

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday September 12th, 2006
Sekiu Community Hall
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- 10:00 a.m. **Introductions and Review Agenda**
Updates and Announcements
- 10:15 a.m. **Review and Acceptance of August 15, 2006 Meeting Notes and
Action Items from Meeting**
- 10:20 a.m. **Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team - Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye
Viability Criteria and Life Cycle Model**
(TRT Representative and Mike Haggerty, contractor)
 - Update from TRT on the Viability Criteria
 - Life Cycle Model
 - How it will be used
 - Assumptions
 - TRT tie in
 - Next Steps
- 10:50 a.m. **Steering Committee Opportunity Cost Questions for Mark Plummer**
(Rosemary Furfey, NOAA)
 - Specific types of information needed
 - Opportunity costs
 - Major Land Owners in watershed providing cost information,
like RMAP

-Steering Committee Questions and Discussion, Comments to NOAA,
and Next Steps (Mark Plummer plans to attend the October 17 Steering
Committee Meeting)
- 11:15 a.m. **Follow up - Broad Sense Recovery - New language ideas**
(Rosemary Furfey, NOAA and Mike Haggerty, contractor)
- 11:30 a.m. **Update of Hypotheses on Limiting Factors**
(Mike Haggerty, contractor)
 - Presentation of next version (Combined life stages and limiting factors)
 - Steering Committee questions and comments
 - Next Steps and schedule
- 12:15 p.m. **Lunch Break**
- 12:30 p.m. **Draft Steering Committee Purpose, Decision-Making, and
Groundrules**
(Bob Wheeler, Facilitator)
 - Steering Committee consideration of purpose and, decision-making, and
groundrules

- 12:45 p.m. **Brainstorm Existing Recovery Strategies – Existing plans review –**
Hatchery Plans, Forest and Fish, HCPs – State and Private Lands,
County Road Plan, Critical Areas Codes, ONP Management Plan,
Noxious Weed Programs, etc.
(RF, MH)
-Section of Plan
-List of what should be included
-SC help in developing these
-Next Steps and Schedule
- 1:00 p.m. **Steering Committee Brainstorming on Recovery Actions**
(Rosemary Furfey, NOAA Fisheries and Bob Wheeler, Facilitator)
-Introduction
-Potential Categories – Steering Committee Brainstorming
-Programmatic and Site Specific Actions-Steering Committee
Brainstorming
Next Steps and Schedule – Steering Committee Assignments
- 1:55 p.m. **Next Steps and Meetings**
 - October 17th
 - November 14th
 - December 12th
- 2:00 p.m. **Adjourn**

Attachments:

- Draft August 15, 2006 Meeting Notes
- Draft Steering Committee Purpose, Decision-Making, and Groundrules
- Draft Broad Sense Recovery Goals and Objectives (revised; edited September 6, 2006)
- Draft Hypotheses for Limiting Factors will be sent to the Steering Committee on Friday, September 8, 2006 via separate email.

**Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting
Facilitator's Meeting Summary**

Sekiu Community Hall
September 12, 2006
10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Participants for the Meeting

See attached list of meeting participants.

Summary of Recovery Planning Tasks/Actions

- Individuals should comment on the draft Olympic National Park Management Plan.
- The next Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (PSTRT) meeting plans to discuss Lake Ozette viability criteria – Steering Committee members who want to track this should consider attending.
- Steering Committee members' comments on Draft #4, Hypotheses on Limiting Factors (LOS RP SEC 4 ver2_1), are due to Mike Haggerty, Rosemary, and Triangle by October 2nd;
- Mike Haggerty will prepare a draft document that compiles and addresses the comments on limiting factors for distribution for the October 17 Steering Committee meeting.
- Steering Committee questions about costs and economic analysis outlined at the September 12 meeting will be forwarded to Mark Plummer for his October 17 Steering Committee presentation.
- Actions:
 - Steering Committee members will come prepared to discuss Processes, Strategies, Action Categories, and Actions at the October 17 meeting. NOAA Fisheries will prepare a template document that includes a few start or example ideas assist the Steering Committee in generating ideas for input.
 - DNR 2005 color ortho-photos for the Lake Ozette watershed (County) will be developed.
 - Triangle will update the Steering Committee attendance chart.
 - Rosemary Furfey will confirm meeting room reservations in Port Angeles at Olympic National Park (ONP) for the November and December meetings.
 - A brief explanation about the goal year 2050 will be given at the October 17 meeting.

