

**Draft Agenda**  
**Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting**  
January 22, 2009  
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Hall

**Meeting Purpose:** to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the April 29, 2008 meeting, review the summarized comments from the 60-day public comment period (ended on June 23, 2008), hear an update from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center's RITT, and explore the next steps and responsibilities for the recovery plan.

<b>Time</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Materials</b>
10:00 a.m.	<b>Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements</b>	
10:10 a.m.	<b>Review and Acceptance of April 29, 2008 Meeting Notes</b>	- April 29, 2008 Meeting Summary
10:15 a.m.	<b>Status Updates and activities since the April 29, 2008 Steering Committee meeting</b>	- Updated Recovery Plan Timeline
10:45 a.m.	<b>Recovery Plan: Comments from the Public and Peer Review Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introduction and overview of public comment review process</li><li>• Highlights of response to comments and changes to the Plan, LFA, and TRT documents</li><li>• Steering Committee questions, comments &amp; dialogue</li><li>• Next steps to finalizing all documents</li></ul>	- Proposed Recovery Plan (CDs, recovery plan summary) - Draft Peer Review Summary - NMFS Comment Responses - draft LFA
12:00 p.m.	<b>Lunch</b>	
12:30 p.m.	<b>Recovery Plan: Comments from the Public and Peer Review Committee (cont.)</b>	- See above
1:30 p.m.	<b>Northwest Fisheries Science Center Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Report on changes to draft TRT population and viability documents</li><li>• Report on peer review and RITT review process</li><li>• Report back on abundance planning targets</li></ul>	- Viability Criteria - Draft Peer Review Summary - See above
2:20 p.m.	<b>Steering Committee Discussion About Next Steps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Next steps</li><li>• Implementation</li></ul>	- Updated Recovery Plan Timeline
3:00 p.m.	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**Facilitator's Meeting Summary**  
**Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting**  
 Thursday, Jan. 22, 2009, 10:00 am – 3:00 pm  
 Sekiu Community Center, Sekiu, WA

**Meeting Purpose**

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the April 29, 2008 meeting,
- to review the summarized comments from the 60-day public comment period (ended on June 23, 2008),
- to hear an update from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center's Technical Recovery Team (TRT)/Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT), and
- to explore the next steps and responsibilities for the recovery plan.

**Participants at the Meeting**

The list of meeting participants is attached to this summary.

**Action Items**

- Triangle Associates will set a final Steering Committee under the planning stages of recovery planning with meeting participants on potential meeting dates: **March 9** and **13**.  
*Update: March 9* was chosen.
- John Miller will work with Clallam County staff to get up-to-date parcel information and supply the information to National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).
- Triangle Associates will circulate revised implementation questions electronically.

*Update on next meeting presentations with details in parentheses*

<u>Presentation attendance confirmed –</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (yes; will additionally provide operational funding info)</li> <li>▪ NMFS (yes)</li> <li>▪ Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (yes)</li> <li>▪ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (yes)</li> <li>▪ Representatives of the timber industry (yes; Harry Bell and Norm Schaaf will coordinate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quileute Tribe (yes)</li> <li>▪ Department of Natural Resources (yes)</li> <li>▪ Non-landowner and non-agency participant (yes)</li> <li>▪ Olympic National Park (yes; Pat Crain will inquire about representative)</li> <li>▪ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (yes)</li> </ul>
<u>Presentation attendance to be confirmed/contacted –</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Makah Tribe (will be contacted)</li> <li>▪ Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (Rosemary Furfey will contact a representative)</li> <li>▪ Department of Ecology (Rosemary Furfey will contact a representative)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Private landowners (Depends on landowner response)</li> <li>▪ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Rosemary Furfey will contact a representative)</li> </ul>

### **Introductions, Review Agenda**

Facilitator Bob Wheeler reviewed the agenda and explained the purpose of the Steering Committee meeting. He also noted that including this meeting, only two meetings remain before current NMFS funding ends.

### **Announcements**

Ed Bowen expressed his concern that there has been a large time gap since the April 2008 meeting. Bob Wheeler recognized that this was also a concern for NMFS and stated that the future Steering Committee meeting would occur hopefully in one or two months.

Ed Bowen inquired if public comment would be accepted at this meeting. Rosemary Furfey responded and clarified the meeting's purpose and goals: to help fill the gaps, and to clarify facts or any previously submitted comments. She wanted to underscore that the public comment period has closed, but this meeting offered people an opportunity to correct any errors or to refine their comments made to the Proposed Recovery Plan.

Harry Bell asked for a clarification about how long people might have to submit comments on their comments. Rosemary replied that there would be two weeks to make comments.

### **Review and Acceptance of April 29, 2008 Meeting Notes**

Following Bob Wheeler's request to the Steering Committee for any comments or clarifications, Ed Bowen clarified a comment that he had sent to Blake Trask about a request for recovery plan development information from NMFS and "attorney-client privilege." Rosemary Furfey explained that two types of information exist. The first, pre-decisional information is part of the determination process when developing the Proposed Recovery Plan and is not available for public review. The second type of information is the administrative record, which includes the various drafts of recovery planning documents. The latter is available and the information in the administrative record could be requested. Ed Bowen asked that the "attorney client privilege" reference be removed from the meeting summary. Bob Wheeler said it would be. In addition, Norm Schaaf asked to correctly spell "Oregon" in reference to Oregon Coho.

With the suggested edits, the meeting notes were then approved.

### **Status Updates and activities since the April 29, 2008 Steering Committee meeting**

Rosemary Furfey reported that the two May 2008 public meetings had a good turn out (while overall numbers were not overwhelming, turnout equaled that of open houses for recovery plans that spanned a larger area) and she thanked the Steering Committee members for their attendance, support, and input. Since June 23, 2008 comment period had ended that NMFS staff have been busy and worked to provide periodic progress reports to the Steering Committee.

Rosemary Furfey thanked the NMFS team for their hard work and supporting staff, including Triangle, RITT, and Clallam County staff for their support, review of, and assistance in distributing the Recovery Plan documents.

### **Recovery Plan: Comments from the Public and Peer Review Committee**

Rosemary Furfey referred to the document titled "Updated Schedule and Key Steering Committee Agenda Items." She estimated that the process and finalization of the Recovery Plan would take about two months. It will then be made available on the Clallam County and NMFS Internet sites. Rosemary noted that every comment had been taken seriously and that several comments led to changes to the Recovery Plan. NMFS received comments from twenty individuals (including

tribes, state, and federal agencies), and from five members of the independent peer review process organized by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. All comments were compiled and included in the “Draft Response to Comments” document. In response to a question if peer review comments were separated from the general comments or if they were combined, Rosemary confirmed the latter.

Rosemary requested that the Steering Committee review the “Draft Response to Comments” document and provide her with any clarifications or comments within two weeks. The two-week deadline for commenting on the “Draft Response to Comments” document would end on February 9, 2009.

In response to a question about how the Recovery Plan’s five-year update would interact with the adaptive management plan (which will be written following the publication of the Recovery Plan), Rosemary noted that the adaptive management plan could indeed affect the Recovery Plan, but that a 5-year review is always required by NMFS.

