

Draft Agenda

Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday August 15th, 2006

Sekiu Community Hall

10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- 10:00 a.m. Introductions and Review Agenda
Updates and Announcements
- 10:10 a.m. Update on Status of Puget Sound TRT's draft Lake Ozette Sockeye
Viability Criteria and Development of a Life Cycle Model
-Discussion of next steps
- 10:40 a.m. Review Comments on Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Broad Sense
Recovery Goals
(Rosemary Furfey, NOAA)
-Discussion of proposed edits
- 11:10 a.m. Review Comments on Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Goals
(Mike Haggerty, contractor)
-Discussion
- 11:40 a.m. Update on Status of Hypotheses for Limiting Factors
(Rosemary Furfey and Mike Haggerty, contractor)
-Discussion of comments
- 12 noon Lunch Break
- 12:15 p.m. Continue Discussion on Status of Hypotheses for Limiting Factors
as needed (Rosemary Furfey and Mike Haggerty, contractor)
-Discussion of comments continued
- 12:30 p.m. Review Proposal for Developing Recovery Actions
(Rosemary Furfey, NOAA Fisheries)
- 1:30 p.m. Identify recovery planning tasks for next meetings
Review follow-up actions

Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
Sekiu Community Hall
August 15, 2006
10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Participants for the Meeting

See attached list of meeting participants.

Summary of Recovery Planning Tasks/Actions

- Notify Steering Committee members of TRT meetings related to Lake Ozette sockeye
- Provide more formal presentation of Life Cycle Model at September Steering Committee meeting (Mike Haggerty)
- Provide new language for Broad Sense Recovery Goals and Objectives related to “ecosystem” and “aquatic ecosystem” and Objective #6
- NOAA will continue fine-tuning the recovery goals
- For limiting factors, criteria and definition clarifications are needed and should include consideration of both the magnitude and persistence of the limiting factor. It was also agreed that Mike Haggerty would continue his work and fill in the rationales.
- Steering Committee members should begin listing potential recommended actions
- Pat Crain will report out on how the Park Plan affects the Sockeye Recovery Plan
- Pat Crain will see if the Steering Committee can communicate with the Park, but individuals should follow up on Olympic National Park Management Plan.
- Pat Crain will send the 2004 Technical Paper about the effect of anadromous fish on freshwater habitat via email

Introductions and Review of Agenda

Rosemary introduced the new facilitator for the Steering Committee, Bob Wheeler of Triangle Associates, Inc. Bob introduced himself and provided background on Triangle and himself.

Meeting participants then introduced themselves and reviewed the following agenda:

- Update on Status of Puget Sound TRT's Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Viability Criteria and Development of a Life Cycle Model
- Review Comments on Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Broad Sense Recovery Goals
- Review Comments on Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Goals
- Update on Status of Hypotheses for Limiting Factors
- Review Proposal for Developing Recovery Actions
- Identify Recovery Planning Tasks for Next Meetings

Updates and Announcements

1. Pat Crain of the National Park Service reported on a snorkel survey he and others conducted on the entire Ozette River. The dominate species was northern pike/minnows from Lake Ozette downstream a few miles. They did not see many

salmon species but did see a few adult sockeye and some cutthroat and rainbow trout. It was noted that year-round catches are allowed for northern pike.

2. Pat Crain noted that the National Park Service General Management Plan Open House meetings will include a PowerPoint presentation with highlights of the Plan, along with posters of the alternatives. Staff experts will be available and both written and oral comments will be taken. Meetings take place over the next several weeks in Forks, Miranda Peak, Seiku, Port Angeles, Sequim, Silverdale, Shelton and at the Seattle REI. Most are scheduled from 5:00 -8:00 PM. There is also a second meeting scheduled in Port Angeles.

