

Draft Agenda
Lake Ozette Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, April 29, 2008
10:00 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Sekiu Community Hall
Sekiu, WA 98381

Meeting Purpose: to bring the Steering Committee up to date on activities since the December 14, 2007 meeting, discuss the proposed Recovery Plan, review the next steps for the Recovery Plan process during the 60-day public review period, discuss strategies for conducting the public hearings in Port Angeles and Sekiu, and explore the next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan.

Time	Item	Materials
10:00 a.m.	Introductions, Review Agenda, and Announcements	
10:10 a.m.	Review and Acceptance of Dec. 14, 2007 Meeting Notes	- Dec. 14, 2007 Meeting Summary (Email attachment)
10:15 a.m.	Status Updates and activities since the Dec. 14, 2007 Steering Committee meeting	- DNR Letter to Rosemary Furfey (Email attachment)
10:30 a.m.	Recovery Plan—Next Steps • Highlights of the proposed Recovery Plan noticed in the Federal Register • Steering Committee Questions, Comments & Dialogue • Next steps to finalize proposed Recovery Plan • 60-day public comment period • Finalizing the Recovery Plan	- Federal Register Notice (Internet address sent at time of publication; to be distributed at meeting) - Proposed Recovery Plan: CDs, hardcopy, Recovery Plan summary (To be distributed at meeting)
12:15 p.m.	Lunch	
12:45 p.m.	Northwest Fisheries Science Center Update • Peer Review Committee: who is a member and what are their tasks? • Status of the NOAA Regional Implementation Science Team (RIST) • Task for abundance planning targets	
1:15 p.m.	Public Workshops • Introduction • What is anticipated? • Agenda for May 15 & 17 Public Workshops • Steering Committee Comments and Feedback: Advance publicity strategies for the workshops	- Draft PPT slides (Distributed at meeting) - Draft public workshop agendas (To be distributed at meeting) - FAQ sheet (To be distributed at meeting)

- 2:00 p.m. **Implementation**
- What does the future bring?
 - Discussion with Rich Osborne, North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Coordinator
 - Input from Steering Committee
- 2:45 p.m. **Schedule/ Timeline**
- Review of updated Recovery Plan Timeline
- 3:00 p.m. **Next Steps and Meetings**
- 3:15 p.m. **Adjourn**
- Draft agenda for summer Steering Committee meeting (To be distributed at meeting)
- Updated Recovery Plan Timeline (To be distributed at meeting)

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

Tuesday, April 29, 2008
10:00 a.m. – 3:15 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 December 14, 2007 meeting,
- Discuss the proposed Recovery Plan and review the next steps for the Recovery Plan process during the 60-day public review period,
- Discuss strategies for conducting the public hearings in Port Angeles and Sekiu, and
- Explore the next steps and responsibilities for implementing the Recovery Plan.

Participants at the Meeting

The list of meeting participants is attached to this summary.

Action Items

- Rosemary Furfey and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) staff will distribute press releases and additional information in advance of the upcoming public workshops
- Steering Committee members agreed to follow up on removing older drafts that were posted on websites, such as North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity (NOPE)
- Rosemary will follow up and report back on the status of Peer Review Committee nominees
- Steering Committee members will provide their comments in written form during the 60-day public comment period
- Steering Committee members were encouraged to attend the May 15 and May 17 public workshops

Introductions, Agenda Review, and Meeting Summary Review

Bob Wheeler from Triangle Associates welcomed the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee went around the table and made introductions and reviewed the agenda.

Pat Crain gave an update about the new Olympic National Park superintendent who is transferring from Big Cypress National Preserve in Florida. Pat noted that Olympic National Park staff had minimal involvement in the hiring process, which was carried out by the regional National Park office. John Jarvis, who was in charge of the hiring for the regional National Park office, is aware of tribal issues and the new superintendent is likely experienced with tribal issues.

Rosemary Furfey provided some background about a letter sent from Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to her regarding some papers written by Don Hamerquist and Janeen Porter. Porter and Hamerquist's papers commented on the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and the DNR HCP. Don Hamerquist noted that he has submitted a public information request for the 2007 DNR Compliance Documents.

In response to a comment that the governor's office did not have a representative at the meeting, it was noted that Phil Miller has been coordinating closely with the NMFS recovery planning team and will be briefed on the meeting. Additionally, he will be attending the upcoming public workshops in Port Angeles and Sekiu.

The draft December 14, 2007 Steering Committee meeting summary was presented for review. No changes or edits were suggested and the summary was approved.