In response to a question on how NMFS addressed and responded to comments, Rosemary explained that public comments were batched by comment topic area. 219 specific comments to the Proposed Recovery Plan were made. The topics were subsequently categorized and NMFS worked closely with Norma Jean Sands and the TRT/RITT to update the viability criteria. The six documents included in this review process included:

- Draft response to comments
- Updated viability criteria
- Peer review of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan
- Redline RP draft
- Draft Limiting Factors Analysis
- Keys to understanding

To clarify what distinguished a redline edit draft, Rosemary noted that such a draft contained strikeouts and that these marked edits offered a useful way for people to track where changes had been made following the previous draft. Phil Miller clarified that the federal register posting included the Proposed Recovery Plan, Limiting Factors Analysis, and Viability Criteria and that these documents formed a combined publication for review and comment by the public.

Rosemary Furfey then reviewed highlights from the Response to Comments document. The following provides a listing of Steering Committee questions and dialogue. Rosemary indicated that she and the writing team would consider the input from the Steering Committee and make appropriate final changes to the Recovery Plan and supporting documents as necessary, as long as there was the understanding by the Steering Committee that such changes would be made to help clarify or correct what is being said in the existing documents:

#### *Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan*

Criticisms were made about an overreliance on the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in the Proposed Recovery Plan. A response to this comment explained that NMFS had approved this HCP and NMFS’s view was that taken together with the Proposed Recovery Plan, the Forest Practices HCP represents a path toward sockeye salmon recovery. Don Hamerquist commented on page 96, comment 7.1, “the effects of the implementation of HCP are soon to be satisfactory.” He noted that the water quality criteria have not been met, the requirements for adequate staffing have not been met, and they will likely fall short given current economic conditions. He added he was not sure how the response could assume satisfactory conditions.

### *Critical Habitat Designations*

Comments about critical habitat designations were made. One commenter asked, “why was certain habitat included in that designation?” Based on this comment NMFS sought to clarify what defined critical habitat and its relationship to private landowners. Specifically, critical habitat relates to federal actions, and doesn’t affect private lands unless an explicit partnership exists. The response to comments sought to add language to best clarify this point.

- If critical habitat designations were amended, the Recovery Plan would be changed and the Recovery Plan would need to go through an additional public process.
- Pat Crain noted that he did not see anything in the Proposed Recovery Plan about county designations. Critical Area Ordinances are tied to the critical habitat designations.

### *Fishery and Harvesting*

In response to a question about whether the Recovery Plan goals are focused on establishing a commercial sockeye salmon fishery, it was noted that the stated intent was to delist sockeye. If sockeye abundance increased, an evaluation by managers would be conducted to determine if a commercial fishery could be possible.

Pat Ness asked about subsistence harvesting and if that related to this commercial fishery. Pat Crain added that Olympic National Park staff does not see the Recovery Plan affecting the Boldt decision. Kurt Hughes noted that if a fishery were possible negotiations would occur on an annual basis as they currently do. Katie Krueger clarified that the tribes have fishing rights and they need to be brought into the discussion for any actions taken that affect fish.

Pat Ness asked about the segment on tribal rights on page 62, “tribes will be considered when concerning the cultural and social and economic needs.” Rosemary said that NMFS chose to err on the side of inclusivity and the intent would be to hold a broad discussion with stakeholders. Katie Krueger also spoke about the role of the tribe in economics – anything that would affect water quality would ultimately affect the fish and the tribes would be at the table.

### *Large Wood Placement*

While the Proposed Recovery Plan refers to large wood placement at several locations within the basin, the Proposed Recovery Plan specifically states no large wood would be placed in the upper portion of the Ozette River (the upper 1.3-mile portion of the Ozette River was determined as the point that would, from a hydrologic standpoint, likely affect lake levels). The analysis that showed this to be the reach that affects the lake level was from studies conducted by Herrera. Additional discussions, included:

- Pat Ness asked for a clarification about the phrase on page 21 of the Response to Comments document, “paying landowners to move their homes out of the floodzone.” Rosemary Furfey explained that future studies cannot anticipate what research or scenarios would look like. Pat Ness indicated that there is a possibility that following future studies, large wood placement would occur.
- Pat Crain said that for large wood placement either on the lakeshore or in the Ozette River, Olympic National Park would conduct an analysis and evaluation. Olympic National Park would include as part of this and any decisions a public process. Ultimately, the Park Superintendent would make the final decision on large wood placement, and that depending on the impacts determine if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required. Regardless, surrounding property owners would be consulted.
- Pat Crain noted that the Park’s position on wood removal is that the lakeshore and river should be managed for natural processes. One potential exception could be addressing the

sediment plug. If it was determined that the plug was caused by an anthropogenic process, it could be managed.

- Pat Ness expressed a concern about landowner impacts, and that flooding did not address the “take” with the loss of landowner’s property, in addition to their cabins. Rosemary noted that there were several locations in the Proposed Recovery Plan that discussed take and that NMFS legal council had been consulted. Pat Ness noted that research could result in a take, even if it did not occur on her property. Rosemary indicated that that issue might be beyond the scope of the Recovery Plan. Bob Wheeler suggested that a clarifying comment be added to the text of the Recovery Plan stating that landowners be notified if their property was being directly or indirectly affected.

#### *Predators/Predation*

Based on comments, various comments and modifications were made to the predator sections and additional research and monitoring suggestions for pinipeds and fish predation were made.

Pat Crain noted that Olympic National Park has management concerns that differ from private lands. He added that some the responses to comments made by NMFS would not pass through the Park’s review process (e.g., a metal weir at the mouth of the Ozette River). Tim Tynan said the responses attempted to provide new solutions. Pat Crain said that this topic also was a concern because the weir would border the Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.

#### *Landowner Issues*

Pat Ness pointed out an inaccuracy about the Umbrella Reach research section and noted that her private land is actually referenced as National Park land. In response, John Miller offered to go back to Clallam County to review ownership issues and pass the information to NMFS. Pat Ness said that the county parcel maps were not developed for this type of legal scrutiny. Ed Bowen suggested Rick Wagoner, the Olympic National Park realtor, as an excellent contact for researching property issues.

#### *Research*

Pat Crain highlighted that Olympic National Park recently administered a research permit to a University of Washington graduate student, Aaron Brooks. The Park used a landowner permission template developed by the State of Washington for private landowners to enter into agreements with researchers. Pat Ness used this template for Aaron Brooks’ research that would occur on her private property. She also noted that such an approach addressed her liability concerns.

Pat Ness reiterated that many landowners are supportive of the Recovery Plan, but have liability and ownership concerns. She felt good about Aaron Brooks’ research and saw this as a big step in bridging the divide between research and landowners. She complimented Pat Crain on his help. Ed Bowen said that this has been a huge success story and said that he hoped it would be a model as the Recovery Plan moves forward. The Steering Committee discussed Aaron Brooks presenting his research at the next meeting, and Ed Bowen requested that Aaron Brooks present any preliminary results.

A suggestion was made to help determine historical abundance by looking at lake sediment core samples. This has been added to the research topics section. Ed Bowen asked that this topic be included as an educational activity at a future Steering Committee meeting. Mike Haggerty noted that the chances of success would be about 10% because of the high nitrogen rates in Lake Ozette (Alaskan lake core samples are more successful because there is less nitrogen present).

In response to a question about acidification and its effect on Lake Ozette, Rosemary said that NMFS would encourage partnerships with other agencies monitor parameters like Ph levels. Pat Crain noted that some monitoring occurs now. For other water quality concerns, high mercury concentrations in Lake Ozette were mentioned as an issue. As a result of this discussion, Rosemary indicated that she would consider adding a section titled “other additional research topics” to include actions related to emerging issues, such as mercury contamination.

