

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Sockeye Steering Committee Meeting

January 20, 2011, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To review final Implementation Plan; discuss next steps for the RM&E Plan; consider LOSC facilitation through June 2011; consider budget needs July 1, 2011 through June 30 2013, bring the Steering Committee up-to-date on activities since the last meeting; and where pertinent make decisions/recommendations.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	“Meet-and-Greet” (optional, for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, Approve WCSSP to chair this meeting	Draft Agenda
10:30 a.m.	Review and acceptance of October 6, 2010 meeting summary	October 6, 2010 Meeting Summary
10:45 a.m.	The Future of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee, Use of Available Facilitation Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from Steering Committee members on funding • Provide direction for proceeding with meeting facilitation 	Letter Request to RCO Support Letter from NMFS
11:15 a.m.	Review of Final Changes to Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review final changes to cover public input on specific projects • Discussion of joint approach for implementing priority actions 	Final Draft Three-Year Implementation Plan
12:00 noon	Break	
12:30 p.m.	2011-2013 Implementation Budget <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request from WCSSP for two year projection on cost of Recovery Plan Implementation • Capital and Non-Capital expenses • Sub-Committee Membership and Work Plan 	
1:15 p.m.	Presentation by Makah Tribe staff on Previous Year’s Sockeye Monitoring Data	
2:15 p.m.	Presentation by Green Crow staff on Results of Gravel Spawning Research Study	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
January 20, 2011; 10:15 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Decisions List:

- The Committee agreed by consensus to have Miles Batchelder, WCSSP Director, facilitate the meeting.
- The Committee made several editing suggestions to the draft October 6th meeting summary. After agreement to these suggested edits, the Committee approved the draft October 6, 2010 Steering Committee meeting summary by consensus.
- The Committee decided to use the facilitation funding recently awarded to WCSSP to hire Triangle Associates to facilitate two meetings between January and June 2011, and explore options for how to use remaining funds on public outreach and education.
- The Implementation Schedule table was reviewed and discussed. A motion to add language to the comment column was tabled. The Administrative Team was asked to discuss this topic and bring suggested language or next step suggestions to the next Committee meeting.
- The Committee agreed that it will meet again in March 2011 and future meeting agenda topics were identified. The Committee's Administrative Team will hold a conference call to identify potential meeting dates and draft a proposed agenda.

Meeting Purpose:

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- discuss the future of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee and use of available facilitation funding;
- review the draft Implementation Plan for National Marine Fisheries Service completion and discuss landowner contact;
- discuss the 2011-2013 implementation budget
- presentation from Makah Tribe staff on previous year's sockeye monitoring data
- presentation by Green Crow staff on results of gravel spawning research study
- where pertinent, make decisions/recommendations.

Introductions, Agenda Review, Announcements, and Meeting Summary Review

It was agreed by consensus that Miles Batchelder, Director of the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership, would facilitate the meeting. Miles welcomed the Steering Committee. Steering Committee members went around the table making introductions (see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees) and reviewed the draft agenda. There was one addition made to the agenda and that was to add "discussion of landowner contact" to the agenda item for the draft Implementation Plan.

- The Steering Committee then reviewed the draft October 6, 2010 meeting summary. There were several edits suggested for the draft meeting summary and the Committee agreed to make these edits (see edits to draft meeting summary). The summary as amended by these edits was then approved by consensus.

Announcements:

- The ONP representative announced that the proposed acoustic research study on otters by the Makah Tribe was not approved. He explained that the research permit request did not fall into the Park's standard research categories for a usual "no effect" determination. There are other options that may be explored such as government-to-government discussion. A Committee member asked for transparency during any government-to-government process.
- The NMFS representative described a process that is being coordinated by NMFS' Northwest Fisheries Science Center to standardize the limiting factor and threat terminology used in recovery plans in the northwest into consistent "ecological concerns" terminology. This will allow for consistency in terminology between recovery plans and linking them to the terms used in NMFS' Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund that funds state salmon recovery actions. This process does not change the limiting factor or threat terms used in the Recovery Plan.
- A Committee member announced that the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary has a draft Management Plan out for public review and public meetings will be held in the future. It was agreed that a Committee member will check on meeting dates. There was discussion about whether a letter should be written regarding this proposed draft showing the linkage with sockeye recovery.

The Future of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee, Use of Available Facilitation Funding

The WCSSP representative gave an update on the letter requesting SRFB funding for Steering Committee facilitation. The funding request letter from WCSSP and letter of support from NMFS were shared with the Committee. He announced that \$ 11,000 was allocated to WCSSP to fund meeting facilitation between January and June 2011.

One Committee member raised concern about the process of seeking funds and expressed that he wished the state's Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) had communicated with the Steering Committee prior to its decision, which he felt shows they are not engaged with the Committee. There was discussion about the options for how to use these funds and what facilitator to hire. The County staff person said they were not available before June to do this facilitation work. There was discussion about the pros and cons of hiring Triangle Associates. It was noted that Triangle Associates has expressed interest in continuing to provide facilitation services and is available to do this work right now. There was discussion about the short time frame for using these funds and the difficulty of finding a facilitator who is immediately available between now and June.

After discussion and proposal of a motion and seconding of the motion, the Committee decided to hire Triangle Associates to facilitate two meetings between January and June 2011. One Committee member went on record as opposed to this decision, but was willing to have the decision move forward.

Presentation of Makah Tribe Staff on Previous Year's Sockeye Monitoring Data

A Makah Tribe staff member presented sockeye monitoring data based on data collected at the weir on Umbrella Creek. In 2009, 6,325 sockeye returned to Umbrella Creek. Of these fish, 1,170 were hatchery fish and 5,155 were naturally spawned returning fish. He shared data from the smolt trap and discussed that it is difficult to operate the smolt trap during high water events. There was discussion about whether there have been any habitat changes in Umbrella Creek and

comment that fish use unexpected habitat to spawn in. There was discussion about lake levels and whether anyone was studying bank or beach erosion factors. No research is currently being conducted on this topic.

Review of Final Changes to the Draft Implementation Schedule

The NMFS representative reviewed the latest draft Implementation Schedule and described the language added to the table header and comment column based on recommendations from the last Steering Committee meeting.

There was a lengthy discussion about actions that may affect private property owners. Language was suggested by a Steering Committee member who owns property in the Ozette watershed to address her concerns about protection of her private property rights. Committee members expressed support for addressing landowner concerns and making sure that projects are not imposed on them. There was discussion about the Park's scenic easement agreement, and the landowner noted that any habitat alterations to private property would be in violation of the landowner's scenic easement agreement. There was further discussion about proposed legal language to be added to the table stating that permission is required from a landowner for access to private property. The point was made that the recovery plan is voluntary and that projects should be kept on the list, but it needs to be indicated that projects need prior landowner permission. There was a motion proposed to incorporate language about the need to consult with private landowners and that a binding contract is required with all affected private landowners before a project can be carried out. The ONP representative expressed concern that this language may not be consistent with NEPA processes which relates to the landowner where the project is being implemented, not all potentially affected landowners.

Based on this discussion and lack of agreement among Committee members, it was suggested and agreed to table this motion of the proposed language. The motion was tabled. It was agreed to have the Administrative Team discuss this issue at its next call and come back to the next Committee meeting with a suggested alternative. The ONP representative suggested he speak further with the landowner who proposed the language after the meeting to see if they can agree on new language. One Committee member cautioned that the term "affected" has legal implications and suggested we use the language from the Recovery Plan instead.

