

**Draft Agenda**  
**Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting**  
November 16, 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 June 29, 2009 meeting, receive updates on other relevant plans/programs, dialogue about steering committee structure, discuss Implementation Plan, and where pertinent make decisions/recommendations.

<b>Time</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Materials</b>
10:00 a.m.	<b>Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements</b>	
10:05 a.m.	<b>Review and acceptance of June 29, 2009 meeting notes</b>	- June 29, 2009 draft meeting summary
10:10 a.m.	<b>Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Update on actions to implement Recovery Plan</li><li>• Monitoring update: what is the status of sockeye, who is doing what monitoring?</li><li>• Potential presentations: status of DIDSON Monitoring System; Mercury study</li><li>• Identify topics for new presentations</li></ul>	
10:30 a.m.	<b>Steering Committee Purpose and Organization</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presentation on Co-Leads' proposal and options for Steering Committee Role and Process</li></ul>	
12:00 p.m.	<b>Lunch</b>	
12:30 a.m.	<b>Developing a Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Goal and Purpose of Implementation Plans</li><li>• Review recovery strategy in Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan</li><li>• Group Exercise to identify action priorities over lunch and into afternoon</li><li>• Plenary Discussion</li><li>• Recommendations</li></ul>	- Implementation Plan examples
2:45 p.m.	<b>Next Steps and Future Meetings</b>	
3:00 p.m.	<b>Adjourn</b>	

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

Monday, Nov. 16, 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 June 29, 2009 meeting;
- Receive updates on other relevant plans/programs, dialogue about Steering Committee structure;
- Dialogue about steering committee structure; and
- Discuss the Implementation Plan the next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan.

**Introductions, Agenda Review, and Announcements**

The 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.

**Meeting Summary Review**

The draft June 29, 2009 Steering Committee meeting summary was presented for review. One member noted that a gap of discussion existed in the meeting summary when Triangle staff had stepped out of the room for a “closed door session” about next steps and facilitation services. A representative from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) agreed to use her notes augmented by a recording from a Committee member to create an attachment reporting on this portion of the meeting. Approval of the summary was proposed with the understanding that the missing section will be reviewed and then added as an attachment to the summary at the upcoming meeting. Following the conversation, no other changes or edits were suggested and the June 29, 2009 summary was approved by consensus.

**Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation**

A NMFS representative noted that the Recovery Plan update segment of the meeting will be a standing agenda item for future meetings. This portion of the meeting will allow Steering Committee members to update their colleagues on new or existing recovery actions occurring within the Ozette Basin.

Steering Committee members provided several updates on research and restoration efforts. A small-scale sedimentation project between local landowners and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is starting, but the change in staffing at DNR's Forks office has made it difficult to coordinate. More information about this project will be provided at future Steering Committee meetings. Olympic National Park (ONP) issued a research permit to Chad Van Furl to conduct water quality testing at Coal Creek and at an unnamed creek that drains to the west shore of Lake Ozette. This permit constitutes part of ongoing mercury research and the researcher has offered to present to the Steering Committee. Additionally, it was noted that the study's scope of work is available online. The Steering Committee also briefly discussed a joint U.S. Geological Survey/National Park Service funding proposal to look at climate change in the Ozette Basin, specifically how implementing actions in the Recovery Plan would mitigate for the effects of climate change.

The Steering Committee then discussed additional updates related to sockeye salmon recovery. A NMFS representative provided one update about her work with a contractor on the Three-Year Implementation Plan Action Table that will be discussed later at the meeting and over the course of the upcoming Steering Committee meetings. Representatives noted that Green Crow and Merrill & Ring did not receive funding on sediment reduction efforts. Steering Committee members also discussed the role of the Steering Committee on study design, peer review, and collaboration with regards to research in the National Park. One Committee member noted that this is a difficult issue because not all research conducted in Olympic National Park is Lake Ozette sockeye-related. He questioned giving the Steering Committee the authority to review or approve all research activities for Olympic National Park due to the limited scope of Lake Ozette in the National Park boundaries. Based on Steering Committee concerns about transparency and what research is proposed and being conducted, it was noted that National Park research permit applications are available to the public.

