

Agenda
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
Sekiu Community Hall, Sekiu, WA (www.sekiu.com)
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Goals: to update the Steering Committee on the status of the Peer Review process; to update the Steering Committee about draft Recovery Plan revisions and new draft chapters; to allow for Steering Committee discussion, dialog, and comments on key report sections; to prioritize strategies and actions; to discuss and obtain Steering Committee input on the implementation chapter; and to review and update the ongoing schedule for the year as the road map for completing the recovery plan.

Time	Item	Attachment(s)
10:00 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, Announcements and Purpose	
10:10 a.m.	Review and Acceptance of May 31, 2007 Meeting Notes and Action Items from Meeting	#1
10:15 a.m.	Peer Review Criteria and Panel Selection Update (Rosemary Furfey)	
10:30 a.m.	Revised and New Draft Recovery Plan–Presentation and Discussion (Rosemary Furfey) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Revisions to Prior Chapters Reviewed by the Steering Committee • Forest Management – FFR, HCP and the Draft Recovery Plan and Tool Box • Steering Committee Discussion, Dialog, and Comments 	#2
12:30 p.m.	Working Lunch: Prioritizing Strategies and Actions	
1:45 p.m.	Implementation Chapter—Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by Phil Miller, Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office, on “Statewide Implementation Approaches” • Discussion on Approach • Agreement on Sept 27 or Oct. 4 Meeting to Discuss Details 	
2:45 p.m.	Next Steps, Meetings and Updated Timeline	#3
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

Attachments:

No.	Agenda Item	Attachment Items
1	Review and Acceptance of May 31, 2007 Meeting Notes and Action Items from Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 31, 2007 draft Meeting Summary • Meeting Summary for April 24, 2007 meeting incorporating edits from Tim Tynan
2	Revised and New Sections of Draft Recovery Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Draft Plan (send by 8-24-07)
	Forest Management – FFR, HCP and the Draft Recovery Plan Tool Box	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington Forest Protection Association White Paper and Chapter 7 text
	Prioritizing Strategies and Actions	
3	Next Steps and Updated Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Ozette Recovery Timeline 08-20-07

Draft Facilitator's Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
Sekiu Community Hall, Sekiu, WA (www.sekiu.com)
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Goals: to update the Steering Committee on the status of the Peer Review process; to update the Steering Committee about draft Recovery Plan revisions and new draft chapters; to allow for Steering Committee discussion, dialog, and comments on key report sections; to prioritize strategies and actions; to discuss and obtain Steering Committee input on the implementation chapter; and to review and update the ongoing schedule for the year as the road map for completing the recovery plan.

Participants at the Meeting

See Appendix I for a list of meeting participants.

Action Items

- The Steering Committee has until September 17 to make comments before the draft Recovery Plan is modified and sent to the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT), unless arrangements for a longer period have been made with NOAA Fisheries
- Triangle will suggest dates for a November/December Steering Committee meeting
- Triangle Associates will email the Steering Committee the September 5, 2007 meeting summary and the revised May 31, 2007 meeting summary with additional edits
- Triangle Associates will email the Steering Committee both Phil Miller and Rosemary Furfey's PowerPoint presentations (see October 2 email)
- NOAA Fisheries via Triangle will send out a proposed list of Peer Reviewers selected to review the draft Recovery Plan (see October 2 email)
- Katie Krueger will make available her meeting notes from the August 20 meeting between the Quileute Tribe and NOAA Fisheries
- NOAA Fisheries and Triangle will update the Recovery Plan schedule (emailed to the Steering Committee on Sept. 26)
- NOAA Fisheries will work with the Washington Forest Protection Association to obtain Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans
- NOAA Fisheries will set up additional consultation with the Makah Tribe and the Quileute Tribe
- NOAA Fisheries will set up a meeting with staff from Olympic National Park
- NOAA Fisheries will speak with Mary Ruckleshaus about Steering Committee questions on the peer review process and then will send those responses to the Steering Committee (see October 2 email)
- NOAA Fisheries will revise the August 24 version of the draft Recovery Plan based on Steering Committee comments from the September 5, 2007 meeting, as well as any additional comments that are submitted by September 17
- NOAA Fisheries and Mike Haggerty will continue to develop the "Action Integration" table
- NOAA Fisheries via Triangle will send out a modified draft Recovery Plan to the Steering Committee when the draft is sent to the TRT, as well as afterward when the TRT comments are received

Introductions, Review Agenda, Announcements and Purpose

Bob Wheeler welcomed the Steering Committee to the meeting and discussed the day's agenda. He explained that the meeting was designed around receiving comments and input on the August 24 draft Recovery Plan and that NOAA Fisheries was here today to listen. As Bob outlined the agenda, he explained that in addition to hearing a presentation on changes and additions to the draft Recovery Plan, another important part of the meeting was to talk about implementation. Phil Miller from the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office planned to present the state's perspective on implementation.