There was another suggestion to distinguish between a "master list" of actions from the Recovery Plan and a short list of projects the Committee can agree to carry out in the near term. In support of this idea, it was suggested that the Committee go back to the short list of projects that were identified at a previous meeting and for which there is Committee support.

Presentation by Green Crow Staff on Results of Gravel Spawning Research Study

Doug Martin (Martin Environmental) presented findings from a spawning gravel sediment monitoring project that he and Harry Bell (Green Crow) performed over the past three years in streams on the North Olympic Peninsula. The project evaluated the effectiveness of monitoring trends in spawning gravel quality using fine sediment intrusion traps (sedtrap) that were installed in typical spawning areas in Coal, Umbrella, Trout, Sekiu, and Big River. The sedtrap consist of a perforated 1-liter plastic cup that is filled with clean gravel. The traps were buried in spawning gravel for two to three months during the winter incubation period. After trap removal, fine sediment intrusion was measured by sieving contents (gravel and fines) by standard methods. Based on three years of monitoring, they concluded:

- The levels of fines varied annually.
- There were significant differences among stations; however the differences were generally consistent over time.
- Sedtrap method was capable of detecting small differences (means of 2% to 3%) in fines between stations.

In addition to these findings, they compared the sedtrap method to the standard McNeil core method and to a shovel sample by collecting McNeil and shovel samples from the same riffles where the sedtraps were buried. They found that:

- The sedtrap measure of fines is not significantly different from either the McNeil or shovel; therefore the sedtrap could be used as an alternative method to measure fines in spawning gravel that is comparable to the McNeil or shovel.
- The sedtrap can detect smaller differences in the level of fines than that measured by either the McNeil or shovel methods.

They also compared the Sedtrap findings from 2010 to spawning gravel data that was collected in 1992 at some of the same sample stations (data from study by McHenry et al. 1994). This comparison showed that fines were higher in 2010 at two stations in the Sekiu River, but levels were similar or lower at stations in Umbrella, Trout, and Big River.

Another set of sediment traps will be installed this winter.

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
Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	(360) 289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
Chris Byrnes	WDFW	(360) 417-1426	Chris.byrnes@dfw.wa.gov
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3071	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	(503) 231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Mike Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olympen.com
Doug Martin	Consultant		doug@martinenv.com
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe	(360) 374- 2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
Tim Tynan	NMFS		Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov
Joe Hinton	Makah Tribe		mtchoko@olympen.com
Pat Ness	FOLO & Landowner	(360) 928-0266	bobandpatness@gmail.com
Susan O'Brien	FOLO & Landowner	(360) 531-1795	Boneobrien1@gmail.com
Randy McIntosh	NMFS		Randy.mcintosh@noaa.gov
Joe Murray	Merrill Ring		jmurray@merrillring.com
Al Voner	Olympic National Park		Al_Voner@nps.gov
Roy Morris	Citizen		able@olympen.com
Ed Bowen	Ozette citizen		rockypt@olympen.com
Rich Osborne	NPCLE		rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
March 30, 2011, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To discuss next steps for the Implementation Plan; to recommend Steering Committee public involvement activities through June 2011; and to bring the Steering Committee up-to-date on activities since the January 20, 2011 meeting.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	“Meet-and-Greet” (optional, for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review agenda and materials • Approve January 20, 2011 meeting summary 	-Lake Ozette Steering committee Function + Structure - January 20, 2011 draft meeting summary
10:30 a.m.	Implementation Plan Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review status • Discuss Steering Committee goals • Options for moving forward • Steering Committee identifies recommendations and/or next steps. 	- Draft Implementation Schedule (Jan. 2011) - Attachments 2a and b (including priorities table) - Recovery Plan page 7-40
12:30 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Implementation Plan Discussion (cont.)	
2:00 p.m.	Lake Ozette Steering Committee Public Involvement Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee public involvement update • Discussion on public involvement for Steering Committee • Identify next steps/timeline for enacting efforts identified 	
2:40 p.m.	Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on actions to implement Recovery Plan • Identify topics for new presentations or discussion 	- Mercury Concentrations in Lake Ozette Sockeye - Schindler, et al, <i>Population diversity and the portfolio effect in an exploited species</i>
3:00 p.m.	Next Steps and June 1 Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of meeting action items • Review of next meeting potential topics 	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 Wednesday, March 30, 2011
 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
 Sekiu Community Hall

Meeting Decisions List:

- The Steering Committee provisionally approved the January 20, 2011 meeting summary (pending discussed changes) by consensus.
- The Committee agreed by consensus to support the short list of public outreach ideas, to form a subcommittee on public outreach, and to use the remaining GSRO funds for Triangle Associates to support this effort.
- The Committee reached provisional consensus to keep a Recovery Action Master List that will serve as a reference sheet (pending revisions to the comment column)
- The Committee agreed by consensus to develop a “Near-Term Project List.”

Meeting Purpose

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the January 20, 2011 meeting;
- Discuss Steering Committee public involvement needs and next steps;
- Discuss the options and next steps for the Implementation Plan; and
- Receive updates on other relevant plans/programs.

Introductions, Agenda Review, Announcements, and Meeting Summary Review

The meeting Facilitator, Blake Trask from Triangle Associates, welcomed the Steering Committee and reviewed the agenda and meeting materials. The Steering Committee went around the table making introductions (see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees). Members agreed to add land transfers to the agenda and to switch the times for discussions on the Implementation Plan and public involvement.

The Committee then reviewed the January 20 meeting summary. One member requested that the third bullet on the decision list include public outreach and education. Another member requested a revision to the statement on scenic easement agreements on page 3. A paragraph on Doug Martin’s presentation will be added to the summary, although concern was expressed that his presentation did not have accurate information. Following the discussion, the Steering Committee provisionally approved the January 20 meeting summary and agreed to allow Rich Osborne to audio record the meeting.

DNR-Green Crow Land Transfer

Committee members discussed the proposed land transfer between the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and Green Crow, which has been in the making since the 1980s. In Lake Ozette, the transfer would occur between DNR to Green Crow and would involve four parcels of land in Critical Habitats. The land proposed for transfer includes one section that straddles Big River and smaller sections on Gold Creek. Green Crow intends to log much of this land in the near future should the transfer be completed.

For Information about the proposed land transfer,

visit: www.dnr.wa.gov/BusinessPermits/Topics/LandExchanges/Pages/amp_exc_foothills_exchange.aspx

It was noted that the public meeting with DNR was sparsely attended and that DNR staff lacked detailed knowledge on the potential transfer. DNR has offered to meet with the Makah Tribal Council regarding the transfer. Several concerns were raised about the potential transfer. One member expressed concerns

about the impacts that logging would have on sockeye, as Green Crow would have less restrictive rules than DNR. For these reasons, it was said that the sockeye would be better off if DNR retains ownership. There was also concern about access to Makah sediment monitoring stations on these lands, which Green Crow has historically denied.

There was discussion on Washington Department of Natural Resources Habitat Conservation Plan and Washington State Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan and their relation to the Recovery Plan. One Committee member felt the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process should acknowledge concerns about the Recovery Plan, and individual members discussed following up on what would require SEPA review for this land transfer process.

The Steering Committee discussed how the proposed land transfer fits into the Steering Committee role. While the group felt it important to be informed on this issue, individual Steering Committee members will follow up on this issue outside of the Steering Committee.

