

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
June 23, 2010, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To review the Implementation Plan for NMFS’ completion; receive a briefing on next steps for the RM&E Plan; to discuss the long-term WCSSP role; consider future LOSC efforts, meetings, resource needs, and funding approaches; bring the Steering Committee up-to-date on activities since the April 7, 2010 meeting; and where pertinent make decisions/recommendations.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	“Meet-and-Greet” (optional, for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements	
10:20 a.m.	Review and acceptance of April 7, 2010 meeting summary	- April 7, 2010 draft meeting summary
10:25 a.m.	Developing a Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review changes to Implementation Schedule cover narrative and document table • Present what the Implementation Plan is and what it isn’t – Discuss Steering Committee expectations • Discuss prioritization process • Steering Committee reviews Actions for On-the-Ground, RM&E, and Public Outreach • Presentation on streamlined permitting process (Chris Byrnes, WDFW) 	-Revised Three-Year Implementation Schedule; Attachments 2a and b
12:30 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	The Future of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee, Short and Long Term Consultant Needs, and Funding Needs and Sources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee discussion on future Steering Committee efforts and schedule • Identification of resource support for Steering Committee – Facilitation and/or other • Develop a funding plan – amount needed, potential funding sources, actions needed by Steering Committee to secure funding • Identify next steps/timeline for enacting efforts identified – Include summary of commitments by Steering Committee members • WCSSP role in Lake Ozette sockeye salmon recovery and with the Steering Committee: discussion and recommendations 	- Documents to be determined
2:15	Introduction to Research, Monitoring, & Evaluation Planning (RM&E) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Steering Committee briefing • Next steps/timeline for completing the RM&E Plan 	

- 2:45 p.m. **Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation**
- Update on actions to implement Recovery Plan
 - Monitoring update: status of sockeye, sockeye return data and DIDSON monitoring update (Jeremy Gilman)
 - Report out on OCNMS request for comments on Acoustic Receiver Arrays
 - Identify topics for new presentations
- 3:00 p.m. **Next Steps and Future Meetings – Next Meeting?**
- Summary of meeting action items
 - Review of next meeting potential topics
 - Resource support recommendation
- 3:15 p.m. **Adjourn**

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
June 23, 2010, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Decisions List:

- The Committee approved the April 7, 2010 meeting summary (as amended at the meeting) by consensus.
- The implementation prioritization table will incorporate limiting factors in the prioritization ranking process as the first sort, followed by area and then hierarchy. Steering Committee members will provide updates on status of Actions that are ongoing for the Implementation Table
- The Committee chose to not submit a letter of advice to OCNMS regarding the Kitama array permit.
- Steering Committee members affirmed their support to continue meeting as the Lake Ozette Steering Committee to discuss sockeye salmon recovery issues. Committee members will work to seek out funding and other in-kind support for facilitation services.
- The Administrative Team will plan to hold a conference call in mid-August with a Steering Committee meeting to be tentatively planned in the third week of September 2010.

Meeting Purpose:

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- review the Implementation Plan for National Marine Fisheries Service completion;
- receive a briefing on next steps for the Research, Monitoring & Evaluation Plan;
- discuss the long-term Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership role; consider future Lake Ozette Steering Committee efforts, meetings, resource needs, and funding approaches;
- bring the Steering Committee up-to-date on activities since the April 7, 2010 meeting; and
- where pertinent, make decisions/recommendations.

Introductions, Agenda Review, Announcements, and Meeting Summary Review

The meeting Facilitator, Bob Wheeler from Triangle Associates, welcomed the Steering Committee. Steering Committee members went around the table making introductions (see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees) and reviewed the agenda. The Facilitator outlined the purpose and keys for the day and provided a recap of the Steering Committee's past three meetings, which have dealt with the development of an Implementation Schedule for the recovery plan and organizational approaches for the Steering Committee. The Facilitator underscored the import of discussing the future of the Steering Committee during the day's meeting.

The Steering Committee then reviewed the draft April 7, 2010 meeting summary to approve it. A representative from the Quileute Tribe requested that several changes be made in the meeting record to better reflect the Quileute position that the Tribe does not support the Kitama array application to the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. This opposition is due in part because the applicant will not agree to share data. She explained that the Quileute had already drafted a letter opposing the project and she offered to forward it to Steering Committee members. Following the discussion of changes, the summary was approved.

Developing a Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan

Steering Committee members then turned to reviewing changes to the Implementation Schedule cover narrative and action table. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) representative presented an update on the progress of changes to the Implementation Schedule introduction

section and explained that due to Steering Committee member input, the document had changed considerably since the April 7, 2010 Steering Committee meeting. The introduction had been altered to better highlight the strong link between it and the recovery plan, and the fact that the Implementation Schedule is not intended to serve as a project workplan – which will come after the three-year Implementation Schedule is finalized. Instead the Implementation Schedule is simply the list of recommended actions in the Recovery Plan that are prioritized based on the criteria selected.