Harry Bell, Green Crow, asked a question about how the NPS Management Plan relates to the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan. The response was that the hope is that the Management Plan will be flexible enough to include all of the actions that might be included in the Recovery Plan. The committee agreed that the Management Plan will be critical for a successful Recovery Plan and that members should be encouraged to individually attend hearings and make comments. Pat will check to see if the Steering Committee can respond as a group.

3. Caroline Peterschmidt, Makah Tribe, reported that the weir at Ozette is coming out today (August 15th) with the smolt trap.

Update on Status of Puget Sound TRT's Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Viability Criteria and Development of a Life Cycle Model

The Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT) met with the Steering Committee last July and has been working on revising the viability criteria. They will be at the September Steering Committee meeting to report out on their efforts and progress. The TRT is meeting monthly and working on other efforts in the Puget Sound area. Some Steering Committee members wanted to be made aware of when the TRT will discuss Lake Ozette issues.

Mike Haggerty, contractor, reviewed the goals and outputs of a Life Cycle Model he is developing for the Recovery Plan and he then presented the Life Cycle Model diagrams (*Beach Spawning Sockeye Life History and Limiting Factors; Tributary Spawning Sockeye Life History and Limiting Factors*). He introduced information about how the model will be used by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT). He described each box in the model schematic and identified each limiting factor at each life stage. Mike will present a power point of this at the September Steering Committee meeting.

In discussion the question arose as to how the information generated from the Life Cycle Model will be used. The following are two ways in which that information will be used: (1) assist in the development of the viability goals and (2) provide a means of asking the what-if questions (e.g., how it is under different scenarios).

A question arose as to how the model takes into consideration the ocean conditions. It was explained that random ocean conditions and random ocean survival values are used.

Review Comments on Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Broad Sense Recovery Goals

A review of the broad sense recovery goals (*Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Broad Sense Recovery Goals and Objectives*, Edited August 11, 2006) brought forward suggested changes in wording and discussion of the written comments provided to this draft prior to the meeting.

Suggested changes from the discussion include:

- 1st paragraph, Broad-sense Recovery Goal (page 1): Change to “Protection and restoration *actions implemented in the Ozette watershed to recover sockeye...*”
- 1st paragraph, Broad-sense Recovery Goal: Several members thought that “aquatic” either should be dropped altogether or possibly defined and clarified. Some members felt that it was important to include “aquatic” ahead of “ecosystems”. One statement was that the focus is on fish, not the whole ecosystem.

Some of the discussion related to defining “aquatic” was intended to indicate what parts of the ecosystem affect the aquatic system and sockeye salmon while not being “all inclusive” of parts of the ecosystem that will not impact salmon. One suggestion was to change this one sentence to, “*Protection and restoration actions implemented in the Lake Ozette watershed to recover sockeye salmon have sustained processes necessary to maintain sockeye....*”

- 3rd paragraph, Broad-sense Recovery Goal (page 1, 1st sentence): Reference was made to paragraph #4, with a suggestion to delete the word “ecosystem”. It was mentioned that the original group agreement was that the group is working on an “ecosystem approach”.

It was agreed that NOAA would bring back new language for this section related to “ecosystem.”

It was noted that Ed Bowen’s ideas for a vision statement are included in the document.

Objective #6 needs clarification (*6. Out-of-basin limiting factors are addressed equitably and in concert with in-basin limiting factors*). There was discussion about the intent of the language for this objective:

- Recognize all the factors and not have any one sector carry a larger burden than the others
- Ensure that everybody has to pay their fair share
- Recognize that we are paying more here within the basin and that there is an economic impact because of that.

NOAA will clarify the language of this section.

Review Comments on Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Goals

The Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Goals text was previously distributed by Mike Haggerty to Lake Ozette Sockeye co-managers on behalf of NOAA Fisheries. The purpose was to begin discussion of recovery goals for the Sockeye Recovery Plan. The text distributed had been updated based on edits and comments received up through July 6, 2006. No additional comments were received since that date.