A Clallam County representative provided an update about a land acquisition project that was now before the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). The Makah Tribe and the North Olympic Land Trust are working to acquire 36 acres on Big River and currently WRIA 20 and DNR have been discussing the project. One Committee member noted that he opposed the project and that he had not received positive feedback from neighbors. Another Committee member noted that the land owner is willing to sell the property to the Land Trust and Tribe.

Steering Committee members then discussed recent monitoring efforts surrounding sockeye recovery. The Makah Tribe representative noted that their monitoring efforts have indicated a strong year for sockeye returns, and that he expects to publish information on the final returns in April 2010, but that rough numbers should be available by December 2009. He noted that more reaches are being monitored this year. Lake surveys will commence, but to date most monitoring has focused on tributaries. In response to a request to provide an update on monitoring efforts, the Committee agreed to schedule a report on 2009 sockeye counts and monitoring activities as a future agenda item.

A Committee member from NMFS reported that Andrew Gray is assembling a report related to the DIDSON (Dual-frequency IDentification SONar) fish counting trial conducted at the outlet of Lake Ozette in 2009. Mr. Gray is reporting that the trial has produced some interesting observations about predation. Steering Committee members discussed the high cost of the system and also mentioned efforts to work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to acquire a DIDSON system. Other members noted that because sockeye return at a time when other salmon runs do not, that it might be possible to use one DIDSON for multiple basins.

The Steering Committee then discussed the pros and cons of applying for SRFB funding to acquire a DIDSON system for Lake Ozette sockeye monitoring. For background, a state representative explained that typically monitoring efforts are not funded as much as restoration efforts are by SRFB. One Committee member expressed concern that implementation groups may have priorities (e.g., DIDSON), but a funding agency may have other priorities that do not align with the local organization. He wondered how to reconcile this problem. Steering Committee members discussed alternative ways for funding, or more creative methods for acquiring a DIDSON system such as sharing it between different watersheds. One member observed that one of the Steering Committee's powers will be in making endorsements on funding proposals.

Steering Committee members asked to have University of Washington graduate student Aaron Brooks present his findings on dissolved oxygen in Lake Ozette at the upcoming January 2010

meeting and to have Chad Van Furl present his mercury study findings at a following meeting (once his project has acquired more data).

### **Steering Committee Purpose and Organization**

The interim Co-Leads Group made up of local, federal, and tribal governments (Makah Tribe, Quileute Tribe, Clallam County, Olympic National Park, and NMFS) presented Steering Committee structure options. The Co-Lead presenter outlined content from the document titled *Draft Transition Strategy for Lake Ozette Steering Committee*, which contains several tasks for the Steering Committee to accomplish by June 2010. Following the presenter's explanation, several Committee members offered edits to add to the document's clarity.

Steering Committee members discussed the background, purpose and role of the Co-Leads Group. One Committee member requested that the Co-Leads specifically define their roles during the transition process. Another member asked for an explanation about the authority of the Co-Leads. One Co-Lead representative explained that from his perspective, the Co-Leads have a role because each of the governments has a responsibility for sockeye salmon recovery. He noted that this is not to take away from the important role of other stakeholders, but simply there is a legalistic durability in the role of each of the Co-Leads.

The Co-Lead presenter then discussed the second document developed by the Co-Leads titled, *Revised Decision Making Options*. He outlined the components of the options that spanned a spectrum of decision making from one end where all Steering Committee members need to support an action for its approval, to another end of the spectrum where the Steering Committee serves as an advisory group to governments who are tasked with implementing different elements of the recovery strategy. Steering Committee members discussed the different options and models for membership to the Steering Committee. The individual Co-Leads then discussed their thoughts about Option 4a – "Participating Governments Provide Logistical and Functional Support, Steering Committee Provides Advice on Policy/Technical Items." The difference between Options 4 and 4a was clarified noting that with Option 4a, Co-Lead roles were not necessarily formalized and any of the governmental bodies could enter into topic- or project-specific agreements if they chose to.