Updates and Announcements

- Pat Crain, National Park Service (NPS), announced that the due date for comments on the *Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan and EIS* has been extended through September 30, 2006. It was noted that if Steering Committee members provide comments on the NPS Draft Plan, it would be helpful if comments are in context of the recovery plan and actions. Individuals should provide comments through the public process.

Review and Acceptance of August 15, 2006 Meeting Notes and Action Items from Meeting
The August 15, 2006 meeting notes were accepted as written.**Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (PSTRT) – Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Viability Criteria and Life Cycle Model**

The PSTRT update in the Viability Criteria was presented by Norma Jean Sands, PSTRT representative. The next PSTRT meeting is scheduled September 21 and will include discussion of Lake Ozette and viability criteria. New data will be discussed at this meeting. It was noted that historic data, such as Quinault Tribal data, is not being used. The Steering Committee discussed that there are 3 “legs” to the technical components of the recovery plan – Mike Haggerty’s model, the Quinault data, and capacity. With regard to other data sources, it was noted that the time series for those might not be long enough.

Mike Haggerty, contractor, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the basics of the Life Cycle Model – how it will be used, the assumptions, and the tie-in with the PSTRT as requested at the August meeting. Steering Committee members were reminded that the Life Cycle Model can serve two purposes, i.e., (1) to help establish viability goals and (2) to pose possible “what ifs.”

At last month’s meeting, a question arose as to how the model takes into consideration the ocean conditions. In discussion about ocean mortality rates, Mr. Haggerty noted that the marine environment is now a “contributing” limiting factor rather than a “key” limiting factor. Ocean survival may always be a high mortality factor, as has historically been the case. Phil Miller, Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office, noted that even a healthy stock will have high ocean mortality, and he suggested that the focus be on the actions and factors that cause the species to be threatened and for which actions can be taken. Another area where little is likely to be done relates to climate change issues.

During discussion about the Life Cycle Model, it was noted that food into the lake is not considered a limiting factor. It was confirmed that Lake Ozette is holding constant for both beach and tributary populations.

Mike emphasized that the goal is to test the sensitivity of the model to varying egg survival options. He noted that the model has different scenarios and six options. He presented information about each of the graphs and clarified that he varied the egg to fry survival based on the range contained in the literature.

Mike noted that based on the information presented, the question is whether or not the model is providing expected results. He noted that the model is sensitive to the aspect of egg to fry survival and noted that it is difficult for the model to distinguish between the two with certainty. In answer to a question about other life stages, Mike explained that he has tested other life stages, as well, and noted that he has done some work on marine survival.

Don Hamerquist noted that the population is sensitive to the egg to fry survival and that the model is sensitive to variability in survival. Survival at low density, therefore, is a critical factor.

Mike summarized the take home messages related to the Life Cycle Model – those being:

1. Model – Sensitivity testing is necessary
2. Results – The Model is really sensitive for egg to egg survival and that is very difficult to have much certainty in extinction probability

The Steering Committee asked about what the TRT will do with the Model. The TRT is looking at the Model now to evaluate how it can be used in their determination of viability criteria. The Steering Committee does believe that the Life Cycle Model is a key tool for the viability criteria.

Steering Committee Opportunity Cost Questions for Mark Plummer

Rosemary Furfey, NOAA Fisheries Project Manager, started this session by indicating that although Mark Plummer was not able to attend this meeting, she had talked with him about the comments the Steering Committee had from their August meeting. Mark is planning on attending the October 17 Steering Committee meeting.

Rosemary talked to Mark about including opportunity costs in his cost evaluation of actions. Mark indicated that he had not seen that done on other Recovery Planning efforts and that most recommended actions are not at that level of specificity. Most plan actions are more at a 30,000 foot level, and opportunity costs are generally incorporated into base costs, especially for regulatory actions. Rosemary gave an example of the Clean Water Act (CWA) program when an entity is required to do a stormwater NPDES, e.g., that is a cost already included as a baseline program cost.

Rosemary requested that the Steering Committee develop specific questions for Mark so that he can come to the next Steering Committee meeting prepared to respond to the concerns of the group.