Recovery Plan—Next Steps

Rosemary thanked the writing team and acknowledged the input of the Steering Committee in the development of the Proposed Recovery Plan. The Steering Committee input, as well as that from Ozette landowners, contributed to the NMFS internal review process that occurred in January and February 2008.

The Steering Committee reviewed the updated recovery plan timeline and what had transpired since the December 14, 2007 Steering Committee meeting. The timeline items included recovery plan revisions, review of the revised Recovery Plan, and approval in NMFS regional and national offices leading up to signature and approval for the Proposed Recovery Plan's (including the Limiting Factors Analysis, or LFA, the Recovery Plan, and the two Technical Recovery Team, or TRT, documents on population identification and viability criteria) submission to the Federal Register and its publication on April 23, 2008. There is now a 60-day public comment period that ends on June 23, 2008.

Questions about responses to comments

In response to a question asked if the written records of NMFS's internal consultation for the recovery plan were available for public review it was noted that—excluding any content regarding attorney-client privilege—they were available for public review. They could be provided by request. In a related note, Rosemary Furfey noted that senior level NMFS managers who reviewed the Proposed Recovery Plan commented that they were very pleased with it.

An inquiry was made if written responses existed for the comments made on previous drafts of the recovery plan. It was noted that formal response had not occurred and that previous comments were taken and addressed while revising the plan, but they were considered “informal.” It was stated that NMFS is not required to provide any type of public involvement process prior to publication of a draft Recovery Plan. NMFS, in the case of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan did provide for public input but were not required to formally respond to any input until after the publication. Now that there is a Proposed Recovery Plan, NMFS is legally required to make formal responses to all comments during the 60-day process.

Clarification was requested as to what “substantive” meant since the Federal Register Notice states that NMFS written responses will only be made to “substantive comments.” Rosemary Furfey explained that as a general rule all comments relevant to sockeye recovery would be responded to. Thom Hooper clarified that the word “substantive” had no legal meaning and that it was intended to steer the public to provide focused comments. He noted the operative word was “consider” and that NMFS will consider all comments submitted.

The Steering Committee discussed identifying and removing older recovery plan drafts available on the internet, such as on the NOPE website. Mike Haggerty noted that additional websites host older recovery plan drafts. Rosemary suggested also adding updated information on those same sites. Katie Krueger noted that North Pacific Coast Lead Entity (NPCLE) does not have a website, but is working to set one up.

Review of key edits and additions to the Proposed Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan

Rosemary Furfey reviewed the highlights of the Federal Register notice and the Proposed Recovery Plan included in the handout titled, “Summary of Key Edits in the April 2008 Proposed Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Noticed for Public Review and Comment.” Three key things that must be in

an ESA recovery plan were highlighted in the Federal Register Notice: (1) recovery plans have to meet measurable objectives criteria, threats criteria, biological criteria, and delisting criteria; (2) site specific actions are also required; and (3) Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires an estimate of the time and cost to carry out recovery actions. It was clarified that any formal comments made at the Steering Committee must be also made in written form and submitted to NMFS during the 60-day public comment period.

Recovery Plan Summary – Keys to Understanding: Rosemary Furfey noted that the Proposed Recovery Plan Summary, titled “*Keys to Understanding*,” was intended to be accessible and short enough to convey the essential components of the recovery plan. The Summary was written to answer some fundamental questions that have been raised. It was also intended to be comprehensible by a member of the public who is unfamiliar with the process.

Steering Committee comments on the Summary included:

- The Vision Statement appears to indicate that the language is endorsed by Steering Committee. There was some disagreement as to if consensus on the language of the Vision Statement had in fact been reached at a previous meeting. Steering Committee members agreed to review meeting summaries to verify the position of the Steering Committee.
- A request was made to clarify what type of harvest was referred to in the Vision Statement.
- Related to abundance targets, a clarification was requested to note that these numbers have not been formally endorsed by the Steering Committee.
- With regards to a question about the need for a reference to a non-tribal subsistence fishery (page 13), it was noted that the state fisheries regulations do not apply to Lake Ozette. Residents in the Ozette basin have historically lived off the land and a request was made to make non-tribal subsistence fishing a goal of the recovery plan.
- The science related to large wood located on the shores of Lake Ozette on page 15 of the Summary was questioned. A question was posed about what wood was removed from the shoreline (if ever) and how does the removal of large wood on the shoreline affect hyporheic flow?
- A concern was noted that the Summary might overemphasize Steering Committee agreement and/or support with the Proposed Recovery Plan.