Public Outreach

Interest was expressed in developing public outreach strategies for Steering Committee activities. The Facilitator reported that March 30 Steering Committee meeting announcements were placed in *Forks Forum*, *Peninsula Daily News*, and on the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) and Clallam County websites. Understanding that limited funding exists for public outreach, the Committee discussed a variety of different approaches for the remaining monies in the current contract with Triangle Associates.

Committee members discussed public outreach goals, which included: increasing public awareness and understanding of salmon recovery issues; engaging local schools and science teachers; promoting transparency; and defining strategies to best involve the public.

After brainstorming several possible approaches, the Steering Committee agreed by consensus to support the list of public outreach ideas, which included: posting advertisements/notices for the June meeting in the *Peninsula Daily News*, *Forks Form*, and on the WCSSP and Clallam County websites; having *Peninsula Daily News* write and publish an article about the sockeye salmon recovery process; developing a website archive of past Steering Committee meeting agendas and summaries; and forming a subcommittee on public outreach activities. Committee members also agreed to use the remaining Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) funds for Triangle Associates to support this effort.

The subcommittee will discuss engaging local schools/science teachers, developing content for a poster/flier to be displayed in Olympic National Park and potentially other locations (schools, businesses, etc.), and exploring opportunities for collaborating on sockeye-related articles with Peninsula College journalist students. The subcommittee will schedule a conference call to discuss their next steps. Triangle will coordinate posting advertisements for the next meeting, developing the website archive, and contacting a journalist at *Peninsula Daily News* regarding an article.

Additional public outreach ideas to potentially pursue in the future included: a press release; a roadshow PowerPoint (one for kids and one for adults); advertising Lake Ozette successes by profiling "how the fish are doing" and using numbers; advocating for support by having public meetings and creating a summary page to educate state/federal lawmakers.

Implementation Plan Discussion

The Facilitator and Administrative Team members provided background on the February Administrative Team conference call about potential agenda topics, including how to move forward on creating a plan for Recovery Plan implementation. One of the concerns expressed was that the current draft 3-year Implementation Schedule contained more recovery actions than what was viable in a 3-year plan.

Additional concerns noted were that the prioritization process and the resulting draft Implementation Schedule had seemingly diverged from the Lake Ozette Recovery Plan itself.

The North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (NPCLE) Coordinator added that the Lead Entity needs a short list of recovery action projects to propose for Salmon Recovery Fund Board funding. He explained that NPCLE's annual plan strategy was just finalized for this year, but that the Lead Entity proposal lacked a list of Lake Ozette-specific projects to move forward for funding. While a project can still be funded if it is not on the NPCLE priority list, it helps to be on it. Ideally, the Coordinator explained, this project list would be refined to around 5-6 projects annually in support of the SRFB funding process.

The Steering Committee then reviewed four options included in the table titled "Identification of Options for Lake Ozette Steering Committee." Option 1 would maintain the status quo and move forward with the Implementation Schedule prioritizing *all* actions contained in the Recovery Plan. Option 2 would deprioritize the Implementation Schedule by creating a "Master List" of recovery actions ordered numerically or alphabetically and create a separate recovery action list of specific Committee priorities. Option 3 included the option that the Committee would not recommend the Implementation Schedule but would recommend implementing a smaller list of recovery actions. Finally, Option 4 would be that the Steering Committee would not recommend either the Implementation Schedule or a separate recovery action list.

Recovery Action Master List

In order to focus the conversation, the Steering Committee chose to first focus on the larger list of recovery actions prior to addressing how it wanted to address potential short-term priorities. One Committee member expressed concern about missing funding opportunities for projects that are not chosen to be on a short-term list. Another Committee member requested that projects on the long-term list not be forgotten. Additionally, a Lake Ozette landowner requested that language from landowners and others be included in the comments column of the long-term list, identifying projects that are "highly controversial to landowners."

Following this discussion, the Steering Committee reached provisional consensus to create a Recovery Action Master List (13 people in agreement). The "Master List" will serve as a reference sheet that is not ordered by any prioritization method, but still includes all of the recovery actions contained within the approved Recovery Plan.

Consensus is provisional and will require a review of language to include in the comment column of the Recovery Action Master List. The NMFS and Olympic National Park representatives agreed to discuss this issue with a Lake Ozette landowner prior to the June meeting.

Near-Term Project List

Steering Committee members had a discussion on what to call the short-term list of projects that had previously been referred to as a 3-year priority list. They ultimately agreed by consensus to develop a document with the title, "Near-Term Project List." Committee members then discussed and decided on assignments (see assignment chart on the March 30 Decisions/Action Items document) for developing specific projects from the October 2010 list of priority recovery actions. More than one project may be developed from a recovery action, and a single project can draw on multiple recovery actions; the priority recovery actions will merely serve as a reference. It was acknowledged that while many additional projects on the Master List could be near-term projects, it was better to focus only on those projects that had a proponent to advocate for them.

Many felt that some of the prioritized recovery actions were too broad and that some of the specific details had been lost, so they would be fleshed out in the "Near-Term Project List." The near-term projects should identify what studies have been done so that it can serve as a reference and so science

guides policy and program development. It was also requested that language on the Makah Tribe's priorities be incorporated into the "Near-Term Project List." Additionally, Steering Committee members discussed the potential road relocation and road improvements to Hoko Road.

Steering Committee members agreed by consensus that the "Near-Term Project List" will contain the following: (1) an edited proviso noting that the Near-Term Project List will not preclude other recovery actions from being considered for funding; (2) specific projects that refer to one or more of the following recovery actions HRA-2, HRA-3, HRA-10, HRA-21, PRA-5, PRA-6, PRA-7, PEA-6, RME-5, RME-18; (3) language noting the need to conform to the annual schedule in support of the Lead Entity Group; (4) inclusion of Makah recovery action priorities. Steering Committee members were asked to contact Triangle Associates if there were any "red flag" projects.

Committee members also agreed to add reference to the potential road relocation and road improvements to Hoko Road on the "Near-Term Project List." NPCLE agreed to discuss this issue with a Lake Ozette citizen prior to the June meeting.

Each project that Committee members develop should include the five NPCLE requirements in preparation for next year's submittal—a title, the location of the project, the limiting factor being addressed, the action itself, and any stocks being affected (for example, sockeye). Individual Committee members will report back on their projects by early May. The Near-Term Project List will need to be refined to 5-6 projects annually in support of the NPCLE process, as they cannot fund all projects. Committee members agreed to further discuss the NPCLE process, its proposal schedule, and how it should be integrated in the long-term structure of Lake Ozette Steering Committee at the June 1 meeting.

Funding Opportunities

The Steering Committee discussed several funding opportunities. The North Pacific Coast Marine Resources Committee has a grant proposal deadline coming up for consideration of funding. Like NPCLE funding, it would require receiving funding through a tribe, county, non-profit entity etc., which is limiting for an ad hoc group, like the Steering Committee. One Committee member suggested that the nonprofit West End Betterment Society could potentially serve as an entity for acquiring grant monies.

Updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation

Steering Committee members provided the following updates on past and upcoming items.