Additional research discussions at the meeting included:

- Ed Bowen discussed the sediment plug and mentioned that the assistant deputy director of the Northwest Region of NMFS, Rob Walton, had previously said that NMFS would develop research to address the plug. He added that he did not believe a model is research.
- Another topic raised in the Proposed Recovery Plan public comment period was to use river camera data to identify the hatchery fin clip ratio. NMFS staff wants to follow up on the viability work.
- One commenter wrote that beach spawning should be reviewed. NMFS agrees.

#### *Limiting Factors*

Pat Ness had asked about the apparent difference between the Olympic National Park Management Plan, which said the sockeye salmon had crashed before significant timber harvesting, and the limiting factors in the Proposed Recovery Plan. Don Hamerquist noted that the factors that limit sockeye recovery now are not the same issues that resulted in the overall fisheries decline in the 1950s. Tim Tynan said that something happened in the 1950s that led to a crash of sockeye salmon. He noted that this crash was coincidental with the removal of wood from the rivers, but no data exists to confirm or refute this hypothesis.

In addition, several limiting factors not originally included were identified in the public comment period. Some new research topics have been added based on these suggestions.

#### *General Questions Related to the Recovery Planning Process*

In response to a question about commenter anonymity, Rosemary explained that it was standard NMFS protocol. Phil Miller added that it would be important to publish the final version of the response to comments along with the final plan.

Ed Bowen asked about which documents were included in the comment review process. He wanted to be clear to the public what documents these comments addressed. Rosemary recognized some confusion existed, but explained that a specific protocol was followed. The documents were noticed and comments were received and responded to.

Ed Bowen asked if all comments received an adequate response. He noted his concern was that NMFS “cut and paste” one group of comments and addressed them as a single comment. He expressed concern that the context of one comment could be confused with the context of another comment. Rosemary noted the NMFS team had painstakingly worked to respond to the content of all comments, and that while they had consolidated comments, she felt that responses to all comments were adequately covered.

Norm Schaaf thanked NMFS staff for their work. He said he saw a clear trail related to the rationale for how the Recovery Plan was developed and he appreciated it.

At the conclusion of the Steering Committee comments and discussion on this agenda item, Rosemary thanked the Steering Committee for their input, reminded everybody that the official public comment period had ended, and expressed her interest in incorporating Steering Committee recommended changes, focused on clarifications and corrections, after she and the writing team had time to consider each specific comment. She also reminded Steering Committee members that she would consider any additional thoughts provided that they would be submitted by February 9.

### **Northwest Fisheries Science Center Update**

Norma Jean Sands, from the NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center presented the two documents written by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT) – population identification and viability criteria. There were no comments on the population identification document which will now become a technical memo. Kit Rawson, a member of the TRT, then presented the November 2008 viability criteria report. He provided an explanation about what viability means: essentially that in the future the sockeye will be here. The TRT guidance for sockeye viability for 100 years in the future and the certainty is 95% to 99% of the time sockeye salmon will meet those viability criteria. He explained the guidance included four aspects of sockeye salmon viability: 1) abundance; (2) productivity; (3) spatial distribution; and (4) diversity.

Kit Rawson also noted that the TRT looked at past numerical data, and compared data at Lake Quinault for variability (Remember that because data did not exist for Lake Ozette on sockeye salmon that the TRT decided to use Lake Quinault as a comparable situation for sockeye salmon evaluation in Lake Ozette). He explained that fundamental differences exist between sockeye in Lake Ozette and Lake Quinault: one of those likely being that there is increased variability in Lake Ozette. He added that the viability criteria questions that the TRT sought to respond to were (1) what is the capacity for smolts and (2) what is the capacity for spawners? The TRT determined that minimum numbers for viability are around 30,000 for a 5% extinction probability and 100,000 for a 1% extinction probability. Kit provided an explanation of some report highlights and answered questions from the Steering Committee:

- Phil Miller asked about the time relationship of viability and how it would change given different growth rates. Kit said that this would be an interesting question to further explore, but that without more specific information he felt that variability probably would conflict with the linear growth rate that such a statistic would show.
- Pat Crain asked if there was any discussion about benchmarks. Kit responded because of the data uncertainty the report was more focused on the general population growth rate.
- Rosemary Furfey was asked by Bob Wheeler about how the viability criteria were included in the Proposed Recovery Plan. Rosemary responded that this information with the two viability numbers was incorporated into the Proposed Recovery Plan and in the comments.
- Ed Bowen asked for additional narrative in the “Keys to understanding” document describing the differences between Lake Quinault and Ozette and how the differences between the two sockeye populations were addressed. Rosemary indicated that she would look at this.
- Katie asked about the use of the term “incorporated by reference” versus “reference.” She noted that a legal difference existed.
- Pat Crain raised the issue of a need for a time/growth rate projection for Lake Ozette sockeye salmon and that this task should be included as an implementation task. Kit said it would be up to the Steering Committee, or another entity to determine when the goal should be realized. Pat Crain said that some interim goals should be stated and that the Recovery Plan should include goals, and/or interim goals.

- Norm Schaaf asked about the three tributaries that are currently being used for spawning and if there is an assumption on whether spawning can occur in the other tributaries. Kit responded that there can be spawning based on Mike Haggerty's analysis, but the capacity analysis just includes the three tributaries.
- In response to a question if the TRT, and now the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT), is part of NMFS, Norma Jean Sands answered that it was a separate entity even though it was organized by NMFS.

### **Steering Committee Discussion about Next Steps**

Bob Wheeler noted that one more meeting – likely in March – is left before the current NMFS funding runs out. NMFS has sponsored the Steering Committee meetings for several years now as it has been preparing the Recovery Plan and supporting documents. Now that the plan is moving into implementation, the group would need to create an approach to implementation and for the future of the Steering Committee. He presented a possible agenda for the next meeting, which would focus on implementation issues.

Bob Wheeler also commented that while implementation is not addressed in great detail within the Proposed Recovery Plan, it is an important next step if actions and ultimate recovery of Lake Ozette sockeye salmon are going to be successful. He suggested the idea that different groups/organizations/agencies/governments come to the next Steering Committee meeting to discuss their ideas and roles related to implementation, following a template of questions brought up in the document entitled, "implementation discussion guide." The suggested groups included:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| ▪ Governor's Salmon Recovery Office               | ▪ Makah Tribe                                |
| ▪ NMFS  | ▪ Quileute Tribe                             |
| ▪ Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership | ▪ Department of Ecology                      |
| ▪ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity                 | ▪ Department of Natural Resources            |
| ▪ Olympic National Park                           | ▪ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |

In addition to the proposed list of participants, Steering Committee members suggested additional speakers from:

- Representatives of the timber industry
- Private landowners – whether or not they speak will need to be determined later
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Non-landowner and non-agency participant

In response to the proposed approach, Ed Bowen suggested the adding one more question to the implementation discussion document: "*how will your agency respond to inquiries about the planning and implementation process?*"

The Steering Committee discussed holding a "next steps" conversation following the presentations to ask (1) "what does the Steering Committee want/need to do?" and (2) "who will convene this process and what is the agenda?"

The Steering Committee discussed several additional ideas and issues regarding the future of implementation, including continuing without funding, different models for consensus building, and seeking facilitation services.

Pat Crain noted that there could be a meeting or two without facilitation, but that the group needs a centerpiece organization for moving forward. With another situation –the Dungeness River Management Team - paid staff provided by the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe keeps the Management Team moving along. He concluded that he felt there was no way the Steering Committee would be here without the help of NMFS and the facilitation it provided.