Announcements

Pat Crain from the Olympic National Park provided a quick overview about Lake Ozette bass with high mercury concentrations. Additionally Pat Crain spoke about the annual funding cycle for research funds. He said the pre-proposal would be due Friday and he has applied to do research that would look at the effects of fine sediment on egg survival. Pat asked for the Steering Committee's input.

Review and Acceptance of May 31, 2007 Meeting Notes and Action Items from Meeting

Bob Wheeler asked the Steering Committee to approve the meeting notes from the May 31, 2007 meeting (**Attachment # 05**). He explained that some errors still existed and that Triangle would make the appropriate changes. With no objections, the May 31, 2007 meeting notes were approved.

Peer Review Criteria and Panel Selection Update

Rosemary Furfey updated the Steering Committee about the Peer Review process. Rosemary explained that she recently had spoken with Mary Ruckleshaus about using the criteria developed by the Steering Committee to find additional individuals to ensure a broad range of expertise for the Peer Review Committee. Rosemary told the Steering Committee that all of their suggestions were forwarded to Mary and they will be considered. The goal, Rosemary explained, would be to assemble a panel in time for the public comment period. The Peer Review of the LFA and draft Recovery Plan will happen concurrently as the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT) reviews both documents, as well. Rosemary said she would inform the Steering Committee when the development of the Peer Review process is complete, and she reiterated that it is not too late to propose additional names for the Peer Review Committee.

Coleman Byrnes asked if the Peer Review meetings would be open to the public. Rosemary replied that she was not certain about the format, but that she would look into that question. She reiterated that all information from the Peer Review will be made available. Coleman asked to be included on the email list for any Peer Review updates.

Katie Krueger asked if the Tribe and public would have the opportunity to comment on the Peer Review Committee findings. She highlighted the Quileute Tribe's experience with a similar process for the Olympic Coast Marine Sanctuary. She indicated that a comment period seemed appropriate for a public process.

Phil Miller asked for a clarification that there will be a package of the TRT/Peer Review responses, so that a comment period would be included. Rosemary affirmed Phil's question that as it was determined at April's Steering Committee meeting that the Steering Committee would be able to see the comments provided by the TRT and the Peer Review Committee. Phil then asked if the TRT and Peer Review member comments would be combined together, or if they would remain individually identifiable. Rosemary explained that for the Peer Review Committee, each peer reviewer's comments will be provided and the TRT would then distill these comments into a summary of the entire Peer Review Committee. Rosemary said that the distillation of the Recovery Plan done by the TRT would be separate from its own review work on the draft Recovery Plan. Norm Schaaf requested that Rosemary share via email the proposed list of peer reviewers. Rosemary agreed to do so.

Harry Bell asked if the Steering Committee will see and comment on the final Recovery Plan. Rosemary said yes, but explained that there will be a point when it is time to stop discussing in order to publish a Recovery Plan. Katie asked about when a post Peer Review/TRT meeting would be scheduled. Rosemary replied that she understood that a future meeting would be important and that one would be set when the schedule is better defined. Bob Wheeler recapped that he heard that the Steering Committee would like another review meeting after the Peer Review, TRT, and public comment period ends, recognizing that at some point NOAA needs to finalize the Recovery Plan. He also reiterated that this is a fluid process and nothing is set in stone.

Don Hamerquist asked if the Peer Review would look at the draft Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA) or the draft Recovery Plan or both. Rosemary answered that the review would be of the whole package—both the draft LFA and the draft Recovery Plan. Rosemary also reiterated that this review by the Peer Review Committee is not a political or policy review, but rather a technical one.

Pat Ness said she had the impression that the draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan is moving quickly compared to other recovery processes. She asked if this is the case, why? Rosemary responded that given its smaller scale and scope compared to larger recovery plans (e.g., Puget Sound Chinook), NOAA Fisheries has taken a comparable amount of time. Rosemary added that the timeline for the draft Recovery Plan has been extended a couple months because all parties want a good plan. She concluded that these plans always take longer than one originally thinks.

