

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
Monday, June 29, 2009
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the March 9, 2009 meeting, discuss the published Final Recovery Plan, discuss recovery plan implementation next steps, dialogue about steering committee structure, and receive updates on other relevant plans/programs.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements	
10:05 a.m.	Review and acceptance of March 9, 2009 meeting notes	- March 9, 2009 draft meeting summary
10:10 a.m.	Final Recovery Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) update• Steering Committee understandings of approved Recovery Plan and discussion	- FR notice, final Recovery Plan, and supporting documents.
10:30 a.m.	Steering Committee Funding – Nancy and Rosemary	
11:00 a.m.	Implementation Plan/ RM&E Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on Implementation and Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (RM&E) Plans<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Introduction○ Plan examples○ Next steps and discussion (tasks for next meeting)	- Implementation discussion responses (Summary attachments 2a & 2b) - Implementation and RM&E Plan examples
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
12:30 p.m.	Steering Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What does the Steering Committee want to do?• What structure would be best for the Steering Committee?• What decision making process does the Steering Committee want?• How do we communicate?• How do we obtain long term funding for the Steering Committee and implementation projects?• Is there any narrowing of Steering Committee options or decisions; are there any assignments?	
1:45 p.m.	Update on other planning efforts/programs that impact recovery plan implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sockeye monitoring report: Didson monitoring equipment and recent site visit• OCNMS Management Plan Review• Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) updates (and plans to possibly accelerate them)• Clallam County update on stimulus money	
2:45 p.m.	Next Steps and Future Meetings	
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

Facilitator's Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting

Monday, June 29, 2009
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Sekiu Community Hall
Sekiu, WA 98381

Meeting Purpose

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the March 9, 2009 meeting.
- Explore the next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan.
- Dialogue about steering committee structure, and receive updates on other relevant plans/programs.

Introductions, Agenda Review, and Announcements

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

Announcements and general dialogue

Requests made by Steering Committee members included:

- that all information recorded on flipcharts be saved with the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP).
- to discuss how the Steering Committee can become more involved in the development of agenda topics. Bob Wheeler asked to have that discussion in the 12:30 p.m. Steering Committee meeting discussion.

The Steering Committee talked about other planning meetings that had occurred since the March 9, 2009 Steering Committee meeting. It was noted that there was one interim co-lead planning call, as well as a coordination meeting to discuss project proposals to acquire National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) stimulus funding. This meeting was requested and volunteers sought at the last Steering Committee meeting with the understanding that there was a very short timeframe to recommend projects.

NOAA Stimulus Funding

A report out was made regarding the group that met on the NOAA stimulus funding coordination meeting. Attendees at the NOAA stimulus funding coordination meeting included Tom Swanson, Norm Schaaf, Harry Bell, Tim Tynan, Ed Bowen, Pat Ness, Pat Crain, Rich Osborne, Mike Haggerty. Phil Miller and Nancy Allison worked together to develop a list of projects from the Coast Region, including Lake Ozette, to present to the Governor's office for Governor Gregoire's endorsement. Ultimately through the discussions the group proposed three projects affecting Lake Ozette to the Governor for her endorsement. After the Governor's review, one barrier project was forwarded on to NOAA. NOAA will be making the announcement at the end of June 2009.

In response to a question about what criteria were used to recommend projects for the stimulus funding, it was noted NOAA and Washington state used two different sets of criteria in the stimulus process. Washington state decided that monitoring projects would not meet its criteria for the Governor's endorsement because they did not meet the criteria for jobs creation. The state felt projects had to be "shovel ready" and able to generate jobs. Several Steering Committee members disagreed with the state's assumptions that monitoring projects do not create jobs.

Other discussion topics related to stimulus funding:

- A landowner made a recommendation to require additional evaluation for future research projects that hold the potential to have environmental impacts on private properties.

As part of its NOAA stimulus funding request the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) proposed a nearshore assessment that includes a small component affecting the Ozette Basin. This project was the only other request for NOAA stimulus dollars affecting the Ozette Basin.

One Steering Committee member noted that there appeared to be a large land purchase occurring in the Ozette Basin as well as some other issues that haven't been discussed by the Steering Committee to date. Steering Committee members spoke about the importance of communication, particularly how to communicate and share information.

Other announcements:

Phil Miller noted that as Recovery Plan implementation begins the Steering Committee needs to define itself and its relationship to other government entities and organizations. Because the Recovery Plan is voluntary, there are some government entities that have certain provisions under the Endangered Species Act, but for other parties (e.g., the Steering Committee) the Recovery Plan is a voluntary process.

Harry Bell announced that in August 2009 the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) would reconsider whether it can fund Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) projects (currently SRFB cannot fund RMAP projects). He encouraged Steering Committee members to support changing the SRFB's position to allow funding for RMAPs.