Section 3.3.1: Mike Haggerty noted that abundance numbers were modified from the previous range of 12,000 to 50,000 to new a range of 35,500 to 121,000 over a number of years (the time period has not yet been defined). Rosemary Furfey explained the NMFS Northwest Region office is asking the Recovery Implementation Technical Team, or RITT (formally known as the TRT), to come up with the mean abundance over x number of years. These abundance criteria would then be used for the delisting criteria. One suggestion was to extend the range to a couple of sockeye lifecycles (at least 8-12 years).

In response to a question about what parties would be included on a delisting committee, it was noted that a delisting committee would not be formed. The review process for delisting is analogous to the process for listing, but in reverse. In response to a question about what, if any, ESA delisted species had been made commercially viable it was noted that Puget Sound Coho were petitioned for listing and are now harvested and Oregon Coast Coho have also been commercially viable.

The Steering Committee discussed the relationship between the abundance criteria numbers and harvest levels. The NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Division, the tribes, and the state would be looking at harvest rates in the future. In response to a question about whether the number for delisting Lake Ozette sockeye is the number for a commercially viable harvest it was noted that harvest is a broad

sense goal for the recovery plan. In response to whether the figures assumed a one-to-one recruitment, it was noted that the 35,500 figure would represent sustainable recruitment without harvest and the 121,000 number represents the biological capacity of the Ozette system.

Bob Wheeler noted that delisting decisions had an earlier range and now the request has gone to the RITT to come out with a number that would be sustainable over a period of years. Next steps for the RITT appear to be: (1) to analyze what the abundance criteria numbers will be; (2) to consider how harvest would affect the abundance criteria; and (3) to provide more information about steps for delisting and how the tribes are involved.

Pages 3-9 and 3-11: A suggested correction for the verb tenses on pages 3-9 through 3-11 was requested. The suggested change would read, “have been” not, “are.”

Page 4-6: Language was revised in the Proposed Recovery Plan to broaden the geographic scope beyond Coal Creek. The table would be changed to better represent the hypothesis.

Section 7.2: Revisions were made to make this section more accessible to the reader. Rosemary Furfey noted that the process for large wood placement in the Ozette River was clarified by segmenting the river into two sections: a lower section (where Large Wood could be placed without affecting lake levels) and an upper section (where additional studies to analyze the impact of large wood upon water levels in Lake Ozette prior to *any* large wood placement).

Page 8-1: Two questions related to adaptive management in section 8.3 were asked by a Steering Committee member: (1) is the adaptive management process separate from the Recovery Plan?; and (2) what the commitment is to allow status trend and effectiveness monitoring on public land? It was noted that the Proposed Recovery Plan sets the approach, but a detailed research and monitoring and adaptive management program will be developed after the plan is completed and made final.

Section 8.2: In response to a question about how data will be correlated to see if there are gaps that need to be filled, it was noted that data gaps are summarized in section 8.2. As the document gets peer reviewed, more data gaps will be found.

Section 9 Diagram: Several comments by Steering Committee members were made regarding the organizational diagram:

- For the box representing DNR, a concern was raised that this agency isn’t the only venue for discussing HCPs. In the box it should say “compliance with the Forest Practices HCP.”
- There should also be a relationship with DNR and WDFW for adaptive management. Compliance with the HCP should be a part of the relationship with DNR. Additionally, DNR should participate in monitoring.
- Pat Crain observed that the Section 9 diagram omits language about the Park’s regulatory role.
- A clarification was requested to be uniform in the identification of parties as co-managers.

Section 9.2: Rosemary Furfey highlighted some of the changes made by NMFS economist Mark Plummer for cost estimates of the Proposed Recovery Plan.

Relationship of LFA of the Proposed Recovery Plan

The finalization process for the draft Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA) was discussed. It was reported that a suggestion by Elizabeth Gaar of NMFS was made for the Steering Committee to develop a process for finalizing it. Rosemary Furfey noted that the LFA is in draft form and that like the Proposed Recovery Plan, NMFS is seeking comments on the LFA during the 60-day comment period. The LFA, the two TRT documents and the Proposed Recovery Plan were posted on the Federal Register as a package of documents and they will be finalized together.

The Steering Committee also discussed clarifying the authorship, funding, and which groups were involved in the development of the LFA. The Steering Committee identified that: (1) a need exists to define the process for the public review and clarify the finalization process; (2) to look at the title page and to reevaluate if it is clear enough for readers to understand the LFA's authorship and origin; and (3) to have NMFS review and clarify what the LFA finalization process is.