- The facilitator noted that a decision made at the March 2010 Steering Committee meeting to modify the *Function + Structure* document (number 3, top of page 2) was not incorporated. The Administrative Team language on membership should note that a citizen at-large is appointed by Friends of Lake Ozette (FOLO). Committee members discussed whether an additional citizen position should be included but chose to defer on any decision.
- Additional Administrative Team discussion included that Committee members felt it important to keep a Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) presence. The Committee recommended that Rich Osborne should clarify if he is the official Clallam County representative, or not.
- Louise Johnson is the new Natural Resources Coordinator at Olympic National Park. She previously worked at Yosemite National Park and at Lassen Volcanic National Park. Feel free to contact her.
- Washington Coast Savers (a program of the Washington Clean Coast Alliance) is sponsoring a beach clean-up on April 23. Visit CoastSavers.org to sign up.
- The Marine Sanctuary Management Plan comment period closed. Some Committee members felt it important to express that the LOSC wants representation.
- The Salmon Recovery Conference is being held at Great Wolf Lodge in Grand Mound, WA on April 26 and 27.

- North Pacific Coast Marine Resources Committee, which is funded through WDFW, has funded a river otter scat study on sockeye for the second year in a row. Genetic analysis for fish bones is done on the otters' scat to determine what salmon species are being eaten by the otters. It will be published in September.
- There is a new organization called "Working Wild Olympics" that is questioning efforts to expand park boundaries. The group could potentially present issues for the Steering Committee to consider.

Next Steps

A request was made for DNR to give a 15-20 minute presentation at the beginning of the June 1 meeting on the proposed Green Crow/DNR land transfer. There was also a request to further discuss Dual Frequency Identification Sonar (DIDSON). The public outreach subcommittee will give an update on their public outreach and education efforts. Steering Committee members will report back on the status of the comment section of the Master List and discuss the status of the Near-Term Project List. The group will also discuss the long-term funding, structure, and operational functioning of the Steering Committee. Committee members will discuss how to package deliverables for the additional education/outreach funding from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). Finally, Triangle will report back on the status of additional public involvement activities.

Adjourn

The facilitator thanked the Steering Committee for its input and adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1	Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	360-289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
2	Harry Bell	Green Crow	360- 417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
3	Ed Bowen	Ozette Citizen		rockypt@olypen.com
4	Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	360-565-3075	Patrick_crain@nps.com
5	Larry Cooke	Makah Fisheries	360-640-1144	LarryCooke@centurytel.net
6	Dave Easton	Olympic National Park	360-963-2756	solcatdave@hotmail.com
7	Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	503-231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
8	Don Hamerquist	Citizen	360-913-2413	
9	Joe Hinton	Makah Tribe	360-963-2784	mtchoko@olypen.com
10	Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe	360-374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
11	Randy McIntosh	NMFS	360-534-9309	Randy.mcintosh@noaa.gov
12	Roy Morris	Sekiu Citizen	360-963-2442	able@olypen.com
13	Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	360-460-3733	jmurray@merrillring.com
14	Pat Ness	Ozette Landowner	360-928-0266	bobandpatness@gmail.com
15	Susan O'Brien	Landowner/citizen	360-531-1795	Boneobrien1@gmail.com
16	Rich Osborne	North Pacific Coast Lead Entity/Clallam County	360-417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
17	Dana Sarff	Makah Tribe Sustainable Resources	360-640-8125	Sarff.dana@centurytel.net
18	Sarah Saviskas	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	ssaviskas@triangleassociates.com
19	Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com
20	Al Voner	NPS	360-963-2725	Al_Voner@nps.gov

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
June 1, 2011, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To discuss next steps for the Implementation Plan; to recommend Steering Committee public involvement activities through June 2011; and to discuss next steps for Steering Committee activities.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	“Meet-and-Greet” (optional, for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review agenda and materials • Review March 30 meeting summary 	- June 1, 2011 draft agenda - March 30, 2011 draft meeting summary
10:30 a.m.	Action updates and planning efforts/programs for Recovery Plan implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on proposed Green Crow-DNR land transfer (Cathy L. Baker) • Update IHNV Pathogen Detection in the Lake Ozette Watershed (Joe Hinton) 	
11:15 a.m.	Review Master List comment column language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review comment additions • Next steps 	-Proposed comment column language
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
12:40 p.m.	Review near-term project list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review list and next steps • DIDSON update 	-Draft Near-Term Priority List
1:30 p.m.	Public Outreach Subcommittee update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Call Recap • Next Steps 	-Website Archive proposal -Draft Subcommittee Call Summary -Public Outreach Options
2:30 p.m.	Steering Committee next steps and long-term structure/operational functioning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPCLE activities and workload • Review updated <i>Function + Structure</i> document • Funding update from WCSSP & NMFS • Identify group needs and long-term funding • Next steps 	-Updated <i>Function + Structure</i> document
3:00 p.m.	Committee updates and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of meeting action items • Review of potential topics for next meeting 	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, June 1, 2011

10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Sekiu Community Hall

Meeting Decisions List:

- The Steering Committee approved the March 30, 2011 meeting summary by consensus.
- The Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) website will host the archive materials and the Clallam County website will link to the WCSSP website.
- Pending no “red flags” on the comment column language, the Committee agreed to remove the provisional acceptance status to the “Recovery Action Master List.”
- The Committee approved by consensus the name “Near-Term Project List.”
- The Committee approved by consensus to direct WCSSP funding in support of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee towards facilitation support by Triangle.

Meeting Purpose

The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Discuss next steps for the Implementation Plan
- Recommend Steering Committee public involvement activities through June 2011
- Discuss next steps for Steering Committee activities

Introductions, Agenda Review, and Meeting Summary Review

The meeting Facilitator, Blake Trask from Triangle Associates, welcomed the Steering Committee and reviewed the agenda and meeting materials. The Steering Committee went around the table making introductions (see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees).

The Committee then reviewed the March 30 meeting summary. There was a question about if the title “Near-Term Project List” should be reconsidered, but the Committee agreed to discuss this later in the meeting. The Steering Committee then approved the March 30 meeting summary.

Based on a question about the Dual-Frequency Identification Sonar (DIDSON), it was agreed that any DIDSON updates would be discussed later in the meeting in the context of the Near-Term Project List.

DNR-Green Grow Land Transfer Updates and Presentation

Before the presentation by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the Steering Committee followed up on outstanding action items from the March 30 meeting related to the land transfer. Olympic National Park (ONP) noted the land transfer is currently a low priority due to its involvement in the Wild Olympics campaign. While the land transfer is connected to the campaign, the Park is more focused on how the transfer would affect the Wild Olympics proposal than on how it would affect the Park itself.

There was a question if, as a result of the Wild Olympics campaign, private land owners within the designated areas, would be required to sell their properties to the government when they chose to sell their properties. ONP noted that the Park’s policy in the General Management Plan is that there needs to be a willing seller/buyer for the Park to acquire land. There was a suggestion to have proponents of the Wild Olympics campaign give a 30 minute presentation at the end of the next meeting.

Cathy Baker, the Land Transaction Coordinator at DNR in Forks, then gave a presentation on the proposed land transfer. The proposed Foothills Land Exchange involves four counties (Grays Harbor, Clallam, Jefferson, and Mason). DNR proposes to exchange up to 6,840 acres of state trust lands for approximately 9,351 acres of Green Crow private forest lands, the bulk of which are in Clallam County.

The purpose of the exchange is to consolidate trust ownership in the north Olympic Peninsula for long-term landscape sustainability, to improve operational efficiency for DNR and Green Crow, and to acquire forest land that is at the risk of conversion.

Land exchanges must meet several criteria. Each trust in a land exchange must give and receive the same value, or be “value for value”. Land exchanges must also maintain public forest land base, increase benefit to the trust, and abide by existing legislative authority (Revised Code of Washington (RCW)). While land transfers are usually exempt from the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), this transfer went through SEPA because the Olympic Discovery Trail is authorized for public use.