During the discussion on recovery goals, a question was raised about the definition of “co-managers”. It was explained that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Tribes, and National Park Service are co-managers; and that the NPS manages all species.

Pat Crain explained the unique role of the National Park Service as the manager. This watershed has a large National Park, and the NPS is the manager without a requirement for consultation with the state, though the Park does work with the State. In further describing the NPS management role he indicated: 1) The NPS has exclusive jurisdiction over Olympic National Park (over all park resources), and 2) Treaty rights supercede Park rights.

NOAA will continue its efforts on developing the recovery goals.

Update on Status of Hypotheses for Limiting Factors

During the discussion, several questions and issues were raised:

- How will we use the distinctions between limiting factors (“key” versus “contributing” limiting factors)?
- Prioritization of actions should include what we can actually do something about.
- Clarification is needed on how to delineate between the three categories of limiting factors:
 - “key” [suggested clarification is that the limiting factors are – *persistent and have a potential of high impact*]
 - “contributing” [suggested clarification is that the limiting factors are - *intermittent, less frequent, infrequent; do not affect the whole population, and have a moderate impact*]
 - “not likely” [suggested clarification is that the limiting factors – *have a low probability and when they do occur, only affect some of the population*]

Criteria should be used or developed to decide which category to select.

- Distinguish between activities that are occurring now or occurred in the past.
- The ratings are from the Limiting Factors diagram (*Limiting Factors Affecting All Population Segments; 7/27/2006*) in the limiting factors report (*LF Hypotheses RP Ver 1_3_djm review*)
- There is support for the clarification on how to delineate among three categories of limiting factors with the idea that others need to understand how the decisions were derived.
- A magnitude of the effect needs to be included, and it does not have to be long-lasting

- Mike Haggerty mentioned that he is using the diagram from the Limiting Factors Analysis report and will continue to expand the report.
- It was noted that limiting factors can also be cumulative.
- As Mike's report is updated, it was recommended that more attention be given to the rationale.
- It was suggested that Mike fill in the list of hypotheses. It was also suggested that descriptions are needed in the rationale to show how the distinctions/ratings were derived.

For future direction, the group agreed to include issues of magnitude and persistence. It was also agreed that Mike would continue his work and fill in the rationales.

Review Proposal for Developing Recovery Actions

The group discussed the framework for developing recommended actions. The two documents referred to related to action development were (1) Mark Plummer's Recovery action cost estimation – further guidance, and (2) Programmatic and Site Specific Actions for Recovery of Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon.

Specific discussion points were:

Actions are often misstated as Goals. We need to develop actions that can have scope and scale to them so Mark Plummer can provide the costs and schedule. Programmatic and specific actions need to be established so that Mark can help develop the most realistic process that can be implemented. The key idea is that the Steering Committee needs to be actively engaged in the process.

It was mentioned that the information for developing actions (e.g., costs, data) will be best if it comes from the Steering Committee members. There are general numbers that can be used, but the data from the Steering Committee is more specific and considers other factors, such as costs far out on the North Olympic Peninsula.

It was suggested that the Lake Ozette Recovery Plan should learn from other Recovery Planning efforts. For instance, some plans have not been specific enough so that actions have been too general. For Lake Ozette, the Steering Committee desires the recommended actions to be as specific as possible so that implementation can occur readily.

A process is needed to develop the Actions – who, what, how, when, where. A structure is needed to identify Actions:

- Strategy for actions
- Identify and prioritize recovery actions
- Prioritization framework

Types of Actions:

- Programmatic – broad table X on page 3
- Site specific

It was mentioned that Mark Plummer has developed some categorization of actions which can be seen in his document.

During further discussion, the following questions were raised:

- Are we developing opportunity costs or do we intend to develop them? In response it was noted that some recovery plans are discussing recovery costs and discussions of other economic considerations such as:
 - Opportunity and lost opportunity costs – An example was given of creating a wetland
 - Costs and Benefits

The Steering Committee does not want to preclude discussion of other economic considerations.