Pat Crain mentioned that in a recent restoration prioritization effort of National Park Service lands in Washington state, Umbrella Creek and Big River rose to the top of the prioritization list. He offered to bring the results of this report at an upcoming meeting.

A request was made for email notifications of any meetings held in addition to Steering Committee meetings.

Meeting Summary Review

The draft March 9, 2009 Steering Committee meeting summary was presented for review. The Steering Committee clarified and discussed a section on page 3 of the summary related to Steering Committee next steps. It was noted that the text should be revised to refer to the co-lead group as "interim co-lead."

Regarding updates and news that had occurred since the March 9, 2009 meeting (but were not included in the meeting summary because the events transpired *after* the meeting) it was agreed that the June 29, 2009 meeting summary could reflect those updates.

A request was made to make a modification in Attachment 2a, page 6 regarding "Other interested citizens." A clarification will state, "other interested citizens are non-landowners from outside the watershed."

It was also noted that the list of participants who volunteered to meet to discuss NOAA stimulus funding should include John Miller and not Rich Osborne.

The Steering Committee discussed the protocol for privacy and how to notify local landowners about projects that could affect their properties in the Ozette Basin. Joe Hinton from the Makah Hatchery noted that he was interested in contacting the appropriate landowners when salmon-related projects could affect private properties. Pat Crain noted that he could help facilitate conversations and information between the Hatchery and local landowners. Pat Crain noted a gray area exists with respect to interactions between tribes and the Park on habitat issues (because NMFS is the agency that typically works with tribes on these issues). The hatchery is the grayest of those areas. There is a hope that it will be dealt with via the new memorandum of understanding that is currently under development between the Park and the tribes.

Following the conversation, no other changes or edits were suggested and the March 9, 2009 summary was approved.

Final Recovery Plan

Rosemary Furfey noted that the Recovery Plan was adopted on May 29, 2009 and now the challenge will be to implement it. Prior to the Recovery Plan adoption there were two organizational changes made to the Recovery Plan based on review by NOAA Headquarters:

- A fuller description of the recovery strategy was requested by NOAA's national office. Some sentences were added in the first two pages of Chapter 6.
- A closer crosswalk between the recovery strategy and the actions was also requested. In Appendix D an additional column was added that referenced the recovery strategy for actions.
- Cost estimates were moved from the Appendix into Cost Estimate Chapter 9

Rosemary Furfey stressed that in the final revision process no new content was added to the Final Recovery Plan, but some content within the Plan was relocated. For example, Appendix E of the Recovery Plan, which included the information on Recovery Plan costs, is now located in Chapter 9. Appendix E was then deleted from the final Recovery Plan.

Rosemary Furfey noted that all public comments were responded to during the Recovery Plan comment process. In response to a question about the November 2007 landowner meeting summary, it was clarified that this summary document was not considered part of the public comment, but that the comments from landowners meeting helped shape content within the Recovery Plan. Pat Ness thanked the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for holding the landowner meeting and for writing the meeting summary. Additionally she requested that reviewers for future research proposals would consider the comments and concerns contained in the landowner summary, which is located as an appendix in the final Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon Recovery Plan.

Steering Committee Funding

Triangle Associates staff Bob Wheeler and Blake Trask stepped out of the meeting for a Steering Committee-only discussion about funding efforts and facilitation support for future meetings.

Implementation Plan/RM&E Plan

Rosemary Furfey provided an introduction about next steps in Recovery Plan implementation and outlined the upcoming two tasks:

- Writing an Implementation Plan. The timeline of the plan could vary. Rosemary Furfey said that she wanted to coordinate and get input from Steering Committee members.
- Writing a Research Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E) Plan, also known as an Adaptive Management Plan.

Rosemary Furfey explained that, consistent with the recovery plan, implementation is non-regulatory and voluntary. An implementation plan does not preclude, direct, or mandate any action, but it does help to indicate the high priority of the actions in species recovery. She noted that the goal for the next six months would be the completion of these two plans. Rosemary Furfey then underscored that the Implementation Plan, or schedule, translates the recovery actions into a table along with dates associated with the recovery actions. Typically, implementation schedules cover actions over a three- to six-year timeframe.

In response to a question about NMFS funding for the Recovery Plan, Rosemary Furfey explained that direct funding for implementation and restoration does not currently exist, but that she would be able to advocate and compete for funding opportunities as they arise.

Phil Miller noted that an implementation plan can serve to “build a bridge” to various funding sources as it provides more supplemental information to each action and how an action promotes species recovery. He also noted that the guiding purpose or ground rule for developing the Implementation Plan is its consistency with the Recovery Plan. The process of turning the model of the Implementation Plan into something “real” could be the role of the Steering Committee.