The Steering Committee developed the following list of questions for Mark:

1. What is included in baseline costs and what is not included?
2. How are costs split when some costs are part of the Recovery Plan and some are part of another program, like RMAP, NPDES permits, etc.?
3. How does Mark address costs when only regulatory actions are recommended in the plan but that further actions beyond the regulatory actions will be necessary, such as actual implementation of regulations?
4. What package of action categories and actions has Mark seen included in other plans and what does he anticipate in this plan?
5. How can Mark best address the fact that costs on the west end and Lake Ozette in particular have a very different reality than what is experienced nearer population centers?
6. Is it possible to obtain costs from private entities related to costs associated with activities such as RMAP (Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans) and Habitat Conservation Plans, both for past, present, and future efforts?
7. If the actions recommend additions to existing programs such as RMAP, how will Mark incorporate those additional costs into his analyses?

8. In the context of the recent HCP and comparing that to the Recovery Plan, who will use the cost information and what will use of the cost information do?
9. What Limiting Factors will be addressed and to what level of detail?
10. In the listing of Sockeye by NOAA Fisheries, an economic analysis indicated an impact of \$32 per person. How has this value changed since the listing and how do you generate more real numbers?
11. How do you factor in cumulative effects, such as the fact that certain governmental entities are not able to participate in the process now because of lack of resources even though they should be? Can costs be factored in that would include their participation in the process for the future?
12. How has the costing process matured since the shared strategy?
13. Can costs include secondary other costs, so if there is an estimate for a regulatory cost, that would result in other secondary efforts for which there would be costs?
14. Can costs be included for all participants, government, tribes, business, and private?
15. Can inflationary costs be included and what inflationary rate do you use?
16. Will costs beyond some set time, like 15 years, be used, i.e., what is the time period for costs?
17. Can costs for ongoing aspects of implementation of this Recovery Plan be included, such as research, monitoring, etc.?
18. Are costs of enforcement and tracking included as well as costs to private citizens and businesses as they have to monitor and track Recovery Plan implementation and its effects on them?
19. Can and should opportunity costs be included?

Broad Sense Recovery Goals – Follow-Up and New Language Ideas

Rosemary initiated the follow-up discussion about terminology used in the Draft Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Broad Sense Recovery Goals and Objectives document (draft, edited September 6, 2006). The task from the August meeting was to provide new language for the document related to “ecosystem” and “aquatic system” and Objective #6. The edited language within the September 6 draft document was presented.

Discussion focused on the following terms: ecosystem, wildlife species, and ecological integrity. There remained disagreements by the Steering Committee on what words and terms should be used in this document, and the Steering Committee members presented their individual perspectives. NOAA Fisheries will consider these comments and return at a future Steering Committee meeting with its final Broad Sense Recovery Goals document and language.

Draft Steering Committee Purpose, Decision-Making and Groundrules

Bob Wheeler facilitated the discussion of the Steering Committee’s consideration of its purpose, decision-making process and operational groundrules. The following discussion items ensued:

- Is there a need for consensus in development of this plan? The response was that, no, consensus is not absolutely needed. NOAA Fisheries, however, prefers a consensus approach where that is possible because it will lend greater credence to the plan.
- There was some discussion about whether or not meetings should be recorded. While some felt this would be good, there was a concern about additional costs for the process; and, there was some concern about the need to allow free discussion in developing

detailed scientific topics, ideas, and recommendations without being held to comments made at a later time and/or without having comments taken out of context.

- There was some discussion of allowing opinions of committee members to be included in the Recovery Plan. NOAA Fisheries will consider this request.

Bob will bring a revised version of the document to the October 17 meeting for Steering Committee consideration.

Update of Hypotheses on Limiting Factors

Mike Haggerty presented the latest version of the hypotheses on limiting factors (combined life stages and limiting factors). He outlined the Chapter goals and reviewed the definitions developed for “key”, “contributing” and “factors not likely limiting”. The limiting factor diagrams were presented in order to outline the factors that affect all salmon population segments.

