuss what the HCP includes (e.g., the science that went into it, the decisions made, etc.). There is a record of the science and decisions made somewhere.
 - i. What does the HCP do to help recovery and what does its science do to contribute?
 - ii. The Recovery Plan needs the science and what the HCP does to help the Limiting Factors.
- b. Until that is done, Green Crow is not likely to support the Recovery Plan.

9. Janeen Porter, Citizen

- a. It is incumbent upon the timber companies to demonstrate what the FRR has done toward recovery.
 - i. There is no data and/or the companies won't allow data to be obtained; or,
 - ii. It is considered private information.
 - iii. On that note, she questioned whether the recovery plan will make any sense.
- b. It is incumbent on the timber companies to demonstrate what the FFR has done toward recovery.
- c. It is her belief that the companies either don't have any data or won't allow data to be taken; or, if they do have information, it is private and unavailable.

10. Joseph Murray, Merrill & Ring

- a. The State of Washington and the federal Services have developed a lot of data to support the HCP.
- b. He stated that it is not the timber companies' responsibility to look that up for the Steering Committee. He emphasized that more of the HCP should be incorporated into the Lake Ozette recovery plan.
- c. He noted that he has been participating since the inception of the Lake Ozette project; has participated in the field trips; and has been told since the beginning that the recovery plan is a federal process and that NOAA Fisheries will make the final decision on the recovery plan.
- d. He noted that if there are conflicts in the recovery plan, information could be incorporated from the HCP. Since this information is relatively new, the process should be allowed to work itself through. It won't happen overnight.
- e. He emphasized that any specifics about inconsistencies have been noted via their written comments (all timber folks).

**ATTACHMENT III: CONSENSUS ITEMS AND SENSE OF THE GROUP
 WITH VOTES AND DISCUSSION**

<i>CONSENSUS ITEMS</i>	<i>OK</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NEUTRAL</i>
<p>1. LWD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LWD in selected tributaries ➤ Move to natural systems versus artificial placement/projects ➤ Ensure projects do what they are designed to do ➤ Concerns about liability issues <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstention vote was cast on the basis of “not enough information.” • Concern was expressed about the integrity of riparian buffers, with a suggestion to add windrows to provide natural addition of wood and to reduce sediment loading. • Concern was expressed about looking for consensus on any of the items. • Concern was expressed about liability issues, e.g., approach projects with caution to ensure that they do what they are designed to do. • Who incurs the liability if a LWD project fails or causes problems? • How does LWD placement fit in with wilderness designations? What is the scientific basis for LWD placement? • LWD recruitment has not been natural for several decades. • LWD creates ponding and refuge for the fish. If channel morphology is lost, LWD will quickly restore the morphology for fish habitat. • One main issue is the need to secure the LWD. • It was explained that any action would need to be approved by the ONP (ONP). Projects require cooperation with the governing entity and a public process to carry out the project (i.e., permitting, etc.). • In terms of the recovery plan, there will be adaptive management. There are both the immediate effects and longer-term effects (i.e., a few years out). With monitoring and adaptive management, there is the opportunity of changing actions if something is not working. The fluid and dynamic aspect of the recovery plan as a living and changing document was emphasized. • It was noted that all restoration activities will require a consultation with NMFS (i.e., Section 7 consultation process). • The National Park Service is currently supportive of LWD projects where such projects make sense. • There was a general statement by one Steering Committee member in favor of LWD projects with the caveat that LWD is not a cure-all. Until the Steering Committee prioritizes all the possibilities, this member will not agree or say OK to any of the items discussed. • A question was raised as to how items will be picked up if not initially identified in the Limiting Factors Analysis or recovery plan. It was explained that as a living document, the recovery plan will be updated as research, monitoring and adaptive management processes inform NMFS of what the changes should be. • It was noted that Middle Umbrella Creek suffers from substantial wood loss and channelization problems. With Umbrella Creek, the idea is to maintain the processes upstream so that sediment isn't deposited on spawning beds downstream. Reference was made to the modeling work done by Herrera 	15	2	1