Discussion on the Steering Committee’s role in developing the Implementation and RM&E Plans

Phil Miller noted that the June 29, 2009 Steering Committee meeting represented the potential for the beginning of a new relationship between the Steering Committee and NMFS. He noted that in the old relationship the Steering Committee served as an advisory body. Now NMFS has the responsibility to get these two new plans done, but there is much more flexibility for how the Steering Committee wants to be involved. The Steering Committee if it develops a structure could influence NMFS.

The Steering Committee discussed the ownership of the Implementation Plan and whether or not the Steering Committee or NMFS would take the lead. It was noted that implementation plans (often referred to as implementation schedules), do not undergo the same formal notice procedures as a recovery plan. Rosemary Furfey added that one of the first tasks would be to determine if the Steering Committee wants to develop the Implementation Plan or if that task will be left to NMFS. Rosemary Furfey said that NMFS needs to have the two plans completed, and hopefully it can be supported and owned by the community and other entities. John Miller said it’s important for the Steering Committee to seek ownership – the process of how to get there is up for debate, but ownership is critical.

Additional discussion topics on implementation and RM&E plans included:

- The Steering Committee discussed the merits of how to develop the Implementation Plan. One suggestion provided was to set up a template Implementation Plan and then modify it based on this initial information.
- It was noted that an Implementation Plan containing a schedule of prioritized actions could offer a good visual to help community members around the Ozette Basin envision what next steps for the Recovery Plan would be.
- One suggestion was made for the Steering Committee to focus its energies on the Adaptive Management Plan since the Implementation Plan is an extension of the work of the just-completed Recovery Plan.
- Bob Wheeler noted that while actions are included in the Recovery Plan, priorities have not been assigned and that action prioritization could be part of the role of the Steering Committee.

- The Steering Committee discussed the sequencing of actions and how recovery actions could be implemented.
- It was noted that new research, monitoring information, or other changes affecting sockeye salmon would be included in the Adaptive Management Plan.

Steering Committee Discussion on Its Future Role

Bob Wheeler presented the Steering Committee with a series of questions to consider as the group moved forward into implementation. The following information was recorded by Bob on flip charts at the meeting:

What does the Steering Committee want to do?

- To make decisions
 - Rank implementation actions in a high, medium, low format
- Design an implementation schedule/plan
- To own the Implementation and RM&E (Adaptive Management) Plans
- To be responsible for the Implementation s and RM&E Plans
- To create a new relationship with NMFS
- Monitor status of species, water quality, and other environmental factors
- Implementation actions
- Interact with public and work for community buy-in
- Report progress or lack of progress (a longer-term process for the Steering Committee)

A suggestion was made that the Steering Committee should focus on how to make decisions and to come to some agreement. One option discussed for ranking recovery action priorities over the next five years was to rank actions on a high, medium, and low scale.

What structure would be best for the Steering Committee?

- What are agreements on how we interact?
- Should work groups (technical, co-leads) be formed?
- Steering Committee is the interim Advisory Committee – open membership
- Membership
- Sub-groups may be necessary
 - With only four meetings currently planned it may be necessary to complete work with sub-groups in parallel to Steering Committee meetings.
 - Technical work group

In response to a suggestion that it would good to have a scientist to rely on for technical advice Norma Jean Sands from NMFS said that the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT) is able to support Lake Ozette sockeye recovery and to help out on technical needs as they arise. The RITT has this role for Puget Sound Chinook recovery and Hood Canal Summer Chum recovery, as well. In those other regions the RITT works to review implementation plans for consistency and helps to address recovery action sequencing, as well as working on other technical issues.

What decision making process does the Steering Committee want?

- Consensus
- Vote
- Who sits at the table to make decisions?

The Steering Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of using a consensus-based process for future Steering Committee decision-making.

Steering Committee members discussed who should make decisions for the Steering Committee and if the interim co-leads should be charged with taking the lead on decision making.

The Steering Committee discussed options for what to do with money allocated toward helping it work on the Recovery Plan.

Narrowing of options

- Consensus – defined group
- Governments make decisions with input from Steering Committee
- Majority rule – defined group
 - Write up of models (who will do that? Turn into a page of what will happen)

How do we communicate?

- Through a website - WCSSP
- Via public interactions
- Coordinate press coverage
- Facilitate landowner communications
- Develop Steering Committee and subgroup work

Updates

Lauren Bennett, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

Lauren Bennett of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary gave an update on the Sanctuary's Management Plan review process. She emphasized the need for future coordination and outlined the timeline for Management Plan Review.

Ed Bowen asked Lauren Bennett to stay apprised of Lake Ozette sockeye implementation activities and to include them into the Management Plan Review.