Committee members offered general comments regarding the Steering Committee process to-date and their opinions about how to move forward. Members discussed the significant change that has now occurred since the adoption of the Recovery Plan. Now the Steering Committee, which was an advisory body for the development of the Recovery Plan, will need to consider what role it will play during the implementation phase. A couple members noted that the Recovery Plan could be used as a tool and focal point for moving forward. Another member voiced concern about involving the same government agencies that he felt caused some of the problems that necessitated the Recovery Plan in the first place. One Committee member reiterated this concern and wondered if the same models that have been used during sockeye decline could work for sockeye recovery. One member urged the Committee to decide on how it makes decisions before beginning to tackle issues like the Three-Year Implementation Plan.

Committee members then discussed a number of facets regarding past structuring of the Steering Committee, as well as the proposed Options developed by the Co-Leads. Regarding Option 4a, some members wondered why it would be worthwhile to attend if they did not have full decision making authority. A NMFS representative noted that the Committee would still be a forum for information exchange, brainstorming funding strategies, and education about sockeye recovery. She noted that these components would serve alongside the Steering Committee's important advisory role to ensure that successful implementation occurs. Another Committee member noted

that the advisory role would be indispensable for projects to avoid technical or legal difficulties during implementation. Regarding Option 4a, one Committee member asked for further clarification about consensus, noting he did not want to encounter situations where the majority of the Steering Committee membership would disagree with the agency or owner involved in the decision. A member representing Merrill & Ring noted that his company would not participate in a process if decisions were made by majority vote. He added that because of the voluntary nature of the Recovery Plan, actions and/or policy statements need to be consensus-based, except where they are made by an agency or landowner only on their own behalf and not committing other landowners or agencies

Other members discussed the pros and cons of Option 2 – full voting. One member felt that the only principled way to make decisions would be to ensure a membership body that makes votes on issues. She noted that significant differences exist within the Steering Committee membership that cannot always be finessed. Similarly, another member voiced his support for Option 2 noting that it is good to know the political differences within the Steering Committee membership. One Steering Committee member noted that with Option 2, Steering Committee membership would need to be defined and majority and minority opinions articulated, which could be beneficial. Another member suggested that Option 2 had longer term potential for the Steering Committee but first it would need to function under a model similar to Option 4 before adopting the components of Option 2.

Following lunch, the Facilitator reported on what he heard the Steering Committee saying about the different options and about its preferences for a committee structure. He explained that he didn't see the group reaching consensus just yet on one of the options presented in the Co-Lead document. He said that people valued the open membership model, and he then presented an Option 5 for the Steering Committee to consider. The option places an emphasis on open membership, an advisory role for the Steering Committee, a desire to reach consensus for funding requests, and for a delegated management team that will help coordinate logistics and administrative matters.

The Steering Committee then conducted a straw poll to determine who preferred Option 4a over Option 2. 10 Committee members supported Option 4a, 3 members supported Option 2, and 6 abstained. One of the abstaining votes noted afterward that they supported Option 3 and another Committee member felt as though there were other options to consider. Following this straw vote, one Committee member asked for a straw poll to gauge support for Option 5 proposed by the Facilitator. In the vote, 12 members supported this option, 3 opposed it, and 4 abstained. One Committee member said that he needed to review Option 5 in greater detail before opining on it.

Based on the discussions, the Facilitator noted that the January 2010 Steering Committee agenda would include time for additional discussion about Steering Committee structure and decision making.

### **Developing a Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan**

Over lunch, Steering Committee members participated in a dot exercise to indicate their level of preference for the actions listed in the Three-Year Implementation Plan Action Table. Steering Committee members were provided as many color-coded dots as they wanted. The green dots indicated the top action priority for the first three years of recovery plan implementation; yellow dots signified a lesser priority that may have questions related to that particular action; and red dots were placed by projects that are seen as the least important actions for recovery plan implementation in years 1-3. Steering Committee members were also encouraged to write comments in the blank areas provided next to implementation actions. Comments could include

supporting ideas and/or suggestions for what entities (agencies/ implementers) should lead and/or support on the action in question. NMFS indicated that it would then take the results and reorganize the Three-Year Implementation Plan Action Table according to the results provided by the Steering Committee. It was noted that none of the actions would drop off the list and that the poll itself was not scientific. Some members expressed concern regarding the dot process, noting that they felt it was redundant to previous efforts made by NMFS and the Steering Committee.