The next steps of the process are to hold public meetings; determine property values through an appraisal; hold public hearings and review public comments/testimony; balance the exchange and prepare an exchange agreement; present the agreement to the Board of Natural Resources for a decision; and if approved, exchange deeds. For more information on the land transfer, visit: http://www.dnr.wa.gov/BusinessPermits/Topics/LandExchanges/Pages/amp_exc_foothills_exchange.aspx.

Many concerns were expressed by some Committee members about the potential exchange. One concern for many Steering Committee members was that this exchange would result in a complete net loss of DNR lands in the Lake Ozette basin. It was suggested that DNR land in the basin is more valuable than Green Crow land because of its timber. There was also continued concern that the exchange would negatively impact sedimentation and sockeye recovery. Specifically, concerns were expressed that the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for Green Crow would hurt sockeye recovery. In response it was noted that the HCPs for both Green Crow and DNR are designed to protect the fish. Finally, there was concern about a lack of public outreach/hearings in the basin. Several Committee members thought a public hearing in Port Angeles was inadequate because of the distance required to travel for many Committee members.

The Steering Committee discussed the presentation in Port Angeles and the need for follow-up on comments and questions provided at the meeting. There was question as to who ultimately decides which properties are affected by the exchange and when that decision is made. It was noted that an upper-level team at DNR and Green Crow decide which properties are needed in the exchange to achieve an equal exchange value.

There was a request to have a follow-up presentation from DNR after the appraisals are completed that is more specific to the Lake Ozette watershed.

Update on IHNV Pathogen Detection

The Infectious Hematopoietic Necrosis Virus (IHNV) is a common virus found in Pacific Northwest sockeye. IHNV has only been detected in the Ozette watershed six times in the last 25 years and has only resulted in fish kills twice. However, IHNV was detected and resulted in fish kills this past season. The infection was caused by fish spawning in Stony Creek (a satellite to the Umbrella Creek hatchery), and while workers tried to transfer Stony Creek eggs that were believed to be virus-free, they had already been infected. Fish pathologists advised that all eggs from Stony Creek be destroyed, which is a standard means of controlling the virus.

At the end of the day, half of the total fish production was destroyed this year—all of the fish from Stony Creek and about half of the fish from Umbrella Creek. Fish from Umbrella Creek that had no sign of disease were released, and they are fairly confident that the released fish did not have the virus. The run size from Umbrella Creek is estimated at 6,000-7,000; however, counts were not very accurate last season

because of equipment problems and high water levels. The total hatchery release in the basin would have been roughly 300,000 had the fish not been infected. There is not a count on lake spawners.

It was noted that there are two different strains of IHNV, and the current strain is different than the one found in steelhead last year. There was a suggestion to use a new location on Stony Creek as an incubation site because over 70 fish per day were seen spawning there. There was also a question about the objective of hatchery work, and it was noted that the objective is to boost fish populations rather than house stock genetics.

Recovery Action Master List

After reviewing the comment column language for Recovery Actions HRA-14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 27, the Steering Committee provisionally accepted the *Recovery Action Master List*. A private property owner expressed that she is open to communication and cooperation regarding the recovery actions with comment language.

There was a request to add comment column language for additional recovery actions beyond Umbrella Creek. Specifically, several Committee members noted that HRA-11 should have similar language added. Concern was expressed that if too many recovery actions contain comment language, the weight of comments may be lost.

A small group of Steering Committee Members met during the lunch break to discuss additional comment column language. After lunch, this small group proposed that the following language be added to the HRA-29 and HRA-11 comment columns: “Lakeside property owners have requested notification and consultation to determine if any alterations will occur or affect those private properties by this restoration action.” One Committee member agreed to review the *Recovery Action Master List* and send out a final proposal, which may request this language be added to additional recovery actions.

Pending no “red flags” on comment column language, the provisional acceptance status to the *Recovery Action Master List* will be removed by June 30, 2011.

Near-Term Project List

Based on the decision at the March 30 meeting to develop the *Near-Term Project List*, Triangle compiled feedback and drafted a Near-Term Project List containing an outline of information to be included in this document. Originally, the Steering Committee thought that all the near-term projects would qualify for North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (NPCLE) funds, but a project must be focused on restoration efforts to qualify. The projects on the *Near-Term Project List* that do not fit the NPCLE template, such as scientific research projects, will likely require funding outside Salmon Recovery Funding (SRF) Board but can still be included in the work plan. It was noted that occasionally SRF Board funds can be used for scientific studies and assessments if that study is filling a “high priority” data gap, but this is not common. It was also noted that NPCLE funding is not available for monitoring a project’s success.

Some Steering Committee members agreed to continue to develop projects for the Near-Term Project List. A project does not necessarily need to link to a task ID. Projects still need to be developed on road relocation and Makah priorities. The Steering Committee would have to submit the *Near-Term Project List* to NPCLE by October 1, 2011 in order for projects to be considered for the next round of SRF Board funds. NPCLE liked the format of the document put together by Triangle, and Committee members suggested a few additions to the document, including information on the project status and potential funding sources. The Steering Committee approved by consensus to call this a *Near-Term Project List*.

There was a clarification that the Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) Type N Soft Rock Study project will not require outside funds but will be implemented internally. There was a suggestion to break down the RME-18 abstract into multiple projects, but it will remain a single project for the time being. The Committee discussed whether or not to keep predation projects (PRA-5 and 6) on the *Near-Term Project List*, as it would be hard for them to win the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service grant. The Committee decided to keep these projects on this list because other funding sources, such as the Marine Resources Committee (MRC), have previously funded predation studies. The Steering Committee can reevaluate if PRA-5 and 6 are still needed after the RME-5 project is developed.

The Steering Committee briefly discussed potential funding sources, but decided to focus on project development before addressing funding. In the upcoming months, Steering Committee members will explore which projects their organization, tribe, or other affiliation is interested in supporting and will also research potential funding sources for near-term projects. There was a request to think about how to incorporate citizen science, though it was noted that this often requires someone to monitor data and follow up with citizens.

Public Outreach Subcommittee Update

The Public Outreach Subcommittee reported out that it had held a conference call on May 23, 2011. The Subcommittee discussed the idea of replacing the currently dated kiosk at the Ozette Ranger Station and that it is a good time to do so because the Park is updating its displays. All content and formatting of the display would need to be officially approved by the Park, and tribes and Steering Committee members would be able to provide input on the language for the kiosk. Unfortunately, because of the requirements for producing a kiosk display it would cost approximately \$20,000-\$25,000. In the shorter term, the Subcommittee proposed developing a 1-2 page handout that could serve as a prototype for the kiosk content.

While producing the kiosk would be costly, one Committee member noted that three local kiosk projects, designed by kiosk specialists, were much cheaper than the production cost proposed by the Subcommittee. These projects also had additional cash donations from local tourism agencies, driving the cost down further. It was noted that content for the kiosk already exists in the Recovery Plan's executive summary, which would make the project less expensive. While these kiosks would not be able to be located in the Park, they could be located elsewhere including Clallam Ranch and other parks. A Steering Committee member agreed to inquire about the possibility of using these kiosk specialists.