*Funding Future Steering Committee and Recovery Plan Activities*

Nancy Allison remarked that it was clear that a passion exists amongst members of the Steering Committee and that there are many different opportunities to move forward. She added that the Lead Entity program is good at obtaining funding for such efforts. She added that an ad hoc group could also propose funding. Additional funding discussions included:

- Nancy Allison commented on her understanding that the Steering Committee had reservations about receiving support from the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP). Pat Crain said he was unaware that the Steering Committee had expressed its reservations about receiving support from WCSSP. Katie Krueger noted her concern, of the possibility of having someone in Pacific County being involved in management decisions for Ozette sockeye.
- Nancy Allison also indicated that while the WCSSP may not be desired for a leadership role, that funding could still flow through the organization.
- Katie volunteered to draft an interlocal agreement. She noted that multiple governments cannot share the funding without an interlocal agreement. The public does not need to participate in this agreement, but it's an option. She volunteered to draft the agreement.
- Pat Crain mentioned that the federal government was funding the Puget Sound Partnership, along with the state government for Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal summer chum. He said that implementation at Lake Ozette would not take same amount funding that the Puget Sound Partnership receives, but it will require similar types of funding from federal sources.

Pat Ness asked about how the state was funded, and would it be possible to acquire funding from the State. Phil Miller explained that (1) state funding to the lead entity was occurring; and (2) the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office was funding WCSSP. Additional comments, dialogue, and suggestions included:

- Katie Krueger presented the idea of forming a 501(c)3 and asked the Steering Committee members to consider this as one option.
- John Miller said the federal government could also be involved in the interlocal agreement.
- Phil said the WCSSP operates as a group with Grays Harbor County as the fiscal agent. WCSSP is under a state statute as a regional salmon recovery board. Phil noted that if a group wished to administer funds, then it would need to proceed through an organizing process. He offered to provide information about operational funding in his presentation at the next meeting.
- John Miller explained that for the WCSSP all four counties with real estate in play have developed an interlocal agreement where Grays Harbor County serves as the fiscal agent for the WCSSP.

In closing the meeting, Steering Committee members representing the different implementing perspectives agreed to present their perspectives, based on the implementation discussion guide, at the next meeting. In addition, other groups not in attendance will be contacted by Triangle for their participation in the final Steering Committee planning phase meeting.

Bob Wheeler thanked Steering Committee members and adjourned the meeting at roughly 3:00 p.m.

**Attachment 1 Attendance:**

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Carol Johnson	North Olympic Timber Action Committee	(360) 452-6645	<a href="mailto:notac@olympen.com">notac@olympen.com</a>
Coleman Byrnes	Citizen	(360) 428-1032	<a href="mailto:swampdog@olympen.com">swampdog@olympen.com</a>
David Levin	Resident Property Owner – Big River	(360) 963-2304	<a href="mailto:Dalev_11@yahoo.com">Dalev_11@yahoo.com</a>
Don Hamerquist	Citizen	(360) 963-2413	<a href="mailto:janeen@olympen.com">janeen@olympen.com</a>
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		<a href="mailto:rockypt@olympen.com">rockypt@olympen.com</a>
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 452-3325	<a href="mailto:harry@greencrow.com">harry@greencrow.com</a>
Herb Yancy	Green Crow	(360) 461-1337	<a href="mailto:herb@greencrow.com">herb@greencrow.com</a>
Jim Springer	WA DNR	(360) 374-2818	<a href="mailto:jamespringer@wa.dnr">jamespringer@wa.dnr</a>
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	<a href="mailto:jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us">jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us</a>
Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 963-2378	<a href="mailto:pysht@olympen.com">pysht@olympen.com</a>
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe – Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	<a href="mailto:Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org">Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org</a>
Kit Rawson	Tulalip Natural Resources		
Kurt Hughes	WDFW	(360) 249-1204	<a href="mailto:hughekmh@dfw.wa.gov">hughekmh@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Michael L. Blanton	WDFW	(360) 417-3301	<a href="mailto:BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov">BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Nancy Allison	Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	(360) 289-2499	<a href="mailto:nancya@wcssp.org">nancya@wcssp.org</a>
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-2367	<a href="mailto:nschaaf@merrilring.com">nschaaf@merrilring.com</a>
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3075	<a href="mailto:Patrick_crain@nps.com">Patrick_crain@nps.com</a>
Pat Ness	Landowner – Ozette	(360) 928-0266	<a href="mailto:bobandpattness@gmail.com">bobandpattness@gmail.com</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>
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>
Rob Snyder	The Lost Resort	(360) 963-2899	<a href="mailto:lostresort@hotmail.com">lostresort@hotmail.com</a>
Roy Morris	Stream Keepers	(360) 963-2442	<a href="mailto:able@olympen.com">able@olympen.com</a>
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	<a href="mailto:Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov">Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov</a>
Thom Hooper	NMFS	(360) 753-9453	<a href="mailto:thomas.hooper@noaa.gov">thomas.hooper@noaa.gov</a>
Tim Tynan	NMFS	(360) 753-9579	<a href="mailto:Tim.tynan@noaa.gov">Tim.tynan@noaa.gov</a>
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	<a href="mailto:Norma.sands@noaa.gov">Norma.sands@noaa.gov</a>
Michael Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	<a href="mailto:mhaggerty@olympen.com">mhaggerty@olympen.com</a>
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:bwheeler@triangleassociates.com">bwheeler@triangleassociates.com</a>
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:btrask@triangleassociates.com">btrask@triangleassociates.com</a>

**Draft Agenda**  
**Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting**

March 9, 2009  
10:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Sekiu Community Center

**Meeting Purpose:** to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the January 22, 2009 meeting, follow up and report back on subsequent changes to response to comments, hear research on Ozette Sockeye, hear about recovery plan implementation perspectives from different governmental representatives, and discuss next steps in Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon Recovery Planning.

<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 January 22, 2009 meeting notes</b>	- January 22, 2009 draft meeting summary
10:10 a.m.	<b>Research presentation by Aaron Brooks, Univ. of Washington</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Title: <i>A Hydrological Assessment of Sockeye Spawning Habitat on Lake Ozette, WA</i></li></ul>	
10:40 a.m.	<b>Proposed Recovery Plan: follow up and report back from January Steering Committee meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Update on action items/inquiries from the Steering Committee</li></ul>	
11:00 a.m.	<b>Implementation presentations &amp; Working Lunch (note: we will break for 15 minutes at a presentation transition point for lunch, break, etc.)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introduction (Bob Wheeler)</li><li>• Governor's Salmon Recovery Office</li><li>• North Pacific Coast Lead Entity</li><li>• Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership</li><li>• Clallam County</li><li>• Makah Nation</li><li>• Quileute Tribe</li><li>• Olympic National Park</li><li>• Washington Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife</li><li>• Washington Department of Natural Resources</li><li>• Washington Department of Ecology</li><li>• Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary</li><li>• Timber industry</li><li>• Ozette landowners [<i>if desired</i>]</li><li>• Interested citizens [<i>if desired</i>]</li><li>• U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</li><li>• National Marine Fisheries Service</li></ul>	- Implementation discussion questions
2:00 p.m.	<b>Steering Committee Discussion About Next Steps in Implementation</b>	
3:25 p.m.	<b>Next Steps</b>	
3:30 p.m.	<b>Adjourn</b>	

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

Monday, March 9, 2009  
10:00 a.m. – 3:30 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 January 22, 2009 meeting.
- Explore the next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan.

**Introductions, Agenda Review, and Announcements**

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.