Steering Committee members talked about the utility of the Implementation Schedule. While some actions show up in the table as higher or lower priorities, this ranking does not preclude entities from taking on specific actions and implementing them. Furthermore, because the Recovery Plan is not mandatory, the Implementation Schedule is a voluntary guide for sockeye salmon recovery. Additionally, the Implementation Schedule can be used as a tool to enhance a grant application for funding a specific implementation action or actions.

The Steering Committee then discussed details related to implementing the Recovery Plan. In response to one question about the steps required to move forward on an activity, Steering Committee members noted that whatever entity is implementing the action must abide by the necessary rules, regulations, and permits. In other words, many guidelines exist that could relate to communications or assessments that may need to be carried out to implement a recovery action. In addition, the funding sources often stipulate certain requirements (e.g., communications) in order for funding eligibility. It was noted that some recovery actions or research projects might not require public involvement for various reasons; one being that no environmental impact is identified.

The Committee then discussed several aspects related to recovery plan action tracking. Depending on the level of public review, several members suggested that it would be good to have a list – like the Implementation Schedule – that could track the various projects to better understand how recovery implementation is proceeding year-by-year. Members also discussed adding a status column to help the reader know if certain recovery actions (e.g., RMAP activities) are proceeding now. Because of concern related to the adequacy of implementing a certain action, it was suggested that a status update could simply note the action is occurring without specifying its efficacy (a determination that could depend on one's point of view).

One Steering Committee member indicated that she did not have concerns with the individual implementation actions listed on the Schedule, but she did have concerns about the process for how projects were reviewed, monitored, and implemented. She wondered if this would be the role of the Steering Committee or not. Another member indicated that process was also concern, but that in the WRIA 20 process, nothing is done secretly and that everyone is welcome to attend and engage in the process. The NMFS representative noted that the intent is to have the Steering Committee play a key role in tracking and monitoring of the recovery plan, and immediately the Steering Committee needs to work to identify its future workplan and to determine how it will continue forward.

A Steering Committee member then observed that he felt the current prioritization process that focused on geographic location and recovery plan action hierarchy was missing a key relationship in linking to the limiting factors of sockeye salmon recovery. He then hypothesized that many of the projects identified as important implementation actions by agencies and individuals likely had a stronger relationship to the limiting factors than to hierarchy or geography. The NMFS consultant agreed with this analysis and said that he felt that the prioritization process should be

addressing the key limiting factors. The Facilitator asked if the Implementation Schedule should incorporate limiting factors into the sorting process.

The group then reviewed the Implementation Schedule to examine the projects highlighted by agencies, governments, and individuals' as their top implementation actions (the actions highlighted in green on the draft Implementation Schedule), to see if the limiting factors seemed to line up with these priorities. Through this conversation, topics included the relationship of the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity, sedimentation issues surrounding Coal Creek and its effect on lake hydraulics, as well as concerns about lake levels and wood placement. Based on this discussion the implementation prioritization table will incorporate limiting factors in the prioritization ranking process as the first sort, followed by area and then hierarchy.

In addition to reviewing on-the-ground recovery actions and research, monitoring and evaluation actions, the Steering Committee addressed public outreach and education actions. High priorities seemed to be developing a clearinghouse that was open and transparent and that could foster information sharing. In addition to specific changes that were recorded by NMFS and its contractor (e.g., place a footnote on the methodology for sorting the implementation actions; individual changes to implementation actions), the Facilitator noted several actions that the Steering Committee agreed on:

- 1) combine certain PEA categories to improve clarity
- 2) sort to distinguish programmatic and on-the-ground actions
- 3) include a comment category to add more detail to track action progress
- 4) add updates to the status of implementation actions – but do not include value statements associated with these updates
- 5) include information on funding sources and sponsors
- 6) remove the dot exercise from the action table
- 7) recommend that the Steering Committee review and consider annually the implementation and RME and recommend changes for updates to those plans.
- 8) include references, such as a footnotes explaining the sorting of the tables

The NMFS representative explained that they would take this additional feedback to refine the Implementation Schedule.

The Future of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee, Short and Long Term Consultant Needs, and Funding Needs and Sources

Discussion surrounding the future of the Steering Committee began with a summary of the current status: the June 23 meeting is the last meeting where funding exists for facilitation support. Members asked the group if they were supportive of continuing to meet as the Lake Ozette Steering Committee. Representatives from Olympic National Park, Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership, NMFS, Clallam County, timber companies, and landowners all expressed their support, and the WDFW representative said that his agency could participate on a quarterly basis.