The Steering Committee expressed satisfaction with the advertisements for the meeting and requested that future ads include links to the WCSSP and Clallam County websites. The Committee reviewed the website archive proposal and confirmed that only final versions of the materials would be included in the archive. The Steering Committee agreed that the WCSSP website will host the archive materials and that the Clallam County website will link to the WCSSP website. Triangle is waiting to contact journalists about writing an article on Lake Ozette sockeye until the Steering Committee has developed its message.

The Committee discussed the Citizen Science Fair event on June 11 in Forks, and some Lake Ozette sockeye materials (Executive Summary, Q&A handouts, tri-fold flier) will be available at the event. The Steering Committee briefly discussed other public outreach options listed on the document *Public Outreach Options*, but agreed to table these options until the handout is completed. It was also noted that the Park Service website should be updated.

Steering Committee Work Plan and Long-Term Structure

Moving forward, the Steering Committee needs to develop a work plan that is more long-term than planning on a meeting-to-meeting basis. The Steering Committee began discussing how it would be best to create a consolidated list of tasks and responsibilities. Some Committee members could take a lead in

developing project descriptions for the *Near-Term Project List* and others could take a lead in finding funding, implementing near-term recovery actions, or implementing Subcommittee public outreach efforts. The next step is to solidify what this work plan will look like.

The Steering Committee discussed how it should use its newly-approved \$20,000 biennium WCSSP budget. There was also potentially \$11,000 of NMFS funding to use for facilitation, but that was not confirmed at the time of this meeting. It was noted that there could be a significant drop in biennium funding next year depending on how much funding the State, so the work plan may need to be altered accordingly. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of saving some of the \$20,000 or spending it all in case the money evaporates. The Committee discussed the cost of rehiring Triangle Associates and approved by consensus to direct WCSSP funding in support of the Lake Ozette Steering Committee towards facilitation support by Triangle.

Updates and Next Steps

The Steering Committee discussed scheduling for the next meeting and agreed to meet in early October. The first and third Tuesday and Wednesday did not work for several Committee members.

It was noted that many projects on the *Recovery Action Master List* do not require funding and therefore some should potentially be added to the *Near-Term Project List*. These projects are easy wins. The Steering Committee will discuss this further at the next meeting.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1	Cathy Baker	WDNR	360-374-2860	Cathy.baker@dnr.wa.gov
2	Miles Batchelder	WCSSP	360-289-2499	milesb@wcssp.org
3	Harry Bell	Green Crow	360- 417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
4	Ed Bowen	Ozette Citizen		rockypt@olypen.com
5	John Burdick	Local Resident	360-963-2438	jckburdick@gmail.com
6	Karolyn Burdick	Local Resident	360-963-2438	jckburdick@gmail.com
7	Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	360-565-3075	Patrick_crain@nps.com
8	Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	503-231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
9	Jim Graves	Green Crow Intern	360- 417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
10	Don Hamerquist	Citizen	360-913-2413	
11	Jim Heuring	WDNR	360-374-2800	James.heuring@dnr.wa.gov
12	Joe Hinton	Makah Tribe	360-963-2784	mtchoko@olypen.com
13	Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe	360-374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
14	Randy McIntosh	NMFS	360-534-9309	Randy.mcintosh@noaa.gov
15	Roy Morris	Seki Citizen	360-963-2442	able@olypen.com
16	Pat Ness	Ozette Landowner	360-928-0266	bobandpatness@gmail.com
17	Susan O'Brien	Landowner/citizen	360-531-1795	Boneobrien1@gmail.com
18	Rich Osborne	North Pacific Coast Lead Entity/Clallam County	360-417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
19	Janeen Porter			janeen@olypen.com
20	Drew Rosanbalm	WDNR	360-374-2807	drew.rosanbalm@dnr.wa.gov
21	Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	360-452-2367	nschaaf@merrillring.com
22	Sarah Saviskas	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	ssaviskas@triangleassociates.com
23	Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com
24	Tim Tynan	NMFS	360-753-9579	tim.tynan@noaa.gov

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting
 October 26, 2011, 10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Location: Sekiu Community Center

Meeting Purpose: To discuss Near Term Projects, development of a Work Plan, Steering Committee public involvement activities, RMAP, and next steps for Steering Committee.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	“Meet & Greet” with snacks (optional, for those who can arrive early)	
10:15 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review agenda and materials • With added summary of D. Martin presentation: can January 20, 2011 meeting summary be posted on web archive? • Review June 1 meeting summary: changes, approval 	-Draft agenda -January meeting summary with Doug Martin overview -June 1, 2011 draft meeting summary
10:30 a.m.	Review & Updates on Near-Term Priority List <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leads give updates (DIDSON, etc.) • Fill in gaps on Near-Term Priority List • Funding: can we ID one or more projects (most fundable) that could benefit from LOSC “top-priority” status? • Should those not requiring funding go on Near-Term Priority List? 	-Near-Term Priority List -LOS Beach Spawner Monitoring Project description -Update on NPS, USGS, USFWS Funding
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
12:40 p.m.	Work Plan for Projects We Are Pursuing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review rough Work Plan template • Who maintains it? How many years out should it look? 	-Work Plan template
1:30 p.m.	Road Maintenance & Abandonment Plans (RMAP) Update from Jim Heuring (WA DNR) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation • Q and A 	
2:00 p.m.	Public Outreach Subcommittee Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference call recap • Action items & next steps 	- Handout: Screenshot of Website Archive -Subcommittee Conference Call summary -Draft outline of flyer
2:30 p.m.	Steering Committee Operational Functioning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPCLE activities and workload • WCSSP funding update and discussion 	
3:00 p.m.	Committee Updates and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcements • Summary of action items • Next meeting dates (January, March, June) & Agenda Topics 	
3:15 p.m.	Adjourn	

Meeting Summary
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, October 26, 2011

10:15 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Sekiu Community Hall

Meeting Decisions List:

- The Steering Committee approved January 20 and June 1, 2011 meeting summaries by consensus.
- The Steering Committee agreed to move the projects we're actively working on/pursuing funding for to the top of the Near-Term Priority List.
- The Steering Committee agreed to table the idea of a Work Plan and incorporate long-term goals and funding source deadlines into the Near-Term Priority List.
- The Steering Committee agreed to continue tracking follow-up action items in the Decisions/Actions document rather than in the Near-Term Priority List.
- The Steering Committee approved by consensus to propose that support for public outreach (instead of support for meeting facilitation) would be the target of any potential Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) budget cuts.
- The Committee identified topics for the next quarterly meeting to be held in January 2012.

Meeting Purposes:

- Receive updates on the status of Near-Term Projects
- Discuss the development of a Work Plan
- Discuss Steering Committee public outreach activities
- Receive an update on Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans (RMAP)
- Discuss next steps for the Steering Committee

Introductions, Agenda Review, and Meeting Summary Review

The meeting Facilitator, Chris Page from Triangle Associates, welcomed the Lake Ozette Steering Committee (LOSC or "The Committee") and introduced himself. He reviewed the agenda and meeting materials. LOSC members introduced themselves (*see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees*).

The Committee then reviewed the June 1 and January 20 meeting summary documents. The Steering Committee approved the two meeting summaries.

Near-Term Priority List

The Near-Term Priority List has been updated since the June 1 LOSC meeting, and project leads took turns introducing their projects. Refer to Near-Term Priority List for more information on projects.

Road 5800: The project lead explained that the work on Road 5096 is complete, and they are currently working on Road 5800 bridge/culvert installation. The design work is already complete.