Revised and New Draft Recovery Plan—Presentation and Discussion

Bob Wheeler explained that the presentation of the August 24 version of the draft Recovery Plan was intended to give an overview and a summary of what was rewritten and a review of meetings that NOAA Fisheries held with specific groups and co-managers. He added that the forest management component, particularly the discussion about habitat conservation plans (HCPs), would figure prominently. Bob also mentioned that consensus was still the goal, but he recognized that there were places where it would not exist and that in those cases, all perspectives were welcomed.

Rosemary began her introduction stating that the Recovery Plan is just the beginning. She explained that implementation is the goal and that it is important to not lose sight of that. Rosemary noted that the Recovery Plan is the roadmap for recovery, but it is non-regulatory and non-mandatory. Because the Recovery Plan is non-binding, Rosemary said that everyone's willingness to stay at the table will be important. She reminded the Steering Committee that the draft Recovery Plan was still being edited, and it would continue to change. Rosemary highlighted that in 2008 an implementation plan (who's doing what when) will be needed, as well as an adaptive management plan. She wished to underscore that these will be big undertakings.

Ed Bowen asked for the names of the writing team on the Recovery Plan. Rosemary listed herself, Mike Haggerty, Tim Tynan, Thom Hooper as the authors, and Molly Hollenbach as the editor.

Meetings with Washington Forest Protection Association and Tribes

Rosemary gave a brief review of what happened between the May 31, 2007 Steering Committee meeting and September 5, 2007: two meetings occurred between NOAA Fisheries and the Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), which Regional Administrator, Bob Lohn, agreed to. On June 4 the WFPA wanted to understand more about how NOAA Fisheries was interpreting the HCP with regard to production of a recovery plan. On August 9, NOAA Fisheries met again with the WFPA who provided two draft pieces, which Rosemary then shared with the Steering Committee in the August 20 email package.

Pat Crain asked about the two WFPA documents—the Martin et al paper and proposed text describing the Forest Practices HCP. Rosemary explained that some of the language from the document with proposed text describing the Forest Practices HCP was used in the latest draft Recovery Plan, but that these two documents from the WFPA were essentially treated as comments from an interested party.

Rosemary added that NOAA Fisheries also met with its co-managers the Makah Tribe on May 30, 2007 and the Quileute Tribe on August 20 regarding the Recovery Plan and tribal treaty rights. Katie Krueger offered to make her meeting notes from the Quileute Tribe's meeting with NOAA Fisheries available to the Steering Committee.

Pat Crain then asked if there was any update with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) as co-managers. Rosemary said no, but she hoped to receive their comments. Phil Miller added that WDFW was committed to doing a review out of their Montesano office as the public and Peer Review process moved forward. Katie asked about the availability of any WDFW comments about the draft Recovery Plan to which Phil responded that the comments would be available for the Steering Committee.

Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans and Additional Data

Jeremy Gilman inquired if the Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) schedules and annual accomplishments would be provided. He added that roads and culverts should be inventoried in the schedule. Rosemary agreed and Harry Bell added that acquiring the schedules and annual accomplishments was a logistical bottleneck. The GIS layers, he explained are not easy to combine. Bob Wheeler asked NOAA Fisheries if it was committed to getting RMAP information and Rosemary said that was a specific conversation NOAA Fisheries had with the WFPA. She explained they intended to get digital copies of the RMAPs to identify additional recovery actions. There were inquiries about how to best acquire the information from the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Jim Springer from DNR said that for acquiring RMAP data it would be best to contact Jim Harry (sp.?) because a lot of the digital data exists, but it may not be online.

Inquires about the LFA and Prioritization

Harry Bell asked if the LFA was a work in progress and if so when would it be changed and how would LFA edits affect the draft Recovery Plan. Rosemary Furfey responded that it was a package and when comments were received the necessary changes would be made to both the LFA and draft Recovery Plan.

Katie Krueger noted that there would be a point when NOAA must say, “we disagree, but we need to publish”. She remarked that the value of commenting on the Recovery Plan is that it provides one standing to sue. Rosemary agreed that people sue on Recovery Plans. She provided an example about how the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lost a lawsuit against a Recovery Plan when the recovery actions in its plan had not adequately addressed the LFA. She explained that she keeps that lesson in the back of her mind: that recovery actions must address the LFA.