The Committee then discussed next steps for prioritization. Through the conversation, all participating Steering Committee entities/individuals agreed to develop their top 3 implementation actions for sockeye recovery and agreed bring them to share at the January 2010 Steering Committee meeting.

### **Next Steps and Future Meetings**

The Steering Committee then discussed and decided on the structure of a January 2010 meeting. Members spoke about some of the pros and cons about holding a meeting without facilitation support. One member recounted a past ad hoc planning process that did not require facilitation. Members discussed the cost of facilitation services and the contract for \$22,000 that the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) holds for Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Planning support. Other Committee members noted that it would be beneficial to have facilitation to help make decisions related to the implementation schedule. A Committee member made a motion, which was seconded, on whether to have Triangle Associates facilitate the January 2010 meeting. By a vote of 17 in favor, 1 against, and 2 abstentions the Committee approved the motion.

Based on this vote another poll was conducted to ask if it would be acceptable for the Co-Leads to coordinate with Triangle to prepare for the January 2010 meeting. By a vote of 16 in favor, 0 against, and 2 abstaining, the Committee agreed to allow for this planning structure. Finally the Committee discussed the composition of the Co-Leads and mentioned that they would like to make sure that WCSSP does serve as a direct member of the Co-Leads group so that they can effectively help serve as supporting entity to support and assist the Co-Leads at the upcoming meeting.

### **Adjourn**

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

**Attachment 1: Meeting Participants**

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Coleman Byrnes	Citizen	(360) 428-1032	<a href="mailto:swampdog@olypen.com">swampdog@olypen.com</a>
Chris Byrnes	WDFW	(360) 417-1426	<a href="mailto:Chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov">Chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		<a href="mailto:rockypt@olypen.com">rockypt@olypen.com</a>
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	<a href="mailto:Patrick_crain@nps.com">Patrick_crain@nps.com</a>
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 417-3643	<a href="mailto:harry@greencrow.com">harry@greencrow.com</a>
Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	(503)231-2149	<a href="mailto:Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov">Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov</a>
Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe		<a href="mailto:jeremygilman@centurytel.net">jeremygilman@centurytel.net</a>
Mike Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	<a href="mailto:mhaggerty@olypen.com">mhaggerty@olypen.com</a>
Don Hamerquist	WRIA 19		<a href="mailto:janeen@olypen.com">janeen@olypen.com</a>
Joseph Hinton	Makah Tribe	(360) 963-2784	<a href="mailto:mtchoko@olypen.com">mtchoko@olypen.com</a>
Thom Hooper	NMFS	(360) 753-9453	<a href="mailto:Thomas.hooper@noaa.gov">Thomas.hooper@noaa.gov</a>
David Low	WDFW	(360) 249-1216	<a href="mailto:lowdl@dfw.wa.gov">lowdl@dfw.wa.gov</a>
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	<a href="mailto:jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us">jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us</a>
Phil Miller	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	(360) 902-2219	<a href="mailto:Phil.miller@esa.wa.gov">Phil.miller@esa.wa.gov</a>
Roy Morris	Stream Keeper	(360) 963-2442	<a href="mailto:able@olypen.com">able@olypen.com</a>
Joseph F. Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 460-3733	<a href="mailto:pysht@olypen.com">pysht@olypen.com</a>
Rich Osborne	Salmon Recovery Funding Board/ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	(360) 417-2569	<a href="mailto:rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us">rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us</a>
Janeen Porter	WRIA 19		
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	<a href="mailto:Norma.sands@noaa.gov">Norma.sands@noaa.gov</a>
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-3325	<a href="mailto:nscaaf@merrilring.com">nscaaf@merrilring.com</a>
Tim Tynan	NMFS	(360) 753-9579	<a href="mailto:Tim.tynan@noaa.gov">Tim.tynan@noaa.gov</a>
Herb Yancy	Green Crow	(360) 452-3661	<a href="mailto:herb@greencrow.com">herb@greencrow.com</a>
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:btrask@triangleassociates.com">btrask@triangleassociates.com</a>
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:bwheeler@triangleassociates.com">bwheeler@triangleassociates.com</a>