*Discussion about NOAA Stimulus Funding*

Nancy Allison with the Washington Coast Sustainable Partnership provided an update on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) stimulus funding and the request for proposals that had come out. She asked if a subcommittee of Steering Committee members would work together on a submission for funding recovery projects from the NOAA stimulus funding. Rich Osborn, Roy Morris, Thom Hooper, Tim Tynan, Pat Crain, and Harry Bell volunteered to be part of a subcommittee organized by Nancy Allison to explore stimulus funding.

Additional discussion items on this topic included:

- It was noted that the NOAA stimulus funding is different from typical state salmon recovery funding.
- The Steering Committee discussed National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements regarding stimulus projects.
- A question was asked about if infrastructure replacement projects could be considered for the stimulus funding, and if a replacement culvert would count.
- A question was asked about stimulus funding and “shovel ready”. It was noted that “shovel ready” meant proposed projects need to be ready to start by August 1, 2009.
- Landowners would need to be notified for any projects. A request was made if all landowners could give their emails to Rich Osborn so they could be informed of North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (NPCLE) work.
- Bob Wheeler said that the Steering Committee email list is available for notifying property owners and others for projects, coordinating for stimulus funding, and other activities related to Lake Ozette sockeye salmon recovery.

**Meeting Summary Review**

The draft January 22, 2009 Steering Committee meeting summary was presented for review. The Steering Committee clarified and discussed content on page 9 regarding the second bullet that describes how funding can flow through the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP). If a group identified a funding source for Lake Ozette sockeye recovery the funding could pass through the WCSSP.

The Steering Committee also discussed jurisdictional concerns related to how members of the WCSSP who were not involved in Lake Ozette sockeye salmon issues do or do not relate to Ozette sockeye recovery efforts.

Following the conversation, no changes or edits were suggested and the summary was approved.

Bob Wheeler reviewed the clarifications made to the April 29, 2008 Steering Committee meeting summary, which was approved at the January 29, 2009 Steering Committee meeting.

**Research presentation by Aaron Brooks, University of Washington**

University of Washington graduate student Aaron Brooks gave a PowerPoint presentation about his thesis research, titled “A Hydrological Assessment of Sockeye Spawning Habitat on Lake Ozette, WA.” Study questions included:

- How much suitable habitat exists for beach spawning sockeye around Lake Ozette?
- Is the quality of suitable beach spawning habitat detrimental to the egg to fry emergence survival in the Lake spawning aggregations?

Sites selected for the research included: Allen’s Beach, Olsen’s Beach, Umbrella Beach, and two beaches that resemble good quality spawning habitat.

Sampling included: sediment core samples (particle size analysis), dissolved oxygen levels, and temperature.

Following his presentation the Steering Committee asked the following questions:

- *Question:* Would this be a good project to conduct over many years to gather trends? Aaron Brooks replied that a longer research project would be beneficial and would provide better information regarding spawning habitat.
- *Comment:* Are the salmon helping to turnover gravel on the beaches, or is upwelling doing that? It was noted that gravel compaction might reduce upwelling and reduce dissolved oxygen levels, and that conducting some restoration work might prove beneficial.
- *Comment:* Some of the areas chosen for research in Lake Ozette indicate through water temperatures and low dissolved oxygen that groundwater upwelling is occurring.
- *Question:* What about bias in sampling dissolved oxygen? Aaron Brooks replied that he has not looked at potential biases in his sampling methods.
- *Question:* Do lake levels affect dissolved oxygen levels? Aaron Brooks responded that different conditions and lake depths could affect dissolved oxygen levels.
- Aaron Brooks said he would work with Pat Crain to distribute the presentation, and his thesis. The annual National Park report produced will also include a summary of his thesis work and findings will be available to the public.
- Aaron Brooks said he would be happy to pass out his the email to landowners.

**Follow up and report back from January Steering Committee meeting**

Rosemary Furfey provided an update about follow up comments from the January 29, 2009 Steering Committee meeting. She explained that NMFS has been responsible for writing the voluntary and non-regulatory recovery plan, and noted NMFS’s commitment to implementing the recovery plan. She underscored that NMFS is here to stay. She also reiterated that there would be no recovery actions carried out without the full support of participants and private landowners. She noted that throughout Oregon and Washington private landowners are key to implementation in recovering endangered or threatened salmon.

Rosemary Furfey reported that the final edits to the proposed Recovery Plan were being completed. The compendium recovery plan documents will be sent out to the Steering Committee

when possible. Rosemary Furfey explained that she would like to post the documents on both the NMFS and Clallam County websites.

### **Implementation presentations & Working Lunch**

Bob Wheeler discussed implementation issues and what different groups would like to see in implementing the recovery plan. He walked the group through the questions posed to Steering Committee representatives who agreed to make a presentation to the Steering Committee on their role in implementation of the Lake Ozette sockeye salmon Recovery Plan. The speakers used the document titled, *Implementation discussion guide for presentations at Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting, March 2009* as a guide for their presentation. Please see Attachments 2a and 2b for the presentation content and discussions.

### **Steering Committee Discussion Regarding Implementation and Next Steps**

Steering Committee members agreed to continue the Committee's efforts and asked for an implementation meeting in June 2009. The Steering Committee further agreed to ask WCSSP and volunteer co-leads to work together to hold a meeting. Organizations that offered to help lead the continuation of the Steering Committee effort included:

- Olympic National Park
- WCSSP
- Clallam County
- NMFS
- A suggestion was made to also invite the tribes to be co-leads.

The Steering Committee discussed the uncertainty in funding future meetings, and the importance of continuing the momentum with the group.

It was noted that Olympic National Park did not have funding identified for this process, but that the Park was willing to help coordinate and seek funding opportunities where available.

### *Next Meeting Agenda Items*

Bob Wheeler outlined the potential agenda items, which included:

- Review the published Final Recovery Plan
- Coordination amongst entities and developing a communication plan
- Discuss Steering Committee structure and what to accomplish for the future
- Discuss what implementation of the Recovery Plan looks like
  - Discuss the steps toward developing the Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation plan
- Discuss other planning efforts/programs that impact recovery plan implementation
  - OCNMS Management Plan Review
  - Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan updates (and plans to possibly accelerate them)