Rosemary explained that the LFA presents the information and the Recovery Plan addresses how to carry it out. She added that the LFA will not prioritize, it is simply background. The Recovery Plan, she noted, would ultimately be the document that synthesizes and distills recovery efforts. Bob Wheeler summarized the comments by saying prioritization was important and one needed to take advantage of implementing recovery action opportunities as they arise.

Pat Ness asked about what research was being done now and what priorities might exist. She asked about the validity of computer-generated models. Ed Bowen agreed that modeling was just a

hypothesis and the data was not very good. There was some debate over the assertion of poor model quality.

Summary of Revisions to Prior Chapters Reviewed by the Steering Committee

Rosemary Furfey began her presentation (**Attachment # 02**) by comparing the changes between the April 12 version and the August 24 version of the draft Recovery Plan. She proceeded through Sections 2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2.3.1, 6.1.3, and 6.5, for which there was no Steering Committee comment. The following sections summarize Rosemary's presentation and documents Steering Committee discussion, comments, and recommendations.

Section 7.1—Fisheries Management Actions

Rosemary outlined the reorganization of Section 7.1 and explained that new text was included to provide more clarity about tribal ceremonial and subsistence fisheries.

Steering Committee Ideas and Comments

- Pat Ness asked about subsistence harvest for non-native residents. She noted that historically homesteaders lived off the Sockeye. Mike Haggerty responded that a description of the locals' use of fish was written into the draft Recovery Plan text. Pat Ness added that recognizing recreational and non-native subsistence needs in the Recovery Plan should be addressed. Katie Krueger added that non-native and native fishing was different, largely due to the nature of usual and accustomed fishing areas. Bob Wheeler summed the subsistence conversation up by saying that the draft Recovery Plan could include text that no recreational fishing be allowed until delisting. Additionally, Bob noted that a difference between tribal rights and non-tribal fishing should be mentioned. Tim Tynan mentioned that Section 7.3 explains what must be done for recovery before fishing can resume.

Section 7.2.1.1—Forest Practices HCP

Rosemary continued her presentation on Section 7.2.1.1, the Forest Practices HCP. She noted that the expanded text described the provisions of the Forest Practices HCP. In an earlier version, an internet link was provided to explain the HCP, but in the most recent draft Recovery Plan the language was inserted into the text. Bob Wheeler clarified to the Steering Committee that the two documents provided by the WFPA did not represent specific language put into the Recovery Plan, but instead represented comments that NOAA Fisheries used for expanding Section 7.2.1.1. Mike Haggerty clarified that some of the text from the WFPA HCP document was put in the draft Recovery Plan, but the text inserted did not include any text about environmental or preferred choices.

Steering Committee Ideas and Comments

- Katie Krueger noted that both the Forest Practices HCP and the Department of Natural Resources HCP operate in the Lake Ozette watershed and that Section 7.2.1.1 needed to differentiate these two HCPs more clearly.
- Don Hamerquist described his understanding of the relationship between the HCP and the draft Recovery Plan. He said he believed the problem lies with the HCP because the HCP has found that forest practice rules are sufficient to ensure recovery of Sockeye salmon in Lake Ozette. He referenced page 269 of the Forest Practices HCP Biological Opinion (BiOp), as well as pages 178-179 which mentioned assumption #6 "adaptive management." Don continued by saying that as he read it, the HCP says without adaptive management, that forest practice rules are sufficient to recover adequate sockeye habitat in Ozette. Don explained that he thought it would be reasonable for timber companies to ask why they have to do any more if NOAA Fisheries already agreed with timber companies that the HCPs were sufficient for recovery. Don added to his position by saying the argument advanced in the BiOp was that specific studies have been made of all the stocks—including Ozette sockeye—and he did not

believe studies on Lake Ozette existed. In his view the LFA was far more developed regarding Lake Ozette Sockeye than what the BiOp conclusion was based on. He said that voluntary programs have to be specifically laid out. He explained that he believed the timber companies opposition was not to the cost, but instead to accepting a precedent whereby other recovery plans would need measures more extensive than what the HCP provides.