- Will RMAP costs be included? A statement was made that there is a RMAP cost and for forest practices so those should be included in the cost evaluation for those costs relevant to sockeye recovery

The Steering Committee felt the action development framework was an acceptable way to proceed. Further discussion led to the following Steering Committee desires:

- Invite Mark Plummer to a Steering Committee meeting to help the committee to better understand his points and desires for what type of information is needed.
- Clarify the role between Table X and Table Y.
- Distinguish costs from funding sources
- Factor in costs for the west end, which tend to be greater than areas nearer higher population centers
- Determine funding potentials – that might help determine what we recommend
- Consider pilot projects, for example: a specific road repair site that could reduce sediment loading into a creek.
- All recommended actions should specifically address sockeye recovery
- It was noted that there was a NEPA coarse economic analysis prepared for the forest and fish agreement (re: HCP EIS). The desire is to keep the Recovery Plan at the 30K foot level (not below the 10K foot level)


The Steering Committee was encouraged to begin thinking about possible actions for future discussions.

Next Meeting Dates

The following Steering Committee meeting dates were identified:

- Tuesday, September 12, 2006
- Tuesday, October 17, 2006

Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 List of Meeting Participants
 August 15, 2006

 = in attendance

SC *	Name	Organization	Phone Number	Email Address	
	Ann Shaffer	WA DFW	360.457.2634	shaffjas@dfw.wa.gov	
	Caroline Peterschmidt	Makah Tribe	360-645-3175	cpeterschmidt@centurytel.net	
	Cathy Lear	Clallam County	360.417.2361	clear@co.clallam.wa.us	
	Cheryl Bauman	NOPL	360.417.2326	cbaumann@co.clallam.wa.us	
	Coleman Byrnes	Citizen and Property Owner	360-928-1032	swampdog@olympen.com	
	David Low	WA DFW	360.249.1216	lowdl@dfw.wa.gov	
	Derek Poon	EPA	206-553-4497	Poon.derek@epa.gov	
	Don Hamerquist	Citizen and Property Owner	360-963-2413	janeen@olympen.com	
	Doug Martin	Consultant		doug@martinenv.com	
	Ed Bowen	Ozette Landowner	360-452-8008	rockypt@olympen.com	
	Gwen Bridge	Makah Tribe	360-645-3173	gbridge@centurytel.net	Has left Tribe
	Harry Bell	Green Crow	360-452-3325	harry@greencrow.com	
	Janeen Porter	Citizen and Property Owner	360-963-2413	janeen@olympen.com	
	Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe	360-645-3155	jeremygilman@olympen.com	
	Jim Rochelle	Rochelle Env. Consulting	360-491-3961	rochellej@olywa.net	
	Jim Springer	DNR	360-374-2818	James.springer@wdnr.gov	
	Joseph Murray	Merrill and Ring	360-963-2378	pysht@olympen.com	

SC *	Name	Organization	Phone Number	Email Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Kris Northcut	Quileute Tribe		knqnr@centurytel.net	
	Matt Longenbaugh	NOAA Fisheries	360-753-7761	Matthew.longenbaugh@noaa.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Mike Haggerty	Contractor	360-928-0124	mhaggerty@olympen.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Norma Jean Sands	NOAA, TRT	206-860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov	
	Pat Crain	NPS	360-565-3075	Patrick_Crain@nps.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phil Miller	GSRO	360-902-2219	Phil.miller@esa.us.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Rob Snyder	Lost Resort	360.963.2899	lostresort@hotmail.com	
	Rosemary Furfey	NOAA Fisheries	503-231-2149	Rosemary.Furfey@noaa.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Seth Barnes	DNR	360-902-1396	Seth.barnes@wadnr.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Tim Tynan	NOAA Fisheries	360-753-9579	Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Bob Wheeler	Facilitator Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	rwheeler@triangleassociates.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>