Discussion yielded the following clarifications, questions and/or concerns:

- Key limiting factors are related to both human actions and predation factors.
- Predation by cutthroat and pikeminnow is a concern.
- Concern was expressed that the emphasis is on human impacts (e.g., not taking into account any naturally caused limiting factors)
- How are “unknown” factors distinguished from “low” or “negligible” factors?
- Dislike of the rating of limiting factors was expressed by Harry Bell, Green Crow, for the following reasons:
 - It doesn’t take into account the certainty of the factors;
 - It doesn’t take into account the temporal aspect of the factors;
 - There needs to be a way to evaluate why a factor should be rated a particular way; and,
 - The focus needs to be on those things we can “fix”.
- Concern was expressed that there are too many factors included in Hypothesis 2 (e.g., temperature, turbidity, etc.)
- The current draft document is much clearer.
- It was suggested that strategies be prioritized.
- It was recommended that there be from 2 to 5 strategies, with actions.

It was agreed that additional comments on Draft #4 (LOS RP SEC 4 ver2_1) be sent no later than October 2. Comments will be compiled and addressed within a draft document to be forwarded to the group no later than October 11 for consideration at the October 17 Steering Committee meeting.

Brainstorm Existing Recovery Strategies and Actions

Derek Poon stated that strategies and actions should follow a system developed by Roni focusing on limiting factors, strategy hierarchies, goals, recovery strategies, and actions. He stated it will be more important, given limited time, to develop the strategies over specific actions.

Don Hammerquist stated the importance of restoring natural processes and to do that could require the acceleration of such ongoing actions like RMAP.

The Steering Committee indicated that actions are needed that can have a scope and scale to them that allows for economic analysis (from Mark Plummer). The Steering Committee understood that to get to such detail will require input and information from Steering Committee members and a need to learn from other recovery plans. The group agreed that they prefer a plan that has some amount of specificity to it because that will make it easier later on.

The brainstorming discussion resulted in the following ideas, thoughts, and questions:

- Actions should be kept limited to a number from 2 to 5
- Strategy should include prioritization; individual, scientific
 1. Action Items – from what documents, plans, places, and locations should the Actions Start List be taken?
 2. What level and categories of Actions are we talking about?
 - 30,000 foot level? 10,000 foot level?
 - Programmatic, site specific, implementation
 3. Action Categories
 4. Actions
 5. Priorities – how to prioritize

Next Steering Committee Agenda Topics (October 17):

- Introductions and Outline of Agenda Items
- Approval of September 12, 2006 Meeting Notes
- Draft Steering Committee Purpose, Decision-Making and Groundrules
- Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team
 - Viability Criteria
 - Tie to Life Cycle Model
- Costs – Mark Plummer
- Strategy
- Actions
- Recovery Goals – for November meeting

Future Meeting Dates

The following Steering Committee meeting dates were identified:

- Tuesday, October 17, 2006, 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM, Sekiu Community Hall
- Tuesday, November 14, 2006, 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Olympic National Park Facility in Port Angeles
- Tuesday, December 12, 2006, 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Olympic National Park Facility in Port Angeles
- Tuesday, January 23, 2007, 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Olympic National Park Facility in Port Angeles

Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
List of Meeting Participants
September 12, 2006

*	Name	Organization	Phone Number	Email Address
	Bill Freymond	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	360.249.1225	
*	Caroline Peterschmidt	Makah Tribe	360-645-3175	cpeterschmidt@centurytel.net
*	David Low	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	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@olypen.com
*	Ed Bowen	Ozette Landowner	360-452-8008	rockypt@olypen.com
*	Harry Bell	Green Crow	360-452-3325	harry@greencrow.com
*	Janeen Porter	Citizen and Property Owner	360-963-2413	janeen@olypen.com
*	Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe	360-645-3155	jeremygilman@olypen.com
*	Joseph Murray	Merrill and Ring	360-963-2378	pysht@olypen.com
*	Matt Longenbaugh	NOAA Fisheries	360-753-7761	Matthew.longenbaugh@noaa.gov
*	Mike Haggerty	Contractor	360-928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
*	Norma Jean Sands	NOAA, PSTRT	206-860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov
*	Pat Crain	National Park Service	360-565-3075	Patrick_Crain@nps.gov
*	Phil Miller	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	360-902-2219	Phil.miller@esa.us.gov
*	Rosemary Furfey	NOAA Fisheries	503-231-2149	Rosemary.Furfey@noaa.gov
*	Tim Tynan	NOAA Fisheries	360-753-9579	Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov
*	Bob Wheeler	Facilitator Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	rwheeler@triangleassociates.com

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