CONSENSUS ITEMS	OK	NO	NEUTRAL
<p>Environmental Consultants in the late 1970s.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was expressed about the competing interests of fish versus people, as opposed to the cooperative idea of fish and people. There are people pursuing the idea of how the lake level can be lowered; and those people are competing with the interests in raising the lake level. The idea is what can we do together to recover fish instead of continuing to compete with each other about this. 			
<p>2. LWD IN OZETTE RIVER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Hydrologic assessment (low gradient system) ➢ LWD creates resistance (blow-outs) <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the Ozette River is a low gradient system (low enough where LWD is a resistance factor), and therefore placing anything within it is an objection. By placing LWD upstream, a “blow-out” scenario is created that nature never intended. The question then becomes where to place it (e.g., in the tidal prism, first 2-3 miles upstream, lower?). The lower placement might be OK (otherwise, one Steering Committee member expressed opposition to it overall). 	5	5	4
<p>3. LAKE LEVEL CONCERNS AND ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydrologically assess river What is the goal for controlling the lake level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What impact does that have on spawning? What impact does that have on predation? What are the human impacts? Benefits of lowering the lake level <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that all the hydraulic and hydrologic modeling was accomplished using the current lake level. There may be the need for something more dynamic (e.g., a more powerful model than what was used in the first two rounds of modeling). Questions in discussion were raised about using LWD (or other means) to prevent seal migration (which is a predation issue); and about how LWD reactivates floodplain connectivity. An example to explain reactivation of the floodplain connectivity was that of Umbrella Creek (recovery plan reference: 7.2.2.3.1) It was noted that what is missing is a clear statement and goal regarding the hydrology of the lake. What lake level provides what benefit to spawning (10% increase? 0% increase?). There is a need to put it into context, i.e., wood provides “X” for us, doesn’t provide “Y” – what is the corresponding lake level? It is futile unless the level wanted is known (what is optimal for fish and the adjacent landowner). 	No Vote		
<p>4. GROUP SENSE ON CONDUCTING A HYDROLOGIC ASSESSMENT OF THE LAKE OZETTE RIVER AND LAKE (BROADLY) – SEE ITEMS 2 and 3 ABOVE</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference was made to section 7.2.2.2 of the recovery plan regarding 	11	2	1

CONSENSUS ITEMS	OK	NO	NEUTRAL
<p>hydrological assessment. The model is used to look at different scenarios (model: Tim Abbey, Phillips and Associates, Herrera and Associates).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee members were advised to review the Herrera recommendations. For example, there is a correlation between lowering the lake and wood removal that results in a 60% reduction in spawning habitat. • It was noted that if the lake level is lowered, then there would be no gain in spawning area. With dry years where the lake level is down, the sockeye tend to populate further out (move further out into the lake). • John Miller noted his abstention on behalf of Clallam County because the lake level and LWD issues are linked. He noted that his department both protects property rights and enforces environmental regulations. He supports a hydrological assessment of the Ozette River. He is in agreement with the return to natural processes and with LWD introduction. • There were differing views on raising and lowering the base level of the lake. Hope was expressed that a hydrological assessment could look at both sides of the entire picture. 			
<p>5. SENSE OF THE GROUP THAT THE RECOVERY PLAN SHOULD HAVE A FOCUS ON ADDRESSING SEDIMENT, E.G., FROM ROADS</p>	10	5	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the FFR and HCP 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without consistency with the FFR and HCP 	9	5	0
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on addressing sediment e.g., from roads. There are other sources from sediment, as well, and these should not be ruled out (e.g., if shoreline erosion is a significant input, it needs to be included). • The focus should include addressing sediment in a way consistent with the Forest Practice Rules and the HCP. This should be added into the draft Plan. • The critical analysis study talked about other sources of sediment (natural sources). In some cases, the information conflicts with that of the Herrera study findings. It would be useful to estimate future contributions. • The issue is the context that sediment is put in (i.e., actually recovering the population). With existing sediment levels, what are the impacts to incubation, mortality and survival; and what is the importance of the life cycle phase? What is the existing survival rate and how much can that be changed (effectiveness of treatment)? These are the items that tell you what needs to get worked on or what needs to get fixed. • Without a context, how important is sediment and how can the fixes be defined or the relative importance be determined? • Since we do know a lot and have a fair idea about the sediment issues, there could be a sidebar discussion about what we think certain fixes could do; and what things could get done now to put it into context without having to measure. Later we could verify, measure, and evaluate. • It was noted that there are existing rules in the HCP that cover private forest lands. The DNR lands are covered in a separate document. Included are requirements for road maintenance, which are documented scientifically for salmon recovery. The focus is on sediment reduction from roads and other sources. What is being done is what is required (not more, not less). • The main point in this discussion is how important is sediment with regard to 			