John Viada, Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

John Viada provided an update on RMAP implementation from the perspective of DNR:

- Current economic problems are reducing the ability of timber companies to fund RMAPs
- Hydraulic Project Approval fish windows, which limit the number of months that RMAP actions can occur, restricts how much work can be completed each year.
- The RMAP deadline for completing projects is 2015.
- In response to a question about whether the area where DNR defined blockage was analyzed via electrofishing or by default characteristics, John Viada responded that he thought it was default characteristics.
- Blake Trask offered to send the Steering Committee website links to the state lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and forest practices HCP. He will also follow up with John Viada to find out how to access RMAP information. He will report out to the Steering Committee about the RMAP information.
- The Steering Committee discussed acquiring additional funding through the SRFB.

In closing John Viada listed three items as key limiting factors in accelerating RMAPs: (1) the limited yearly HPA window; (2) the lack of money to complete RMAP projects due to the recession; and (3) the limited number of skilled workers able to complete the work.

Cynthia Rossi, Makah Tribe

Cynthia Rossi gave a presentation on the DIDSON (**D**ual-frequency **I**dentification **S**ONar) Monitoring System and compared it to the VCR system that is currently used at the outlet of

Ozette River. She explained the DIDSON system represents a new class of identification sonar, which gives near video quality images of what passes through the Ozette River.

Some key advantages and disadvantages for both systems include:

Advantages to DIDSON system:

- Un-interrupted migration path
- Possibly less predation

Disadvantages to DIDSON system:

- Technicians need a lot more training to identify sockeye from pike minnow
- More expensive

Advantages to the VCR system:

- Easy ID for technicians
- Cheaper cost

Disadvantages to the VCR system:

- Increases susceptibility to predation (due to the weir required)
- One thing that is lost with the DIDSON system is that fin clips cannot be read – the VCR system can. Despite this, it was noted that the VCR data is statistically invalid for the fin clip observations because the methods do not meet NOAA guidelines.

John Miller, Clallam County

John Miller reported that one of the recent agenda items for the Clallam County Commissioners' was public works projects. The County will soon issue bids to replace culverts. Additionally, the County would be interested in providing engineering services to augment potential funding for salmon recovery projects. Clallam County is hoping that there is a second stimulus funding opportunity. John Miller concluded that the County would need landowner help if a culvert project did proceed.

Steering Committee Discussion Regarding Implementation and Next Steps

Steering Committee members agreed to have the interim co-lead group continue the Steering Committee's efforts and asked for an additional meeting in August 2009. Organizations that offered to serve as interim co-leads included:

- Clallam County
- Quileute Tribe
- Makah Tribe
- Olympic National Park
- NMFS
- WCSSP

Pat Crain agreed to host a conference call for the six interim co-leads to schedule logistics.

Bob Wheeler outlined the potential agenda items for the next meeting, which included:

- Implementation plan and priorities
- Steering committee organization
 - Defining decision making structure
 - Organization
 - What role will the Steering Committee play in sockeye salmon recovery
- Follow up on presentations if any?
- New presentations of research? New topics?
- Monitoring update: what is the status of sockeye, who is doing what monitoring?

Adjourn

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

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Coleman Byrnes	Citizen	(360) 428-1032	swampdog@olypen.com
Cynthia Rossi	Makah Tribe	(360) 645-3175	crossi@centurytel.net
David Low	WDFW	(360) 249-1216	lowdl@dfw.wa.gov
Don Hamerquist	WRIA 19		janeen@olypen.com
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		rockypt@olypen.com
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe		jeremygilman@centurytel.net
Jim Palmquist	Ozette landowner		
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
John Viada	WA DNR	(360) 374-2800	John.Viada@dnr.wa.gov
Joseph Hinton	Makah Tribe	(36) 963-2784	mtchoko@olypen.com
Joseph F. Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 460-3733	pysht@olypen.com
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe –Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
Lauren Bennett	OCNMS	(360) 457-6622 x32	Lauren.Bennett@noaa.gov
Michael L. Blanton	WDFW	(360) 417-3301	BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov
Mike Haggerty		(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
Nancy Allison	WCSSP	(360) 289-2499	nancya@wcssp.org
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Pat Ness	Landowner	(360) 928-0266	bobandpatness@gmail.com
Phil Miller	Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office	(360) 902-2219	Phil.miller@esa.wa.gov
Randi Knox	Ozette Landowner	(360) 769-8623	randi@kennerud.com
Rich Osborne	Salmon Recovery Funding Board/ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	(360) 417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
Roy Morris	Stream Keeper	(360) 963-2442	able@olypen.com
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bwheeler@triangleassociates.com
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com