Funding options for Steering Committee activities were discussed. The NMFS representative reported that the Governors Salmon Recovery Office recently indicated that the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office could offer some funding support, but any request to the Office would best be made from the NMFS Regional Director. The Steering Committee voiced concern that this funding request could compete with a request to acquire enough money to raise the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity coordinator's salary to the same level as his peer lead entity coordinators across the state. It was noted that a Steering Committee funding a request would not come out of the same funding stream, so this conflict should not exist.

The Facilitator then outlined the tasks related to some of the facilitation tasks that are required for the Steering Committee: communications (emails and notices), meeting summary development, meeting facilitation, advertising, logistics to support the meeting (venue, etc), and meeting preparations and administration.

Additionally the Olympic National Park representative indicated that he has identified two relatively immediate sources of funding and in-kind support from the Park: (1) finding a Park volunteer who has facilitation experience; and (2) seeking a portion of the revenue from Park visitor fees to help support the Steering Committee. For the latter option, it was noted that how to allocate visitor fees is an annual decision made by the National Park and the representative indicated that he felt the Steering Committee's public outreach benefits could qualify it for this type of Park funding. The Quileute representative expressed some concern of the neutrality of a National Park volunteer in facilitating the Steering Committee.

Steering Committee members addressed the draft funding letter drafted for the Steering Committee to use in requesting support for its activities. Individuals also brainstormed about additional funding opportunities including a specific request to NOAA for end-of-year discretionary funds, to non-governmental organizations or private foundations, to timber companies (or their foundations), and to tribes. Based on the conversations about specific requests, several follow-up actions were outlined for the Steering Committee members. They are listed below:

- The Olympic National Park representative will draft a letter, but won't do anything without the Steering Committee's approval, to apply for Olympic National Park to ask for visitor fees revenue. He will also check on the application cycle (when a letter request is due) and report back to the Steering Committee on next steps.
- The Olympic National Park representative will speak with the Olympic National Park volunteer coordinator and will develop a draft job description for a facilitator and note taker. Once these tasks are complete he will send them on to the Steering Committee for consideration.
- The Olympic National Park representative will also check to see if the Olympic National Park interpretive ranger would be willing to take notes for the Steering Committee.
- The NMFS representative will revise the Steering Committee funding request letter and then will send it out to Administration Team to see who needs to adapt it to make sure their respective groups/governments can sign the letter requesting support for Steering Committee activities.
- The NMFS representative will investigate what content is necessary for the new NMFS regional administrator, Will Stelle, to support such a funding request from NMFS.
- The Quileute Tribe representative will conduct research necessary for applying for funding from the Packard Foundation.
- The Merrill & Ring representative will look into what funding opportunities (matching opportunities, etc.) are feasible to apply for with foundations operated by local timber companies.
- The WCSSP representative will conduct some additional research on funding opportunities with additional non-governmental organizations.

Introduction to Research, Monitoring, & Evaluation Planning (RM&E)

Because of time limitations, the NMFS representative provided a quick introduction to the initial RM&E draft that was provided to Steering Committee members. It was noted that the RM&E Plan is a key component in the effort to delist sockeye salmon. RM&E is essential to develop monitoring programs and data needs to establish information for the status of the species. Without

a RM&E Plan it will be hard to establish a case to delist sockeye if and when it recovers. The draft version currently is essentially an annotated outline of what the Plan will be and it will ultimately identify the actions to carry out to build a case for delisting. The statutory listing factors guided the basic outline that contains information on the objectives, monitoring priorities, monitoring types, monitoring questions and the approach, analysis, and status.

NMFS will be funding the development of the RM&E Plan, and it will be reviewed by the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT) as it is developed. While NMFS is drafting, there still is a need for stakeholder input and perhaps a technical workgroup to discuss ideas. Unfortunately NMFS does not have funding to help support the Steering Committee at this time.

Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation

The Steering Committee discussed whether or not to move forward on the Kitama array support letter. Based on concerns about data sharing and other concerns about negative impacts concerning the array, the Steering Committee declined to approve the draft letter of support.

Next Steps and Future Meetings

The Administrative Team will plan to hold a conference call in mid-August with a Steering Committee meeting to be tentatively planned in the third week of September 2010. Individual members will pursue meeting support activities and will report back to the entire Steering Committee as information becomes available.

Adjourn

The Facilitator thanked the Steering Committee for its input and adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	(360) 289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
Chris Byrnes	WDFW	(360) 417-1426	Chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	(503) 231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Mike Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
Don Hamerquist	Citizen	(360) 913-2413	
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe	(360) 374- 2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 460-3733	jmurray@merrillring.com
Pat Ness	FOLO & Landowner	(360) 928-0266	bobandpatness@gmail.com
Susan O'Brien	FOLO & Landowner	(360) 531-1795	Boneobrien1@gmail.com
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bwheeler@triangleassociates.com