Two Studies from Green Crow: The project lead gave an update on Green Crow projects and reviewed two handouts—the first listed Green Crow 2011 RMAP Accomplishments and projects scheduled for 2012; the second documented the preliminary results of Green Crow's Gravel Sediment Study in 2010. For the CMER Type N Soft Rock study, CMER hasn't made a decision on a site yet. One Committee member asked questions about the study, which will be answered via email. A report in the next few months will describe the analysis of designs and how samples were taken.

Dunham Creek: No updates were provided since the project lead was not present at the meeting.

NPS Projects near Lake Outlet listed under HRA-21: Olympic National Park (ONP) reviewed the projects on the Near-Term Priority List (potential projects in the Park's General Management Plan and in the Sockeye Recovery Plan). There is funding to remove the ranger house/cabin near the lake outlet, to occur next year (2012). The kiosk may be relocated because it floods each year, though, there is no guarantee that it will move. There was a request for ONP to reconsider its strategy on kiosk interpretive services.

Question: Will ONP's work allow the river to migrate or change? *ONP Response:* The work will not allow this. The rehab plan for the site includes re-vegetation to prevent migration and control erosion.

PRA-5 and -6 and RME-5

A Quileute representative noted that ONP and NOAA need to agree on what can be done before predation projects move forward. There will be a conference call to plan how to proceed with predation projects. First, we need information from the RME-5 project (an investigation of each Lake Ozette watershed predator type, a necessary first step for the Park to participate in any predation patrol). It is unclear if that will be a full investigation or if it will be an investigation on a species-by-species basis.

The two types of predators—fish and mammals—have different legal implications. River otters are not marine mammals so fall under jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, not NOAA. There was a suggestion for ONP to first investigate fish then river otters, and marine mammals as a long-term goal. A Committee member voiced concern about the numerous previous studies on this topic and noted inconsistencies in Park regulations (e.g. although the pike minnow is a native species, there are no limits on its harvest). In response, it was noted that even though the pike minnow is a native species, no one fishes it. There was a suggestion to have presentations on marine mammal predation issues and on otter predation at the next LOSC meeting. It was also suggested that the Steering Committee partner with the Puget Sound Partnership, as there is a lot of success on predation issues in Puget Sound.

Dual Frequency Identification Sonar (DIDSON)

Beach spawning ground studies have previously been conducted through snorkel surveys, scuba surveys, gill net sampling, etc., but high lake levels, water visibility and turbidity make these studies difficult. Sonar can be used to conduct spawning studies in these conditions. Through a small contract with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the project leads will test the DIDSON on Lake Ozette. During peak spawning, they will mount the DIDSON on a boat and slowly pass by spawning areas to see what kind of imagery is produced. They hope to do this in the first week of December. It will never be possible to produce exact fish counts, but in the long run, they could develop an "Index of Abundance" and a survey method that is repeatable. They have looked to Canada, Alaska, and Europe as places that have used DIDSON, but the technology has not been used very much at this point.

Next step is to write a proposal to seek more funding. The long-term goal is to purchase a DIDSON for Lake Ozette and conduct annual monitoring. The equipment is very expensive; a DIDSON costs \$75,000 at minimum, \$110,000 if it comes with software, and an additional \$90,000 for training. Possible funding sources include PACSURF or the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

DIDSONs have about an 8-year lifespan. The proposal will ask for the infrastructure and training of DIDSON specifically for sockeye salmon recovery. One Committee member suggested leasing a DIDSON, but since the Elwha Tribe's DIDSON will soon be used year-round, there is no one to lease from. In sum, the first step is to conduct field testing; the second step is to write a proposal for funding; and the third step is to acquire a DIDSON.

The Committee discussed funding DIDSON. Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funding (PCSRF) and SRF Board were mentioned. We can show direct benefit because DIDSON would help lessen the amount of predation. Since PCSRF money is distributed to governments, a governmental entity would have to take the lead. There was a suggestion to write a Local Economic Development (LED) Grant.

There was a discussion on who would operate the DIDSON, as there would need to be experienced staff to run the DIDSON and train others. Someone from the Makah Tribe could be trained in the technology. “Streamkeepers” does a monitoring program, and we may be able to get someone through there. Ed Bowen proposed a few other options.

The Committee felt it important to know how the Makah Tribe feels about pursuing an alternative to the existing weir. Makah suggested a trial period of two years for testing the DIDSON. There was a proposal to create a DIDSON subcommittee to discuss parameters for what DIDSON can be used for, pursue funding, talk to other users, etc. The Committee also discussed whether DIDSON should be considered a “high-priority” project. Several Committee members supported both ideas, but no decision will be made until the Makah representative discusses the ideas with her colleagues.

PEA-6: For public education and outreach projects, see below.

RME-18: ONP discussed an abstract on the effects of upwelling and fine sediment on egg survival of Lake Ozette sockeye. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) tools are available, such as a fiber optic cable with signal reflection that gives precise temperature estimates. This can be used this to look at existing spawning beaches and see if there are problems with upwelling on those beaches. It might be possible to get USGS interested in the project, since there is now a USGS contact at ONP.

Road relocation: Clallam County is updating the 6-year County Road Plan. Regarding relocating the Hoko-Ozette Road, the start and end mile posts need to be resent to the County road engineer who will then assess the relocation project for the County Road Plan. There was question as to whether this project should be on the Near-Term Priority List, as it takes a lot of energy to pursue projects and not all Committee members view it as a priority. Road Relocation will stay on the list for the time being.

Makah priorities: The project lead has identified priority task IDs but has not developed any specific projects yet. The Lead Entity will be revising its strategy for the upcoming year at a technical committee meeting in December or January; it was suggested that Makah develop a project and write a proposal that might qualify for SRF Board funds.

It was noted that it would be helpful to have data on sockeye use on Crooked Creek.

Work Plan

The Facilitator introduced the idea of a Work Plan to enable the Steering Committee to take more initiative and leadership moving forward and help outline funding sources and long-term LOSC milestones (1-year, 2-year, etc.). Several people felt most information can be tracked on the Near-Term Priority List and that a second document was not necessary. Others felt it would make more sense to develop a Work Plan once projects are funded, and it could be an attachment to the Near-Term Priority List.

It was also noted that it is hard to keep track of the funding source deadlines, and it would be helpful to develop a way to keep track of them. There was a suggestion to move the 3-4 projects that we are actively working on/pursuing funding for to the top of the Near-Term Priority List, and the Committee agreed to this. There was also a suggestion to write to Congress to raise attention on sockeye salmon recovery, but it is unclear if any action would be taken by Congress at this time.

The Steering Committee agreed to table the idea of a Work Plan and to incorporate long-term goals and funding source deadlines into the Near-Term Priority List.

RMAP and DNR Presentation

The Green Crow representative gave background on RMAP (road maintenance and abandonment), a 15-year agreement under which landowners would update all their roads to standards in the Forests and Fish

Agreement by 2016 with the option to apply for an extension until 2021. All landowners were required to inventory roads projects on fish passage and road drainage by 2006.

A Washington State Department of Natural Resources representative presented information on the status of RMAP. Each large land owner inventoried their roads for RMAP's five elements: fish barriers, sediment delivery issues, road instability, ground water interception, and unstable slopes (from side-casting). A color-coded map showed culverts that need to be fixed, repaired fish barriers, where protocol surveys are, sediment delivery problem areas, and roads (including non-drivable and semi-abandoned roads). The current map shows 125 fish passable areas in Ozette (37 were passable prior to 2000). The Merrill and Ring representative described his company's RMAP work to address issues on their 8,800 acres and 67 miles of roads in the Ozette watershed: they have upgraded 23 miles of road, opened 10 miles of fish habitat via opening 234 culverts and putting in eight bridges at a cost of roughly \$1M.