Inquiries about the Steering Committee Process

The Steering Committee discussed its role in the recovery planning process, the ground rules, and decision-making. Some concerns were raised about reaching final decisions. In response to a request for the Steering Committee to be more consensus based, Bob Wheeler noted that the Steering Committee ground rules were consensus based. Additionally, it was noted that the Steering Committee has played a large role in developing the Proposed Recovery Plan and it was an advisory body in the recovery planning process. Likewise, when consensus was not needed, input from the Steering Committee would be available to NMFS for consideration on any final decisions.

Northwest Fisheries Science Center Update

Norma Jean Sands provided an update about the new Recovery Implementation Technical Team, or RITT. She noted that the Recovery Implementation Science Team, or RIST is not the same as the former Technical Recovery Team (TRT). The RIST will serve as an umbrella group over salmon recovery domains, and because the Puget Sound TRT worked well, it will continue under a new name as the Puget Sound RITT. RITTs are intended to provide technical information during the implementation phase of recovery. While most TRTs are phasing out, one TRT will continue to exist for Puget Sound steelhead as the recovery planning process is just beginning.

The members of the RITT are mostly holdovers from the Puget Sound TRT. During the 60-day comment period the RITT intends to review the package of Proposed Recovery Plan documents and will submit its comments. Developing a list of abundance targets was noted as a priority for the RITT.

Peer Review Committee Update

An update on the peer review team was provided. Right now three members are on the Committee. Generally, they will provide comments on the documents posted in the Federal Register Notice limited to their specific scientific expertise. The three peer review members are Andy Ritche from the University of Washington, Mark Shirell of NMFS, and Mike Crewson of The Tulalip Tribes. In response to a question if any of the reviewers suggested by private industry were invited, it was noted that the list of private industry nominees was forwarded to Mary Ruckleshaus who was in charge contacting the pool of nominees. Mike Haggerty observed that Mike Crewson and Andy Ritche might pose a conflict of interest in conducting an independent peer review, as they were both authors of the LFA. Additionally, it was noted that the members of the Jacobs panel might be a good addition to the peer review committee. Rosemary Furfey explained that she would follow up on and report back to the Steering Committee questions regarding the peer review process.

The Steering Committee followed up with questions about the Peer Review Committee selection process, such as:

- Who was mentioned?
- Who was contacted?
- Who was selected?
- Who was not selected and why?
- What about industry group representation?
- A conflict of interest may exist with Ritche and Crewson.

Public Workshops

Rosemary Furfey outlined the goals and objectives for the May 15 and 17 Public Workshops. They will provide the public an opportunity to make comments and to be educated about the components of the Proposed Recovery Plan. It was noted that the Steering Committee's input is important to make the workshops successful. The Steering Committee discussed the scheduling of the public workshops. Katie Krueger registered an official complaint about the public hearings because the tribes were not consulted when scheduling the public workshops.

The Steering Committee discussed the possibility of having a third public workshop in Seattle. A public workshop in Seattle had occurred when updating the Olympic National Park General Management Plan. The rationale for holding a workshop farther away was that the Proposed Recovery Plan will have national scale interest and such a meeting could facilitate input from this broader public. A question was asked if there would be an additional landowners meeting with NMFS or if the public workshops provided that forum. It was stated that the public hearings are intended to provide the forum for the landowner input.

The Steering Committee considered ways to provide access to and awareness about the Proposed Recovery Plan. Ideas included:

- Rosemary Furfey said she would develop a press release hopefully by the end of the week with the assistance of Brian Gorman who is the press contact at NMFS office in Seattle.
- It was suggested to provide information available in the local news, such as the *Peninsula Daily News*, before the meetings occur. An advance story would dissipate high emotions that people might have when they come to the meeting.
- Distributing the Proposed Recovery Plan:
 - Distributing hard copies to the regional branches of the North Olympic Library System.
 - Clallam County may be able to post it on their website and a hard copy could be available at the County courthouse.
 - WDFW might be able to post the plan and/or a link to the NMFS Lake Ozette page
 - Katie Krueger said the Quileute Nation website could post a link on their website.
 - Pat Crain said he would look into making it available at the Ozette Ranger Station and linking to the NMFS Lake Ozette page from Olympic National Park's website.
 - The University of Washington Olympic Natural Resource Center may be able to post it.
 - A suggestion was made to see if the link could be posted to the www.sekiu.com website.

Implementation

The next Steering Committee meeting was proposed for the summer or early fall. The two goals of the next meeting would be to review the NMFS responses to comments provided in the 60-day public comment period and the second goal would be to focus on implementation steps. Bob Wheeler reviewed the summer agenda, including who might come to talk about implementation issues.

