

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 January 17, 2013, 10:00 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
 Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To discuss Near Term Projects, Steering Committee outreach activities, project funding sources, and next steps for Steering Committee.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Optional “Meet & Greet” with snacks (for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review agenda and materials • Review September 27 meeting summary—any changes? • Updates and announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report on this year’s run: upstream migration, downstream monitoring? ○ State of the Salmon Report: Ozette Sockeye ○ Call for volunteers to participate in filmed interview for Oral Histories 	-Draft agenda -September 27, 2012 draft meeting summary
10:45 a.m.	Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIDSON update and video of recent beach spawner survey field work • NOAA's Recovery Action Mapping Tool (brief presentation with Q&A) • Other updates from project leads • Hoko-Ozette Road Assessment: status and next steps (<i>see following pages</i>) • Any other potential projects out there? 	-Near-Term Priority List
12:15 p.m.	Lunch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign up for Oral Histories interview with Peggy Foreman (optional) 	
12:45 p.m.	Near-Term Priority List dialogue (continued)	
1:45 p.m.	Public Outreach Subcommittee Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brochure: final draft for approval per agreed-upon process (<i>see next page</i>) • Conference call report out (Peggy Foreman) • Oral history project update • Straw poll on Wikilinks • Discussion about Subcommittee priorities • Action items & next steps 	-Final draft of brochure -Public Outreach Subcommittee call summary
2:45 p.m.	Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications submitted? New sources? • Potential sponsor organizations/individuals for smaller projects? • Update on facilitation funding (\$ in hand for two meetings after this one) 	-Near-Term Priority List
3:00 p.m.	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of action items • LOSC member list: existing one dates back to 2006, should we update it annually, and/or supplement it by an “active member” list? • Next meeting date (early April or early May): agenda topics? 	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Proposed Process for Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee to Review Draft Products

Approved by Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC)

on April 19, 2012

GOALS:

- No surprises for Steering Committee members
- Steering Committee members know what's being written
- Steering Committee members have an opportunity to review and comment on draft products
- Steering Committee members cannot veto a draft product

PROCESS:

1. Notify Triangle Associates about your product (e.g. you're writing an article for West End NR News) and target date for publishing. Triangle will relay this information to the Steering Committee via email (at minimum) and have LOSC determine if a review process is needed or not, with a two-week window for response. If yes, complete steps 2-10.
2. Write draft
3. Share with LOSC Public Outreach Subcommittee
4. Incorporate Outreach Subcommittee input (1–2 weeks)
5. Share with LOSC (allow 2 weeks for review & comment of non-technical draft product; 4 weeks for technical draft product)
6. Edit based on LOSC input
7. Authoring Agency Review
8. Share final draft with LOSC (1 week to provide comment on burning/substantive issues)
9. Last Authoring Agency Review (if needed)
10. Publish and share final product with LOSC

EXAMPLES OF PRODUCTS REQUIRING REVIEW BY LOSC:

- If it is written on behalf of the LOSC (e.g. product for the Public Outreach Subcommittee)
- If it refers to support by, or a decision of, the LOSC
- If it refers to information provided by the LOSC
- If the LOSC is an active participant in the product
- If it describes the role/function/history of the LOSC

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, January 17, 2013
10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Decisions List:

- The Committee approved the September 27, 2012 meeting summary by consensus.
- The Committee approved the Ozette Sockeye brochure by consensus.
- The Outreach Subcommittee’s number one priority should be posting a kiosk at Lake Ozette, and the number two priority should be developing a scope of work for a Seasonal Interpretive Position.
- The Outreach Subcommittee will eventually bring the scope of work for the Seasonal Interpretive Position to the Committee for review.
- The Outreach Subcommittee will not pursue creating a Wikilinks page for Lake Ozette sockeye since other region-specific fish (e.g. Puget Sound Chinook) do not have pages.
- A decision about Hoko-Ozette Road was tabled until a Clallam County representative is present to discuss it.

Introductions, Agenda Review, and Meeting Summary Review

The meeting facilitator, Chris Page from Triangle Associates, welcomed the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC or “the Committee”), and LOSC members introduced themselves (*see Attachment 1 for attendee list*). The facilitator reviewed the meeting agenda, and the Committee reviewed the September 27 meeting summary. There was a request to revise language at the top of page 4 regarding the State of the Salmon Report. The sentence was revised to read as follows: “LOSC members also agreed that the ‘Recovery Plan’ excerpt from the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Summary should be used since that language has already been approved by the Committee.” Pending this noted modification, the Steering Committee approved the summary by consensus.

Announcements and Business

- The latest Shoreline Master Program update for WRIA 20 has been drafted. A map was available for viewing on the back table. They are close to starting the public approval process. Landowners may be concerned about the update because zoning restrictions vary along Big River—one section of the river may be more restrictive and another section less restrictive.
- Resource Conservancy Zoning is another anomaly occurring in WRIA 20. It is geared towards the timber industry and resource protection, but private homeowners are also located in this area. One potential concern for citizens is that some properties are being surrounded on all 4 sides by this designation.
- Two bills have been submitted in the State Legislature (House bills 1112 and 1113), which deal with standards for the use of science to support public policy. One addresses issues with WA Department of Ecology and the other addresses issues with WA Department of Fish and Wildlife. These might affect the LOSC, so we should keep an eye on what happens with these bills.
- West End Natural News is looking for articles.
- Sarah Creachbaum is the new superintendent of Olympic National Park (ONP). She is quick to catch onto things and has a lot of experience working in small communities. Her last position was in

Hawaii working with native Hawaiian communities. Additionally, the Chief of Maintenance left ONP, so the Park does not currently have one.

- There were good capture rates at Umbrella Creek and the weir in 2012. 760 adults were processed through the weir this year. Based on the fin clips, approximately 60% were hatchery returns. They are continuing to refine the numbers from the otolith studies.
- The State of the Salmon report was put online on January 15, 2013 and includes information about Lake Ozette sockeye for the first time. Prior to this meeting, one Committee member expressed concern about some of the language on sockeye, but since no credit was given to the LOSC in the report, this individual is okay with the product. The report is a living document that can be updated over time. A link will be sent to the Committee.
- Peggy Foreman is looking for volunteers to participate in a filmed interview that would address “What does sockeye recovery mean to you?” Please contact Peggy if you are interested in participating.

Review and Updates on Near-Term Priority List

The Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) will confirm how much money projects received from the Salmon Recovery Funding (SRF) Board and notify the LOSC. If any projects want to apply for SRF Board funds, the application has to be submitted by the end of February.

Other updates and discussion items included:

HRA-8, Invasive Weeds

- The Lead Entity for the Coast Region has put in a request to the State legislature for money for coast habitat restoration, and this included Lake Ozette invasive species.
- There was a request for the Predation Subcommittee to recommend how to address erosion and stabilize the shore, as erosion has been a big issue for landowners after reed canary grass is removed. ONP will follow up with their plant ecologist about the issue.
- There was a request for Yellow Iris to become a higher priority because it is an indicator of water quality, and it is choking naturally-occurring Phragmites at Barnes Point (outlet of Big River). This project could potentially receive SRF Board funds. If the Committee wants to apply, the application has to be submitted to Rich Osborne by the end of February.