### **Adjourn**

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

**Attachment 1: Meeting Participants**

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Al Voner	Olympic National Park	(360) 963-2725	<a href="mailto:Al_voner@nps.gov">Al_voner@nps.gov</a>
Aaron Brooks	University of Washington		<a href="mailto:acbrooks@u.washington.edu">acbrooks@u.washington.edu</a>
Cat Hawkins Hoffman	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3060	<a href="mailto:Cat_hoffman@nps.gov">Cat_hoffman@nps.gov</a>
Coleman Byrne	Citizen	(360) 428-1032	<a href="mailto:swampdog@olypen.com">swampdog@olypen.com</a>
Cynthia Rossi	Makah Tribe	(360) 645-3175	<a href="mailto:crossi@centurytel.net">crossi@centurytel.net</a>
David Low	WDFW	(360) 249-1216	<a href="mailto:lowdl@dfw.wa.gov">lowdl@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		<a href="mailto:rockypt@olypen.com">rockypt@olypen.com</a>
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 417-3643	<a href="mailto:harry@greencrow.com">harry@greencrow.com</a>
Jim Springer	WA DNR	(360) 374-2818	<a href="mailto:jamespringer@wa.dnr">jamespringer@wa.dnr</a>
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	<a href="mailto:jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us">jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us</a>
John Viada	WA DNR	(360) 374-2800	<a href="mailto:John.Viada@dnr.wa.gov">John.Viada@dnr.wa.gov</a>
Joseph Hinton	Makah Tribe	(36) 963-2784	<a href="mailto:mtchoko@olypen.com">mtchoko@olypen.com</a>
Joseph F. Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 460-3733	<a href="mailto:pysht@olypen.com">pysht@olypen.com</a>
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe –Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	<a href="mailto:Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org">Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org</a>
Liam Antrim	OCNMS	(360) 457-6622 x16	<a href="mailto:Liam.antrim@noaa.gov">Liam.antrim@noaa.gov</a>
Michael L. Blanton	WDFW	(360) 417-3301	<a href="mailto:BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov">BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	(360) 580-7838	<a href="mailto:milesb@wcssp.org">milesb@wcssp.org</a>
Nancy Allison	WCSSP	(360) 289-2499	<a href="mailto:nancya@wcssp.org">nancya@wcssp.org</a>
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-2367	<a href="mailto:nschaaf@merrilring.com">nschaaf@merrilring.com</a>
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	<a href="mailto:Patrick_crain@nps.com">Patrick_crain@nps.com</a>
Pat Ness	Landowner	(360) 928-0266	<a href="mailto:bobandpatness@gmail.com">bobandpatness@gmail.com</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>
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>
Rob Snyder	Lost Resort	(360) 963-2899	<a href="mailto:lostresort@hotmail.com">lostresort@hotmail.com</a>
Roy Morris	Stream Keeper	(360) 963-2442	<a href="mailto:able@olypen.com">able@olypen.com</a>
Megan Morlock	NMFS	(503) 231-2315	<a href="mailto:Megan.morlock@noaa.gov">Megan.morlock@noaa.gov</a>
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	<a href="mailto:Norma.sands@noaa.gov">Norma.sands@noaa.gov</a>
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	<a href="mailto:Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov">Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov</a>
Thom Hooper	NMFS	(360) 753-9453	<a href="mailto:thomas.hooper@noaa.gov">thomas.hooper@noaa.gov</a>
Tim Tynan	NMFS	(360) 753-9579	<a href="mailto:Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov">Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov</a>
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:bwheeler@triangleassociates.com">bwheeler@triangleassociates.com</a>
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:btrask@triangleassociates.com">btrask@triangleassociates.com</a>

**Draft Agenda**  
**Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting**  
Monday, June 29, 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 March 9, 2009 meeting, discuss the published Final Recovery Plan, discuss recovery plan implementation next steps, dialogue about steering committee structure, and receive updates on other relevant plans/programs.

<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 March 9, 2009 meeting notes</b>	- March 9, 2009 draft meeting summary
10:10 a.m.	<b>Final Recovery Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) update</li><li>• Steering Committee understandings of approved Recovery Plan and discussion</li></ul>	- FR notice, final Recovery Plan, and supporting documents.
10:30 a.m.	<b>Steering Committee Funding</b> – Nancy and Rosemary	
11:00 a.m.	<b>Implementation Plan/ RM&amp;E Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focus on Implementation and Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (RM&amp;E) Plans<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Introduction</li><li>○ Plan examples</li><li>○ Next steps and discussion (tasks for next meeting)</li></ul></li></ul>	- Implementation discussion responses (Summary attachments 2a & 2b) - Implementation and RM&E Plan examples
12:00 p.m.	<b>Lunch</b>	
12:30 p.m.	<b>Steering Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What does the Steering Committee want to do?</li><li>• What structure would be best for the Steering Committee?</li><li>• What decision making process does the Steering Committee want?</li><li>• How do we communicate?</li><li>• How do we obtain long term funding for the Steering Committee and implementation projects?</li><li>• Is there any narrowing of Steering Committee options or decisions; are there any assignments?</li></ul>	
1:45 p.m.	<b>Update on other planning efforts/programs that impact recovery plan implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sockeye monitoring report: Didson monitoring equipment and recent site visit</li><li>• OCNMS Management Plan Review</li><li>• Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) updates (and plans to possibly accelerate them)</li><li>• Clallam County update on stimulus money</li></ul>	
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, June 29, 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 March 9, 2009 meeting.
- Explore the next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan.
- Dialogue about steering committee structure, and receive updates on other relevant plans/programs.

**Introductions, Agenda Review, and Announcements**

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.

*Announcements and general dialogue*

Requests made by Steering Committee members included:

- that all information recorded on flipcharts be saved with the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP).
- to discuss how the Steering Committee can become more involved in the development of agenda topics. Bob Wheeler asked to have that discussion in the 12:30 p.m. Steering Committee meeting discussion.

The Steering Committee talked about other planning meetings that had occurred since the March 9, 2009 Steering Committee meeting. It was noted that there was one interim co-lead planning call, as well as a coordination meeting to discuss project proposals to acquire National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) stimulus funding. This meeting was requested and volunteers sought at the last Steering Committee meeting with the understanding that there was a very short timeframe to recommend projects.

*NOAA Stimulus Funding*

A report out was made regarding the group that met on the NOAA stimulus funding coordination meeting. Attendees at the NOAA stimulus funding coordination meeting included Tom Swanson, Norm Schaaf, Harry Bell, Tim Tynan, Ed Bowen, Pat Ness, Pat Crain, Rich Osborne, Mike Haggerty. Phil Miller and Nancy Allison worked together to develop a list of projects from the Coast Region, including Lake Ozette, to present to the Governor's office for Governor Gregoire's endorsement. Ultimately through the discussions the group proposed three projects affecting Lake Ozette to the Governor for her endorsement. After the Governor's review, one barrier project was forwarded on to NOAA. NOAA will be making the announcement at the end of June 2009.

In response to a question about what criteria were used to recommend projects for the stimulus funding, it was noted NOAA and Washington state used two different sets of criteria in the stimulus process. Washington state decided that monitoring projects would not meet its criteria for the Governor's endorsement because they did not meet the criteria for jobs creation. The state felt projects had to be "shovel ready" and able to generate jobs. Several Steering Committee members disagreed with the state's assumptions that monitoring projects do not create jobs.

Other discussion topics related to stimulus funding:

- A landowner made a recommendation to require additional evaluation for future research projects that hold the potential to have environmental impacts on private properties.

As part of its NOAA stimulus funding request the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) proposed a nearshore assessment that includes a small component affecting the Ozette Basin. This project was the only other request for NOAA stimulus dollars affecting the Ozette Basin.

One Steering Committee member noted that there appeared to be a large land purchase occurring in the Ozette Basin as well as some other issues that haven't been discussed by the Steering Committee to date. Steering Committee members spoke about the importance of communication, particularly how to communicate and share information.

*Other announcements:*

Phil Miller noted that as Recovery Plan implementation begins the Steering Committee needs to define itself and its relationship to other government entities and organizations. Because the Recovery Plan is voluntary, there are some government entities that have certain provisions under the Endangered Species Act, but for other parties (e.g., the Steering Committee) the Recovery Plan is a voluntary process.

Harry Bell announced that in August 2009 the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) would reconsider whether it can fund Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) projects (currently SRFB cannot fund RMAP projects). He encouraged Steering Committee members to support changing the SRFB's position to allow funding for RMAPs.

Pat Crain mentioned that in a recent restoration prioritization effort of National Park Service lands in Washington state, Umbrella Creek and Big River rose to the top of the prioritization list. He offered to bring the results of this report at an upcoming meeting.

A request was made for email notifications of any meetings held in addition to Steering Committee meetings.