NPCLE Update

Rich Osborne, North Pacific Coast Lead Entity Coordinator (NPCLE), provided an update on salmon recovery activities in the area. He explained that the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership is in the process of hiring an executive director. NPCLE continues to develop and work on project lists basin-by-basin. An excellent project list for the Quileute Basin was developed a few years ago and this year NPCLE is concentrating on the Hoh in order to present projects for Salmon Recovery Funding Board funding. Rich concluded by noting that the Proposed Recovery Plan is a

valuable document to use to solicit projects for funding. He reported that as of now the consensus of the NPCLE members was to not have NPCLE be the focal point for the recovery planning of Lake Ozette Sockeye.

Implementation of the Recovery Plan

In response to a question about the role of NMFS during implementation it was noted that NMFS intends to finalize the Proposed Recovery Plan and will have the responsibility to carry out actions that it has authority over. NMFS wants implementation to occur, but how that will proceed will be a future agenda item to consider. The Steering Committee discussed funding options and the need for multiple sources of funding. It was noted that it might be difficult for one entity to carry out implementation of the recovery plan.

Norm Schaaf noted the challenges to prioritizing implementation of the 121 proposed projects, especially since all of them are voluntary. Rich Osborn explained that NPCLE would work on implementation actions through its technical review team. Many different factors would be considered but the ESA listing for sockeye could help NPCLE acquire funding. Katie Krueger observed that the Makah Hatchery is not mentioned regarding implementation and they should be included when considering such questions. Ed Bowen inquired about what the decision making process will be for determining the implementation entity structure. He also noted that funding should be made available for citizen involvement.

John Miller reiterated that the Clallam County engineer would like to replace about a mile of road that has a salmon-blocking culvert. The road replacement would cost about \$1 million and funding would need to be acquired for the replacement. Additionally, he reported that the County recently received a letter from a lawyer who is representing property owners in the Ozette Basin.

Next Steering Committee Meeting in Summer/Fall 2008

Bob Wheeler thanked the Steering Committee, adjourned the meeting at 3:15 PM, and said he looked forward to seeing them at the upcoming public workshops and then again in Summer/Fall 2008 with a Steering Committee meeting.

Post-meeting LFA review

Following the close of the meeting Steering Committee members were invited to stay and to review the highlights of changes made to the LFA. The revision process included reviewing about 200 pages of comments, and two timber position papers. With that input, the writing team made revisions to the LFA accordingly.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Al Voner	Olympic National Park	(360) 963-2725	Al_voner@nps.gov
Cindy Paulin	Friends of Lake Ozette	(360) 457-5662	cynthiapaulin@hotmail.com
Coleman Byrne	Citizen	(360) 428-1032	swampdog@olypen.com
David Low	WDFW	(360) 249-1216	lowdl@dfw.wa.gov
Don Hamerquist	Citizen	(360) 963-2413	janeen@olypen.com
Ed Bowen	Landowner/ Ozette		rockypt@olypen.com
Harry Bell	Green Crow	(360) 452-3325	harry@greencrow.com
Ian MacIver	Rayonier	(360) 374-7226	ian.maciver@rayonier.com
Janeen Porter	Citizen		janeen@olypen.com
Jeremy Gilman	Makah Tribe	(360) 465-3155	jeremygilman@centurytel.net
Jim Springer	WA DNR	(360) 374-2818	jamesspringer@wa.dnr

John Miller	Clallam County	(360) 417-2323	jmiller@co.clallam.wa.us
Joseph Murray	Merrill & Ring	(360) 963-2378	pysht@olypen.com
Kathleen Ruland	Citizen	(360) 963-2350	Mumruland@aol.com
Katie Krueger	Quileute Tribe – Natural Resources	(360) 374-2265	Katie.krueger@quileutenation.org
Michael L. Blanton	WDFW	(360) 417-3301	BlantmlB@dfw.wa.gov
Mike Libera	Citizen	(360) 457-5662	mikelibera@crescomm.net
Norm Schaaf	Merrill & Ring	(360) 452-2367	nschaaf@merrilring.com
Pat Crain	Olympic National Park	(360) 565-3075	Patrick_crain@nps.com
Rich Osborne	Salmon Recovery Funding Board/ North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	(360) 417-2569	rosborne@co.clallam.wa.us
Roy Morris	Stream Keeper	(360) 963-2442	able@olypen.com
Rosemary Furfey	NFMS	(503)231-2149	Rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov
Thom Hooper	NMFS		thomashooper@noaa.gov
Norma Jean Sands	NMFS	(206) 860-5607	Norma.sands@noaa.gov
Michael Haggerty	Consultant	(360) 928-0124	mhaggerty@olypen.com
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bwheeler@triangleassociates.com
Blake Trask	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	btrask@triangleassociates.com