RME-5, Investigate Predator Types

The Predation Subcommittee (ONP, Rich Osborne, Makah, Quileute, WDFW, National Marine Sanctuary, and USFWS) is scheduled to talk on January 28, 2013. The group will figure out what direction it should go in, what product they should develop, and what studies are needed.

- There was a request for the Subcommittee to reconsider having a weir to help keep out predators, even though the Park has previously been opposed to it.
- There was also a request to look at the report from the National Marine Mammal Lab on Lake Ozette predation.

PEA-6

It was noted that there might be funding opportunities through the Lead Entity.

DIDSON Presentation

The DIDSON had previously been used at a weir, but before last year, studies had never been done on whether it could be used for scanning beaches where sockeye are spawning. Last year, Mike Haggerty presented initial findings on this inquiry, and since purchasing the DIDSON, they have continued fine-tuning the methodology. Mike is developing a written report and will share it with the LOSC.

- Mike Haggerty presented his latest DIDSON findings from studies conducted on December 12 and 20, 2012 and January 4, 2013.
- The goal of the survey was to develop an index of abundance, using data from the DIDSON in addition to visual observations from the boat of fish on the beach.
- The type of lake bottom did not significantly affect the results.
- It appears spawning primarily happened at deeper depths. There was a request to study this further at two specific locations.
- Researchers observed limited spawn-able habitat at Umbrella Beach.
- It was noted that you can pause and add a grid to the video to make counting analysis easier.
- There was a question about why the shoreline at Allen beach has high variation in fish concentrations. It was noted that this is due to spring water running into the lake at certain spots, which affects water temperature.
- The DIDSON is still included in the Lead Entity's sockeye recovery strategy. A Lead Entity representative asked if there are any funding needs for the DIDSON in the next year. Makah indicated no, and they could deal with anything that comes up internally. NOAA will check internally and get back to the Lead Entity.
- It was noted that the DIDSON can operate in a wide temperature range and is not affected by thermoclines.

NOAA's Recovery Action Mapping Tool

- Shanna Dunn, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), gave a presentation on the tool she is helping develop, which tracks recovery planning efforts for Endangered Species Act (ESA) salmon and steelhead in Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho. A West Coast-wide reporting tool does not currently exist, and project information is currently tracked in various systems.
- One challenge is figuring out how to track the implementation of the recovery actions and how to report updates to citizens, State, Congress, etc. It is important to track recovery implementation for a variety of reasons, listed below:
 - The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) funded many recovery efforts, so it wants to know how the money is being spent and if it is effective.
 - The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) requires that NMFS be able to report "the number and percent of ongoing or completed recovery actions."
- The Tool can capture data for **actions** (more broad) and **projects** (more specific to a particular location).
- The Recovery Action Mapping Tool is currently in the final stages of development/testing and is expected to be released around June 2013.
- NMFS asked for feedback from the Steering Committee on what is being incorporated in the tracking tool. Log-in access can be provided to members of the LOSC, if desired.

Discussion

- PCSRF projects entered into the Project Information System (PRISM) database will be included in this new mapping tool. NMFS is trying to include all funding sources and projects.
- NMFS is collaborating with the Lead Entity, who is collecting similar data in the Habitat Work Schedule tracking system, so NMFS is not duplicating work.
- NMFS will connect with the National Park Service (NPS) to capture its recovery efforts directly related to salmon. Committee members also recommended adding projects from the Forest Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
- It was noted that the Tool will not house data associated with the projects because NMFS does not want to duplicate what is already available. For example, it will not house DIDSON raw data; it will merely include information like “the DIDSON was funded” or “the DIDSON project is complete.” However, the Tool can include links to where the data is stored.
- **Action Item:** LOSC members can provide suggestions for other sources to be added to the tool by contacting Shana directly: shanna.dunn@noaa.gov.

Hoko-Ozette Road Assessment

- Prior to this meeting, a LOSC work group developed an approach to this Near-Term project that included outreach to local citizens during scoping. At the September meeting, those in attendance thought it made sense to put together a draft Transportation Improvement Project write-up (including outreach) that the full Committee could review and submit to Clallam County. However, a Committee member subsequently requested this project be removed from the Near-Term List.
- The purpose of Near-Term List is to feature projects that are a priority for the LOSC and that can be acted on immediately. Some Committee members felt funding from the County or other sources is unlikely for this project, so it should not be on the list.
 - There was a request to add more projects to the Near-Term List that could be funded by Salmon Recovery Funding Board.
- There was a motion to remove this project from the Near-Term List because it likely will not go anywhere—the County has chosen not to address it in the County Commissioner’s Actions for 2013-2017—and because it requires a lot of time and energy to ensure that the public is heard. This motion did not receive support from the full Committee (since the project sponsor, Clallam County, could not attend the meeting and could not be patched in by telephone) and failed.
- A major geomorphic assessment of the entire region needs to be conducted before we can know how to address the problem. There was a suggestion to have “Hoko-Ozette Road Geomorphic Assessment” become the item for the Near-Term list, but some LOSC members were uncomfortable changing the title of this project without County representatives present.
- Sections of the Hoko-Ozette Road are creating habitat issues, but they do not have the background yet to prioritize those areas. A geomorphic assessment would be helpful in developing a list of discrete projects that will improve salmon habitat **and** benefit the County and roads system.
- There was discussion about whether community outreach should happen before or after the geomorphic assessment is conducted. Parties felt passionate about each side.
- There was a suggestion to create a new section of the Near-Term List (potentially called an “Interest List”) for this project, should the county ever decide to fund it, and possibly CMER.
- **Decision:** This item was tabled until Clallam County is present to discuss it.

Public Outreach Subcommittee Update

Rosemary Furfey expressed her gratitude for all the work the Subcommittee has done, and she presented certificates of appreciation to Peggy Foreman, Joe Hinton, and Roy Morris.

Brochure

- This effort began last spring, and at the last meeting, the Committee agreed to produce one brochure instead of two. The goal of this agenda item was to approve the final brochure.
- NOAA has some money to print brochures. It can work with ONP and Committee members to distribute the brochure in the community and post it online.
- There was a request to make an edit to the map—removing the lower line of Crooked Creek as it enters the lake, if possible.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the brochure for distribution by consensus.

Oral History Project

- Dean Butterworth (NPS) created 2 lessons for teachers, which provide background on Lake Ozette salmon and watersheds.
- Peggy Foreman showed the LOSC video clips from the field trips (3 out of 4 have taken place) and explained the filming process.
- Only 1 school has started their video (Quileute Tribal School). The hope is for all the videos to be completed in the next two months, but definitely by the end of the school year.
- NOAA is having a challenge inspiring the schools/students to continue their involvement in the project. Therefore, Peggy is hoping some LOSC members will volunteer to participate in a filmed interview that would address “What does sockeye recovery mean to you?”
- It is important for the community and LOSC members to find ways of connecting with the kids (e.g. who do you know in common) because this is so meaningful to the kids.
- It will be up to the students if/how/where they will present their videos.