- Phil Miller explained that the HCP was sufficient for avoiding jeopardy, but neither of the two HCPs would achieve recovery. He added that the HCP was consistent with recovery, but if the Recovery Plan said it was sufficient for recovery, then he had a problem with the Recovery Plan. Don said that a need to clarify the role of the HCP in the Recovery Plan existed.
- Katie referenced a recent court case and said HCPs were not intended to guarantee recovery. She explained that incidental take was allowed under the premise that it would not affect the recovery of salmon.
- Bob Wheeler asked the Steering Committee if the Recovery Plan stated that the HCP would result in recovery of Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon. Phil said that it was unlikely for any BiOp to ever say it was sufficient for recovery.
- Pat Crain mentioned that on page 7-12—the riparian management zone subsection—that it seemed a little abbreviated and is not consistent with the specificity of the rest of the plan.
- Norm Schaaf noted his appreciation for the inclusion of parts of the WFWA document in the draft Recovery Plan. He also suggested that further links from HCP to recovery actions be made. Mike Haggerty mentioned that linking the HCP to recovery actions was avoided in this section because of the presence of small landowners which obfuscated the role of the forest management in the Lake Ozette watershed. Norm offered to help Mike make the links in light of small landowners.
- Don thought that the plan programmatically should ask the DNR to buffer all streams and rivers that potentially affect Lake Ozette. He suggested that DNR avoid forestry experimentation in the Lake Ozette watershed.
- On the notion of Best Management Practices (BMPs) under roads for the Forest and Fish HCP, Don asked for clarification about the language that indicates that BMP on roads are not mandatory. He added that the programmatic position is that BMPs be implemented on roads.
- Lyle Almond mentioned that one of the glaring omissions he saw in the draft Recovery Plan was that LWD placement was the only thing provided as a recovery action, whereas there are other issues that affect riparian zone health.
- Phil said that programmatic sections within the recovery plan referencing both HCPs need to link program actions to the monitoring and coordination of the Recovery Plan. He added that there should be an explicit link and an effort to clarify that relationship. Mike Haggerty mentioned that Section 7.2.1.1.5 referred to that.
- Don brought up the differences in management requirements between the two HCPs. Mike Haggerty noted that NOAA Fisheries would likely say that the DNR HCP was equivalent or had more stringent environmental protections when compared to the Forest Practices HCP.
- Don stated that he didn't think the description was adequate between the role of the HCP and the draft Recovery Plan.
- Harry Bell asked if the HCP could be linked to the LFA. Rosemary replied that was not done, but it could be.
- Don discussed the implementing agreement and said that he thought it was important to have elements of the HCP, specifically about "revocation of agreement" in the Recovery Plan. He explained that there should be a structure that can develop a monitoring and research program and that service should be that if the service is impeded, it should be addressed. Don added that he thought his suggestion would be an addition of grounds. Bob summed up that the writing team should consider how to incorporate Don's suggestion.

Section 7.2.2.3—Large Woody Debris

Rosemary Furfey explained that due to the comments from the Steering Committee, Section 7.2.2.3 was completely rewritten. She reiterated that the challenge is that the Recovery Plan is non-mandatory and non-regulatory, and so how would one carry out placing large woody debris (LWD) with sensitivity to private property owners? She noted that a lot of this work had been drawn from previous modeling studies.

Rosemary said that LWD could be allowed in the Olympic National Park despite its wilderness designation. Pat Crain added that if LWD met the minimum requirements for restoration, it would be permissible under the Wilderness Act. He said LWD placement had to meet the requirements of a restorative action that would be the least invasive option. Bob Wheeler said it appeared that NOAA Fisheries would have to clarify the policy of LWD placement in Olympic National Park.

Steering Committee Ideas and Comments

- Ed Bowen said that the language in Section 7.2.2.3 appeared to be a continuation from the last version of the draft Recovery Plan. He expressed his belief that there was an overdependence on LWD as a solution in the draft Recovery Plan. Coleman Byrnes replied that studies show there is a correlation between LWD and salmon production. The evidence, he said, was overwhelmingly in favor of LWD placement for restoration. Bob recapped that he heard Ed say that LWD cannot be a fix without evidence that it helps salmon.
- Harry Bell reported that there have been some situations where LWD has failed. He expressed his belief that landowners are increasingly cautious. He added that if LWD was discussed as a possible action, the Recovery Plan should mention the possibility of failure and the legal consequences that would result with such a failure.
- Pat Ness expressed her opinion that there should be studies done now on lake levels and the impact on Sockeye—in other words, water levels are high this summer and the effect of that on sockeye should be studied and evaluated this year. Jeremy Gilman noted that the Makah Tribe was looking at the lake level right now. He noted that anything within the first mile of the river's opening from the lake should continue to be modeled (taking a precautionary approach by not placing LWD until sufficient information supports that action), but the lower four miles of the river should have LWD placed in it for habitat restoration purposes because placement in the lower reaches would not affect lake levels.
- Don Hamerquist noted that from his reading of the positions in the LFA and draft chapter that timber companies wrote that there is a higher reliance on LWD project actions than other restoration projects. He wanted to make it clear that the timber companies were pushing hard for LWD as a restoration action.