### **Meeting Summary Review**

The draft March 9, 2009 Steering Committee meeting summary was presented for review. The Steering Committee clarified and discussed a section on page 3 of the summary related to Steering Committee next steps. It was noted that the text should be revised to refer to the co-lead group as "interim co-lead."

Regarding updates and news that had occurred since the March 9, 2009 meeting (but were not included in the meeting summary because the events transpired *after* the meeting) it was agreed that the June 29, 2009 meeting summary could reflect those updates.

A request was made to make a modification in Attachment 2a, page 6 regarding "Other interested citizens." A clarification will state, "other interested citizens are non-landowners from outside the watershed."

It was also noted that the list of participants who volunteered to meet to discuss NOAA stimulus funding should include John Miller and not Rich Osborne.

The Steering Committee discussed the protocol for privacy and how to notify local landowners about projects that could affect their properties in the Ozette Basin. Joe Hinton from the Makah Hatchery noted that he was interested in contacting the appropriate landowners when salmon-related projects could affect private properties. Pat Crain noted that he could help facilitate conversations and information between the Hatchery and local landowners. Pat Crain noted a gray area exists with respect to interactions between tribes and the Park on habitat issues (because NMFS is the agency that typically works with tribes on these issues). The hatchery is the grayest of those areas. There is a hope that it will be dealt with via the new memorandum of understanding that is currently under development between the Park and the tribes.

Following the conversation, no other changes or edits were suggested and the March 9, 2009 summary was approved.

### **Final Recovery Plan**

Rosemary Furfey noted that the Recovery Plan was adopted on May 29, 2009 and now the challenge will be to implement it. Prior to the Recovery Plan adoption there were two organizational changes made to the Recovery Plan based on review by NOAA Headquarters:

- A fuller description of the recovery strategy was requested by NOAA's national office. Some sentences were added in the first two pages of Chapter 6.
- A closer crosswalk between the recovery strategy and the actions was also requested. In Appendix D an additional column was added that referenced the recovery strategy for actions.
- Cost estimates were moved from the Appendix into Cost Estimate Chapter 9

Rosemary Furfey stressed that in the final revision process no new content was added to the Final Recovery Plan, but some content within the Plan was relocated. For example, Appendix E of the Recovery Plan, which included the information on Recovery Plan costs, is now located in Chapter 9. Appendix E was then deleted from the final Recovery Plan.

Rosemary Furfey noted that all public comments were responded to during the Recovery Plan comment process. In response to a question about the November 2007 landowner meeting summary, it was clarified that this summary document was not considered part of the public comment, but that the comments from landowners meeting helped shape content within the Recovery Plan. Pat Ness thanked the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for holding the landowner meeting and for writing the meeting summary. Additionally she requested that reviewers for future research proposals would consider the comments and concerns contained in the landowner summary, which is located as an appendix in the final Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon Recovery Plan.

### **Steering Committee Funding**

Triangle Associates staff Bob Wheeler and Blake Trask stepped out of the meeting for a Steering Committee-only discussion about funding efforts and facilitation support for future meetings.

### **Implementation Plan/RM&E Plan**

Rosemary Furfey provided an introduction about next steps in Recovery Plan implementation and outlined the upcoming two tasks:

- Writing an Implementation Plan. The timeline of the plan could vary. Rosemary Furfey said that she wanted to coordinate and get input from Steering Committee members.
- Writing a Research Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E) Plan, also known as an Adaptive Management Plan.

Rosemary Furfey explained that, consistent with the recovery plan, implementation is non-regulatory and voluntary. An implementation plan does not preclude, direct, or mandate any action, but it does help to indicate the high priority of the actions in species recovery. She noted that the goal for the next six months would be the completion of these two plans. Rosemary Furfey then underscored that the Implementation Plan, or schedule, translates the recovery actions into a table along with dates associated with the recovery actions. Typically, implementation schedules cover actions over a three- to six-year timeframe.

In response to a question about NMFS funding for the Recovery Plan, Rosemary Furfey explained that direct funding for implementation and restoration does not currently exist, but that she would be able to advocate and compete for funding opportunities as they arise.

Phil Miller noted that an implementation plan can serve to “build a bridge” to various funding sources as it provides more supplemental information to each action and how an action promotes species recovery. He also noted that the guiding purpose or ground rule for developing the Implementation Plan is its consistency with the Recovery Plan. The process of turning the model of the Implementation Plan into something “real” could be the role of the Steering Committee.

*Discussion on the Steering Committee’s role in developing the Implementation and RM&E Plans*

Phil Miller noted that the June 29, 2009 Steering Committee meeting represented the potential for the beginning of a new relationship between the Steering Committee and NMFS. He noted that in the old relationship the Steering Committee served as an advisory body. Now NMFS has the responsibility to get these two new plans done, but there is much more flexibility for how the Steering Committee wants to be involved. The Steering Committee if it develops a structure could influence NMFS.

The Steering Committee discussed the ownership of the Implementation Plan and whether or not the Steering Committee or NMFS would take the lead. It was noted that implementation plans (often referred to as implementation schedules), do not undergo the same formal notice procedures as a recovery plan. Rosemary Furfey added that one of the first tasks would be to determine if the Steering Committee wants to develop the Implementation Plan or if that task will be left to NMFS. Rosemary Furfey said that NMFS needs to have the two plans completed, and hopefully it can be supported and owned by the community and other entities. John Miller said it’s important for the Steering Committee to seek ownership – the process of how to get there is up for debate, but ownership is critical.

*Additional discussion topics on implementation and RM&E plans included:*

- The Steering Committee discussed the merits of how to develop the Implementation Plan. One suggestion provided was to set up a template Implementation Plan and then modify it based on this initial information.
- It was noted that an Implementation Plan containing a schedule of prioritized actions could offer a good visual to help community members around the Ozette Basin envision what next steps for the Recovery Plan would be.
- One suggestion was made for the Steering Committee to focus its energies on the Adaptive Management Plan since the Implementation Plan is an extension of the work of the just-completed Recovery Plan.
- Bob Wheeler noted that while actions are included in the Recovery Plan, priorities have not been assigned and that action prioritization could be part of the role of the Steering Committee.

- The Steering Committee discussed the sequencing of actions and how recovery actions could be implemented.
- It was noted that new research, monitoring information, or other changes affecting sockeye salmon would be included in the Adaptive Management Plan.

### **Steering Committee Discussion on Its Future Role**

Bob Wheeler presented the Steering Committee with a series of questions to consider as the group moved forward into implementation. The following information was recorded by Bob on flip charts at the meeting:

#### *What does the Steering Committee want to do?*

- To make decisions
  - Rank implementation actions in a high, medium, low format
- Design an implementation schedule/plan
- To own the Implementation and RM&E (Adaptive Management) Plans
- To be responsible for the Implementation s and RM&E Plans
- To create a new relationship with NMFS
- Monitor status of species, water quality, and other environmental factors
- Implementation actions
- Interact with public and work for community buy-in
- Report progress or lack of progress (a longer-term process for the Steering Committee)

A suggestion was made that the Steering Committee should focus on how to make decisions and to come to some agreement. One option discussed for ranking recovery action priorities over the next five years was to rank actions on a high, medium, and low scale.