Subcommittee Conference Call Overview

- The Subcommittee is looking to the full Steering Committee for guidance on what their future priorities should be now that the brochure has been accepted. Potential projects on the list have included:
 - Kiosks at Lake Ozette—this is a long process since it involves ONP procedures.
 - Scenic Highways signage (bulletin board) on Lake Ozette
 - Clallam County signage
 - Hot Point Sites
 - Wikilinks
 - Seasonal Interpretive Position—the subcommittee needs to develop a scope of work.
- **Decision:** The Subcommittee’s number one priority should be posting a kiosk at Lake Ozette, and the number two priority should be developing a scope of work for a Seasonal Interpretive Position.
- **Decision:** The Subcommittee will eventually bring the scope of work for the Seasonal Interpretive Position to the Committee for review.
- **Decision:** The Subcommittee will not pursue creating a Wikilinks page for Lake Ozette sockeye since other region-specific fish (e.g. Puget Sound Chinook) do not have pages.

- The brochure should serve as a jumping off point for kiosk language, but language will not solely be based on brochure content and will be tailored (as appropriate) to help the LOSC receive funding.
- Committee members provided the following suggestions for the Seasonal Interpretive Position:
 - This position could potentially be funded through the outreach section of the Lead Entity and could be added to the priority list.
 - Washington National Park Fund is a potential funding source.
 - Work with ONP to develop a scope of work for a Volunteer Coordinator Interpreter. This is one possible way to get more talent and enrichment.
- If a restoration project is funded by the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), signage can be included in the project budget. RCO will pay for signage as long as the sign acknowledges the funder(s). However, RCO will not pay for a grant that is solely for signage—it has to be part of a restoration project. It was noted that signage could possibly be added onto the Big River bridge abutment removal project.

Funding

- Triangle is funded for facilitating two more meetings.
- One Committee member encouraged the LOSC to prepare a statement on why the Committee needs facilitation since there will be a lot of competition for funds.
- NOAA announced that it will seek to match any WA State funding for facilitation again.
- **Action Item:** The Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office should report at the next meeting on what a request for funding should include.

Next Steps

The facilitator will follow up with the draft meeting summary and a Doodle poll to determine the next meeting (likely to be scheduled for early April or mid-May 2013).

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1.	Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	360-289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
2.	Ed Bowen	Ozette Landowner		rockypt@olypen.com
3.	Chris Byrnes	WDFW	360-417-1426	chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov
4.	Kim Clark	Makah	360-640-4811	kim.clark@makah.com
5.	Larry Cooke	Makah	360-640-1144	larrycooke@centurytel.net
6.	Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	360-565-3075	patrick_crain@nps.gov
7.	Scott DeRousie	UPS		
8.	Shanna Dunn	NOAA Fisheries	503-231-2135	Shanna.dunn@noaa.gov
9.	Peggy Foreman	NMFS, NWRO	206-930-8840	peggy.foreman@noaa.gov
10.	Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	503-231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
11.	Mike Haggerty	Mike Haggerty Consulting	360-928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
12.	Joe Hinton	Makah	360-963-2784	joseph.hinton@makah.com
13.	Katie Krueger	Quileute	360-374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
14.	Stephanie Martin	Makah	360-645-3173	stephanie.martin@makah.com
15.	Kat Moore	Salmon Recovery Funding Board/Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO)	360-902-0210	Kathryn.moore@rco.wa.gov
16.	Roy Morris	Clallam Bay/Sekiu Lions	360-963-2442	able@olypen.com
17.	Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	360-460-3733	jmurray@merrillring.com
18.	Rich Osborne	UW Odegaard Writing & Research Center	360-374-4560	osborner@uw.edu
19.	Paul W. Parker Jr.	Makah		
20.	Al Voner	Olympic National Park	360-963-2725	al_voner@nps.gov
21.	Sue Wolf			
22.	Chris Page	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	cpage@triangleassociates.com
23.	Sarah Saviskas	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	ssaviskas@triangleassociates.com

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 May 9, 2013, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
 Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To discuss Near Term Projects, Steering Committee outreach activities, project funding sources, and next steps for the Steering Committee.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Optional “Meet & Greet” with snacks (for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review agenda and materials • Review January 17 meeting summary—any changes? • Discuss next steps for LOSC email distribution list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approach proposed in January and suggested new approach (“If you would like to be removed from this list, please email Triangle...”) ○ Existing members date back to 2006. Should we update the member list annually? • Updates and announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report from the Lake and/or tributaries? ○ Call for volunteers to participate in filmed interview for Oral Histories? 	-Draft agenda -January 17, 2013 draft meeting summary
10:45 a.m.	Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List (NTPL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIDSON update • Other updates from project leads • Consideration of a two tier Priority List (add “Projects of Interest”). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Purpose of NTPL—living document with actionable projects that will help sockeye, or other? ○ Hoko-Ozette Road Assessment—status and next steps • Consideration of the Coho turbidity study proposal 	-Near-Term Priority List -Coho Turbidity Study proposal
12:15 p.m.	Lunch	
12:45 p.m.	State of the Salmon Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider dropping controversial sentence 	-State of the Salmon intro verbiage for Ozette Sockeye
1:15 p.m.	Predation Workgroup Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recap of call • Action items & next steps 	-Predation workgroup call summary
1:45 p.m.	Public Outreach Subcommittee Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West End Natural News draft article (<i>see handout</i>) • Conference call report out • Oral history project update • Action items & next steps 	-Public Outreach Subcommittee call summary -Draft article
2:45 p.m.	Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications submitted? New sources? • Potential sponsor organizations/individuals for smaller projects? • Update on facilitation funding (\$ in hand for one meeting after this one) • Future funding outlook 	-Near-Term Priority List
3:00 p.m.	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of action items • Next meeting date (August)/agenda topics? (Following meeting in Nov.) 	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
May 9, 2013, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Decisions List:

- Approved the January 2013 meeting summary.
- Discuss NOAA’s Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan at the next LOSC meeting.
- Insert language into LOSC emails enabling people to get removed from the email distribution list.
- Develop a list of everyone on the mailing list, noting who has not attended recent meetings. The Committee will review the list at the next meeting and determine who Triangle should contact directly to see if they would like to remain on the list.
- Admin Team calls will be open to the whole Committee to listen in and the list of those who participated will be made available to LOSC.
- Discuss House Bill 1194, if it passes, at the next LOSC meeting.
- Harry Bell and Roy Morris will draft a simple form letter with talking points and distribute it to LOSC members to use when writing individual letters to DNR. The letter will request a CMER presentation at the next LOSC meeting. This would ideally happen before June 1st.
- Discuss the possibility of a NCASI presentation at the next LOSC meeting.
- Remove the sentence in question from the State of the Salmon Report.
- The West End Natural News article can be published as written without a formal review process, pending the one small requested modification.
- For outreach, efforts will focus on wayside exhibits (inside or outside of the park) instead of a kiosk.
- Hold a field trip in July to investigate potential wayside exhibit locations.