Section 7.3.1.5—Beach Spawning Sockeye

Rosemary Furfey outlined that the beach spawning section was added to describe short-term actions to investigate beach spawning sockeye supplementation in support of future potential long-term actions to supplement beach spawning aggregations.

Steering Committee Ideas and Comments

- Ed Bowen inquired what is driving this issue to be a short-term action. He also wondered about the drive to include an action that was not in the Hatchery Genetic Management Plan (HGMP). Tim Tynan mentioned that this section of the draft Recovery Plan referred to research, not management. Ed asked that if beach spawning research was a short-term project, all parties would need to come to the table to discuss it. Tim responded that a need existed to look at all measures in the toolbox and this particular project represented one potential option. Bob captured two items on the flipchart: (1) that the Steering Committee would like to know why this is a short-term option; and (2) all parties should be at the table.

- Pat Ness added that there should be landowner notification for any effect of this research to their land. She felt that no language in the draft Recovery Plan exists that mentions landowner assurances about research projects. Harry Bell asked if this section referred to a research project. Tim Tynan said yes and explained that a lot of technology to deal with river spawning existed, but little research was present on beach spawning supplementation.
- Katie Krueger suggested that NOAA Fisheries consider a beach that was not privately owned for potential research.
- Pat Ness added that the Umbrella beach is not presently being used for spawning. She felt that it would be best to do a pilot project on a spawning beach that was being used by sockeye. She concluded that following a successful project, landowners might be more willing to participate in future research projects.

Section 7.4—Other Predation-Related Recovery Actions

Rosemary explained Section 7.4 was added in response to Steering Committee suggestions.

Steering Committee Ideas and Comments

- Katie Krueger asked that the text in this section include tribes as “co-managers.”

Section 7.6—Public Education and Outreach Action

Rosemary noted that Section 7.6—Public Education—was a new section.

Section 7.7—Recovery Strategy and Action Integration and the "Action Integration" table

Rosemary noted that Section 7.7 highlights what Mike Haggerty spoke about earlier as recovery actions not being integrated enough. Mike presented an idea for a new table that would include all the recovery strategies. He explained that he wanted to use this table to evaluate or track actions and strategies for the draft Recovery Plan.

Steering Committee Comments and Ideas

- Phil Miller commented that such a table appeared to be a potential bridge to an implementation strategy.
- Katie Krueger suggested the development of a process to add new projects and to update the plan.
- Bob Wheeler explained that this table could be a mechanism for prioritizing. He explained that the current plan would help the development of an implementation plan for 2008.
- Norm Schaaf suggested that the table include a cost-benefit, or cost effectiveness ranking in the table. Mike replied that instead of ranking projects, the projects would be categorized under a “high”, “medium”, or “low” rating system.
- Harry Bell said existing actions should also be included in this “action integration” table.

Section 9--Implementation

Rosemary Furfey concluded her presentation on Section 9. She said the time and cost estimates were inserted in appendix C. She emphasized there would be a need to keep refining the cost estimate tables and ultimately identify the total cost for recovery. Rosemary added that other recovery plans are looking at how the Lake Ozette sockeye Recovery Plan has planned and approached cost estimates. Rosemary said this draft Recovery Plan has become a model for others.

Steering Committee Comments and Ideas

- John Miller explained that the sections that pertained to Clallam County roads had not been provided yet but that they will get the updated information on county roads to NOAA Fisheries.

Implementation Chapter—Discussions

Rosemary began the discussion on the implementation chapter by explaining that an implementation schedule is included in every Recovery Plan. A detailed implementation plan, however, is generally developed after the Recovery Plan is finished. Rosemary emphasized that when discussing implementation actions we want to talk about, “how will we implement?” The goal is to not have the Recovery Plan collect dust, she added.

Phil Miller then handed out the outline of his presentation (**Attachment # 03**) and began discussing implementation from the State of Washington’s perspective. He began by reminding the Steering Committee that in the next 4-8 months some decisions will have to be made about what the Steering Committee wants implementation and coordination to look like. He reiterated that his purpose in giving his presentation was to help start the implementation discussion by providing the state’s perspective.