#### *What structure would be best for the Steering Committee?*

- What are agreements on how we interact?
- Should work groups (technical, co-leads) be formed?
- Steering Committee is the interim Advisory Committee – open membership
- Membership
- Sub-groups may be necessary
  - With only four meetings currently planned it may be necessary to complete work with sub-groups in parallel to Steering Committee meetings.
  - Technical work group

In response to a suggestion that it would good to have a scientist to rely on for technical advice Norma Jean Sands from NMFS said that the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT) is able to support Lake Ozette sockeye recovery and to help out on technical needs as they arise. The RITT has this role for Puget Sound Chinook recovery and Hood Canal Summer Chum recovery, as well. In those other regions the RITT works to review implementation plans for consistency and helps to address recovery action sequencing, as well as working on other technical issues.

#### *What decision making process does the Steering Committee want?*

- Consensus
- Vote
- Who sits at the table to make decisions?

The Steering Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of using a consensus-based process for future Steering Committee decision-making.

Steering Committee members discussed who should make decisions for the Steering Committee and if the interim co-leads should be charged with taking the lead on decision making.

The Steering Committee discussed options for what to do with money allocated toward helping it work on the Recovery Plan.

#### *Narrowing of options*

- Consensus – defined group
- Governments make decisions with input from Steering Committee
- Majority rule – defined group
  - Write up of models (who will do that? Turn into a page of what will happen)

#### *How do we communicate?*

- Through a website - WCSSP
- Via public interactions
- Coordinate press coverage
- Facilitate landowner communications
- Develop Steering Committee and subgroup work

### **Updates**

#### *Lauren Bennett, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary*

Lauren Bennett of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary gave an update on the Sanctuary's Management Plan review process. She emphasized the need for future coordination and outlined the timeline for Management Plan Review.

Ed Bowen asked Lauren Bennett to stay apprised of Lake Ozette sockeye implementation activities and to include them into the Management Plan Review.

#### *John Viada, Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR)*

John Viada provided an update on RMAP implementation from the perspective of DNR:

- Current economic problems are reducing the ability of timber companies to fund RMAPs
- Hydraulic Project Approval fish windows, which limit the number of months that RMAP actions can occur, restricts how much work can be completed each year.
- The RMAP deadline for completing projects is 2015.
- In response to a question about whether the area where DNR defined blockage was analyzed via electrofishing or by default characteristics, John Viada responded that he thought it was default characteristics.
- Blake Trask offered to send the Steering Committee website links to the state lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and forest practices HCP. He will also follow up with John Viada to find out how to access RMAP information. He will report out to the Steering Committee about the RMAP information.
- The Steering Committee discussed acquiring additional funding through the SRFB.

In closing John Viada listed three items as key limiting factors in accelerating RMAPs: (1) the limited yearly HPA window; (2) the lack of money to complete RMAP projects due to the recession; and (3) the limited number of skilled workers able to complete the work.

#### *Cynthia Rossi, Makah Tribe*

Cynthia Rossi gave a presentation on the DIDSON (**D**ual-frequency **I**dentification **S**ONar) Monitoring System and compared it to the VCR system that is currently used at the outlet of

Ozette River. She explained the DIDSON system represents a new class of identification sonar, which gives near video quality images of what passes through the Ozette River.

Some key advantages and disadvantages for both systems include:

Advantages to DIDSON system:

- Un-interrupted migration path
- Possibly less predation

Disadvantages to DIDSON system:

- Technicians need a lot more training to identify sockeye from pike minnow
- More expensive

Advantages to the VCR system:

- Easy ID for technicians
- Cheaper cost

Disadvantages to the VCR system:

- Increases susceptibility to predation (due to the weir required)
- One thing that is lost with the DIDSON system is that fin clips cannot be read – the VCR system can. Despite this, it was noted that the VCR data is statistically invalid for the fin clip observations because the methods do not meet NOAA guidelines.

*John Miller, Clallam County*

John Miller reported that one of the recent agenda items for the Clallam County Commissioners' was public works projects. The County will soon issue bids to replace culverts. Additionally, the County would be interested in providing engineering services to augment potential funding for salmon recovery projects. Clallam County is hoping that there is a second stimulus funding opportunity. John Miller concluded that the County would need landowner help if a culvert project did proceed.

### **Steering Committee Discussion Regarding Implementation and Next Steps**

Steering Committee members agreed to have the interim co-lead group continue the Steering Committee's efforts and asked for an additional meeting in August 2009. Organizations that offered to serve as interim co-leads included:

- Clallam County
- Quileute Tribe
- Makah Tribe
- Olympic National Park
- NMFS
- WCSSP

Pat Crain agreed to host a conference call for the six interim co-leads to schedule logistics.

Bob Wheeler outlined the potential agenda items for the next meeting, which included:

- Implementation plan and priorities
- Steering committee organization
  - Defining decision making structure
  - Organization
  - What role will the Steering Committee play in sockeye salmon recovery
- Follow up on presentations if any?
- New presentations of research? New topics?
- Monitoring update: what is the status of sockeye, who is doing what monitoring?

### **Adjourn**

Bob Wheeler thanked the Steering Committee for its input and adjourned the meeting at 3:00 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>
Cynthia Rossi	Makah Tribe	(360) 645-3175	<a href="mailto:crossi@centurytel.net">crossi@centurytel.net</a>
David Low	WDFW	(360) 249-1216	<a href="mailto:lowdl@dfw.wa.gov">lowdl@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Don Hamerquist	WRIA 19		<a href="mailto:janeen@olypen.com">janeen@olypen.com</a>
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		<a href="mailto:rockypt@olypen.com">rockypt@olypen.com</a>
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 417-3643	<a href="mailto:harry@greencrow.com">harry@greencrow.com</a>
Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe		<a href="mailto:jeremygilman@centurytel.net">jeremygilman@centurytel.net</a>
Jim Palmquist	Ozette landowner		
John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	<a href="mailto:jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us">jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us</a>
John Viada	WA DNR	(360) 374-2800	<a href="mailto:John.Viada@dnr.wa.gov">John.Viada@dnr.wa.gov</a>
Joseph Hinton	Makah Tribe	(36) 963-2784	<a href="mailto:mtchoko@olypen.com">mtchoko@olypen.com</a>
Joseph F. Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 460-3733	<a href="mailto:pysht@olypen.com">pysht@olypen.com</a>
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe –Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	<a href="mailto:Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org">Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org</a>
Lauren Bennett	OCNMS	(360) 457-6622 x32	<a href="mailto:Lauren.Bennett@noaa.gov">Lauren.Bennett@noaa.gov</a>
Michael L. Blanton	WDFW	(360) 417-3301	<a href="mailto:BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov">BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Mike Haggerty		(360) 928-0124	<a href="mailto:mhaggerty@olypen.com">mhaggerty@olypen.com</a>
Nancy Allison	WCSSP	(360) 289-2499	<a href="mailto:nancya@wcssp.org">nancya@wcssp.org</a>
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	<a href="mailto:Patrick_crain@nps.com">Patrick_crain@nps.com</a>
Pat Ness	Landowner	(360) 928-0266	<a href="mailto:bobandpatness@gmail.com">bobandpatness@gmail.com</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>
Randi Knox	Ozette Landowner	(360) 769-8623	<a href="mailto:randi@kennerud.com">randi@kennerud.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>
Roy Morris	Stream Keeper	(360) 963-2442	<a href="mailto:able@olypen.com">able@olypen.com</a>
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	<a href="mailto:Norma.sands@noaa.gov">Norma.sands@noaa.gov</a>
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	<a href="mailto:Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov">Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov</a>
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:bwheeler@triangleassociates.com">bwheeler@triangleassociates.com</a>
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	<a href="mailto:btrask@triangleassociates.com">btrask@triangleassociates.com</a>

**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>