Meeting Purpose: To discuss Near Term Projects, Steering Committee outreach activities, project funding sources, and next steps for the Steering Committee.

Introductions, Agenda review, and Meeting Summary Review

Sarah Saviskas, Triangle Associates, welcomed the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC or “the Committee”), and LOSC members introduced themselves. Sarah reviewed the agenda and asked the Committee for suggested changes. One Committee member noted that there was previously a request to discuss NOAA’s Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan, but this agenda item was tabled to the next Committee meeting. The Committee reviewed and approved the January 2013 LOSC meeting summary with no modifications.

Discussion of LOSC email distribution list

At the January meeting, the Committee discussed trimming the email distribution list because its size had grown over time. One suggestion proposed asking distribution list members to confirm (via email) that they wished to remain on the list and remove those who did not respond. The Committee revisited this suggestion, as this method could remove individuals who were on vacation or missed the confirmation “opt-in” email. It was noted that it might be more appropriate to ask mailing list members to “opt-out” of the mailing list.

Comments, Discussion, and Decision

- Some legislative emails “bounce back” suggesting that legislative email addresses need to be updated, such as Alexandra Fastel’s of Senator Cantwell’s office.

- One Committee member noted that a long email list can create a false perception of commitment from the community and that the mailing list should contain only email addresses for people who advocate remaining on the list; however, actively removing individuals can appear exclusionary.
- The Committee agreed to insert an “auto-removal” link into LOSC emails so that people can remove themselves from the list. (Note: Since the May 9 meeting, Triangle has learned that this is not possible. Triangle will insert a note into all LOSC emails indicating that anyone who does not want to be on the list anymore can contact Sarah Saviskas for removal.) Triangle will also develop a list of everyone on the mailing list, noting who has not attended recent meetings. The Committee will review the list at the next meeting and determine who Triangle should contact directly to see if they would like to remain on the list.

Administration Team

The Committee discussed the current make-up of the Admin Team and if that make-up is appropriate. The Admin Team’s responsibilities are to review draft meeting agendas and set meeting dates.

Comments and discussion:

- Cathy Lear is the Clallam County representative – LOSC should clarify with her if she wants to stay on the Admin Team.
- One individual expressed that the Admin Team calls should either involve a Lead Entity or a Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) representative, but not both, in order to avoid overrepresentation.
- Admin Team meetings are public – anyone can call in and listen.
- It is important for the County to be a functioning member of the Admin Team.
- The Committee decided that the Admin Team calls will be open to the whole committee to listen in and that the list of those who participated would be made available to LOSC.

Updates and Announcements

- Salmon Recovery Fund (SRF) Board projects in progress include an assessment of Freeman Creek, restoration of ponds in the Hoe, restoration of the Vicki Camp pond, and multiple site visits.
- May 18th is the annual Ocean Fair; there will be a BBQ and showing of the film Ocean Frontiers. Posters will be given to the Streamkeeper booth.
- A draft Shoreline Master Program has been delayed but will be available to the Committee in the future. The No-net Loss Study and Cumulative Effect Study were both awarded to Environmental Science Associates (ESA). One LOSC member suggested that LOSC should provide input into those studies.
- House Bill (HB) 1194, “Limiting liability for habitat projects”, impacts the LOSC Recovery Action Master List. There is concern regarding removing liability for large wood projects in the basin, considering the land is owned by both government agencies and private owners. The Committee decided to discuss HB 1194, if it passes, at the next LOSC meeting.

Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List (NTPL)

Crooked Creek: Road 5800

The project is expected to commence in July and be completed by September.

Big River

This project is expected to take place this summer/fall.

DIDSON Update

Dual frequency **I**dentification **S**ONar (DIDSON) (sonar imaging technology) was installed April 8th and is up and running in the river. It is capturing good images, including harbor seals fishing and sockeye swimming right up to the lake. The DIDSON, and training, was acquired through an SRF Board grant.

- There is no disruption from lead nets other than the lead single line.
- DIDSON will ultimately replace the weir.
- Water temperature is being collected 200 yards downstream of the confluence with Coal Creek.
- DIDSON may be used to do spawning and ground surveys. NOAA funded researching methods for doing those surveys, which has led to an important refinement.

Hoko-Ozette Road Assessment and Consideration of a two tier Priority List

Tabled until County and Quileute representatives are present.

Discussion on Studies (CMER and new studies)

1. A Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Type N study would research how forest practices are protecting certain waters over a multi-year, pre-post controlled study. The only two sites for the study at this time are in the Peninsula, which is not enough for a full study. Landowners are being approached to participate (perhaps including DNR and The Nature Conservancy).
2. The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) is conducting a nationwide study looking at the relationship between turbidity and fish populations and will be monitoring water quality, sediment, fish movement, and several other indicators.
3. A third study was noted and is targeting extensive vegetation monitoring; it would use vegetation as a surrogate for temperature.

Comments and Discussion:

- It would be a good idea to have either a NCASI or CMER presentation at the next LOSC meeting.
- The vegetation monitoring study could use volunteers such as fly fisherman to collect data.
- The CMER study is attractive because it measures temperature against some distinction between what happens on the land versus what is impacted, while the NCASI study measures everything that happens at a site, so it is harder for the NCASI study to attribute causality.
- The Committee could draft a letter to DNR to request a presentation on CMER at an upcoming meeting; however the letter would need to be sent immediately because the CMER study is underway.
- Letters could come from the Committee as a whole, or letters could come from LOSC members individually, indicating that the writer of the letter is a LOSC member.
 - The Committee has not written a cooperative letter before and there may not be time for that process considering the time constraints; if letters are sent from individual members indicating that they are LOSC members, it suggests that the letters come from the Committee (yet they would not have LOSC approval).
- The Committee decided to draft a simple form letter with talking points and then distribute it to LOSC members to use when writing individual letters to DNR. The letter will request a CMER presentation at the next LOSC meeting. This would ideally happen before June 1st.
- Miles will take the letter to the CMER Subcommittee.
- Depending on the presentation, LOSC may decide to participate in the CMER study.
- The Committee decided to discuss the possibility of a NCASI presentation at the next LOSC meeting.

State of the Salmon Report

The Committee continued discussion of a controversial sentence/language in the State of the Salmon Report. The State of the Salmon Report is delivered to the legislature every two years. Previous editions

of the report have not included Lake Ozette, but the current version does. The LOSC developed language for the report, but because certain language did not completely meet the needs of the Committee, the page of the report regarding Lake Ozette was taken down from the website where the report is hosted.

Discussion and comments:

- One member commented that the sentence in question attempts to interpret the intent of the mission statement, which they felt is a mistake, and that the vision statement without that sentence sufficed.
- It was noted that some members were missing from the meeting, but that one reported by email that they approved of keeping the sentence in question.
- Other members voiced concern about leaving the sentence intact.
- One member noted that a previous suggestion included simply using what was already in the Recovery Plan without altering it (i.e. removing the sentence in question).
- The Committee decided to remove the sentence in question from the State of the Salmon Report.
- Miles will request that the State replace the page taken down from the host website with the sentence in question removed.