CONSENSUS ITEMS	OK	NO	NEUTRAL
salmon recovery?			
<p>6. SENSE OF THE GROUP THAT A KEY TO THE RECOVERY PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION IS TO PRIORITIZE STRATEGIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection raised: objection to agreement on meaningless statements • Question: if you had \$100,000, what would you focus on that will best recover sockeye? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Look at RMAPs and prioritize habitats for repairs ➤ Public information <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is critical to prioritize strategies (e.g., Chapter 9, etc.). The key part refers to prioritizing strategies, finding common ground; assisting with funding efforts, etc. Given the sense of the group's discussion, it was noted that prioritization appears to be a key issue. • It was noted that the implementation part of the draft Plan will get to prioritization in more detail. Based on the Steering Committee discussion, it was suggested that more detail is needed in Chapter 9 now (i.e., what will best serve what we want to do, taking the money/funds issue out). To do this, input will be needed from the Steering Committee members. • Concern was expressed that recommendations could not be made which are beneficial to recovering sockeye and which go beyond current state and federal laws (including the forest practice rules and HCP). Without the ability to put such recommendations forward, the question arose as to the benefit of being at the meeting. If there isn't a chance to have a conversation about such recommendations, the opinion was expressed that it is hopeless. • The question was raised to the Steering Committee as to whether or not a recommendation could be made that would be beneficial to sockeye salmon that goes beyond existing federal and state rules and regulations and which is critical to recovery. In discussion, the following were noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very, very difficult to do. The recommendations can be made, but it is difficult to make the recommendations happen. • For priority actions, a suggestion was made to look at the RMAPs and assess the priorities for repairs (regarding sockeye recovery). • A suggestion was made to have a "parking lot" list of items, one list if the law changed and another list if law isn't changed. • NOAA Fisheries staff noted that there are opportunities to partner with the timber companies; opportunities to accelerate certain activities; opportunities to find funding in partnership with the state, federal government, Steering Committee and tribes. It is the desire of NOAA Fisheries to be able to have those sorts of collaborative conversations. It is through working in good faith with the various land managers that such opportunities can be found. • It was noted that because there is a recommendation in an HCP, that does not mean that it is the only thing that can be done. If other opportunities are found, these can be accelerated as other actions. • Concern was expressed that a commitment to meet the Clean Water Act should be given by those entities that have a big impact on the land. These entities should voluntarily consider something above and beyond just what the law says to demonstrate a commitment to sockeye recovery. • It was noted in discussion that public information is available regarding 	16	0	0

CONSENSUS ITEMS	OK	NO	NEUTRAL
<p>prioritized RMAP projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Besides the timber companies, there are others to look at who are big players with respect to water, i.e., Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, ONP, etc. For example, we can go ahead and look at whether or not nearshore is even an issue without having to wait for a general management plan from the Sanctuary. • It was noted that the Steering Committee didn't submit comments on the ONP management plan. A question was raised as to why the ONP isn't addressing some of these same issues within its own plan. • It was noted that within a prior Steering Committee meeting summary, it was noted that the Lake Ozette recovery plan cannot propose something stricter than the HCP. The issues include: imposed versus voluntary; recommendations in the recovery plan are not binding. It was stated that if the Lake Ozette recovery plan goes far afield of the HCP, the timber companies will object. It was noted that Merrill Ring has information related to the prioritization of RMAP projects. • It was suggested in discussion that Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research (CMER) may need outside direction and that there may be an opportunity here. It was noted that CMER does quite a few things. It processes slowly and is constrained by budget. Information is available on the internet. 			
<p>7. SENSE OF THE GROUP ON THE IMPORTANCE OF HARVEST ON LAKE OZETTE SOCKEYE RECOVERY (OK=Important; NO=Not Important; Neutral=Neutral)</p>	No Vote		
<p>8. SENSE OF THE GROUP ON THE NEED FOR FOCUS ON MONITORING AND DATA ACQUISITION AND EVALUATION (OK=Important; NO=Not Important; Neutral=Neutral)</p>	No Vote		
<p>9. SENSE OF THE GROUP ON THE IMPORTANCE OF INCORPORATING MORE ON FFR AND HCP INTO THE RECOVERY PLAN</p>	No Vote		