Question: Have we identified key watersheds and tributaries? What other objectives do you use to determine which will be done first?

- With a "worst first" principle in place, landowners can identify how they came up with their priorities.
- Decisions are also based on where we operate and funding.

The Committee held a substantial dialogue on sediment delivery and the monitoring and modeling used to gauge RMAP impacts. Concerns were raised about baseline information, quality of data and data collection methods, targets for sediment reduction, and the new roads being built that could negate the sediment reduction achieved via RMAP work. Others noted that sophisticated monitoring equipment is costly.

Comments: current practices are better than the old ones; sediment is a bigger overall problem for sockeye than fish passage. *Question:* the sediment outflow at crooked creek improving because of RMAP?

Public Outreach Subcommittee Update

A representative from the Public Outreach Subcommittee summarized the outcomes of the September 14, 2011 conference call. Discussion topics included:

- Kiosk in Olympic National Park: involves working with the Park and marine sanctuary. This makes it a long process to design the kiosk, which is also expensive. When the kiosk gets updated, it would include information on Lake Ozette sockeye.
- Seasonal Interpretive Position: Tribal Employment Rights Office is a potential source of funding. It serves the need of educating and employment.
- Publication of different articles: West End Natural Resource News (January 2012) and the Bugler (April 2012).
- Communications Plan: NOAA's staff lead for the LOSC met with Olympic Marine Sanctuary staff to brainstorm ideas and tools. They are doing a needs assessment on salmon in schools: where are the gaps, how to develop actions.
- Handout/Flyer—will engage the public on a basic level, get them to care, and let them know what action is being taken. NOAA staff drafted text for a tri-fold brochure for members to review, and several comments were made on the draft flyer. Common themes included:
 - Add colorful, eye-catching pictures and graphics
 - Need to hit more on "Why should I care?" and "How can I help?"
 - People forget that we eat them and we miss eating them.
 - They are important commercially, recreationally, culturally, and for food.
 - NEED TO SIMPLIFY.

Steering Committee Operational Functioning

The State Recreation and Conservation Office has asked WCSSP and all salmon recovery regions to conduct a 5% and 10% budget cutting exercise. Realistically, the cuts may be around 20%. These cuts may impact

WCSSP's \$20k funding for Lake Ozette Steering Committee facilitation. *Comment:* even if the \$20k is preserved, LOSC will get less funding for projects since SRF Board funding will decrease.

The Committee discussed where cuts should be made in case of funding reductions. The cost of Triangle facilitating one meeting is roughly \$5,000. Options discussed included (1) reducing/eliminating public outreach facilitation, and (2) keeping public outreach facilitation and internally facilitating one meeting. One Committee member strongly felt that meeting facilitation support was more important.

Updates and Next Steps

ONP is starting a Wilderness Management Plan on how to deal with wilderness. This will potentially affect land around Lake Ozette and LOSC actions because in the future, some coastal land may be considered wilderness land. The ONP General Management Plan identifies specific areas under consideration. There will be a number of public meetings to allow for comments. It is in the beginning phases, and there has not been scoping yet. Contact the public outreach officer with any questions.

Funding Deadlines

The next NPCLE meeting is November 15. They will conduct the first review of strategy in December. Please submit any Lake Ozette project proposals by the end of December or early January.

It was noted that the USFWS often has year-end money that they have to decide what to do with (\$150,000-\$200,000). The pot of money is shrinking in this economy, but it is worth looking into because the USFWS has a vested interest in the sockeye program (because it runs the hatchery) and we have a very specific need. LOSC can pull money from different funding sources and does not need only one funding source.

American Rivers seeks proposals for restoration project grants in partnership with the NOAA Restoration Center. This Partnership funds stream barrier removal projects. Grants for three distinct project phases: Construction, Engineering Design and Feasibility Analysis. Construction proposals may request a maximum of \$150,000. Proposals for Engineering Design or Feasibility Analysis phases may request a maximum of \$100,000. **Deadline: 12/9/2011.** To learn more, see www.americanrivers.org/NOAAGrants OR contact Kavita Heyn at 503.827.8648 or khey@americanrivers.org

The Whole Watershed Restoration Initiative (WWRI) is accepting proposals for community-based habitat restoration projects. Eligible restoration projects include, but are not limited to, the following activities: Breaching or removal of levees, Removal of dams or other large obstructions to rivers and streams, Culvert removal and culvert replacement with stream-bed simulation type culverts or bridges, Reestablishing river flow patterns, meanders, and channels that have been altered or obstructed, Restoring and enhancing connections between lakes, sloughs, side channels, the floodplain, and the main channel, Restoring riverbanks and floodplains, including riparian restoration, and Road decommissioning. Applicants may request between \$20,000 and \$100,000 in funding for projects within WWRI's *Priority Basins*. **Deadline: 12/15/2011.** To learn more, visit www.ecotrust.org/wwri OR contact Kate Carone at 503-467-0814 or wwri@ecotrust.org

The Steering Committee discussed scheduling for the next meeting and agreed to meet near the end of January 2012. Potential future meeting topics include:

- 1) Information on marine mammal predation issues and considerations
- 2) Presentation on latest findings of otter scat research and otter predation
- 3) Update report on status of field testing the DIDSON to survey beach spawners
- 4) Updates and report on implementation of Near-term Priority List projects
- 5) Report on outreach and education tasks and activities

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1	Harry Bell	Green Crow	360-417-3643	harry@greencrow.com
2	Ed Bowen	Ozette Citizen		rockypt@olypen.com
3	Larry Cooke	Makah Fisheries	360-640-1144	Larry.cooke@centurytel.net
4	Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	360-565-3075	Patrick_crain@nps.com
5	Megan Duffy	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office	360-902-2800	Megan.duffy@rco.wa.gov
6	Rosemary Furfey	NMFS	503-231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
7	Jim Gift	Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society's Conservation Committee	360-681-2989	jjgift@gmail.com
8	Mike Haggerty	Mhaggerty Consulting	360-928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
9	Don Hamerquist	Citizen	360-963-2413	
10	Jim Heuring	WDNR	360-374-2800	James.heuring@dnr.wa.gov
11	Kirt Hughes	WDFW—Fish Program	360-249-1204	Kirt.hughes@dfw.wa.gov
12	Randi Knox	Property Owner	360-769-8623	randi@kennerud.com
13	Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe	360-374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
14	Cathy Lear	Clallam County	360-417-2361	clear@co.clallam.wa.us
15	Randy McIntosh	NMFS	360-534-9309	Randy.mcintosh@noaa.gov
16	Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	360-460-3733	jmurray@merrillring.com
17	Susan O'Brien	FOLO and Citizen	360-531-1795	Boneobrien1@gmail.com
18	Rich Osborne	North Pacific Coast Lead Entity/Clallam County	360-417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
19	Kim Robertson	Makah Tribe	360-640-4811	kimberlyrobertson@centurylink.net
20	Dana Sarff	Makah Tribe	360-640-8125	Sarff.dana@centurytel.net
21	Sarah Saviskas	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	ssaviskas@triangleassociates.com
22	Chris Page	Triangle Associates	206-583-0655	cpage@triangleassociates.com
23	Tim Tynan	NOAA Fisheries	360-753-9579	tim.tynan@noaa.gov