Predation Workgroup Update

The predation workgroup conference call went well, though a few individuals could not participate. On the call, the workgroup reviewed why the predation group was formed, which is partially in response to predation being highlighted as a Key Limiting Factor in the Recovery Plan. The workgroup discussed an ecosystem model of addressing the predation issue. The workgroup will investigate the best way to use that model on the next workgroup call and report-out to the LOSC at a future LOSC meeting. The workgroup will also continue to look for an eco-model that shows the lifecycle of sockeye and at what point predation impacts recovery. Input from other experts (who are not local) may be needed.

Discussion and comments:

- Yellowstone is facing problems similar to Lake Ozette and they may already have data they'd be willing share.
- Part of how Yellowstone deals with predation by fish is that non-native predator fish cannot be re-released if caught by a fisherman. Our Pikeminnow (predator fish) are native and further, people don't particularly enjoy catching them.
- The scope of the model is not completely understood. At first review, it looks to be a life-history model.
- The DIDSON may be able to provide predation information. We may want to find someone with DIDSON expertise to be involved in this part of the discussion, such as Pat Garron.
- This model should be the predation workgroup's primary focus for now.
- It would be good to know how the model is built and if local site-specific empirical data can be used as input. In general, how well can the model be calibrated is an important question.
- The ecosystem model will help LOSC identify what the right targets are.
- The community is interested in this project because community members want to help.
- The Committee decided to revisit the topic at the next LOSC meeting after the Predation Workgroup has time to learn more about the ecosystem model and address the discussion points raised by LOSC.

Public Outreach Subcommittee Update

West End Natural News article

Previously, a LOSC member drafted an article for submission to the West End Natural News, and it was subsequently requested that LOSC review and vet the article prior to its publication. The Committee discussed whether or not it was necessary for the article in question to go through the formal, approved process for reviewing draft products. Given that the first two paragraphs describe "the

role/function/history of the LOSC”, the Committee needed to decide if a formal review process was necessary (per Step #1 in the process).

- The Committee discussed if the best course of action would be to vet the article via the review process, or to change some of the language so that the article would not need to go through the review process.
- It was requested that one phrase be added to the first paragraph: “This past year, **in partnership with the Lake Ozette Steering Committee**, the tribe was able...” The LOSC agreed to this modification by consensus.
- The Committee ultimately decided that the article could be published as written without a formal review process, pending the one requested modification.

Note: Due to a concern raised after the meeting, the DIDSON section in the article was removed.

Conference call report out

A subcommittee representative gave a brief report on the public outreach conference call held on April 26, 2013. Call participants focused their discussion on posting a kiosk/wayside exhibit at Lake Ozette. It was noted that the kiosk at the Ranger Station was recently updated and that the purpose of that kiosk does not necessarily align with LOSC needs, so the group discussed alternative spaces for signage. The group proposed creating a doodle poll to set a date for a summertime field trip during which they would inspect possible signage locations. The signage would inform the public about sockeye and the local ecosystem.

Discussion and comments:

- The kiosk does not necessarily need to be located in the park; it could be located outside the park.
- Bulletin boards come with fewer regulations than kiosks do.
- One Committee expressed a desire for Hoko River State Park signage to be up at the sign-board and that information posted is about LOSC instead of coming attractions.
- Regarding interpretation, a guest at the LOSC meeting from University of Washington may be able to secure an internship through UW to be an interpretive agent at the lake for public outreach.
- The Committee decided to focus on wayside exhibits (inside or outside of the park) instead of on a kiosk.
- The Committee decided to hold a field trip in July to investigate potential wayside exhibit locations.
- Rich Osborne will see if a van can be provided for the field trip.
- There was a request for the subcommittee to report to LOSC with a presentation about what sort of outreach is feasible and associated timelines.

Oral History Project update

Peggy Foreman reported on updates from the Oral History Project. Several tribes did not participate in the project because oral histories are sacred, though two tribal elders were interviewed. Students created films to show the importance of sockeye and their relationships with the fish. On May 18th, videos from Forks High School (and hopefully Quileute Tribal School) will be highlighted at the North Pacific NRC annual BBQ. The Committee thanked Peggy for all of her hard work.

Discussion and comments:

- Currently, it is not possible to host the DVD of the student films on the NRC website, though that would be ideal.
- It may be possible to raise funds to take the schools on field trips to the lake.

Funding

- NOAA has a small amount of funding for conserving coastal fish habitat. Triangle will forward more information on this to the Committee.
- USFS is looking at stewardship contracting, which will allow for USFS to work with local stakeholder groups to apply timber sales revenue to habitat restoration. This could impact the lake.
- NPS Science Learning Network is offering a total of \$80,000 for seed money for projects within any of the Northwest parks, in grants of \$5,000 to \$10,000. This could be used for DIDSON or Cutthroat spawning surveys. These grants are available annually and are open for anyone to apply.
 - This could be used for a Cutthroat survey next year.
 - These grants could be of interest to Peninsula College as well.
- LOSC could put together a list of needs for Sockeye Recovery Research and post it on the NPS website.

Facilitation Funding

- There is currently enough funding for one more meeting this year.
- Miles will be requesting funds for the next two meetings within the next year.
- Extra funds (beyond what is required for facilitation) can be applied to public outreach; therefore, the LOSC can, if need be, demonstrate that the money is being used for multiple purposes.

Next Steps

- Triangle will produce the meeting summary and summary of action items.
- The next two LOSC meetings will be in September and late November / early December. In between, likely in July, Triangle will attempt to organize a field trip for the Public Outreach Subcommittee (and any interested LOSC members) to review signage locations.
- Tentative agenda items for the September meeting include:
 - NOAA's Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan
 - CMER Presentation
 - DIDSON Presentation
 - Predation Workgroup Update
 - Public Outreach Update
 - HB 1194 Review
 - Review need for NCASI Presentation

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1.	Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	360-289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
2.	Ed Bowen	Ozette Landowner		rockypt@olympen.com
3.	Chris Byrnes	WDFW	360-417-1426	chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov
4.	Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	360-565-3075	patrick_crain@nps.gov
5.	Peggy Foreman	NMFS, NWRO	206-930-8840	peggy.foreman@noaa.gov
6.	Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	503-231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
7.	Tim Tynan	NMFS	360-753-9579	Tim.tynam@noaa.gov
8.	Scott Rumsey	NOAA Fisheries	503-872-2791	Scott.rumsey@noaa.gov
9.	Tim Sears	UW Student	360-640-9316	tssears@uw.edu
10.	Stephanie Martin	Makah	360-645-3173	stephanie.martin@makah.com
11.	Roy Morris	Clallam Bay/Sekiu Lions	360-963-2442	able@olympen.com
12.	Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	360-460-3733	jmurray@merrillring.com
13.	Rich Osborne	UW Odegaard Writing & Research Center	360-374-4560	osborner@uw.edu

14.	Al Voner	Olympic National Park	360-963-2725	al_voner@nps.gov
15.	Chris Page	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	
16.	Sarah Saviskas	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	ssaviskas@triangleassociates.com
17.	Alan Foster	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	afoster@triangleassociates.com