Phil explained that the state approach is a bottom up one. Currently, he said, there are six regional recovery organizations. For the state to recognize a new regional recovery organization there is one qualification: that the Lead Entities request the state to recognize them to perform regional salmon recovery functions. All six of the existing regional groups have worked on or finalized recovery plans. He said the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRF Board) was a source of funding for salmon recovery regional organizations.

Phil provided an update on the Coast Lead Entity process for organizing a regional salmon recovery organization—now named the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP)—which is now being proposed as a new regional salmon recovery organization. He said that September 27 will be the date that the SRF Board will decide on whether to approve the WCSSP request for funding the formation of a regional group. John Miller added that interviews for hiring North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (NPCLE) coordinator were scheduled for September 6.

Phil explained that the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office would encourage the SRF Board/Resource Conservation Office to support both the WCSSP and the NPCLE to assist the implementation of the Lake Ozette sockeye Recovery Plan, but he added that while administrative support can be provided to a regional salmon recovery organization or a lead entity, it cannot be given for volunteer participation by members of the Steering Committee.

Phil reiterated that it appeared that the state will support the larger scale regional organization like the WCSSP and a lead entity organization at the NPCLE scale. He suggested that both organizations could then function to support Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan implementation, along with any local group that continues to function. Phil then posed the question to the Steering Committee: “what do you want local participation to look like?” Bob Wheeler emphasized that Steering Committee input would be necessary to answer this implementation question.

Steering Committee Comments and Ideas

- Katie Krueger made a point to compliment the southern lead entities for their help in letting WRIA 20 gain its status as the NPCLE lead entity. She expressed her confidence that great people are working to make the process move forward.
- Lyle Almond asked about the WCSSP and if it emphasized the ESA designation of Lake Ozette sockeye. Phil explained that the functions that the regional group would be to support implementation of the Lake Ozette recovery plan and to look at regional criteria and strategies for how to best move forward. As he put it, one would be in a much better position if the entire coast worked together.

- Bob added that he thought the WCSRP recognizes the status of the Lake Ozette Sockeye and the development of a Recovery Plan. Bob added that the WCSRP was intended to be a regional effort to improve its ability to get grants and represent coastal needs.

Olympic National Park Jurisdiction

Pat Crain introduced his perspective as a representative of the Olympic National Park in the Recovery Plan process. He explained he had been tracking whether the actions suggested in the draft Recovery Plan were possible based on the Olympic National Park general management plan process. He explained that the last version of the draft Recovery Plan included an important question, “what role does the park play in the implementation plan from a regulatory point of view?”

Pat Crain explained that there are three types of National Parks that have different jurisdictional authority with respect to outside governmental entities: (1) small historical National Parks (e.g., Klondike National Historic Site) that have no jurisdiction; (2) parks where jurisdiction in the park is concurrent with the state (e.g., North Cascades National Park) where if one was to conduct a restoration project they would have to comply with state regulations; and (3) an exclusive jurisdiction park where the state ceded control to the federal government. Olympic National Park, Pat explained, fits into the third category. Pat said that for any projects done in the park, the permitting process would be different than in state lands because the State's HPAs (Hydraulic Permits) don't apply in the park or the river because they lie in the Park's jurisdiction. To place LWD, one would have to do a full National Environmental Policy Act Environmental Impact Statement. In addition, Pat mentioned that research projects are considered and approved by the Olympic National Park and lake spawning is entirely in the park. Pat explained to the Steering Committee that as the implementation chapter is devised, there needs to be explicit recognition of the National Park's role.

Steering Committee Comments and Ideas

- Katie Krueger emphasized that Olympic National Park did not have exclusive jurisdiction over the tribes—only with the state. She said that when the Park initiated a project, it still would need to consult with the tribes. Pat agreed and said a unique relationship existed because of the treaty rights and their co-management situation, but that this situation does not change the permitting requirements.
- There were inquiries about whether Lake Ozette was under exclusive ownership or jurisdiction of the Olympic National Park.
- Pat Ness spoke about the 200 foot scenic easement that landowners have with the Park. She asked for more discussion with NOAA Fisheries on this issue. Pat Crain mentioned that the county could be a part of those discussions, as well.
- Harry Bell asked what the ramifications would be if a LWD project failure caused erosion or affected Olympic National Park. Pat Crain responded that the Olympic National Park jurisdiction does not extend beyond the park. If outside events impacted the Park, it would rely on other jurisdictions to resolve the issue as any other member of the public or as another agency would.
- Bob Wheeler summed up the discussion by saying that the draft Recovery Plan might look to focus more on the Park's role in recovery and its jurisdiction, especially on implementation. Additionally, Bob said he heard that other jurisdictional capabilities need to be mentioned (e.g., usual & accustomed fishing areas).