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 September 4, 2013, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
 Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To discuss the LOSC consensus decision-making process, Near Term Projects, Landowner Liability Legislation, Steering Committee outreach activities, project funding sources, and next steps for the Steering Committee.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Optional “Meet & Greet” with snacks (for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review agenda and materials • Review May 9 meeting summary—any changes? • Review Ground Rules (Scott Rumsey) • Updates and announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public Comment received ○ LOSC email distribution list ○ Predation Workgroup ○ Report from the Lake and/or tributaries? ○ Status of NOAA Resource Management Plan (RMP) update ○ Others? 	-Draft agenda -May 9, 2013 draft meeting summary -Ground Rules -Email distribution list
10:45 a.m.	Consensus Decision-Making Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background from Triangle • Discuss and make preliminary decision on model that works best for LOSC (final decision will be made at next meeting) • Clarify: on Admin Team calls—others can speak, but Admin Team members are decision-makers 	-Options for Consensus Decision-Making
11:30 a.m.	Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List (NTPL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next steps for CMER presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note: NCASI presentation on Coho can happen, but likely not until Fall 2014 • DIDSON update • Other updates from project leads • Consideration of a two tier Priority List (add “Projects of Interest”) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarify purpose of NTPL—living document with actionable projects that will help sockeye; projects that can realistically be done in near-term to help sockeye; or other? ○ Hoko-Ozette Road Assessment—status and next steps 	-Near-Term Priority List -CMER draft letter
12:30 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List (NTPL) (continued)	-Near-Term Priority List

Time	Item	Materials
1:45 p.m.	Briefing on Landowner Liability Legislation (RCO Representative) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q&A and Discussion 	-House Bill 1194
2:15 p.m.	Public Outreach Subcommittee Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Trip/conference call report out • Oral history project update • Action items & next steps 	-Public Outreach Subcommittee call summary
2:45 p.m.	Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications submitted? New sources? • Update on facilitation funding 	-Near-Term Priority List
3:00 p.m.	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of action items • Next meeting date (Nov/early Dec) / agenda topics? 	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
September 4, 2013, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Decisions List:

- Approved the May 2013 meeting summary with suggested edits.
- Agreed to maintain a safe environment for discussion.
- From now on, the agendas will note whether an agenda topic is a decision item.
- For the consensus decision-making process, Committee members generally opposed the options of: having all decisions made at the meeting final and having no timeline for expressing concerns about decisions made at meetings. They agreed to rule out those two options and consider the other two as a hybrid option at the next meeting. LOSC members are encouraged to send the facilitators examples for those options.
- Triangle will include the Meeting Decisions List (in the body of the email) when the draft meeting summary is sent (as an attachment).
- The Committee gave the Public Outreach Subcommittee approval to organize a fish viewing event in October or November.

Introductions, Agenda review, and Meeting Summary Review

Sarah Saviskas, Triangle Associates, welcomed the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC or “the Committee”), and LOSC members introduced themselves (*see Attachment I*). The facilitator reviewed the agenda and asked the Committee for any requested revisions. One Committee member requested that the NOAA Resource Management Plan (RMP) update and Predation Workgroup agenda topics receive more time at a subsequent meeting. The facilitator explained that the Predation Workgroup has not had a conference call between the May and September LOSC meetings, which is why it did not receive more time in the agenda, and that a NOAA representative would update the Committee on the RMP update at this meeting.

The Committee considered the May 2013 draft meeting summary, and the facilitator noted that Triangle would add a note to the section on the *West End Natural Resources News* article to reflect that the DIDSON section was removed after the meeting due to concerns. One LOSC member asked for clarification of the difference between signage and exhibits, since previous documents replace “signage” with “wayside exhibits.” It was explained that the Park uses “wayside exhibits” for official signs. One Committee member requested more time to review the summary due to potential concerns, so the Committee reconsidered the summary at the end of the meeting. At that point, the Committee had resolved the outstanding questions and approved the May LOSC meeting summary with the suggested edits.

Ground Rules

Scott Rumsey, NOAA Fisheries, discussed the importance of having a respectful environment at meetings in which LOSC members hold each other to mutual expectations. As a co-convenor, NOAA has a responsibility to ensure a respectful, professional, civil, and safe environment at LOSC meetings. He asked that the Committee consider and approve the draft ground rules presented by the facilitator. If the Committee is unable to agree to ground rules and foster this type of environment, NOAA might take action to further ensure the safety of all people working towards Lake Ozette sockeye recovery, including moving the meeting location to a secured building in Port Angeles or ending the NOAA financial sponsorship of facilitation services. The representative from the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon

Partnership (WCSSP) explained that he also has an obligation to his Board to use the LOSC sponsorship funds in a responsible manner.

The facilitator presented the draft ground rules for discussion, which include ground rules for both participants and the facilitator. These were developed from an earlier set of broad ground rules that LOSC considered and other ground rules that the facilitator has used successfully with other groups. The hope was to preliminarily approve the ground rules at this meeting, allow for further consideration, and approve them at a subsequent meeting.

Comments & Discussion

- In the past (January 2010), the Committee had considered ground rules but they were never formally adopted by the Committee.
- The Committee considered how long to discuss an issue, since LOSC is ultimately focused on progressing recovery issues. One LOSC member suggested that there be a hand signal when Committee members believe an issue has been discussed enough and are ready to make a decision or move on. Another member suggested that it is important for the facilitator to check in with the group to see if everyone feels a given conversation is relevant or if the group should move on.
- A LOSC member suggested that since the facilitator's role is to keep the group on track, the participants should respect the facilitator's authority to guide off-track conversations back to the topic at hand. The facilitator can use a "parking lot" list to keep track of conversations that are not germane to the agenda but are important to consider at a later date.
- One suggestion was if a small number of people are really interested in a topic, LOSC can ask them to form an ad-hoc subcommittee to consider that topic in detail and report back.
- A LOSC member expressed concern about operating under formal ground rules.
- After some discussion about whether the draft ground rules should apply to this meeting or not, the facilitator asked the group to agree to maintain a safe environment for discussion. In between this and the next meeting, the facilitator will work with individual Committee members to develop a list of draft ground rules that will have more support. The facilitator will provide a revised draft to LOSC members at least one week prior to the next meeting.

Public Comment

Triangle keeps a log of public comments, though there have not been many throughout the years. A public comment was submitted in May; this comment focused on the lack of progress by the Committee. This brought up the larger question of where information is archived, such as the public comments. Though WCSSP had a hiccup in their archival LOSC information, they are willing to continue to archive. The question of what to do with the public comments and if responses are merited, which will be a discussion topic at a subsequent meeting.

LOSC Email Distribution List

The facilitator reviewed a handout reflecting the current email distribution list with highlighted names of those who attended at least one meeting since 2011.

Comments and Discussion

- Some email addresses have changed, though the facilitator receives no "bounce back" emails. It is possible that those people have their emails forwarded to another email address which is why there is no "bounce back."
- It was noted that some individuals have moved on or may have retired.
- There are a few organizations that are not represented on the list who should be receiving information.

- Committee members are asked to email the facilitator regarding which contacts to edit, remove, invite to be added to the list, or follow up with regarding if they want to stay on the list.

Predation Workgroup

No meetings or work has happened since the May 2013 LOSC meeting. Pat Crain hopes to organize another conference call for the Predation Workgroup sometime this fall. Though there has not been any progress over the summer, there is still a desire to keep moving because this is a big issue. The facilitator will follow up with Pat to help keep it moving.

Report from the Lake and/or tributaries

- Quite a few visitors and landowners have noticed a seal population presence.
- A fish kill happened on bullhead catfish (a non-native species). It lasted for about three weeks in late June or early July, and about 20 dead fish were discovered on the beach.
- The phragmites have grown considerably this summer and are now competing with bearded iris.
- Last year, the Park installed thermographs for water and air temperature and collected habitat and benthic insect information. This summer, the Park found all the thermographs so they have a year's worth of temperature information, and they can redo the habitat and benthic insect information.
- Harry Bell (Green Crow) has about five years' worth of sediment data from the area. He provided handouts for the Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans (RMAP) projects that Green Crow has done, mostly in the Coal Creek drainage. He suggests doing a field trip in the middle of winter (rainiest time) so LOSC can see where the water is.
- Makah is in the process of analyzing data from Umbrella Creek.

Status of NOAA Resource Management Plan (RMP) update

There have been no meetings or progress on the RMP update yet. The RMP will continue because it does not have a "sunset provision". The tribe will inform NOAA if they want to continue the Plan, and it is more an opportunity to check in about the RMP than make major revisions it. The RMP update is a key action to reestablishing the tributary spawners.

Comment: There was a request for NOAA Fisheries to clarify whether it intends to do a public process, what the timeline will be, and who the main point of contact is for this process. NOAA will follow up with this person individually.

Consensus Decision-Making Process

The facilitator explained that a concern was raised by someone absent at the last meeting about a decision. To help clarify the process to reduce confusion in the future, Triangle developed some questions for LOSC to consider about how to make long-lasting consensus decisions. The facilitator then walked the group through the graphic handout.

Comments and Discussion

- Topics can drag on if there is no deadline for a decision. The group has struggled with this in the past because Committee members are interested in being flexible to consider complex issues but also having the ability to make quick decisions when there is a tight timeline.
- It was noted that while LOSC is an ad-hoc committee that does not make binding decisions, LOSC can help support issues if there is consensus. If an individual or individual agency needs to move forward with something, they can do so regardless of the Committee's actions. The Committee strives to seek consensus, but that may not always be possible in given timelines.

- There is a difference between products that refer to the LOSC and products that are written by someone who is on LOSC but reflect personal views. The “Process for Review of Products” document outlines what kinds of products going out to the public need to be vetted by the group.
- Sometimes a decision item commits a member to do something, and if that member is not present at the decision-making meeting, it may turn out that he/she is unable to follow through on that decision. This is why having an ability to revisit a decision is important.
- It was determined that in addition to including the Meeting Decisions List at the beginning of the meeting summary, Triangle will also include it in the body of the email when it sends out the draft meeting summary (as an attachment).
- It was suggested that Triangle combine two options into one broader option for the consensus decision-making process. If there is a deadline associated with the decision, the concern should be worked out via email within 30 days after the meeting. If there is no deadline, the concern can be worked out via email or at the next meeting.
- Triangle will present the revised process at the next meeting. LOSC members are encouraged to send the facilitators examples for those options.

Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List (NTPL)

DIDSON Update

Dual frequency Identification SONar (DIDSON) (sonar imaging technology) was taken out of the river. There are four sets of data: the DIDSON before the weir, alongside the weir, independent sampling, and while the weir was out. They had some software issues that backed up viewing/analysis, and now they are in the fourth generation of the software.

Comments and Discussion

- One Committee member asked if Makah could do more sampling once the rains come to collect any data for late run sockeye. If that’s too costly, there could be other options:
 - Do only one week of sampling.
 - Ask the Washington Clean Coast Alliance to do citizen observation during their annual clean-up in two weeks.
- Makah is currently completing the grant reporting requirements, so once they complete that process, they can let the Committee know if there are available funds.
- A Committee member noted that the Navy may be interested in supporting their projects.
- The Park just purchased a similar software system as the DIDSON so once they have trained their staff there could be a potential for troubleshooting collaboration.

Big River Abutment Removal and Floodplain Restoration

Merrill & Ring and Makah have pulled out the abutment and all the trees on both banks and put down straw. In the complex ecosystem, they are trying to allow native species to thrive, including treating and burying knotweed. The project is nearly complete.

Crooked Creek: Road 5800 Bridge Replacement

The bridge has been ordered and is scheduled for delivery in early October. Merrill & Ring and Makah hope to go forward with placing the bridge (weather permitting), otherwise they will wait until next year. They hope to go forward with the road construction, though the plan is to keep the old railroad piling intact.

Basin-Wide Invasive Weed Assessment

The Park just received the request for proposals for internal Park funding. Last year, they had put together a proposal for invasive weeds Park-wide, including Lake Ozette. Steve Acker will try to revive that proposal and resubmit.

Comments and Discussion

- Quileute just wrote a grant for treating invasive weeds (submitted but not yet funded). In general, private landowners and DNR are not able to keep up with the spread of invasive weeds and rely on grant projects by others.
- The Park's Dan Campbell (invasive weeds lead) is working with the County and timber companies to reduce the spread of invasive weeds and exotic plants.
- One Committee member asked that Steve Acker consider how to re-vegetate when the Park removes invasive weeds.
- It was noted that there is a lot of morning glory and knotweed in Big River.
- The Committee discussed the potential of having a GIS map with each species being a different layer. It is important to see where each species is individually but also how they interact across the landscape.
- In the past, Makah has put out public articles or posters showing photos of invasive weeds and asked people to contact Makah if they see that plant. If this were done again, it could help with a mapping effort as well as teaching the public how to deal with these weeds on their own property.
- The Clallam County Noxious Weed Control Board acts as an information clearinghouse for each invasive species. LOSC is interested in continuing to provide that information to the County and having them serve as a communal data collector.
 - It was suggested that the County add a place on their website for landowners to indicate how they want to be contacted by the County for information about invasive weeds.
- LOSC discussed the importance of ongoing treatment and education, since the weeds are so pervasive.
- It would be helpful to have information about each invasive species added to fishing pamphlets so boaters can better understand what to look for.

(A LOSC member indicated after the meeting that WDFW has a flyer on this already, available at: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00713/wdfw00713.pdf>.)

Egg Survival Study (RME-18)

The Park will submit a proposal for the incubation survival on the lake's spawning beaches to the Park's NRPP program for funding in 2019.

Predator Investigation (RME-5)

The Park will try to acquire funding through USGS.

CMER Study

Harry Bell has tried to reach out to see if this study can happen somewhere in the Ozette basin, but has not heard back from anyone related to CMER. LOSC members are encouraged to email DNR to find out why this study will not include the Ozette basin and if CMER could present on this project at the next LOSC meeting.