Next Steps, Meetings and Updated Timeline

Final Steering Committee Comments and Questions

- Jim Woods requested for further Makah consultation and Rosemary agreed.

- Ian MacIver mentioned the need to make sure the Recovery Plan is done right. He requested that the process not be pushed too fast, and that he would rather have a better plan based on good science that took longer.
- Harry Bell asked about the LFA timeline and if the Steering Committee would see another version based on TRT comments. Rosemary replied that she was not exactly sure, but seeing the TRT comments and how NOAA Fisheries responds to those comments would likely drive that answer.

Rosemary Furfey ended the meeting by expressing her appreciation for the substantive comments provided by everyone. She then reminded the Steering Committee to provide comments sooner than the September 17 deadline, if possible. She said the next step would be to send the draft Recovery Plan to the TRT, but that it will be sent to the Steering Committee at that time, too. Also she planned to follow up with representatives of the National Park and will send out the proposed names of Peer Reviewers to the Steering Committee.

Bob Wheeler said that it appeared that NOAA Fisheries was not 100% sure about the timeframe and when the LFA and draft Recovery Plan would be reviewed by the TRT and Peer Review Committee. What he heard was that the Steering Committee wanted to review the TRT comments and NOAA Fisheries’ response to those comments.

Phil Miller said that he saw this next review as a “red flag” review. What he meant by that was that everyone should be looking to see if there is anything that one would object to for public review. He added that until the TRT and Peer Reviews are completed and NOAA Fisheries makes appropriate Recovery Plan changes, the current Recovery Plan draft is only a discussion version. Only after these reviews and changes would the plan go public for a final review.

Bob explained that given the timeline of the TRT, that a November or early December Steering Committee meeting looked preferable. In that meeting he said the committee would talk about the TRT version, the status of the draft Recovery Plan, as well as discuss involving the public through open houses and presentations. He then suggested an additional Steering Committee meeting around the February/March timeframe.

Bob explained that the writing team would be taking the input from this meeting and comments over the next couple of weeks to complete a new draft Recovery Plan. He summarized that the Steering Committee wanted a few more meetings and that the Steering Committee would like to know a little more about the TRT schedule. He said the expectation for the next review would be to come back for a review where readers should look to see “if there’s anything you can’t have going out for public review.” Bob closed the meeting and thanked the Steering Committee again for their participation.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM

Appendix I—Meeting Participants

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Charles Thompson	GMO Renewable Resources		Charlie.thompson@gmo.com
Coleman Byrnes	Citizen	(360) 928-1032	swampdog@olypen.com
David Low	WDFW	(360) 249-1216	lowdl@dfw.wa.gov
Don Hamerquist	WRIA 19	(360) 963-2413	janeen@olypen.com
Doug Martin	Timber Industry		doug@martinenv.com

Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		rockypt@olypen.com
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 452-3325	harry@greencrow.com
Ian MacIver	Rayonier	(360) 374-7226	ian.maciver@rayonier.com
Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe	(360) 465-3155	jeremygilman@centurytel.net
Jim Springer	WA DNR	(360) 374-2818	jamespringer@wa.dnr
Jim Woods	Makah Tribe	(360) 645-3151	jimwoods@centurytel.net
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
Joseph Hinton	Makah Tribe		mtchoko@olypen.com
Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 963-2378	pysht@olypen.com
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe – Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
Lyle Almond	Makah Tribe	(360) 645-3173	lylealmond@centurytel.net
Mike Doherty	Clallam County	(306) 417-2233	mdoherty@co.clallam.wa.us
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-2367	nschaaf@merrilring.com
Norma Jean Sands	NOAA/PS TRT		Norma.sands@noaa.gov
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3075	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Pat Ness	Landowner/ Ozette		chitobch@olypen.com
Phil Miller	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	(360) 902-2219	philmiller@esa.wa.gov
Rosemary Furfey	NOAA Fisheries	(503)231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Tim Tynan	NOAA Fisheries	(360) 753-9579	Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov
Michael Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bwheeler@triangleassociates.com
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com