Comments and Discussion on NTPL

A lot of progress has been made on many near-term projects, which should be celebrated. This may also mean that some near-term projects will be complete, which could allow space for some projects from the master list to move up instead of creating a 2-tier project list.

- A limiting factor is that there are not enough people willing to volunteer to lead the projects. If there is funding for a project but no sponsor, the project cannot move forward.
- One Committee member suggested that LOSC invite the Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition (PCSC) to consider projects in the Ozette basin and that they could send a representative to participate in LOSC. The Committee agreed that it would be good to include the PCSC on the LOSC email distribution list. Rich Osborne and Rosemary Furfey will work together to invite them.

- It was also suggested that a LOSC member join the North Olympic Salmon Coalition Board.

Briefing on Landowner Liability Legislation

At the last LOSC meeting, the Committee discussed the need to explore how the new legislation would impact LOSC Recovery Actions. Brian Abbott and Kat Moore from the Recreation & Conservation Office (RCO) joined via conference call, as RCO is developing guidance to implement this legislation, to try to address LOSC questions and concerns.

Questions, Explanation, and Discussion

- *Question:* Does a landowner need to hire a geologist or engineer for a project that does not involve instream construction (i.e., controls weeds or is an assessment or acquisition), because those are considered habitat projects? *Response:* The engineer/geologist is required only for the liability coverage, and projects that are weed control, acquisition, or assessment probably have less of a liability risk.
- *Question:* How does one comply with the mandate to include all the listed people in the lead entity? *Response:* As long as you have reached out to the people on the list, you have met the intent of the “shall” clause about including everyone in a lead entity.
- *Question:* What is the liability for the funder? *Response:* The Attorney General’s office outlined that the sponsor carries almost all of the liability.
- *Question:* How should one measure the length and diameter of the logs? *Response:* It is not clear to RCO how to interpret the size; if the log is in question, err on the side of tagging it since it should be in protection of the landowner.
- *Question:* Is there a plan to establish a WAC for this legislation? *Response:* RCO will find out and follow up with LOSC.
- *Question:* Could a landowner or contractor, be it a governmental agency or NGO (who does not have a specific interest in the land), be relieved of liability for a project? *Response:* They have not identified a plan yet but will follow up with LOSC.
- *Question:* Are federal landowners (i.e., US Forest Service) able to get compensation if a landowner causes property damage through a restoration project?
- *Question:* What is the plan for public outreach of this legislation? *Response:* There is no process outlined right now for public outreach; RCO expects that the sponsors will do that. RCO will get back to LOSC with more specifics as they develop.
- *Question:* What happens to projects that are not funded by the SRF Board, such as a tribe which has not waived sovereign immunity? *Response:* As long as the project is on the Habitat Work Schedule, it should be eligible for landowner exemption. RCO will follow up with LOSC about the sovereign immunity question.
- One LOSC member voiced a concern that RCO staff interpretation may not protect the sponsor from liability as would a clear directive from a statutory amendment or regulation. Staff changes can result in changes regarding application of the law.

Items for RCO to communicate back to LOSC:

- Whether or not there is a plan to develop a WAC from this legislation.
- Whether a landowner or contractor (such as a governmental agency or NGO without a specific interest in the land) can be relieved of liability for a project.
- The plan for public outreach to educate about this new legislation.
- The ability for a tribe that has not waived sovereign immunity to still receive landowner liability coverage.

RCO will keep the Committee informed as it goes through this process. RCO also encouraged LOSC members to talk with sponsors about their liability when they sponsor projects. One Committee member

noted that it is unclear how the liability will address something that the state is starting to incorporate (such as floodways). These questions can be considered when LOSC reviews the master list again.

Public Outreach Subcommittee Update

The Subcommittee is now focused on wayside exhibit signs. This is a specific term to mean the signs are posted on a slant so that they explain the view just beyond the sign.

The field trip in July went well and they stopped at many locations where signs could be useful.

- The state is making a more permanent bulletin board that will explain things to do or see in the area, and they can laminate the LOSC brochure and post it there.
- The Big River abutment site is a great place to have a sign with before and after pictures. The landowner has agreed to a sign there.
- The Umbrella Creek site owner (Forterra) suggested that since that land is in a temporary hold, it may be better not to do anything with that land right now.
- The Park could have a slanted sign on the Ozette River bridge.
- The Subcommittee would like to move forward with developing two new signs at Big River and Ozette River.
 - One Committee member noted that the Big River site is a better one to focus on in the short term.
 - The RCO might help support a sign at Big River, which a LOSC member is exploring.
 - The Park could have a furlough employee do the interpretative work. Getting approval for a sign at Ozette River could take 5-10 years. The process for a sign at Big River would be much faster since it's on Merrill & Ring land. This would just be a pull-out with a sign but no bathrooms or picnic tables.

The Public Outreach Subcommittee would like to sponsor a fish-viewing event this fall, and hopefully make it a destination event every fall. This year they can start with one day of activities, sometime in late October or early November. The Park can put information on their website to encourage participation.

- It was noted that there will be a fire prevention campaign happening on October 12th, so that could be a good date since there will be other community activities happening as well.
- The Public Outreach Subcommittee got approval from LOSC to pull together an event like this.

Lastly, Peggy Foreman noted that it would be great for LOSC members to promote the Lake Ozette Schools Project as much as possible. People are encouraged to talk to Peggy if they know people and/or schools in the community who would be interested. One member suggested reaching out to the homeschool community.

Next Steps

Tentative agenda items for the November/December meeting include:

- How to best deal with public comments
- Consider RCO's responses to the landowner liability legislation
- Revisit the consensus decision-making process
- Hear from the Outreach Subcommittee how the October/November fish viewing event went
- Hear from CMER about the study, if DNR and Ecology respond to LOSC members' requests
- Report on recovery actions and other activities

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1.	Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	360-289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
2.	Harry Bell	Green Crow	360-452-3325	harry@greencrow.com
3.	Ed Bowen	Ozette Citizen		rockypt@olypen.com
4.	Kim Clark	Makah Tribe		Kim.clark@makah.com
5.	Larry Cooke	Makah Tribe	360-640-1144	Larry.cooke@makah.com
6.	Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	360-565-3075	patrick_crain@nps.gov
7.	Gerald Dahlby		951-321-9351	gcdahlby@aol.com
8.	Peggy Foreman	NOAA Fisheries	206-930-8840	peggy.foreman@noaa.gov
9.	Rosemary Furfey	NOAA Fisheries	503-231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
10.	Katie Krueger	Quileute	360-374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
11.	Scott Rumsey	NOAA Fisheries	503-872-2791	Scott.rumsey@noaa.gov
12.	Stephanie Martin	Makah Tribe	360-645-3173	stephanie.martin@makah.com
13.	Roy Morris	Clallam Bay/Sekiu Lions	360-963-2442	able@olypen.com
14.	Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	360-460-3733	jmurray@merrillring.com
15.	Rich Osborne	UW Odegaard Writing & Research Center	360-374-4560	osborner@uw.edu
16.	Sarah Saviskas	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	ssaviskas@triangleassociates.com
17.	Claire Turpel	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	cturpel@triangleassociates.com